HOUSE OF ASSEMBLY

Wednesday 18 March 1992

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

PETITIONS: GAMING MACHINES

Petitions signed by 2 370 residents of South Australia requesting that the House urge the Government not to introduce gaming machines into hotels and clubs were presented by Messrs S.J. Baker, Becker, Brindal, M.J. Evans, Lewis and Wotton.

Petitions received.

PETITION: PUBLICATION STANDARDS

A petition signed by 290 residents of South Australia requesting that the House urge the Government to stop reduced standards being created by publishers of certain magazines and posters debasing women was presented by Mr Becker.

Petition received.

PETITION: RIVERLAND CITRUS FRUIT PRODUCTS

A petition signed by 745 residents of South Australia requesting that the House urge the Government to allow the sale of Riverland citrus fruit products from the roadside of Tapleys Hill Road, West Beach, was presented by Mr Becker.

Petition received.

PETITION: JUNIOR SPORTS POLICY

A petition signed by 15 residents of South Australia requesting that the House urge the Government to amend the junior sports policy to allow children greater access to competitive sport was presented by Mrs Kotz.

Petition received.

PETITION: DRUG OFFENDERS

A petition signed by 1 864 residents of South Australia requesting that the House urge the Government to increase penalties for drug offenders was presented by Mrs Kotz.

Petition received.

PETITION: CITIZENS INITIATED REFERENDA

A petition signed by 410 residents of South Australia requesting that the House urge the Government to hold a referendum to implement all aspects of citizens initiated referenda was presented by Mr Lewis.

Petition received.

QUESTIONS

The SPEAKER: I direct that the following written answer to a question without notice be distributed and printed in *Hansard.*

DUMPING OF CANNED TOMATOES

In reply to **Hon. P.B. ARNOLD (Chaffey)** 11 February.

The Hon. LYNN ARNOLD: In a notice dated 5 December 1991, the Australian Customs Service made a preliminary finding that there are sufficient grounds for the publication of:

- a countervailing duty notice in respect of canned tomato exports from Italy, Spain, Thailand; and
- a dumping duty notice in respect of canned tomato exports from Italy, Spain, Thailand and the People's Republic of China.

On the same day, Senator John Button, Minister for Industry, Technology and Commerce, announced a speeding up in the time allowed the Australian Customs Service to investigate alleged dumping by cutting from 35 days to 25 days the time for that service to make its initial consideration of a complaint of alleged dumping on the Australian market (except in unusually difficult cases). Customs would then have a further 100 days to make a preliminary funding. After this, the Anti-dumping Authority would have 120 days to make a final finding. Senator Button claimed this would give Australia one of the speediest systems for handling complaints in the world—faster than the United States, Canada and the European Community.

Even so, the South Australian Government is still concerned at the possibility of injury to domestic producers and processors and their employees as a result of the time required to investigate allegations of dumping. I am advised that Berrivale Orchards Ltd has not canned any tomatoes this season, resulting in 5 000 tonnes of mainly Victorian tomatoes not being canned. Riverland tomatoes grown under contract for juicing are being processed in similar quantities to the two previous seasons. Around 100 seasonal jobs are affected in the Riverland by the temporary closure of the canning line. I have written to my Federal counterpart, Hon. S. Crean, Minister for Primary Industries and Energy, informing him of South Australia's concern and, by way of example, highlighting the apparent injury to domestic tomato producers and processors as a consequence of dumping of canned tomatoes by Italy, Spain, Thailand and the People's Republic of China.

QUESTION TIME

STATE BANK

Mr D.S. BAKER (Leader of the Opposition): My question is directed to the Treasurer. How much of the $178 million written off by the State Bank because of the termination of financing arrangements and recognition of increased tax liabilities relates to car leasing and horse leasing, and are other leasing losses likely?

The Hon. T.H. Hemmings interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order!

Mr D.S. BAKER: Obviously, the member for Napier needs an explanation. Luxury car leasing by the State Bank Group through Beneficial Finance was the subject of a raid by the Federal Police and the Australian Taxation Office on 20 March last year. The State Bank Group had also been heavily involved in bloodstock leasing, incurring large losses through the Pegasus group of companies. The total losses from these car and horse leasing ventures, the progress of legal proceedings and the likely cost of the tax scams involved have still not been made public despite the Treasurer's undertaking to the House to do so.

The Hon. J.C. BANNON: I will take that question on notice and see what information can be provided.

BY-ELECTIONS

Mr QUIRKE (Playford): Will the Deputy Premier say how much the by-elections for the seats of Kavel and Alexandra will cost the community of South Australia?

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order!

The Hon. H. Allison interjecting:

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

Mr QUIRKE: Media reports indicate that the by-elections will cost about $70 000 each. I understand that this figure is based on the most recent example of the Custance by-election.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order! The member for Playford will resume his seat. The Chair cannot hear the question. I will ask the member for Playford to repeat the question. If the noise continues, action will be taken. Will the member for Playford please repeat the question.

Mr QUIRKE: I understand that this figure is based on the most recent cost of a State by-election in Custance held in June 1990.

The Hon. D.J. HOPGOOD: The reference to the Custance by-election is perhaps apposite, because it was the means whereby Senator Olsen was replaced in this House by the current member. One would well remember the serve that Senator Olsen, as Leader of the Opposition, gave the Labor Party when Chris Hurford vacated the seat of Adelaide and there had to be a by-election. So, sauce for the goose is sauce for the gander.

I have somewhat of an apology to make because when I heard that there was to be a by-election for the seat of Alexandra and that there may be a by-election for the seat of Kavel—and I think that is as much as we can put on it still, as I find it hard to believe that the current member will step down; I will believe it when he does and so will he—I put out a statement in which I said that the by-elections planned for May, if they took place, would cost the South Australian community at least $140 000.

I was wrong, and I apologise for that. As is my wont, I was far too modest. I have now obtained information from the State Electoral Commissioner, who tells me that the cost of the two by-elections will be $200 000—not $140 000. The cost is broken down into $40 000 for Kavel, if the by-election occurs; Alexandra, $35 000; advertising and mail-out, $90 000; and miscellaneous, $34 000. So, these machinations over the Liberal Party leadership will cost the community of South Australia $270 000 in 18 months—and Senator Olsen had the gall to criticise the Labor Party over the Adelaide by-election!

Of course, the interesting point arises that Senator Olsen has a number of hurdles to jump. First, he has to get preselection; then he has to win the by-election; and then he has to win the leadership. What if he does not win the leadership? Will it be back to Canberra? Will there be a further by-election? What will that cost?

LUXURY CAR LEASES

Mr S.J. BAKER (Deputy Leader of the Opposition): We will now have some substance. My question is directed to the Treasurer. Is the State Bank Group—

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order!

Mr S.J. BAKER: —using the East End Market Company for writing luxury car leases? Is the Treasurer aware that this scheme may be injecting funds into the East End Market Company to cover up the substantial losses on the East End Market redevelopment project? The State Bank Group has paid about $50 million for the East End Market site in a redevelopment project—

Members interjecting:

Mr S.J. BAKER: Just listen for a change.

The SPEAKER: Order!

Mr S.J. BAKER: —which was supported by the Treasurer, who described it last March as 'exciting and visionary', but the site is now worth only $20 million. It has been put to me that, rather than take the loss on the project, the Treasurer and the bank may be concealing the extent of the loss by using revenue from luxury car leases as an income item for the East End Market company. The litigation and tax losses involved in the group's previous car leasing schemes are unresolved. The concern about this new scheme is heightened by a company search which reveals that the auditor of the East End Market Company either resigned or was removed earlier this year.

The Hon. J.C. BANNON: I will have to take the detail of that question on notice, as the Deputy Leader would have expected me to do. Let me comment on the East End Market. It is certainly true that Beneficial Finance did acquire that site and was to be part of a major development, which would have been extremely exciting, as I said at the time. I challenge any member opposite to say whether or not that was the case.

As is known, Beneficial Finance and its operations have been absorbed into the State Bank as a result of restructuring, and the actual disposal of that land, the future of that project, is under active consideration. It is an important landmark area. The city council, the State Government—indeed our whole community—should be interested in the possibilities and potential of that great site, and that is being looked at at the moment. But the Deputy Leader himself indicates the problems that are involved in such projects in this country, not just in South Australia and, indeed, in some other places: there has been a dramatic reduction in property values, as he points out. Any organisation which has been involved in property development, which holds property, has experienced this massive loss in the value of its assets. Of course, that is in the current recessionary climate. Whether and to what extent there will be a restoration—and I think the question is not whether but to what extent—we cannot predict at this time. Certainly, the signs of growth in the economy, as revealed by the figures yesterday, the potential of things such as the One Nation statement and the cycle that is going through, depending on what is happening in international circumstances—and one must be concerned about the situation in Japan—will see Australia's economy bouncing back and, with that bounce-back, will come a bounce-back in property values. All those things that at this point in time and in this market the Opposition is using to castigate institutions will turn around very markedly indeed. That will be good news for jobs, good news for South Australians and very bad news for the Opposition.

HOUSING TRUST DEVELOPMENT

Mr De LAINE (Price): Will the Minister of Housing and Construction advise the House what the South Australian Housing Trust has done and is doing to assist in the development of housing in the City of Adelaide? It is well recognised and supported by the city council that Adelaide needs to develop more housing suitable to a permanent residential population and, in particular, to accommodate all forms of residential tenure.

The Hon. M.K. MAYES: I thank the honourable member for his question and his interest in this housing issue because, during his time in this Parliament, he has indicated that he is a keen supporter of the continuation of public housing policies, particularly in the inner city areas. It goes without saying that, from the studies we have to date, particularly

the study that the central planning exercise is undertaking at the moment, we will see a careful audit conducted by the 2020 Vision exercise on the cost comparisons between development in the outer greenfields area versus inner city infill or urban consolidation.

The City of Adelaide presents a unique opportunity for the housing authority to continue the growth of population within the city. All members would have seen the figures presented by the city council and various public housing spokespersons with regard to the city population at the turn of the century and how it has dropped over the past 50 or so years. We want to see a rejuvenation of the city area.

The Housing Trust has been involved in developing a number of programs to ensure there is an opportunity for people who want to live close to the city but who may not have the wealth of others to purchase very valuable land and devote that into housing accommodation. The trust has worked on the Manitoba development, the Box Factory, significant developments in Albert Lane, Edwards Place, Maud and Alfred Streets, and the apartment developments in and around Carrington Street. The trust continues to pursue that activity and it is looking at another innovative step in that process.

In addition to that stock of housing, which is approximately 8 per cent of the overall stock, we are now looking at joint venturing with the private sector. That presents an interesting opportunity for us to extend the housing dollar by joining with significant South Australian and interstate developers, even overseas developers, to create additional housing stock in the city area. I know that is endorsed by a variety of council members and also by the planning department of the City of Adelaide, because it wants to see housing growth in particular parts of Adelaide.

The trust has asked for expressions of interest from significant private developers, which have been received, and, in the next few weeks, we are looking to put together three joint ventures to deal with land in Carrington Street and in other parts of the city of Adelaide. That will create an increase in both public and private housing stock of high quality and will offer opportunities for people to live within the city confines. People may need to be close to major hospital services, or they may just wish to live within the city district itself.

I am pleased to be able to say that we are pursuing other opportunities, not just the traditional public housing solution. I believe that I will have some exciting projects to announce in the next few weeks which will see additional housing stock, both public and private, in the central business district of Adelaide.

UNIONISM

Mr MATTHEW (Bright): Does the Premier endorse an agreement orchestrated by his Finance Minister in which the introduction of poker machines will be used to force employees of hotels and clubs in South Australia to join a union? I have in my possession the minutes of a meeting of the executive of the Licensed Clubs Association. These minutes refer in part to concerns expressed by one association member about being approached by the Liquor Trades Union seeking an industrial agreement with the Licensed Clubs Association which would compel staff in hotels and clubs to become members of the Liquor Trades Union. In return, the union would support the association's joint proposal with the Hotel and Hospitality Industry Association for the formation of the Independent Gaming Corporation to oversee the administration of poker machines in licensed premises. The same minutes also note that 'Mr Frank Blevins, MP, had encouraged the LCA to form an alliance with the LTU.' The Liquor Trades Union had previously endorsed the South Australian Lotteries Commission as the appropriate supervising body. I have been approached by club and hotel operators who believe that 'these facts show that the Government is endorsing blackmail in which poker machines will be used to shore up compulsory unionism in South Australia.'

The Hon. FRANK BLEVINS: I heard on the ABC news at midday some comments by a journalist which I now understand came from the same source. The insinuation on the ABC was that this is a secret agreement. I would have thought an agreement that was in the minutes of the Licensed Clubs Association and distributed would hardly be secret, but that is by the by. The Licensed Clubs did come to see me—I cannot remember when, but many months ago—and I can tell the House precisely what I said, because it is exactly what I say and what I am proud to say to all employers: if you are starting an industry or if you have some problems with your employees, go to see the union, sort it out and get an agreement. I have been saying that to employers for almost—

The Hon. S.M. Lenehan: One hundred years!

The Hon. FRANK BLEVINS: Not quite that long—26 years. I am pleased to say that many employers, including the Licensed Clubs Association, apparently, have taken this wise advice, gone ahead and sorted out the problems that they have had with the union. I am absolutely delighted to hear that. I also heard that I had given my blessing to this agreement. As I have seen no agreement nor know the content of any agreement, until now, I have certainly not given my blessing to it. However, now that I have heard that there is an agreement between the Licensed Clubs Association and the Liquor Trades Union, if it is an agreement to the mutual benefit of both parties, I am happy to bless it right now.

The Licensed Clubs Association came to see me when there was talk of video gaming machines being brought into the Casino. They would not have had to be geniuses to work out who to see. My interest in this area is fairly long-standing, purely as an academic exercise, as I am not a gambler, I am happy to say. It was a private member's Bill of mine that finally passed with the assistance of my very good friend the member for Hartley (he is not with me at the moment) that was responsible for guiding the legislation through the Parliament and establishing the Casino.

I also had responsibility, on behalf of the Government, for the introduction of video gaming machines in the Casino, and members opposite with long memories will recall that during the Tonkin Government years I was the only ALP member to cross the floor to vote with the Tonkin Government for the introduction of soccer pools.

Members interjecting:

The Hon. FRANK BLEVINS: I was castigated by a lot of my colleagues and a lot of unions: I remember that some of my colleagues at that time were not happy. They were later colleagues, although they had expected to be colleagues at the time. In the Labor Party there is a conscience vote. The ALP gives members a conscience vote on an issue, and one cannot complain if members use it.

As to the question of the Independent Gaming Corporation and my support for it, the member for Bright commented that my support for the corporation was on the basis that it did a deal with the Liquor Trades Union. That is absolute nonsense. I will tell members why I support the Independent Gaming Corporation in the Bill before the House. I believe that the public sector has a role, and should

not hesitate—Government should not hesitate—to intervene in the private sector where it is necessary. I have no hesitation whatever in doing that. Under the Bill before the House (and I will not refer to it in detail), the public sector—the Government—has total control over the licensing, regulation and supervision of poker machines. The private sector can do the rest. I believe that any further intervention by the Government into the private sector on this issue would be completely gratuitous.

PUBLIC TRANSPORT VANDALISM

Mr HAMILTON (Albert Park): Can the Minister of Transport explain to the House what action has been taken to reduce the incidence of vandalism on public transport? In late 1991—

Members interjecting:

Mr HAMILTON: Wash your ears out—

The SPEAKER: Order!

Mr HAMILTON: In late 1991 widespread publicity was given to the vandalism that occurred to a bus in West Lakes. The public outcry was predictable, and the media seized upon the moment to criticise the Government over its lack of action. Can the Minister advise what procedures are now in place to minimise this type of incident recurring? Touche!

The Hon. FRANK BLEVINS: The most common type of vandalism we have to contend with on the STA is graffiti, not the large murals (or whatever they are called) but the senseless tagging of STA property. Other types of vandalism we have to contend with are slashed seats and broken windows. The STA has introduced various approaches and programs in an attempt to combat this type of violence, and there is quite an extensive list which I will certainly not go through.

Indicative of some of the action we have taken is that patrol members are now assigned to ride on buses in plain clothes and to identify problem routes. The STA has also introduced youth education programs, and these are regularly held. First offenders are asked to attend lectures with their parents in lieu of court proceedings, and these lectures are conducted by a transit squad member.

When particular schools are giving us a problem, we liaise with the principal, teachers and students of those schools and, with the cooperation of the schools, transit squad members attend the schools, and try to deal with the problem. We have also decentralised our now very extensive transit squad—I believe it is close to 100 personnel—to various bus depots and interchanges, and I think that this has helped enormously in those regional areas of our system. We have increased extensively the mobile security and transit squad patrols.

That is all designed to prevent graffiti but it still does occur. Many members have commented to me that it is occurring less and less as a result of this prevention strategy, but nevertheless it does happen. After graffiti has occurred, the STA has a policy of removing it from vehicles, both rail and bus, as quickly as possible—from vehicles within 12 hours and from buildings such as railway stations within 24 hours. As everyone would know, trains are particularly liable to suffer extensive attacks of graffiti vandalism. These attacks were occurring both while the trains were in traffic and while stable. Since the advent of the quick clean-up program, the severity and frequency of these attacks has diminished to the point where they are now almost nonexistent. The problem with graffiti on buses has also shown a marked improvement. The vandalism and graffiti problem on railway stations has been largely overcome through the rapid clean-up and the 'adopt a station' scheme.

Dwelling on that for a moment, I point out that 26 stations have now been adopted by various community groups, including service clubs and Neighbourhood Watch. This program has been an outstanding success because the vandals no longer have the satisfaction of seeing their handiwork on display. The STA has also embarked on a program of removing graffiti from all fences and buildings adjoining the railway and tram corridors. The STA and the Department for Family and Community Services have a number of programs in place which use juvenile offenders to clean up graffiti vandalism. To a large extent, while the graffiti and vandalism has not disappeared entirely, the efforts of the STA and the community have been very successful.

GAMING MACHINES

Mr SUCH (Fisher): Have the Minister of Emergency Services and the Government endorsed the recommendation of the Police Commissioner that the Casino Supervisory Authority and not the Independent Gaming Corporation should monitor and regulate the introduction of gaming machines in South Australia and, if not, why not? In a memo to the Minister dated 4 March, the Police Commissioner advised that this model 'will present the least opportunity for corrupt practices to occur'.

The SPEAKER: I will not call on the Minister. Presently there is a Bill before the House and, in the opinion of the Chair, that matter will be better served in the debate on the Bill and not during Question Time.

Government members: Hear, hear!

The SPEAKER: Order! The honourable member for Spence.

TRANSPORT HUB

Mr ATKINSON (Spence): Can the Minister of Industry, Trade and Technology advise the House what progress has been made with the transport hub proposal?

The Hon. LYNN ARNOLD: I thank the honourable member for his question on this very important topic. Significant work continues to be carried on with respect to the transport hub, both with industry in South Australia and with transport representatives nationally and internationally, as well as work within Government in South Australia to determine the most effective means of seeing a transport hub develop, focused on South Australia. The Hub Development Steering Committee has completed its analysis of Adelaide's position as a transport hub and concluded that it has a sustainable competitive advantage as a reliable international gateway for domestic freight exchange and distribution centre for time sensitive goods. In that context, it has a competitive advantage over alternative ports such as Sydney and Melbourne.

Discussions are continuing with key players both within Australia and overseas in respect of their investment in the transport hub, and at this stage we are pleased with their rate of progress. The key components of the hub which require development are the airport site, within the existing boundaries providing improved air services and handling facilities, the Outer Harbor container berths and adjacent land with improved shipping, rail and terminal facilities, including the establishment of a container freight station and distribution centre, systems integration and operations

centre, as well as an export manufacturing zone; direct weekly shipping services to Port Adelaide provided by international shipping lines; more frequent and regular international air freight services to and from Adelaide International Airport; and supporting transport infrastructure between the freight centres of Outer Harbor, Islington freight centre and the airport, as well as the road and rail corridors to Sydney and Melbourne.

In that context, the issue of the National Rail Freight Corporation becomes particularly important, and we are having ongoing discussions on that matter with the corporation which, as members will be aware, has now been established by legislation in the Federal Parliament. It is very important that the National Rail Freight Corporation have, as far as possible, all its operations in South Australia. That is critically important for our transport hub concept. It is very important for South Australia that that should be the case. Naturally, therefore, one would expect that all who speak on behalf of South Australia would be actively supporting that proposition. Therefore, it was with great concern that I noted when the matter was being debated in the Federal arena last year, when it was important for all members of this House that we be putting as much of a view for South Australia as possible, that in the States' House, the only Senators from South Australia who spoke on that matter were Labor Party Senators. There was nothing to be heard from any of the Liberal Senators in that Chamber, particularly not from the apparent to be Leader of the Liberal Party in this Chamber, Senator John Olsen.

The member for Bragg says that perhaps it is because we did not tell him anything about it. I would have thought that enough has been said about the transport hub in South Australia for our voices to be heard in the States' House, by members, including Senator John Olsen. When he went to that place, he said he was going to speak up on behalf of South Australia—that is what he said he was going to do there—but now the member for Bragg says that perhaps he did not know anything about it. That may well be true, because I must say that a scanning of his contributions to the Federal Senate shows precious few references to South Australia at all. In the States' House, this State's voice—this person who said he was going to speak up and who now wants to come back here and stand up in this Chamber to speak on behalf of South Australia—is silent on this very important issue. As with so many other issues, he pays no attention to the needs of South Australia in his contributions. I think members opposite would do well to read his contributions in the Senate over the past two years or so before they start casting their votes to determine who is to be the new Leader of the Opposition in this State.

On a number of issues, we require multipartisan support. We require support from both sides of this House as we argue cases before the Federal Government or the Federal Parliament. We need, therefore, members on the other side who are able to support positive issues for South Australia and, on the matter of the National Rail Freight Corporation, Senator John Olsen was not one of them.

ONKAPARINGA HOSPITAL

The Hon. E.R. GOLDSWORTHY (Kavel): My question is directed to the Premier.

Members interjecting:

The Hon. E.R. GOLDSWORTHY: I wonder who his successor will be. He is on the skids if ever a member was.

The SPEAKER: Order! The honourable member will resume his seat. There have been several occasions this afternoon of gratuitous remarks or comments when questions have been asked. They will not be allowed, and I warn the honourable member to come promptly to the question.

The Hon. E.R. GOLDSWORTHY: My question is directed to the Premier. What personal responsibility will he accept for any loss of life that occurs as a result of the closure of the Onkaparinga Hospital at Woodside, given that this is yet another casualty of his financial mismanagement of the State that has cost the taxpayers about $3 billion?

The Hon. D.J. HOPGOOD: I am very happy to answer this question because obviously the matter falls within the area of my general portfolio. I note that the Onkaparinga Hospital is considering the possibility of continuing as a private hospital. I have no objection to that occurring if it wants that to happen. However, I am not prepared to see the State continue to fund a hospital that has over 30 FTEs and only eight patients.

It would be different if we were talking about somewhere in the Far North or on the West Coast where there are no alternatives, but there are two excellent hospitals nearby—in fact, much closer than, say, Goolwa is to the South Coast District Hospital at Victor Harbor—where both acute and nursing home patients can go. Arrangements have already been made for the transfer of those nursing home patients who are prepared to accept transfer, and the Mount Barker Hospital stands ready to accept immediately emergency and acute patients. Both of those hospitals will receive increases in funding as a result of this arrangement, but at the same time savings will occur.

I remind members that yesterday the Opposition put before the House a matter of urgency that talked about wasteful recurrent expenditure. How often do we hear a general call for reduction in expenditure and then wails of horror every time there is a specific attempt to save anything in these areas?

An honourable member interjecting:

The Hon. D.J. HOPGOOD: Yes. Certainly, the Leader of the Opposition will not get away with it. He cannot have it both ways: he cannot on the one hand ask for cutting and slashing of costs everywhere and then, on the other hand, have his members criticise the Government every time there is some rationalisation of service delivery that would meet those goals that he would place before us.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order!

The Hon. D.J. HOPGOOD: It is ridiculous to suggest that the defunding of this hospital will put anyone at all at risk. Again, I put before the honourable member examples such as Yankalilla or Goolwa, on the South Coast. Is there any prospect that the Government would build a hospital at either of those places? Are there any calls from members opposite? Were there ever any calls from the departed member for Alexandra that we should start putting public beds at Yankalilla or Goolwa or places like that? Of course not, because the area is perfectly well serviced by a regional hospital. The same is true for the Onkaparinga Valley, and it will be well serviced in the future. However, if the Onkaparinga Hospital wants to continue as a private hospital beyond, I think, 24 April and take full responsibility for debts incurred, of course it has responsibility for that.

STREAKY BAY EFFLUENT DISPOSAL SCHEME

Mrs HUTCHISON (Stuart): Will the Minister of Water Resources advise the House whether any assistance will be

provided by the Government to establish a septic tank effluent disposal scheme at Streaky Bay?

The Hon. S.M. LENEHAN: I am sure that the member for the area will be interested in this answer as well as the honourable member who asked the question. I certainly can advise that last week I announced that there would be the provision of $670 000 towards the cost of the Streaky Bay septic tank effluent disposal scheme. Members may be aware that, as a result of negotiations between the State Government and the Local Government Association, an advisory committee has been formed to oversee the Government subsidy program which provides financial assistance to councils to overcome problems with septic tank disposal. The importance of the Streaky Bay scheme is that it is the first such program to be funded under the new arrangements. For members who may wonder why I am talking about this issue, I point out that I now have the responsibility for the STED scheme along with the responsibility generally for the provision of sewerage facilities in South Australia.

The importance of the scheme is threefold: not only will it provide a collection system and a lagoon treatment facility but also the reclaimed effluent will be disinfected and will be used on local parks and gardens. Members opposite will applaud that because it is recycling, and they are most certainly into recycling, including former Leaders. However, the scheme also has another positive benefit, because not only will it be able to be used for the irrigation of parks and gardens but also it will reduce Streaky Bay's demand for water. That water supply is currently drawn from the Robinson Basin, and it is under stress.

Therefore, the STED scheme in Streaky Bay will enable us to not only improve health facilities, because we will offer a facility for the safe disposal of sewage effluent, but also we will be able to reuse some of that water and lessen the stress and pressure on the Robinson Basin. This scheme highlights the Government's commitment right across the State to look at environmentally sound ways of disposing of our waste water. This is an excellent example and is the first of the new programs that will operate under the auspices of the E&WS Department.

HAZARDOUS SUBSTANCES DUMPS

Mr LEWIS (Murray-Mallee): My question is directed to the Minister for Environment and Planning. What are the risks, both short and long-term, to the health and safety of people who live near and/or on farm sites considered as a hazardous waste dump? Constituents of mine around Tailem Bend and Blanchetown have expressed concern to me about a suggested dump for hazardous waste nearby. The site is one of six being considered in South Australia. Apart from Tailem Bend and Blanchetown, others are south-west of Port Wakefield, north-west of Woomera, north-west of Renmark and another between Port Augusta and Woomera.

The Hon. S.M. LENEHAN: I am aware of the matter to which the honourable member refers, that is, that the Waste Management Commission, with my blessing and encouragement, released a consultative report identifying about six sites, as the honourable member has said, around South Australia for the safe disposal of hazardous waste. We did this because we believe it is important that the South Australian public have access to all information in respect of these proposals. I can assure the honourable member that every single environmental consequence will be investigated thoroughly.

The residents of Tailem Bend and those in the honourable member's area, as well as those in the Riverland (and quite properly so, because of the site's proximity to the river and other areas and the concern that has been engendered by talk upstream of high temperature incinerators; so I can understand Riverland constituents looking a little sceptically at such a proposal), have expressed concern. When I released this information through the Waste Management Commission, I also participated in a discussion, I think on ABC radio. It was interesting to note that the person who followed me on the program was the Mayor of Port Augusta. She requested that this site be located in the area to which the honourable member has alluded which, from memory, is west of Port Augusta. There is a recognition that, if we can make sure that we dispose of this type of waste in a safe way, it will also have the potential for job creation. Indeed, we have to face as a community the fact that we produce this form of waste and must be responsible for the disposal of it within our own society.

I am not sure what the honourable member is alluding to. If the honourable member is suggesting that somehow there will not be a very full, frank and open discussion about the safeguards that will be required wherever the site is located, I can assure the honourable member—

Mr Lewis: What about the risks?

The Hon. S.M. LENEHAN: The risks will be completely analysed by the Waste Management Commission. Surely commonsense would have prevailed, and the honourable member would have realised that, because it has released the report. If the honourable member is concerned about risks, they will be fully analysed and examined.

From my informal discussions with the Waste Management Commission, I believe that a number of communities have indicated that they would like to have this facility within the identified site in their local community. Therefore, the honourable member can inform his constituents that, if in the fullness of time they do not wish to have such a facility, other communities will be quite pleased with that information. As I said, the Port Augusta community, through the Mayor of Port Augusta, have indicated to me that they would like to have this facility located in their area. I would be happy to ask the Waste Management Commission to provide a briefing for the member for Murray-Mallee on this matter.

CONSERVATORY COGENERATION PLANT

Mr FERGUSON (Henley Beach): Will the Minister for Environment and Planning provide information on the interesting technological step taken by the Botanic Gardens in its acquisition of a cogeneration plant?

Members interjecting:

The Hon. S.M. LENEHAN: Notwithstanding the oohs and the ahs, I have to say that this week I was asked to formally launch, if you like, this plant on behalf of my colleague the Minister of Mines and Energy. The Gas Company informed me that he had been asked to launch the last one and it was thought important that the joint, cross-sectoral nature of this event be picked up. It is certainly a very important project.

The conservatory has purchased a remarkable new plant which will help keep the plant life within the complex alive. This is the first such plant of its type to be placed within a major public conservatory anywhere in the world, and it is important that we recognise that fact. It is a cogeneration plant which produces both heat and electricity for the conservatory 24 hours a day and maintains the specialised environment required by the tropical plant collection. It is important that we recognise the positive role of the South

Australian Gas Company, because the plant is fuelled by natural gas. It was developed by the Gas Company in concert with a private sector company located at Enfield.

The cost of the project was approximately $86 000, but it will save the gardens something like $24 000 a year in operating costs. It has a pay-back period within four years. This highlights the important work that is going on quietly in South Australia through the leadership and direction of the Minister of Mines and Energy and his department, the Office of Energy Planning, and my department, which is striving to meet the greenhouse targets that have been agreed nationally and internationally. It is a successful project for the Gas Company, having provided the initiative and a $30 000 subsidy towards its operation. As I said, it worked with a private sector company that actually built the cogeneration plant. I look forward to seeing many of these plants in South Australia because not only are they environmentally sound but they are also very cost effective.

GAMING MACHINES

Mr SUCH (Fisher): Has the Minister of Emergency Services had further discussions with the Police Commissioner regarding the introduction of gaming machines in clubs and hotels? If so, will he indicate any new stance or developments as a result of those discussions?

The Hon. J.H.C. KLUNDER: I can best answer the honourable member by indicating that I made the Commissioner's advice available to the House on the basis that it was a Bill that was going through the House on a conscience vote. In fact, if it had been information that was to be available to the Government to make its determination, clearly it would not have been advice tendered by me on such a public basis. The final advice—

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order!

The Hon. J.H.C. KLUNDER: The final advice—

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order!

The Hon. J.H.C. KLUNDER: Members opposite do not realise that advice is tendered by public servants to the Government on Bills before the House at all times, and I made it publicly available this time because it is a situation where every member of the House wishes to make their own independent judgment on the matter.

I remind members that the final statement by the Commissioner in that advice was that the Bill before the House could be handled in terms of regulations and adminstrative instructions by the Commissioner in such a way that the element of corruption was negligible, even under the current system. Since then, as I indicated, discussions have taken place between the Minister of Finance, and the Commissioner and me. As a result, the Commissioner has gone back to talk to his officers, but that is as far as it has gone at the moment.

AUTOMOTIVE INDUSTRY

Mr HAMILTON (Albert Park): Can the Minister of Industry, Trade and Technology advise the House of the future of General Motors-Holden's Australia employees in South Australia? In the past month there has been speculation in the press about the future of the Australian vehicle industry, culminating in the announcement by Nissan that it would cease vehicle manufacture in Australia in October this year. My constituent, who is a GMHA employee, is anxious to know what reassurances the Government has received about the future of the company and, indeed, about my constituent's job security.

The Hon. LYNN ARNOLD: I thank the honourable member for his question and appreciate his great concern for his constituents, as indeed I appreciate the concern of any other member in this House whose constituents are employed in the motor industry at this time. Clearly, the downturn in vehicles sales has been a matter of great concern, plus the spectre of further tariff reductions, particularly those proposed under the Hewson Fightback plan.

Of course, no-one can give any guarantees for the long term, but I must say that we maintain close liaison with those major manufacturers and component manufacturers in South Australia and give them every degree of support that is practicable for us to give in order to maintain their viability and consequently to maintain the viability of the Australian automotive industry.

I can say for their part that the major manufacturers and component manufacturers of South Australia take a positive attitude to the future. They certainly have strong comments to make, first, about the tariff reductions that were announced last year by the Federal Government and certainly about those proposed by the Hewson Fightback package, but they are wanting to look at what can happen to make them competitive in the Australian market and the international marketplace.

General Motors-Holden's is actively participating, for example, in the task force that I chair, and it is pleasing to note that now we have all the manufacturers represented on that task force. They were not represented at the start, but they are now all coming onto the task force, including those basically located interstate. They are recognising the initiative of the South Australian Government in standing up for the automotive industry when other State Governments have not, and they have joined us on that. Their participation in that and the discussions we have with them from time to time make it clear to us that they are in it for the long term if the automotive environment in this country can be at all conducive.

One other thing that could be said is that Nissan's decision to pull out was speculated upon by many component makers, in particular, and that is why a number of South Australian component manufacturers did a major exposure to Nissan; they were winding that down over the previous two years. In any event, Nissan's withdrawal from the industry in Australia does achieve one of the significant planks of the automotive plan that Button announced in the early 1980s when he said they should reduce from five to three manufacturers. Consequently, that reduces the pressure on the other major manufacturers to then consider rationalising out of the industry, especially in the context of the GMH-Toyota joint venture, which effectively makes it the three that Button said we should have by 1994.

For those sorts of reasons, there is certainly a future for the industry. It will be determined by industry aggressively taking on the circumstances that face it and by State Governments, such as this State Government, working as we can with them, and we have committed ourselves to working with them to help them survive into the future. Only time will tell what the success of that will be.

However, we continue to be gravely worried, as does the automotive manufacturing sector, by the spectre of the Hewson Fightback package ever having any clout because, if it does, the zero per cent tariff base will suddenly put sidewind to missiles in the automotive industry in this country, and then no-one can give the guarantees that the honourable member is seeking about the future of any of

the major manufacturers or the component manufacturers in this State or country.

HILLS BUS SERVICES

The Hon. D.C. WOTTON (Heysen): Will the Minister of Transport guarantee that STA bus services in the Adelaide Hills will continue to operate if the Government decides not to grant Mount Barker Passenger Service the right to operate the services? Last month the Government decided to contract out to the private sector some STA bus routes in the Adelaide Hills. When tenders closed at the end of February, only one proposal, from Mount Barker Passenger Service, had been received. This proposal was accompanied by a number of conditions—

The Hon. T.H. HEMMINGS: On a point of order, Mr Speaker, does the question asked by the member for Heysen impact in any way on Orders of the Day: Other Motions No. 2 for Thursday 19 March?

The Hon. D.C. Wotton: No, Sir, it doesn't. It is a totally different issue.

The SPEAKER: That is a decision the Chair will make. I do not uphold the point of order.

The Hon. D.C. WOTTON: This proposal was accompanied by a number of conditions including the right of access to STA buses. The Australian Tram and Motor Omnibus Employers Association, which represents STA bus operators, is understood to oppose the leasing of STA buses to private operators. If the Government bows to union pressure and rejects the Mount Barker Passenger Service proposal on this ground, will people in the Adelaide Hills continue to have access to STA services?

The Hon. FRANK BLEVINS: I thank the member for Heysen for his question, because it enables me to go through some of the figures again in case anybody in the House has forgotten them. I would urge all members of the House not to forget them, because they are extremely important. The question was ill-founded to the extent that the STA did not contract out, or even attempt to contract out, those services. What the STA said was that it would withdraw from those services. It was then open to the private sector to come in and see what it could do and at what cost.

I must say right from the start that I have been very disappointed with the private sector. While I have been the Minister of Transport, the private sector has been telling me how good it is compared with the STA, how efficient it is and how it can do things better than the public sector. I said to these people, 'Well, here's an opportunity. Let's see how good you are,' and I was disappointed with the result: I was not surprised, but I was disappointed.

Mrs Kotz interjecting:

The Hon. FRANK BLEVINS: I beg your pardon? I cannot hear, I am sorry.

The SPEAKER: Order! The Minister will resume his seat. Interjections are out of order. I spoke before about gratuitous comments. The Minister will direct his remarks through the Chair. The honourable Minister.

The Hon. FRANK BLEVINS: Thank you, Sir. It just seemed rather rude to ignore the lady, but you, Sir, are quite right—absolutely right.

The SPEAKER: Order! The Minister will resume his seat. The Chair is always right. The honourable Minister.

The Hon. FRANK BLEVINS: At all times; even if it means being rude, Sir, I will have to concede it. I was not surprised, but disappointed, and it is clear that the private sector would find it extremely difficult to take over those routes—which are there for anyone to take over—without increasing fares by, in some instances, double, and without wanting a large increase in the rate of concessions that the Government gives for the various groups. They want all that before they will even attempt to run a service. It may well be that, on some calculations, it would be more expensive for the State if it acceded to those requests and subsidised the private sector to run the service rather than run the service itself. We are still working through those figures.

The question of payroll tax does not come into it because the STA pays payroll tax exactly the same as does the private sector. It makes no difference, so I suggest that the honourable member understand something about public finance before making those kinds of interjections. For the metropolitan area, the average subsidy per passenger is in the order of $130, whereas for these Hills services it goes as high as $400. The member for Heysen is saying that, irrespective of the cost to the taxpayer—it does not matter that the private sector is not interested; unless there is a huge handout (more than the cost now)—at any cost, you keep those services that are run by the STA. That is quite contrary to what his Leader says. His Leader does not say that. His Leader has some integrity—

Members interjecting:

The Hon. FRANK BLEVINS: Well, his Leader today, who has said quite clearly that he does not believe in that philosophy. He believes that the private sector ought to move into some of these areas. He has integrity, not like the member for Heysen. As I stated when I announced these changes, they will not take place until August. I announced them six months in advance to enable us to have discussions with the unions, the private operators, our customers and with anybody else involved. There has been absolutely no question of the STA unions saying that we would put a black ban on this or that. The STA unions have never said that to me. They know—they are not stupid—that there is no long-term future in the STA's running empty buses and empty trains into areas where the level of subsidy is two or three times the normal rate of subsidy. The STA unions know that, and they are cooperating with us to see which services can be provided in these areas at the minimum cost to the taxpayer.

I will quote one more figure. Every single family in South Australia, whether it is a family in Kimba who is doing it hard on the land, whether it is a retrenched steel worker, or whether it is a family whose members are unemployed, is paying $350 per year to the STA. I believe there is an obligation on parliamentarians—

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order!

The Hon. FRANK BLEVINS: —to ensure that that money is spent wisely, and that does not mean running empty buses and trains or attempting to operate in areas where it may well be that the private sector can do it more cheaply.

PARLIAMENT HOUSE ELEVATOR

The Hon. J.P. TRAINER (Walsh): My question is directed to you, Mr Speaker. Would you consult with your fellow Presiding Officer regarding the maintenance and repair of the main elevator in Parliament House and advise what your ruling would be in the event of a division being affected by an honourable member being stuck in the elevator? I point out that one member of the Legislative Council staff was stuck in the elevator for an hour on Friday, as was, I understand, the Hon. Diana Laidlaw for about half an hour earlier today.

The SPEAKER: I will confer with the Presiding Officer in the other place. With regard to the matter of a member

missing a division, we have had an experience in this House where the bells malfunctioned and we recommitted the vote. That will be the practice if it occurs again. However, I will undertake to have the honourable member's question examined.

GRIEVANCE DEBATE

The SPEAKER: I put the question that the House note grievances.

Mr FERGUSON (Henley Beach): I wish to refer to a matter that was raised during Question Time regarding the problems of the manufacturing industry in South Australia. This matter has been brought to my attention in particular by the very large number of redundancies now occurring at one of our premier print shops, the Griffin Press. The Griffin Press may be described as a pillar of the printing industry, and the people who are being put off are very highly skilled printers who have spent many years in their trade. These people will not be replaced easily if the Federal Government decides to reverse its policy on tariffs. There will be no solace if the Liberal Opposition happens to gain Government federally because the Liberal Party's Fightback proposal is for a zero or negligible tariff across the board by the year 2000.

I will remind members of what is happening to our manufacturing industry. A wide range of South Australian firms have been hit by tariff reductions and by the recession. Employment in the South Australian manufacturing industry has fallen by 19 per cent in the past two years. The effect of this structural change will unfortunately continue beyond the recession and add to our unemployment woes, particularly in South Australia where a larger proportion of the population is engaged in the manufacturing industry than in any other State.

Tubemakers (auto components) will close its Kilburn plant in 1992. Yazaki (auto components) has relocated manufacturing to Western Samoa, reducing employment at its Lonsdale plant from 1 000 to under 100. BHP Long Products (Whyalla) will lose 1 600 jobs by May 1993, and a number of South Australian firms in the TCF industry have been relocated overseas, including Korfu Jeans, which is moving to New Zealand.

The Federal Government has suggested that a tariff of 12 to 15 per cent that now applies will be reduced to 5 per cent by 1996, the 35 per cent tariff on the motor vehicle industry will be reduced to 15 per cent by the year 2000 and the tariff of up to 50 per cent on the TCF industry will be reduced to 25 per cent also by the year 2000. The efficiencies that are expected in the manufacturing industry to try to make up the difference in the tariff reductions are impossible by any standard one would care to think of. It is impossible to produce a 13 per cent efficiency in the time that the Federal Government has given to the South Australian manufacturing industry. I have no doubt that members opposite will have heard the call to the Federal Government by the President of the Chamber of Manufactures and the United Trades and Labor Council to slow down the introduction of tariff reductions so that our manufacturing industry will not be devastated.

I have had the opportunity to observe the manufacturing industry in other countries. I had a look at the printing industry in Singapore, and the conditions in that industry are very poor. No attention has been given to safety, and very little attention has been given to the needs of the work force in that area, and the wages are extremely low. Mr Speaker, do you know that in parts of Singapore some sections of the printing industry have been contracted out to Indonesian immigrants at the rate of 8c per hour? I have seen Indonesian immigrants in Singapore stacking and counting cartons in the hot tropical sun with no protection for 8 cents an hour.

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

Dr ARMITAGE (Adelaide): I want to address a very sad case, that is, the Minister of Health and his apparent misconception as to what is happening with the closure of the Onkaparinga Hospital. During Question Time, the member for Kavel asked the Premier what responsibility he would take for any deaths that may occur because of the closure of this hospital. Clearly, the Premier takes no responsibility, because he handballed the answer from the organ grinder to the organ grinder's monkey. Unfortunately, the Minister of Health clearly does not understand that in some cases, particularly in the Hills (which were mentioned to me), immediate attention to the problem may save lives. The Minister, very unctuously and courageously, said, 'No-one will die because of this decision'—and I am glad I have the opportunity to re-emphasise that because, clearly, he is saying that he is confident that there will be no mishaps.

Equally clearly, the Minister could not have been at the public meeting. Indeed he was not: he sent his messenger. Of course, he did not have the courage to go to the meeting himself at which many people were told of the heart-rending cases of people whose life literally had been saved because they had immediate treatment at the Onkaparinga Hospital, rather than going to one of the hospitals which the Minister so blithely says will be able to take the overflow. In the media release made by the Minister yesterday, he says:

> The residents of the Onkaparinga area will still be well served by existing medical facilities, and there will be no reduction in the inpatient services available to residents.

Let us look at what inpatient services are available to residents and see from what there will be no reduction. A general practitioner from the area wrote to the Chairman of the Medical Users Association of the Mount Barker District Hospital—and I remind members that this is the hospital which is to take the overflow. He says:

> Yesterday and today I was refused permission to bring a patient back from the Royal Adelaide Hospital to Mount Barker Hospital. This was due to staff shortages due to budget constraints.
>
> The situation is ludicrous. The Royal Adelaide Hospital feel that he no longer needs their expertise, and I agree. We cannot take him because our budget constraints are even tighter than theirs. As taxpayers, we pay both budgets and should treat patients to their needs at least inconvenience and lowest cost to the State.

What sense is there to have patients in the Royal Adelaide Hospital at great cost, when they could be in the Mount Barker Hospital? Further, he states:

> We are already trying to keep within budget by at times redirecting non-urgent outpatients to our surgeries to minimise nursing costs. There are also significant personal costs, for instance, families travelling to Royal Adelaide Hospital to visit rather than locally. This does not appear on any Health Commission budget, so the commission seems not to care.
>
> With a surgical ward closed for months and constraints put on surgeons on their list I personally feel that our hospital . . . is only working at 60 per cent efficiency.

That is the hospital that will take the overflow. A surgeon also wrote to me in relation to the Mount Barker Hospital, as follows:

> The surgical wing of the hospital has now been closed for six weeks and will probably remain closed until the new financial year. The operating theatre is now restricted to a maximum of one list per week day . . . The theatre must be vacated by 3.30

p.m. . . . After hours emergencies requiring surgery continue to be redirected to Adelaide . . . It is rumoured that the theatre suite will completely close . . . If this hospital is projected as the regional base, why are no funds forthcoming?

That is the situation of the hospital that is going to take the overflow. Gumeracha Hospital, the other one, has had a role change; it has become not much more than a nursing home.

It is quite clear that the Minister's unseemly grab for cash, which has been caused by the parlous state of South Australia's finances, is likely to cause tragedy. The Minister and the Premier have shelved their responsibility, but we will not let them do it. We are quite clear that the people of South Australia will continue to claim stridently that, when their health is affected, they will not let this Government off the hook. It is simply not good enough for the Minister to try to shelve his responsibility.

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

Mr HAMILTON (Albert Park): Today, I directed a question to the Minister of Transport in relation to an incident that occurred in December 1991 on Bartley Terrace at West Lakes, an incident about which the media quite properly made great play.

Mr Ferguson: Is it in your electorate?

Mr HAMILTON: It is in my electorate, yes. The media made great play of the incident: they sensationalised it. What outrages me is that very little follow-up has been done by the media. They are prepared to criticise the Government and the State Transport Authority but, in my view, some sections of the media are too damned lazy to get off their butt and do a follow-up to the incident. A lot of work has been done by the State Transport Authority in this area.

In 1990 an incident occurred on the Outer Harbor line in which the public on that train supported the guard and the driver. As a consequence, a 13-year old lad was let off in the Juvenile Court with a $10 fine. No conviction was recorded, nor was a community service order imposed on him. Because I am an ex-railway employee and a past President of the Australian Railways Union—an honorary position, I hasten to add—I was incensed by the latitude that was displayed by the Juvenile Court. I contacted the Attorney-General's office and, subsequently, the regulations were changed so that community service orders can be imposed on such juveniles.

In his response today, the Minister of Transport indicated exactly what the State Transport Authority has been doing. Some sections of the media do not have the wit to address the problem, but bury it in a small section of the newspaper. I believe it is only proper that, if they want to sensationalise issues, they should give equal space to the redress that takes place. It is interesting to note the amount of work that the State Transport Authority has done in relation to the incident in December last year to which I referred. A meeting was called of interested parties. They included the South Australian Police Force, the Multicultural Services Department, churches, Exodus, the Woodville Council, representatives of the Aboriginal community and the State Transport Authority. They all participated in a plan of action to overcome the problem. The plan involved the use of police, youth counsellors and church youth group representatives travelling on the buses involved.

The STA arranged for the Thursday 9.15 p.m. bus from West Lakes to Port Adelaide to be operated by the same bus operator each week. The operator chosen was a person with whom the juveniles could easily relate. This gave the opportunity for the passengers and the operator to recognise and greet each other—a contributing factor in the success of the plan. In summary, the plan was an outstanding success, which has been shown in the marked reduction in vandalism and unruly behaviour around West Lakes Mall on Thursdays. The problems which were occurring on the 9.15 p.m. bus to Port Adelaide have virtually disappeared.

I congratulate all the people involved in this issue. It is important that the public be made aware of this, rather than the sensationalism that these incidents attract. I think some sections of the media—and I make no apologies for this, having been in the job for 13 years—should give recognition to those incidents on the basis of equal time and equal space where those matters have been addressed. I only hope that the media goes to the STA and ascertains what it is doing in terms of addressing this important and critical issue out in the community. Elderly people, in particular, are concerned about these issues, as indeed are other people in the community. Again, I congratulate the STA and transit officers on the tremendous job they have done in addressing these problems and in assisting all the other people in the community.

Mr MATTHEW (Bright): In Question Time today I revealed a disturbing new twist in the poker machines saga that is unravelling before us in this State. I asked the Premier a question and the Premier would not answer it. Instead, he handballed it to his Finance Minister. The question I asked the Premier concerned an agreement or deal organised by the Minister of Finance between the Liquor Trades Union and the Licensed Clubs Association. In my question I gave the Premier details of that deal, but he handballed the question to the Minister of Finance, so this Parliament still does not know whether the Premier approves of the Minister's activities. It is becoming increasingly obvious to this Parliament that the Finance Minister has a hidden agenda. He has run around with some of his union mates and has ensured that they can benefit from the introduction of poker machines through an Independent Gaming Corporation.

Before the introduction of the Bill last month, the Minister did not consult the Commissioner of Police or the Lotteries Commission. However, there is no doubt that the Minister did a lot of talking to the Liquor Trades Union. Indeed, he circulated copies of the Bill to many groups in this State, but we know he did not give a copy of the Bill to the Police Commissioner. I know from a minute entitled 'Gaming Machines Bill' sent by the Minister on 10 February 1992 to the Premier that the Hospitality Industry Association and the Licensed Clubs Association were given a copy of the draft Bill on 24 December 1991. The Minister's minute to the Premier, which was for all of Cabinet, states in part:

In its response of 14 January 1992 the HHIA and LCA agreed with the thrust and content of the proposed Bill and raised no objections.

We have it from this minute that the Finance Minister sent to the Premier for consideration by Cabinet that the Bill was circulated before those groups and that they approved of it. However, the Bill was not given to the Police Commissioner to look at. That is despite the fact that in 1982 the select committee into the Adelaide Casino called the Police Commissioner as the then Deputy Commissioner to give evidence. He established himself as a credible witness who had knowledge of both organised crime in South Australia and links of organised crime to the poker machine industry. Despite the Deputy Commissioner, as he then was, having established himself as an expert witness in the field, he was not given the courtesy or the commonsense approach of being shown a copy of the Bill, despite the fact that the Bill was widely circulated and there is documentary proof

that it was given to the Licensed Clubs Association and the hotel industry and there was a lot of lobbying by the Minister with his mates from the Liquor Trades Union.

As a result of this lobbying, the Minister has obviously orchestrated a deal in which the union will be able to extend compulsory unionism through clubs and hotels. The facts are plain from the Licensed Clubs Association minutes that I quoted in my question. The union has done a complete about face in its deal with the Minister to secure new members. Indeed, the union wrote to all members of Parliament on 20 November 1987 and stated:

> We believe that the South Australian Lotteries Commission has an impeccable record in conducting a variety of forms of gambling and that the community should tap into their expertise. We believe a strong case can be made out for a Small Games Division being created within the South Australian Lotteries Commission.

I have brought this matter before the House today because all members need to know, as we approach debate on this legislation, about some of the very shady deals that have been going on behind the scenes involving Labor Party operatives. This is about deals that can be done within the Party to shore up more union support and to shore up support for individual members. I do not shy away from those comments. It is important that all members of the Labor Party know about some of the things that are happening behind the scenes, so that those members of the Labor Party who would support other proposals know of some of the things that are being orchestrated at present. I raise this matter as a matter of public interest and, quite rightly, it needs to be aired within this Parliament. I ask all members from both sides to analyse this situation as it unfolds, because there is a lot more to come.

The Hon. T.H. HEMMINGS (Napier): I would like to share with the House information to which I have been privy in regard to the real, 100 per cent, fair dinkum reason why Senator John 'Tombstone' Olsen is now coming back to enter State politics.

The Hon. JENNIFER CASHMORE: On a point of order, Mr Speaker, I ask the honourable member to withdraw a derisory reference to a member of the Federal Parliament, that is, his reference to Senator Olsen as Senator 'Tombstone' Olsen.

The ACTING SPEAKER (Mr Heron): I ask the member for Napier to be very careful with his remarks.

The Hon. T.H. HEMMINGS: If it upsets members opposite, I will not refer to Senator Olsen in that way again, Sir. It has nothing to do with Ted Chapman's resignation or Dean Brown seeking the top job in the Liberal Party. It has nothing to do with the member for Victoria cracking under pressure, taking the white feather and retreating to the farm. In fact, all those scenarios have been floated to conceal the real story, which I am about to reveal.

The story starts way back in 1988 when the present member for Custance, then known as Ivan Venning, wealthy grazier from the Mid North, bagman for the Liberal Party, wanted desperately to get into this Parliament. There was no way possible he could do that by the normal preselection methods, so a deal was done. John Olsen promised that if he lost the 1989 election he would resign and go into the Senate, thereby creating a vacancy for Mr Venning to fill. Because Mr Venning was a great friend of the member for Victoria, the deal was extended to include the member for Victoria taking over leadership on a caretaker basis.

There was an agreed timetable to adhere to in order to get rid of the member for Kavel, and I found that rather hard to believe when I was told that story, because I wondered what the member for Kavel had to do with this and why he was considered to be such a threat. But, someone said, 'Read back through the member for Kavel's speeches and you will find the real reason', so I did: he is just a complete drag on the Liberal Party.

A story was concocted that Dean Brown, who was to come into this Parliament as the result of Ted Chapman's resignation, represented a real threat to the member for Victoria, the current Leader. Mr Acting Speaker, if you are getting confused, I can understand that, because I am confused as well. Little did the Liberal Party know that the member for Victoria was due to go out anyway as part of the deal with Senator Olsen and the member for Custance. That story was concocted around the Party room—that if Dean Brown came in, he would be a great threat to the current Leader of the Opposition, the member for Victoria, who we all know is going back to the farm. In that way the member for Kavel fell for it hook, line and sinker. They approached him and said, 'You must make the great sacrifice', and the member for Kavel, perhaps because of his age (I do not know) or because of all the travelling he has been doing on behalf of the Commonwealth Parliamentary Association, copped it full. Very foolishly he said that he would resign, until someone told him to include a proviso that he 'intended' to resign.

There we have the scenario. At the end of it, everyone is happy. The member for Custance is in Parliament, and may I say that I quite appreciate the talents of the member for Custance—he speaks very well. The member for Kavel is out, albeit a fairly wealthy man because of the generous superannuation we have. Senator John Olsen will be back in his rightful place, albeit some $150 000 richer as a result of his going from this Parliament to the Senate and now coming back to this Parliament. What is the cost? The cost has been told to us by the Deputy Premier. It will cost you, Mr Acting Speaker, me and the taxpayer something like $220 000—

An honourable member: $275 000.

The Hon. T.H. HEMMINGS: I stand corrected; it will cost us $275 000 to enable this rather shonky deal to take place. I am not very proud to be the person to let the world know this story. When it was told to me, I was assured that it was a very true story, and I am happy to share it with you, Sir, and everyone else in this State.

Mr OSWALD (Morphett): I am pleased that the Minister of Aboriginal Affairs is in the Chamber this afternoon; he may choose to make a ministerial statement later in the afternoon, or perhaps tomorrow, to respond to the issue that I will raise. Question Time ran out, and I did not have the opportunity to ask the Minister a question about this matter and enable him to put his reply on the public record.

My concerns relate to the happenings at the Aboriginal Community College at Port Adelaide over the past two days. Members may not be aware that a picket has been mounted at the college over the past two days by Aboriginal students. I believe that approximately 80 students were involved in the picket at the various entrances to the college, protesting at the sacking of three non-Aboriginal teachers at the college by the Aboriginal Principal.

This is probably the first time I have heard of a situation where the Aboriginal community has felt so strongly about an issue—the sacking of three non-Aboriginal teachers by an Aboriginal Principal—that they chose to use chains and picket the entrance to the college. I understand that one teacher has been there for 17 years, another for 10 years and the other for 13 years. They had gained the confidence of the Aboriginal community. From my discussions with the Aboriginal people, they are extremely upset at the actions

taken and would like some answers. Their questions prompt the need for public questions and a public response, hence my request to the Minister that he make a statement to the House to enable us to know what is going on down there.

I further understand that at 4.30 yesterday the Industrial Court ordered that the three teachers be reinstated. I would be interested to know the basis for that order, why the teachers had been sacked in the first place and why the court has chosen to have them reinstated. I have been trying to find out this afternoon, but the lack of time prevented my obtaining all the background to this matter. However, I understand that there is a problem between the Aboriginal Principal and the students. There appears to be no communication and certainly much incompatability. I was appalled at one statement I heard down there this morning about the language used in front of students. The allegation was that it was stated, 'You are adults now and you should be able to handle the adult language.' I would like that cleared up. If that is going on in the college, it should be stopped.

I would also like to know the role that Chris Larkin played concerning media control over the issue. The Aboriginal community has suggested there was an attempt to put a media control over the issue, despite the fact that certain cameras were there and certain reports were taken. From talking with the Aboriginal community, it is quite clear that they believe that the Principal should go. I will not be judgmental about that, but I am sure that the House would like to hear the Minister's view before the matter is taken any further.

It has also been put to me this afternoon by the Aboriginal community that the college committee was put in an invidious position by the principal's involvement in the instruction that the non-Aboriginal teachers had to be sacked or there would be further sackings of themselves. With that fear in mind, they went ahead, although they believe that the sackings occurred by coercion.

Clearly, some questions have been raised. I have not raised this matter with the media. I intended to ask the Minister to respond at Question Time in order to give him the opportunity to acquaint the House with the actual position. Depending upon his response this afternoon or possibly tomorrow, the Aboriginal community will then no doubt be satisfied with his reply or seek to pursue the matter further.

I reiterate that I have not raised my questions with the media, although I know that they are probably listening on the intercom upstairs. The Aboriginal community put these genuine questions of concern to me this morning and after lunch today and, as I have indicated, I would be quite happy to consider a reply from the Minister either today or tomorrow.

UNIVERSITY OF SOUTH AUSTRALIA (COUNCIL MEMBERSHIP) AMENDMENT BILL

The Hon. M.D. RANN (Minister of Employment and Further Education) obtained leave and introduced a Bill for an Act to amend the University of South Australia Act 1990. Read a first time.

The Hon. M.D. RANN: 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

This Bill embodies the final act of the Parliament in establishing the University of South Australia—South Australia's third and largest university. The creation of this university is probably the most significant development in South Australian higher education for a quarter of a century. The Bill deals primarily with the council of the university and, as befits such a significant development, members will see that the structure of the council includes some innovative features.

I say the final act of the Parliament because I know that there is a great deal left to do within the university in setting its sights on the future as a major South Australian institution. Of course, a great deal has already been achieved and I would like to take this opportunity, before dealing with the Bill in detail, to recount some of those achievements for honourable members.

- The university is well advanced in the development of a university plan. The council adopted a mission statement and goals for the university early in 1991 and followed this with the adoption of a set of medium and long-term objectives in July. The development of strategies and action plans will be undertaken this year ensuring that the university is successfully moving towards achieving targets and that its goals and objectives remain relevant.
- The university has established Australia's first university Faculty of Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander Studies.
- The university is a leader in physiotherapy research and education, and the university's School of Physiotherapy is a pace setter in a science within constantly expanding horizons. In 1991 the school introduced an innovative system of multi-level awards in postgraduate work that range from a postgraduate certificate in physiotherapy to an advanced specialisation Masters. Students from the United States, Israel and Iceland are coming to the School of Physiotherapy for postgraduate study.
- In a joint venture with the South Australian Department of Agriculture the university has developed a seed placement test rig which will aid in vital research into maximising the effectiveness of seeding procedures and their effect on crop yield.
- A partially parallel stump jump mechanism developed by the university won a commendation in the Primary Industry Category of the 1991 BHP Australian Steel Awards. The mechanism could save around $100 million a year in tillage fuel costs for Australian farmers and could revolutionise tillage methods and produce better yields for broad acre farmers.
- The university held a publishing forum at its Underdale campus, the first of its kind to be held anywhere in Australia, which examined issues in academic publishing, marketing and distribution. Emphasis was placed on the possibilities of the three South Australian universities cooperating in the establishment of a press in association with the proposed MFP Academy.
- Research and development work by the energy/engines group in the university's School of Mechanical Engineering is attracting international interest from Government and private organisations in Argentina, Belgium, Canada, Germany, Italy, Japan, Malaysia, New Zealand, Norway and Singapore which see natural gas as the main road fuel of the future.
- Commonwealth Government funding of $12.42 million has been allocated for a new Cooperative Research Centre, the Centre for Sensor Signal and Information Processing, in the university. The new centre will be the national focus for advanced research into sensor signal processing equipment such as radar and vision systems.
- Successful completion of a major research project, funded through the Australian Mineral Industries Research Association, into the chemistry of processing sulphide minerals has led to the launching of a new three-year program for mineral extraction research supported by top Australian and overseas mining companies. This project is the biggest of its kind ever conducted in Australia and one of the largest chemical research programs current in the international minerals processing industry.
- The university has introduced an innovative new degree sequence designed to equip engineers for top positions in industry by following engineering studies with a Master of Commerce course.
- The University of South Australia and The University of Adelaide have introduced a Master's degree in Medical and Health Physics that will increase specialised training opportunities in this area by applying discoveries in physics to the diagnosis and treatment of diseases. Students will undertake work in such things as surgical use of lasers, magnetic resonance imaging and gamma camera.
- A member of the university's staff, Dr Pietrobon, has invented a new decoding system and transmitter which will assist the United States National Aeronautical and Space Administration

by transmitting pictures from the orbiting Hubble space telescope seven and a half times faster.

- The university is a member of a cooperative venture with The University of Adelaide, the University of New South Wales, Hawker de Havilland Australia and other companies which has won its second Space Industry Development Centre. The new Space Engineering Centre of Australia will carry out research and development into a range of space engineering projects, including launching, tracking, ground control, satellite payloads and power from solar cells.
- Registered nurses will be able to further their knowledge of advanced practice and increase their career choices by enrolling in the university's new Master of Nursing—Advanced Practice course. Although other opportunites for a Master's degree are offered in South Australia, this is the first time an advanced practice course for registered nurses has been offered in the new university. It will meet a demand from nurses wishing to improve their professional status.
- The university has supported the development of inter-university research cooperation and the promotion of closer relations between tertiary education and the MFP Academy program.

So it is clear that this new university is already making its mark in the international research field and is already making a significant contribution to scientific and technological development in South Australia. I think the university deserves the congratulations of this House on its efforts so far.

I turn now to the Bill before us. Members will recall that section 10 of the University of South Australia Act 1990 expires on 30 June 1992. The reason for this was that, as an interim measure, the council of the university, which section 10 deals with, was established largely by drawing members from the governing bodies of the former South Australian College of Advanced Education and South Australian Institute of Technology. In addition, some members were appointed by the Governor on the Minister's nomination, after consultation with the Leader of the Opposition, and two members were appointed by the Governor on a joint address from the Houses of Parliament.

The council was required to report by the end of 1991 on the operation of the Act with specific recommendations on the long-term structure of the council. This Bill deals with the implementation of recommendations made by the university.

The principal content of the Bill relates to the council, the membership of which is proposed to be as follows:

(a) the Chancellor, *ex officio*;
(b) the Vice Chancellor, *ex officio*;
(c) the presiding member of the Academic Board, *ex officio*, or if that person is the Vice Chancellor then the deputy presiding member;
(d) the President of the Student Organisation, *ex officio*;
(e) six members appointed by the Governor on the recommendation of the Minister after consultation with the Leader of the Opposition;
(f) two members of Parliament appointed by the Governor pursuant to a joint address from both Houses of Parliament;
(g) 10 elected members being two members of the association of graduates, if one has been formed (other than staff or students), elected by that association, four academic staff members elected by the academic staff, two general staff members elected by the general staff, and two students elected by the students so that when taken together with the President of the Student Organisation there are two undergraduate student members and one postgraduate student member of the council;
(h) up to two co-opted members who are not staff or students.

This is between 20 and 24 members—a quite manageable size. As I mentioned earlier, there are some innovative features of this membership. The first is that there will be six ministerial nominees which is unusual for university councils in South Australia. However, the university believes that past experience demonstrates the efficacy of its proposal since it allows careful selection of members to ensure representation of a broad spectrum of South Australian society on the council. To avoid the possibility of political 'stacking' of the council, which would clearly be undesirable, the Leader of the Opposition must be consulted in the process. This provision allows for a bipartisan consensus to be achieved on the appointments concerned.

To keep the size of the council manageable the university has proposed the continuation of the present arrangement for the representation of Parliament on the council and this is included in the Bill.

The other significant feature of the membership of the council is the more even balance between elected representatives of academic staff, general staff and students. The representation of these groups on the council of the University of South Australia will be four, two and two respectively. This contrasts with the situation at Adelaide University—eight academic staff, two general staff and five students; and Flinders University—eight academic staff, one general staff and four students. This feature reflects the long-standing commitment to equity and non-elitist practices brought to the university from its antecedent institutions.

As well as dealing with a long-term membership for the council the Bill deals with a number of other matters requiring attention.

Sections 12 and 16 of the Act contain interim provisions for the appointment of the Chancellor and Vice Chancellor. These need to be changed and provisions in this Bill accomplish this in accordance with the university's wishes.

Members will recall that last year The Flinders University of South Australia Act 1966 was amended to empower that university to offer awards jointly with another university. This was particularly to facilitate the offering of joint engineering degrees by Flinders University and the University of South Australia. This Bill provides for complementary powers at the University of South Australia.

The Bill provides for the establishment of a fund to assist students in necessitous circumstances and incorporates provisions relating to the university's common seal. Redundant provisions relating to the provision of funds to the university and to reporting requirements are to be repealed.

In recent times it has become clear that the office of visitor to the university needed review. It was originally thought that a primary role of the visitor was to resolve conflicts between the council of a university and its senate or convocation. To that extent it is an unnecessary office for the University of South Australia, in particular since there is no body to be created with a role similar to that of the Senate of The University of Adelaide or the Convocation of The Flinders University of South Australia.

Furthermore, recent times have shown an increasing trend towards litigious individuals—staff and students—seeking to use the visitor as a further court of appeal for disputes with their institution. Not only can this cause additional, and at times prohibitive, expense for the university concerned but potentially could cause additional expense for the Government. I think honourable members will agree that there can be no justification for allowing to members of university communities some legal or semi-legal redress beyond the courts of the State.

This Bill repeals the provision in the Act which established the office of visitor.

The Act requires that statutes and by-laws made by the university council must, once confirmed by the Governor, be placed before both Houses of Parliament where they may be disallowed. This is clearly a proper procedure in the case of by-laws, which relate to such matters as traffic, parking, access to university grounds and so forth, where there may be significant implication for members of the general public. However, statutes deal with academic matters and matters relating to the internal operations and discipline of the university and the university has argued that there is no need for such matter to be subjected to parliamentary scrutiny. Accordingly, this Bill repeals those provisions which would require changes to statutes to be laid before Parliament.

Clause 1 is formal.

Clause 2 provides for commencement by proclamation.

Clause 3 inserts some definitions relating to students, staff and graduates that are relevant to the election of council members.

Clause 4 makes it clear that the university may confer degrees, diplomas, etc., jointly with any other university. (A similar amendment was recently passed by the Parliament for Flinders University.)

Clause 5 empowers the university to set up a fund for assisting necessitous students.

Clause 6 repeals the provisions that set up the interim council of the university and replaces them with a membership structure consisting of four *ex officio* members, up to 10 appointed members (two of whom are parliamentary members and two of whom may be co-opted by the council itself) and 10 elected members.

Clause 7 provides that appointed members of the council (other than the parliamentary members) will have four year terms of office. Elected members will be elected for two year terms. Half of the first membership of the council will be appointed for half terms to ensure ongoing experience on the council.

Members (other than parliamentary members) may be removed from office by the Governor on various grounds. A member's seat on the council becomes vacant if he or she no longer satisfies the eligibility criteria that led to his or her appointment or election. If the Chancellor is appointed from the membership of the council, a further member will have to be appointed. New section 11a provides that the two parliamentary members must be appointed at the commencement of each new Parliament and will hold office until the next appointments are made.

Clause 8 deletes the provisions relating to the interim Chancellor and Deputy Chancellor. A person from outside the univer-

sity or one of the six Governor appointed members of the council may be appointed to the office of Chancellor. The Deputy Chancellor will also come from the same group within the council.

Clause 9 inserts a provision dealing with the common seal of the university and the manner in which it is to be affixed to documents.

Clause 10 is a consequential amendment.

Clause 11 deletes the provisions relating to the interim Vice Chancellor.

Clause 12 deletes the now obsolete provision relating to the first report that the council was required to make to the Minister.

Clause 13 repeals the provision dealing with payment of money by the Treasurer to the university.

Clause 14 repeals the provision that made the Governor the official visitor for the university.

Clause 15 repeals the provisions that required statutes to be laid before Parliament and therefore to be subject to disallowance.

The Hon. B.C. EASTICK secured the adjournment of the debate.

PITJANTJATJARA LAND RIGHTS ACT

The Hon. M.D. RANN (Minister of Aboriginal Affairs): I move:

That pursuant to section 42c(11) of the Pitjantjatjara Land Rights Act 1981, this House resolves that section 42c of the Act shall continue in operation for a further five years; and that a message be sent to the Legislative Council requesting its concurrence thereto.

Mr OSWALD (Morphett): The Opposition is happy to support this motion. I think that this committee, the subject of the motion, is one of the most productive committees established by the Parliament. From the way in which the committee has been working, it can only benefit the Aboriginal community. The Opposition considers that five years is a reasonable time and, in these circumstances, is happy to support the motion.

The Hon. T.H. HEMMINGS (Napier): I am encouraged that the spokesman for the Liberal Party is agreeable to an extension of time so that the committee can continue to carry out its very able work. I well recall the insistence of some members, when this legislation was originally enacted many years ago, that a sunset clause be included, because they felt it was a waste of time. They felt that this Parliament should not be, in effect, dictated to by the Aboriginal people regarding what was required in their own community. Thankfully, since that time there has been a marked change of attitude. An education process has taken place on the other side of politics, mainly due to the member for Eyre.

In the time I have served in this place, the honourable member has been on the Pitjantjatjara, Maralinga and Aboriginal Lands Trust committees and in this case, by using his influence not only on his side but also this side of politics in conjunction with the Minister, has ensured through the committee that Parliament has acknowledged the wishes of the Aboriginal communities in this State. Once again, I commend the member for Morphett, who has agreed to this extension on behalf of the Liberal Party, and hope that Parliament will eventually consider making a simple amendment so as to ensure that we do not have to debate a motion such as this every three years or so in order to extend further the continuation of this committee. I support the motion.

The Hon. M.D. RANN (Minister of Aboriginal Affairs): I put on record my congratulations for the work of the committee since 1987. Of course, it was set up after the success of the Maralinga lands parliamentary committee, which was originally a Liberal initiative. The committee's role is to oversee the Pitjantjatjara Land Rights Act 1981, taking an interest in all matters that affect the interest of the traditional owners. We have now extended the role of the committee to cover the Aboriginal Lands Trust, and that is because members of communities in Aboriginal Lands Trust areas have seen the success of the operations of the committee in terms of the Pitjantjatjara and Maralinga areas.

This is one of the most successful committees of this Parliament, and I pay tribute to all members of the committee, particularly the member for Eyre, who has just returned to the Chamber. I believe that the committee operates in a truly bipartisan way, providing Aboriginal communities with access to members of Parliament. If I am asked to examine an issue, I discuss it at length with committee members and we visit the communities and see problems and opportunities at first hand. Certainly, the strong desire of Aboriginal communities in the Pitjantjatjara and Maralinga lands, and elsewhere, is for this committee to continue, because it gives them a chance for a forum and for contact, particularly in the remote lands. I am delighted that this committee will have the support of all members of Parliament in both Houses, as I am confident it will, because all of us can see that it is successful and works well.

Motion carried.

ASSOCIATIONS INCORPORATION (MISCELLANEOUS) AMENDMENT BILL

Second reading.

The Hon. J.H.C. KLUNDER (Minister of Emergency Services): 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

The purpose of this Bill is to make amendments to the Associations Incorporation Act 1985 which have been shown to be necessary during the course of administering this Act. The principal Act has not been amended since it was first enacted in 1985. The Associations Incorporation Act 1985 repealed the 1956 Act which had been described as 'recklessly permissive' as there was in that Act a complete absence of any requirement for financial accountability, of any form of control over management and of any power of investigation of complaints by the authority responsible for the administration of the Act. The 1985 legislation sought to remedy these and other deficiencies of the 1956 legislation.

The current Bill recognises the fact that many incorporated associations have a high public profile, possess significant assets and are often funded wholly or in part by public donations and Government grants. There can be no argument that it is in the public interest that there must be adequate regulation of incorporated associations. At the same time, the law should not impose on a small local sporting club the same obligations that are imposed on large associations whose operations are, in some cases, comparable with those of public companies. This distinction, which is provided for in the principal Act, has been preserved in this Bill.

Although the principal Act produced such significant reform, it was recognised that amendments would be required in the light of experience. The amendments proposed in this Bill are the product of that experience, the input of persons who responded to a public invitation to make submissions and of the views of persons and organisations to whom drafts of the Bill have been exposed.

Most of the provisions in the Bill are technical in nature and some of the amendments clarify parts of the principal Act which have been subject to differing interpretations. For example, the

re-enactment of the definitions of 'accounts' and 'special resolution' are typical examples of the technical amendments proposed in the Bill. The intent of amendments of that kind is to assist those who are subject to the Act and their professional advisers.

There are, however, other provisions of the Bill which go beyond technical matters and clarification of existing provisions to break new ground. For example, the Bill provides for matters which must be addressed in the rules of associations. This provision is seen as an aid to persons drafting rules or amendments to rules of associations and has been adapted from a recommendation of the New South Wales Law Reform Commission. It is not retrospective and does not abridge in any way the right to include in rules any other provisions which are appropriate to the nature and objects of a particular association. Another of these amendments is that, in the future, incorporated associations claiming to be emanations of the Crown will be bound by the legislation.

The principal Act was enacted on the basis that, where appropriate, company law provisions should be applied to incorporated associations. This policy is reflected in these amendments in relation to the winding up of associations, to persons disqualified from being involved in management committees of associations and to the duties and conduct of committee persons. The Bill includes a provision that enables incorporated associations to enter into a scheme of arrangement or compromise with their creditors, a form of insolvency administration that has always been available to companies but which has not previously been an option for associations experiencing financial difficulty.

The application of the accounts and audit provisions of the principal Act are to be applied only to those associations with gross receipts exceeding $200 000. The account and audit provisions have been strengthened considerably on the suggestion of practising accountants and auditors who have been involved with incorporated associations. Recent events have shown that the concept of independence and of conflict of interest are not always well understood by managers and auditors of bodies corporate. Amendments in relation to committee persons, including a provision that prohibits a committee person also acting as auditor of the association are therefore considered to be timely. These provisions aim for adequate accountability of the persons who have the responsibility for the administration of an association's affairs (which often includes the application of money derived from the taxpayer or from charitable donations by members of the public). Even in associations where there is no charitable object and no government funding involved, it is no less appropriate that the affairs of such an association are conducted with due regard to the rights of members and creditors.

At present, the requirement for an audit and for the lodgment of audited accounts with a periodic return applies only to associations with gross receipts in a financial year exceeding $100 000. This threshold figure is calculated in accordance with the definition of 'gross receipts' which, in the principal Act, excludes donations. Some associations have maintained that government grants are donations for the purposes of this definition. Under the principal Act, some associations could raise vast sums of money from appeals to the public but as long as the receipts from other sources remained below the $100 000 threshold, those associations are not publicly accountable. This is unacceptable as it is not in accordance with the public interest. The Bill amends the definition of gross receipts so that it now includes donations and government grants while raising the threshold to $200 000.

The principal Act limits the general power of exemption of the Corporate Affairs Commission in relation to specific requirements of the Act. To take into account of the scope of this legislation and the diverse nature and activity of associations to which it applies, a general power of exemption is appropriate and it is provided in the Bill. There is an almost identical power given to the Corporate Affairs Commission contained in the Co-operatives Act 1983.

The existing provision relating to invitations to non-members to deposit money with an association has been strengthened. It is consistent with the current investment climate that associations seeking such deposits from non-members should have the approval of the Corporate Affairs Commission. This approval will be subject to invitations being made on the basis of a simple disclosure document as provided for in the Bill.

Existing provisions dealing with the securing of pecuniary profits to members of associations have been clarified as has the provision dealing with oppression of members. The latter has been extended to include oppression of former members of an association. This is appropriate as complaints have been made by former members that they have no standing under the present provision to seek the intervention of the court in what they perceive as wrongful expulsion.

The principal Act has also been amended to conform with current drafting style and to include other amendments arising from statute law review.

In summary, the Bill seeks to reach the correct balance between regulation that is necessary for the public interest and regulation that would just impose significant administrative burdens and expense on the state without having any corresponding benefits for members, creditors and the community generally.

Clauses 1 and 2 are formal.

Clause 3 amends section 3 of the principal Act.

The amendment—

- inserts definitions of 'authorised person', 'beneficiary', 'body corporate', 'gross receipts', 'prescribed association', 'putative spouse' and 'total receipts and payments';
- strikes out the definitions of 'accounts' and 'officer' and substitutes new definitions of these words;
- strikes out the definition of 'committee' (an unnecessary definition);
- amends the definition of 'special resolution'; and
- provides for subclause (6) to be inserted that defines an 'associate' of another person member for the purposes of this Act.

Clause 4 repeals section 4 of the principal Act, the section that contains the repeal and transitional provisions in relation to the principal Act that are now obsolete and substitutes a new provision. This clause provides that the Crown is bound by this Act.

Clause 5 repeals sections 7 and 8 of the principal Act and substitutes a new provision. While the proposed section 7 is not significantly different from the repealed section, it does provide the Commission with power to deal with defaults in complying with requests of the Commission in relation to documents submitted to it that are not present in the repealed section.

The proposed section 7 contains 5 subsections. Proposed subsection (1) provides that where the Commission is of the opinion that a document submitted to the Commission contains matter that is contrary to law, matter that is false or misleading in a material particular, has not been duly completed by reason of omission or misdescription, does not comply with the requirements of this Act or contains an error, alteration or erasure, then the Commission may refuse to register or may reject the document and may request that the document be appropriately amended or completed and resubmitted, that a fresh document be submitted or, where the document has not been duly completed, that a supplementary document in the prescribed form be submitted.

Proposed subsection (2) provides that the Commission may request a person who submits a document to the Commission to provide the Commission with such other document or information as the Commission considers necessary in order to form an opinion whether it should refuse to register or reject the document.

Proposed subsection (3) provides that where a person fails to comply with a request of the Commission made pursuant to subsection (1) or (2), a court of summary jurisdiction may, within 14 days after the service on the person of the request, on application of the Commission, order the person to comply with the request within a specified time.

Proposed subsection (4) provides that an order made under subsection (3) may provide that all costs of and incidental to the application are to be borne by the person responsible for the non-compliance.

Proposed subsection (5) provides that it is an offence for a person to contravene or fail to comply with an order made under subsection (3). If the offence is committed in respect of a prescribed association, the penalty is a division 6 fine ($4 000) and in any other case is a division 8 fine ($1 000).

Clause 6 amends section 13 of the principal Act by upgrading the penalties for offences against this section (dealing with privileged communications) from a fine of $1 000 to a division 6 fine ($4 000).

Clause 7 amends section 14 of the principal Act—

- by striking out from subsection (1) 'Subject to this section', a phrase which has no relevance in this instance; and
- by altering the penalties for the offences contained in this section (that is, offences against this Division) so that where the offence is committed in respect of a prescribed association, a division 6 fine ($4 000) is imposed or in any other case, a division 7 fine ($2 000) is imposed.

Clause 8 amends section 15 of the principal Act by striking out from subsection (2) 'section' (which is incorrect) and substituting 'Division'.

Clause 9 repeals section 17 of the principal Act (which provided a definition of 'authorised person' for this Division) and substitutes a new section which deals with secrecy.

Proposed subsection (1) provides that where an authorised person has, by reason of the authority granted to him or her pursuant to this Act, acquired information, that person must not,

except to the extent necessary to perform his or her official duties or to perform a function or to exercise a power authorised by this Act, make a record of, or divulge or make use of in any way, the information acquired. Contravention of this carries a division 5 fine ($8 000).

Proposed subsection (2) lists the circumstances in which, notwithstanding subsection (1), a person is not guilty of an offence—that is, if he or she produces or divulges to a court in the course of any proceedings before the court a document, matter or information that has come under his or her notice due to that person's official position, if it is in the public interest that the document or information be produced or divulged or if another Act requires or permits the production or divulging of the document or information.

Clause 10 amends section 18 of the principal Act—

- by striking out 'Minister' from subsection (5) and substituting 'Commission';
- by substituting subsection (6) *(a)* which provides that an incorporated association is not to be regarded as having as a principal or subsidiary object the securing of a pecuniary profit for its members or engaging in trade or commerce by reason only that the association makes a profit that is divided among or received by the members or any of them otherwise than in accordance with section 55;
- by striking out from subsection (6) *(b)* 'the public' and substituting 'non-members (other than spouses, children or parents of members)'; and
- by inserting in subsection (7) after 'Minister' twice occurring, in each case, 'or the Commission'.

Clause 11 amends section 19 of the principal Act by inserting paragraph *(ca)* after subsection (2) *(c)*. Proposed paragraph *(ca)* makes it a requirement that where a contemplated trust is referred to in the rules of an incorporated association or where any rule of an incorporated association relies on a contemplated trust for its operation, a copy of the settled draft of any instrument prepared for the creation or establishment of the trust of which the association is intended to be the trustee must accompany the application for incorporation.

Clause 12 amends section 21 of the principal Act by striking out subsection (2) and substituting a new subsection (2) which provides that, except as may be provided by the rules of an incorporated association, a member of an association is not liable to contribute towards the payment of the debts and liabilities of the association or the costs, charges and expenses of a winding up of the association.

Clause 13 amends section 22 of the principal Act which deals with the amalgamation of two or more incorporated associations, by striking out from subsection (1) *(b)* ', not later than one month after those resolutions have been passed,'. This amendment will mean that an application to the Commission for the amalgamation may be made at any time after such a special resolution has been passed by each association. The section is further amended by inserting paragraph *(da)* after subsection (2) *(d)*. Proposed paragraph *(da)* makes it a requirement that where a contemplated trust is referred to in the rules of an incorporated association proposed to be formed by the amalgamation of two or more incorporated associations or where any rule of an incorporated association proposed to be formed by the amalgamation relies on a contemplated trust for its operation, a copy of the settled draft of any instrument prepared for the creation or establishment of the trust of which the association is intended to be the trustee must accompany the application. (This amendment matches with that made in clause 11.)

Clause 14 amends section 23 of the principal Act by designating its present contents as subsection (1) and by inserting a new subsection (2) which provides that a reference in this section to the rules of an incorporated association extends to rules, by-laws or ordinances of the association relating to any matter.

Clause 15 inserts section 23a after section 23 of the principal Act. Proposed subsection (1) provides that the rules of an incorporated association must state the name of the association and set out its objects, must not contain any provision that is contrary to or inconsistent with this Act and that certain other matters, including membership (in the case of an association that has members), the committee, the auditor, powers of the association must be dealt with sufficient particularity and certainty in the rules of an association.

Proposed subsection (2) provides that this section only applies to rules or an altered rule submitted to the Commission for registration after the commencement of this section.

Clause 16 amends section 24 of the principal Act by striking out and substituting subsections (1) and (2). Proposed subsection (1) provides that an alteration to a rule of an incorporated association may be made by a special resolution of the association unless other provision is made in the rules of the association.

Proposed subsection (2) provides that an association must register the altered rule with the Commission within 1 month of the making of the alteration.

Clause 17 repeals section 30 of the principal Act and substitutes a new provision. The substituted section 30 provides in proposed subsections (1) and (2) that the following persons may not be members of the committee of an incorporated association or be concerned in any way with the management of an incorporated association—

- an insolvent under administration (unless the Committee has given that person leave);
- a person convicted of certain offences within five years after conviction or within five years of release from prison (unless the Commission has given that person leave).

A person convicted of an offence against subsection (1) or (2) is liable to a division 6 fine ($4 000).

Proposed subsection (3) provides that when the Commission is granting leave under this section, it may impose such conditions or limitations as it thinks fit and any person contravening or failing to comply with such a condition or limitation is guilty of an offence that carries a division 6 fine ($4 000).

Under proposed subsection (4) the Commission may revoke leave granted by it under this clause at any time.

Clause 18 amends section 31 of the principal Act which deals with the disclosure of any pecuniary interest that a committee member may have in a contract or proposed contract—

- by substituting in subsection (1) 'the association' for 'the committee';
- by upgrading the penalty for an offence against subsection (1) from a fine of $1 000 to a division 6 fine ($4 000); and
- by inserting after subsection (2) *(b)* a new paragraph *(c)* that provides that subsection (1) does not apply in respect of a pecuniary interest that exists only because the member of the committee has the pecuniary interest in common with all or a substantial proportion of the members of the association.

Clause 19 amends section 32 of the principal Act which deals with voting on a contract in which a committee member has an interest—

- by substituting in subsection (1) 'the association' for 'the committee';
- by upgrading the penalty for an offence against subsection (1) from a fine of $1 000 to a division 6 fine ($4 000); and
- by substituting a new subsection (2) that provides that subsection (1) does not apply in respect of a pecuniary interest that exists only by virtue of the fact that the member of the committee is a member of a class of persons for whose benefit the association is established or that it is a pecuniary interest that the member of the committee has in common with all or a substantial proportion of the members of the association.

Clause 20 repeals section 33 of the principal Act as this section has been substantially re-enacted in clause 25—see the proposed section 39a in clause 25.

Clause 21 repeals section 35 of the principal Act and substitutes a new provision dealing with the accounts to be kept by a prescribed association.

Proposed subsection (1) provides that a prescribed association must keep its accounting records in such a manner as will enable the preparation from time to time of accounts that present fairly the results of the operations of the association and the accounts to be conveniently and properly audited in accordance with Part IV Division II of the Act.

Proposed subsection (2) provides that an incorporated association must, as soon as practicable after the end of the association's financial year, cause—

- that year's accounts to be prepared;
- the accounts to be audited by an auditor (who must meet certain qualifications); and
- to be attached to the accounts, before the auditor reports on the accounts' a report of the association made in accordance with a resolution of the committee and signed by two or more committee members.

The report of the association must—

- state that the accounts present fairly the results of the operations of the association for that year and the state of affairs of the association as at the end of that year;
- state that the committee has reasonable grounds to believe that the association will be able to pay its debts as and when they fall due; and
- give particulars of any body corporate that is a subsidiary of the association within the meaning of section 46 of the Corporations Law and of any trust of which the association is a trustee.

The penalty for failing to comply with this subsection is a division 6 fine ($4 000).

Proposed subsection (3) provides that a person who is an officer, a partner, employer or employee of an officer or a partner or employee of an employee of an incorporated association may not be appointed as auditor of the accounts of the association for the purposes of this section.

Proposed subsection (4) provides that the committee of an incorporated association must cause a report of the committee to be made (in accordance with a resolution of the committee and signed by at least two committee members) that states—

- whether during the financial year to which the accounts relate, an officer of the association, a firm of which the officer is a member or a body corporate in which the officer has a substantial financial interest, has received or become entitled to receive a benefit as a result of a contract between the officer, firm or body corporate and the association, and if so, the general nature of the benefit;
- whether during the financial year to which the accounts relate, an officer of the association has received directly or indirectly from the association any payment or other benefit of a pecuniary value, and if so, the general nature and extent of that benefit.

Proposed subsection (5) provides that the committee of an incorporated association must cause the audited accounts (including the statement prepared by the association in accordance with subsection (2) *(c)*), the auditor's report on those accounts and the committee's report prepared in accordance with subsection (4) to be laid before the members of the association at the annual general meeting or, if an association is not held, within five months of the end of the financial year to which the accounts relate.

Proposed subsection (6) provides that a member of the committee of an association who fails to comply with or secure compliance with this section is guilty of an offence. The penalty, if an offence is committed with intent to deceive or defraud the association, creditors of the association or creditors of any other person or for any fraudulent purpose, is a division 4 fine ($15 000) or division 4 imprisonment (4 years). The penalty, in any other case, is a division 6 fine ($4 000).

Clause 22 amends section 36 of the principal Act by making consequential amendments to subsection (1) (that is, by substituting 'a prescribed association' for 'an association to which this Division applies') and by striking out subsection (3) and substituting a new subsection (3) which upgrades the penalty for failing to lodge periodic returns with the Commission from a fine of $1 000 to a division 6 fine ($4 000).

Clause 23 repeals section 37 of the principal Act and substitutes two new sections relating to auditors acting under this Division (that is, Part IV Division II).

The substituted section 37 contains eight subsections. Proposed subsection (1) provides that an auditor of a prescribed association has a right of access at all reasonable times to the accounting records and other records of the association and is entitled to require from any officer of the association such information and explanations as he or she desires for the purposes of an audit.

Proposed subsection (2) provides that an officer of a prescribed association must not, without lawful excuse, refuse or fail to allow an auditor of the association access, for the purposes of this Division, to any accounting or other records in his or her custody or control, refuse or fail to give any information or explanation as and when required by the auditor or otherwise hinder, obstruct or delay an auditor in the performance of his or her powers as auditor.

Proposed subsection (3) provides that the auditor must furnish to the committee of the association, in sufficient time to enable the committee to comply with section 35 (5), a report that states—

- whether the accounts are drawn up so as to present fairly the results of the association's activities for the association's financial year and the financial state of the association at the end of the association's financial year;
- whether the auditor has examined the accounts and auditor's reports of each body corporate that is a subsidiary of the association within the meaning of section 46 of the Corporations Law and each trust of which the association is a trustee and the conclusions drawn from the examination;
- where the auditor's report includes qualifications by the auditor, whether the accounts on which the report was prepared are adequate given the nature and scope of the association's activities; and
- whether the auditor has obtained all of the information and explanations that he or she required from the association.

Proposed subsection (4) provides that if, in the course of performing his or her duties, he or she is satisfied that it is likely that there has been a contravention of, or failure to comply with, a provision of this Act or the association's rules or that there is a deficiency in relation to the accounts or information in respect of the activities of the association that will not be adequately dealt with by bringing it to the attention of the committee, the auditor must immediately report the matter in writing to the Commission.

Proposed subsection (5) provides that an auditor who is removed or dismissed as auditor of an incorporated association must immediately report the matter of his or her removal or dismissal and the surrounding circumstances in writing to the Commission.

Proposed subsection (6) provides that an auditor is not, in the absence of malice on his or her part, liable to any action for defamation in respect of any statement that he or she makes, orally or in writing, in the course of performing his or her duties. The definition of 'auditor', in this subsection, includes a person who has been removed or dismissed as the auditor of an incorporated association (see subsection (7)).

Proposed subsection (8) provides that subsection (6) does not limit or affect any right, privilege or immunity that an auditor has, apart from that subsection, as a defendant in an action for defamation.

Proposed section 37a provides that the reasonable fees and expenses of an auditor of an incorporated association are payable by the association.

Clause 24 makes consequential amendments to section 39 of the principal Act (by striking out any reference to 'an incorporated association to which this Division applies' and substituting 'a prescribed association') and strikes out subsection (3) which is now obsolete.

Clause 25 inserts 2 new divisions (each comprising 2 sections)—'Division IIIA—Duties of Officers, etc' and 'Division IIIB—Records' after section 39 of the principal Act.

Proposed section 39a (1) provides that an officer of an incorporated association must not, in the exercise of his or her powers or the discharge of the duties of his or her office, commit an act with intent to deceive or defraud the association, members or creditors of the association or creditors of any other person or for any fraudulent purpose.

Proposed subsection (2) provides that an officer or employee of an incorporated association (or former officer or employee) must not make improper use of information acquired by virtue of his or her position in the association.

Proposed subsection (3) provides that an officer or employee of an incorporated association must not make improper use of his or her position with the association so as to gain directly or indirectly, any pecuniary benefit or material advantage for himself or herself or any other person, or so as to cause a detriment to the association.

The penalty for an offence against subsection (1), (2) or (3) is a division 4 fine ($15 000) or division 4 imprisonment (4 years).

Proposed subsection (4) provides that an officer of a prescribed association who does not at all times act with reasonable care and diligence in the exercise of his or her powers and the discharge of the duties of his or her office is liable to a penalty of a division 8 fine ($1 000).

Proposed subsection (5) provides that a person who contravenes a provision of this section is liable to the association for any profit made by him or her and for any damage suffered by the association as a result of that contravention.

Proposed section 39b provides that any provision exempting an officer or auditor of an association from, or indemnifying him or her against, any liability that by law would otherwise attach to him or her in respect of any negligence, default, breach of duty or breach of trust of which he or she may be guilty in relation to the association, is void. This section does not apply in respect of a contract of insurance, nor does it prevent an association from indemnifying an officer or auditor against any liability incurred by him or her in defending any proceedings in which judgment is given in his or her favour or in which he or she is acquitted.

'Division IIIB—Records' contains two sections. Proposed section 39c provides that an incorporated association must keep such accounting records as correctly record and explain the transactions of the association and the financial position of the association at the place at which the associations is situated or established within the State or in the custody of an officer of the association in accordance with its rules or a resolution of the committee. If an incorporated association fails to comply with subclause (1), the association and any officer of the association who is in default are each guilty of an offence that carries, in respect of a prescribed association, a division 7 fine ($2 000), and in any other case, a division 8 fine ($1 000).

Proposed section 39d provides that a member of an incorporated association may apply to the District Court which may authorise an inspection of the association's books (on behalf of the member) by a person authorised under this Act to audit the accounts of a prescribed association or a legal practitioner who may, at the inspection, make copies of, or take extracts from, the association's books. The court may, on such an application, make such further or other orders as it thinks fit, including an order for costs.

Clause 26 amends the heading to Part V of the principal Act so that the heading will be 'Compromise, Winding Up, Transfer of Activities and Dissolution'.

Clause 27 repeals section 41 of the principal Act and substitutes four new sections.

Proposed section 40a provides that Part 5.1 of the Corporations Law (dealing with arrangements and reconstructions) applies, with such modifications, additions or exclusions as may be necessary for the purpose, or as may be prescribed, as if an incorporated association were a Part 5.1 body and as if that Part were incorporated into this Act.

Proposed section 41 (1) provides that, subject to the succeeding provisions of this section, an incorporated association may be wound up by the Supreme Court, voluntarily or on the certificate of the Commission issued with the consent of the Minister.

Proposed subsection (2) provides that Parts 5.4 to 5.6 of the Corporations Law (dealing with winding up by the Court, voluntary winding up and winding up generally) apply, with such modifications, additions or exclusions as may be necessary for the purpose, or as may be prescribed, as if an incorporated association were a company and as if those Parts were incorporated into this Act.

Proposed subsection (3) sets out the grounds on which an association may be wound up by the Supreme Court. These are—

- that the association has by special resolution resolved that it be wound up by the Court;
- that more than a year has elapsed since the date of the association's incorporation and it has not commenced any activity or function;
- that the association is unable to pay its debts;
- that members of the committee have acted in their own interests rather than in the interests of the members as a whole or have acted in any other manner that appears to be unjust or unfair to other members;
- that affairs of the association are being conducted in a manner that is oppressive or unfairly prejudicial to, or unfairly discriminatory against, a member or members or in a manner that is contrary to the interests of the members as a whole;
- that an act or omission (or a proposed act or omission) by or on behalf of the association was or would be oppressive or unfairly prejudicial to, or unfairly discriminatory against, a member or members or was or would be contrary to the interests of the members as a whole; or
- that the Court is of the opinion that it is just and equitable that the association be wound up.

Proposed subsection (4) sets out the circumstances in which an association is to be taken to be unable to pay its debts.

Proposed subsection (5) provides that where an application has been filed with the Court for the winding up of an association on the ground that it is unable to pay its debts, the association is not, without the leave of the Court, entitled to resolve that it be wound up voluntarily.

Proposed subsection (6) provides that, subject to subsection (5), an association may resolve, by special resolution, that it be wound up voluntarily.

Proposed subsection (7) provides that the Commission may issue a certificate for the winding up of an association where the association—

- has contravened or failed to comply with a condition imposed on it by the Commission;
- has been incorporated by means of mistake or fraud;
- has, after notice by the Commission of any breach of this Act or the rules of the association, failed within the time referred to in the notice to remedy the breach;
- has not, within three months of notice being given under section 42, requested the Commission to transfer its undertaking to another body corporate;
- is defunct.

Proposed subsection (8) provides that for the purposes of this Act, the winding up of an incorporated association on the certificate of the Commission commences on application to, and lodgement with, the Court by the Commission of a copy of the certificate and is to proceed as if the association had by special resolution resolved that it be wound up by the Court.

Proposed subsection (9) provides that the Court may, on an order being made for any winding up of an association by the Court, appoint a person who is not a registered company liquidator to be the liquidator of the association if the Commission nominates such a person.

Proposed subsection (10) provides that the Commission may, in relation to the voluntary winding up of an association, approve the appointment of a person who is not a registered company liquidator as the liquidator of an association.

Proposed subsection (11) provides that the reasonable costs of a winding up are payable out of the property of the association.

Proposed section 41a provides that a person aggrieved by an act, omission or decision of—

- a person administering a compromise or arrangement;
- a receiver (or a receiver and manager) of property of an incorporated association; or
- a liquidator (or provisional liquidator) of an incorporated association,

may appeal to the Supreme Court which may confirm, reverse or modify the act or decision, or remedy the omission, as the case may be, and make such orders and give such directions as it thinks fit.

Proposed section 41b applies to sections 589 to 596 and section 1307 of the Corporations Law (dealing with offences relevant to Part V of the Associations Incorporation Act 1985) with such modifications, additions or exclusions as may be necessary for the purpose, or as may be prescribed, as if a incorporated association were a company and as if those sections were incorporated into this Act.

Clause 28 amends section 42 of the principal Act by striking out from subsection (3) 'On the publication of an order' and substituting 'On the date specified in the order'. This relates to an order by the Commission that the undertaking of an association be transferred to a body incorporated under another Act.

Clause 29 amends section 43 of the principal Act by striking out subsection (1) and substituting two new subsections. Proposed subsection (1) provides that, subject to subsection (1a), it is not lawful to distribute among members, former members or associates of members or former members of an association any surplus assets available for distribution at the completion of the winding up of the association under this Part.

Proposed subsection (1a) provides that the surplus assets of an association may, with the consent of the Commission, be distributed among the members of the association if each member of the association is also an incorporated association that has identical or similar aims and objects.

Clause 30 amends section 44 of the principal Act (which deals with the power of the Commission in relation to incorporated associations which are, in the opinion of the Commission, defunct) by inserting subsection (3) after the section's current contents. The additional subsection provides that where the Commission is satisfied that an incorporated association was dissolved as a result of an error on the part of the Commission, the Commission may reinstate the association as an incorporated association after which the association is to be taken to have continued in existence as if it had not been dissolved and any property which may have vested in the Commission under section 45 is revested in the association.

Clause 31 inserts section 44a after section 44 of the principal Act. Proposed section 44a (1) provides that after an association has been dissolved, where it is proved to the satisfaction of the Commission that if the association still existed, it would be bound to carry out, complete or give effect to some dealing, transaction or matter, and that this could be effected by a purely administrative act by the association (if it still existed), then the Commission may do, or cause to be done, the act as the representative of the association or its liquidator.

Proposed subsection (2) provides that where the Commission executes or signs a document or instrument (adding a memorandum that it has done so pursuant to this section) the execution or signature has the same force, validity and effect as if the association, if it still existed, had duly executed the instrument or document.

Clause 32 inserts two new sections at the beginning of 'Part VI Miscellaneous' of the principal Act. Proposed section 49a (1) provides that the Commission may, on the application of an incorporated association or a person authorised to make such an application—

- extend any limitation of time prescribed by or under this Act whether or not the prescribed period has expired; or
- exempt the association or any officer from any obligation to comply with any provision of this Act.

Proposed subsection (2) provides that an application under subsection (1) may be granted by the Commission on such conditions as it thinks fit.

Proposed subsection (3) provides that where an association or an officer of an association contravenes or fails to comply with a condition imposed by the Commission under subsection (2), the association or the officer (as the case may be) is guilty of an offence. Where the offence is committed in respect of a prescribed association the penalty is a division 6 fine ($4 000) and in any other case the penalty is a division 8 fine ($1 000).

Proposed subsection (4) provides that the Commission may revoke or vary an extension or exemption under subsection (1) at any time by instrument in writing.

Clause 33 amends section 50 of the principal Act by inserting subsection (2a) after subsection (2). Proposed subsection (2a)

provides that the Court may, if it is satisfied that it is just and reasonable in the circumstances to do so, dispense with the requirement that an appeal be lodged within the period fixed by this section (see subsection (2) which fixes this time as 21 days after the act or decision being appealed against).

Clause 34 substitutes a new section for section 51 which expired on 1 July 1990. Proposed section 51 (1) provides that an incorporated association must cause minutes of all proceedings of general and committee meetings to be entered in books kept for that purpose and cause them to be confirmed by the members of the association present at a subsequent meeting and signed by the member who presided at the meeting at which the proceedings took place or by the member presiding at the meeting at which the minutes are confirmed. Proposed subsection (2) provides that if an association fails to comply with this section, the association and any officer who is in default are each guilty of an offence and liable to a division 7 fine ($2 000).

Proposed subsections (3) and (4) are of an evidentiary nature and provide that minutes that are entered and signed in accordance with subsection (1) are to be taken, in the absence of proof to the contrary, as proof—

- of the proceedings to which the minutes relate;
- that the meeting to which the minutes relate was held;
- that the proceedings that are recorded in the minutes as having occurred during the meeting occurred; and
- that all appointments of officers or auditors that are recorded in the minutes as having been made at the meeting were validly made.

Proposed subsection (5) provides that the minute books must be kept at the place where the association is situated or established or in the custody of an officer in accordance with the association's rules or a resolution of the committee and proposed subsection (6) provides that the minutes of general meetings must be available for inspection by any member without charge.

Proposed subsection (7) provides that if default is made in complying with subsection (5) or (6), the association and any officer in default are each guilty of an offence. If the offence is committed in respect of a prescribed association, the penalty is a division 7 fine ($2 000) and in any other case, is a division 8 fine ($1 000).

Clause 37 repeals section 53 of the principal Act and substitutes a new section. Proposed section 53 (1) provides that an incorporated association must not invite a person who is not a member of the association to invest or deposit money with the association, unless—

- prior to or at the time of making any such invitation, the association issues to the person a disclosure statement in accordance with subsection (2); and
- the Commission has approved the invitation (on such conditions as the Commission thinks fit—see proposed subsection (8)).

Proposed subsection (2) sets out that which must be contained in a disclosure statement, including—

- the name and principal objects of the association;
- the names, addresses and occupations of the committee members;
- the total amount of deposits sought and what it will be applied for; and
- details of the association's assets and liabilities.

A transaction made in response to an invitation that is contrary to subsection (1) is void (see proposed subsection (4)).

A person who authorises a disclosure statement that is false or misleading or that omits anything required to be included, is guilty of an offence the penalty for which is a division 6 fine ($4 000) (see proposed subsection (5)).

Proposed subsection (6) provides defences to a charge under the preceding subsection.

For the purposes of subsection (5), a statement is to be regarded as part of a disclosure statement if it is contained in any report or memorandum that appears on the face of, or is issued with, the disclosure statement, or is incorporated by reference in the disclosure statement, wherever the reference occurs.

Proposed subsection (9) provides that this section does not apply to an invitation by an association for the investment of money in a fund that was being maintained by the association on 1 March 1985 or in accordance with an approval of the Commission given before the commencement of this section.

Clause 36 amends section 54 of the principal Act by upgrading the penalty for an offence against that section (failing to have name of incorporated association printed, stamped or endorsed on every notice, etc.) from a fine of $200 to a division 8 fine ($1 000).

Clause 37 repeals section 55 of the principal Act and substitutes a new section that also deals with the prohibition against securing a profit for members.

Proposed subsection (1) provides that, unless the Commission otherwise approves, an incorporated association must not conduct its affairs in a manner calculated to secure a pecuniary profit for the members, or any of them, or for associates of the members or any of them.

Proposed subsection (2) provides that, unless the Commission otherwise approves, an association must not make a payment from its income or capital or dispose of any of its assets *in specie* to the members, or any of them, or to associates of the members or any of them.

Proposed subsection (3) provides that subsection (2) does not apply to reasonable remuneration of a member of the association for work done by the member for or on behalf of the association or to any payments or dispositions that are incidental to activities carried on by the association in accordance or consistently with its objects.

Proposed subsection (4) makes it an offence for an officer of an association to be knowingly concerned in, or be a party to, a contravention of subsection (1) or (2). The penalty is a division 6 fine ($4 000) or division 6 imprisonment (one year) or both.

Proposed subsection (5) provides that the approval of the Commission under this section may be granted on such conditions as the Commission thinks fit and may, by instrument in writing, be varied or revoked by the Commission.

Clause 38 amends section 56 of the principal Act—

- by striking out subsection (4) and substituting a new subsection (4) that provides that where an incorporated association is without a public officer for a period longer than 1 month, the association is guilty of an offence, the penalty for which is a division 8 fine ($1 000); and
- by striking out from subsection (5) 'Five hundred dollars' and substituting 'Division 8 fine' (that is, $1 000).

Clause 39 repeals section 57 of the principal Act and substitutes a new section 57 which also deals with the penalty for non-compliance with the Act or a condition imposed under it.

Proposed subsection (1) provides that an officer of an incorporated association who fails to take all reasonable steps to secure compliance by the association with its obligations under this Act, is guilty of an offence and liable to a penalty of a division 8 fine ($1 000).

Proposed subsection (2) provides that if an incorporated association or an officer of an incorporated association which contravenes or fails to comply with a condition imposed under this Act by the Commission or the Minister in relation to the association, the association or the officer (as the case may be) is guilty of an offence and liable to a penalty of a division 8 fine ($1 000).

Clause 40 repeals section 58 of the principal Act as this section is now encompassed in the new Division IIIA of Part IV—Duties of Officers.

Clause 41 amends section 59 of the principal Act by upgrading the penalty (for failure to notify the Commission, within the time required, of a variation or revocation of a trust which is referred to in the rules of an association or on which a rule of the association relies) from a fine of $500 to a division 8 fine ($1 000).

Clause 42 amends section 60 of the principal Act by upgrading the penalty (for misrepresenting that a body is an association incorporated under this Act) from a fine of $1 000 to a division 6 fine ($4 000).

Clause 43 amends section 61 of the principal Act by striking out subsections (1) and (2) and substituting two new subsections. Section 61 deals with oppressive or unreasonable acts.

Proposed subsection (1) provides that a member or former member expelled by an association may apply to the Supreme Court (within six months of the expulsion) for an order under this section, where that person believes—

- that the affairs of the association are being conducted in an oppressive, unfairly prejudicial or in an unfairly discriminatory manner, against a member or members, or in a manner that is contrary to the interests of the members as a whole;
- that an act or omission or proposed act or omission, by or on behalf of the association, would be oppressive, unfairly prejudicial or unfairly discriminatory against a member or members, or would be contrary to the interests of the members as a whole;
- that the rules of the association contain provisions that are oppressive or unreasonable; or
- that the expulsion of the member was unreasonable or oppressive.

Proposed subsection (2) provides that if, on the hearing of such an application, the Supreme Court is satisfied that the affairs of the association have been conducted in such a manner as to bring it within any of the heads of subsection (1), the Court may, subject to subsection (3), make such orders as it thinks fit, including an order that the association be wound up, or that the member expelled be reinstated as a member.

This section is further amended by inserting a proposed subsection (4a) which provides that where an order appointing a receiver or a receiver and manager of the property of the association is made pursuant to subsection (2), the provisions of the Corporations Law relating to receivers or receivers and managers apply, with such modifications, additions or exclusions as may be necessary for the purpose, or as may be prescribed, in relation to the receiver or receiver and manager as if an incorporated association were a company.

Other amendments made to this section—

- upgrade the penalty for an offence against subsection (6) from a fine of $200 to a division 9 fine ($500); and
- make subsections (3) and (7) fit in with the proposed amendments to this section.

Clause 44 repeals section 62 of the principal Act and substitutes 6 new sections. Proposed section 62 deals with the examination of persons by the Supreme Court (on the application of the Commission or a prescribed person under subsection (2)) where it appears to the Commission or prescribed person that a person has been guilty of some negligence or malfeasance in relation to an association or that a person will, on examination, be able to provide information regarding the affairs of an association to the Court.

Proposed subsection (1) defines a prescribed person for the purposes of this section. On an application under this section, the Court may make such orders as it thinks fit in relation to the examination of such a person (see proposed subsections (3), (4) and (5)).

If a person—

- fails to attend for examination whenever ordered to by the Court (see proposed subsection (6));
- on attending for examination, fails to take an oath or make an affirmation or to answer a question that he or she is directed by the Court to answer, or refuses or fails to produce a book in his or her control to the Court when ordered to do so (see proposed subsections (7), (8) and (9)); or
- makes a statement that is false or misleading in a material particular (see proposed subsection (11)),

the person is liable to a division 5 fine ($8 000) or a division 5 imprisonment (two years).

Proposed subsection (12) provides that although a person is not excused under examination from answering a question that may tend to incriminate him or her, where the person claims, before answering the question, that the answer will be incriminating, the answer is not admissible in evidence against him or her in criminal proceedings other than proceedings under this clause or other proceedings in respect of the falsity of the answer.

This section further provides that such an examination may be conducted by putting the questions and answers in writing to be signed by the person being examined (see proposed subsection (13)). Subject to the proviso against selfincrimination in subsection (12), a signed written record of an examination or an authenticated transcript of an examination may be used in evidence against the person (see proposed subsection (14)). A person ordered to attend for an examination under this section may employ a solicitor or solicitor and counsel to appear during the examination on his or her behalf (see proposed subsection (16)).

Proposed subsection (18) provides that where the Court that made the order under subsection (3) for an examination is satisfied that the examination was obtained without reasonable cause, the Court may order the whole or any part of the costs incurred by the person ordered to be examined to be paid by the applicant or by any other person who, with the consent of the Court, took part in the examination.

The inserted section 62a deals with orders against persons concerned with associations and follows on from the previous section. Proposed subsection (1) provides that where the Court is satisfied, on an application, that a person is guilty of fraud, negligence, default, breach of trust or breach of duty in relation to an association and that the association has suffered, or is likely to suffer, loss or damage as a result of that, then the Court may make such order or orders as it thinks appropriate against, or in relation to, the person, notwithstanding that the person may have committed an offence in respect of the matter to which the order relates.

An order may not be made against a person under the previous subsection, unless the person has had the opportunity to give evidence, to call witnesses, to adduce other evidence and to employ legal counsel (see proposed subsection (3)).

Proposed subsection (4) provides that the orders that may be made against a person include—

- an order directing the person to pay money or transfer property to the association; and
- an order directing the person to pay to the association the amount of the loss or damage.

Proposed subsection (5) provides that nothing in this section prevents any person from instituting any other proceedings in relation to matters in respect of which an application may be made under this section.

Proposed section 62b provides that no civil proceeding under this Act may be stayed by reason only that the proceeding discloses, or arises out of, the commission of an offence.

Proposed section 62c provides for the form and evidentiary value of books that are required to be kept or prepared under this Act.

Proposed section 62d provides that where a person is convicted of an offence against this Act and after that conviction the act or omission that constituted the offence continues, the person is guilty of a further offence, and is liable to an additional penalty for each day on which the act or omission continues of an amount not exceeding one-tenth of the maximum penalty for the offence of which the person was convicted. An obligation under this Act to do something is to be regarded as continuing until the act is done, notwithstanding that any period within which, or time before which, the act is required to be done, has expired or passed.

Proposed section 62e provides for proceedings for offences under this Act. An offence against this Act—

- that is not punishable by imprisonment is a summary offence (see proposed subsection (1));
- that is punishable by imprisonment is, subject to proposed subsection (3), an indictable offence (see proposed subsection (2)).

Proposed subsection (3) provides that where proceedings for an offence are brought in a court of summary jurisdiction which is to hear and determine the proceedings on the request of the prosecutor, the offence is to be taken to be a summary offence and must be heard and determined as such.

Proposed subsection (4) provides that a court of summary jurisdiction may not impose a period of imprisonment exceeding two years or cumulative periods of imprisonment that will exceed five years.

A prosecution for an offence against this Act must be commenced within three years of the date on which the alleged offence took place and may be commenced by the Commission, an officer or employee of the Commission or by any other person who has the consent of the Minister (see proposed subsection (6)).

Proposed subsections (7) and (8) contain evidentiary provisions in relation to the consent of the Minister to a prosecution and the employment of a complainant by the Commission.

Clause 45 amends the evidentiary provision of the principal Act, section 63, by inserting after subsection (6) a new subsection (7). This proposed subsection provides that in any proceedings for an offence against this Act, an allegation in the complaint—

- that an association is or was at a specified time incorporated under this Act;
- that an association is or was at a specified time a prescribed association;
- that the defendant is or was at a specified time an officer of an association named in the complaint; or
- that any meeting of the members of an association required by a specified provision of this Act to be held has not been held,

is, in the absence of proof to the contrary, to be accepted as proved.

Clause 46 amends section 67 of the principal Act which deals with the regulation making power under the Act by striking out paragraph *(e)* of subsection (2) and substituting a new paragraph *(e)* which allows a penalty that does not exceed a division 8 fine ($1 000) to be imposed for contravention of, or non-compliance with, a regulation.

Schedule 1 contains transitional provisions.

Schedule 2 contains amendments to the provisions of the principal Act that are of a statute law revision nature.

Mr S.J. BAKER secured the adjournment of the debate.

MFP DEVELOPMENT BILL

Adjourned debate on second reading.

(Continued from 17 March. Page 3261.)

Mr MEIER (Goyder): I have reservations about this Bill and about the MFP project as a whole. It was interesting to see in the *Advertiser* of Saturday, 7 March, a full-page advertisement headed 'MFP Australia: the Environmental Impact Statement and Supplementary Development Plan'

appearing there at about the same time as a comprehensive document entitled 'The Draft Environmental Impact Statement for the MFP Australia' was formerly released.

I read with interest the material in the *Advertiser* of 7 March. Members can imagine my great consternation when I found that the large map contained some serious inaccuracies. I found that instead of North Arm being where it should be, the map showed Barker Inlet. Instead of the North Arm Creek being where it should be, the map showed simply North Arm. It seemed to deliberately leave out Broad Creek and Swan Alley. Members will probably know that Barker Inlet is to the north-east of Torrens Island. Barker Inlet was in completely the wrong place.

The Hon. Jennifer Cashmore: That doesn't inspire confidence, does it?

Mr MEIER: Indeed, it does not promote any confidence at all. In the first official announcement following a couple of years of protracted discussions with other countries and after, I assume, months of work on the key environmental document as to whether or not the project should go ahead, we see glaring inaccuracies. I took the trouble to look at the environmental impact statement. I thought that it was perhaps just the *Advertiser* that got it wrong, that it printed the incorrect map. Members can imagine how I felt when I found in the environmental impact statement that map 1.1, map 2.3 and map 3.6 exhibited the same inaccuracies as displayed in the one page advertisement in the *Advertiser*.

From the outset, the Opposition has been saying that we should consider the EIS before we consider the Bill, and more and more that is proving to be correct. The EIS is incorrect in some very obvious areas, namely, the identifications on the map. How much else of the EIS is incorrect? Is it simply a typographical error that has occurred in three different maps? But it occurred in the advertisement in the *Advertiser*, which I am sure the MFP people put together and checked.

Whilst I have had fears about this concept for a long time and whilst I have been looking for answers to my queries, I am being left more and more in doubt as to whether the people who are being paid large sums of money know what they are talking about. We can take it further. On that one page advertisement in the *Advertiser* appears the official logo for the multifunction polis. I was very interested to read in a dissertation by Joseph Wayne Smith that the logo—

The Hon. Jennifer Cashmore: He is from Flinders University: Dr Smith.

Mr MEIER: Yes, as my colleague the member for Coles rightly points out, Dr Smith indicated that the logo for MFP Australia was designed by a renowned graphic artist for the cost of $30 000.

The Hon. Jennifer Cashmore: It is almost the cost of a by-election.

Mr MEIER: $30 000 would have seen a good half by-election. Perhaps the member for Gilles could take the opportunity to resign from the Labor Party altogether and contest his seat in his own right. I am sure that we could have gone halfway towards the cost by not having a logo for the multifunction polis. Dr Smith described the logo in an article in the *Advertiser* of 31 October 1991 as consisting of three spheres penetrated by a spike-like triangle. A number of critics writing letters to the Editor of the *Advertiser* on 6 November 1991 pointed out the obvious: that the MFP Australia logo comprises three discs, not spheres. One of those persons asked:

> If the disciples of the proposed MFP can't even recognise a geometrical figure that has been known and defined since at least the days of Pythagoras, about 800 BC, can we have any faith at all in their ability to conceive, never mind design, even a low-tech facility for the twenty-first century?

The more we delve into the MFP, the more we have great reservations and wonder whether really it is pie in the sky. I will be the first person to say that we need new technology in this State. We need new development, provided it is done at a cost we can afford, preferably by private sector contributors.

What is more important, and I would have thought that the Government would recognise it, is the fact that we have to have development in our regional centres. Those centres are experiencing an enormous decline, and the Government should appreciate that our regional centres located in rural areas are right there where South Australia makes or breaks. In other words, we have seen clearly that, when the agriculture sector in South Australia had a decline and a downturn, the rest of the State followed. In this last harvest, thankfully, particularly in the grain areas, much of South Australia had a good return.

It is those same rural people who are now able to spend some of that money, after they have paid back the massive debts incurred. In fact, only yesterday figures were released indicating a ray of hope for the future with some sentiment being expressed that perhaps we have turned the corner. I will tell the House why we have turned the corner. A key reason is that our agricultural sector performed well in South Australia, as well as in other parts of Australia; commodity prices increased considerably; and interest rates came down to a level much more acceptable than in earlier times.

We must ensure that any development—whether it is called MFP or whatever—is not restricted to one central location. Yesterday in this debate the member for Napier suggested that one member of the Opposition might have preferred to see the MFP established in the Barossa Valley. The Barossa Valley has had its MFP for years, as was pointed out to me in a visit last year: it has had its metwurst, its fritz and its port since its beginning. The member for Napier should have realised that that is also occurring, but of course I am talking about a slightly different MFP.

The Hon. B.C. Eastick: It's the Barossa's 150th year this year.

Mr MEIER: It is the Barossa Valley's 150th anniversary, which is a notable achievement. As a person born and bred in the Barossa Valley, I offer my congratulations. The Barossa, with all other regions in this State, would benefit tremendously if the Government's MFP were to be decentralised in many of its functions and activities. That brings me to ask what are the MFP's functions and activities? No-one has identified them to my satisfaction. We hear all the time about high tech industries and about the fact that the MFP will incorporate a large residential component—high density living. We hear that the MFP is to have modern transport and communication networks. That is fine, but I would like some specifics.

I gained some idea from the Montpellier MFP in France when the member for Mount Gambier detailed how successful that MFP is. He indicated that it is a totally different concept, that it was a small centre in the beginning and they built a larger centre. It is also different because of its close proximity to the geographcial centre for many hundreds of millions of people. Compare that to South Australia and Adelaide where, unfortunately, we are far from the geographic centre of large population areas or large economic communities.

Dealing first with the type of activities that occur, I would assume and know from the Montpellier experience that it involves industries such as computers, electronics, advertising and communications. All those activities could well be

undertaken in any high tech development. It is also pointed out that in many potential industries the technology does not even exist today. In other words, those industries will be something for the future, and that will be great to see. If we are really interested in these industries that do not occupy a great deal of space and do not require massive areas of flat land, as is required by GMH and similar industries such as aircraft manufacturing, could we not look to our existing infrastructure? When I look around the city now, what do I find? Number 1 Anzac Highway is a massive high rise building only two or three years old, very new and modern, with a glass exterior gleaming in the sunshine—

The Hon. B.C. Eastick: Never had a tenant.

Mr MEIER: As my colleague says, it has never had a tenant. In fact, it has been up for international tender for some time. What about the Riverside Building not far from here? It has been conspicuous with its 'for lease' sign on the outside, and the State Government is coming to the rescue by trying to occupy some of the floor space.

The Hon. B.C. Eastick: That's fortunate for the public servants.

Mr MEIER: Indeed. What about Southgate at the southern end of King William Street on the corner of South Terrace? That is another magnificent high-rise building conspicuous by its changing colour. That building is also for sale by international tender and has been for lease for a long period. These are three significant and modern high-rise buildings that could all incorporate components supposedly to be set up in the MFP. This morning I had the opportunity to be outside the STA building, waiting to obtain a Glenelg tram timetable. As I was there before 9 a.m., I had a few minutes to spare and I looked up and down Grenfell Street and saw several 'for lease' signs. They were in King William Street as well. I had time to walk 100 metres or so up and down Grenfell Street and I found many buildings for lease virtually within sight of the corner of Grenfell and King William Streets. I did not walk further down King William Street, but I saw a few signs there as well. The following buildings were displaying 'for lease' signs:

Commercial Banking Company of Sydney
T & G Building
ANZ Building
National Mutual Building
Tattersalls Building
Eagle House
Pearl Assurance House
Grenfell Centre
Sun Alliance Building
New Zealand Insurance Building
Da Costa Building
Chesser House
Wyatt House
Australis Centre
Coopers and Lybrand Building
Acoa House
Woodham Biggs Building
Corfu House
Aviation House
Dunn and Bradstreet Building
Rigonis Building
Burns Cumming House
Peel Chambers

Within about 100 metres on either side of the Grenfell Street/King William Street intersection I found about 23 buildings, all with extensive areas for lease. Here we are debating a potential multi-billion dollar Bill to house new technology, yet most of it could be housed at no cost in those buildings that are now empty. But the Government is saying that the Opposition has to be responsible and recognise the need for this new MFP; that it will be the saviour of this State. I can understand why the Government is saying this, because the Premier is scared stiff: come the next election he has to have some little object there. Although this MFP is way beyond the present, some 10, 15 or 20 years down the track, he wants the legislation up and running.

We certainly need new technology and new development. We need new businesses like we have never needed them before. This State is going broke, and is well on the way there now. But, to say that we will spend billions of dollars—and how much of that will be taxpayers' money we do not know—when we are billions of dollars in debt is totally irresponsible. Many other matters have been mentioned by other speakers, particularly from this side of the House.

In the brief time left to me I will highlight some of the potential pollution problems in respect of the MFP site. It has been pointed out to me that at present crustacea are not allowed to be taken from West Lakes because of their high lead content—apparently it is four times the normal level. So, it is forbidden to take oysters, mussels and cockles from those lakes. It has also been pointed out to me that one of the key reasons why the high lead content is in those crustacea is because of the material that is washed off the roads into the lakes. I put it to members that lakes are also to be in the waterways of the MFP.

We have heard from other speakers about the massive amount of pollution that is already in the MFP area. In fact, the EIS goes into full details on that. We are proposing, for the future, to build a whole series of roadways in this new MFP site, thereby increasing pollution out of all proportion. We need our head examined if we do not realise the consequences of such actions. I was in the area adjoining the MFP site during the parliamentary break, visiting an industrial business. I was staggered by the number of noisy, large industries in the area, the number of semitrailers and commercial vehicles and the lack of adequate roads servicing those industries. On one occasion I was virtually lost. I was bamboozled; the road cut out, I turned the wrong way and I had to go back to find the industry I was looking for.

This is the area that people will come through from the MFP, and I wondered whether it would impress the people who want this modern city. The MFP will be surrounded by an industrial area, and that is completely unsuitable. There is no doubt we need new technology for this State, this city and our regional areas, but what we are doing here leaves me with grave concerns. I believe that more than anything else, restrictions on what money is spent are needed.

Mr MATTHEW (Bright): In rising this afternoon I would like to acknowledge the presence of the member for Playford, the member for Albert Park, the member for Henley Beach, the member for Napier (who has just entered the Chamber) and the Minister of Emergency Services, because they are the only Government members who are sitting in this Chamber today when it has before it one of the most important Bills to come before the South Australian Parliament in a decade. It may well be that the Minister on the front bench does not like that comment, but it is a fact that the Government has the responsibility—

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

A quorum having been formed:

Mr MATTHEW: There is no doubt that 20 minutes is insufficient time to do justice to this issue. That is why members have heard differing speeches from this side of the Chamber, each addressing different parts of the Bill. While the Bill, in the Premier's words, 'provides the legislative structure to enable the continued development and

promotion of the MFP project', there is no doubt that it goes much further than that.

The MFP Development Corporation, which will be established if this Bill passes, is subject to direction by the State Minister and has powers to do such things as acquire real and personal property, divide and develop land and carry out works, enter into partnerships and joint venture arrangements or form, or acquire, companies and other entities and interests in them. The Liberal Party has supported consistently the concept of an MFP-type development to attract more investment and industry to South Australia, particularly in high technology. However, we have concerns about the open chequebook statement that has been made publicly by the Premier of this State. The Premier said that the chequebook is open and the money will be there to get the MFP off the ground.

Is it any wonder that South Australians and members of the Opposition are concerned about that statement? This is the same Premier who has presided over a $2.2 billion loss (so far) from the State Bank. This is the same Premier who presided over a loss of $81 million through SGIC. This is the same Premier who presided over business bankruptcies and who has seen those businesses fall down faster through the imposts of payroll tax and WorkCover. This is the same Premier who presided over record unemployment in South Australia—the highest unemployment rate of any State in the country.

Now that same Premier is asking this Parliament to support a Bill that will give an open chequebook to enable this development to get off the ground. That same Premier is telling us that this is the answer to South Australia's economic woes. Let us have a close look at exactly what that answer is and where the money will come from. To do that, I think it is important to look at the history of how this project has developed. By now I would hope that all members would be aware that the MFP was first proposed by Mr Tamura, the Japanese Minister for International Trade and Industry (known as MITI), to the Australian Minister for Industry, Technology and Commerce, Senator Button, at the Japan-Australia ministerial committee meeting in January 1987. This was followed by the release of a paper prepared by MITI for a multifunction polis scheme for the twenty-first century, otherwise known as the basic concept paper which outlined the Japanese perspective of this project.

Early in 1988 the Australian and Japanese Governments agreed that there was a sufficient community of interest for them to undertake a feasibility study of the MFP concept for Australia. In June 1990 the joint select committee that was established 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.

So, we have an endorsement of Adelaide as the site, but a very guarded endorsement. A number of processes occurred, but in March 1992 we finally saw the draft EIS published, based on the conclusion that there were no environmental obstacles that the development project should not be able to overcome. However, it should be noted that the draft EIS actually relates only to the development of the Gillman-Dry Creek land within the core site, which is 1 840 hectares. That is all very interesting so far, but there was a guarded message from the joint steering committee. It is important to look at the viability of an MFP and some of the analyses done towards that end.

A final report was published in 1990 after a study of locations in Sydney and Melbourne, as well as Adelaide, for the project. That study was commissioned by the joint steering committee and undertaken by Anderson Consulting in conjunction with Kinhill Engineers, two very well-respected organisations in the Australian community. They said, in part:

> The results of the economic analysis undertaken by the National Institute for Economic and Industy Research indicate the MFP is viable only if it adopts a specific scale and mix of activities and is located correctly.

So, once again, it is very guarded.

Mr Ferguson: We've heard all this.

Mr MATTHEW: The member for Albert Park says that we have heard it all before. I would hope that he considers this sort of evidence—

Mr HAMILTON: On a point of order, Sir, I made no such comment at all. I was sitting here reading a document in front of me. I think the honourable member might be on magic mushrooms or something.

The ACTING SPEAKER (Hon. T.H. Hemmings): Order! There is no point of order.

Mr MATTHEW: I am advised by one of my colleagues that it was in fact the member for Henley Beach. I apologise to the member for Albert Park for identifying him incorrectly against that comment. However, I would commend that statement to him as well to absorb in his deliberations on the Bill. It is interesting to note that, at a multifunction polis seminar in Sydney on 30 October 1990, a member of the National Capital Planning Authority, Mr Tony Power, said:

> The latest decision to opt for Adelaide as the preferred location has little or no chance of succeeding, in my opionion. If the project is to be funded or carried out by private enterprise in the main and possibly by international financial joint ventures then I think south-east Queensland offers the best and probably the only prospect for success.

So, we are in a situation where there are a number of authorities who have said, first, that the project must be of a particular size and nature, and secondly, that the project may not be best placed in Adelaide. I think we need to look at the reason why many members are looking at those statements, and it concerns the ever changing MFP proposal, because this Parliament has never had before it a consistent proposal. In saying that, I point initially to the South Australian submission that was based on putting some 100 550 residents on the site in three stages. The first stage required 40 000 dwellings, and the submission claimed:

> 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 cite 100 000 people, not 100 550, as the number of people who were to live on the MFP site, and the site is 3 500 hectares. The Premier, Mr Bannon said in the *Advertiser* of 30 June 1990:

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

Later the Premier gave a speech to the MFP seminar in Sydney on 30 October 1990 and said, in part:

> 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.

However, in early 1991, the MFP project team gave a first public indication of a project of reduced size. On 24 January 1991 the *Advertiser* quoted Mr Tony Read, a study manager of Kinhill Delfin, as saying that 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.

We now have the scenario of the ever-reducing MFP. It is interesting to note that the reduction in size was not in accordance with the statements that initially selected Adelaide as the site. It is important to look at the suitability of Gillman as a site. The Supplementary Development Plan, which was released recently, states in part:

> 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.

Further, the draft EIS, which was also released recently, states:

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

It is interesting to find from MFP documents where that material for compaction and fill is now to be obtained. It will be obtained from offshore sand bars. It will be obtained using what is a finite, valuable resource in South Australia—sand. Members of this Parliament who represent southern and south-western coastal electorates in particular, including me and my colleagues the members for Hayward and Morphett, and indeed the member for Henley Beach who is here for this debate, would be aware of problems on that part of the coast that this State has experienced with sand. Indeed, the State Government has in the past 12 months contracted a New Zealand dredging company to transport sand from one part of the coast to another. The cost of that dredge is $1 000 per hour—to find sand and take it to the right site. But here in the MFP documents we are told that we have this source, and we can use it for compacting fill for the MFP. How seriously does the Government expect us to treat its proposal when it supports ludicrous situations like that? Is it a finite, vanishing resource.

In my electorate a few years ago, an experiment—and a failed one—was conducted on the beach at Seacliff. Because sand was in scarce supply, the Government obtained Mount Compass sandy loam from the side of a hill and trucked it to the beach. It could not get enough sand, but all of a sudden it seems there is enough sand around the MFP site to use it as fill. I wonder how thinking citizens in South Australia will react to this? This Government had better give very careful consideration to some of the outrageous proposals it is starting to support.

In the time available to me, it is absolutely vital that I also talk about infrastructure, because it is infrastructure for the MFP that has the potential to rob developing suburbs of South Australia more than any part of this project, notwithstanding that this project has already robbed northern and southern developing suburbs of $40 million from the Better Cities program—$40 million that was diverted at the expense of the southern and northern suburbs (and already some members of this Parliament have jumped up and said that it should not occur). I am sure that even you, Mr Acting Speaker, would have to be concerned that the area you represent is missing out on this money which it deserves, just as the southern suburbs deserve it. It is important that members of Parliament stand up and say that that money should not be diverted.

If the Federal Government—and it is a big 'if'—has a commitment to this project, we need to see the colour of its money. We will not stand by and see this State dragged further into debt by putting up infrastructure in an area when other areas do not yet have it. We are told in the South Australian Government's May 1990 submission to the joint steering committee that estimated public moneys '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 sources' would be needed. We have not seen much of the Federal Government's $1 billion yet. It has simply diverted $40 million from the Better Cities program. It has robbed Peter to pay Paul. This estimate was upgraded in June 1990 when the Premier said:

> Adelaide's selection as a site for the $7 billion multifunction polis would not cost taxpayers.

So, suddenly the cost has gone up, but it will not cost us anything. The MFP would cost the Government about $280 million for infrastructure development. We have also seen interesting reports in the *Advertiser*. On 20 March 1991, it was reported in the *Advertiser* that it would cost an estimated $705 million just to clean up the Gillman site. A lot of very big figures have been floating around. We are certainly used to seeing large amounts of money thrown around as a result of the State Bank loss, but at the end of the day we have not seen a constructive financial analysis of this project put before this Parliament or the people of South Australia that demonstrates how much the project will cost, where the money will come from and, more importantly, who will back it. The Japanese have indicated that they do not want to back it: they want to sit back and wait. Who can blame them? At the moment it does not look like a viable investment for the Japanese.

Much has been said about the need to attract high technology to South Australia. I endorse that need totally. There is no doubt that high technology has the potential to move this State forward. It has the potential to provide jobs and to utilise the skills available within our community to develop systems and products that are not available anywhere else in the world. We can market them. In fact, we already have an established record of developing high technology in this State for what is now regarded as the common—but was not always so—photocopy machine: it was actually developed here in Adelaide. It was a fantastic development that is now used world wide.

So, the potential is there and the brain power is there, but the thing that seems to be escaping the notice of members of the Government is that we do not need to centralise high tech in one location. Indeed, high technology by its very nature means that it is clearly possible for a number of remotely located industries to co-op together using the high technology products that they are developing. In the age of the computer, the silicon chip, high tech and ease of communication, these things do not need to be concentrated in one area but can be located anywhere. They can be located in the southern and northern suburbs of Adelaide, in the regional centres, in the Riverland, in the South-East or up north. They can be located in all those areas. South Australia has an opportunity to show to the world how it is using high technology to its ultimate capacity. By establishing technology in that way, we would provide jobs that are so desperately needed in the southern areas as well as in the northern areas and in the country and regional centres instead of encouraging mass migration to the centre of the city.

Mr Holloway interjecting:

Mr MATTHEW: I am surprised that the member for Mitchell is sitting there parroting away over this. He gets up in this Chamber and tells us about the problems that his electorate is having with traffic passing through. This is an opportunity for the honourable member to avoid some of that movement and to concentrate jobs in areas where people live.

The last point on which I want to touch is public transport, because the Premier has told this Parliament and the public quite clearly that he sees Gillman as an opportunity to establish 'a network of state of the art transport links to integrate the development within suburban Adelaide and the city'. The southern suburbs are still waiting for a decent transport system to serve that outer metropolitan extremity. They are still waiting for the extension of the Noarlunga line, which has been promised on numerous occasions in this House but which has not occurred.

The MFP is one of many other promises. Quite frankly, I doubt whether many people in this Parliament or in this State believe that the Government can deliver. Unless the demands by the Opposition for tight financial control over this project are met I, like many other members in this Parliament, will quite rightly oppose this Bill.

Mr HAMILTON (Albert Park): What a very interesting contribution from the member for Bright. What a terrible use of a name and what a terrible contribution by the honourable member himself: the electorate is Bright by name but the member for Bright is certainly not bright. An editorial in today's *News*, to which I will refer in a moment, is headlined 'Bickering towards a brain drain' and 'Recovered confidence' in South Australia, two issues very much in the mind of most people in this State. Before referring to that article, I would like to cite an editorial from the *News* of 6 March 1992 headed 'Our View: The Liberal's play the Luddite card', which states:

> Very well, Mr Baker: What? An alarming speech from the State Liberal Leader is highly critical of the multifunction polis project. SA will survive without it, he says. Besides, it should be decentralised to include the South-East. He just happens to have his electorate there. It is a bunyip view of directions in technology.
>
> Of course South Australia can survive without the MFP. It can survive as a community gradually retreating to an agrarian, peasant economy. It can survive as a theme park catering for affluent visitors from the 21st century who come to enjoy the sunshine and the Chardonnay.
>
> Unless this State seizes the opportunities presented by the MFP, this is the future which beckons, a State with a permanent brain drain because its best minds and liveliest talents are forced to move elsewhere.
>
> In recent times there have been increasingly strong signals that the Liberal Party is preparing to politicise this project. It will ally itself with green extremists and Luddites. Mr Baker's speech is the strongest expression yet of this sentiment.

The article continues under the heading 'Mortal wound':

> If this does become Liberal Party policy it will be a terrible blow to SA. It will make the re-election of the shopworn Bannon Government a necessity. Getting the MFP for Adelaide was a coup. Making it work was not going to be easy in any circumstances.
>
> If the Liberals refuse to offer bipartisan enthusiasm it is grievously, and probably mortally, wounded. We repeat: what specific alternatives does Mr Baker plan?

I could not have put it any better. These Luddites, these blinkered people are more concerned about their political ambition, in my opinion. They are more concerned about gaining government than gaining jobs for this State. They are not concerned for the people they purport to represent. They are prepared to grovel in the grime, to grasp at anything to try to knock this project, a project that any other State of Australia would have grabbed at. We all know that Queensland, New South Wales and the other States could not get their hands on it quick enough if given the opportunity. But it was what we did in South Australia that got this project directed towards us.

It is clear that, if we do not pick up the MFP, there will be an increasing brain drain, as has been stated in the editorial in today's *News*. We need to retain the ability of many of our people who are brilliant in many fields. Not only do we need to retain people in this State, we need to attract people from all parts of the world to assist not only the members of Parliament but those people out there whom we purport to represent. We hear the cries and the bleating by members opposite who yesterday stood up with that false charade about their concern for the unemployed people in this State. Here is an opportunity for them to put their money where their mouth is.

Let us have a look at the project. I refer to the West Lakes development, for example. Where would it have been today if we had had these same Luddites sitting opposite? The project would not have gone ahead. The Opposition is not prepared to concede. I suggest that very few members opposite have been down there and had a look at the project. They have been blinkered by their own ideology and by their attempt to knock everything that this Government puts forward. They are blinkered and are trying to grab power at any cost; they are not concerned about those unemployed people or about all those jobs that would be created by the multifunction polis.

When I first came down from the country in October 1968, I can remember standing with my two young sons at a spot in West Lakes where the Chinese Palace now stands (and it is a very nice restaurant), and we watched the graders coming in and scooping out all the mud and slush and the development taking place. If members opposite had the wit to do a little research into what has taken place and to look at what has happened in other parts of the world, they would know that almost anything is possible using today's technology.

However, they are not prepared to accept that. They are not prepared to talk to people from the Delfin company. Have they spoken to anyone from Delfin management? Have they spoken to any of those who are interested in the project, who want to get it up and running, who want to create thousands of jobs for South Australia and who want to create a future for our children—those children whom we are now putting through high school and encouraging to continue their education to gain that scholastic ability to be able to provide not only for themselves but indeed for many others at some time in the future?

We have a responsibility to look after those young people who are coming on today, those who are in the schools and universities and those who are yet to commence their schooling. But, no, members of the Opposition are blinkered by their luddite approach. As I have indicated, they obviously have not had discussions with the Delfin company or the Kinhill engineering group. I would even suggest that very few of them would have read the reports written on the MFP or taken the opportunity to be briefed on the project.

When the MFP was first mooted in 1987, what did we get? We had this rabid, fascist group, who were anti-Japanese and anti-development, displaying posters all around Adelaide on which Mr Bannon and the MFP were attacked and claiming that the project was a Japanese attempt to create an enclave on Australian soil. I have a long memory and I remember those fascists, those people who have a brain the size of an ant—and that is probably being kind to them. These people do not have the will nor the desire to research this matter and to find out what this development can and will do for not only South Australia but indeed Australia. They were not prepared to do that; they were blinkered by their hatred for the Japanese and Asians. They did not have any time for people who did not come from Europe or who were not white. The puerile contributions of these people are almost sickening to the stomach. This was the first group who were not prepared to accept this project. An article in *Australian Business Magazine* of 19 June 1991 states:

Three years later, after sparring over whether the MFP should be located on Queensland's Gold Coast or in Adelaide, the Australian project of the twenty-first century has broadened its scope, but it will still need overseas investment to realise its full potential.

Why should we on this side of the House support this project? The reasons lie in the magnitude of the growth projections. Let us have a look at some of those projections—and they are not mine—made in *Australian Business Magazine* article, which states:

Between 1993 and 2014, MFP Adelaide has the potential to increase State gross product by a minimum of $1 628 million and a maximum of $10 854 million, with the public sector receiving between $325 million and $2 170 million in taxes and charges.

Have we heard anything from members opposite? Where is the member for Bright now—the man who stood up and castigated Government members for not being in the Chamber? What do we see on the other side of the House? I can see two Opposition members and the member for Flinders, who is always here—or nearly always here. Where are the Opposition members now? Blinkered again by their ideologies.

The Hon. T.H. Hemmings: They're in a leadership spill.

Mr HAMILTON: They may well be at another challenge. The member for Hayward must be the next speaker, otherwise he would not be in the Chamber: he would probably be out lobbying for preselection for some other seat. Why is the Opposition opposed to this project? Members of the Opposition know, as we do, the benefits to South Australia and, in particular, to the western suburbs of Adelaide which have been screaming out for development for years. We need development in that area for those people whom we must try to look after. You, Mr Speaker, the member for Henley Beach, others and I try to do our best and get these projects but we have these knockers from the Liberal Party.

Let us look at some of the other benefits of the MFP. It will directly and indirectly be responsible for the creation of an extra 43 000 jobs by the year 2008—not all that far away. We have the hypocrisy of members opposite reflected in the urgency motion they put up yesterday in this House, and now we hear them bleating and knocking all over the place. I have not heard of one good thing from any member of the Opposition and, although I am perhaps being unkind to the member for Hayward, I doubt whether he would have anything decent to say about the project. The article continues:

It will cost the South Australian Government $105 million in initial infrastructure costs and $9 million a year (1991 dollars) in additional costs. Up to 50 000 people could live in villages on the core site at Gillman and another 50 000 could be attracted to live elsewhere in Adelaide. The development of the Gillman site as a real estate proposition offers rates of return of about 24.3 per cent. From an engineering standpoint, the civil engineering involved in constructing the urban village at Gillman offers no insurmountable obstacles.

The feasibility study prepared by Kinhill Delfin (a consortium formed by Kinhill Engineers Pty Ltd and Delfin Property Group Ltd) found that the scale and nature of the proposed development enabled the location of specific features and design to be modified to accommodate the constraints.

We know there is a company or group of companies that have had experience in the past. Whether it be Delfin's operation at West Lakes or the one at Golden Grove, here is a company that has a proven track record in terms of development from the 1960s and 1970s. Yet we have members opposite suggesting that these companies do not have the ability to develop the MFP. It is extremely disappointing that we have seen the Opposition, the Liberal Party in particular, knock just about every project that has been brought before us. Only last year, I can recall many times when members opposite were still knocking the entertainment centre which was nearing completion. Is it any wonder that people believe that that is the correct attitude? If one tells a lie often and long enough, we see the Goebbels mentality. That is what is coming across—the Goebbels mentality. If you tell a lie long enough and often enough—

Mr Ferguson interjecting:

Mr HAMILTON: I am not going to call people fascists, as my colleague suggests; that might be a bit extreme. Nevertheless, they are Luddites, Luddites of the worst kind. If they see any benefits to South Australia, they are not prepared to say so. I suggest that they want to see an early election so they can get in after most of the hard yakka has been done and then give support to the project.

The International Advisory Board, comprising notables such as ANZ Chief Executive Will Bailey, Santos Managing Director Ross Adler and Nippon Steel director Eishiro Saito, encapsulated the three key issues for the success of MFP Adelaide. They include developing community and long-term bipartisan political support (something that we are not getting, and I am not surprised), a well-managed international promotion and marketing program built on a credible vision, and identification of what would be necessary to attract key people and companies to the MFP. However, as well intentioned as the MFP proponents are, the Federal Government is unlikely to support a State-initiated project on the grand scale currently proposed. That was stated in June 1991. Interestingly, the Federal Government has got behind the project.

For us in the western suburbs, we believe very strongly that this is a project that South Australia needs. I see that you, Mr Speaker, are nodding your head. Everyone in the western suburbs should get behind it. We are not concerned for ourselves but for your children, Mr Speaker, my children and all the children in the western suburbs and in South Australia. We should be building for a brighter future. This is one of the last chances that South Australia has to move into the next century and to make South Australia and Australia a centrepiece.

Why is it that other countries have similar developments? Because their industrialists have got behind the projects. Members opposite have knocked this project from its inception, as I have demonstrated, confronting us with a number of problems. That attitude is demonstrated in the *Advertiser* today in its editorial opinion. It is a very conservative newspaper, which in my view is not a great supporter of this Government. But it has strongly criticised the Opposition for the manner in which it has addressed this problem. People who have dealt with the Japanese know that they operate by consensus. Unfortunately, we are not getting it from members opposite. I regret that they have chosen to adopt that attitude but I believe that time will tell. I hope that I am around when we can say, 'Come along you Luddites, enjoy the opening of this project.'

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

Mr BRINDAL (Hayward): If Hans Christian Andersen were sitting in the gallery today, I wonder how he would be feeling. It was many years ago that he wrote a famous fairy story called *The Emperor's New Clothes*. Yet in 1992 the Government has rewritten the fairy story, and it is now entitled the MFP Development Bill. I will carefully go through some of the points raised by the member for Albert Park. I have always thought that he is an honourable man and that he believes what he says, so I trust that he will listen and, at the end of the debate, might at least have cause to go into the Caucus room and ask his Government about some of the assumptions on which this Bill is based.

Although I cannot address him directly, I would like the honourable member to read my lips when I say that this Opposition does not oppose the Bill. The Opposition questions the Bill and would like to see many aspects of it modified, but it does not oppose the MFP Development Bill. Try as it might, this cynical Government will fail in its cynical attempts to convince the people of South Australia that somehow this Opposition is anti-development in this State. It is arrant nonsense and can be perpetrated only by members opposite who have already been described as yesterday's men. Tomorrow's men would not bother with such stupidity.

I believe we should examine the history of the MFP because there are many questions which this Bill apparently addresses but which in reality remain unanswered. In 1988 Kinhill Engineers were commissioned and, as everybody knows, the initial study put locations in Sydney and Melbourne ahead of Adelaide for the project. A final report was published in 1990 by Kinhill and I will read into the record some extracts from that. The economically viable scenario for compelling and implementable aspects of the MFP concept were these:

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 direct jobs and perhaps 130 000 indirect jobs.

As can be seen from the contributions in this debate and from the figures read by the member for Albert Park, the initial concept of the MFP and the current concept of the MFP are horses of a vastly different colour. The member for Albert Park claims that a total of 43 000 jobs will be created for a significantly reduced population, accepting a Gillman population of 50 000 and a peripheral population of 50 000, which is the lowest Kinhill figure for a viable MFP. Kinhill talked about 160 000 jobs. That is a big difference, and I would like the member for Albert Park or one of his Ministers to explain the basis of this difference, because we seem to be getting much less value for our money.

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'. It stated:

... the sheer quality of the raw site will assist the image and marketing of the concept and hence facilitate the achievement of other objectives.

That background is important, because we then come to May 1990, when the South Australian Government made a final submission to the joint steering committee. That submission was made in the name of our current Premier, Premier Bannon. The submission was based on putting 100 550 residents on the site in three stages (from the South Australian submission P. B-1), 'requiring 40 000 dwellings' (P 5-8). The submission also claimed:

Based on earlier documentation, the average MFP requirement will be about 4 000 overseas migrants per annum. This is well within the range of Australia's recent experience. (P. 5-3)

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 that site was detailed as being 3 500 hectares in size. I quote:

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

That was Premier Bannon as quoted in the *Advertiser* on 30 June 1990. So, we had this happening consistently: we had Minister Arnold in the *News* of 2 July 1990, we had in the *Advertiser* an advertisement on 15 September 1990 from the MFP-Adelaide project team, and then an advertisement under Mr Bannon's signature in the *Advertiser* of 10 October 1990—all stating that there were 3 000 hectares involved and 100 000 people to be housed. However, on 24 January 1991 the *Advertiser* referred to Mr Tony Read, study manager for Kinhill Delfin, as follows:

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.

I draw the House back to the original assumption underlying the MFP: that it should be a discrete city involving between 100 000 and 200 000 people. That idea has flagrantly been breached and cannot be fulfilled, and that was acknowledged as early as 24 January 1991. The 3 500 hectares that was consistently argued about right from that time was by then changed, and I refer to the status report by the MFP management board, which refers to a 'designated core site, of 2 405 hectares.

We have had shrinkage of 1 100 hectares and a population loss of about 50 000 people from the site. That change was apparently the result of a stroke of the pen, but we are told that the site is still viable even though, according to the original parameters, it would clearly be unviable.

Turning to the problems of the Gillman site itself, I refer to a report to the Department of Premier and Cabinet of August 1989 'Stratigraphic Investigation of the Gillman Development Site, Port Adelaide Estuary', which advised:

Holocene marine sequence up to 8 metres thick overlies late Pooraka formation [layer] and ... Glanville formation sediments.

It went on to state:

... the Holocene strata are saturated, loose, organic rich and permeable, with very low bearing capacity.

That is important and I shall return to it after I have dealt with one more fascinating aspect of the MFP site. I refer to the vegetation, and you, Sir, and every member of this House have seen wonderful Venice-like visions of the MFP rising out of a flat, featureless swamp. It has wonderful architectural features, magnificent waterways and canals but, above all this, is a magnificent urban forest, which will sweep up and break the horizontal boredom of the landscape as it currently exists. But in December 1990 Coffey Partners International presented to Kinhill Delfin an 'Interim Working Paper on Preliminary Geotechnical Groundwater and Agronomic Investigations'. Significantly, this report has never been published, but it does much to dispell the myth of the great urban forest that will arise in Gillman, because it states:

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.

The report goes on to indicate that much of the soils are too acid, many others are too alkaline, and nearly all the soils are too saline. There is a significant problem with the ground water, so much so that the report says this of 17 of the 21 samples taken from the site:

... were high to 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 saltbush can grow.

I have made approaches to friends who know about botany and they assure me that, if the only types of vegetation that can be supported are those similar to saltbush, it will be impossible to grow any significant tree of any size currently known to exist in the world.

Members interjecting:

Mr BRINDAL: I look forward to the member for Price gazing out over those lush saltbush forests to see what he can see—or (and this might truly be part of the MFP) 200

foot plastic gum trees complete with plastic koalas and plastic birds, forming part of that site. It will be wonderful seeing the latest technology being applied to the MFP, with plastic trees, plastic koalas and plastic birds. If we hose them down correctly, I am sure no-one will know. That is all the urban forest will involve.

Members interjecting:

Mr BRINDAL: I know, Mr Speaker, that we must not reply to interjections, but there is a chortling from the member for Mitchell, 'Have you ever seen West Lakes?' I have, and I challenge the member for Mitchell to consult his colleague the member for Albert Park, who regularly door-knocks and trots around West Lakes, to ask him how many trees of significant size exist on the West Lakes site. There are many shrubs and bushes but there are no trees of significant size on the West Lakes site.

Mr Hamilton interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order!

Mr BRINDAL: The member for Albert Park has invited me to visit his electorate and I will take that invitation up with interest. Until then, I will stick by my words. For our criticism of the MFP we have been dubbed 'Luddites'. I point out to the members for Albert Park and Napier that perhaps they might investigate who the Luddites were. Luddites were people who broke machines, that is true, but they broke machines in a time when they feared that their machines were going to dipossess them from their land and rob them of their jobs. They were ordinary working people in England who feared the onslaught of the technological revolution and, in fact, that is what happened. They were cleared from the land like scum and herded into the cities to be used as factory fodder for generation after generation. The Luddites eventually spawned the Labor Party. If there is one criticism I have of the Luddites, it is that they spawned the Party we have to put up with every day in this Chamber. If, by calling us Luddites, members opposite in their ignorance are saying that we are sticking up for the—

The SPEAKER: Order! The honourable member will return to debating the Bill.

Mr BRINDAL: I will, Sir. But, if Luddites mean that we represent the ordinary people of South Australia, long may we be Luddites. In that context I will look at the housing issues in the MFP Bill and expose members opposite for the hypocrites they are. The Government's May 1990 submission to the joint steering committee stated that this new MFP would be a mixture of social housing, an international city which 'will be able to counter any tendency for racial or socioeconomic elites to develop and moderate the pace and demographic profiles of the new settlement development'. A report of May 1991 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.

That is what the member for Albert Park and the member for Price said was needed in the area and that, Mr Speaker, I am sure is what you think is needed in the area. However, if we read the Report on Housing Market Issues for the MFP Development, North-Western Adelaide, which was prepared by John M. Cooper at the request of Wendy Bell, the planning consultant for the MFP, dated 14 November 1991, we find a very different story. The report 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 feature 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.

Then comes the crunch. The report states:

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

Mr BLACKER (Flinders): I do not intend to talk for very long about this legislation, but I feel that I must place on the record a few of my concerns. I think it is necessary that we recognise that this is a very long-term project. Many of us presently in the Chamber may not see the project earn income for the State, so we must have a long-term vision and determine whether or not we believe it will be in the interests of coming generations. In this case a 20 to 30 year project would be a minimum, and we may well find that when development projections are made that 20 or 30 years will work out to be 40 or 50 years, and the cost analysis should be worked out on that basis.

If we find that the MFP develops into a commercial area in the twenty-first century, we all will applaud that because South Australia has expertise in areas that are recognised worldwide. Earlier today one of my colleagues raised the fact that the photocopier was invented and developed in South Australia. We have seen those sorts of developments occur on many occasions but, for them to be commercially produced, more often than not they have to go overseas and the fruit of the labour of the inventor is lost to Australia and South Australia. If this project can help bring to fruition and put into commercial production some of those ideas, there will be considerable value in it.

Other areas that will be identified in commercial development include health, space, tourism, leisure, media, entertainment and transport. There is room for considerable improvement in those areas, and no doubt we would like to see South Australia play an effective role in relation to that. Government members have been somewhat critical of Opposition members for daring to question the legislation. I think that it is the Opposition's role to quiz and check the validity and authenticity of matters before the House, and it has a right and obligation to question all aspects of legislation. I think it is wrong for Government members to berate Opposition members for doing their job. That raises the question: if Government members are going to berate Opposition members in that way, are they hiding something? Why do they have to run down the Opposition when it merely questions an argument? If the answers are there, the Government should lay them before the House.

Mr Holloway interjecting:

Mr BLACKER: I am sure that all Opposition members would like that to occur. An honourable member opposite just said that the answers are there. I have been in this place long enough to know that, although we have been told that all the answers are there, projects have failed. We all know that Redcliff failed because it was fundamentally flawed; it tried to put industrial manufacturing into a highly sensitive environmental area. The homework had not been done. I have raised this matter on many occasions previously in the House, that when one looked at the marine map for Redcliff one found that it was not possible to get a ship into the jetty of the proposed site. The plan looked nice, and the site and jetty with the required depth at its end were set out. But, the Government did not tell the House that the end of the jetty was in a hole and that it was impossible to bring a ship from the gulf to the end of the jetty without massive dredging. The proposal was fundamentally flawed because somebody failed to conduct the elementary exercise of looking at the marine map to ascertain whether a ship could get that far up the gulf. Also, there were many other environmental matters of concern.

We had a similar situation with Monarto, which has a great grove of very costly trees (which nobody complains about), and this State is probably still paying for some of the misjudgments that occurred on that occasion. It is the Opposition's right to be able to question, and there have been many occasions when that questioning has been of benefit to the Government. If Opposition questioning can circumvent a problem and save the State and taxpayers millions of dollars, obviously it is of benefit.

The member for Albert Park mentioned that anything is possible when it comes to the development of the project. I know that anything is possible, and I tend to agree with that statement, but it is all possible at a cost. My fundamental concern is that we are putting a project which should be world class in a site that has many problems. Those problems can be overcome at very great expense, and many people in this State would ask: why that site, if in fact it will cost us hundreds of millions of dollars to get to ground level, without putting a project on top? The infrastructure that will be underground, so to speak, in stabilising the earth to provide a reasonable foundation for the buildings is, in my view, a problem. It can be overcome. Whether in fact the State can afford the cost to overcome it, just to prepare a flat and level site, remains to be seen.

I wish to put on notice my fundamental concern about the site. Having a Science Park or Technology Park, or something of that ilk, is something which I totally support and applaud. My only question is: at what cost, and how far will the next generation be committed to the expense of those issues? I just put those words of caution. I hope I do not have to come back here at a later date and say, 'See, I was right', and I hope that members of the Opposition do not have to do that. I note with interest a number of amendments that will be considered. I share the sentiments of those amendments, because they attempt to put responsibility on this House to be answerable for probably one of the most important developments likely to occur in this State. To that end, any Act that will bring an accountability and responsibility which must be shared by this House is something that needs to be supported.

Mr QUIRKE (Playford): I will be asking some questions in the Committee stage in respect of the relationship of the State Government to local government. Before I go into the main part of my remarks, I will say that some of the comments made on this Bill have been extremely useful in terms of the way that this project is evolving. I am a little dissatisfied with the lack of homework that has been done by members of the Opposition on this issue. They have had approximately two years and a couple of months since South Australia was made the MFP centre for Australia. In fact, they have still not made up their mind. That can be seen quite clearly by the way they have tackled the debate in this House. On the one hand, they do not want to upset their developer mates in South Australia (and I can understand that). On the other hand, the new found greenies of the 1990s who take the view that any kind of development around the place may be a problem is something they will not countenance, and naturally because they do not tell the developers that.

Then there is the other eclecticism which is obviously in the Opposition, with their walking away from hard decisions. Whether or not they support the MFP in a bipartisan approach is something which requires leadership and standing. It requires the Opposition to take a much longer view than next week. Unfortunately, it has not been able to take that view on this issue. In essence, the development on the whole Gillman site—and, in fact, the broader MFP project area—is something which South Australians will see evolve over the next decade or more. When the project first was touted for Australia, a number of people had a look at this project and some of the States that made submissions on it had ideas about how the MFP would evolve and take in a number of local industries, expand those industries and solve some of the problems of having industrial development along with residential living.

The South Australian proposed project site was always superior to that of the other States. The reason for that is the curious happenstance that Gillman, which is close to the city and the industrial heart of the north-west of this city, is a site which has seen no development for a whole range of different reasons, and was largely, if not wholly, under Government control. As a consequence, it provided the best site in Australia for this sort of development. I use the words 'this sort of development' because, in the early days of the MFP, there was a great deal of confusion out in the community about exactly what was to be built on that site.

In essence, the project is evolving through a series of stages, and one of those stages is where we will see the coming together of a number of core industries or, as in the case of the multifunction polis, the poles that this project will hinge upon. In Montpellier in France we see clearly the best example of this sort of project. The French MFP in Sophia Antipolis is also another example of this kind of development which has been going on now for approximately 22 years. However, the Montpellier experience is much closer to the one we are looking at here in South Australia. Sophia Antipolis in the south of France is separated by some distance from Nice. However, in many respects, it has become part of the suburbs of Nice. In Montpellier, the development that has taken place since the 1970s is really what we can expect from the MFP, should the project go into the next century, on a grander scale.

In Montpellier, the local civic authorities determined that they did a number of things extremely well. One of those things was related to the arts and tourism, which immediately has some comparisons with South Australia. The other thing they did extremely well was medical research and technology. They had a couple of other industries which employed not only a number of locals but in fact were centres of excellence in Europe. The civic authorities in Montpellier earmarked certain developments and brought together the poles of the technopolis and concentrated all their activities in particular areas of the city to develop

specific themes. I refer specifically to the themes of arts and tourism and medical technology. The Montpellier community is now the centre in Europe for those activities.

Montpellier has a greater metropolitan population of approximately 400 000. It is a city which one really has to be going to rather than going through to some other area, in the sense that it is in a remote part of France. It is about 10 hours driving time from Paris. It is very definitely out in the periphery. In fact, it has very few geographical or economic reasons to prosper in the way it has, except that some sensible, long-term and innovative decisions took place.

In fact, I think quite clearly that is the case in our community in South Australia. One of the reasons why the MFP is essential, in my view, is that it brings together all the planning, economic and other issues that we as a State need to resolve. In many respects, the future of the MFP is entwined very definitely with the future of our State. The reason South Australia has had a number of problems economically and traditionally over the past 156 years is that South Australia is a place where many products are manufactured. The materials for manufacture have to be brought in and then the products are exported to a point of sale. We do not have the population of some of our eastern States or the density of population of overseas countries.

The economic development of this State has prospered in the past 150 or so years because people have made decisions that affect the future. They have encouraged investment in a number of key industries, and South Australia has had the service of Governments—in particular, this Government—that have realised the vulnerability of our State and have gone out there to do something about it.

Some very legitimate concerns have been raised about the relationship of local government to the MFP project, one of which relates to the fact that local government spends a great deal of time on the provision of infrastructure to the community. About 75 per cent of my electorate is covered by the Salisbury council which was concerned that it may be expected to provide infrastructure spending up front for this project. The council had some hesitation in its whole approach to the MFP on the quite legitimate ground that its funds are already fully committed for some years on many other projects in the community.

I am pleased to say that a series of negotiations have taken place between the Premier and the Salisbury council. In fact, I have a copy of a letter from the Premier to the City of Salisbury that illustrates clearly some of the answers to the particular points that were raised. The letter refers to infrastructure spending and states:

> The only situation where Salisbury council would be involved in capital costs is where the Development Corporation and the council agree to jointly fund infrastructure of mutual benefit.

I do not think there is any doubt that that statement made by the Premier on behalf of this Government clarifies the position and gives the City of Salisbury the freedom to engage in this project on the basis that it will not be expected to commit large sums up front but can feel comfortable negotiating with developers at key points as the project evolves. The letter states further:

> The council should be reassured that it will not be required to meet capital costs of infrastructure within the core site over the development period, unless by agreement with the Development Corporation.

The key words in that paragraph are 'unless by agreement with the Development Corporation'. Under the heading 'MFP Development Bill' the letter states:

> The MFP Development Bill is essentially an enabling Bill to establish a Development Corporation with the necessary functions and powers to implement the MFP project.

The letter states further:

> As foreshadowed at the meeting with Focus Group members on 14 February it is intended to introduce an amendment to clause 8 (2) of the Bill to include the words 'local government' after 'instrumentalities of State'. Thus the Development Corporation will be required, in carrying out all of its operations, to consult with local government in areas related to or affected by those operations.

I believe there is no doubt that cooperation between the three levels of government is absolutely essential for this project to come to fruition. I hope that this Bill is successful in this House and in the other place. It is my view that, regardless of what we do here today and in the ensuing days to ensure the passage of this enabling legislation for the MFP project, the reality is that intergovernmental cooperation between the three tiers of government will be an essential part of this project and arguably as important as the investment that will have to be committed to the project as the years unfold. The letter concludes:

> I would like to thank the council for its continued support of the MFP project and the efforts that have been put in by council members and staff to the activities of the MFP Local Government Focus Group.

I hope that Governments of the future—because this project is of the future—will continue to negotiate freely on all levels with both the Federal Government and local government, and will ensure that when points of friction emerge, as no doubt they will further down the track, on a whole range of different issues people of goodwill can resolve them, because it is only through people of goodwill with the clear intention of doing the best for our State in the future to generate investment and employment that we will see the Gillman site and, in fact, the whole MFP project develop.

I want to finish my remarks today by raising the question of the environment at Gillman and to point to the curious paradox that seems to bedevil the Opposition Parties and much of the correspondence concerning some of the Democrats' contributions on this issue. On the one hand, the area is too heavily polluted to do anything with it: on the other hand, we must do something. We must clear the environment. We must do what we can to ensure that the Gillman site is habitable for future development. We must ensure that, where the Gillman site is concerned, the pollution that took place in years gone by is reversed where possible.

It seems to me that what the proponents of those conflicting views—and they are quite often the same people—have not recognised is that, without development, we cannot resolve those issues. We cannot clear the Gillman site of pollution without raising the question of development and the necessary funding and infrastructure without doing something with what arguably is one of the best sites in Australia for such a project. I think I started this speech by saying that one of the reasons for South Australia's success was that we had such a large parcel of land on which we could envisage a project such as this. I think it is a shame that some of the contributions to this debate have been so trivial as to suggest that the site needs to be looked at again, that it needs to be put hundreds of miles away and that, in fact, all the work that is being done today should be ripped up.

I have no problem supporting this legislation. I indicate again that I will ask some questions in Committee that I would like to have answered in the interests of people in my community who have raised them.

The Hon. J.C. BANNON (Premier and Treasurer): This has been a very long debate, much longer than is usual, but one cannot cavil about that because this is a very important

project. Indeed, I thank members for the attention they have given this measure. By that attention, they have acknowledged the basic starting point that the Government adopted in deciding to bid for the MFP project. The history of this project has been recounted on a number of occasions in a number of different ways through the debate, but let me just remind members that this project was a keenly sought after, competitive exercise. All around Australia proposals were developed and refined, and money was spent on their feasibilities in a bid to secure the MFP.

Each of those proposals obviously had its own special characteristics. I suggest that in large part the reason for South Australia's successful bid in relation to Adelaide and the project we have before us was that we were able to define the proposal and refine it in our own way. The fairly crude initial concept—and I call it crude—of some kind of recreational project or development, which tended to centre on the eastern coast, particularly the north-eastern coast, was something that we felt could not be successfully sustained in this country, and I believe that time will prove us right.

We cannot prove that an MFP located in that way—stand-alone, recreationally based and land development based in terms of value—would have been a failure. It was certainly what seemed to have been behind some of the early thinking. But we just had a brief taste of it on the Queensland Gold Coast, as property owners attempted to get in for their chop, as others demonstrated against what they saw as foreign ownership, and as all sorts of misrepresentations and problems arose around the project. In the end, it simply was not sustainable in that context. That vindicated totally, in my view, the proposal that Adelaide and South Australia had put forward.

I suggest that, if it had not been for the Adelaide and South Australian proposal, the way in which it was structured, the way in which it has been presented, there would not be any more talk about an MFP in Australia today: far from it being somewhere else, it probably would not have happened at all. That is not to say that, having taken it to this point, we have not got a desirable proposal—very desirable indeed, because the other States have since woken up.

Just in the past couple of weeks, as the Opposition and others have cavilled or suggested that there are problems and so on, as there have been indications in South Australia from certain sections that they are less than whole-hearted in their support for this project, we have seen other States coming in very strongly indeed, saying, 'Fine; if you don't want it, we will have it. We are delighted.' And they will be delighted, too, to pick up all that work we have done, all that work in developing a concept, in making a proposal which suits Australia's needs, and particularly adapted, of course, to South Australia's capability, and to transfer that somewhere else. Victoria was offering last week, New South Wales the week before, Queensland has always said, 'Yes, we will have it back', and so on.

As we debate this measure, let us not forget that everybody has their eyes on us here in South Australia. If we falter, if we stumble, if we see this project blocked or if needless hurdles are put up in its way, many others around this country will be willing to take it on, but what a gross indictment that would be for South Australia. Obviously, I will respond in detail as we consider amendments and the clauses of the Bill in Committee. But the debate has seen a number of well researched contributions. Unfortunately, it has seen a number of not so well researched contributions—attempts to damn it with faint praise and attempts to claim that, while supporting the vision of the project, as many hurdles as possible should be placed between it and its accomplishments.

So, I am disappointed in a number of the contributions, because I think there has been very much that flavour in them. It would be a great pity if that flavour were the end result of this Parliament's consideration of this project. I repeat: any hesitation on our part will be eagerly seized upon by those who would like to pinch this project from us, and we must not allow that to happen, having done so much work to get it to the stage that we have.

I must say that I thought that the member for Bragg's contribution was certainly a very well researched and, indeed, well documented assessment of the project. A number of the points he made in demonstrating the research, the reports that were quoted and so on, indicated just how much this project has been studied, how much work has gone into it. I would say that without a doubt it is the most studied project this century. It is hard to imagine that some of the great engineering projects in Australia, such as the Snowy Mountains scheme, the construction of the Trans-Australian Railway and the Ord River project, would ever have been completed, much less started, if they had faced the sort of scrutiny and study the MFP has endured. The important thing is that, for all that study, for all those reports, at the end of the day we still have a feasible project. It is not an accomplished project by any means—this is an essential part of that process—but we have a feasible project on our hands, and we need to make sure that it does happen.

One of the chief things that needs to be said—and it needs to be said before we enter the Committee stage of this debate—is that this Bill is not meant to be the MFP project. It cannot be: it is simply the legislative framework in which that project can occur. It does not guarantee the project will happen; it does not guarantee any aspect, but it does provide the enabling legislation, that is, the way in which we can demonstrate to Australian and overseas participants in this project that things can be done and these are the rules and regulations which apply to how they can be done, that they can come with certainty to South Australia to become part of this project, knowing exactly what are their rights and obligations and knowing that all sorts of last-minute blocks, impediments and other pettifogging things cannot be put in the way of decisions that have been made to take part.

However, this legislation is a framework: it is not every 'i' dotted and 't' crossed. It cannot be and it should not be. I hope that, as we go through the Committee stage, members will remember that. They are sure to ask all sorts of questions that are unanswerable at this stage, because the project is still in a process of development, and the Bill is not addressing those issues: the Bill is setting up the framework for them. I made that clear in the second reading explanation, and it has been repeated by a number of my colleagues, and it is appropriate to view the legislation in those terms.

I would like to take up three issues which were common themes in many of the contributions from members opposite: first, the issue of consultation, and local government, in particular, has been mentioned in this context; secondly, the environmental impact assessment process; and, thirdly, the scale of the project and its viability. In relation to consultation, I do not think there is any project that has more consultation—not just the normal consultation that one does in contact with groups or individuals, the submissions that are made, but a systematic consultation process at a national level funded by the Federal Government, taking place in all parts of Australia and not just South Australia. It is a pity that that process did not completely eliminate many of the misconceptions that are still around

this project. They will not be eliminated until we see the tangible reality. I make that comment in relation to the member for Bragg's contribution on this question of people not necessarily understanding fully what is involved. I guess in a sense none of us does, because it is an evolving project. We cannot say in year one of a 20 to 30-year project, 'This is exactly the course it will take and this is what it will be like.'

We do not know what our community, our society, our travel modes, or our communications will be in 10 years time, much less 20 or 30 years time. Look back 10 years and one can see how true that is and how there has been an acceleration of those things. It is even more true as we approach the 21st century. There will still be unanswered questions and there must be; if not, the project would not be worth doing.

To the greatest extent possible, information has been provided and consultation has taken place comprehensively. Access has been given; there was meeting after meeting. I am told many of the same faces appeared at each of the meetings, saying the same things and not listening to the response that was given. Aside from that, there were also a number of individuals and groups who attended, listened and understood, and there will be many more as the project takes shape. There has been massive consultation.

Reference was made to local government and its concerns, and I have put amendments on file with respect to it. That consultation process took place and has yielded results in terms of those amendments. It has been suggested that that indicates second thoughts about the Bill or an embarrassing change of mind on the part of the Government. That is absolute nonsense and one or two of the proposals that the Opposition has placed on record in this debate I do not see as unacceptable. On the contrary, they are a sensible contribution to the improvement of this legislation.

It does not worry me if I am told that that is embarrassing for the Government because those who tell me that are ignoring the process that we established. The Bill itself was tabled in this place, was given its first reading, in November, quite deliberately, so that over the break until we resumed in February all those bodies that had been involved in consultation and in the process of getting it to that stage could have a further look at it and see it in concrete terms and make representations. The Technology Park Development Corporation did so and we have some amendments that reflect that. Local government did so, and we have some amendments that reflect that. Others have had a look at it and the result of that process was inevitably that we would want to make some changes.

Of course, the Opposition is seeking some changes, as are other members in this Parliament. Again, that is fine. That is part of the process and I hope and believe that we will have a better Bill for it. In saying that, I point out that other proposals from the Opposition are totally unacceptable because they affect the viability of the project and its presentation to a national and international audience. Let us never forget that. We would like it to be a nice, cosy little parochial development, an urban development in our city, but it will not work and it will have no significance if it is left at that level. As much as possible, we want it to have the requirements of normal developments that take place, but it must be special, as well. We should not shrink from that special nature. That is an important part of the project and a vital part of its presentation.

If the developments in Montpellier or Sophia Antipolis, which have been referred to by a number of members, including the member for Playford, were seen as ordinary, normal suburban developments around the cities of Nice and Montpellier, they would not be worthy of note. It is because they have been given a special character, as we are giving this a special character, that they become significant, and that must not be overlooked. For people to draw attention to those differences is elevating the project in the way it is meant to be elevated. I do not regard it as a criticism in any way. The consultation has yielded those results and I believe that they have been productive.

I mention the concerns about the environmental impact assessment process. For a start, as an enabling Bill there was absolutely no need for us to await the publication of this massive environmental impact statement and all the accompanying documentation to consider the measure that is before us. I do not disagree that it certainly aids the concept and the debate by our having it before us. However, there was no need for it because it is a process that is parallel to the enabling legislation that establishes the project. The fact that we have the environmental impact statement before us at this time has been a positive part of the debate, but it has not been necessary to it. One may ask, 'What about other projects?' The facts of life are that it is very rare to have an EIS before you at the time of debating the legislation setting up such a project.

As an example, I cite Roxby Downs, the Olympic Dam project for which the Tonkin Government passed legislation through this House. It was highly controversial legislation and far more sensitive environmentally because it dealt with uranium and the nuclear fuel cycle than anything we are dealing with here, some would argue. That is certainly so given the time when we looked at it. Yet that Bill was assented to on 21 June 1982. The EIS was not even submitted until October 1982. The final approval to it was not granted until we had come to office and the new Government—our Government—granted that approval on 23 June 1983.

Would anybody in the House suggest that the joint venture should have been asked to go away until the EIS was finished, that everything should have been put on hold and that nothing more could have happened until that occurred? Not even those of us who were concerned with the EIS were prepared to say that that was absolutely necessary and in many ways we felt that our attitudes on that Bill were premature. Indeed, we maintained our objections to it right through that process but, at the end of the day, the Bill having been passed, it was months before the EIS appeared. That is just one of a number of precedents in this case.

Having said that, there is no doubt that the question of the environment is of great importance. The MFP provides a unique opportunity, not only to rehabilitate an important area, but to provide an environment dividend for the whole State and an example of what can be done in areas neglected or degraded in whatever way. Let us not forget history in this context. Some amazing things have been said about Gillman and its sensitivity.

I refer members to the environmental impact study and a figure at paragraph 3.15 of the terms of reference. It shows that native vegetation and mangrove clearance occurred prior to 1954 in a massive way. That exercise was done in the most brutal fashion imaginable. There are those who can remember the work that was done on what was called site preparation in the 1950s under the aegis of the Harbors Department to prepare that site for the industrial development that would take place side by side with what is now the West Lakes urban living development. Gangs of workers went through and just cleared the mangroves willy-nilly. Levee banks were set up. The associated fish nurseries and all the things that we have studied were ignored in that process.

Over time, one can see that we are talking about an area that has been changed fundamentally by that action. This project provides us with the means of reversing that degradation, of expanding the mangrove area, of repairing some if not all of the damage that was done from 1836 to the 1970s. Surely it is an opportunity that we must grasp and grasp easily. Those who criticise the project on environmental grounds ignore the fact that the environment is at the absolute core of the whole proposal. Without the environmental connotations, without this reclamation of degraded, inner urban land, we would not have a real case for a project. We would not be saying anything different than any other development in any other city in this country says about itself.

There are tech parks and all sorts of other things proposed in every State and city. This is special and unique because of the way it tackles this particular area. Of course, it is also connected intimately with the surrounding areas. It incorporates the Port centre area and the technology park that we have developed.

It links in to the rest of Adelaide in all sorts of ways. It links in to the rest of Australia and, indeed, to the rest of the world, but the core site and what is done there is a fundamental part of this whole proposal. Whatever ancillary, interconnected, related or staged developments that can have an MFP badge on them are concerned, we still have to see that focus, and this is part of the project.

Environment is fundamental to it. There are some enormously exciting proposals contained in the plan. There are some great ways of looking at not just dealing with the problems of that particular site but surrounding areas as well, and they can all be wrapped up in an urban development proposal that can be a world leader, an exemplar.

Is that not what we would like to see in this State? Is that not what anyone sensitive to environment and conservation issues would be demanding? The answer, I think, is a resounding 'Yes', and the material is there. The member for Bragg in his contribution referred to a number of studies that have taken place. It is certainly easy to go through those studies and find considerable doubts or problems in the site. We know that it is a problem site, and that in large part is why it was chosen, but one must remember that that is part of a process, that the consultants have gone back to it.

For instance, the EIS itself, in reassessing work that had already been done by the consultants in that process, made a number of major findings. It found the old sea coast and solved the problems of how we compact the soil adequately and appropriately in a most exciting and interesting way. Significantly, in doing so, it actually found out that it could cost a lot less. Indeed, the effect of the EIS proposals—as they have been developed—is a cheaper as well as a far more effective alternative to what we were looking at last year in that initial study.

If that is an example of what can be done with this project, we can feel very optimistic about it indeed and I would refer members in terms of this EIS to that large list—I think it was some 80 but maybe 120, from memory (although I cannot remember the exact number)—of problems and issues that are all there and tabulated and need to be tackled in terms of how, who, where and over what period.

It is a mighty impressive table, but it does not impress one, if one looks positively at this, as a list of issues that mean that the project is unattainable: it is an exciting list of challenges for which there is a solution in all cases and in all ways, and that is a great aspect and attribute of this project. That is the basis of the environmental issues and argument around this project, and they are fundamental and important as well.

In terms of the project's scale and viability—and this is the third point I said I would deal with—a number of members opposite have made a great deal out of comparing initial proposals as we have worked through the sequence of this development—the projections on population and on the area that the project would encompass—with where we have arrived today. I repeat: again where we have arrived at today is not the end point by any means, and it cannot be over a 20 to 30 year period, but it has been done in a way to actually criticise or attack the viability of the project. They have actually turned the argument on its head. They are saying that, because we are no longer talking about 100 000 on 3 000-plus hectares on that particular location, in some way the value of the project has been dissipated or its viability has been affected.

First, the value of the project is in no way dissipated. On the contrary, with thousands of jobs anticipated, the possibilities have increased in the sense that a much wider net is being called on, even though what is actually happening on the core site has been refined and scaled down. Secondly, the project has increased its viability. One of the criticisms of the proposal as originally presented was that it was just too large in scale. Was this possible? We were biting off too large a morsel, even though it was only over this 20 or 30 years. As a rseult of the detailed study and of the site refinement and all the work that has been done, appropriately the scaling has been changed and I would have thought that, far from being seen as a criticism of the project, that would be seen as one of the strengths of the process that we have gone through and, indeed, we will have a better project for it.

I do not care whether we are talking about 40 000 people on site or 20 000 or 100 000, or whether it is 200 hectares, 150 or 300 hectares: what we need is something that is viable, sustainable and that meets our objectives, and that is what we are going to get. All of those alternatives, whatever scale one puts up, must be seen as viable and must deliver that value, which is what we are proposing.

The costings are there. Any contribution that is made from the public sector in this State will be made as we would make a contribution for any significant project and, when looked at in the context of that range of other projects that have been referred to from time to time in this debate, this one is very cheap. Its inner urban nature for a start saves us enormously on the normal infrastructure costs for the delivery of power and water to a site.

All of that is there on the doorstep, as it were, and there are enormous savings to the public sector in that. Of course, there are all sorts of consequential infrastructure costs that any such development incurs, and we would expect to incur them. Why should we say that we are not incurring them in this case? Of course we are. But, taken over the life of the project, they are certainly not abnormal and are certainly delivering huge value in terms of the private sector investment and jobs that flow from it.

I would have thought that that argument, remembering that the project is staged and long term, is one that can be well dealt with. Again, the Bill does not dictate the pace of the project or its scale in that sense: the Bill simply enables it to take place stage by stage at whatever pace is appropriate. Obviously, it is difficult in a recession to get a visionary project of this sort going, but I would suggest that it is more vital in a recession that we do these things.

If we lose sight of the long-term gains and developments, we are in big trouble. Now is the best time, when there is a capacity in our economy to study these things and to try

to get them ready to turn into reality. The MFP is indeed at a crucial stage. We have established the concept and have won support for it, but there is no doubt that there are many sceptics around and many people who would like to see us fail, or fail in part—and ironically—because they would be able to pinch the project from us. Let us not forget that.

At the end of the day in a sceptical marketplace in this period, we are going to have to really sell ourselves and we do not need cavilling, low grade, bitty objections to this project: we need a wholehearted support and endorsement of it if we are going to convince all of those sceptics that it will really work. It is a great opportunity for long-term gains and we have to keep our eye on the long term.

Planning the shape and directions of our communities in the years ahead will be a hard enough task for us, anyway. Here is a project that can be a model of that. We have to remain determined. Our vision must remain always in front of us. This project is not just a responsibility for South Australia. If we fumble the ball, we are actually fumbling the ball that Australia is trying to carry in an international environment. We have been given a great responsibility and we cannot afford to back away from it. Right from the beginning the MFP has been controversial: it is complex, innovative, different and difficult but, unless we learn how we can tackle such an international project, unless we can follow the Montpelliers, Sofias, Tsukuva cities and others of this world, we are in big trouble in this State and in this country. All of the elements that are needed are there in the MFP and, by looking at that vision, I believe we can sustain it.

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

CRIMINAL LAW CONSOLIDATION (DETENTION OF INSANE OFFENDERS) AMENDMENT BILL

Received from the Legislative Council and read a first time.

STAMP DUTIES (EXEMPTION-MOTOR VEHICLES) AMENDMENT BILL

Mr S.G. EVANS (Davenport) obtained leave and introduced a Bill for an Act to amend the Stamp Duties Act 1923. Read a first time.

Mr S.G. EVANS: I move:

That this Bill be now read a second time.

I believe that this matter is of importance not to a lot of people at any one time but to a lot of people over a period. On 15 August last year I asked the Premier:

> Will the Premier take the necessary action to exempt victims of motor vehicle theft from having to pay stamp duty on their replacement vehicle? Something like 16 000 motor cars are stolen in this State per year, 2 000 of which are never recovered. Others of the 16 000 are not recovered in time for the owner to be able to use them, so that person requires a second vehicle. The people who approached me are concerned about the 2 000 cars that are never replaced. Stamp duty on a $20 000 motor vehicle is $740. The amount the Government charges on average to victims of car theft is about $1.5 million. I ask the Premier to take action to make sure those people are not penalised.

Eventually in October, I received the following reply from the Premier:

> I refer to your question without notice to me in Parliament on 15 August 1991 concerning the exemption from the levying of stamp duty on the registration of motor vehicles purchased to replace vehicles that have been stolen and not recovered. I indicated in my reply in the House that I would consider this matter, and have accordingly taken advice.
>
> While an exemption may appear to be justified in these circumstances, it should be clearly understood that there would be considerable difficulty in administering any such arrangements and that anomalies are likely to be created. Based on information available, at this stage I must conclude that a change to the current exemption criteria in the Act is not warranted at this time.

That reply is hogwash. It is contemptible for any Premier of this State to say that victims of crime should be taxed by the Government when they seek to replace a vehicle that was stolen from them. Talk about helping victims of crime! A constituent brought to my notice the paying of stamp duty on a replacement car that has been bought because their car was stolen, burnt, wrecked or sold interstate. Although the vehicle in question may not be owned by the person from whom it was stolen—it could be on hire or lease or encumbered by a bank or other institution—these people are being taxed as a victim of crime because they have to borrow again to buy the replacement vehicle and to pay the stamp duty.

If we had accurate figures from the department, the amount gained by this means would exceed $1.5 million a year. I take this matter one step further. The constituent who brought this matter to my notice found, four months later, that his stolen car had been doctored up and sold to someone else, and that they had paid stamp duty on its purchase. The police called on these people, told them the car had been stolen and that the number on the chassis and engine had been faked, and they also lost the car, having bought it not knowing it was stolen (and we have read articles in the paper about that lately). When these people went to get another car they were also charged another lot of stamp duty.

Mr Meier: Can they get the stamp duty back?

Mr S.G. EVANS: No, they do not get it back on the first vehicle. If the car they bought was stolen they lose the car and the stamp duty. I am not seeking to correct the second case: that is another injustice. With this Bill I am seeking to correct the first one. I would like members to think about this very seriously, particularly the Government and the Minister of Finance who is on the front bench and presently in charge of the House. I ask him not to ignore it but to consider what effect a stolen car has in these tough times on people who have lost their job or who struggling to meet commitments on the car (or may have paid for it) and need it to either look for a job or go to their job, because public transport in this State is not the greatest service one receives. When a crime is committed against them—their car is stolen—and they go along to register the replacement vehicle the Government says, 'Bad luck. You are a victim of crime, but we will rip you off.'

I do not think that any of us believe that that is justice. In response the Premier said, 'While an exemption may appear to be justified in these circumstances . . .', but both he and I know that it does not 'appear' to be justified; it is justified. There is no doubt that it is justified. If all the people who lost their vehicles and who paid that tax in a year were in a marginal electorate and raised this issue, it would have been fixed last year. But, because these people are scattered and are insignificant in the final analysis of who is elected to Parliament, it does not mean anything. If it was a group of people who were disadvantaged in other ways and who had to rely on social security or Government agencies for help, the news media would pick it up and run it with a headline such as '$1.5 million ripped off a disadvantaged group by a Government that claims to have a social conscience'. It would be in the headlines until the Government corrected the situation. But, in this case it has been shoved aside.

Although I was told that an exemption may appear to be justified, anyone who has had this matter explained to them would know that it is justified and that a person should be able to register a replacement vehicle up to the value of the one stolen without paying extra stamp duty. In reply the Premier also said that my proposal would cause considerable difficulty. What difficulty would it cause? The Premier did not tell me. Would it be a little bit of bookwork? Both the Federal and State Governments do not give a damn about small business and the bookwork they create for small business or other individuals through bodies such as the Bureau of Statistics and other agencies which want to know every detail about your life. To say that it will create some difficulty for these people to get an exemption is nonsense. All you need is a statutory declaration to satisfy the registrar that the original vehicle has been stolen and that you are there to register a replacement vehicle, and you should be able to receive a credit of the stamp duty up to the value of the vehicle you lost.

For that amount above the value of the vehicle you lost, you paid stamp duty on the value of the vehicle at the time it was stolen, burnt or whatever. It was just an easy way for the Premier to say, 'I have too much on my plate; I won't do it.' He has enough sidekicks around him within the department to do it. I do not need to say any more, except to explain the provisions of the Bill. Clause 2 provides:

(a) that no stamp duty is payable where—

- an applicant satisfies the Registrar of Motor Vehicles that he or she is the owner of the vehicle and that the vehicle was purchased for or by the applicant as a replacement for a vehicle owned by the applicant that—
- was stolen at least 14 days before the date of the application and, at the date of the application, remains unrecovered;

or

- was stolen or used without the applicant's consent and destroyed or damaged to such an extent that it has become necessary to replace the vehicle;

and

- the value of the vehicle does not exceed the value of the vehicle being replaced.

(b) that, where the value of the vehicle exceeds the value of the vehicle being replaced, duty will be payable on that part of the value of the vehicle that exceeds the value of the vehicle being replaced.

For the purposes of the subsection, the value of the vehicle being replaced will be taken to be its value immediately before it was stolen or used without the applicant's consent, as the case may be.

I have said previously how strongly I feel about this. When the matter was last raised, and after I received a little publicity about it, people said that, because they believed that the Government had a social conscience, they were sure that the Premier would correct this situation. I hope that that will be the case. However, if some technicality arises down the track, and if this is treated as a money Bill—and you, Sir, will make that judgment—I ask the Minister of Finance whether his Government will consider taking the necessary action in this House to allow the Bill to pass, if that classification is given. I ask the House to support the Bill.

Mr HOLLOWAY secured the adjournment of the debate.

STATUTES AMENDMENT (ILLEGAL USE OF MOTOR VEHICLES) BILL

Adjourned debate on second reading.

(Continued from 26 February. Page 3079.)

The Hon. T.H. HEMMINGS (Napier): If ever an old proverb was appropriate for this legislation, it is 'Act in haste: repent at leisure.' Even with a limited knowledge of the Children's Protection and Young Offenders Act 1979, the Criminal Law Consolidation Act 1935 and the Road Traffic Act 1961—and I freely confess I am not an expert—and when one looks at this piece of paper before us which is taking up the valuable time of this House, one can see it was cobbled together with the idea of getting a bit of publicity. Shame on the member for Hayward for doing it. If I were uncharitable, I would even go so far as to say that he had some advance publicity about the redistribution of the seat of Hayward and that he was trying to get some publicity for the new seat of Hartley, because that is what it is—a headline grabbing piece of legislation which has to tap in to the attitudes of those members of the community who have had their motor vehicles stolen.

I can quite understand the outrage of the community at this particular crime. There is far too much of it, but it is being adequately dealt with by the Select Committee on Juvenile Justice, chaired most ably by the member for Hartley and serviced by members on both sides of the House in a bipartisan way. I understand that that select committee is travelling the length and breadth of the State to obtain evidence from the community as to how this Parliament should frame the legislation. I am sure that you, Sir, will agree with me when I say that that is the correct way to deal with a subject such as this.

But no, the member for Hayward wants his jollies up there on page 3 of the *Advertiser*. This House will pay scant regard to this trivial, frivolous piece of legislation currently before us. Let us look at what the Bill seeks to do. It seeks to remove from the Road Traffic Act and insert into the Criminal Law Consolidation Act the offence of stealing motor vehicles. This is part of a package of offences in the Road Traffic Act, including illegal and fraudulent use of motor vehicles, careless and dangerous driving and driving under the influence of liquor or drugs. The offence of stealing a motor vehicle is more appropriately dealt with in the Road Traffic Act, and there is no rhyme or reason to move it into another Act. I would have thought that the member for Hayward, because he is trying to tell the House that he is an expert in this area, would have known that.

Next we look at not so much the shabby way but the hasty way in which it has been done. It creates a new offence of entering onto land with the intent to commit an offence involving the illegal use of a motor vehicle. Just think about it. Think of all the problems that that would create with respect to providing proof of that offence. Someone is seen to be illegally entering a property, but how is it proved that they are actually trying to steal a motor vehicle unless they are actually doing it? It is so full of holes that any defence lawyer—and my colleague the member for Hartley made quite a good living as a lawyer prior to coming into the House—would have a field day. Well may the member for Hartley nod his head. He would see the dollar signs actually coming up in front of him.

As I said, a person would have to be seen actually breaking into a vehicle. There is no way that a person could be charged with illegally entering a property because this Bill does not cover that situation—it deals with the actual offence of breaking into a motor vehicle. For the first offence the penalty is seven years imprisonment. I do not argue with that penalty, but more serious offences attract terms of less than seven years. I do not object to that penalty but I do object to the penalty for a second or subsequent offence, which is imprisonment for four years. An offender gets a shorter term of imprisonment than for the first offence.

Mr Brindal interjecting:

The Hon. T.H. HEMMINGS: I heard the member for Hayward, who was out of his seat, say 'Oh, come on', but for a first offence the penalty is division five imprisonment, whereas for a subsequent offence the penalty is not less than division seven imprisonment and not more than division four imprisonment. For the first offence the penalty is seven years, but for a second or subsequent offence the penalty is only four years. If we follow the logic of the member for Hayward, if an offence is committed 20 times the offender will be given a bonus. That is the stupidity of it. I do not know why I have to stand up here and waste the time of this House proving what a foolish piece of legislation we are being forced to deal with.

I turn now to the more serious aspects of the Bill in respect of the Childrens Protection and Young Offenders Act. This piece of legislation pre-empts the report of the Select Committee on Juvenile Justice. That select committee is going full bore. In fact, I fear for the health of the members of that committee because of the way in which the Chairman is subjecting them to meetings around this State. That committee has visited my electorate on four occasions. One could wonder why the committee has visited my electorate on four occasions, but I will not comment on that. The committee is going all over the place. It has been to Port Adelaide, Salisbury and Munno Para, and I understand that it will shortly visit Ceduna. On behalf of this Parliament, the committee is gathering evidence on the way to deal with the Childrens Protection and Young Offenders Act.

If I understand the comments that I have heard from the Chairman and the members of the committee, they are trying to produce the report as quickly as possible so that the Government can deal with these particular offences. The committee has already taken extensive evidence from a number of individuals and organisations. Whilst I am bound by the Standing Orders of this Parliament and cannot quote some of the evidence—

The SPEAKER: Order! The honourable member will resume his seat.

The Hon. B.C. EASTICK: On a point of order, Sir, the honourable member is seeking to pre-empt the decision of the committee.

An honourable member interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order! If that is the intention of the honourable member, he is definitely out of order. I ask the member for Napier to be careful of the way he phrases his speech.

The Hon. T.H. HEMMINGS: I assure you, Sir, that when you read *Hansard* tomorrow you will see that that could not be further from the truth. That was simply a gallant attempt by the member for Light to protect his foolish and more junior colleague, and I pay tribute to him for that. It will be different in the next election when the member for Light has retired and the member for Hayward—or Hartley as he might well be then—will have no-one to defend him. As a Parliament, we should await the report of the select committee, consider it in depth, discuss it and then hopefully signal to the Government of the day the exact feeling of this Parliament on how this kind of offence should be dealt with. We should not heed the publicity hungry approach of the member for Hartley. We should dispense with this Bill and treat it with the contempt it deserves.

The SPEAKER: Order! The member for Light.

The Hon. B.C. EASTICK (Light): I certainly do not rise to protect my colleague the member for Hayward from the inane comments of the member for Napier; I rise to protect the procedures of the House. When we read *Hansard* tomorrow it will be quite clear that the member for Napier was going astray. The people of this State have been calling out for positive action by the Parliament—not just by the Government—to make sure that action taken by a number of young offenders in relation to the stealing of motor vehicles is dealt with promptly.

Members on the other side have risen to indicate their abhorrence of the loss suffered by their constituents just as I rise to indicate my concern on behalf of my constituents. The member for Hayward has taken positive action by picking up the concerns that have been expressed on both sides of the House over a period of time in the full knowledge that the work undertaken by the select committee will not be reported on for some considerable time. We have the opportunity of giving the police a weapon to use against these people who are a blight on society and of saying to the police, 'We are supportive of you in a very positive way', not like members of the Government, including Ministers, who last week walked away from supporting the police who were doing what they were required to do under the law in respect of some nude actors.

Mr Hamilton: Grow up.

The Hon. B.C. EASTICK: The honourable member would do well to go out and talk to the community.

Mr Hamilton: Get out amongst the working class areas.

The Hon. B.C. EASTICK: Yes, and I know what the working class areas are telling me because I have a number of contacts at Napier and Elizabeth, and I read the letters to the editor in the newspapers. I know full well what a large number of people in the community think of the lack of support given by the Minister last week and of the way in which the Government walked away from the proper support of the police. Here is a chance to support the police in a very positive way. I am quite confident that the Bill before the Chair tonight will be supported by a majority of this House because it is necessary to show that we really mean business and do not just mouth platitudes. I support the Bill.

Mr HAMILTON (Albert Park): I would like to enter this debate because of the statements made by the previous speaker. Since coming into this place in 1979 I have attempted to address law and order issues. Members who wish to address law and order issues should go back to the filthy, disgusting campaign that was launched by the Liberal Party in its lead-up to the 1979 election. I refer to the puerile attempts to denigrate people such as the then Premier Des Corcoran and the stocking-masked ads that were run in the 1979 election. I remember them very well, and the attempts to denigrate decent people in the South Australian community who decided that it was their democratic right to run for Parliament. They had the democratic opportunity to run for Parliament, but they were pilloried by some sections of the media.

The member for Henley Beach, others and I were on the receiving end of that disgusting, filthy, rotten campaign. I would like to add some other adjectives, but I know that you, Mr Speaker, would not allow it, nor do I want to disgrace myself in this Parliament by using those sorts of adjectives. When I entered this Parliament, I vowed that one of the issues I would address would be the issue of law and order. I do not believe any backbencher has spoken more than I on this issue. There might be some who have spoken as much, but none of them has spoken—

An honourable member interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order!

Mr HAMILTON: The fool opposite who interjects said that the Neighbourhood Watch scheme would not work. I still have that on documentation in his own handwriting, and he still denies angrily that he did not say that, but that is evidenced by my colleagues on this side of the House. Nevertheless, it was agreed to by this Parliament in November 1983 and by the then Minister, the Hon. Gavin Keneally, and the Police Commissioner agreed at the end of that month—and the record will show it—to proceed with the Neighbourhood Watch scheme.

The issue of stolen vehicles is one that angers almost every person in the community. As one who has been on the receiving end, I know the anger and frustration that people feel. Once one has been on the receiving end, it is not easy to stand up and talk pragmatically in the Parliament. I do not like the attitude of the honourable member opposite. His attitude is gung ho. I do not always agree with the member for Napier, but on this occasion I must. I believe—and I do not wish to be uncharitable to the honourable member opposite—that it is easy when in Opposition to seek a cheap headline at the expense of, say, some of those in the community who fall from the straight and narrow.

Few of us in this House at one time or another have not made a mistake. There are those, including the member for Napier, who have made many mistakes, but perhaps we have not been caught. The reality is that, when one is in Opposition, it is easy to stand up and test the wind and say, 'Well, this is a good opportunity to make some gain at someone else's expense.' I suggest that the real test, Mr Speaker—and you have been in this place as long as I have—is when we get into government. People assess and judge us on what we say. It is then a matter of how the constituency supports us in subsequent elections. That is the real test.

The honourable member opposite has yet to be tested, as to whether he will receive that support. I suggest that he, like many others I have seen in this place, is a oncer. I can remember, between 1979 and 1982, predicting that the then member for Henley Beach would be a oncer and, indeed, he was. I suggest that the honourable member opposite, but not you, Mr Speaker,—

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

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

Mr BRINDAL: Sir, I ask you to rule on the matter of relevance.

The SPEAKER: I understand the point of order regarding relevance. I ask the member for Albert Park to come back to the matter before the House.

Mr HAMILTON: I am guided by your wisdom, Sir and, as one who has been in this place for as long as you, I was referring to the law and order issue that has been raised. I do not believe that the member opposite will gain a great deal from what he has said or what he is jumping up and down about. It is easy to kick the down and outs and the disadvantaged in the community. The attitude of members opposite is, 'Kick them in the guts; lock them up.' That is an easy attitude for them to adopt. However, when it comes to reality, we must look at all aspects of this Bill. I do not believe that the honourable member opposite has done that.

Mr GROOM (Hartley): I will be brief to enable the member for Hayward to have his right of reply within the time allocated. I will support the second reading of this Bill for the purposes of enabling it to be debated in Committee. Very important measures are attached to the Bill introduced by the member for Hayward. Many of the sentiments that he has expressed quite clearly have the support of speakers on this side of the House, and they are worthy of consideration in Committee. My support for the second reading of the Bill is limited to enabling a debate to take place in Committee.

I will not support clause 3 of the Bill for the same reason as has been eloquently enunciated by the member for Napier, quite simply, because the Select Committee on Juvenile Justice is considering issues of, I would say, an identical nature, and I believe that that would usurp the function of the select committee at the stage of deliberations it has currently reached. The issue of sentencing in being dealt with in an adult court is a fundamental issue before the select committee. That is not to dismiss the concern of the member for Hayward. I believe his concern is a justifiable one, and he is justified in raising the issue in the way in which he has done to enable public debate.

In relation to the remainder of part 3 of the honourable member's Bill, once again, he deserves some credit for raising the matter in the way he has done in this House. It is a proper matter to be raised publicly; it is proper for a private member to deal with this issue of illegal use, which is occupying the attention of the community. Members of the community are rightly outraged about the prevalence of illegal use and the ease with which their motor vehicles are stolen and destroyed. I know that the sentiment expressed by the member for Hayward in his second reading contribution is a sentiment that is, at this point, shared by members on this side. Consequently, I do not indicate my position as to part 3, clause 4, of the Bill, because I want to hear about the extent of consultation that has taken place between the member for Hayward and sections of the community—whether the police have been involved and whether the Attorney-General's Department has been involved. I want to know the extent of consultation. I want to know why the honourable member is moving to have this part taken out of the Road Traffic Act and put into the Criminal Law Consolidation Act.

I most certainly agree with his sentiments that harsher penalties are called for by the community and, of course, I think he is lining up the illegal use penalties with larceny penalties, effectively equating the offence, certainly by way of penalty, with larceny. I know that the member for Playford has been vociferous in relation to this matter, and I think the member for Spence might have made a contribution much along the same lines in this debate. I know that this is a sentiment that is shared by members on this side of the House and, likewise, by members on the other side. I do not believe that the member for Hayward should be denigrated in the debate simply because he has sought to exercise his right as a private member and raise what is an issue of fundamental concern to the South Australian community. It is his right, and he must be given some credit for introducing this legislation by way of private member's Bill. For that reason, I will support a debate on the Bill in the Committee stage.

The Hon. J.P. TRAINER (Walsh): I cannot totally agree with the remarks of the honourable member who spoke last and who completely accepted at face value the Bill introduced by the honourable member opposite. This is an attempt to appeal to prejudice within the community, somewhat justified prejudice, regarding the people engaged in the sort of activity to which reference has been made. I seethe with anger at the thought of what these young hooligans do to the cars that belong to the good people of South Australia. But it is only a very small percentage of recidivists who engage in this activity, and we have to be careful that we

do not in our anger apply remedies that are nearly as bad as the problem.

This matter can well be referred to the Select Committee on Juvenile Justice. We have to be careful and methodical in the way in which we approach this problem. Sources tell me that the Liberal Party is shortly to release a leaflet, if it has not already done so, on which there is a photograph of a smashed Commodore and beneath it a lurid red heading stating:

The 15-year-old who stole our car was travelling at 140 kilometres an hour along Main North Road when it crashed. The Juvenile Court gave him bail.

An honourable member interjecting:

The Hon. J.P. TRAINER: I understand that it has been released, and it is quite obvious that members opposite are trying to exploit this social problem for political gain. What they are trying to do is the equivalent of the Willy Horton phenomenon in the 1988 presidential elections in the United States, where a very serious community problem was exploited for political purposes. The Liberal Party will get an angry response in the community, I am sure, because all of us are angry at this problem.

A whole lot of matters must be addressed, such as the nonsense of the concept of the illegal use of a motor vehicle. As far as I am concerned, anyone who indulges in the illegal use of a motor vehicle for joy-riding purposes is really stealing that vehicle. Maybe they do not meet the legal requirements of permanently depriving the owner of his possession but, for all intents and purposes, they are stealing.

We may have to give consideration to treatment as adults for some of these young recidivists. However, the cure might be worse than the disease. We have to be very careful that we do not create bigger problems than the problems we already have. These problems must be methodically analysed and assessed, and community evidence must be weighed and considered by the select committee that has been established to regard this very problem. The Government will support the second reading of this Bill so that it can go into Committee, but we do so in the hope that this Parliament, in its wisdom, can remove the faults in the Bill.

Mr QUIRKE (Playford): A great deal of debate about this issue over the past few years, both inside this Chamber and out in the community, has demanded a number of things. One of those things is the question of illegal use of motor vehicles. As the member for Walsh illustrated a moment ago, I fail to understand why a person who goes down the road and steals a motor vehicle is charged with illegal use but a person who breaks into someone's house and steals a stereo is charged with larceny. That is ridiculous and it is time that something was done about it.

When this Bill goes into Committee, I will question a number of provisions in it. Like the member for Hartley, I have some reservations about attempting to pre-empt what is already proving to be a very energetic select committee that is going around South Australia gathering evidence on the question of at what point a child becomes an adult in the eyes of the law.

I have some reservations about the provisions in clause 5 because in some respects I think that they might not be tough enough. I would like to see further measures within this Bill regarding second offenders and those who are really causing the problems, that is, the multiple offenders who, in many instances, it has been reported to me, are responsible not for one or two stolen cars but for 10, 15 or more. Clearly the present law has not worked. I have always been up front in saying that something needs to be done in this area. I have my reservations that this Bill solves all problems and, as I said, I will look at some provisions with great interest in Committee. However, I have no problem with any measure which seeks to make car stealing a matter of theft, and I will support the honourable member if that is his intention in this Bill.

Mr BRINDAL (Hayward): I thank all members who have contributed to this debate, although the quality was varied. I must again note that it is the great tragedy of this Government that the modicum of intelligence that it possessed is now sitting on the Independent benches. It is something that this State will rue. To let a person of the calibre of the member for Hartley leave its ranks and sit on—

The SPEAKER: Order! I remind the member for Hayward of the necessity for relevance, which he himself raised in this debate.

Mr BRINDAL: Thank you, Sir, for your instruction. I commend the member for Spence, the member for Elizabeth, the member for Hartley, the member for Playford and my own colleagues who contributed to the debate. Their contributions were worth while and worth listening to. I am sorry that I can go no further in my commendation. I place on notice the concerns which I have noted from members of the Select Committee on Juvenile Justice. I make no apology for introducing this provision. Unlike what members opposite tried to cobble together as my reason, it was merely an attempt to answer or to generate debate about a serious social problem of today. If it is not the province of this Parliament, I do not know what is.

An honourable member opposite spoke about kicking the down and out. We are talking about people who steal and destroy property. Sometimes his own electors see it. People who have a car on hire purchase might have it stolen from them and it might be totally destroyed. They are left without a vehicle and with a bill or a debt that they cannot repay. Yet we have to sit in this place and listen to a member opposite talking about kicking the down and out. If that is intelligent debate in this Chamber, I will not be ashamed to be a oncer. If that is the standard to which this Chamber has degenerated, perhaps my time would be best spent elsewhere.

I note the concerns of the members of the juvenile justice committee and I note in particular that the member for Morphett and other of my colleagues have expressed those reservations. I assure them as I assure the House that any Bill brought into this Chamber is capable of mature decision and amendment by this House. Unlike the Government, I do not believe that everything I do is perfect and I look to all members of this House to help me make it better for the people of South Australia.

However, for the benefit of the member for Hartley, I make the point that I believe that the Select Committee on Juvenile Justice is open so that anything which can be changed at the time may be changed and that measures can be taken from this House. I acknowledge that the member for Hartley said that. On my part, I do acknowledge that this issue might well be so central to the work of the Select Committee on Juvenile Justice that it is best left to it and, therefore, I will look to members to make the appropriate amendment at the appropriate time.

The member for Harley obviously understands, as do members on this side of the House, the reason for the Bill being introduced in its present form. The reason is simply this: our law is ancient and bound by tradition and I—and the member for Playford will be interested in this—looked to have made it a theft of some sort. The advice of counsel was that it was impossible, because of the traditions of our law, to actually have a motor vehicle illegal use equated

with a theft because of the need to prove that the intention was to permanently deprive. Therefore, as the member for Hartley rightly interpreted, if we cannot make it a theft, let us make it in every way equivalent to a theft of similar value. That is what it does.

Finally, I would like to take on the totally spurious and absolutely insulting remarks of some members opposite, namely, the members for Henley Beach and Napier, who fixed on the first penalty, which is prescribed. The second penalty, for the second offence, provides a minimum and a maximum penalty. They are fixed on the minimum penalty and that the penalty for the second offence is less than the penalty for the first offence. That is spurious, that is stupid and it is not even worthy of the intelligence of other members of this House.

There is a minimum and a maximum penalty, exactly equivalent to the Criminal Law Consolidation Act in respect of larceny. I thank those members of the House who are concerned for the good government of South Australia, for the betterment of the people of South Australia and for supporting measures, though they be introduced by a private member, which are for the betterment of South Australia, and I commend the Bill to the House.

Bill read a second time.

In Committee.

Clause 1—'Short title.'

Mr FERGUSON: This clause provides:

This Act may be cited as the Statutes Amendment (Illegal Use of Motor Vehicles) Act 1991.

I ask the member for Hayward why he proposes the provisions regarding illegal use in the Road Traffic Act. There would be more sense in leaving this provision in the Road Traffic Act, because that Act is part of a package of offences in respect of illegal use, including illegal and fraudulent use of motor vehicles, careless and dangerous driving and driving under the influence of liquor or drugs. It would seem that it would be more appropriate—

The ACTING CHAIRPERSON (Mrs Hutchison): Order! The member for Henley Beach. My advice is that this question relates to clause 6 and so it cannot be debated under this clause.

Mr FERGUSON: Madam Acting Chairpersopn, this clause provides:

This Act may be cited as the Statutes Amendment (Illegal Use of Motor Vehicles) Act 1991.

The ACTING CHAIRPERSON: That is merely the title of the Bill.

Mr FERGUSON: I am talking about the title, Madam Acting Chair.

Members interjecting:

Mr FERGUSON: Excuse me: I have as many rights in this Committee as any member on the other side, and I intend to use them.

Members interjecting:

The ACTING CHAIRPERSON: Order! The Chair has made a ruling. I ask the member for Henley Beach to sit down.

Clause passed.

Progress reported; Committee to sit again.

SUBORDINATE LEGISLATION (COMMENCEMENT AND EXPIRY) AMENDMENT BILL

Adjourned debate on second reading.

(Continued from 20 November. Page 2149.)

Mr McKEE (Gilles): I oppose the Bill on the basis that it simply attempts to delay the effects of regulation by a mere three months or 120 days. I point out that currently, before any regulation is gazetted, it has gone before the Minister, Executive Council and the Governor, so there is a mechanism for review in three areas before the matter is gazetted and becomes law. However, as a member of the Legislative Review Committee I know that, if any member of the community objects to any regulation, they can appear before the committee to give evidence and state their case in opposition. This Bill simply attempts to try to tie the hands of the Government.

Given that Opposition members would like to be, and may eventually be on this side of the House, before they support this Bill they should consider the matter seriously. The Bill is simply a means to try to tie the hands of the Government in respect of regulations. We must remember that people are able to lodge their objections and that there are mechanisms available to the committee. For example, the regulations in respect of the hire and drive boat industry were brought before the Subordinate Legislation Committee.

As a result of the mechanism open to members of the public, we indicated that the parties should get together to debate the issue and come back before the committee with an agreed set of regulations. Under the present system, members of the public are able to lodge objections before the committee and state their case, and there is a mechanism to sort out the parties. The parties can be brought together to debate the issue. Further to that, if some time is needed before a regulation is gazetted, it can be written into the regulations. I do not mind change, but change for change's sake is ridiculous. This is a pedantic piece of legislation without any substance at all.

Mr GROOM secured the adjournment of the debate.

MFP DEVELOPMENT BILL

Second reading debate resumed.

Bill read a second time.

Mr INGERSON (Bragg): I move:

That Standing Order 364 be suspended during the consideration in Committee of clause 8.

Motion carried.

In Committee.

Clauses 1 and 2 passed.

Clause 3—'Interpretation.'

The Hon. J.C. BANNON: I move:

Page 1, after line 25—Insert paragraphs as follows:
(ab) Science Park Adelaide;
(ac) Technology Park Adelaide:.

I move this amendment as a consequence of discussions I have had with the Chairman of the Technology Development Corporation, which is integrated with the MFP. In the initial stages it will continue as a separate operation and will only be subsumed into the MFP at a time when it is mutually felt that that is appropriate. Of course, the development of Technology Park and Science Park will continue throughout this phase. The MFP should provide them with some impetus, and that has already happened. There has been an integration of staff; for instance, the Chief Executive (Barry Orr) of the Technology Development Corporation has the dual role of working with the MFP office in its marketing area. This and a subsequent amendment relating to the schedule and maps are aimed at ensuring that Science Park and Technology Park are recognised as entities within the Bill. It is strictly not necessary, but the Chairman

and I agree that it would be good to have that recognition because they are geographically separate sites.

Mr INGERSON: Has this amendment been moved because of conversations with—and, I understand, a significant delegation from—the Salisbury council? It has been put to me by the council that over the years it has made a significant investment, particularly at Technology Park, Salisbury, and that it was concerned that nowhere in the legislation was there any recognition of its past, and perhaps future, involvement. Will the Premier explain whether this amendment has come about because of the delegation and whether there are other ways the Salisbury council's role will be recognised in the future?

The Hon. J.C. BANNON: I think it is a two-way process. Salisbury has benefited greatly from Technology Park and the developments surrounding it in relation to promotional activity, the image of the City of Salisbury and residents who obviously wish to locate in association with it. I think there is no problem in this recognition, and we are not detracting in any way from those developments. I have had discussions with the council and I think it is satisfied as to that.

The Hon. H. ALLISON: I mentioned the development area, which in the Bill is defined as being the MFP core site, in my second reading contribution and I notice that in reply the Premier did not respond specifically to the general questions that were asked by a number of my colleagues. Although we have the Premier's amendment before us, does it mean that other areas right across the State, including the northern and southern suburbs of Adelaide and regional townships, will not be considered by the MFP authority for decentralisation? Is it intended to concentrate on the MFP core area adjacent to Gillman and Port Adelaide to the exclusion of the northern and southern suburbs and rural South Australia?

Recently members would have received a pamphlet from the Australian Bureau of Statistics entitled 'South-East in Brief', and I draw attention to a number of facts contained in that pamphlet. One is that the South-East has only 3 per cent of the State's farming area but actually contributes 18 per cent of the State's revenue through agricultural and other productivity. Secondly, the Premier would be aware that Mount Gambier this year is considered to be, by the national adjudicating body, the tidiest town in South Australia, and it is currently vying for the tidiest town in Australia (we are before the judges and are hopeful that we can demonstrate to everyone that we are just as attractive a place as anywhere in Australia for development).

More significantly, I think we should be looking at the statistics on page 2 of the ABS pamphlet which show that the rural population of the South-East, however attractive and prosperous it may be, has declined since 1986 when the population was 60 251, to 59 837 in the 1991 census. Although it is only a slight population decline of 414 people, it reflects the continuing trend in rural South Australia and a movement from country to city that has been going on for decades.

In my second reading explanation I drew the Premier's attention to my contention that decentralisation should be more than lip service, that it should be fact, and that rural South Australia might well be considered for a share of the $42 million Better Cities funds which obviously have been earmarked specifically for the MFP rather than being allocated across South Australia as other States have generally used them. We have earmarked really what are Federal Better Cities funds for the MFP, when that does not represent a contribution from the Federal Government specifically for the project at all, and that troubles me greatly. The Federal contribution to the MFP is really minimal, and we have earmarked funds to go towards the development of this project which could have been used for other purposes. Has the Premier rejected decentralisation in the metropolitan area and decentralisation to rural South Australia in favour of the Gillman MFP? I believe that this is a very serious question from the point of view of the whole of South Australia.

The Hon. J.C. BANNON: Definitely not. The MFP is not an exclusive project. In other words, it is not the MFP and nothing else. It is not an either/or situation. We have to build where and when we can. The MFP represents a particular type of urban opportunity, but there are many others for rural and regional South Australia. There is an inevitable trend of population reduction in many areas because of increasing productivity and larger productive units which tend to mean—and this is a trend that goes over most of this century—a reduction in the rural population, but can be accompanied by an increase in the urban towns in rural areas provided we can find industries.

I agree with the honourable member, the South-East is a very productive area indeed. It has great potential which still remains largely untapped. He will be well aware of the great efforts we made through the green triangle project to think laterally and harness the strengths of Western Victoria with the South-East of South Australia. Unfortunately, the Victorian Government backed out of that and, I think, much to its detriment. Certainly we persist in our efforts to see activity generated in those areas.

Coming back to the MFP itself, if it goes well it will certainly contribute to activity in the whole of the State. There is no question that while the corporation obviously will not be acquiring land or specifically acting outside of this core area, nonetheless there will be enterprises that might be appropriately located in regional South Australia which feed into the MFP and carry the MFP banner or badge. That is a trend that should be encouraged.

On the question of Federal allocation of Better Cities money, the total Better Cities allocation has not been devoted to the MFP. Many programs will benefit. Some fairly strict guidelines have been laid down by the Federal Government when attempting to negotiate greater flexibility in those areas. We certainly will see a supplementation from unallocated funds supporting the overall program. The overall program is still MFP plus a number of other things, but there is no question also that MFP comes squarely within the sorts of things that a Better Cities program should be seeking to do.

Amendment carried.

Mr INGERSON: I move:

Page 1, line 27—Leave out 'proclamation under this section' and insert 'regulation'.

We have been concerned for a long time about the need for the Parliament to be aware of all the developments that occur with the corporation but, more importantly, to have the opportunity if any areas are added to the core site to question that by regulation and to give the Parliament the right, if it disagrees with it, to disallow the particular regulation. In this case it is done by proclamation. We have argued for years that this Parliament should do more things by regulation and less by proclamation.

The Hon. J.C. BANNON: I oppose this amendment. There are many ways in which Parliament can and will be involved in the shape of this project. One of the things we must guard against is putting barriers, or appearing to put them, in the way of those who want to invest or who feel certain about the procedures which are in place. Unfortunately, in some quarters South Australia has a reputation

of being a place in which it is very hard to get developments under way.

Mr Oswald: Not wrong.

The Hon. J.C. BANNON: There are all sorts of blocks, impediments and so on. The member for Morphett interjects, 'Not wrong': obviously he has been aware of it. There is no sinister or other problem with this: 'proclamation' is an appropriate way of giving effect to these arrangements; 'regulation' is clumsy and unnecessary in this case.

The Hon. JENNIFER CASHMORE: The Premier opposes the amendment on the grounds that it is difficult often to get development to proceed. The reasons for that are obvious and are rooted in our settlement origins, I believe. South Australians have a very strong attachment to the land—a very strong proprietary interest in the way land is developed in this State—and this has been the case from the outset, because the whole settlement of South Australia was based on land settlement through free settlement. Therefore, it is understandable why the debates have occurred when land development has taken place contrary to the wishes of either a majority of South Australians or a majority living in the particular location in question.

The notion of proclamation would perhaps not be so repugnant to the Liberal Party if it were not accompanied, as it is in this Bill, by a provision for compulsory acquisition of sites. That power, combined with the power of proclamation, puts into the hands of the corporation and the Government an extraordinarily wide power over land in any part of this State. Literally any part of this State could be the subject of a proclamation and subsequently could be the subject of a compulsory acquisition. Any freehold landholder who is threatened by that prospect would be well and truly justified in objecting to this provision. On behalf of all people who own land in this State, the Opposition believes that this amendment is one that should be supported by the Committee, and asks for that support.

The Hon. J.C. BANNON: There are all sorts of protections through Planning Acts and so on, and compulsory acquisition is governed by an Act which lays down procedures and does not allow for simple arbitary or whim operation. Those protections are contained in other legislation. They do not need to be inserted here. This is an appropriate procedure and there is ample precedent for it, and I think it has been well accepted.

Mr GROOM: I oppose the amendment of the member for Bragg. The Government must not only have the flexibility to deal with this important developmental project in the way in which it sees fit by proclamation, but there must also be certainty from the point of view of our reputation internationally. I would see the substitution of 'regulations' as being a device to impede the project and to prolong debate in the Parliament on what could develop into unnecessary issues.

An honourable member interjecting:

Mr GROOM: The fact of the matter is that regulations can be disallowed in either House, and there only has to be a debate on some minor matter that could really jeopardise the whole project. I believe that the Government has the confidence of South Australia in so far as its position as a Government is concerned. It must bring this development to fruition. It must be dealt with efficiently. It must have the flexibility to do it. It must not be unduly impeded and I would see substituting 'regulation' as simply a means of imposing unnecessary debate and damaging our standing internationally.

The Hon. JENNIFER CASHMORE: I reject the arguments put by the member for Hartley. He describes a regulation in this instance as a device to impede certainty of development. I would describe the use of 'proclamation' as a draconian device and the use of 'regulation' as a device to achieve justice and equity for landholders. We must recognise that the compulsory acquisition powers, which the Government has quite rightly and properly used for its own purposes over the years, are primarily for the purposes of Government. When we talk about this corporation, we are talking about a body that has the power to acquire, hold and lease property, to divide and develop land, to enter into partnerships and joint venture arrangements and to form, acquire, deal with or dispose of interests in companies and other entities. We are also talking about a corporation that has the object of attracting foreign investment.

To give a Government the power of compulsory acquisition in order to provide infrastructure that is required in the interest of the State, such as roads, bridges or any other engineering works for a public purpose, is one thing, but to give this power to a corporation that in many respects will be competing with private enterprise and will, in fact, be embodying private companies in its role is, to our mind, quite wrong because it provides a quite unequal balance of power between every other company in the State and the Multifunction Polis Corporation which, as I have said, has the power to acquire companies and embark upon joint ventures. One does not need very much imagination to see the totally unequal balance of power and rights that will be held by the corporation *vis-a-vis* every other private developer in this State if the power of proclamation combined with the power of compulsory acquisition is provided under this Bill.

The Hon. H. ALLISON: Does the phrase 'any other area declared by proclamation under this section' mean literally any other area anywhere in South Australia? I note that a later clause provides a method specifically for the compulsory acquisition of land within the core area, that is, that the land shall be valued as if this Bill had not been enacted. However, there is no mention of how the land would be acquired and what valuation and negotiation might be necessary for compulsory acquisition. Do I understand that that would happen, first, by agreement between the parties and then, if agreement is not reached, by arbitration?

The Hon. J.C. BANNON: On the last point, that would be subject to the Land Acquisition Act which lays down very strict procedures and protections for anyone whose land is sought to be acquired. On the first point, clearly it is not intended that this power be used to proclaim any area anywhere in the State. It is simply a reserve or ancillary power if necessary to secure a right of way or something like that.

Picking up an earlier point made by the member for Mount Gambier, if an industry or business establishing at Mount Gambier wished to have specific links to or be brought within the aegis of the corporation, the power to declare by proclamation could, in fact, be appropriate, but I would envisage in that situation that they would actually be saying, 'We want to be part of it' and, as I said earlier, 'Can we have your badge on our particular activity?' The concept of a compulsory arrangement there is just not on as far as I am concerned.

Mr INGERSON: The clause refers to 'any other area declared by declaration under this section to be a development area.' As I understand it, that means anywhere in South Australia can be a development area. The Premier's amendments extend Science Park, Technology Park and the core site. They are the official areas of the site as it relates to this Bill, but then there is this extra clause which quite clearly provides for 'any other area'. The Committee needs clarification on that point because it is my understanding

that, as the member for Coles has quite rightly said, when you link this with compulsory acquisition it could mean that any piece or block of land in South Australia could be acquired.

The Hon. J.C. BANNON: The honourable member was obviously preparing his question rather than listening to my answer to the member for Mount Gambier. The corporation has more than enough land or area for its own purposes, but in the instance that I mentioned it may be that it would be appropriate for some other area in some other part of the State to be so declared, and that is allowed for.

Amendment negatived.

The Hon. J.C. BANNON: I move:

Page 2—

Line 2—After 'shown in' insert 'Part A of'.

Line 3—Leave out 'Schedule 2' and insert 'Part B of that Schedule'.

Line 10—After 'site' insert ', including Science Park Adelaide and Technology Park Adelaide'.

After line 10—Insert definition as follows:

'Science Park Adelaide' means—

(a) the area shown in Park A of Schedule 2 and more particularly discribed in Part B of that Schedule;

(b) where the area is altered by proclamation under this section, the area as to altered.

Amendments carried.

The Hon. JENNIFER CASHMORE: Is it the Premier's intention to continue to administer this legislation and, if so, for what period? The clause identifies the State Minister as being the Minister for the time being administering the Act. I think it is important that the Parliament understand for what period the Premier intends to administer it. Will the legislation continue to be under his administration while he is Premier or will it be delegated to another Minister?

The Hon. J.C. BANNON: It is my intention to continue the responsibility for this legislation in its initial stage as it involves a lot of negotiation with the Federal Government, international investors and so on. I do not anticipate that necessarily remaining the position, but I have put no particular time scale on it. Certainly, at some time in the future I envisage delegating the responsibility for this project after the initial period.

Mr INGERSON: Have any other areas been studied for incorporation into the MFP area, and have any areas outside the metropolitan area been studied at this stage for incorporation within the whole concept of the MFP?

The Hon. J.C. BANNON: No.

Clause as amended passed.

Clause 4—'Repeal and transitional provisions.'

Mr INGERSON: I mentioned earlier in relation to a deputation to me from the Salisbury council that there was concern that, in the changeover from ownership as it relates to the Technology Park Development Corporation to the MFP Development Corporation, there will need to be some protection for the investment the Salisbury council has made. On many occasions, the council said that, whilst it recognised that there was cooperation between the Government and the local corporation not only in terms of dollars but in terms of being on committees, it would like some reassurance from the Premier that all its existing rights and its involvement with this corporation will continue to enable it to have direct representation through this new MFP Development Corporation.

The Hon. J.C. BANNON: As I said earlier, it has been a two-way relationship, of course, to the extent that Salisbury council has contributed to Technology Park's development, Technology Park has contributed to Salisbury council's revenue through rates, the business established there, anciliary developments and the Government infrastructure which has been put into Technology Park. There has been a pretty good relationship there, and certainly the overall impact on the City of Salisbury would have been very positive. There is no reason why that should not continue.

Of course, the Bill allows for the incorporation to take place on a date to be fixed by proclamation. It is worded in that way to allow a reasonable transition time and, when it is felt appropriate by all the parties concerned, it will be done. In the meantime, of course, Technology Park will continue in its current administration. Even following that, I would have thought that what is now the Technology Development Corporation would maintain some sort of existence as a delegate to the MFP Corporation Board, that would be the most effective way of handling it.

Clause passed.

Clause 5—'Objects of Act.'

The Hon. JENNIFER CASHMORE: Clause 5 *(c)* of the Bill provides:

The objects of this Act are to secure the creation or establishment of a focus for international investment in new and emerging technologies.

It is an unhappy coincidence that we should be debating this clause on the day when the Japanese stock market has fallen to approximately half its index just prior to the stock market crash of three years ago. The stock market is now less than half its peak at 38 000: it is now down to 19 600, and most commentators say that the Japanese economy is slipping into recession.

Of course, it is obvious that we are not relying solely on Japan for investment in the MFP, but it is equally obvious that, as the initiative for the MFP came from Japan and the agreement in principle was established between the Japanese and the Federal Governments, as well as the State Government of SouthAustralia, it is to Japan that we look principally for investment in this project. In view of the fact that Japan is now facing its most serious prospect of recession for 12 years, and in view of the fact that rather than investing in Australia Japanese companies are, according to most financial commentators, likely to be liquifying their assets in Australia, what precisely has been the level of interest and direct inquiry shown by Japanese companies in the MFP? What definite prospects, if any, are there of investment? What can the Premier tell the Committee about the likelihood of there being any investment whatsoever in the MFP before 1994?

The Hon. J.C. BANNON: In relation to the clause to which the honourable member refers, the emphasis there is very much aimed at one of the problems we have always had in Australia, which is innovative, interesting designs and developments which end up being taken overseas for their production and marketing. It has happened time and again, and we would hope to see some reversal of that trend through a focus such as the MFP. So, we are talking not just about international investment and bringing a technology from somewhere overseas into Australia but about technologies that have been developed here, but at the moment find it very hard to get investment capital or any sort of support domestically. Time and again we see good Australian inventions, designs and ideas simply being taken offshore and, when one inquires about this or complains, one hears that the rounds are being done by the companies attempting to get Australian investors to support them, and they have just drawn a blank. So, in the end, they go offshore.

We have had other instances. I can think of one just recently in which a company said that it had approached 64 Australian investors, large companies, life companies, and so on, to try to get some support for something. In the end, it had to go offshore. It hopes that the project will still

be done here. It had to get Federal Investment Review Board approval, and so on. It is simply because the owners of capital in Australia are not prepared often to venture or risk. So, one would hope that the MFP would provide some sort of capacity for that. Certainly, recession in Japan is bad news, but these things are relative. If one looks at the overall strength of the Japanese economy and its ability to recover, one sees there is no question that our fortunes are very closely aligned to the Japanese economy and its health. However, in a recessionary period—as everyone acknowledges—it is very hard to get some investment.

I pick up the honourable member's point that this is not solely linked to Japanese investment. While the origin of the proposal came from bilateral discussions between the Australian and Japanese Governments, it has broadened very much further from that since then, and the composition of our international advisory board suggests the way in which the focus has shifted. We would hope that there will be substantial Japanese involvement, and their recession makes it much more difficult. At the moment, a number of negotiations are going on. The report of the MITI investment mission has been considered at a number of major seminars in Japan, and from that a number of companies have picked up interest in the MFP.

Arising from that mission, there are contacts and proposals, but it is kind of the chicken and egg situation. We are being told that they would like to see the substance of the MFP in terms of the legislation, a corporation established and the Commonwealth Government's commitment; then things will flow from that. Despite the recession, the prospects are good, in part because the sort of industries that we are looking for are sunrise industries, the things that investment needs to take place in the 21st century, not simply the bolstering of existing investment. Our proposal is not driven by a land or property type approach, which some of the propositions were. I hope that will prove a strength. We need to test that and we will not really be able to fully test it until we get the structure set up.

The Hon. JENNIFER CASHMORE: The Premier did not answer my question directly with respect to what specific investments or indication of investment have occurred. From what the Premier said, at this stage it is based on nothing more than hope. He said that he hoped for some substantial Japanese involvement and that a number of Japanese companies were interested. How many and which companies are interested and what level of investment is expected?

The Hon. J.C. BANNON: That is the subject of detailed discussion at the moment. The companies concerned do not wish to be identified until they are ready to make some sort of commitment. They are well-known companies. They have been participating in the MITI committees in Japan throughout this exercise. One could guess at the companies and their nature, but it is not appropriate that they be announced as participants until they feel ready to make such an announcement themselves.

Mr OSWALD: A couple of years ago I visited the Sophia Antipolis in France and, as we were touring it, one of the points that the guide made over and over again was that the success of the project was its multinational input, particularly the Eurodollars. Italy, Germany, France, Britain and the United States were all mentioned. If the emphasis there was on the multinational nature of the financial input, I am interested to know what other countries are showing an interest in the MFP here and have got to the stage of saying that they are prepared to put their name up front and be involved, or are we talking at this stage only of Japan?

The Hon. J.C. BANNON: No, there have been wide-ranging discussions. The European members of the International Advisory Board, which has been in operation over 12 months and which is scheduled to meet again in Australia in October, I think, have formed a subgroup and they are working with the Agent-General, following up a number of specific leads. Interest has come from France, Sweden, Germany and Britain, and there may be others. Based on the experience of Sophia Antipolis, some of the participants in that proposal are interested in a southern hemisphere development and see the MFP as a possible opportunity. It is very much in the embryonic stage and, as I say, I hope that our European group will be able to market the project when we get this legislation through and the corporation is established.

In the United States, there are some interests as well, particularly in the information technology area. Interest has been shown by Korea and Taiwan and a Thai representative is on the International Advisory Board. There may be one or two others, and it is certainly a multinational exercise. When the honourable member toured Sophia Antipolis, he might have been told that it was a long process from concept to early development to its present state where there is now a waiting list of companies wanting to be part of it. That took 15 years or so. We are trying to accomplish that initial stage on a faster time scale but we cannot be too impatient if we are to get the development.

The Hon. JENNIFER CASHMORE: With respect to clause 5 *(c)*, I refer the Premier to the report of the joint steering committee commissioned on the feasibility study of the multifunction polis, in which it was stated on page 9 that 'financing techniques would be used which wherever possible use non-Australian capital while achieving largely Australian retention of investment returns'. In his answer to my previous question the Premier explained that it was difficult to get Australian investment in new technologies. I venture to say that it is even more difficult to get Australian return on non-Australian investment.

Given that it is in sporting terms a big ask, can the Premier explain to the committee how he expects there to be Australian return on overseas capital when at this stage he does not have any overseas capital? Let us assume that there is some overseas capital. What financing techniques will be used to ensure that there is Australian retention of investment returns?

The Hon. J.C. BANNON: For a start, in most of these cases some sort of joint venture arrangement is involved, so there is Australian participation in association with an international investor. That is desirable to encourage. They tend to look for that because it gives them more long-term security in the economy. You get long returns from that. The very activity that is created, the employment and so on, is of direct benefit to our economy and to our community.

The honourable member really raises the much larger question of foreign investment generally. Is it desirable that foreign capital invests in a country and the profits are repatriated? There are quite a lot of incentives to reinvest and to retain profits in a country due to the tax system and other incentives and most corporations with a long-term future do just that. I guess there is a broader philosophical argument but, if one still concedes that Australia is a developing country, we are going to need foreign capital to assist in that development. We should welcome it, provided it returns some benefits to our own economy. This project envisages that it will.

Clause passed.

Clause 6—'Establishment of corporation.'

Mr INGERSON: The May 1991 report of the MFP Management Board states:

> The Management Board also believes that the number of staff required for the development of the core site has been underestimated. Even taking into account the proposed strategy of making maximum use of contractors, it is the opinion of the Management Board that additional staff will be required for such purposes as day to day liaison with contractors. This will increase the estimated annual operating cost to approximately $5 million.

What are the latest estimates of the annual recurrent costs of the corporation? Who will be responsible for these costs? Is there any commitment from the Commonwealth Government to help meet these recurrent costs? How many staff are currently employed and what is the maximum number of staff expected to be employed by the corporation?

The Hon. J.C. BANNON: At the moment 18 staff are working full time on the project, with six working part time. Most of those are on secondment and, in some cases, such as the CEO of the Technology Development Corporation, whom I mentioned before, they are working in other capacities as well. The office is structured in a series of divisions: executive, urban development, strategy, industrial development, marketing and investment, communications and support services. There are three positions currently unfilled: manager of the strategy development division, media liaison officer, and a group secretary and finance officer, who will be required when the corporation is established.

There may be need for additional clerical support, perhaps another engineer and an industry development adviser so that, with those positions I have outlined, we are looking at a staff in terms of equivalent full-time positions of no more than about 30. One can then look in time at the TDC staff. Presently about 14 people are employed in the Technology Development Corporation whose skills and activities obviously relate to the MFP. That is currently the situation. Obviously, the corporation is seen as a body that is kept fairly lean and hungry and, as much as possible, the skilled services and things it needs will be contracted.

Mr D.S. BAKER: The first part of the question sought an estimate of the annual recurrent cost, and the Premier did not answer that question.

The Hon. J.C. BANNON: The salaries and on-costs at the moment are slightly in excess of $1 million. An operating cost includes all the other activities—

Mr D.S. Baker interjecting:

The Hon. J.C. BANNON: Yes; about $2 million or $2.5 million. The total budget estimate for this year is $4.3 million, but $2.5 million is being provided from the Commonwealth Government, so there is a net cost to the State Government of $1.8 million.

Mr INGERSON: As a supplementary question, has there been any arrangement at all that locks the Commonwealth into any recurrent costs or is it purely and simply a State budget concern?

The Hon. J.C. BANNON: The Federal Government has approved a total in excess of $12 million over the three years start up, and that is aimed at establishing the development corporation but, in addition, the Commonwealth Government is fully funding the operations of the International Advisory Board, which is an important component of the whole project, and developing linked activities overall. There is also a contingent of 18 or so full-time employees in our office and about 14 in DITAC—the Federal department—as part of its MFP unit.

They are providing both direct, start-up support to those administrative costs, the national and international marketing, the IAB and their own back-up service. I would hope to see in the not too distant future some of those Federal employees colocated here in Adelaide to work from the offices in Adelaide, and that should happen within the next few weeks.

Mr INGERSON: Of the $12 million to which the Premier referred, how much has already passed through to the MFP Development Corporation for use not necessarily in recurrent costs but in the EIS, in planning or in other areas?

The Hon. J.C. BANNON: For 1991-92 a bit over $1 million has been received from the Commonwealth, and progressively further payments will be made as expenditure takes place.

Clause passed.

Clause 7—'Ministerial control.'

The Hon. J.C. BANNON: I move:

> Page 3—
> Line 28—Before 'direction' insert 'control and'.
> After line 28—Insert subclause as follows:
> (2) Any direction given to the corporation by the State Minister must be in writing.

The amendment simply brings this clause into line with the normal provision that one sees in most Acts in South Australia. The clause would thus read:

> The corporation is subject to control and direction by the State Minister.

The purpose of the proposed new subclause is to ensure, first, that the corporation, which is established on corporate lines—and obviously its members will have strict corporate requirements to follow in terms of responsibility for their administration—can be subject to direction only where the Minister actually issues a written instruction.

Obviously, there would be dialogue and reporting procedures and so on between the Minister and the corporation but, essentially, the corporation is established to do its job of running affairs in accordance with the Act. If the Minister feels the need to make a direction that the corporation do something, to protect both the Minister and the corporation it is suggested that it should be in writing. This is relevant to provisions later in the Bill where it is suggested that the report that the corporation tables should include any such directions. They will obviously be made public.

Mr GROOM: I support the amendment and the insertion of the words 'control and'. The new subclause would provide:

> The corporation is subject to control and direction by the State Minister.

That emphasises ministerial responsibility to Parliament. In moving his amendment, the Premier also acknowledges the work of the previous Public Accounts Committee in its report dealing with statutory enterprises when it set out that one of the criteria for accountability of Government and statutory enterprises to Parliament was control and direction by the Minister. They do have meanings, and I thank the Premier in moving his amendment for recognising the role of the former PAC in its recommendation to Parliament. It emphasises ministerial responsibility and allows the Westminster doctrine of that convention to be applied.

Amendments carried.

Mr INGERSON: I move:

> Page 3, after line 28—Insert subclause as follows:
> (2) The State Minister must cause any direction to the corporation to be published in the *Gazette* within 14 days after it is given to the corporation.

The purpose of my amendment is to request the State Minister, having made the direction, to have it gazetted or published in the *Gazette* within 14 days of giving the direction. I have moved this amendment because we believe it is important that, when the Minister specifically directs the corporation to take action, that ought to be made public and be out in the open. This Bill sets up a statutory corporation with traditional powers. If we are to ask directors

to have special powers of involvement in the corporation, if a special direction comes from the Minister, recognising that it will be in writing, it ought to be published in the *Gazette*.

The Hon. J.C. BANNON: I oppose this amendment on the basis that it is onerous and unnecessary. Experience would suggest that there will be few instances where such directions are necessary. In the normal course of events, the reasons for such directions and the issuing of them may be public but, in other instances, it may not be appropriate. I accept the point that the honourable member makes that, if such directions are given, at some point they should be made public. I suggest the appropriate manner of doing that is for them to be recorded in the report of the corporation, so that they are specifically noted and recorded. In fact, that is the subject of a later amendment that has been circulated by the honourable member. I am foreshadowing that I am accepting the principle of what he is saying, but I believe it is better done by that provision; this one is onerous and unnecessary.

The Hon. JENNIFER CASHMORE: The Premier has recognised the principle and the merit of the Opposition's argument that Parliament and the public should be informed of the circumstances in which directions are given and the nature of any directions given by the Minister. It seems to me that it could be entirely relevant that the timing of the knowledge of information coincides with the timing of the direction. Whilst it is gratifying to note that the Premier accepts the merit of the principle, it seems to me that in practice there is no reason whatsoever why ministerial direction and control should not be made public at the time it is exercised. I think the Committee should insist that this be adhered to.

This Government has been one of the greatest proponents of open government that one could ever wish for, and it seems to me that it amounts to nothing more than lip service if there is to be a potential passage of time of a maximum of 12 months before we are informed what kinds of directions the Minister has given. It seems to me that this amendment has considerable merit and should be supported by the Committee. I would like the Premier to explain why something that is acceptable in an annual report is not acceptable in principle at any time.

The Hon. J.C. BANNON: There is nothing to prevent its being made public at any time. I am just suggesting that it is unprecedented to insert a requirement that it be published in the *Government Gazette* within a certain period of time. There could well be circumstances where that would be most inappropriate.

The Hon. JENNIFER CASHMORE: This is an unprecedented project. According to all the commentaries I have read, there is nothing in Australia's history that approaches the multifunction polis in terms of its impact on the relationship between Australia and at least one other country, namely, Japan. It is unprecedented in terms of the powers and functions that are given to the corporation. In fact, if we look at the clauses in the Bill, we are looking at what is potentially a nation within a nation, particularly when we look at the clause we are about to examine in a moment. It seems to me that ministerial direction and control, whilst it is certainly strongly supported by the Liberal Party, is something that should be open and acknowledged, because it will be very influential on the course of the development of this site, this project and the corporation, and it is something about which we should be informed.

I see no reason whatsoever why ministerial directions should not be published immediately they are given. It could be quite critical to other decisions of the Parliament to know what kind of ministerial directions are given, and I believe that the Premier's explanation as to why he will not support the amendment sits ill with his support for the principle of the directions being recorded in the annual report. I ask the Premier to reconsider and again to explain, with better justification than he has given the Committee, why he refuses to accept the amendment.

The Hon. J.C. BANNON: All these provisions are drawn from the Techology Development Act, and there was no such provision in that legislation. There is no such requirement in terms of Roxby Downs or some other large projects. Therefore, I can only repeat what I said: there is nothing to prevent such directions being made public, if that is desirable.

Mr INGERSON: I find it quite amazing that, with a project involving $2 billion—in essence, the State Bank debt—the Premier is prepared to accept that this information can be contained within an annual report but is not prepared to accept that it be published within 14 days of a direction being given. It seems quite odd to me that the Premier has accepted the principle that it should be published but is not prepared to accept that that should be done within 14 days.

Dr ARMITAGE: I understood the Premier to say that there may be circumstances in which it may be inappropriate for a direction given to the corporation to be published within 14 days. Can he give me examples of where it may be inappropriate?

The Hon. J.C. BANNON: I have not thought of specific examples, and anyway they would be hypothetical. I am just suggesting that that may be a case. I think that this is an onerous and unnecessary provision.

Dr ARMITAGE: If there is a direction to the corporation by a Minister of the Crown involving the use of public money, surely it is appropriate, particularly if that direction is to come out at some later stage in an annual report, that the people of South Australia should expect that direction to be published as soon as possible.

Amendment negatived; clause as amended passed.

Clause 8—'Functions of corporation.'

Mr INGERSON: I move:

Page 3, line 31—Leave out 'plan and develop and manage' and insert 'coordinate the planning, development and management of'.

We believe that the Development Corporation should coordinate the planning and management of the whole development project, and it is more appropriate to use the words contained in my amendment, because this development will be a Government-private sector development. The coordination of all that will require the Government to do the planning, developing and managing of the project. We think that the amendment provides better wording.

The Hon. J.C. BANNON: While I understand the intention of the amendment, I think it poses an unnecessary and difficult restriction on the corporation in certain instances. I guess that an analogy can be drawn with the South Australian Urban Land Trust, which is prohibited from specifically developing land. Under one of its powers it may enter a joint venture, and in effect that is how the Golden Grove exercise was carried out by the Urban Land Trust. In fact, this provision would be significantly more restrictive than even the current Urban Land Trust requirements, because at least under the the trust Act, while the trust cannot carry out general urban land division and development unless in joint venture, it is empowered to divide land for the purpose of making it available in parcels that are suitable for further division and development.

It may well be that an investor or proposed user of a site in the MFP would like the corporation to parcel or set up

some sort of turnkey operation. In that instance, it should be possible for them to do so. In practical terms, it would not be envisaged that the corporation would be employing its own construction staff and things of that nature, as I outlined in an earlier answer: that is certainly not envisaged. But to insert that particular provision immediately reduces the scope of the corporation to respond to legitimate requests that it might get, and in fact would prevent it from carrying out some of its functions.

It would be difficult for the corporation to coordinate planning and management, for instance, without actually engaging in planning and management functions. It would be very hard to define where the coordination ends and actual function begins. It really just confuses the whole issue, and I think it is unnecessary. I do not believe that there is any danger of the corporation—it would have to be a matter of the policy of a future Government—establishing its own in-house total operations which I understand the honourable member is trying to guard against by this clause.

Mr D.S. BAKER: The member for Mount Gambier gave the example of expanding the MFP other than in the Gillman site, and the Premier said there was nothing wrong with that. In the case of a company, say, at Mount Gambier, interested in becoming involved in the MFP, quite obviously the MFP corporation could not plan, develop and manage it but it could coordinate it into the MFP as a structure in South Australia. What would happen if an area in the South-East or at Port Pirie wanted to get involved? Surely that would be a coordination role and not a direction role?

The Hon. J.C. BANNON: It is a case of the specific not excluding the general and vice versa. Just because the word 'coordinate' does not appear in the current clause, that does not mean that coordination is prevented. In many cases, that is exactly what the corporation would do—certainly in the cases that the honourable Leader of the Opposition has mentioned. To insert that word would immediately restrict the scope of operation in the corporation quite undesirably, but that does not mean that by not being there they cannot coordinate. On the contrary, that would be the way to operate in those instances.

Amendment negatived.

Mr INGERSON: I move:

Page 4, line 13—leave out paragraph (i) and insert—

(i) to perform any other functions that are necessary or convenient for or incidental to the performance of functions referred to above.

It is our belief that paragraph (i) in the Bill is very wide and this amendment brings it back to the performing of functions incidental to those listed previously.

The Hon. J.C. BANNON: I would suggest that clause 8, as worded, with the functions of the corporation listed in paragraphs *(a)* to *(h)* and of carrying out other operations to give effect to the objects of this Act, really does refer back to those matters, but I do not find any problem with a substitution of those words by the words suggested by the honourable member. If he feels more comfortable with them, I am prepared to accept the amendment.

Amendment carried.

Mr INGERSON: I move:

Page 4, lines 14 to 16—leave out subclause (2) and insert—

(2) The Corporation must, in carrying out its operations, consult with and draw on the expertise of—

(a) administrative units and other instrumentalities of the State;

(b) Commonwealth Government and local government bodies; and

(c) non-government persons or bodies,

with responsibilities or particular expertise in areas related to or affected by those operations.

The purpose of this amendment is to expand the existing definition from the administrative units and instrumentalities of the State to include the Commonwealth and local government bodies and, particularly as far as we are concerned, to include the private sector. We have used 'non-government persons or bodies' to define the private sector.

The purpose of including the other bodies is that we believe that in the consultation process, the MFP Development Corporation should have as many as possible numbers and groups of people with whom it can consult. Since we have had representation from local government and many people in the private sector, we believe that these additional people in terms of consultation would improve the general operations of the whole corporation.

The Hon. J.C. BANNON: I oppose the amendment. As my own amendment suggests, I am willing to insert a specific reference to local government because it is appropriate in this context. The rest of the honourable member's amendment is fairly meaningless. To require the corporation to consult with non-government persons and bodies—who are they and what for? Who has a right to such consultation? It is just left open. I am sure that the private sector will be involved where appropriate. This is really aimed at getting access to the resources of Government initially, and I foreshadow local government as well, but it should be left at that.

Amendment negatived.

The Hon. J.C. BANNON: I move:

Page 4, line 15—after 'instrumentalities of the State' insert 'and local government bodies'.

A reference to local government bodies would be appropriate because we are talking about the governmental instrumentalities within the State. From my discussions with local government—both the councils and the focus group—they would like to see a number of references specifically to local government to indicate its involvement, and this is certainly one of those areas where that is appropriate.

Mr S.J. BAKER: Why is the Commonwealth not mentioned in this section as the member for Bragg intended in his amendment?

The Hon. J.C. BANNON: The relationship between the State and the Commonwealth is different and is covered under other arrangements, such as the appointment of the board and the memorandum of understanding entered into between the Commonwealth and the State.

Amendment carried.

The Hon. J.C. BANNON (Premier and Treasurer): I move:

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

Motion carried.

The CHAIRMAN: I draw the attention of the Committee to the suspension of Standing Orders in relation to the asking of questions on clause 8.

The Hon. D.C. WOTTON: One of my concerns about the site involves the contamination of soil, to which I referred in my second reading speech. High arsenic levels have been identified ranging in concentrations from 50 to 100 milligrams per kilogram of soil on six sites along the southern boundary of the study area from Eastern Parade to the Wingfield landfill. As far as I can see, no explanation has been given for these high levels. What can be done, what is being done and at what cost to reduce this contamination to acceptable levels? As I indicated in my second reading speech, it is suggested in the draft EIS that these matters can be fixed. If that is the case, why are the problems that we have in areas such as Bowden and Brompton involving contaminated soil not being addressed?

The Hon. J.C. BANNON: Contamination has been found in a number of areas around the city. This problem has emerged as developments take place on pug holes, waste dumps and so on. It is certainly a problem on the Le Fevre Peninsula in areas such as where the Submarine Corporation is established. I guess that this is in part a consequence of slack practices in the past. The site has been extensively examined on a number of occasions. I refer the honourable member to the report and the various papers indicating the nature and extent of these problems, but we are advised that, by one means or another (the technicalities of which I do not think there is much point in going into in Committee, because none of us are experts in this area), measures will be taken. That is taken into account in the cost of site development.

Part of the way in which this will be done is to ensure that appropriate developments take place in appropriate areas. This means that the clean up or covering of soil or removal of particular types of waste will relate to the particular use to which the site will be put. A factory or a house has different requirements than simply a recreation or grassed area that might be reverted to urban forest or something of that kind. The whole purpose of this very detailed examination of the site is to see where things are best located to reduce or, in some instances, eliminate the costs of that contamination reclamation.

The Hon. D.C. WOTTON: It is suggested in the EIS that there are already solutions to this problem. We should be advised of those solutions. I do not think that the answer that has been provided of covering it up is satisfactory. I asked a question about the cost involved. If we are looking at the overall cost of the development of the area, there must be some estimation of the cost for this work.

I could also refer to the unacceptable levels of mercury that have been identified on the west side of the Port River on the site of a former sulphuric acid and fertiliser factory. Because there is particular concern in the community, I ask what investigations are being undertaken to identify other possible high mercury levels. What can be done in this case to reduce the contamination which is of particular concern, and what costs are estimated to carry out this work?

The Hon. J.C. BANNON: I can only refer to what I was saying a moment ago. Whether or not the level of contamination is acceptable depends very much on the use to which the area is put. For instance, residential use is obviously highly sensitive, but other forms of use may not have the same sensitivity. In fact, it is often better to leave contaminated land undisturbed in these instances. Those assessments are made when planning for the site. I repeat: neither I nor the honourable member has the technical, scientific or other expertise to deal with the specific methodology. If the honourable member would like a briefing on that, I would be very happy to provide scientific experts to do so.

All I can say is that the experts have identified problems and where and how solutions to those problems can be undertaken. The overall conclusion is that that is very possible, that the clean up of this overall area is attainable. It will cost more to do so, but against that in terms of development you have accessible infrastructure and, therefore, a much lower cost structure of providing services to the area. For instance, one could go further afield to an uncontaminated area, a broad acre area that has only been farmed—of course, even farming can lead to contamination—where you would not have that particular problem of cost. However, on the other hand, you would have very considerable costs in providing the services and infrastructure. If you compare outer Tea Tree Gully with the inner suburbs, we are talking thousands of dollars per block. So, that is the set-off. Broad calculations have been made for that and they are contained in the documents to which the honourable member has access.

The Hon. D.C. WOTTON: I do not believe that that answer is good enough. I am sure that the Premier would be aware of the concern within the community about these matters. The Minister for Environment and Planning would have received a lot more correspondence on the subject than I, and I have certainly received a considerable amount of correspondence from people concerned about this matter. They want to know what is happening. It is not good enough for the Premier to say that he will facilitate a briefing for me. The people of South Australia recognise this as a major problem and they want to know what is going to be done about it.

I certainly do not know. The Premier spoke about methodology. It must be possible to provide some information, because it is certainly not in the EIS. The EIS continues to talk about solutions but does not say what the solutions are. As I mentioned earlier, it is costing hundreds of thousands of dollars to fix up the problems in the Bowden/Brompton area, and that is a small area in comparison. There is concern that even the work that is being carried out there is not satisfactory. How in the world can people have confidence when we recognise the extent of the problem on this site if the Premier is not able to provide answers that will satisfy the community? Certainly, that has not happened at this stage.

The Hon. J.C. BANNON: It is not true that there is large scale contamination: I understand it is around 5per cent of the area. So, first, put the problem in perspective; secondly, the technical solutions are there; and, thirdly, the information is available not just to the honourable member but to the public of South Australia through the EIS and the various papers connected with it. Of course, when particular work takes place in developing a particular section, obviously more information will become available. The whole basis of this project is the clean up and making acceptable of the areas. The standards that have been set can be observed—there are technical means of doing it, and they are detailed here.

The Hon. D.C. WOTTON: I would appreciate it if the Premier could indicate clearly where those solutions are. We are talking not about a small area but about some 200 acres, and that is not a small area in anybody's language. The Premier has conveniently ignored the matter of cost. Somebody must have done their homework to determine how much needs to be set aside for this work. Does the Premier know and, if so, I believe we should be told? Could the Premier indicate the estimated cost of bringing in water for the irrigation of vegetation because of the high salinity of ground water underlying much of the MFP site? It is important that the community is informed in regard to the costs of these matters and the solutions—if there are solutions—that can be found to overcome a lot of these problems.

The Hon. J.C. BANNON: In some cases, contamination need not be actually dug up and removed: it is better if it is not. The use of the land for recreation purposes or whatever will ensure stability there. The estimate for the overall clean up of contamination as identifed is around $9 million for the whole site. That is not an unacceptably high figure by any means. In relation to the salinity question about which the honourable member talks, that is the whole point of bringing the stormwater on to the site. The whole ponding arrangements and the lakes system, which are very well delineated in this report, show how the flushing, the

salinity and the exchange of salt for fresh water will be undertaken.

The Hon. JENNIFER CASHMORE: I dispute what the Premier has just said. I am on pretty firm ground because I am backed by the Institute of Engineers Australia in its position paper on the MFP Adelaide, which was published in July last year. I am talking about the national institution based in Canberra and not about the State body. It said 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 discharge from the Port Adelaide sewage treatment works'.

At no stage has the Premier given any indication of the timing, the program or the cost of that, yet it is absolutely central to issues of water quality which effect the MFP. If the Institute of Engineers, which is a completely disinterested, national body of professional engineers with no axe to grind in this matter, makes the statement that it is of the utmost importance that the elimination of effluent discharge from Port Adelaide be completed before this project can proceed, we can accept that that is the case. It is therefore absolutely necessary that it be costed and that a program for its implementation be provided to the Committee before we can possibly think of giving safe passage to this Bill.

The Hon. J.C. BANNON: That, of course, is a different point from that being made by the honourable member but, nonetheless, it is a very valid point, and it is something that has to be done, whether or not we have an MFP. Indeed, in the forward program of the E&WS, the handling of that sewage discharge and effluent in that area is underway.

The Hon. Jennifer Cashmore: How far forward?

The Hon. J.C. BANNON: Quite well advanced. There has been a lot of vindictive planning, and I understand that a pipeline is to be constructed, and various other proposals of which my colleague the Minister for Water Resources would be in a much better position to provide the details. That is being done as a separate but related exercise to the MFP. Of course, there is also the possibility of such effluent waters being used for industrial purposes and so on where lower quality water is needed. So, those problems are being addressed. They need to be addressed whether or not there is an MFP, because we cannot allow the Port Adelaide treatment works to go its merry way, as it were, and that is part of the program that will march in tandem with the MFP development.

The Hon. JENNIFER CASHMORE: I do not think it is good enough for the Premier to come into a Committee such as this with an airy-fairy response that it is part of a forward program. If the Premier does not know and the Minister of Water Resources does, she should be here to assist him on these matters. We would like to know whether there is a forward program and, if the Premier cannot answer the question here and now, I put it on notice and hope that he will respond very quickly, within a matter of days, with a written reply. What is the forward program for the elimination of the effluent discharge from the Port Adelaide sewage treatment works? What is the precise timing and implementation of that program? What is the precise costing on an annual basis, and when will it be completed?

The Hon. J.C. BANNON: A plethora of options are under examination. Of course, one is to replace the water being drawn from aquifers for industrial use with this effluent water. So, a number of things are the subject of a major study. I undertake to provide some information to the honourable member.

The Hon. D.C. WOTTON: The Premier has glossed over the matter of the high salinity of ground water. I did ask a question regarding the cost of bringing in water for irrigation of vegetation, and I would still like the Premier to answer that question. On top of that, only today, I received correspondence—and I presume the Premier's office would have received the same—from the Port Adelaide Residents' Environment Protection Group, which is very concerned about water quality. It points out that in the area the testing done for the MFP feasibility covered only nitrogen and phosphorous. It indicates that no testing of sediment was done, and the testing was carried out for one to two weeks in January when no stormwater was flowing. I am informed that these tests are the basis for the EIS water quality assessment.

I would like the Premier to confirm or to deny that situation. Even though water quality legislation was passed about 12 months ago, industrial dumping into the river is still not regulated or licensed. Will the Premier indicate whether there is some sort of problem in regard to this matter, or whether there are not sufficent resources currently to carry out that work? These matters are of concern to the local people in Port Adelaide, but the salinity problems overall and the costs involved are matters of State importance.

The Hon. J.C. BANNON: That is why this whole lake system is being constructed. The ponds that are involved provide for settlement of nutrients and effluent, the cleaning up of the water and its re-use for all sorts of purposes. A lot of study is being undertaken and there is some considerable experience as a consequence of the ponding basins established by the Salisbury council. There are virtually identical conditions in relation to Gillman and, therefore, the experience gained there, which is now accruing, because that project has been in operation for a while, will obviously be used in this instance. There is certainly a reasonable body of information, and there will be more.

That is one of the most exciting parts of this project in terms of what can be done with stormwater effluent and how it can be properly introduced into a develpment to get maximum use out of it. In addition, there is the challenge not to let it impede or interfere with the salt or sea environment. That is all covered in great detail in these studies.

Mr D.S. BAKER: It might be exciting with respect to stormwater, but the EIS refers to 'the cumulative risk of dangerous concentrations of toxic gas, vapour or smoke arising from potentially hazardous incidents exceeding the adopted criterion for accepted risks in residential areas over the majority of the study site'. What is being done to minimise the risk by adopting clean-up procedures or by confining residential development to areas that are not contaminated?

The Hon. J.C. BANNON: We are ensuring that residential developments are confined to areas that are not contaminated and there is an ongoing plan of clean-up, where possible, of those emissions.

Mr D.S. BAKER: How much of the area is not suitable for residential development?

The Hon. J.C. BANNON: Very little.

The Hon. JENNIFER CASHMORE: What the Premier has just said is disputed by the McCracken report entitled 'Proposed Gillman Residential and Recreational Development—An Assessment of Risk'. That report states:

> The cumulative risk of fatality to an individual exceeds the adopted criterion for acceptable risk in residential areas over much of the study area. Therefore, most of the study area [that is, the Gillman site] would appear to be unacceptable for residential development if strict adherence to the adopted risk criteria was deemed to be essential.

It is worth noting the contributors to risk, which should be placed on the parliamentary record, as follows:

Potential sulphur dioxide released from the CIG plant at Port Adelaide (26.9 per cent); potential chlorine gas releases from the ICI plant at Osborne (24.7 per cent); potential chlorine gas releases during road transport from the ICI plant at Osborne (11.7 per cent); potential anhydrous ammonia releases from the Penrice Soda Plant at Osborne (9.4 per cent); potential anhydrous ammonia release during rail transport to the Penrice Soda Plant at Osborne (5.8 per cent).

That does not take into account the natural gas pipeline that runs under portions of the site. I am pleased to note that the member for Price is in the Chamber because it is his constituents who are at risk.

Given the international nature of this project and the risk factors identified not only by McCracken but also by the Australian Centre of Advanced Risk and Reliability Engineering Limited (ACARRE), which has reported on this, I say to the Premier that his answer to the Leader's question is entirely inadequate and is contradicted by both McCracken and the ACARRE report. It seems that, as a general conclusion with respect to industrial hazards, McCracken and ACARRE deliver a very severe blow to Gillman as a site that could be entertained if the Government seriously took risk factors into account.

The Hon. J.C. BANNON: The issues raised in the McCracken report have been addressed comprehensively in the subsequent studies and analysis, and aspects of that report are quite out of date and other issues raised in it have been addressed. The ACARRE report—

Mr S.J. Baker: Why don't you answer the question?

The Hon. J.C. BANNON: I will in a second.

Members interjecting:

The CHAIRMAN: Order! The Premier has the floor.

The Hon. J.C. BANNON: The McCracken report was an earlier study and, since then, a considerable amount of work has been undertaken which was analysed by all those listed in the environmental impact statement and the SDP study groups. The ACARRE report, which was quoted by the honourable member, qualifies a number of the McCracken conclusions and says that the site is acceptable, except for one small corner.

Secondly, the honourable member referred to McCracken's reference to CIG and the sulphur fumes emitted from its plant. It no longer produces those because the plant is out of production. She referred also to the ICI chlorine plant. That plant is no longer in operation. That is an example of the way in which these issues are being addressed. The Penrice problem referred to is outside the area involved and, as far as the pipeline is concerned, a requisite distance from that pipe will be observed. All these issues have been addressed. As I said, if members want specifics, I point out that some of the things referred to are no longer carried out. Progressively, of course, that will be the case.

Dr ARMITAGE: I note in reference to the building blocks, so termed, in the health area, a number of things: the CSIRO Division of Human Nutrition, which we all know about, the Flinders Medical Centre, which we know about, optics and vision companies, which are already there, the craniofacial unit, which is already well publicised and the *in vitro* fertilisation program that we all know about. Given that this is a building block of the health area for the MFP, I would be interested to learn whether the Premier can tell us about the Australian Centre for Drug Development, which is proposed as part of the MFP health building blocks.

The Hon. J.C. BANNON: While a number of health-related activities are connected with it, and the honourable member has already referred to some, it is not one of the three core areas. The advice of the International Advisory Board was that concentration should be placed on those three areas. It is part of the building block. I do not have a briefing note on the specific reference of the honourable member, but I undertake to get some information for him.

Dr ARMITAGE: I accept that the Premier does not have that information, although I am disappointed. I presume that I will get advice on that very quickly. I expect that the Premier does not have advice on the cooperative research centres, which are regarded as a building block within the health area, not just a peripheral issue. I am also interested in the tissue growth and repair research centre, and I would like information about that.

Further to the health area, a number of business opportunities are mentioned and I would like the Premier to tell us what amount of money the State expects to get back from these business opportunities. They are: a telemedicine centre, a population health centre, and training and education packages. Given that they are nominated in the MFP report as business opportunities, I am interested to know more about them and how much we can expect to get out of them.

The Hon. J.C. BANNON: It is far too early to say how much money we will get out of them because these are in the feasibility stage, as has been outlined. They are being pursued with that very object in mind. The honourable member is quoting from the feasibility study which explored a range of possibilities. He may recall that, in its assessment, the International Advisory Board suggested that there should be a narrowing of concentration in this field. Although an opportunity might present itself, and it could become part of the building blocks, we must concentrate on some of the central core areas.

The MFP telemedicine project is currently establishing a pilot scheme in Australia involving the Royal Adelaide, Flinders and Whyalla hospitals. At this stage negotiations are proceeding with commercial partners and, until those negotiations are concluded, the actual necessary funding and the various other financial aspects of it will not be available. However, that is what the study is all about.

Mr D.S. BAKER: We have a considerable problem. I ask the Premier why we cannot have the Minister for Environment and Planning in here to answer some of these questions. We have been firing some—

The Hon. J.C. Bannon: I have answered them all!

Mr D.S. BAKER: I can tell the Premier that he has not. This is a sham. You are not even answering the financial questions that we ask—you just duck it over and leave it alone. You have no idea of the environmental questions at all, and you think you are going to snow the Parliament, but you are not going to snow the Opposition.

The CHAIRMAN: Order! The Leader will address the Chair.

Mr D.S. BAKER: My remarks are directed to the Premier. This whole exercise is an absolute sham. We are going to make sure that we get some answers. Is the Premier prepared to get the Minister for Environment and Planning in here to answer questions?

The Hon. J.C. BANNON: I am amazed at this outburst by the Leader. What is the Leader trying to establish? When the member for Coles asked a detailed question about the McCracken report, I seem to remember that I was able to provide some detailed answers.

Mr D.S. Baker: You fudged it.

The Hon. J.C. BANNON: I fudged it! The honourable member said one of the major problems was that a chlorine plant was operating in one place and that there was another one elsewhere. I said that the information is that these things have closed. I explained how the site—

The Hon. Jennifer Cashmore interjecting:

The Hon. J.C. BANNON: Please, Mr Chairman, can I have protection from the honourable member, who is making life hard for this Committee? I am being blustered at by the Leader of the Opposition's saying that I am not providing information—where has he been? I am providing all the information that is appropriate.

Members interjecting:

The CHAIRMAN: Order!

The Hon. J.C. BANNON: I understand the Opposition's intention is to try to create some air of uncertainty.

Members interjecting:

The CHAIRMAN: Order! The member for Bragg is out of order.

The Hon. J.C. BANNON: The member for Adelaide asked me a number of questions based on certain feasibility proposals contained in the earlier documentation. I explained to him that not all of those are being pursued because we are attempting to narrow the focus. I explained to him that in the case of telemedicine, for instance, there is a project in development: parties are involved in discussion but they are not going to put their commercial considerations on the table at the moment, as he would well understand. That is true of a number of things, but that is not what the Bill is about.

The Bill establishes an enabling Act and provides a framework in which the corportion can be established so that these things can be pursued, but they are not bound up with the Bill itself. Therefore, there is no need or reason to have detailed information, much of which is simply just not available publicly at this stage to put before the Committee, because this is not the time for it. Let us get the corporation established and we can work some of these things up. The Opposition is attempting to take the project 10 or 20 years ahead of its time, and that is quite unreasonable.

Mr D.S. BAKER: A typical example was the question asked by the member for Coles. The Premier said, 'Well, we have closed down the ICI facility; we are going to shift PASA, and do all of those things.' This is my next question: what steps are being planned to develop an emergency plan for evacuation or to provide on-site shelters in response to hazardous incidents involving major toxic emissions to the atmosphere? The EIS refers to the need for such a plan. It is in the EIS. Already the Premier has told us that we are going to shift it. Is the EIS a factual document or not? I want the Premier to answer that question.

The Hon. J.C. BANNON: In fact an emergency plan has been developed. It is needed not because there is an MFP but because we are already aware of the hazardous nature of some industry in that area of the State.

Mr OSWALD: My question relates to the disposal of what will be vast amounts of contaminated soil from the site. When we were looking at the disposal of a small amount of toxic soil from cleaning the Patawalonga at Glenelg, compared with the amount that we will have to dispose of at Gillman, the E&WS and the Department of Environment and Planning made it clear that there was nowhere for us to dump the soil that will come from the Patawalonga.

If there is nowhere to dump and dispose of the small amount of contaminated soil that we will have shortly from the Glenelg project, where is the Government going to dispose of the contaminated soil in the quantities required to be disposed of when the Gillman site is under development?

The Hon. J.C. BANNON: Vast amounts are not involved. No vast amount of contaminated soil needs to be moved. It does not need to be moved. As I have already explained, many of those areas can be used for recreation purposes. The soil that does not have to be moved. It can be placed in a tip and be made safe there, and the tip will not be used for residential purposes.

Mr OSWALD: The plan also includes bringing in soil and using it to top up and raise levels prior to building or other purposes. It also refers to bringing in sand, and that alarmed us down on the southern coast because of the sand replenishment scheme. After we took the last amounts of surplus sand out of the island next door to the quarantine station, it was indicated that the sand replenishment scheme had depleted most of the spare sand available to put in the system, and now we are mining offshore. If we do not have any surplus sand in the coastal dune system or on the island out near the quarantine station, from where will the Government obtain the filling required and mentioned in the draft EIS?

The Hon. J.C. BANNON: It would not have to be brought in. Sand is on site and the creation of lakes provides the sand and fill. In the case of soil coming in from the outside, it involves the order that is already being dumped, and it will be simply diverted to this use. There are no special problems involved in that. As I say, in the case of sand, it does not have to be brought on site: it is there, and that is part of the findings of the study.

Mr D.S. BAKER: Following on from that, it appears that two of the five locations identified by the Tweedale and Sylvester reports are identified as unsuitable for residential development, but they remain within the MFP core site: they are Largs North and Pelican Point. Does the Government intend to sell these sites and, if so, when will they be offered for sale? What returns does the Government estimate it will receive from the sale of those two sites?

The Hon. J.C. BANNON: No final decisions have been made on that. Largs will probably remain a recreational site. Pelican Point has a number of interesting development opportunities with, I understand, quite good commercial value.

Dr ARMITAGE: In response to the questions I asked earlier, the Premier seemed to be upset that I was asking for specific details of health building blocks and building opportunities. As set out in the Bill, the functions of the corporation include:

> to promote and assist scientific and technological research and development.

That is exactly what I am asking about, and I do not believe it is unusual at all to be asking about things identified as part of the business and scientific opportunities, given that this is referred to specifically in the Bill. I believe to ask what the State can expect out of the business opportunities in relation to that is absolutely relevant. Further, can the Premier provide details—again in relation to business opportunities—about a privately funded clinic linked to a major university hospital in Adelaide, which is purported to be one of the business opportunities within the health area?

The Hon. J.C. BANNON: I was not objecting to the honourable member asking questions about these things: I was simply pointing out to him that, because they are going through feasibility stages, in many cases the projects have not been developed to a point where a great deal of information can be provided. Where it can be, I will certainly attempt to do so. This particular project mentioned by the honourable member is still in the pre-feasibility stage and therefore I can provide no further information to the honourable member. There are a whole range of ideas, propositions and possibilities, but they need a lot more development and will not really get a kick along until we establish the corporation by passing this legislation.

The Hon. JENNIFER CASHMORE: The answer the Premier gave to the member for Morphett seemed to me to be inconsistent with both the EIS and the Belperio report with respect to the suitability of soils as fill and the proposed soil excavation and compaction methods. Because of the Premier's answer to the member for Morphett (which was a reassuring answer) and because of the apparent disparity between the EIS and the Belperio report, was the Belperio report taken into account in assessing the EIS and, if so, why is the EIS relatively reassuring when the Belperio report, amongst other things, states that overall the sediments (this is, the geophysical structure of the soils) are saturated, the sands loose and unconsolidated and the clays soft with significant potential for compaction? The report goes on to state that soil liquefaction in the event of earthquake is an important issue, and that there are engineering problems associated with acid sulphate soil such as the corrosion of metal and concrete, with load bearing strengths and with uneven subsidence.

All those problems will add immeasurably to the cost of construction. No doubt load bearing piles will have to be used for a large number of the buildings, yet this was dismissed by the Premier in his answer to the member for Morphett as being of little or no account. I believe in answer to the member for Heysen the Premier said that by the time we relate the cost of a block at Tea Tree Gully with the cost of a block at Gillman, notwithstanding the cost component of site preparation, there will not be much difference. Anybody reading the Belperio, McCracken and ACARRE reports, notwithstanding the Premier's rejection of some of their conclusions, and the environmental impact statement, has to realise that there are monstrous, massive costs associated with this site. I repeat the question: to what extent was the Belperio report taken into account by the environmental impact statement, and what costs are associated with building and construction on the site?

The Hon. J.C. BANNON: The process is that a number of reports are commissioned to define the problems. The engineering and other feasibility studies then try to address those problems to see in what way they can be overcome. The Belperio report was taken into account, and that is why it was commissioned and used extensively in the further work that was being done on assessment. The finding is that, once you work these soils, the physical characterics change, and that is the way in which a number of these problems are overcome. Further studies have found that piles are not needed in all cases.

So, one does not get a preliminary report or a report on a particular aspect and say that that is now the definitive and final word on this. In fact, there would be no point in further study if that were the case. They are taken into account and result in those findings—in other words, the technical solutions to the problems that are found. That is why the EIS, for instance, takes the original Kinhill study a considerable distance further. If the honourable member compares those reports, she will find a completely different conformation on the site, because the subsequent study uncovered the original shoreline and the sand deposits there, giving immediate different possibilities to the way in which the site could be developed, and at much less cost, I might add. All those reports are taken into account, and the overall costing we get is the end result of that process.

The Hon. JENNIFER CASHMORE: The Premier did not address my question about the risk of liquefaction in the event of seismic shock. What is the risk of liquefaction in the event of seismic shock, and what is the likely risk of seismic shock on the site?

The Hon. J.C. BANNON: Liquefaction is in the unworked soil—the uncompressed particles. One of the end results of actually working the soil and establishing the site is to eliminate or greatly reduce that problem. Overall Adelaide is on a fault line, and anything we do in and around this city has to have regard to that historical possibility. To the greatest extent possible, it needs to be taken into account. The way in which that particular problem is overcome is by this working of the material.

Mr OSWALD: I refer back to the questions I asked the Premier a few moments ago. The just published Supplementary Development Plan states:

> Poor soil conditions exist over a large portion of the core site. It would make the construction actively difficult. Remedial works would be required and would include removal of unsuitable existing fill, removal of excess organic materials . . .

If the site contains that sort of material which is to be removed, I think my other question is valid, that is, where is this material to be dumped? It will not be dumped willy-nilly around the site so that lawn can be planted and football ovals and recreational facilities can be constructed. If it is to be put on the sites where one, two or three storey commercial ventures are to be erected, we have to bear in mind that already under the surface eight metres of organic materials have been declared, and that will require piles and massive foundations. The builders are hardly likely to put unacceptable, excessive organic materials onto eight metres of what is already totally unsuitable filling. Where is this soil and this unacceptable filling to go?

The Premier says that it will go on site, but logic does not decree that that will be so. Given all this unsatisfactory surface soil of various types, excess soil will have to come from outside the area; it will not be found within the area. If it is to come from outside the area, will it be used just to top dress or to cover the organic soils that are there? This soil will have to come from somewhere, and to get a load of top soil to put on a person's backyard in some cases involves carting it between 50 and 80 kilometres. Huge amounts of soil to be placed at various depths to make up for the marine deposits that have collected over many thousands of years have to come from somewhere. I do not think the Premier has answered either of my questions. First, where is this soil going (and I do not accept that all this surplus organic soil will be spread around the Gillman site) and, secondly, where will the clean soil come from?

The Hon. J.C. BANNON: I have answered both questions. First, no soil need leave the site. The honourable member says that it cannot be spread around the site, but the fact is that it can. The organic material in particular is ideal for ovals and things of that kind, contrary to what the honourable member says. Studies indicate that the soil does not have to be removed. It may have to be taken from one section to another as part of site preparation—that stands to reason—but the site and the nature of its development is such that that does not have to be done. As to soil coming in, as I said before, the volume of soil already being dumped has been calculated, and that equates to about what would be needed in any case for the MFP development. So, there are no special requirements involved there.

Mr OSWALD: For years I have walked up and down the Dean Rifle Range, especially in the winter. At the end of the day, I have been about 12 inches taller because of the mud, clay and slime that ends up on my boots. It does not come off until I get home and hose it off. It must be covered, and massive quantities of soil from outside will have to be imported. It is a simple fact of life. Those quantities of soil will not be obtained from within the area. Where will that soil come from that is needed to top up vast acreages of that area that is now the Dean range and

the associated area. As soon as it receives 10 points of rain, it is a quagmire.

The Hon. J.C. BANNON: Most of that is stormwater which will be contained, and therefore that wetting effect described by the honourable member will be greatly reduced.

Mr S.J. Baker: It is the effect of rain.

The Hon. J.C. BANNON: No, it is stormwater passing over it and wetting it. The soil from the lakes, the excavation, can be used as part of that site containment.

The Hon. H. ALLISON: I listened to the Premier's response about the liquefaction question raised by the member for Coles, and I could not help but smile rather wryly. If the geophysicists who have been advising him claim that liquefaction is not a possibility, or that they have some way of solving the problem—by converting that 1 700 hectares into a safe area when this has been completely impossible in the San Francisco Bay area where there are similar soils—I suggest that we need new geophysicists. It will just not be possible. If they are assuming that there is no chance of earthquake, they are also ignoring the fact that the Mount Lofty-Flinders Ranges in their entirity are ancient horst blocks with vertical splits. There is every chance at sometime or another of a major earthquake. They are not considered to be stable any more than the Mount Gambier volcano is considered to be extinct. It is only 4 400 years since it last erupted, and 10 000 years is the period that determines total extinction. So, we have many small shocks in the Adelaide area. A major shock is apparently—

Members interjecting:

The Hon. H. ALLISON: There will be no major shocks in Mount Gambier, not at the next election anyway, if that is what members are thinking. There certainly will be in Adelaide, along with the horst blocks, but that is by the way. The Premier's advisers seem to be discounting the possibility of a major earthquake, just as they are discounting the possibility of tidal effects, yet we have had high tides in the gulf in the past 20 to 30 years. Certainly, there have been a number in the past 40 to 50 years. They are also discounting the chaos effect which is increasingly prominent in scientific calculations. If the Premier suggests glibly that there is no problem, I ask that he reconsult with a different set of advisers.

The point I really want to raise was the Premier's dismissal of criticism of Pelican Point as a site either for residents or a proposed shopping centre. There was criticism, and he dismissed it, saying it would be all right. At page 249 of the draft EIS, Largs North and Pelican Point are included as potential safe areas for residents, yet in other criticisms, in their comments regarding a number of sites, Tweeddale and Sylvester claim that Pelican Point should in fact be viewed with caution as an area for 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. That is because of the incidence of a wide range of existing pollutants and the pollution which can come from existing industries and which simply will not go away. I do not think we will suggest that the $130 million investment of the cement factory should be taken away. It is just not possible.

The daily emissions of chlorine, sulphur, ethyl mercaptan and a number of other gases that drift over the peninsula from the petrochemical storage at Birkenhead, the biggest in the State, according to Department of Health reports from 1960 to 1986, result in a higher than normal incidence of morbidity from cancers and associated pulmonary illnesses and a higher than anticipated incidence of a number of serious diseases which one would have to attribute to the constant pollution either existing in the soil or drifting over from the variety of industries.

They were questions which I raised in the second reading debate and to which the Premier did not respond in his reply. Has he dismissed those completely as being simply irresponsible meanderings from a number of people who have prepared environmental impact statements to supplement the State's EIS, or will he give the various impact statements, which are repetitive in their advice, fair consideration and simply admit that there are some problems and tell the members who are here today how they will be addressed and at what cost?

The Hon. J.C. BANNON: I certainly do not dismiss them as meanderings, and they are addressed in the EIS. In relation to the first point made by the honourable member, the MFP site is in fact higher than West Lakes and many other coastal areas. They would go well before the MFP, so really he is talking about a problem whether one develops anything anymore anywhere in Adelaide and we could apply that equally to Tokyo, most of the Queensland coast, Newcastle and other areas.

There is a risk factor, I agree, but it is no more and probably less on this site than on others where we have already fully developed. The problems that the honourable member referred to have been addressed. Pelican Point and the possibilities there have been analysed. It is a fill site. There are limits on loadings and what can be undertaken there. There is certainly no intention to uproot major investment industries such as the Cement Corporation and the Submarine Corporation and so on from the peninsula. The honourable member says that all these things are producing unacceptable environmental hazards. He refers to a series of reports done between 1960 and 1986, or whenever it was. I can assure the honourable member that there have been major improvements in that area.

A number of the emission sources that were identified in that report have now been closed down, and I refer back to the remarks I made to the member for Coles. A number of other industries have really started to get their act together in terms of cleaning up. For instance, I imagine that the cement works, as part of that major investment, built in a series of environmentally appropriate controls that were not there before, and that is true of most of the industry. In fact, nearly all the findings of those reports are now well out of date in terms of what the actual situation is. It is improving, and improving greatly.

The Hon. D.C. WOTTON: Can the Premier tell me exactly where I can find an evaluation of the impact of the MFP on the fishing industry? I have looked fairly thoroughly through the EIS and have not found such an evaluation, or certainly one that satisfies me. All members in this place recognise the importance of the mangroves for the future of the fishing industry. It is interesting to note that it was recommended to the Government in 1985 that a monitoring program should be carried out in the mangroves to assess their condition and worth, and to protect them.

In 1988, when the Department of Lands recommended that the mangroves be declared a national park, this monitoring program was again raised. To this day, the State Government has not undertaken this program. In fact, the Government recently rejected a request for mangrove research. However, it promises to look at the mangroves as part of the MFP.

In 1989, the Government's interdepartmental committee on climate change stated clearly that the future of the mangroves and the fish stock for the fishing industry would be secured only if the mangroves were allowed to grow inland.

The MFP does not seriously face this situation, I would suggest—in fact, it is planned—that the residential development be positioned right next door to the mangroves. The fishing industry, both professional and amateur, is greatly concerned about this situation and its future. It is important that the Parliament be advised where we can obtain a true and proper valuation of the impact of the MFP on the fishing industry.

The Hon. J.C. BANNON: The starting point would be section 362 of the report, which deals with mangroves and samphire, and a number of documents relate to that. As the honourable member has rightly identified, the mangroves are the key to the fish nurseries and to the fishing industry. Indeed, the way in which the mangroves have been treated in the past is scandalous. Diagram 315 in the environmental impact statement shows what has been done in terms of clearing mangroves since 1954. In the mid-1950s they were chopping down and clearing and placing levy banks on them. One can see the devastating impact on that map. Fortunately, there are still some mangroves left—

Mr Ingerson interjecting:

The Hon. J.C. BANNON: Yes, there is. There is a great deal about the habitat of fish, and there are ancillary papers that deal with that. Let me finish what I am saying. I am referring to the degradation of the mangroves that has occurred in quite recent times. I am suggesting that there must be a way of preventing that going further and of restoring and enlarging the mangroves area. That is envisaged in this program.

The honourable member says that it has been recommended that conservation zones and so on be established. That is in fact done under the SDP. That is an example of the MFP project being the impetus, the spur to actually do something very positive in these areas to enhance the fishing industry and fish grounds, to expand the mangrove area and to try and redress some of the problems that have been created in the past and—

Mr D.S. Baker interjecting:

The Hon. J.C. BANNON: We are not putting sewage in there.

Mr D.S. Baker interjecting:

The Hon. J.C. BANNON: No, there is a system. We are, in fact, restricting water that goes in there through the ponding system so that settlement and other water quality improvement can occur before any flushing takes place. The engineering details of that are covered in this report.

Dr ARMITAGE: The Premier mentioned buffer zones in answer to the last question. In representations made to me it has been pointed out that these buffer zones will be quite important in relation to the intrusion of large amounts of mosquitoes into the urban population. Mosquitoes are wellknown vectors of disease: Murray Valley encephalitis and Ross River virus are two that spring readily to mind. In fact, the EIS acknowledges this by indicating that there may be the need to spend money on the development of vaccines against these viruses.

The development of a vaccine against one single illness is a multi-million dollar project, and it is pretty much hit and miss: you are very lucky if you can get it. What methods will be used to overcome what could be a major problem within an urban area? What methods will be used to eliminate the mosquito problem and what might be the cost? If it is acknowledged that the method of removing some of the mosquitoes may include chemical spraying, what chemicals will be used and what effect are these likely to have on the mangroves that will be sprayed?

The Hon. J.C. BANNON: The mangroves are actually sprayed by the Port Adelaide council, I think. This is one area where one hopes that some enhancement can take place. This vaccine proposal to which that the honourable member refers I understand is one of the commercial possibilities that might emerge from the MFP. A company is establishing a tech park that is doing some research into this area.

Dr Armitage: It is real hit and miss.

The Hon. J.C. BANNON: Exactly. It is a research project that is being undertaken. It is not crucial to this. It was simply mentioned in the context of the MFP, and one hopes that we will see a series of these things happening. The mosquito problem is identified as an issue and I am told that environmental engineering methods in the way in which lakes are structured can minimise breeding grounds and therefore reduce the mosquito effect. That is obviously one of the techniques that will be adopted. Some limited spraying may be needed, but as I say that is already being carried out. It is suggested that it is a short-term problem that can be managed.

The Hon. D.C. WOTTON: I want to go back to the matter of the evaluation of the impact on the fishing industry. The Premier has indicated that there is a lot of information. I have looked very carefully through the EIS on previous occasions, and I do not believe there is an appropriate evaluation of the effect of the MFP on the industry. Will the Premier make available material from other reports that deal with that matter? I am particularly concerned because in the draft management plan for Port Adelaide and the St Kilda mangroves prepared in 1986 some 50 species of fish were recorded in marine waters adjacent or close to the Port Adelaide-St Kilda mangrove area. That report expressed concern about the impact of the fishing industry on the mangroves at that stage. With the proposed development at the MFP site it is even more important that an appropriate evaluation be provided, and I ask the Premier to make that available.

The Hon. J.C. BANNON: I will undertake to do that. Incidentally, appendix H of the EIS lists fish species and so on. I return to the basic point: the more we can do to improve and enhance the mangrove area and protect it, the more we can do to support the fishing industry. That is the basis of the MFP's impact on the fishing industry—positive.

The Hon. H. ALLISON: There seems to be some inconsistency between the reactions of the Premier and his advisers to the possibility of the greenhouse effect having a warming effect and creating a substantial rise in the water level. The IPCC report advises that there will be no substantial rise, probably a metre, by the year 2000, yet one would suspect that all coastal developments are under much more serious threat than that if one is to believe the Minister for Environment and Planning, who has put the fear of God into all mankind with statements made in the introduction of environmental issues over the past 12 to 18 months claiming that the greenhouse effect and its impact on warming and water tables and rising of sea levels will be much more severe than the IPCC report indicates.

In addition, the Minister insists that some of the shack-owners on the South-East coast, where there are very severe storms—we acknowledge this—and yet where those shacks have not been flooded for 100 years (certainly they have not been anywhere near flooded in the 37 years that I have lived there), are being refused permanency and in some cases the shacks are being demolished because of the potential for flooding caused by the greenhouse effect.

There is a tremendous difference between the opinions of one Minister and the advisers who have reassured us that the Gillman land is safe. Yet the Gillman area is obviously subject to a much more severe impact, were the

shallow gulfs suddenly to have a high tide racing up them. Shallow waters are much more liable to flooding of adjacent land than are the deep coastlines of the South-East coast. Which of the two sets of advisers is giving the correct advice? Is each one of the advisers giving advice which is attuned to the anticipated needs of the relevant Minister? In the Premier's case, he needs favourable advice from his officers, because we want the project to go ahead and succeed. In the case of the Minister for Environment and Planning, she wants to scare everyone into action and, therefore, puts the worst possible connotation on it. Where is the reasonable ground?

The Hon. J.C. BANNON: That is a matter of scientific dispute, as the honourable member says. But we are not getting involved in that argument; we take the worst case. There is about a 2.5 metre allowance and there are levee walls in existence, anyway. That is the worst case suggested not necessarily by the Minister but by the scientific evidence. Of course, that can be done if one is developing a new site because one is not dealing with existing structures.

Dr ARMITAGE: In his previous answer, the Premier indicated that the Port Adelaide council already sprays the mosquitoes in the mangrove area. What does it spray? In what area does it spray it? How often does it spray? I am happy for the Minister to take advice and get back to me. What chemicals does it use? In what way do they differ, if at all, from any which may be envisaged to be used in control of the MFP site?

The Hon. J.C. BANNON: All I know is that I have been advised that the Port Adelaide council sprays: I have no further details. Would the honourable member like me to approach the Port Adelaide council or does he wish to do so?

Dr Armitage interjecting:

The Hon. J.C. BANNON: No. In answer to the honourable member's question, in which he said that the possibility of spraying could be envisaged, which would be a dreadful thing for the area, I mentioned the fact that spraying was already going on. However, in the MFP design, such spraying would be minimised because of the design of the lakes. The engineering solutions are obviously to be preferred to chemical solutions. We may have to have some minor chemical supplement, I do not know. In relation to what is done now, I will certainly inquire of the Port council for the honourable member, but it is not really relevant to the MFP.

Mr BRINDAL: In the Premier's answer to the member for Mount Gambier's question, he referred to page 14 of the supplementary development plan, which 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.

Will the Premier confirm whether the fill which is unsuitable and which has to be removed is the Holocene sequence, which in some areas of the site is up to eight metres thick? Will he confirm advice that that is subject to liquefaction in the event of seismic shock? Will he also confirm that the Pooraka formation is undetermined when it comes to its reaction to seismic shock and could cause the magnification effect that was experienced in the Newcastle earthquake, and say whether the Glanville formation has been similarly investigated? Has any microseismic work been done on the site, because I believe it has not?

The Hon. J.C. BANNON: I have answered most of those questions. The members for Morphett and Mount Gambier, in particular, pursued this question of soil infill. The member for Coles asked questions about how one handles liquefaction, as I recall it. I talked about the compaction techniques, the seismic risk involved. A great deal of material is contained in the environmental impact statement which supports the SDP to which I will refer the honourable member.

The Hon. JENNIFER CASHMORE: I have a question for the Premier about the envisaged marketing strategy, but before asking it I will read an extract from a report of the Department of Industry, Technology and Commerce, entitled 'MFP: an urban development concept', which was published in July 1990. It states:

> 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 settings such as Lucerne, San Francisco or Stockholm.

The report continued:

> While it is acknowledged that a site can be made, like Venice or Amsterdam, and have a 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.

It is hard to relate the Gillman swamps to Venice or to Amsterdam, and I am quite sure that the Premier would not attribute either charm or a sense of magnificence to the MFP site. However, it does have to be marketed. What marketing strategy is envisaged to attract residents to Gillman in light of the site's lack of natural features compared not with Venice or Amsterdam but simply with North Haven, which has direct sea access? What is the estimated cost of the marketing exercise?

The Hon. J.C. BANNON: The most effective way of demonstrating the potential of the site—and it really does have fantastic potential if one has the vision to see how it might be formed—is to actually take people down to West Lakes and give them a before and after glimpse of what has happened there. From that, one can really see the transformation that has taken place. That is obviously one answer to that question. Of course, linking it into the magnificent city of Adelaide, where we have the access to the Hills, and so on, it is not hyperbole to say in time it can equal a Venice or whatever; it certainly has that potential. I am sure Venice looked pretty crook when it was going through a stage of development, an appalling swamp before the Renaissance builders and others took over that site.

As I said, we are very fortunate. This is a very powerful marketing ploy to show the before and after of West Lakes. The marketing program is being developed, but staff still have to be recruited and a lot more work has to be done, which will be enhanced if we can establish the corporation. That will be one of their first and major briefs. For Australia, the emphasis will be on targeting major Australian organisations with a range of proposed activities—members will recall last December BHP indicating that it was making a commitment—and there have been a number of presentations to business audiences.

An honourable member interjecting:

The Hon. J.C. BANNON: I think it is about 7.5 million, or something like that. It is a research and development facility. I was responding to an interjection, and that figure is off the top of my head: I ask the honourable member not to hold me to that. The European investment attraction program is being managed by Geoff Walls and I have already referred to the fact that he has called together the European members of the International Advisory Board to be involved in that. They are looking at getting the services of an experienced operative based in Paris, because there is obviously not only French precedent but French interest in this project. A market research project has been let and work is under way. In Japan and Korea there has been quite

a lot of activity. Mr Eric Olsen is manager of this activity from Adelaide and we have representatives in the north Asia area.

It is intended to manage the US program with the support of the Australian Investment Commissioner, Mr Seddon, who is based in New York, and a program is being developed in collaboration with him. A presentation at a globals project conference in Hawaii marks the beginning of a higher profile for United States investors. So, material is being prepared and developed.

The full plan has not been developed, nor will it be approved until the corporation is in place to approve it, hence the need for this legislation. Market research in various other items is covered in the operating costs which overall total about $2.5 million, but I cannot tell the honourable member without further reference the exact component of that which is related to marketing. That is a general idea of the program. It is very much in its embryonic stage until the corporation is established.

The Hon. JENNIFER CASHMORE: The amount of $2.5 million is a global figure and we do not know over what period it is to be spent. I think it is important that we know that. With all due respect to West Lakes and to the member for Albert Park, who is naturally proud of a pleasant suburb in his electorate, it is a pretty tall order to compare West Lakes with some of the other sites which might be sought for development by people who are looking for investment in Australian real estate. I draw the Premier's attention to a statement made at a multifunction polis seminar in Sydney on 30 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.

The Premier is looking very pleased, as if he is in a position to refute the validity of that statement. The fact is that the MFP Adelaide Design Concept Development and Core Site Assessment published by Kinhill Delfin joint venture in May 1991 acknowledged that report by the National Capital Planning Authority and stated that it had been produced prior to the selection of the site and while potential MFP industries were still being defined. In actual fact, the National Capital Planning Authority's report was published in July 1990 and the Gillman site was nominated by the MFP joint steering committee in June 1990. It is a tall order to attempt to market Gillman by driving people around West Lakes. For any international investor, West Lakes would be recognised for what it is, a pleasant suburb, but hardly one to excite the interest of international investors.

The Hon. J.C. BANNON: While the report was officially published in July, I understand there was access to it in the course of its preparation. The report was acknowledged but it was not endorsed in all respects. The honourable member went on to refer to an address by one of the authors of it, an address which we reject utterly. If the honourable member heard the tone of the address, she would do so too. For instance, I am told one of the statements made by this individual was that anyone who designs a house these days with less than a three car garage is kidding themselves. That is a great concept for urban design and development! I reject that approach. It was very much a Canberra-based vision of a tired old concept for a recreation resort, which perhaps some people have in mind for the MFP, but we certainly do not have that in mind for Adelaide.

Mr BRINDAL: I refer the Premier to one of the objects of the Bill (cl 5 *(f)*) and relate it to the functions of the corporation (cl 8(1) *(a)*) with respect to the social mix of housing which the Government envisages on the MFP site. I understand from press statements released by the Premier and from all published material that I have seen that there will be a complete mix of social housing on the site. However, I direct the Premier's attention to a report, which he made available to the Opposition, prepared by John M. Cooper, at the request of Wendy Bell, planning consultant for the MFP, and dated 14 November 1991. It states in part:

> It is understood that the MFP is to be developed with an integrated mix of household form from a wide range of socioeconomic backgrounds. This aim is at odds with normal housing market mechanisms which are used by households to maximise satisfaction by minimising social mix . . . 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.

I find that a most disturbing and distasteful statement in terms of the objects of this Bill and the functions of the corporation. I therefore ask whether there will be a just and equitable mix of social housing or whether there will be a natural pricing environment. What is the Government's clearly enunciated policy in this matter?

The Hon. J.C. BANNON: We do not agree with that statement or share those views. They are quite unacceptable and I would have thought that the work that had been done by the planning review and some of the other activities indicate that there are ways and means of overcoming those problems of perception and that insulation issue to which the honourable member refers. Indeed, work is being done on that and all I can say is that that is not the way in which this development is envisaged. The social mix that was referred to is a very important part of the process and if there is any validity in those views—superficially they might sound as if they have validity—they will be overcome. We do not share them.

The Hon. H. ALLISON: What sort of advice will the corporation give people under its charter to carry out other operations to give effect to the objects of the Bill regarding construction on the site? I ask that because the member for Coles and others have mentioned that, in a number of the EIS statements, attention is drawn to the high salinity of the groundwater. Mention is also made of the presence of humic acid, and the cautionary advice that has been given by the compilers of the EIS is that those two components, plus the possibility of other chemical components in the soil and groundwater, will have an adverse effect upon construction materials such as steel and concrete which are used for foundations. Both those materials are badly affected by those components in the longer term. If the Premier is in any doubt about that he has only to look further down the coast at West Lakes where for several years the E&WS Department has been replacing the steel sewerage and water pipes with plastic pipes.

That is a relatively minor part of construction. The major construction of concrete and steel piling is essential to the long-term existence of premises that might be built on this site. What advice will the corporation be giving to people who want to construct on this ground and how are they going to offset those chemicals in the soil?

The Hon. J.C. BANNON: That is the whole point of making these intensive studies and assessments available. Anyone seeking to operate on the site will have engineering and other issues identified and they will have to be addressed and overcome and, indeed, they will be.

Mr BRINDAL: Following the question of the member for Mount Gambier and accepting the Premier's answer to my previous question, I would like to explore the problem of footings because, throughout a number of reports, it is clearly identified that footings will be considerably more expensive on the Gillman site than on equivalent areas in Adelaide.

In achieving the appropriate social mix, can the Premier say what provision the Government is prepared to make to the Housing Trust to ensure that the cost of the erection of houses on the MFP site is equivalent to houses elsewhere, given the extra pricings of footings? What market strategy does the Premier envisage in view of the fact that the footings are so expensive that a medium priced house placed upon expensive footings then changes the price structure of the house?

People going to inspect such a house unfortunately cannot inspect the footings, but they will look at a house in the medium price range and they will perceive that they are getting less value for money than an equivalent priced house in another suburb. I put to the Premier that this will present a marketing dilemma for the corporation. How does he believe the corporation will resolve it? How does the Premier believe it is possible to get over the problem that there will be considerable additional cost to the Housing Trust in providing public sector housing on site?

The Hon. J.C. BANNON: I do not think that that is necessarily the case. Remember, infrastructure costs to this site in terms of the service delivery and so on are much lower, so there is a set off in terms of the price of blocks, which helps allow for any extra expenditure on those engineering and other issues that the honourable member raises. That is taken into account in all the financial workings. In the marketing sense, one hopes—and the plans are—that there will be innovative, interesting and environmentally efficient housing in a lively and exciting environment for those who are operating in and around the MFP. I would have thought that marketing was the least of the problems in a way, bearing in mind the nature of the site, the multifarious uses and the fact that we should have a number of overseas scholars and workers and so on involved. There will be an interesting population mix as the project develops.

The answer with respect to the marketing is that it is part of the MFP, an international program. It is like marketing Montpellier or somewhere to any of us—it is a place in the south of France. There are many salubrious places there, I am sure, but it is being part of the MFP that gives it a bit of interest and excitement for those who want to be part of it.

Mr INGERSON: In light of the known fact that frankie piles had to go down 150 feet on the Torrens Island site, what is the depth expected for frankie piles to go down in respect of medium to heavy construction manufacturing industries that are likely to be on this new site? I understand that these piles have to be drilled down until they reach a solid base. When this was done in relation to the Torrens Island Power Station, they had to go down 150 feet. As the Premier would know, this site is fairly close to Torrens Island.

The Hon. J.C. BANNON: The load involved in the construction of a power station is infinitely greater than the sort of structures proposed for this site. That is the first point. Secondly, I am told that there is no need for those piles as other engineering solutions have been developed. One of the interesting things is that even as recently as the development of West Lakes there have been major improvements in technology, analysis of materials, in equipment and so on which make it possible to do a number of things that were not possible then. As we all know, the exponential advance in technology provides considerable benefits. When one is doing a project in the 1990s one is doing it with infinitely better information and materials than one had in the 1970s or, with Torrens Island, back in the 1960s.

Mr INGERSON: As a supplementary question, can the Premier advise the Committee what these new technologies are that have replaced the old frankie pile system? If we cannot obtain that information now, can it be supplied to the Committee so that we can understand how this technology develoment has occurred? We are talking about significant medium to heavy construction taking place on the site, and I would have thought that some of the factory structures that we would expect to see on this site in the next 10 to 20 years would be heavy and fairly significant.

The Hon. J.C. BANNON: We are getting more and more into the technicalities of it. Like the honourable member, I am no building engineer, but again he draws the comparison with Torrens Island. I repeat again that piling is not needed, because the loading levels are less and the Torrens Island structures are further out and are in a much less solid environment. So, the engineering problems on the site are reduced, but there are techniques. Soil is mixed and worked which compacts it. The way in which foundations can be made involves a kind of floating concept, a flexibility is built into that, and all the techniques that have been developed make this possible. I am told in engineering terms that there are solutions.

The Hon. D.C. WOTTON: What assurance can the Premier give the Government that expenditure on the MFP infrastructure will not divert funds away from necessary development on the fringes of the metropolitan area? This fear was identified by a consultant to the Planning Review, Mr Bunker, in a report back as far as September 1991.

The Hon. J.C. BANNON: That is an appropriate question and a good point. It should be remembered that we are trying to undertake a lot more urban consolidation. There is general agreement that far too much pressure is being put on the outer areas, and the next major step in those outer areas is one that is most undesirable. We do not want to go building out in the Willunga or Barossa Valleys and other areas.

The way in which to prevent that sort of ongoing urban spread and to provide a bit of consolidation is to do the sort of mixed housing development that we have at a place like Golden Grove, to develop tracts of land like Northfield and others in the inner city. The MFP falls squarely within that concept. In terms of where one puts resources that we would be using in these developments, the MFP is a good place to do it.

Secondly, if we look at the figures, they are not monumental over the life of the project. They do not represent a major capital accretion as is set out in those costing documents. To the extent that expenditure is forgone in other areas, it is because it is appropriate for it to be so forgone, because we really are stretching the city to the limits and there is general agreement on that point. Secondly, the size and scale of it and the value we will crank out of it will more than compensate.

The Hon. D.C. WOTTON: Can the Premier estimate Government funding for infrastructure? The State Government's cost was originally estimated at $200 million in May 1990 with $1 billion coming from the Commonwealth. A month later the estimate was increased to $280 million from the State Government, while in March last year Mr Guerin stated that the clean-up of the site would cost $705 million,

but he did not clarify what the South Australian Government's share of this cost would be.

The Hon. J.C. BANNON: The basic costs have not really changed; it is a question of whether you use net present values and various other calculations and mixes. In the overall analysis, a total cost of $869 million in 1991 dollars was estimated, and that was divided into $618 million of project costs and $251 million of regional costs. Regional costs include things such as land acquisition, entry roads, services, consolidation, the contribution to open space and lakes systems and the placement of powerlines underground. Those sorts of things were analysed, and there are plus or minus contingencies in any of those figures.

So, an assumption was made about how those costs would be borne. In the Kinhill Delfin report tables 513 and 514 set out the analysis at that time. Against those costs, one sets project revenues which suggest that the revenue of the project after selling expenses would be of the order of $789 million in 1991 dollars: that is, $789 million project revenue, a $51 million contribution to the Government through 6 per cent of sales, and a net project revenue of $738 million. The Kinhill Delfin scenario shows the developer receiving a net revenue of $738 million from a cost of $618 million over the life of the project, and then one goes into the various cash flow estimates.

Potter Warburg has done further analyses, and some of them are discussed in the documents we have. This is where we look at the net cost to the public sector for infrastructure developments, and the figure we are using is $202 million in 1991 dollars, or $105 million at net present value over the 20 to 30 year period, equating to $9 million each year added to the State budget in 1991 dollars.

Mr INGERSON: As a supplementary question, in reading the EIS there is no doubt that there has been a significant change in the design of the lakes system in particular, and consequently there has been a significant change in the size of the allotments that will be available. Has there been any revising of those figures? I understand that this site is significantly smaller now, and that consequently the costs may have changed. I wonder whether there has been a more recent upgrade than the Kinhill Delfin report, which is now some 18 months old.

The Hon. J.C. BANNON: It is true—and I think I referred to this earlier this evening—that the further intensive study for the environmental impact statement uncovered things like the original coastline, the sand contained there and various other aspects of the study, resulting in a redesign of the site. But the capacity of the site and those other attributes of it have not changed: it is simply a relocating in a different way to have regard to the further findings that the report came up with. The preliminary estimate is that by these means the estimated engineering costs could be reduced by as much as $20 million or so. Certainly the consultants are reporting that they believe it will be cheaper, that the further studies have shown that there is a cheaper way of doing it, and this is very encouraging indeed.

The Hon. D.C. WOTTON: I refer to the revision in the English translation of a Japanese report by the mission which last December inspected the Gillman site and visited other parts of Australia. The original Japanese version referred to 'dreams', but the English translation was changed to read that the project had 'a lot of potential'. In reply to a question in the Senate earlier this month, the Federal Minister for Industry, Technology and Commerce, Senator Button, referred to the fact that the South Australian Government was given earlier drafts of this report on 7 February this year. When was the Premier first advised of the contents of the original Japanese version of this report? Did the Premier, any of his ministerial or departmental officers or any officers of the MFP project group have any role in seeking changes to the report? If so, can the Premier explain the sequence of events that led to these changes?

The Hon. J.C. BANNON: I understand that we got a copy about three weeks in advance. Our translation was the same, although I think the word in ours was 'visions', which indicates the difficulty of translating accurately these things. The controversy that was caused I think emanated from the overseas Australian representatives who felt that the use of the word 'dreams' would be misinterpreted and requested a different choice of words to better convey what they felt the mission was telling them. To my mind it is pretty irrelevant. I am ready to concede that it is a dream in the sense of a vision, and that is what we need in this climate.

I refer the honourable member back to what the member for Coles said about marketing. If you just walked on to Gillman and said, 'Here it is. This is what we are going to do here', you would not get too many takers. It is only because you can show a vision of the site, a before and after at West Lakes and some of the other things that have happened around the city and say, 'Can you not conceive what this site could be like?' That is the vision; that is a dream—and I hope that we can make it a reality. That is our task. If we can pass this measure, and I hope we can pass it soon, we are that much closer to making that dream or vision a reality.

The Hon. D.C. WOTTON: I asked three specific questions of the Premier.

The Hon. J.C. Bannon: We did not change it. We translated it ourselves; 'dream' and 'vision' is the same word in Japanese.

The Hon. D.C. WOTTON: I will take up that matter at a later stage in another clause, because there is some doubt about the sequence to which the Premier referred.

Mr S.J. BAKER: My question concerns the apparent conflict between the role of the MFP Corporation and the Department of Industry, Trade and Technology. How does the Premier rationalise their both having the same function in relation to attracting and encouraging international and Australian developments and investments?

The Hon. J.C. BANNON: One is in relation to this particular project, and the objects of the legislation refer to the project. The department and the MFP will work very closely together. It is no coincidence but a deliberate decision that the Chief Executive Officer of the Technology Development Corporation is also in charge of the marketing effort as an executive of the MFP. There is much interrelation between those efforts. Mr Eric Olsen, who is our MFP North Asia man, is employed by DITT, and Geoff Walls, the Agent-General, is actively working on the MFP as part of his overall assistance in our development investment attraction strategy. It is a great way of coordinating our efforts, in the case of the corporation specifically around the MFP itself.

Mr S.J. BAKER: Obviously the efforts will be in the MFP rather than in the other areas, given that we cannot expect to flog the same horse twice. How will that affect our other opportunities?

The Hon. J.C. BANNON: I think it will enhance them greatly. The MFP provides us with a very good marketing tool. It may be that, at the end of the day, somebody is not interested specifically in the MFP, but that is one means and, I would say from the feedback I get from the Agent-General, for instance, a very effective way of attracting attention. It should enhance our overall development opportunities. Not everything will or can be appropriate to the MFP, nor indeed will some of the things that DITT comes

across as part of its program necessarily be unrelated to the MFP. In other words, there will be cross introduction. The more effort we can make, the more attraction we can have, the better.

Mr S.J. BAKER: The next question relates to the commitments made by the Commonwealth. The Premier previously answered a question by my colleague in relation to the State and Commonwealth funding mix. What exact commitments have been made? I note that, on 14 November last year, Senator Button advised the Senate:

> In general principle, any money which is made available by the Commonwealth would be in the nature of an untied grant. It may be that there is an agreement between the State and the Commonwealth Government about the way in which particular funds made available are used. They will not be big.

Has any agreement been made at this stage, will the South Australian Government be seeking further Commonwealth funding for the project and, if so, when?

The Hon. J.C. BANNON: I gave all those figures in detail to the Committee earlier this evening. I refer the honourable member to that information. If and when it is appropriate, we certainly would seek more money from the Commonwealth, but I believe the best assistance that the Commonwealth can provide in that sense is assistance in kind, if you like—the location of certain facilities such as the National Environment Protection Agency and so on on the MFP site.

Mr S.J. BAKER: We know about the $12 million and the $40 million. Beyond that, what concrete commitments have been made by the Federal Government?

The Hon. J.C. BANNON: It has agreed in principle to the location of aspects of the Environment Protection Agency on site, and I understand there are also commitments through DASETT and DAS. The Department of Administrative Services is talking about a research laboratory. There are a number of Commonwealth activities which lend themselves to the MFP and which we would expect to see located there.

Mr S.J. BAKER: Beyond the $12 million and the $40 million, which is our own Better Cities money, we do not have any firm dollars and cents projected at this stage, and that will have to be negotiated at a later stage, is that correct?

The Hon. J.C. BANNON: In terms of cash allocation, yes. I went to some lengths to explain the basis of the three year commitment and so on. That has all been dealt with. I have no further information to put before the Committee, except to say that, if and when it is appropriate, we would hope to get more support from the Commonwealth.

Mr S.J. BAKER: What points has the Premier agreed with the Commonwealth as to when it will be making those commitments so that we have a clear idea of where we stand regarding funding? Obviously, we have a bit of seed capital there to keep the project rolling. Have we any guarantee from the Commonwealth Government at this stage that, within two years, certain matters will be put on the agenda table in terms of a wide range of infrastructure that will be funded by the Commonwealth? Have we gone any way along that track?

The Hon. J.C. BANNON: No, we do not need that. That has not been envisaged. The honourable member has read out the agreements and the bases.

The Hon. JENNIFER CASHMORE: How can the Premier say we do not need that? It is just unrealistic to suggest that the State Government can find the money for this infrastructure. We are in hock to the tune of billions, and the Premier suggests that we will find the funds needed for regional costs plus all the other costs. If one suggests that the regional costs are conservative (and it is impossible to tell), the Premier's reassurances would indicate there is no difficulty in finding the money required for the regional costs, which include land consolidation, relocation of existing industry, placement of powerlines underground and so forth.

Off-site stormwater disposal is identified as $5 million. It is very hard for us to believe that off-site stormwater disposal can be met by an outlay of $5 million. If the Premier does not base his expectation of Commonwealth funding on anything more than hope, how on earth are developers expected to have the confidence to invest in this project? We need a far more defined commitment from the Federal Government than any that the Premier has given. There is absolutely nothing but money which was allocated for another project and which the Premier has redirected from Better Cities to the MFP. There is not one dollar from Federal money committed to infrastructure.

It is simply going into marketing, and the marketing exercise in terms of the challenges it represents will never be accomplished with $12 million. We do not even know over what period that will be spent. The Premier has to provide far more definitive answers as to Commonwealth funding than he has. I ask specifically: over what period and at what points will Commonwealth funding be provided, and particular, when will the first dollar of the Better Cities project be allocated to South Australia and when will it be spent?

The Hon. J.C. BANNON: In relation to the last question, fairly shortly, I hope, and I hope we will be beginning to spend it in the first half of the next financial year. We will spend it as necessary. Do not get me wrong: the more financial allocation we can get from the Commonwealth, the better, and I am delighted that the honourable member supports that, because some of her colleagues in Canberra have been very hostile about that. Secondly, I make the further point that the more we can get from the Commonwealth, the better. Indeed, that is why I was saying to the Deputy Leader that we will certainly continue to pursue further funding. When I said that we did not need it, I meant that what we have before us in terms of the costings and all those things have taken into account the current level of Federal funding. Anything that we can get over and above that will accelerate the project and will help us to produce better results. If the Commonwealth is prepared to pick that up, we can guarantee the results for it. The money we are spending as a State is money that in a number of areas we need to spend anyway. It is cheaper to spend it in relation to a project like this—or we get better value from it—than to spend it somewhere else. It is part of our overall program.

The Hon. Jennifer Cashmore: Seaford or Salisbury?

The Hon. J.C. BANNON: Seaford is going ahead very well; it is well financed and very successful. There is a limit. I do not want to repeat myself. I have talked about the limits of urban growth, and I suggest that, within the next few weeks, when I hope we will have the planning review report, members will understand why this project fits so well into where we should be directing State expenditure that we would expect to be making anyway.

By all means, let us try to get some more supplementary funding from the Commonwealth. One of the best ways to do that is to get this legislation through and this corporation set up with the Opposition wholeheartedly supporting it, because then I can go to Canberra and not be undermined by the Senator Hills and others of this world. The Leader of the Opposition let Senator Hill make his statements when he should have been castigating him and saying, 'Pull your head in. You're meant to be a senator representing South Australia. Why aren't you doing it in this instance?'

I understand that Senator Olsen asks hostile questions in the Senate. Again, instead of inviting him back to be Leader, the Opposition should be saying, 'Hey, you're there to represent South Australia; get behind this project.' The point I am making is that, if we can show united determination to setting up the framework for this project, we will have a much better chance of getting supplementary Federal funding than if this sort of process continues.

The Hon. JENNIFER CASHMORE: My question is supplementary.

Mr Ferguson interjecting:

The Hon. JENNIFER CASHMORE: That is true, but I think the honourable member will recognise that the Premier's statement that we must have united determination is somewhat diluted by the statement of his Federal colleague Mr Graeme Campbell, the member for Kalgoorlie, who describes the MFP thus:

> It combines the worst elements of our past—the cargo cult and the colonial cringe, which we have to overcome if we are to progress—with a view of the future which would reduce the country to a mere geographic space. Internationalists tell us that the forces at work in the world are such that we have no choice but to give up basic elements of our cultures and even, it is strongly implied, our conception of nationhood itself. In short, the very foundation stones of our identity are to be eroded in order to achieve supposed economic gains in the future.

The Premier would recognise the words of his Federal colleague, not mine, the member for Kalgoorlie. That statement happens to be relevant to the question I want to ask in relation to clause 8 (1) *(h)*, which provides that one of the functions of the corporation is to promote, assist and coordinate economic, social and cultural development of the MFP development centres.

Why is it necessary for the Development Corporation to promote cultural development in development centres? I would have thought that that was the function of Federal and State Governments and local governments. The incorporation of social and cultural development as a function of the MFP corporation certainly tends to reinforce the concerns expressed by Mr Campbell, the member for Kalgoorlie. Why would a corporation be active in promoting cultural development when for all other Australians our cultural development is part of our national and State identity and part of the natural dynamics of living in a city, a State and a nation?

The Hon. J.C. BANNON: I do not think that the words quoted are Mr Campbell's. I am not saying that he does not agree with them, because he obviously does if he uses them, but they come from some well known armchair academic critics of this proposal who have virtually, from day one, refused to accept the way in which we have defined it. The way in which the honourable member poses her question suggests that the MFP corporation is the sole repository of this sort of thing. That is nonsense: it is just one approach. I would have thought it would be a pretty sterile exercise if it excluded cultural aspects. It is like any international contact that one wants to develop. One does not do just technology exchanges, trading and so on; one also hopes to understand a bit about culture, and I hope that we are affected by it.

I believe that Australia is potentially one of the richest nations in the world because of the multicultural diversity that we have and the way in which we have so far successfully accomplished that on an integrated and reasonable basis. I was particularly impressed by the comments that the President of Cyprus made on that point. He should know because he lives in this maelstrom of the Balkans and the division of Cyprus and so on. He said, 'You Australians don't realise how extraordinarily successful you have been in integrating these various cultural forces, leaving them with their identity but somehow making them part of the overall fabric.'

That is what this project is all about doing and enhancing. I do not see that as dangerous or to be rejected. On the contrary, I think it should be tried. That is not the only way to do it, but at least it ought to be part of their charter in broad terms but not in those pejorative terms that the armchair academics have used.

The Hon. J.P. TRAINER: Mr Chairman, I draw your attention to the state of the House.

A quorum having been formed:

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

That Standing Orders be so far suspended as to enable the House to sit beyond midnight.

Motion carried.

SURVEY BILL

Returned from the Legislative Council with amendments.

TECHNICAL AND FURTHER EDUCATION (MISCELLANEOUS) AMENDMENT BILL

Returned from the Legislative Council with amendments.

MFP DEVELOPMENT BILL

Adjourned debate in Committee (resumed on motion).

Mr D.S. BAKER: I take the Premier back to an answer he gave when he pleaded for people on this side to join with him and make this project work. We have done that; it has had bipartisan support from the Opposition. The Premier tells us he made a tremendous effort in Canberra to get more money, and he was wiped off like a bad smell. Of course, the $64 million that we were going to get did not eventuate because, whether or not one likes it, it is supposed to be an Australian project.

The Hon. E.R. Goldsworthy: We've got a mirage in the mangroves!

Mr D.S. BAKER: We have a mirage in the mangroves, as the member for Kavel says. Since then, all we have heard are suggestions that we should use our Better Cities program money to go into this project. The Premier still says, 'Please help us to get more money', but if he cannot convince his Federal colleagues—and I can understand that they would perhaps have some misgivings or question his ability to run the project—what more can we do to try to get more money for this project? It appears that it is out of our grasp. Quite obviously, the Federal Government will not support it, and the Premier is trying to get us, as an Opposition, to give him an open chequebook for it. Surely that is an irresponsible attitude.

Mr INGERSON: In May 1990, the South Australian Government's submission to the MFP joint steering committee stated:

> 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.

Will the Premier comment further on those negotiations? What stage have they reached? What reciprocal arrangements have been established with the World University?

The Hon. J.C. BANNON: A number of institutes have been proposed as part of the MFP environmental management: one specialising in education technology and telecom-

munications, a management education institution, an advanced learning systems research centre, an Asia Pacific institute of culture and language, and a health institute. They have come together as part of a world class research and educational facility, which was given the working title the MFP University, and there is still some argument about whether or not that is an appropriate title. The three South Australian universities support this, and a committee of representatives of those universities has been set up to act as a catalyst for it with, of course, a particular Asia Pacific focus.

Therefore, we are not creating an entirely new entity: we are trying to draw on the strengths that already exist within our South Australian community. In parallel with this, a number of research institutes—the signal processing activity which is already under way at Technology Park—and various other units have been identified. The international management education facility for focus on the provision of post-graduate management education, particularly of the Asia Pacific region, with short courses and various other activities has also been proposed. So, they are in the course of examination at the moment. It is important that we get this Bill through, and that we get the corporation established so that we can consolidate and firm up some of those activities.

Mr INGERSON: The Premier is really saying that in the past two years not much has happened. Although it was reported that in 1990 there would be significant work done on this world university, it appears from the comments just made that really we are now no further advanced, other than for perhaps a few meetings, with the basis of the whole exercise. Also at the same time in its submission to the joint steering committee it was stated:

> The South Australian Government's is in current negotiations with three of the largest international information and telecommunication technology companies to establish a major data processing node in Adelaide. The node will be connected to the company's successful worldwide network and will be the largest such node in time zones between India and Japan.

What is the status of those negotiations?

The Hon. J.C. BANNON: Within the next few weeks I hope we will have the actual business case for the information utility for internal examination. A number of partners are involved in this process, including Digital Computers. Of course, our own Telecom is being expanded in this new guise. NTTI (Nippon Telegraph and Telecommunications International) is part of the general business case being developed at the moment. I would hope that certainly within the next few months we will make some definite announcements on that.

Mr INGERSON: In that same report to the joint steering committee the Government referred to the establishment of an advanced learning technologies institute as a component of the world university. Has any agreement for the establishment of this institute been finalised and, if so, who will fund it?

The Hon. J.C. BANNON: This is largely being driven by the Federal departments of DIT and DITAC and they will be the primary source of funding for it.

Mr INGERSON: How far has it proceeded? It is easy to say that it will be funded by some Federal body, but the general impression given to the steering committee was that it would be set up. We are really talking about two years down the track and not five minutes ago. Are we really talking about Federal departments being involved? Can we get any more information than that? I would have thought that at this stage we would have been far more advanced and, if we are not, what is the problem with our Federal counterparts?

The Hon. J.C. BANNON: We are talking about a process that involved the feasibility study and all the other work that has been necessary. Whilst as much as possible there has been parallel development activity, the essential building blocks of the MFP relate to passing legislation such as this, and the assessment of the site and its possibilities—in other words, the physical structures into which these other activities will fit. They are ongoing, but we have to get that show of substance to consolidate and finalise it.

Mr OSWALD: Prior to the project being awarded to South Australia as a result of a political decision taken by the Federal Government, Queensland, New South Wales and Victoria as well as this State were contenders for the project. It has been well documented now from statements made by the various leaders of the states that, once South Australia had been given the project, Queensland and New South Wales both determined they would proceed and plan on an MFP type project for their respective States. It is also known that the Japanese preferred the Queensland site—and in fact still do—to the South Australian site.

If Queensland and New South Wales are still planning an MFP-type project, I ask the Premier what impact this will have on his negotiations with the Japanese and with the world university. It is highly likely that New South Wales and Queensland will end up with an elaborate science park that will develop into an MFP. If the prime investors still favour the Eastern States for what can be provided economically and with respect to population, and if they want to go to Queensland, despite all the discussion that has taken place here tonight and all the planning that has gone into setting up the corporation, enough people in this State are concerned that, at the end of the day, the Japanese will not come here anyway. I want to know how confident the Premier is that the Japanese will come here. How confident is he that he can suppress the enthusiasm of the Queensland Government which is trying to take the project away from us?

The Hon. J.C. BANNON: The longer we sit here with this filibuster over this Bill, the less confident I become. I suggest that we send all this material overseas to show how eagerly we are grasping this project! It is absolutely extraordinary. The honourable member has it in his hands to raise the confidence of these investors. He talked about a political decision being made on the site. That is not true.

Members interjecting:

The Hon. J.C. BANNON: I would like to see the evidence of that, but I do not want to prolong the Committee by asking the honourable member to answer a question. On the contrary, the Federal Government accepted the recommendation from the group that had been established to make the decision. It originally opted for Queensland on certain conditions. It said that it had two extremely fine applications for quite different approaches. Queensland could not get its act together and it said that Adelaide should be the choice. The Federal Government accepted that recommendation.

It is true that the Adelaide project is harder, in a sense. It is harder because we refused to define it in the orthodox way. I would have thought that would be seen as a major plus for the project. In other words, we were not prepared to second guess the Japanese and give them a Japanese style project. If that has made it a little harder to attract Japanese investment, so be it. That is a price we might have to pay, but I am sure that every South Australian is pleased that we maintained a particular national approach to this project. We did not define it as some sort of fancy resort or recreation area. We tried to provide a project with some real substance and long-term value for Australia.

I still believe that is there and and that is the best way that we can outmanoeuvre those in the Eastern States who quite rightly say that they would love this project. Put it into Queensland and they would have this Bill through in five minutes. They would not be wasting time like this. It is only in South Australia that we beat our breasts, agonise and nitpick. The honourable member stated how hopeless it is in South Australia to get Japanese investment. He ought to leave now, go off to the east coast and do us all a favour.

Mr D.S. BAKER: The State Government's May 1990 submission to the joint steering committee referred to the establishment of 'an environmental management systems centre'. Who will establish the centre, what will it cost and who will be responsible for funding it?

The Hon. J.C. BANNON: This is a vital stage of development. One of the elements of it is the Commonwealth Environmental Protection Agency to which I have already referred. There are at least five other companies interested in the concept, and MITI (the Japanese ministry) and DASETT—

An honourable member interjecting:

The Hon. J.C. BANNON: The honourable member asked me who they are; I am afraid they are commercially confidential at the moment, and MITI and DASETT are both involved in this concept as well.

Mr D.S. BAKER: The other question on that issue was: who will be responsible for funding it? Is that Commonwealth Government funding?

The Hon. J.C. BANNON: It is a combination of funding. As the honourable member can see, it is a joint public and private sector venture, but the fact that the two industry trade departments and the education training department are involved obviously means that there will be some governmental funds as well as the private funds.

Mr D.S. BAKER: The Premier was quoted in the *Advertiser* of 30 June as saying:

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

What is the current number of firms which have registered their interest; what procedures have been established to allow for registration of interest; and from which countries are these companies drawn?

The Hon. J.C. BANNON: A network of contacts has been developed. Committees were formed in Japan, for instance; there has been an ongoing committee involving some considerable numbers of Japanese companies under the aegis of MITI, and they have been involved and briefed in the process. The honourable member saw a number of those involved in the MITI mission that visited us last year. There is not much point in providing lists of companies or interests. I would have thought that we were more interested in who was actually committing in a tangible way. In exploring the possibilities for this venture, no stone is left unturned and, if anyone expresses an interest, obviously that is followed up. That is part of the marketing process, but the marketing cannot really develop an edge—be finalised—until we get this legislation through, so let us get on with that.

Mr D.S. BAKER: Premier, you stated on 30 June 1990 that already more than 100 international firms from Europe and the United States had expressed interest. You have been talking about Japan—

The Hon. J.P. TRAINER: On a point of order, Mr Chairman—

The CHAIRMAN: Order! The Leader will address the Chair in making his remarks while addressing the Committee, not the Premier or any other individual.

Mr D.S. BAKER: Did the goose want a point of order over there?

The CHAIRMAN: The Chair was making a direction in relation to normal procedural matters.

Mr D.S. BAKER: I second that, Mr Chairman. My point is that the Premier has been talking about the Japanese. His statement was very clear on 30 June that about 100 European and United States companies have registered interest. The question is now, as there were 100 then, how many now have registered interest and from what other countries has this interest come? If there were 100 at 30 June 1990, no doubt there has been considerably greater interest since then.

The Hon. J.C. BANNON: I gave a fairly detailed answer earlier this evening when I was talking about marketing and investment attraction programs. There are a large number of such companies, and those investment attraction programs encompass Australia, Europe, Japan, Korea in particular and the United States.

The Hon. JENNIFER CASHMORE: The May 1991 management report on feasibility stated as follows in respect of the advanced information technology and telecommunications education facility:

> A feasibility study conducted during this phase has indicated the viability of such a facility. Work now needs to be undertaken to develop a business plan with several companies that have expressed an interest in this project.

I ask the Premier: has this work been undertaken to develop a business plan; which companies have expressed an interest in this project and when is it expected that such a facility will be established?

The Hon. J.C. BANNON: That is a spin-off from the information utility. When that is finalised, obviously that further work will take place; Digital, Telecom, and I understand that the new second carrier, OPTIS are all interested in that.

The Hon. JENNIFER CASHMORE: The Premier has given an answer, but not the answer to the question. What work has been undertaken to develop a business plan, and when is it expected that such a facility will be established?

The Hon. J.C. BANNON: I am repeating myself: the information utility, about which I have already given an answer earlier (and I will avoid repetition), is the first step in that process. This next step will follow after that. I have said in relation to the information utility that one hopes in the next few months we will have some announcements to make.

Dr ARMITAGE: Again as to the health areas of the MFP, how will the health building blocks and business opportunities and so on which are clearly high-tech and which are part of the MFP function actually address the well-recognised health problems in the western suburbs? They are well-documented in social atlases and so on and they are primarily problems of migrants, lower socioeconomic status, women and so on?

The Hon. J.C. BANNON: I hope that any advances in medical technology, particularly epidemiological studies and things of that nature, will provide assistance there. As the honourable member would know, as he has probably studied these things, there are socioeconomic factors involved in health. Particular diseases or obesity or problems like this are often related in part to diet and access to reasonable conditions of living and so on. I would hope that those sorts of studies are part of the process. Let us get this Bill through, let us get the corporation set up and we can get on with it.

The Hon. JENNIFER CASHMORE: The management board report on feasibility of May 1991 in respect of the Australian Software Foundation stated:

A pre-feasibility study has been completed and participants in the feasibility study need to be sought.

Have participants in the feasibility study been identified, and what progress has been made with this proposal?

The Hon. J.C. BANNON: I understand that the Department of Industry, Trade and Technology has been pursuing aspects of that proposal. I do not have the latest information, but I will certainly try to obtain it if the honourable member has a particular interest in it.

The Hon. JENNIFER CASHMORE: The May 1991 MFP Management Board Report on Feasibility stated in respect of a software conversion and development factory:

A full feasibility study is required for the establishment of an Asia-Australia software conversion and development facility at MFP Adelaide.

Has such a feasibility study been undertaken? If so, what are the results of the study? If not, when is it expected that such a study will be undertaken?

The Hon. J.C. BANNON: A number of these feasibility studies are awaiting the passage of this legislation, and major resources were not put into them while the environmental impact statement and other work was being undertaken. We are setting up the framework in which they can be pursued.

The Hon. D.C. WOTTON: The May 1991 management board report on feasibility stated:

Environmental instrumentation
Pre-Feasibility is completed and participants are being sought for a feasibility study.

Have the participants been identified, and what is the status of this study?

The Hon. J.C. BANNON: That is one of the things that BHP is interested in, and it could be embodied in the proposal it is developing for an MFP presence.

The Hon. D.C. WOTTON: In other words, BHP is only just interested at this stage? There is a lack of information. The May 1991 management board report on feasibility stated:

Centre for Aquatic Toxicology
Discussions have been held with an investor. Follow-up is required.

Can the Premier say what follow-up there has been and when it is likely that such a centre will be established?

The Hon. J.C. BANNON: When we establish a corporation we will be able to pursue a number of these things systematically.

The Hon. D.C. WOTTON: Again, the May 1991 management board report on feasibility stated:

Centre for environmental law: several major law firms have expressed an interest in funding such a centre. These expressions of interest need to be pursued.

Can the Premier indicate the status of this project and say whether these expressions of interest have been pursued?

The Hon. J.C. BANNON: They will be.

An honourable member: When?

The Hon. J.C. BANNON: When we get this Bill through.

The Hon. JENNIFER CASHMORE: I submit to the Committee that the possibility of a centre for environmental law in South Australia, based in Adelaide, is in no way dependent upon the MFP. There is no reason whatsoever why the Law School of the University of Adelaide could not right now be designated an international centre for environmental law or, at the very least, a national centre for environmental law. If major law firms have expressed an interest in funding such a centre, why has that not been pursued? It is in no way dependent upon the passage of this legislation; this legislation need have nothing whatever to do with it.

The Environmental Law Department of the University of Adelaide exists and it has the capacity to expand if major law firms wish to sponsor the funding of such a centre. Indeed, it could have started last year or it could begin tomorrow. It is in no way dependent upon the passage of this legislation, and it is misleading for the Premier to suggest that one is dependent upon the other. It is perfectly reasonable for us to ask which major law firms have expressed an interest, when the centre will be established and what funds, if any, a State Government would contribute to such a centre.

The Hon. J.C. BANNON: The particular firm that is very interested in this is not prepared to pursue it until it knows that the MFP will be a reality.

The Hon. Jennifer Cashmore interjecting:

The Hon. J.C. BANNON: That is what the firm has told us. It may be wrong and I will pass onto the firm the honourable member's comments that it has nothing to do with an MFP. I am sure the firm will appreciate hearing that.

The Hon. JENNIFER CASHMORE: I think any expert in or student of environmental law would know that one does need an MFP in order to establish such a centre. One simply needs a law school with some reputation and sponsors who are prepared to gather around and contribute in the way that apparently is the case. I simply wish to state that the Premier's response to that question cannot really be taken seriously.

As to the law firm's alleged response—and I have no reason to doubt the Premier—I would suggest that if he invited the law firm to get together with the Law School of the University of Adelaide and the Environmental Law Department or the environmental law lecturers we would not have to wait for the passage of this legislation; we would not have to wait for the establishment of a corporation or an MFP: it could commence tomorrow.

The Hon. J.C. BANNON: Similar activities are being carried out in Sydney, where there is a market and substantial activity. The market we hope to see will, in fact, be enhanced by the environmental-related activities that are envisaged in the MFP. That is why I say the two are related. The honourable member says they are not. Neither the honourable member nor I will be making the commercial decision, so we must be guided by those who are.

Mr S.J. BAKER: I will ask a block question. The May 1991 management report on feasibility stated:

Distributed education services: a completed pre-feasibility study converted to the feasibility study is required.

The May 1991 management board report on feasibility stated:

International management centre: a feasibility study has been completed and preparation of a business plan is required.

The May 1991 management board report on feasibility stated:

Centre for research into urban environmental management: a feasibility study is required.

We have had two feasibility studies. Have they been undertaken and has the business plan been prepared in relation to the international management centre?

The Hon. J.C. BANNON: The first two have been, as I understand it. In relation to all these—and I understand the questions—you go through everything that was identified in that report. I make the point again that a lot of those feasibility studies await the knowledge that the MFP is going to happen.

Mr INGERSON: The management report to the board on feasibility stated:

Information technology and telecommunications training centre: participants have been identified and the preparation of a business plan is required.

Has this business plan been prepared?

The Hon. J.C. BANNON: I just answered 'Yes' to that question, which was asked by the Deputy Leader. Please do not make a farce of this Committee and waste our time.

Members interjecting:

The CHAIRMAN: Order!

Mr INGERSON: We would not be asking these questions if these matters had been put on the table years ago, as you should have done if you had been honest and fair dinkum—

The CHAIRMAN: Order! The member for Bragg will address the Chair and not the Premier directly.

Mr INGERSON: Mr Chairman, if the Premier had been honest and fair dinkum to the State of South Australia over this period, these sorts of questions would not need to be asked. When one looks at the dates one sees that these statements were made in May 1991, and that everybody in this State has been hoodwinked. All we want to do tonight is get all these issues out in the open so that the people of South Australia really know what is going on with this MFP exercise. My next question also relates to the same report and concerns the Asia-Pacific Institute of Languages and Culture, for which a feasibility study is in progress. So, we have gone a step further in that we actually have a study in progress. When was that study completed (if it has been), and what is the status of that project?

The Hon. J.C. BANNON: I will get the information for the honourable member.

Mr INGERSON: Perhaps this question, which does not require a great deal of information from the MFP, might be able to be answered. The draft EIS refers to the need significantly to reduce or eliminate the outflow of effluent from the Port Adelaide and Bolivar Sewage Treatment Works. However, the Government has given no commitment to do this. The Minister for Environment and Planning has promised that the discharge of sludge but not effluent will be stopped by 1993. Because these two issues are of significant concern in relation to the water quality of the lakes, (and quite a considerable number of pages and a very large effort was put into discussing this issue in the EIS that has now been tabled), what will the Government do significantly to reduce these effluent discharges, as required by the EIS, and what will be the cost to Government to make sure that this in fact occurs?

The Hon. J.C. BANNON: Work is being done with companies at the moment (and I think I referred to this earlier this evening) to get them to use effluent. These companies currently draw water from aquifers. There is a cheaper alternative to use this effluent and the costs, therefore, will be minimal. That is certainly one of the water management strategies that has been adopted and is an important part of this whole process.

Mr INGERSON: The water effluent problems of the site were not related to the question. The EIS stated specifically that the effluent problems of the Port Adelaide sewerage system and of Bolivar have to be removed from the system. That has nothing to do with what effluent might be created in future on the site. We have effluent problems at Port Adelaide and Bolivar right now, and the EIS, as the Premier would know, goes to great lengths to say that, unless those two issues are cleaned up, the dino-flagellate problem in the Port River will flow over into the lakes system and will be a massive problem.

I repeat: what will the Government do to reduce significantly discharges of effluent, as required by the EIS, from the Port Adelaide and Bolivar sewage treatment works? The question has nothing to do with future effluent problems: it relates to the real problems that exist down there today before any of these dreams even start.

The Hon. J.C. BANNON: The answer I gave was relevant, because we are treating it as an overall problem, and it needs to be dealt with that way. The E&WS Department is actively involved in working with us on that. As I said earlier, these problems need to be addressed anyway, and costs will be involved in that. I cannot give a precise estimate of that at the moment, but I do know that comprehensive reports have been prepared on strategy to address these problems, so I will take the question on notice.

Mr D.S. BAKER: What is the current status of negotiations with the Adelaide City Council for the sale of the portion of the site occupied by the Wingfield rubbish dump, and what provision has the Government made in the MFP budget for the purchase of this area?

The Hon. J.C. BANNON: Negotiations are continuing with the city council. We jointly own the Dean Rifle Range site, which was purchased from the Commonwealth cooperatively by the State Government and the city council. Of course, the city council has the adjoining waste dump, which is part of the site. Obviously, there are questions on the valuation of that facility. In terms of the Dean Rifle Range, it is very difficult to put a value on it in the current instance.

In the case of the dump, it has a limited life but, if approvals were given to raise the height, that would extend its life and thus change its value. Whether or not the whole thing can be packaged in the one transaction at this stage, I cannot say. All I can say is that negotiations are continuing, and we are prepared to come to some financial settlement with the council. I do not want to put figures into the equation until such time as we are in a position to finalise the negotiations.

Mr D.S. BAKER: So, the Premier cannot even tell us what is in the budget for the purchase of the Wingfield rubbish dump. We have $42 million from Better Cities to start the whole operation and I believe that a considerable part of that will be for the purchase of this rubbish dump. Can the Premier not tell us how much it will cost?

The Hon. J.C. BANNON: We are negotiating the price. If I give the Committee the estimate, the city council will know what we are planning to pay.

The CHAIRMAN: Order! I appreciate that the nature of this debate encourages direct interchange, but that is not in accordance with the Standing Orders, and I would ask members to direct their remarks through the Chair.

Mr D.S. BAKER: A report to the Department of the Premier and Cabinet from the Department of Mines and Energy, dated August 1989, identified potential major problems in establishing footings for construction on the Gillman site. What further investigations have been made to identify solutions to the problem, and what additional costs are likely to be involved in construction on the site to overcome the problems?

The Hon. J.C. BANNON: I understand that that report is the Belperio report, which was quoted by the member for Coles and on which we had an extensive exchange of information earlier.

Mr D.S. BAKER: In view of the advice obtained as a result of soil sampling that 'only very highly tolerant plants like saltbush can grow' on the Gillman site, what action will the Premier take to improve the amenity of the site? It appears to me that the Minister for Environment and Planning has been saying it will become a forest of trees, but unfortunately that does not gel with the soil sampling that has been done.

The Hon. J.C. BANNON: There are two approaches, I understand, in engineering terms. One is to lower the salt

water level, and that can be done by various engineering methods. Normal vegetation can then be planted. The other is to accept a level of salinity and use saltbush and salt tolerant species. It will be a combination—

Mr S.J. Baker interjecting:

The Hon. J.C. BANNON: Where it would leach through, we would obviously adopt a more drastic solution by actually trying to lower it. In other cases, we can simply accept the level, because there are salt tolerant and salt resistant plantings which can be utilised. It would be a combination of both approaches.

Mr D.S. BAKER: It really is a joke! Surely the Premier understands enough—he grows trees in his back yard, I am told—to know that it is totally impractical to try to grow trees of most varieties if the salt levels are too high. If the envisaged MFP dream that we see in the EIS, with trees all around it, obviously cannot take place—quite obviously it is beyond all feasibility to lower the salt level—why do we have to be misled all the time? Why does not the Premier say, 'All we can grow down there is saltbush. It is totally impossible to lower the salt water level, because it is impractical and too costly.' Why do we have to go through this charade with the Minister for Environment and Planning holding a press conference down there and saying, 'This site will be all trees.' Why can we not get down to the facts? Then the Premier might get a little more support from the Opposition.

The Hon. J.C. BANNON: It is not impossible, point one. Secondly, the Leader should go down to West Lakes, look at what is being grown there, and tell me if it is all saltbush. The village will be on 2.5 metre high pads developed for that purpose, and this relates back to questions asked of me by the member for Morphett earlier today. So, for a combination of reasons, the Leader asks, 'How can this be done? How is it possible?' We have a demonstration based on a 15 to 20 year old technology just down the road. Have a look at it: I invite the Leader to do so.

The Hon. D.C. WOTTON: The May 1991 MFP Management Board report recommended an initial marketing program for the project. The report stated:

> It is recommended that a marketing program be established to carry the project through the decision making phase and, potentially, until a permanent management structure is in place. A commitment to such a program is justified as the board has established that the MFP Adelaide proposal is feasible and that the industry vision and business opportunities identified have sufficient validity in their own right to warrant the attention of investors.
>
> The recommended program was to include: selective testing of business opportunities with potential investors within Australia, Asia, North America and Western Europe; and investment missions to Asia, North America and Western Europe.

Can the Premier report on the outcome of these activities, in particular, how many potential investors in the project have been approached, and how many investment missions were undertaken and at what cost?

The Hon. J.C. BANNON: Much of that has been done. I will need to take the detail on notice. I do not have the information here.

The Hon. D.C. WOTTON: What investment incentives are being proposed to attract overseas companies to participate in the MFP? The report by the Japanese MFP mission earlier this year states:

> Australia has to give incentives, such as subsidies and tax exemptions, in order to attract investment.

The same report points out:

> 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.

What is being planned to overcome the Japanese fears, as expressed in this mission's report, that, while the Japanese were expected to apply new corporate styles and new industrial relations techniques within the MFP project, they had the impression that Australia was not ready to absorb fully the Japanese style of management? Has the Commonwealth Government's proposal to set up the Federal Environmental Protection Authority in Adelaide as part of its contribution to the MFP been confirmed?

The Hon. J.C. BANNON: There are two divisions to this—State and Federal. At the State level we are certainly trying to achieve competitive advantage and there are a number of vehicles for it: the infrastructure provision to the site, the water management systems and things like the information utility for communications. These are all part of the building blocks to provide that competitive edge. For individual projects or investments we have our usual set of State incentives, with which the honourable member will be familiar.

They are the things that would normally have gone through the former Industries Development Committee process and so on. They have all been communicated and were presented in a document to the Japanese mission. In addition, at the Federal level, there is a range of things which have been enhanced by some of the proposals under the 'One nation' statement made by the Prime Minister the other day.

Mr S.J. Baker: That's a joke.

The Hon. J.C. BANNON: The Deputy Leader of the Opposition says that is a joke. One of the problems in this area is presentational. If specific concessions—major tax breaks or something like that—were given by the Federal Government to the Japanese for this project, I think there would be considerable protest. I do not know what the honourable member thinks about that. Well, I do know. Obviously, from the tone of his question, he would support that. However, I suggest that there are precedents and difficulties which would be involved. We have to be very careful how we handle concessions. We are in a very competitive market. Singapore and the Philippines, or wherever in our immediate neighbourhood, do provide some quite substantial tax breaks, tax holidays and things of that kind. That has not been done comprehensively in Australia. I am not aware that it has got strong support, but there are things like depreciation allowances, major project investments, and so on, that a Federal Government can provide which can be seen as positive. Packaged together, they look quite attractive compared with what can be offered in these other countries.

I would be reluctant to do what the honourable member suggests, which is to have some kind of open chequebook on these things. Frankly, if we have to pay a lot to get an industry in, we run the risk that if somebody somewhere else at any time wants to buy it back, that will happen because there is no basic or fundamental reason for it to be here. I think that the best thing we can do, as I said at the beginning, is to establish those competitive advantages through the sheer facility of the place in which they operate, the systems management and the various other attributes that we can give. Concessions are really the icing on the cake; they are not the determinant of it. I reject in part the criticism that has been made by the Japanese and the honourable member's endorsement of it. I think he is going down a dangerous path in advocating those things.

The Hon. D.C. WOTTON: I refer to an extract from the Japanese mission's report on the change of the name from MFP Adelaide to MFP Australia. The Prime Minister, in a speech, said that MFP Australia would not necessarily be confined to Adelaide, but could be elsewhere in Australia. The conclusion of that section of the report states:

> We have the impression that the concept of the MFP was still changing in Australia . . . It was not explained specifically the reasons why the name was changed.

Has the MFP concept been finalised, and if the MFP concept is to be scattered around Australia what coordination will there be with other States in attracting appropriate and complementary technological and research projects and what specific leisure facilities are planned for the MFP in response to the Japanese mission's report that such facilities would be needed to attract investors to counteract the lack of recognition of natural tourist attractions that Adelaide has?

The Hon. J.C. BANNON: A number of points are raised by the honourable member in that question. The name was changed on the recommendation of the international advisory board on which two very senior Japanese sit. A number of other international experts felt that MFP-Australia was a better international presentation for the project. I agree with what the mission says, that in fact some confusing messages were given to them about the way in which this project could be conceived as developing. That is why it is essential that we get this legislation through and in place, because that will be the best demonstration that we can give of the core activity of the MFP emanating from Adelaide, the disparate nature of it and the fact, of course, that all around Australia people are trying to bid for shares of the action. When the MITI mission went to centres in Melbourne, Sydney and the Gold Coast, it was given presentations which were really about urban or local developments but which had an MFP label on them. It is a bit confusing. I think it is important that we consolidate our claim on the project. This is one way of doing it and we should be getting on with it.

Mr S.J. BAKER: Does the Premier recognise that overseas interests could be confused about the lack of definition by the State Government of what infrastructure and land reclamation programs are proposed? I refer to the Japanese mission's report, which states that companies that might be eager to participate in MFP-Australia might adopt an attitude of 'MFP elsewhere in Australia' where they can get a clear idea of what infrastructure is available. The report states:

> It is because land reclamation has not been started yet at Adelaide and, what is more, even details of fund procurement have not been released at present.

This has been alluded to already tonight. What is the anticipated cost of infrastructure projects such as port facilities, roads, information facilities and energy and water supplies, and who will provide these funds—the private sector, State Government, the Commonwealth Government or the development corporation?

The Japanese evidently do not know the answers to any of those questions, and that was of concern to them. The Japanese say that they are not certain who will procure the funds. Under the legislation there is a framework in which the development corporation has the capacity to borrow funds and the State Government guarantees the loans. As the budget has not been appropriated yet, it is not certain how this framework is expected to function. So,my question is: who will take responsibility for future pollution problems on the MFP core site as well as all those other matters—the Government or the land purchasers? This needs to be established before development begins.

The Hon. J.C. BANNON: A lot of the concerns of the Japanese have been answered by the material that has been published since the mission released its report. I refer to the EIS and all those other things.

Mr S.J. BAKER: I am astounded. Suddenly, we have a great rush of interest from the Japanese that no-one knows about. My next question is what is being done to concentrate information industries in Adelaide to create a cost advantage for the privatised telecommunications sector? The Japanese mission's report points out that to make the telecommuncations program for the MFP viable the information utilities need to be attracted to Adelaide rather than the larger cities where they naturally congregate. What national companies other than BHP have expressed interest in investing in the MFP? What countries other than Japan have expressed interest in the MFP, recognising that the Japanese share a wish that the MFP needs to have a broad international image? The Premier has answered some of those questions already. A certain mass is needed to attract international investment in the privatised telecommunications sector.

What incentives are being provided by the State or Commonwealth Governments to provide preferential offset conditions for MFP investors? I presume the Premier knows what preferential offsets are. I point out that, under this offset system, foreign companies which operate in Australia are obliged to conduct early research and development programs. They cannot wait until the completion of the MFP Australia infrastructure, because once these research and development programs are completed, it is difficult and expensive for the operations to be transferred to another State—and the Premier would be aware of that. Unless Adelaide has attractive incentives and the Commonwealth provides preferential measures regarding offset requirements similar to the submarine project, companies are unlikely to transfer their research and development technology to Adelaide. These incentives might well be needed for Australian companies as well.

The Hon. J.C. BANNON: I have explained it.

Mr S.J. Baker: Not about offsets, you haven't.

The CHAIRMAN: Order! Questions and answers will have to be conducted in the normal way through the Chair.

Mr S.J. BAKER: We are not getting too many answers. The Premier's memory is fading at this hour of the morning, and I can understand why he wants to stop it all.

The Hon. J.C. Bannon interjecting:

Mr S.J. BAKER: Well, what's your problem?

The CHAIRMAN: Order! The Deputy Leader has the call.

Mr S.J. BAKER: What intentions are there to transfer Government research instrumentalities, such as part of the CSIRO, to Adelaide to demonstrate the Commonwealth commitment to the MFP?

The Hon. J.C. BANNON: They are making such proposals; work is being done on them.

Mr INGERSON: Why was the targeted population for the MFP core site reduced from a minimum of 100 000 to a figure of up to 40 000 in 1991? Does this not materially affect the viability of the proposal?

The Hon. J.C. BANNON: The adjustment was made because of further detailed study. The honourable member might recall that one of the criticisms of the project was that it was too large in scale, that it was too ambitious in both area and population target. In fact, that was taken on board and, in refining and developing the proposal, the rescaling occurred, but quite consistently with its viability—indeed, arguably improving its viability. The overall impact numbers have not changed, but the question of whether one congregates them all on one site was the issue, and the honourable member might recall the debate at the time. Instead of the Government's saying, 'Well, that's nonsense; forget it. We are going to blunder on without any kind of examination', as I said at the time, we have to keep this under review. Quite a bit was made of this in the course of the debate. I keep coming back to the fact that we are

talking about a long-term project. The projections will change constantly in the course of that project. We have to take it step by step, but this is the first step and we must get it through soon.

Mr INGERSON: What, if any, steps have been taken by the Commonwealth Government to coordinate at a Commonwealth level the activities of various Government departments which are relevant to education, information technology, space and environmental projects which are an integral part of the MFP to avoid a fragmented approach?

The Hon. J.C. BANNON: Mr David McCarthy, from the MFP unit of DITAC, chairs a monthly meeting of an interdepartmental group that is addressing those precise issues.

The Hon. JENNIFER CASHMORE: What is planned to overcome the high concentration of acids, alkalinity, salinity and toxic wastes in the soil caused by the dumping and storage of waste material? The draft EIS talks of likely difficulties for long-term vegetation establishment. What is the cost of overcoming the high concentration of acids and alkalinity of the soils?

The Hon. J.C. BANNON: Most of that material is in the tip and the plan is to simply seal it and thus deal with the problem in that way.

The Hon. JENNIFER CASHMORE: In reference to the tip, I was not within perfect hearing of the Premier when the Leader was asking a question about the cost of purchasing the Wingfield tip from the Adelaide City Council. Did I hear the Premier correctly when he said that the council had an asking price of $30 million for the dump?

The Hon. J.C. BANNON: No, I did not put any figure of that kind into the equation. I said that the value of the dump depends very much on its life—it has a limited life. That life can be extended by getting agreement or approval to raise the height of the dumping level. So, it is very difficult to put a value on it, and that is why the negotiations are taking place. As I said to the Leader, I will not put figures into the public domain when we are in the middle of a negotiation.

The Hon. JENNIFER CASHMORE: I can understand that the Premier would not want to put a figure into the public debate when he is negotiating with the Adelaide City Council. On the other hand, it will be necessary to put a figure on the cost of relocation of the dump. The Liberal Party's policy is to provide recyling centres north and south of Adelaide, which is quite separate and different from dumping as such in terms of the material that is deposited at Wingfield. What plans does the Government have for alternative sites for the Wingfield dump, and what are the estimated costs of those alternative sites? What is the anticipated timing of establishing those new sites so that the Wingfield site can be made available?

The Hon. J.C. BANNON: Such new sites would be commercial because, if we close the Wingfield tip, it is a commercial proposition to open a new tip. To the extent that recycling can occur, obviously the size and scale of such a tip can be adjusted. One of the best ways to encourage recycling is to close the very cheap tip facilities that are available at the moment. I do not know whether that is Liberal Party policy also, but certainly they go in tandem. The life of the tip is the essential question. There is a finite life to the tip. The current rate is five to eight years, unless approval is given to extend the height of the tip. I guess it is in everybody's interest that tipping cease on that site and that recycling becomes very much more widespread and a proper consciousness of trying to conserve rubbish to reduce the volume and flow be encouraged. A number of councils have some quite interesting work going on in that respect; that is actively supported by the Government, and new sites will be established commercially.

The Hon. JENNIFER CASHMORE: It is a very bland general statement that new sites will be established commercially. The Wingfield tip is the prime tip in Adelaide—the primary depository for rubbish. It is important that the Committee be told what negotiations are in train. We are about to sell, for an undisclosed price, the principal tip for the metropolitan area. Yet we are told simply by the Premier that alternatives will be picked up by commercial operators. He does not say where and he does not say who. He does not say whether tenders will be called or when. Those questions must be answered and it is not reasonable for the Opposition to let this Bill pass until those questions have been answered, because they are critical to the operations of many commercial operators and to private individuals. The answer to those questions should be known before this clause is passed.

The Hon. J.C. BANNON: It is a commercially driven activity. As I understand it, there are a number of propositions by councils further north. Companies such as Cleanaway have identified sites that are not commercial at the moment but they will certainly become so if and when the tip is closed. There is no immediate need for access to the tip area and, as I say, it has a finite life. That is the answer to the question: the tip will close eventually. Alternative sites have been identified that will be opened commercially, and that will happen irrespective of whether or not the MFP is established on that site.

The Hon. JENNIFER CASHMORE: Given that there is an estimated life of between five and seven years for the tip, when does the Premier envisage in the time scale of the establishment of the MFP (irrespective of the life of the tip if the MFP were not to take place) that the tip will be closed in order that other construction and development of the MFP site can proceed?

The Hon. J.C. BANNON: That can be fitted into the overall works program any time within three to five years provided that the decision is made that the tip will close. That in turn is dependent in part on whether or not the life of the tip is to be extended. I would argue, as many people would, that that cannot be justified. That decision has not been made as yet.

Clause as amended passed.

Clause 9—'Powers of corporation.'

Mr INGERSON: I move:

Page 3, line 21—Leave out paragraph *(b)* and insert—

(b) arrange for the division and development of land and the carrying out of works;

Considerable concern has been expressed in the private sector that the development corporation should be in a position where it could divide and develop the land itself. My amendment suggests that the provision be changed to arrange for the division and development of land and the carrying out of works. In essence, we do not believe that the development corporation should be the developer of the land but that it should be in a position to arrange for that to occur and to be part of a joint venture of some type with the private sector.

The Hon. J.C. BANNON: I argue that that is consequential on the debate concerning an amendment that was moved to clause 8. I oppose this amendment for the same reason. It puts an unreasonable fetter on the corporation and what it may need to do in particular instances. That is not to say that in dividing and developing land and carrying out works, it will not contract out that work. By and large, it will. There may be some situations where some direct input is needed or questions could be raised about the corporation's capacity to do something. I oppose the amendment.

Mr INGERSON: We have difficulty accepting that because, in essence, the Premier is saying that he sees the development corporation as being a potential developer. I do not think that that proposition was ever put forward seriously to anybody in this State, and we think that it is critical to change this so that there is a clear and positive direction to the private sector that they will be involved in the arrangement and with the developing and division of this land. Our position is clear. I think that the Premier should see it in that light and I would hope that he would change his mind and support our amendment.

Amendment negatived.

Mr S.J. BAKER: The clause begins by providing that the corporation has all the powers of a natural person and it lists the powers that, for example, it may exercise. Does this leave the powers of the corporation unfettered? Should they not be more precisely defined?

The Hon. J.C. BANNON: They have to be read in conjunction with the objects of the Act and the functions of the corporation so to that extent they are read down, in that context.

Clause passed.

Clause 10—'Chief Executive Officer.'

Mr S.J. BAKER: What salary will be paid to the Chief Executive of the MFP, and what salary is being paid to the acting Chief Executive?

The Hon. J.C. BANNON: The acting or interim Chief Executive is simply maintained on his current salary on secondment as Director of Premier and Cabinet. I cannot recall the actual figure, but that is published. The board of the corporation, when constituted, will decide at what level of salary to negotiate the position, but these positions are usually done contractually and it depends a lot on the individual with whom one is negotiating. So, no specific level has been set; it will be whatever is required.

Mr S.J. BAKER: How will the position of Chief Executive be advertised? Can we be assured that every attempt will be made to attract top candidates from the private sector of South Australia, in other States and from overseas?

The Hon. J.C. BANNON: That will be up to the corporation, which has the power to appoint, and I would imagine that, for a position of this importance, certainly, it will be looking for a wide field.

Dr ARMITAGE: I would like advice from the Premier on subclause (3), which provides that the Chief Executive Officer is to be appointed by the corporation. In other words, clearly, the corporation must pre-exist the Chief Executive Officer, but this is not mutually excluded by clause 14 (1) *(a)*, which indicates that the corporation will be appointed by the Governor and, of the 12 members appointed by the Governor, one will be the Chief Executive Officer.

The Hon. J.C. BANNON: If there is a Chief Executive Officer, then that person so designated will be on the board. If there is not one, obviously, they will not be on the board. It is true: the sequence will be that the Governor will appoint the corporation, the corporation will appoint the Chief Executive and, on that appointment being made, the Chief Executive will join the board.

Mr S.J. BAKER: You have the right of instruction, direction and total control, as we have seen under the Act, with the amendment? Will you be instructing the board to advertise interstate and overseas for the position of the Chief Executive Officer?

The Hon. J.C. BANNON: I do not think it is appropriate for me to instruct on these matters. I would hope that we get an eminent board of very well qualified members who will seek the best qualified Chief Executive. I am sure they will search quite widely for that.

The Hon. JENNIFER CASHMORE: That is exactly what the Premier said, if I recollect correctly, about the appointment of the Managing Director of the State Bank, and the Premier as Treasurer had power on that occasion, as he has power on this occasion. I would like to ask the Premier whether he would exercise his power if he were aware that the corporation was proposing a salary in the same order of magnitude as that paid to Mr Marcus-Clark as Managing Director of the State Bank.

The Premier will be aware of the considerable public resistance to the levels of salary paid to chief executives of State Government financial institutions. This corporation could well be looking for executives in the same league as those. Would the Premier be intending to exercise his power of direction and control if the salary were in the region of $200 000 plus as was the case in other instances?

The Hon. J.C. BANNON: The member is quite wrong: I was not empowered in relation to the appointment of the chief executive of the State Bank, nor did I have the power to fix wages or salaries. That is quite clearly the responsibility of the board and I had no power of control and direction. The honourable member should read her Act and remember it.

The Hon. Jennifer Cashmore interjecting:

The Hon. J.C. BANNON: That is a totally wrong assertion. Secondly, I am not an expert on what the market requires in these instance; nor I suspect is the honourable member. Our views of what is a pretty large salary may differ from market perceptions. For a project of this nature we need to get the best. I do not know what the going market rate is, but I would be loath to intervene unless it did seem to be off the planet in some way. I think one must rely on the commonsense of a board in making an appointment that it will offer what is a reasonable and not an extravagant salary. We just do not have those sorts of funds available.

Progress reported; Committee to sit again.

ADJOURNMENT

At 1.17 a.m. the House adjourned until Thursday 19 March at 10.30 a.m.