HOUSE OF ASSEMBLY

Thursday 10 July 1997

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

PUBLIC WORKS COMMITTEE: WALLAROO TO PORT WAKEFIELD ROAD UPGRADE

Mr OSWALD (Morphett): I move:

That the fifty-eighth report of the committee on the Wallaroo to Port Wakefield Road upgrade between Wallaroo and Kadina be noted.

In moving this report, can I say at the outset that I have had some knowledge of this piece of roadway over the past 40 years, having lived at Port Pirie, and in my younger days much of my social life revolved around the Kadina, Moonta and Port Hughes part of South Australia. I used to traverse this area at least once a fortnight, or even more frequently. This is an area of the State which is very important commercially as well as for the rural community and, indeed, more recently as far as the tourism industry is concerned. It also has a very important outlet in Wallaroo for the grain industry.

The road we are talking about is the road from Wallaroo through to Port Wakefield. Over the years the road has been upgraded to some extent and, in particular, the section after the hummocks is in reasonable condition and is a reasonable width. However, by and large, we are talking about a road which links the Copper Triangle, the towns of Wallaroo, Moonta and Kadina, and provides access to the grain facility at Wallaroo, and it is also a feeder into the tourist regions. Over the years the road has become narrow and it needs a considerable amount of work done on it, and the Government in fact addressed this in the submission that it put to public works.

The Department of Transport proposes to upgrade the Wallaroo to Kadina section, that is, Stages 2 and 3 of the Wallaroo to Port Wakefield Road, at a estimated cost of $4.1 million. This project is part of an estimated $8.5 million multi-stage upgrade, of which Stage 1 has already been completed. Moreover, undertaking these works will finalise the upgrade of the main Wallaroo to Port Wakefield Road. The anticipated completion date is November 1988.

In summary, the works for this project include: a 2 kilometre new alignment through the former station yard at Kadina. For members who are interested I would recommend that they go to the report and look at the sketches of the proposed roadway and the way that it picks up the old railway alignment through the town of Kadina. It is not the sort of thing that I can describe in *Hansard*; rather, I ask members to refer to the sketch, because the way in which the road was lifted out of its present alignment, with use made of the railway alignment, is quite ingenious. Other members way wish to consider the long term situation, and there is some debate, I guess, about giving up the railway alignment and putting a roadway through; but the advice we have received is that it is the way to go and there will not be a further use of the railway alignment, certainly in the foreseeable future.

Another part of the project included a 2 kilometre upgrade of Port Road, Kadina, and also an 0.9 kilometre upgrading of the Kadina road at Wallaroo. The Public Works Committee is aware that the existing pavement through Kadina, which was constructed in 1933, consists of two narrow lanes that carry two-way traffic through the town, has a narrow sealed width, contains numerous acute angled intersections and is constantly subject to a large number of heavy commercial vehicles. In other words, at the height of the grain movement times of the year with tourism, buses and general traffic through the area and the way in which those roads are designed, I think the local townspeople will be greatly appreciative of what the Government has done in upgrading that section of road through the township of Kadina.

However, what it might do is reduce police revenue because they have straightened a dogleg in the road just out of Kadina, which is where police have always hidden their radar and speed guns behind some trees—and it is not far away from the road to the Premier's old home. Indeed, many of my former friends have been caught, and I was once caught, at that spot on that particular road. So, that will straighten that out and, hopefully, it will be a lot safer now to drive through Kadina because you will be able to see where you are going.

Consequently, the pavement has now severely deteriorated and, because of this heavy traffic, it is distorted causing the road to have extremely poor riding surfaces. It continually requires maintenance to maintain it in a safe driving condition, especially after the grain carting season. From the point of view of the residents of Kadina, it is really a big win for this project to proceed. The committee acknowledges that the proposed upgrade of this section of road will address these problems and provide a more efficient, safer and expanded traffic carriage facility.

In particular, this project is expected to improve transport accessibility and assist in regional economic development through the increased use of the route by tourist, regional and grain carting traffic. The tourist trade throughout the Yorke Peninsula is quite significant and it is growing all the time. One of the disincentives for those at the bottom end of the Yorke Peninsula travelling to the top end is poor roads. If tourists know that they can come back through the Copper Triangle and the roads are good, then once again it will assist those three centres of Wallaroo, Kadina and Moonta in attracting tourists, as part of a total tourist route at both ends of the peninsula.

In addition, the members generally considered that the proposed works will provide a number of direct economic benefits for the community. These include the provision of more efficient travel times, a reduction in vehicle operating expenses, improved fuel consumption and a decrease in the incidence of accidents. Furthermore, other benefits such as providing an improved amenity for local residents, enhancing environmental pollution control and making available better cyclist facilities are also expected to result from this project.

Finally, based on the information that was provided by the department—and because we were not provided with the detail of the substance of the road construction, we can only assume that the correct materials are being used in the substrata of the road and in the road base—we assume that the actual engineering of the road will be done to the usual engineering standards which we expect of the department. With that site proviso that the information we received was correct, the Public Works Committee endorses the proposal to upgrade the Wallaroo to Kadina section of the Wallaroo to Port Wakefield Road and recommends that the proposed work proceed.

Mr MEIER (Goyder): I am very pleased to see this report come before Parliament, and it certainly has my support. I thank the Chairman of the committee and his committee members for their work and for agreeing to this section of roadworks proceeding. This development is long overdue and has been delayed for a variety of reasons. As the report indicates, stage 1 of the project was completed in 1994-95, and that basically involved the road from the outskirts of Kadina through to Wallaroo. That has been a wonderful improvement to the road surface. It has been used for two grain harvests and has stood up exceptionally well. However, the delay through Kadina has been caused principally by uncertainty as to what AN was going to do with its rail track from Kadina through to Wallaroo.

I recall taking a deputation to the Minister for Transport in 1994 seeking clarification of when this road would proceed, and at that stage the Minister made it very clear that she would not see moneys spent until AN had determined whether the railway line would remain. It was some time after that that AN determined that the track would remain and that the results of the deep sea port committee would need to be analysed in the hope that the rail track may be reopened. As you, Mr Acting Speaker, would be aware, the final report of the deep sea port committee is still to be released. The interim report came out last year, and I dare say the final report is not too far away.

Because AN made the determination to keep its railway line, it then allowed planning to commence as to exactly where the road would go through the railway corridor. As the Chairman of the committee, the member for Morphett, pointed out, the S-bend coming into the town from Port Wakefield-Paskeville will no longer be there; it will be a straight entrance. That road will continue until the end of the rail corridor—in other words, an area right opposite Gunnings—and then it will have an S-bend coming back into the existing roadway.

So, Francis Terrace will become a minor road or a local government road, and that is very important because the Woolworths' expansion, which is nearing completion, relied entirely on Francis Terrace not being a major road so that its car park could be on the other side of Francis Terrace. The council went ahead with allowing Woolworths to proceed, because it was a multi-million dollar expansion, and we did not want to see Woolworths not spend its money in the Copper Triangle and spend it somewhere else; therefore, it is important that this road proceed as soon as possible.

I note that the report does not go into detail on exactly what the engineering specifications will be. I attended one round table discussion where consideration was given to ensuring that the funds were spent in the most efficient way, to cutting total expenditure and to keeping the existing SA Water pipes in place under the new road surface or, alternatively, replacing all the SA Water pipes with new pipes so that the road would not need to be dug up from time to time. This report does not go into detail there—and I am not suggesting it should—because it is not an exhaustive report; rather it is a summary of investigations only. It would take many additional months to go into the full details of this matter.

With this road now being given the go ahead, I am hopeful that appropriate provisions have been made so that the water pipes will not cause us a problem in the future, and the saving of a few dollars now would, in turn, mean the expenditure of many extra dollars in future years. In that respect it is very heartening that the committee's report states:

> Benefits totalling $12.2 million for the 4 kilometre section through Kadina have been calculated based on savings in travel time, vehicle operating costs and accident costs. Parameters used in the calculation include varying traffic growth rates of 3 per cent per annum, 7 per cent per annum discount rate and a 20 year return period. Sensitivity analysis indicates that this project will still provide significant benefits to the community even allowing for variations to the above parameters.

It is very clear that there will be significant cost savings to the community as a whole. In conclusion, I believe that, ideally, a bypass around Kadina would greatly assist in terms of getting the traffic generated by grain trucks right away from the town—and I hope that that will occur in future years. To the people who may pass some criticism—and they would be very few in number—on the Government for undertaking this multi-million dollar project from Kadina to Wallaroo, I point out that this road has been so overdue for an upgrade that everyone will welcome it. In fact, this report notes that the road was originally built in 1933—and, having travelled along it, that does not surprise me.

There are a lot of other roadworks in the area that have to be done. The whole concept of getting grain to Wallaroo needs to be considered. A bypass around Wallaroo is an option that I hope will be followed as soon as possible. There is also the issue of sealing the road between Moonta and Paskeville. I know that this is a local government road and that the local government body, the Copper Coast council, hopes to provide funds for that as soon as possible—and that will certainly please the Moonta residents. The Moonta, Wallaroo and Kadina residents all will benefit from this new road through Kadina. I thank the Chairman and his committee on the work they did to ensure that the Public Works Committee gave the go-ahead for this project.

Motion carried.

ECONOMIC AND FINANCE COMMITTEE: MFP DEVELOPMENT CORPORATION

Mr BECKER (Peake): I move:

> That the twentieth report of the Economic and Finance Committee on Economic and Financial Aspects of the MFP Development Corporation for the year ended 30 June 1996 be noted.

I bring before the House the twentieth report of the Economic and Finance Committee. While this is the Economic and Finance Committee's fourth report to the House since the proclamation of the MFP in 1992, the MFP has previously reported to the committee seven times. The year in question posed a watershed for the MFP which was highlighted by the withdrawal of Commonwealth funding from the project which, from this point on, means the MFP is solely the responsibility of the State Government; the appointment of a new chief executive; and, in more recent times, a refocus of the direction and activities of the corporation upon the merger with the former Urban Projects Authority.

Once again, it has been difficult for the committee to draw a line at the end of the financial year in its examination of the MFP, because it cannot ignore issues arising in hearings and during the period of examination. These 'post balance date' events are currently being pursued by the committee and will inevitably be considered in detail in the next report or under specific references. In this year's report the committee considered the cumulative extent and allocation of both income and expenditure of the MFP since its inception as well as the pace and status of the projects undertaken by the MFP at the end of the 1995-96 reporting period. While the committee has previously recognised that, essentially, the

MFP has a facilitative role, it has always expressed its concern at the perceived lack of achievement by the MFP.

To date, and at the end of the reporting period in question, the organisation has yet to deliver on any of its key projects. The committee acknowledges that establishing the foundations for these projects should take some time but expects that by the end of the 1996-97 financial year, approximately eight years after the establishment of the MFP, the project should be closer to delivery.

In terms of funding, grants from both the South Australian and Commonwealth Governments have always been the primary source of income for the MFP. Since its inception in 1988 the MFP has expended over $111 million. When including the transfer of the net assets of the former Technology Development Corporation to the MFP on 1 July 1993 (a total of $18 012 000), the State Government's indebtedness to the MFP project was effectively $85 084 000 at the end of June 1996 and therefore remains the major stakeholder in the project. As mentioned before, the Commonwealth has withdrawn its contribution and, for the time being, it would appear that the State Government will have to go it alone.

Over the period 1988 to 1996 the MFP's cumulative total expenditure amounted to $87 350 000, of which approximately 40 per cent, or $34 890 000, was allocated to specific projects, and the remaining 60 per cent (or $52 460 000) was allocated to operating and other expenditure. With respect to project expenditure, the committee identified that at the end of the reporting period the MFP has undertaken or intends to undertake 47 individual projects which have specific budget allocations at an anticipated total cost of $85 002 000 over the life of the projects.

The status of each individual project according to moneys expended or budgeted at 30 June 1996 is outlined in the report. On this the committee notes that $31 730 000 or 37 per cent of the total budget allocated to MFP projects as at 30 June 1996 has been spent. At this stage a further $53 290 000 is expected to be expended over the life of the projects; 18 individual projects in progress were at a stage of completion of 50 per cent or greater according to the individual budget allocations at the end of June 1996; six projects at an estimated total of $7 600 000 had yet to be commenced; and only five minor projects had been completed at a total cost of $383 000.

In the previous (seventeenth) report, the committee raised concerns about employment contract conditions, specifically relating to termination payments paid to former MFP executives. It seems that at least eight executives have departed the MFP in the past two financial years, and six of these are known to have received termination payments.

During the 1995-96 financial year, five of the MFP's 16 senior executives left the organisation, taking with them termination payments, bonus payments, often generous superannuation contributions and, in some cases, performance clause settlements (adjustments to reflect the abolition of the bonus scheme). For these five executives, some of whom left the MFP at or before the mid point of the year, the termination payments alone amounted to over $338 000 and superannuation contributions were over $107 000.

Of specific concern to the committee this year was the cost of executive replacement and the use of executive search consultants as part of the recruitment process by the MFP. The relatively high rate of termination and turnover raised the question whether the expenditure on recruitment is money well spent. Recruitment costs over the last two years have totalled $380 660, comprising $197 118 in 1994-95 and $183 542 in 1995-96. In 1995-96 these costs related to the recruitment and relocation of only three staff: the new CEO; the General Manager, Executive Development, AABC; the Executive General Manager, Business Development. It seems that at least some of these appointments were very costly in terms of recruitment and relocation costs for periods of employment of only two or three years, concluding with termination payments.

The Economic and Finance Committee is concerned that executive recruitment costs of the MFP during 1995-96 were high and has recommended in the report currently before the House that the MFP review and give consideration to the cost and extent of executive recruitment and placement; employment contracts which minimise the incidence of termination payments by the Government; and the appointment of executives for a term that is directly correlated with the expected life of the projects to be undertaken.

The committee intends to review the development and progression of the key projects assigned to the MFP in greater detail in its next report on the economic and financial aspects of the operations of the MFP. Last year, in the committee's seventeenth report, I concluded that:

> MFP Australia is primarily a catalyst, coordinator and facilitator for other organisations; it cannot be assessed simply on the basis of tangible projects. Its future must therefore be determined on an assessment of whether its facilitative role provides value for money, bearing in mind that many of the projects it supports are claimed to be approaching the point where the investment over the past several years is about to produce substantial returns and benefits to the State.

By the end of the 1996-97 financial year the committee anticipates that it will be in a better position to assess whether or not value for money is expected to be achieved.

I thank the staff for their involvement in the preparation of the report and the assistance with which they provide the committee, particularly Val Edyvean, who left us before the tabling of this report to seek other employment within the Government. I am pleased to report that she has been able to obtain such employment. It is difficult for staff to serve a committee such as ours for long periods of time, with the uncertainty that they can easily be relocated within the Public Service. I hope the Government continues with the policy of assisting the staff during the time they are with us to provide a service to the Parliament and then facilitating their return to the Public Service, because the experience they gain in working with a committee such as this is invaluable and I know it will make them much better public servants. Our appreciation also goes to our current Secretary, Paul Collett, for assisting the committee and giving the necessary guidance. I commend the report to the Parliament.

Mr FOLEY (Hart): Along with the member for Peake I am a member of the Economic and Finance Committee and very much an author of this report. I will make a small contribution in the short time that is available to me.

An honourable member interjecting:

Mr FOLEY: I have only 10 minutes, but I will use it. The Economic and Finance Committee has, as all members know, been looking at the operations of the MFP for some time now. It would be fair to say that a number of the members of the committee have held very strong views about the accountability of the MFP and have made those views known over some time. I have perhaps been a little more accepting of some of the positions put forward by the MFP over the years and have had faith that at some point the MFP would

finally deliver on the very real objectives that had been laid out for it over many years.

It would be fair to say that both as a member of the Economic and Finance Committee and as the Opposition spokesman for the MFP I am growing a little disillusioned with the MFP. Perhaps some of my colleagues, both Labor and Liberal, who have held very strong views about the MFP, were a bit closer to the mark than I had thought or been in my previous views on the MFP. It would be fair to say now that the Government has made a fairly significant decision to reorientate the MFP under the new Premier. I am somewhat disappointed in that. I think the new MFP as we see it is a far cry from what it was originally intended to be.

I find impossible the task of trying to ascertain those matters for which the MFP now has responsibility: suffice to say that it appears to have responsibility for just about everything that Government does. The MFP is almost being created as a Government within Government. The MFP now has responsibility for not only the Mawson Lakes project, which I understand will be launched today by the Premier—although the Opposition appears not to have been required to be part of that process (and that is fair enough: that is their call)—but also the Virginia pipeline which, of course, as yet is many years in the making and still to be signed off on. The MFP also claims the wetlands at Gillman and Dry Creek as an achievement.

The Premier has now given the MFP responsibility for the Torrens Domain, that stunning piece of political grandstanding by the Premier some months ago. That now gives the MFP responsibility for coordinating the development of 34 projects throughout the CBD of Adelaide. Those projects range from a cinema complex, from memory, to the ill-fated EDS building on North Terrace—of which the MFP has been a strident critic. It now has responsibility for delivering that project which I find somewhat ironic. It also involves a number of other CBD projects, none more substantial than the redevelopment of this Parliament House. For those members who are not aware, the MFP is now the responsible authority for coordinating the redevelopment of Parliament House which I find a somewhat absurd responsibility for the MFP.

Ms Hurley interjecting:

Mr FOLEY: As my colleague says, it is nearly finished. As some cynics may say: the only way the MFP can be seen to have done something is for it to take something over just as it is about to be completed. In my own electorate, the long awaited Harborside Quay development was first announced, I think, by Premier Bannon. I was present when former Premier Arnold turned the first sod for that work. A Labor Government put much of the machinery in progress and then, of course, as we know, the Urban Projects Authority was given carriage for remediation and finally did all the work over many years to put this project to the public. However, within months of the announcement, the MFP logo was stuck on the fence down there and it was claimed as an MFP project. That is absurd to say the least.

Only yesterday, my colleague the member for Taylor alerted me to the fact that the MFP is now responsible for negotiating a ferry service between Kangaroo Island and Glenelg. As important as that project is—do not get me wrong; I think it is essential—I find it somewhat curious that it is now the responsibility of the MFP.

Ms Hurley interjecting:

Mr FOLEY: It is silly. Multifunction—let us give it everything! Projects fall out of the air. Correct me if I am wrong, but I think it is also responsible for the netball stadium and the athletics stadium; and, of course, I mentioned Parliament House earlier. The MFP is doing everything—throw it all into the melting pot and that is what the MFP is all about. The silly thing about it is that the MFP, under both Labor and Liberal Governments, has struggled year after year to define itself, to actually put itself into a concept that the—

An honourable member interjecting:

Mr FOLEY: I said that both Labor and Liberal Governments had struggled to define the MFP so that the average Joe or Mary punter could understand what it is. We have had expensive advertising campaigns telling us what the MFP is all about. Well, just as we are getting close to somehow defining it, they decide to totally throw open the gates and reposition the MFP. So, just when you were about to work out what it was, it changes itself. It is a bit like the 'Blob', in the old science fiction movie, where it gets bigger and bigger; so does the MFP. It is getting to the point where you almost ask the question: why have a Government? Let us just call the Government the MFP or call the MFP the Government.

We now have the tourism development project team in the MFP; the Urban Projects Authority is now in the MFP; we now have contract negotiations for ferry services being undertaken by the MFP; and we have the netball and athletics stadiums as well. Whilst they are doing all this, what do we find? The Virginia pipeline, yet to be signed off on—

Mr Brokenshire: Why?

Mr FOLEY: Exactly. I would like to know why—because they are too busy worrying about the lifts in Parliament House; they are too busy worrying about Nova Cinema in Rundle Street East; and they are too busy worrying about whether we will have a ferry between Kangaroo Island and Glenelg to focus on the main game. The main game, I thought, was the Virginia to Adelaide pipeline or the Mawson Lakes project.

I only wish they would focus on those projects that typify the MFP and have all this other almost irrelevancy that they have been given dealt with by other Government agencies. By irrelevancy, I do not mean that the functions or projects are irrelevant but they should not be undertaken by the MFP. I think Premier Olsen has made a strategic and fundamental error that has caused me as the Opposition spokesperson, together with my Leader, to think that the Opposition is reconsidering its bipartisan support for the MFP. The MFP that we knew clearly no longer exists.

I want to conclude on another issue that is rapidly escalating and is developing potential scandal for the Government, and that concerns the other function of the MFP that has not been delivered on—the Australia Asia business consortia. The Premier has admitted that somewhere in the order of $2.5 million to $3 million, if not closer to $4 million, has been spent. I understand that one executive has been paid in excess of $1 million and also had a travel budget in excess of $300 000. That was all expended on Dr Webber as head of that consortia. As the Premier said in the recent Estimates Committee, it produced nothing, and I am concerned about that.

I am concerned that Dr Webber appears to have been paid in excess of $1 million as well as having an extensive travel budget, and the results have been nil. I look forward, together with my colleague the member for Playford, as I know that you, Mr Acting Speaker, and the member for Peake (the Presiding Member) would, to questioning the MFP on that issue.

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

Mr BROKENSHIRE (Mawson): That is about what I thought I would have heard from the so-called Opposition spokesperson on economic development in South Australia. The honourable member, who was a senior adviser when there was no economic development occurring in South Australia, now purports to know all about the MFP and carries on about Dr Webber. Let me remind the Chamber of just one event that occurred under the Labor Government back in the Bannon-Arnold era. I refer to Dr Bruce Guerin, who happened to be head of Premier and Cabinet on quite a handy package, and because things became a bit embarrassing and someone had to be blamed as a scapegoat, what happened to Mr Guerin? He was handballed across to the university with no reduction whatsoever in his salary.

I have to ask: what is Mr Guerin doing for South Australians in the university, and why is the Labor Party not reminding people of the now millions of dollars they have invested into a nothing there? Members opposite are fairly pleased that nothing has happened with an initiative that was put forward with other facets of the plan to reinstate vigour and opportunities for South Australia. Because thus far an aspect of that has not succeeded—and I refer to the Asia push—we hear the Opposition spokesperson, the member for Hart, knocking.

I remember just before the 1993 election when the Leader of the Opposition—the one we all know who lost 33 000 jobs for blue collar workers in particular in South Australia and really did not achieve anything of real substance when he was part of a Cabinet team that also lost billions of dollars for this State—spent more than $1 million, I would suggest, just marketing and bringing over to the last Adelaide Grand Prix a large consortium of Chinese people in particular.

It was interesting that the last Grand Prix happened to be in October-November, just a week or two, I believe, into the massive six week election of 1993. We do not hear the Labor Party reminding people that that was an absolute failure, and was just an opportunity to try to divert attention and talk up something that would never occur, simply by giving people a free plane ticket, a chauffeured limousine, and an all expenses paid holiday in South Australia.

I would like to talk about the way in which I see the MFP. I can understand why all South Australians—and, I have to confess, myself—had trouble coming to grips with what the MFP was all about when the then Premier John Bannon came out and heralded it as the greatest victory for South Australia since about 1945. I also believe that not long after that (if my memory serves me correctly) the money that was supposed to be forthcoming from Japan, which was supposed to run parallel with and support this project, never occurred. We did not hear the Labor Party then saying that the MFP would not be successful. Clearly, even though it tried to market it, the MFP, in that structure, was not a success. I do not blame the MFP executive for that: anybody who has been down to the wetlands area which it was supposed to be reclaiming—particularly when it lost the money and support from Japan—would realise that the contamination and the difficulty with that site made it an unsuitable location for a smart city. It should have been located in an area similar to where Motorola and those other companies that are now growing quickly in the northern suburbs are being built.

It is interesting to hear the negativism generally from the Labor members from the north, when it comes to things like Mawson Lakes. If they are not interested in those projects, I would suggest that those of us who are members in the south would dearly love the opportunity of $850 million worth of expenditure coming down our way, and I know that our community would embrace it and get on with the job.

So, what has really happened with the MFP? It clearly was not going to work, in the structure that Premier Bannon announced probably six or seven years ago now. But the MFP has an important role, and it can tie in with the economic development arm of the Government because, being a smart city, a technologically advanced city and a city that has growth and economic opportunity, that is what the economic arm should be all about. Surely they should be interactive and able to work together for that common development.

So, I believe, contrary to what the shadow spokesperson has said, that it is a great initiative by Premier Olsen to bring the MFP and the EDA much closer together. Things are happening, there is a lot of expertise there, and I would be very happy to have some of that expertise come down south any time there is a project in which the MFP may be able to be involved. And it may not be too far into the future when that may occur.

Regarding the Bolivar project, I am really fascinated, because for 30 years this was talked about, but we did not get recycled water from Bolivar to the Virginia green triangle. Now I see—particularly the members for Taylor and Hart—openly hoping that the Bolivar project never gets up. That is a real disappointment for any of us who want to see projects and recovery for South Australia. I believe that there has been some quiet behind-the-scenes political interference by some Labor Party members on the other side to do everything they can to stop the Bolivar project from occurring. I also understand that the growers were very happy through all the negotiation, but just right now they do not seem to want to sign off on the project. Perhaps that is because they already have bores that they can switch on. But I suggest that in many others areas of this State people would open their cheque books and be very pleased to sign an agreement that gave them an opportunity to tap into that—

Mr FOLEY: I rise on a point of order, Sir. The member for Mawson has imputed improper motives to members of the Labor Party in relation to the MFP and the Virginia pipeline. I ask the member to withdraw those remarks.

The ACTING SPEAKER: Order! I was speaking and I did not completely hear the comments of the member for Mawson. If the member for Mawson did make those comments, I would suggest that it is inappropriate. The member for Hart cannot demand that they be withdrawn but I suggest that, if those comments were made, it is not good for parliamentary debate, and I would ask that the honourable member consider not making those comments in the future.

Mr BROKENSHIRE: In conclusion, I believe that there are very many agricultural areas within South Australia that will open their arms and their cheque books and appreciate the opportunity of a significant water project being taken into their region. If the people of Bolivar do not want to capitalise on that, they will be the losers not the MFP though, because economic opportunities, job creation and export markets, which can be opened up and which tie in with the reasons why our Government has got on with the expansion of the Adelaide Airport runway, etc., will be missed by those people. I would have thought that all members of this Parliament would have endorsed the new direction for

the MFP and economic development in South Australia and that those members who live in the northern suburbs would have gone around on a daily basis encouraging everyone involved in the Bolivar project to finish it so that we can get on with rebuilding this State.

Motion carried.

SELECT COMMITTEE ON ORGANS FOR TRANSPLANTATION

The Hon. M.H. ARMITAGE (Minister for Health) brought up the report of the select committee.

Report received.

The Hon. M.H. ARMITAGE: I move:

That the report be noted.

In moving this motion, I observe that, at times, as parliamentarians, we have cause to stop and question whether we have a lasting impact on the communities that we are elected to serve. However, there are times that I am convinced that Parliament, more than any other institution, has the capacity to provide leadership—even moral leadership—with clear, tangible benefits flowing to the lives of ordinary South Australians. The work of the Select Committee on Organs for Transplantation is one such occasion.

I particularly thank the members for Reynell, Unley, Giles and Spence for their input and guidance during the hearings of the committee. On my motion, the select committee was established on 12 May 1994 to consider the scope to improve the availability of organs for transplantation. I admit that initially some members of the committee, including myself, were attracted to 'opting out' models. However, during the process of the committee's work we became aware of the work of the Spanish national organisation of transplants, under the world recognised leadership of Dr Rafael Matesanz, which has managed to achieve remarkable increases in donation rates whilst maintaining an 'opting in' approach.

The select committee tabled an interim report on 8 June 1995 which recommended that the Spanish model be implemented. Building on the work of the committee, I hosted a national conference on organ donation in Adelaide in September 1995, with the special guest being Dr Rafael Matesanz from the Spanish National Organisation of Transplants. The so-called Spanish model was met with great enthusiasm in South Australia and, as a direct result, in July 1996 the South Australian Organ Donation Agency was established. This agency is Australia's first organ donation agency to deal specifically with identifying potential organ donors as well as caring for donors' families.

The agency is managed by a small and particularly dedicated team, all of whom I congratulate, and they operate under the expert guidance of the Medical Director, Professor Geoffrey Dahlenburg. Since the organ donation agency commenced operation, a promising trend is starting to emerge. The donation rate in South Australia and the Northern Territory is presently 23 donors per million people. That is more than double the Australian average of 11 donors per million people. Spain achieves an enviable rate of 27 organ donors per million of population.

By adapting our version of the Spanish system the Government is confident that, within two years, South Australia can achieve the same rate of donation and in so doing we will certainly lead Australia, as we are already in a position of pre-eminence. South Australia's organ donation rate now is second only to Spain in the western world. With the birth of the organ donation agency, the State figure is expected to climb to 30 per million people by the start of next century. The committee supports these targets. I commend the report to the House.

The Hon. FRANK BLEVINS (Giles): I too commend the report to the House and congratulate the Minister on the way he ran the select committee, on the interim report and the practical outcome from that interim report. It must be very satisfying for the Minister, as it is for all members of the committee, to see the significant results that have been achieved already. I hope the trend continues. I see no reason why it should not, and the Minister is to be congratulated for that.

As the Minister said, some members of the committee prefer an opting-out model. I am one of those people. An opting-out model means that we can take it as read that anybody who dies would be happy to have their organs donated to appropriate people, unless they had signified otherwise earlier. I am still a supporter of that model and still think that that model is the correct model, but that is not to say that the model that has been introduced in South Australia is in any way second rate just because it is not my first choice. It is still a first-class model, but it does not go as far as I would have liked.

I still prefer the opt-out model because we are still in a position where people are dying for the want of organ donation, and at the same time organs that could be used to save these lives are being burnt and buried every day, when all the public opinion research tells us that the overwhelming majority of people would be happy for their organs to be used should they die and the organ donation was successful. It is a crying shame that we do not save these lives at absolutely no cost to anybody in the community because the people who could donate these organs do not need them any more: they are dead. There is no further use for the organs and to burn and bury them every day, which means that other people die, is a shocking way for any civilised society to behave.

Nevertheless, my assessment is that the Minister is absolutely correct in going down this line rather than for the opt-out model, given the present attitude of the medical profession. The medical profession told us that the wishes of the person who dies do not matter, because the medical profession would do what it wanted to do and, if it suited it, would ignore the wishes of the dead person. The dead person's wishes also would not be respected by the doctors if the dead person's relatives went against the wishes of the dead person. It struck me as extraordinary that the wishes of the dead person were not to be respected. Nevertheless, we have to deal with what we have and not what we wish we had. The Minister is having to deal with the medical profession as it is and not as he wished it were. Given that that is the case, and given that this is what most of us finish up doing in life on most issues, the outcome for the State of South Australia and for those people who rely on organ donation to give them a quality of life or even life itself is such that the Minister, the select committee and the whole of the Parliament are to be commended.

Mr LEWIS secured the adjournment of the debate.

CONSTITUTION (CASUAL VACANCIES IN HOUSE OF ASSEMBLY) AMENDMENT BILL

In Committee.

(Continued from 5 June. Page 1608.)

Clause 3.

Mr LEWIS: This is the operational clause of the measure, the clause to which we need to address ourselves on those aspects of the legislation as it would affect the composition of the Parties. To illustrate what I am saying, there is nothing in this law that would prevent the establishment of the practice of the rotten boroughs. That was not the intention of the member for Davenport at the time he introduced the legislation, nor would it be the current Premier's approach to the way in which it was administered, but it is an obvious consequence of the measure.

There is no merit in saying that 60 per cent is a sound basis for deciding whether or not there is a by-election, determining whether the Party involved to which the member belonged should simply nominate the replacement or whether there should be a by-election. Why 60 per cent? If we look at our own history we find illustrations of where things came undone, where the baton did not clearly pass from the sitting member who resigned to the new endorsed member, such as was the case with Peter Duncan in Elizabeth, and the endorsed Labor candidate who followed. A swing of more than 10 per cent was involved there. As members know, history shows that Martyn Evans won that seat.

Mr Atkinson interjecting:

Mr LEWIS: That does not mean that the electorate did not want the Independent: it did want the Independent and in this case, in the circumstances countenanced by this legislation, the Independent would not have got up. We would deny the democratic right of the people to decide who would represent them. Yet that was a safe seat. The member for Elizabeth became the architect of substantial legislative change regardless of his motives and regardless of the consequences.

Members interjecting:

Mr LEWIS: We are not into that. I do not share the view of members interjecting. By passing this Bill, we deny the people the right to say who will represent them. 'What price democracy?' That is what the member for Davenport has put to us as the reason for having the legislation. 'What price democracy?' I say, 'Any price.' I will have democracy ahead of any arrangement that denies that right. New section 31A(1)(b)(1) provides that at the time of a member's election the member must be elected by a majority of 60 per cent or more of the votes. If you are over 60 years of age in the Party you belong to, the Party nominates; if the percentage of the winning candidate is under 60, the Party cannot nominate and you must go to a by-election.

First, that denies the people the right to have a say. Secondly, that provision is undesirable, because it recreates the rotten boroughs we all know about (or ought to know about) which there used to be in the House of Commons, where you could literally buy a seat. Indeed, there were seats in the House of Commons which had no electors in them, and other seats had few electors in them. This predated universal suffrage, for sure. It was possible, if you belonged to the right Party, to arrange to buy a seat from the sitting member or the sitting member's family. That was corrupt.

In this instance, the relevance in this legislation is that the Premier of the day could entrench herself (or himself) by simply going to any internal opponents and buying them out. They could get rid of anyone who might be threatening their role as leader—one way or the other—and offer them sinecure posts, at taxpayers' expense, to become the administrator of some commission or other, to get them to resign following an election, and then have somebody who was a strong supporter of the Premier of the day, nominated by the Party, to fill the vacancy. Of course, that could easily be—and more likely than not would be—somebody from the Legislative Council, which would result in a joint sitting there to replace the person from the Legislative Council. The honourable member has not countenanced that anywhere in this clause.

These provisions give Premiers the opportunity to ingratiate themselves to their friends or people who have sore heads within the ranks of the Party. Mr Chairman, you and I—and I am sure other members—can countenance the circumstances in which a Premier, feeling as though it would be better for the unity of the Party and better for the strength of the Government and the Cabinet, would remove those people from the ranks of the Party sitting in the Parliament straight after the election by offering them a job outside and bringing in somebody who is fresh-faced and willing to be compliant—at least for the first term or so. Automatically, the replacement will be somebody the Premier of the day and/or the Party machine itself could determine. We would end up with a Parliament, in the so-called safe seats, largely comprised of more Party hacks than they were committed representatives and legislators. There is an enormous advantage to any sitting member to win any full State election, over and above anybody who may oppose them as an outsider.

What Parties could then do in safe seats or even in seats where their support was less than 10 per cent and in which they wanted to lift their support is pick a high profile candidate—a popular person—and get them to run in an election as an endorsed candidate. Straight after the election, they then resign and go back to their professional life, and they are replaced by a hack. That hack could even come from the Upper House or the Senate. The Party could pull a candidate out of either Upper House and put them in the House of Assembly in South Australia by having them resign, and give them a safe seat in the House of Assembly. I assure the member for Unley that there is nothing in this legislation that would preclude that from happening.

Mr Brindal interjecting:

Mr LEWIS: But, up until now, there has been no circumstance in which it could happen. I agree with the member for Unley in his jest. More importantly, we all know at present that there is an increasing level of so-called soft support for the political Parties in the wider community, and that arises from cynicism about what Parties do to individual members and how they attempt to discipline them, and what the Parliament does and how the members of Parliament vote. It is a fair observation to say it is growing exponentially, that the rate of growth of cynicism is accelerating. As I said, it is because the Parties do as they please and compel their members to do likewise. The Labor Party is the worst offender in this respect. The Democrats do not have enough people in here for them to be seen as offending. They could have their Federal council meetings in a phone box.

In the circumstances to which I am referring, I believe we will see the public's cynical contempt for us grow even faster if we pass this legislation in this form, because it shows that we think more about the convenience of the Premier of the day and the Party than we do about the interests of a democratically governed society and a public that has a right to participate in the democratic process. This measure is badly flawed. There needs to be changes if it is to pass at all. Sixty per cent is not an appropriate vote; I would say that it should

be more like 90 per cent. Equally, because of what has happened in South Australia over recent times, it is undesirable in any case to pursue it. It will result in our recreating rotten boroughs and the notion that the Parties are all powerful. Indeed, it will not be just a notion—it will become a reality. You will either do as you are told or you will be kicked out. Why in God's name, why in the name of democracy, do we say to somebody—

Mr Atkinson: I don't think it has much to do with divinity.

Mr LEWIS: It may. People swear oaths as part and parcel of their commitment to public life. In this instance, it is undesirable because it gives a Party the power to run a candidate with a high public profile to lift the threshold vote in a seat from less than 60 per cent to over 60 per cent. Once the election is over, the high profile candidate can then resign and be replaced by a Party hack. Finally, why is it that this approach is suggested only for members who resign and not those who die? Why is this approach not appropriate to nominate the replacement for a member who dies up to six weeks after an election? Curiously, the legislation is silent on that point. I do not think the member for Davenport has thought it through.

Equally, if they do not die, they become incapable, following a motor car accident and resultant brain damage, of exercising any decision in their own right. So, with power of attorney going to someone else, they cannot continue as a member of Parliament. It is countenanced in the Constitution and, even though there is a safe seat, there must be a by-election because the vote was over 60 per cent and they had to leave. What is the difference? Why did the member for Davenport not address that in this proposal?

Mr WADE: I have difficulty with this clause. The first difficulty is with the provision relating to six weeks after the election. Why six weeks? Why 42 days? They had 55 days at Peking, and the good Lord caused a flood for 40 days and 40 nights. We have a precedent in the past of other periods that could be more appropriate, and I cannot see why 42 days was chosen by the member for Davenport. If a member for a safe seat decides to leave parliamentary service following an election, one could assume that it is because that person did not achieve the position of influence and power that they thought was rightfully theirs. I guess a member could resign for reasons of ill health, and that could be because they perceived they had been ill treated by the Party and that made them sick anyway.

Mr Brindal interjecting:

Mr WADE: I thank the member for Unley for that interjection: it is called stress. In that case an aggrieved member would wait six weeks plus one day before resigning, in order to get their own back on the Party. No matter what period the member for Davenport includes in the clause, it would be the same situation. Therefore, the time limit is irrelevant. One assumes that members in a so-called safe seat would be looking upwards to achieving power and position, because they have no need to look around them in the electorate. This Bill assumes that people in safe electorates will vote for that particular Party regardless of the actions of the sitting member. It assumes that voters in the safe electorates are like sheep and will never sway from their allegiance to the Party that has traditionally won the seat. That assumption is based on the past, and I cannot support the view that it will apply in the future. I cannot support the notion that the removal of the democratic right to free choice is based on the demographics of where someone lives rather than on the individual who happens to live there. I find that totally unacceptable. Another area of concern relates to paragraph (c), which provides:

> . . . the resulting vacancy is to be filled by a person—
> (c) . . . nominated by the Party;

I am not sure what the member for Davenport means by that. Does it mean that the central headquarters of the Party, the deciding body, would make the decision, or would the decision be made by those in the electorate?

Mr Atkinson interjecting:

Mr WADE: We have another week to go, at least. It could mean a number of things. That phrase is far too waffly to be even considered and it requires much more detail. I agree with the member for Ridley's comments. I believe that the Bill is ill considered, and in no way should it be endorsed by the Parliament.

The Committee divided on the clause:

AYES (22)

Armitage, M. H.	Ashenden, E. S.
Bass, R. P.	Becker, H.
Brindal, M. K.	Brokenshire, R. L.
Buckby, M. R.	Caudell, C. J.
Condous, S. G.	Evans, I. F. (teller)
Greig, J. M.	Gunn, G. M.
Hall, J. L.	Ingerson, G. A.
Kerin, R. G.	Kotz, D. C.
Matthew, W. A.	Meier, E. J.
Oswald, J. K. G.	Rosenberg, L. F.
Venning, I. H.	Wotton, D. C.

NOES (16)

Andrew, K. A.	Atkinson, M. J.
Blevins, F. T.	Brown, D. C.
Clarke, R. D.	Foley, K. O.
Hurley, A. K.	Lewis, I. P.
Penfold, E. M.	Rann, M. D.
Rossi, J. P.	Scalzi, J.
Stevens, L.	Such, R. B.
Wade, D. E. (teller)	White, P. L.

Majority of 6 for the Ayes.

Clause thus passed.

Title passed.

Committee's report adopted.

REHABILITATION OF SEXUAL OFFENDERS BILL

In Committee.

(Continued from 3 July. Page 1762.)

Clause 9 passed.

Clause 10.

Mr ATKINSON: The relevant part of the clause provides:

> . . . where a person convicted of a sexual offence is counselled and assessed in accordance with this Act as suitable to undertake a rehabilitation program, no court, body or person may, for the purpose of—
> . . .
> (b) determining whether to release the person on parole;
> . . . take into account the fact that the person has undertaken, refused or failed to undertake, or withdrawn from, such a program.

I would have thought that, if a prisoner were assessed as being suitable for the program and then wilfully refused to take any part in the program whatsoever, that would be a most relevant matter to take into account in deciding whether the prisoner should be paroled. It seems to me that, if a sex

offender wilfully refuses a rehabilitation program and then seeks to be let out of the prison on parole only halfway through his head sentence, that is of the very essence of the things that the Parole Board ought to be taking into account. I would like the member for Kaurna to explain why a sex offender can wilfully refuse to undertake the rehabilitation that is offered at the expense of the Crown and then get parole as normal?

Mrs ROSENBERG: This clause is the very essence of the voluntary versus mandatory process. As part of this Bill, I have no wish to use the rehabilitation program as part of any punishment. I think I touched on this matter last week in response to a similar question about mandatory versus voluntary. The rehabilitation program is, in all facets, meant to be a voluntary program. Therefore, it is not seen as a reward program, in that you are rewarded by having a shorter sentence or getting parole more quickly; you are not rewarded for taking the rehabilitation program and, equally, you are not punished, that is, your sentence is not lengthened or the time before parole can be taken is not lengthened by the fact that you do not undertake the program. That is currently what happens. At the moment, prisoners are not offered this program; the program is not there for them to be either rewarded or punished, because it currently does not exist. I am not trying to change the sentencing process by introducing this voluntary program.

Mr ATKINSON: I am surprised by the member for Kaurna's answer. I could follow her reasoning regarding the head sentence. I could understand if the member for Kaurna argued that the knowledge that the prisoner would refuse rehabilitation was not to influence the judge in imposing the head sentence. However, I do not understand that when a prisoner is behind bars subject to a head sentence, and the question is, 'Should the prisoner do all the time, or should the prisoner have the privilege of parole?', that prisoner, according to the member for Kaurna, can have the privilege of parole even though he has wilfully refused a free, a *gratis*, rehabilitation program offered to him under this Bill. I would have thought his refusal is exactly the kind of thing that the Parole Board should take into account: first, that his refusal to undertake the program indicates that he is not contrite for the crime he has committed; and, secondly, that upon release he is likely to be a danger to the public because he is getting out well short of his head sentence and has refused to undertake a rehabilitation program.

I do understand the member for Kaurna when she says the refusal of a sex offender to undertake rehabilitation should not be taken into account in formulating the head sentence; certainly, the prisoner should not get extra time on the head sentence for refusing to undertake the program—not that he would under the current law. However, I could not possibly explain to my constituents why the prisoner should be able to take the benefit of parole after refusing *gratis* rehabilitation.

Mr MEIER: Mr Chairman, I draw your attention to the state of the Committee.

A quorum having been formed:

Mr WADE: When a court imposes a head sentence, it normally imposes a non-parole period as well. And that is imposed regardless of any future rehabilitation programs that person may attend. What the member for Kaurna is trying to do in this case, as I understand it, is let that stand. Keep this specific rehabilitation program outside of any kind of imposed situation and therefore keep it voluntary. We do not wish to interfere with the court scene or how that person is acting in a prison. There are other means that the Parole Board take into account for a person's behaviour within the prison system. This is a treatment program, as I said before, which can have quite significant physical and chemical reactions in a person's body by undertaking that program. It must remain a voluntary program and kept out of the parole/non-parole type of arena.

Mr ATKINSON: I do not see how the offering of a rehabilitation program to sex offenders and its refusal can be quarantined from the question of parole. I have established by way of a parliamentary question to which the Minister for Correctional Services replied that there is almost nothing in the way of rehabilitation for sex offenders in our prisons now. What the member for Kaurna is proposing to do is introduce a Government-funded program for the rehabilitation of sex offenders in our prisons. I have explained earlier that the Government could do this tomorrow or next week if it wanted to without legislative authorisation, but it chooses as part of its budget process not to do so.

So, we have this private member's Bill which may or may not persuade the Government to make the programs for the rehabilitation of sex offenders part of its budget for the 1998-99 financial year. When deciding parole, I do not think we can just ignore the fact that this new program is being offered. Two of the questions to be asked when granting parole: Is the prisoner a danger to society? Is the prisoner sorry for his crime—has he shown contrition? It seems to me that if a sex offender who is a prisoner is offered this *gratis* rehabilitation program in our prisons and refuses, surely that is a matter that should be taken into account when he comes before the Parole Board seeking to get out of prison usually only halfway through the head sentence. I am sure the member for Lee would agree with me.

Mr Rossi: Yes, 100 per cent.

Mr ATKINSON: It is most unsatisfactory that a prisoner who is not contrite and is refusing a free rehabilitation program can then take advantage of the parole system to get out immediately upon the expiry of the non-parole period. Yet, here is a prisoner cocking a snook if you like at the system and saying, 'I am not going to take your *gratis* rehabilitation program. Get lost!'

Mr Brindal interjecting:

Mr ATKINSON: Cocking a snook. That is, he was in defiance of the rehabilitation program which has been generously offered to him *gratis* under the member for Kaurna's Bill. So, I suggest that members of the Government should be very careful if they are supporting this amendment in the division which will follow because, if they do support this clause, they will be going to their electors and saying to them that a convicted sex offender can be offered a free rehabilitation program by the Government and refuse it and then go straight to the Parole Board on the expiry of the non-parole period and say, 'Let me out.' The fact that the sex offender has refused the free program cannot be taken into account by the Parole Board in determining whether the prisoner is suitable for parole.

What the member for Kaurna is doing is blindfolding all the members of the Parole Board about a very relevant fact. The member for Kaurna has made the point in this debate that many sex offenders do not rehabilitate themselves; that they continue to be a danger to society after they are released from prison. She made that point very strongly. So, she says, we have to have a *gratis* rehabilitation program, which we do not now have in our prisons. And there is much to commend what the member for Kaurna has said. But, having said that, she

then says that, if a prisoner refuses the program, that cannot be taken into account in determining whether the prisoner is suitable for parole. The earlier part of her argument is that sex offenders, more than any other offenders in our prisons, continue to be dangerous to society after their head sentence is finished and they are released. These are specially dangerous prisoners, says the member for Kaurna—

Mrs Rosenberg interjecting:

Mr ATKINSON: The member for Kaurna says the Parole Board can take everything into account, except the most relevant fact, and that is that the sex offender has been offered a free rehabilitation program and has defiantly refused it. So, what that means is that the prisoner will be released, as in the normal course of things, not long after the expiry of the non-parole period. This is the Party (the Liberal Party) that came in here and introduced truth in sentencing: all of you voted for truth in sentencing. But now, when there is a highly relevant fact as to whether a prisoner should be released on parole, the member for Kaurna says that the Parole Board ought to be blindfolded. If you support this amendment, be very careful—because your electors deserve to know.

The Hon. D.C. KOTZ: The member for Spence certainly provides a very dramatic argument, but I am quite sure that the member for Spence is also aware, in standing up here and giving his dialogue, that the rehabilitation programs that are already in existence within the prison system have always been voluntary. All the programs that we have at the moment are on a voluntary basis, including the Sex Offenders Treatment Program that is underway very strongly in the prison system at the moment. So, the arguments from the member for Spence are really quite fallacious: they have no standing in fact whatsoever. The member for Kaurna has represented her case very accurately and honestly, and the member for Spence, unfortunately, in his opinion, is entirely incorrect.

Mr WADE: The member for Spence wants to complain about this being voluntary. He is implying that there is only one sexual rehabilitation program available. There is more than one available, and more than one can be introduced. Is the member for Spence saying that a person who seeks to attend, and does attend, another rehabilitation program—not this specific one—will be victimised, because they refuse to attend this one?

Mr Atkinson: It should be taken into account.

Mr WADE: That is what we said earlier. I thank him for coming round, in a circuitous argument, and ending up where we started from. The fact is that it must remain voluntary. It must remain the same as all the other programs that are available and the prisoner must be given that choice.

Mr BRINDAL: I rise on a point of order, Sir. Under Standing Order 364, Mr Chairman, you would be aware that the Committee, when considering Bills other than Appropriation Bills, has a time constraint of 15 minutes and no more than three opportunities to speak on any given question. I notice that all morning there has been no clock operating, and some of the speeches have been inordinately long. Mr Chairman, I ask for your ruling on this matter, and whether the clock should be operational, because there is a strict limit of time that has not necessarily been applied. I make no reference to you, Sir; I merely point out the condition.

The CHAIRMAN: The point of order is correct, but I am not sure about the thrust of the honourable member's comments, because members who speak are timed by the Chair, up to 15 minutes. They have the right to speak for 15 minutes on three occasions. No member this morning has spoken for longer than about 14 minutes, and that would have been the member for Ridley. No other member has spoken for that length of time in questioning, but each member has the right to question three times up to 15 minutes. This morning there has been no-one anywhere near that. The member for Spence has spoken twice and the member for Elder twice.

Mr BRINDAL: I accept that without qualification. I merely made the point because it would be of assistance to other members in the Committee to know how long it might be until they are called. Given that the member for Ridley spoke for 14 minutes, it would have been of assistance to the rest of us to know either that he had one minute to shut up and sit down or that—

The CHAIRMAN: There really is no point of order. That becomes more an instruction than a point of order.

Mrs ROSENBERG: I would like to try to very clearly put on the record the reason for clause 10. A sex offender is convicted in the courts. He receives a sentence. The sentence is his head sentence plus his non-parole period. So, when he is sentenced he knows when he will be eligible to come before the Parole Board to apply for parole. Once that happens, the Parole Board takes into account a range of issues which are put before it—positives and negatives, if you like, from a whole range of people making representations to the Parole Board, including the prisoner.

It is my intention that this be a voluntary rehabilitation program, that it not form part of the sentencing punishment and that it not form a reward. The reason why I do not want it to form a reward is that it is too easy for a prisoner to accept the rehabilitation program, knowing that, having done so, the Parole Board would consider that the prisoner has accepted that they have done wrong, they have accepted this program and, therefore, they ought to be eligible for parole maybe earlier—or certainly successful in their first approach for parole. I do not accept that as being a valid reason because it is far too easy, under a reward system, for a prisoner to enter into a program and fake it.

When the Parole Board is taking that issue into consideration, unless there was another series of tests, assessments or counselling carried out at that time, I do not believe that the information would be presented to the Parole Board. Under the circumstances, if that were made a mandatory part of the parole system, that might work, but under the wording of my Bill it would not work—and particularly if it were seen as a reward system. That is why the wording is the way it is.

The Hon. W.A. MATTHEW: I support very strongly the member for Kaurna's Bill. I confess that I have some difficulty with this clause. In being able to clearly define that difficulty, I believe it is important to look at the Correctional Services Act 1982, which covers the release on parole for a prisoner. Division 3, section 67(4) provides:

> In determining an application under this section for the release of a prisoner on parole, the Board must have regard to the following matters:
>
> (a) any relevant remarks made by the court in passing sentence; and
>
> (b) the likelihood of the prisoner complying with the conditions of parole; and
>
> (c) where the prisoner was imprisoned for an offence or offences involving violence, the circumstances and gravity of the offence, or offences, for which the prisoner was sentenced to imprisonment but only in so far as it may assist the Board to determine how the prisoner is likely to behave should the prisoner be released on parole; and
>
> (d) the behaviour of the prisoner while in prison or on home detention.

Subsection (4)(f) is also important. It provides:

> (f) any reports tendered to the board on the social background, the medical, psychological or psychiatric condition of the prisoner, or any other matter relating to the prisoner.

There are, therefore, a number of references in the Correctional Services Act in respect of the state of mind of a prisoner whilst in prison and the likelihood of that prisoner reoffending. The way in which a prisoner participates in the programs that are envisaged by the member for Kaurna are an important ingredient in the Parole Board's determination of how a prisoner is likely to behave upon release. I understand why the member for Kaurna wishes to make participation in programs voluntary, but the mere participation or refusal by a prisoner to participate in a rehabilitation program is an important indicator to the Parole Board of how that prisoner is likely to behave upon release.

I believe it is vital that the Parole Board be able to take into account a prisoner's participation or otherwise in such programs. I do not believe that, if the member for Kaurna removes the offending part of this clause from the Bill, that will in any way alter the voluntary aspect of what she seeks to achieve. So, I put to the member for Kaurna that, by simply removing that part of the clause from her Bill, it does exactly what she wishes it to and it does not impede the analysis by the Parole Board, which is vital.

I put to the member for Kaurna that, if a prisoner has participated in a program but has not been able to continue with it because the offending behaviour is such that they do not want it to be changed, that is vital evidence which must go to the Parole Board to help it to make its determination. So, I again put to the member for Kaurna that the exclusion of this part of the clause does not change the intent of the Bill. Her Bill would still provide for voluntary participation by prisoners in a program, but it would also enable the Parole Board to assess participation or otherwise in a program as part of the gathering of evidence process before deciding whether to release a prisoner. I think it is important that this Committee acknowledges that since truth in sentencing came into being we now have a number of prisoners in the prison system who, under the old regime, would automatically have been released on parole but who now have not. So, the member for Kaurna's Bill could be an important ingredient in this process.

Mr ROSSI: I would like clause 10 to be removed from the Bill. I apologise to the Committee for not being here this time last week in respect of my amendments, which would have toughened up the provision. The word 'voluntary' could be easily accommodated in the health Act by providing for one of the free treatment chemicals to be obtained over the counter and taken as people wish, just as they take an Aspro.

I do not think that making this voluntary for sex offenders will make any difference, because no-one does these things voluntarily unless, first, they believe that they have the potential to commit a crime—and they would not make that generally known to the community—and, secondly, if this Bill contains this provision, it will be irrelevant—it will take up space as a statute of the Parliament but it will have no effect.

It is my experience with Neighbourhood Watch that, in respect of the resolution of a neighbourhood dispute, the voluntary aspect does not apply. As soon as one party does not wish to attend or undergo counselling, there is nothing that the legal system can do. If it involves a chemical problem, why not, under the direction of the Minister for Health, make these chemicals free through some sort of pharmaceutical provision and forget about this Bill altogether?

The Committee divided on the clause:

AYES (26)

Andrew, K. A.	Ashenden, E. S.
Baker, D. S.	Bass, R. P.
Becker, H.	Brindal, M. K.
Brokenshire, R. L.	Buckby, M. R.
Caudell, C. J.	Condous, S. G.
Evans, I. F.	Greig, J. M.
Gunn, G. M.	Hall, J. L.
Ingerson, G. A.	Kerin, R. G.
Kotz, D. C.	Lewis, I. P.
Meier, E. J.	Oswald, J. K. G.
Penfold, E. M.	Rosenberg, L. F. (teller)
Such, R. B.	Venning, I. H.
Wade, D. E.	Wotton, D. C.

NOES (11)

Armitage, Hon. M. H.	Atkinson, M. J. (teller)
Blevins, F. T.	Clarke, R. D.
Foley, K. O.	Hurley, A. K.
Matthew, Hon. W. A.	Rossi, J. P.
Scalzi, J.	Stevens, L.
White, P. L.	

Majority of 15 for the Ayes.

Clause thus passed.

Remaining clauses (11 to 19) and title passed.

Bill read a third time and passed.

COMMUNITY PROTECTION BILL

Adjourned debate on second reading.

(Continued from 3 July. Page 1768.)

Mr OSWALD (Morphett): I will address the House briefly on this legislation. Up until now the public debate has gone slightly off track in that it seems that everyone believes that this is a Bill about capital punishment and that once this Bill passes the House capital punishment will be on the statute book in this State. I will carefully couch my words because many years ago—bearing in mind that I have been in this House for 17 years or more—page 3 of the *Advertiser* ran a report that I was in favour of capital punishment.

At the time I was in favour of capital punishment, and even now for offenders such as Bryant in Tasmania I have no problem with having a statute on the book that would pick up the Bryants of this world and subject them to capital punishment. However, I am also a realist. The Bill before us is slightly confusing in that the context in which the debate has flowed indicates that, if the Bill passes, we will have capital punishment. In reality it is just a Bill to hold a referendum and, if the referendum is successful, we will have capital punishment. Clause 2 specifically provides:

> (1) At the first general election for the House of Assembly after assent to this Bill the following question is to be submitted to a referendum of electors:
>
> *Do you approve of the Community Protection Act 1996?*
>
> (2) If a majority of the electors casting valid votes at the referendum vote in favour of this Act, it will come into operation on a day (which must be within 12 months after the result of the referendum is published) to be fixed by proclamation.

That is very clear. This Bill is simply about a referendum. The member for Elder was good enough to put on the record last week some of the statistics that are available. One statistic is that over 70 per cent of people are in favour of

capital punishment. He broke it down into 69 per cent of Labor voters and 75 per cent of Liberal voters, so it moves right across Party lines. There is a reasonable probability that if it went to a referendum it would pass. Today we have to accept that, if we pass this Bill, there is a probability that the referendum will get up. Today we have to face up to whether this is or is not a Bill for capital punishment. The short answer is that it is. We now have to address our conscience on this subject and decide what we should do.

Over the years I have thought a lot about the question of capital punishment and whether it is a deterrent to others. I have thought about the impact on a jury when it comes down to the final day with the prisoner standing in the dock and the foreman of the jury having to get up and pronounce 'guilty', knowing that if he does the accused will be executed. I have read the clause in detail about the methods of execution. It is quite nauseating, but if you are a victim being murdered I suppose that it is just as nauseating, so I do not have a problem with that. It is not a pleasant experience either way.

The question that we must consider is whether in this day and age capital punishment acts as a deterrent. The information from the United States and in more violent societies is that it does not act as a deterrent. It would act as a great deterrent to me if I was contemplating such a thing but, in times of emotional passion, perhaps it would not. We should also consider the 70 per cent of the population who are in favour of capital punishment and ask what they are in favour of. Are they in favour of removing an offender from society by killing them or simply removing him or her from society generally?

If you analysed that 70 per cent, you would find that quite a few of them would agree that the prime aim is to take that person out of society. It is for that reason that I may have shifted ground somewhat over the years, leading to a decision that we need something on the Statute book indicating that 'life' means just that. We do not want life being recognised as 25 years imprisonment when, on the basis of the figures for the period 1983 to 1988 as provided with the compliments of the member for Elder, we know that 25 years actually amounted to 13 years and three months. That makes the public very angry. People are saying, 'We want that person removed from society', yet within 13 years and three months that person is back in the community.

In summary, I no longer support the State's running a line for capital punishment. However, I strongly support the Legislature moving to ensure that 'life' means 'life' and that, if an offender commits a heinous crime, is convicted of that crime and receives a life sentence, he or she is not out of prison within 13 years and three months or 25 years but is put away for the term of their natural life. It is on that basis that I regret that I will not be supporting the honourable member's Bill but would urge the Government to consider bringing in legislation providing that 'life' does mean 'life' so that a person convicted of a heinous crime is taken out of circulation forever.

Mr BASS secured the adjournment of the debate.

SUMMARY OFFENCES (PROSTITUTION) AMENDMENT BILL

Adjourned debate on second reading.

(Continued from 3 July. Page 1770.)

Mr OSWALD (Morphett): As I took the adjournment on this matter last week, I feel some obligation to put something on the public record. I will not speak at length on the matter because many members already have done so. First, the Bill proposes to include credit cards as a form of money; secondly, to allow police to be authorised to use reasonable force to enter buildings suspected of being brothels; thirdly, to allow those clients and prostitutes who are prosecuted to be able to expiate the fine by pleading guilty; and, fourthly, to introduce a new section to make the advertising of prostitution, whether direct or indirect, an offence.

The Parliament must have some regard for the views of the Police Force in these matters. The police still have some concerns about the illegal activities that go on in these premises, particularly drug dealing and offensive behaviour. They still have some concerns also about child prostitution and believe that they should have access to those premises. I was a little curious, though, as to the behaviour of the police as reported in the newspaper last week, where they used sledgehammers to get into Stormy Summers' property when the people on the inside claimed that, had they only knocked on the door, they would have opened the door and let the police in.

Mr Atkinson: Have you been there?

Mr OSWALD: No, I haven't been to Stormy's.

Mr Atkinson: It's very hard to get in.

Mr OSWALD: I can imagine it is hard because, from the photographs, it looks like a gaol. Given that it was a police operation, I would have thought they could surround the building to ensure that no-one jumped out a window at the rear of the premises, and they could then knock on the door and enter. Never mind; I have a lot of time for the police and, if in their judgment they found it necessary to do that, then so be it. However, I am still curious as to why they were not given the opportunity of marching in the front door without having to do that.

In summary, certain powers are required, and if the police—particularly the former Commissioner, David Hunt, for whom I have a lot of time and with whom I have discussed this matter—believe that those powers are necessary, so be it; I will support them. It is interesting that the honourable member who introduced the Bill has included the clause involving expiation for prostitutes and others on these premises. I support that provision and the Bill generally and, if the matter gets to a vote, I will vote accordingly.

Mrs PENFOLD secured the adjournment of the debate.

STATUTES AMENDMENT (SEXUAL OFFENCES) BILL

Adjourned debate on second reading.

(Continued from 3 July. Page 1771.)

Ms GREIG (Reynell): I would like to commend the work done by my colleague the member for Elder, who is doing his utmost to ensure that victims of sexual offences are no longer left feeling like the criminal while the real criminal perverts our justice system. I can say this after having consulted with a number of women and some children whose sentence they will carry for life—the humiliation, the loss of trust, the anxiety attacks and the ongoing nightmares taunting them night after night. Feeling dirty, being labelled a slut, cheap or an easy target, scared of being left alone, unable to have

a normal relationship—these are just a few of the results with which many victims are left to contend.

The Bill itself has three objectives: retributive justice, protection and rehabilitation. The Bill will ensure that a person convicted of the outlined sexual offences is gaoled for a mandatory minimum non-parole period. Secondly, the Bill allows victims of sexual offenders to rebuild their lives in the safe knowledge that the convicted perpetrator will not be able to re-offend or disrupt the victim's rehabilitation program and/or recovery from the ordeal for at least three to five years.

Victim fear should be lessened by society imposing a fixed minimum gaol sentence for the offender. The victim should know that all that can be done is being done to prevent the offender from re-offending. Lastly, this Bill enables rehabilitation programs to be undertaken by the perpetrator whilst in gaol and as a condition of release. Minimum sentences are not new to South Australia: they are imposed for drink driving offences, regardless of the extenuating circumstances offered to the court by the offender. The offence of treason has a legislated maximum of up to life imprisonment and a minimum sentence of six months gaol.

Western Australia has a legislated non-parole period of 20 years for the most serious cases of wilful murder. Convention has generally kept previous South Australian Parliaments from imposing minimum gaol sentences and, as it has been acknowledged, convention has no legal basis. Sexual offending is a highly emotive issue which frequently attracts public and media attention because of the traumatic and potentially long-term consequences for its victims.

A number of crime statistics are often produced, both for and against issues such as this, and they provide vital information on the number and type of offences dealt with by the criminal justice system. This information also gives us an insight into how the system responds to, or deals with, the accused persons brought before it. However, for all the good, vital information produced, this information does not provide a valid measure of the actual offences being committed in the community. I think we all acknowledge that a high proportion of offences are never reported to the police and so are never recorded in police data. And again, of those offences reported, a large number are never cleared by the police; for example, the perpetrator is never apprehended, is never brought before the courts and so is never counted in official court data. Because of the nature of this Bill and the impact of this issue on the community, I felt that it was important to gauge the community view on the issue. My office randomly distributed 5 000 copies of a letter explaining the Bill and a response questionnaire. We had a significant return rate and at the same time provided a forum for some informative debate at various community meetings.

What I learnt from this exercise was that the greater majority of respondents thought that with this Bill we are still too lenient but they applaud the fact that a politician has the guts to shake the judiciary on this issue. It was felt that judges have been extremely lenient and need to be educated on what the victim has to deal with. They felt judges were so far removed from working-class areas that they could not understand what it is really like. They understand it is not only poorer people who are often the victims but it is this end of the spectrum that quite often do not have the support networks or the money for a good lawyer and suitable counselling. It is these people who often feel the most isolated. I think last Saturday's *Advertiser* front page highlighted a devastating example of this. Counselling for offenders both inside and outside prison was seen as a must.

Respondents felt very strongly about re-offenders and believed there should be no such thing as a second chance. Responses ranged from life sentences to chemical castration and even capital punishment. Equality was needed in the sentencing system as not all offenders are men. Among my responses were letters from victims and foster parents of abused children. The victims, that is the adults, just wanted to feel safe again. They spoke of their fears, the hate they feel, the cost to them both physically and emotionally, and what impact standing in a witness box has on people. As far as the children are concerned, I do not think we fully understand the trauma younger children endure. One respondent wrote about the two children placed in her care. One of the children is three years of age and the other is 16 months, and both were interfered with by the mother's *de facto* partner. She wrote:

> I can understand why the community wants this sort of animal shot. Those who violate children do not deserve any leniency. Unfortunately for younger children the perpetrators get off lightly; that's if they are convicted at all.

A number of very similar general comments were presented to me, and then there were some that I would like to outline which clearly represented community views on sexual offences, as follows:

> · The recipients of sexual abuse, whatever kind, will wear the scars for life no matter how much counselling they have; you cannot erase months or years of torture in a few sessions. The offenders should be removed from society altogether so they are unable to re-offend.
> . As the wife of a police officer, I have to deal with the side effects of my husband when the law protects offenders more than victims and their families. I want to feel safe, I want my child to feel safe when she plays as children should.

As with all prisoners, the State owes them a second chance. Nobody—but nobody—deserves a third chance. The money wasted on recidivists is astounding. Repeat offenders should be treated to the full weight of public anger. Only a corrupt system gives offenders who have more than one offence the kid glove treatment. The rights of the law abiding citizen should always override the rights of the criminal. This Bill may cause, or I should say it has caused, great concern among some in our legal system and their data may show for them a proud record of sentences, some seen as harsh but most judged by the community as too lenient. Our system still makes the victim feel like a criminal, and it still allows perpetrators who violate young children to get away with it. The system still allows victims to live in fear. It discourages a lot of women from reporting offences because of the intimidation they may endure in our courts and, as a victim, what prognosis is a life sentence; what real justice is there?

I have a friend who was raped violently only a short while ago. I watched a very strong woman change overnight. She is scared to go out because her perpetrator was never caught; he might be watching her. She cannot wash enough; the feeling of being dirty obsesses her. She suffers nightmares if and when she finally sleeps and she suffers anxiety attacks in public places. She is slowly coming to terms with what has happened but it has had a high cost attached. She lost her partner and, even worse, she lost her own self-respect. This man escaped the law, and he will probably, if he has not already, re-offend. My friend is sentenced for life and I can only hope that when her perpetrator, as well as others, are in our courtrooms before a judge, my friend and many men, women and child victims can at least feel that some sort of justice is being done, that they can safely go about putting

their lives in order without the fear of the offender being somewhere nearby watching or waiting.

Mrs PENFOLD secured the adjournment of the debate.

SOCIAL DEVELOPMENT COMMITTEE: PROSTITUTION

Adjourned debate on motion of Mr Leggett:

That the final report of the committee inquiry into prostitution be noted,

which Mr Brindal had moved to amend by inserting after the word 'noted' the words:

and in particular, that all members of the committee agree on the need for change in the current laws, however, given the divergent views of the committee and those expressed in debates in the House during this session, this House resolves to encourage further community consultation and commends to it early attention of the forty-ninth Parliament.

(Continued from 14 November. Page 568.)

Mr BASS (Florey): I move:

That the debate be further adjourned.

The House divided on the motion:

While the division was being held:

The Hon. W.A. MATTHEW: Mr Speaker, I rise on a point of order. A division has been called on whether or not the debate can be adjourned. As the hour has already passed 1 p.m., I would have thought that there could be no division on that call in the first place.

The SPEAKER: Order! Once the decision has been taken to call the division that process must be completed. We are now proceeding to do so.

AYES (27)

Allison, H.	Andrew, K. A.
Armitage, M. H.	Ashenden, E. S.
Bass, R. P. (teller)	Becker, H.
Brindal, M. K.	Brokenshire, R. L.
Brown, D. C.	Buckby, M. R.
Caudell, C. J.	Condous, S. G.
Evans, I. F.	Greig, J. M.
Hall, J. L.	Ingerson, G. A.
Kotz, D. C.	Lewis, I. P.
Matthew, W. A.	Penfold, E. M.
Rosenberg, L. F.	Rossi, J. P.
Scalzi, G.	Such, R. B.
Venning, I. H.	Wade, D. E.
Wotton, D. C.	

NOES (8)

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

PAIRS

Cummins, J. G.	De Laine, M. R.
Meier, E. J.	Geraghty, R. K.
Olsen, J. W.	Quirke, J. A.

Majority of 19 for the Ayes.

Motion thus carried.

[Sitting suspended from 1.5 to 2 p.m.]

SUMMARY OFFENCES (PROSTITUTION) AMENDMENT BILL

A petition signed by 33 residents of South Australia requesting that the House urge the Government to support the passage of the Summary Offences (Prostitution) Amendment Bill 1996 was presented by Mr Brokenshire.

Petition received.

BOLIVAR SEWERAGE PLANT

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

Leave granted.

The Hon. G.A. INGERSON: I received the final Hartley report for the first time yesterday morning and the Environment Protection Authority arranged a formal briefing for myself and the Minister for the Environment and Natural Resources with Mr Hartley last night. The Government accepts the recommendation made in the Hartley report. In essence, Mr Hartley says:

. . . odour production by the stabilisation lagoons resulted from organic overloading. The overloading occurred as a result of operation and maintenance factors. . . The key factors leading to the overloading all appear to revolve around the biological filter system as follows:

(a) The number of operating filters was reduced from 10 to seven in January 1993 and to six in January 1996, apparently with the aim of reducing odour production by the filters. This increased the biological oxygen demand (BOD) of the biofilter effluent.

(b) The rotary distributors on eight filters were slowed down over the period April 1993 to December 1993, again with the aim of reducing odour production. Biofilter effluent BOD increased further. . . '

The key factor leading to the odour was that the lagoons were overloaded. This was partly as a result of slowing the rotation speed of the biological filter arms as recommended by a consultant (Mr Albertson) in July 1993. This advice was implemented by the previous Labor Government and was continued by this Government.

An honourable member interjecting:

The Hon. G.A. INGERSON: There is no question about that. I am saying that.

The SPEAKER: Order! I do not want any interjections; the Minister has the call.

The Hon. G.A. INGERSON: There was a progressive increase in lagoon loading as a consequence of operational changes over the past five years and, more recently, by a series of maintenance events. It is important to note that the recent 'A' gate incident represents one of the many factors that have contributed to the stabilisation lagoon odour problem. The Hartley report (page 68) makes clear that:

. . . Prevention of a recurrence in the long term simply means avoidance of an overload. This requires an upgrade to the lagoon monitoring program and careful evaluation of plant process performance through maintenance of appropriate trend plots. . . '

The level of monitoring and the evaluation of plant processes were insufficient over the five-year period to recognise the problem and, therefore, to prevent it. Despite the recent odour problem, Mr Hartley has confirmed that the quality of the final effluent did not vary significantly from the usual range. This is still the case. Throughout this period, the quality of effluent discharged to the marine environment has remained within the EPA licence parameters.

The Government has embraced the recommendations of the report and will be working with SA Water and United

Water to undertake these necessary changes as a matter of urgency:

- Changes to the operating procedures of the biofilters to ensure that lagoon loading is controlled in a safe range has begun.
- A review of the design, condition, maintenance and operation of the biofilter recirculation system, which will be brought into line with modern standards, has commenced.
- An upgrade of the lagoon monitoring system and maintenance of the appropriate process trend plots, including routine reports from United Water and SA Water, has been implemented.
- The odour control program for the plant is under review.
- Audits on the operation of Glenelg and Port Adelaide treatment plants have commenced.

Against this background, United Water:

- Accepts it should have done more to recognise and change the spiral of events which led to this problem.
- Agrees lessons have been learned (and management reporting, procedures and control changes have been put in place accordingly).

At the same time, SA Water:

- Is committed to the implementation over the next three years to a large scale environmental improvement program.
- As risk managers of South Australia's water and waste water services, accepts accountability for this role.
- Has put in place actions to strengthen the audit and risk management auditing functions.

I have been told today that the cost of the restoration of the lagoons to normal operating process will be of the order of $500 000. I am pleased to advise the Parliament that United Water has agreed to carry all the cost associated with this incident. I make the point that the work done to date by chemical dosing has eliminated abnormal odours emitted from the stabilisation lagoons. The lagoon biology is continuing to recover and over time will come back to normal.

Under the previous Government, the then EWS was operating at a loss and the marine environment was a low priority. Labor was willing to continue a regime of underinvestment in Adelaide's waste water treatment. Labor was not prepared to properly address the real issues surrounding the odour problem. This Government is looking constructively towards the future and is committed to an investment of $200 million in the environmental improvement program for the metropolitan waste water treatment plants.

Finally, let me assure everyone that this Government's focus is fixed firmly on the future of Bolivar. We are committed to upgrading it to the best practice waste water management site. A review of the technology at Bolivar is well under way with SA Water, in conjunction with the international engineering consultants CMPS&F and United Water. Work will include the construction of a dissolved air flotation filtration plant at an estimated cost of $35 million by late next year for the treatment of waste water from the plant to supply the Virginia pipeline scheme and to provide water for the growers to further develop valuable export markets for their produce.

As part of this project there will also be a permanent solution to the odour nuisance endured by Bolivar, Salisbury and other residents in the proximity of the Bolivar plant. These plans will be announced within the next six to eight weeks and I give an unequivocal commitment that this project will be completed within the next three years.

QUESTION TIME

UNEMPLOYMENT

The Hon. M.D. RANN (Leader of the Opposition): My question is directed to the Premier. In light of today's ABS figures showing that, in spite of a welcome 0.1 percentage point drop in unemployment, South Australia still has the highest rate of mainland unemployment and today's report of the University of Adelaide Centre for Labour Studies forecasting double digit unemployment for South Australia by the turn of the century—

Members interjecting:

The Hon. M.D. RANN: It is interesting that the Liberals—

The SPEAKER: Order!

The Hon. M.D. RANN: —regard unemployment as a laughing matter.

The SPEAKER: Order!

The Hon. M.D. RANN: You don't care about people's jobs.

The SPEAKER: Order! I warn the Leader. The Leader will resume his seat. Leader, you turned your back on the Chair. When I called 'Order', you defied the Chair. Leave is withdrawn.

The Hon. J.W. OLSEN: Thank you, Mr Speaker. What the Leader of the Opposition does not want to point out to the House is that employment rose in the month by 6 900 people.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order!

The Hon. J.W. OLSEN: That is what he does not want to point out to the House. There is this half grudging, 'There has been a slight improvement in the performance.' Yes, there has been, and it is out-performing in some respects the national performance. That position is something of encouragement to us. We have seen in this House, and released during the course of this week, valuations of properties in South Australia escalate substantially—better than for almost a decade. The June motor vehicle registrations is the best monthly figure for 11 years. ANZ job survey figures show a trend line in South Australia ahead of the national average for seven consecutive months in South Australia. Drake International released its findings yesterday in terms of information technology, the growth of opportunities and the training mechanisms it will put in place to meet the demand.

What the Leader of the Opposition does not like and will not concede is that the policies that we have put in place, particularly to stimulate the tardy economy in South Australia, are starting to work and the bottom line is that real jobs are being created for South Australians. I can assure this House and the Leader and the public of South Australia that that is the single-minded focus of this Government. It is about job certainty, job security and security for families in South Australia. Given the signposts we have been getting in recent weeks, we are on track.

MAWSON LAKES DEVELOPMENT

Mr ROSSI (Lee): Will the Premier provide details of the new MFP Mawson Lakes development that he launched today in the northern suburbs of Adelaide?

The Hon. J.W. OLSEN: I am delighted to, Mr Speaker. This happens to be out in the northern suburbs, part of the electorate of the Leader of the Opposition, but he did not turn up to the announcement today because—

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order!

The Hon. J.W. OLSEN: Instead, the Leader of the Opposition wrote to the local council when it put to him that he was damaging investment in its local government area—

Members interjecting:

The Hon. J.W. OLSEN: We know what we said. The Leader wrote in reply that he is now withdrawing support from the MFP. On the eve of delivery, on the eve of an $850 million project, on the eve of 1 000 construction jobs and 500 jobs to be created in the housing industry, the Leader of the Opposition walks away. Why? Because he is so embarrassed. He would be too embarrassed to turn up today, because the Leader of the Opposition could not contain himself.

Mr Brokenshire interjecting:

The SPEAKER: The member for Mawson is out of order.

The Hon. J.W. OLSEN: The MFP, as he knew in the last month or six weeks, was moving through to delivery and he had to put some political mud on the project. He had to pull it down because something was going to be successful. He did not want it seen as being successful. Despite the Leader of the Opposition's press releases, I have news for him: this project is on track and going ahead. It is backed by Delfin and Lend Lease. Lend Lease is a major national company in the international marketplace. Delfin reconstructed West Lakes to an internationally recognised project. Telstra is putting in up to some $16 million to make it the smart city concept and, in addition to that, attracting other international players to the site.

There will be 3 700 homes on site. We will be working with the University of South Australia, and with other defence, electronics and IT companies being attracted to this location. A total of 25 per cent of South Australia's stormwater will be collected in the lakes. It will recharge the aquifer. It will be self-sufficient with its own water supply. In environmental terms and the management of a scarce finite resource in water, there is an international demonstration reference site that we have here in South Australia. It is taking the intellectual and creative capacity of South Australians and putting it on show for the benefit of South Australians. It will demonstrate that this State is open for investment again, after the 1980s and 1990s, and this State will lead in IT, defence and electronics—the smart industries—in creating job opportunities.

That is why we have seen a 15 to 20 per cent increase in job opportunities—defence, electronics and information industries over the course of the past three years. It is why we have a shortage of qualified people to meet the opportunities as they are emerging. This underlines clearly that the policies and decisions we put in place over the past 3½ years are resulting in this phase of delivery for job security for South Australians.

WATER OUTSOURCING CONTRACT

Mr FOLEY (Hart): My question is directed to the Minister for Infrastructure. Will the Government impose the full penalties allowed for under the United Water contract following the Hartley report, and the particular finding that primary effluent was allowed to discharge direct to the sewage lagoons for 9 months prior to the odour problems that occurred between April and June 1997? The report by Professor Hartley states:

> . . . After a component was left out of a recirculation meter in April 1996 and failures to other equipment, significant quantities of primary effluent bypassed the biofilter system between September 1996 and May 1997 and that all primary effluent bypassed the filters for six days in April 1997 due to an overhaul of gate A.

Under the water contract, penalties can be imposed on United Water for failing to maintain and operate the Bolivar Sewage Treatment Plant as specified under the contract.

The Hon. G.A. INGERSON: Like most reports, if you want to start at any point in the report, you can pick out any particular issue. Let me start at the beginning. Let me start at the point that Mr Hartley made. He made the point that in 1993, when the Labor Party was in Government, it received a report from Mr Albertson who recommended that it slow down the filters because of the odour problem. As Mr Hartley has said in the report, if you slow down the filters, you increase the load in the lagoons. So that began not in 1996 but back in 1993.

If the member for Hart reads the whole report, he will see that the overload problem is a five year problem, not a problem that automatically occurred in April 1997. Last evening Mr Hartley advised both me and the Minister for the Environment and Natural Resources that the A gate problem in April 1997 was the trigger that put the whole issue right over the top. That is what Mr Hartley said in his report. He did not isolate it to just one incident. He said it is a long-term issue which the Labor Government controlled for two years of the whole program. That is clearly pointed out in the report. The slowing down of the biofilters was a recommendation to the Labor Government which we continued on advice. Both Governments—

Mr Foley interjecting:

The Hon. G.A. INGERSON: I said we have accepted the recommendation. We put that down and that has made it very clear. One of the interesting things about this whole game by the member for Hart is that, if he has a copy of the contract (and he says he has), he would know that, within the contract, the penalty is 50 per cent of the cost of any of the programs. United Water is paying 100 per cent of the cost of this program, not 50 per cent. The total cost is currently estimated to be $500 000. Not only has United Water publicly stated today that it has accepted the concern in relation to this issue but also that it is prepared to pay 100 per cent of the cost, not 50 per cent as is set out in the contract.

The other issue raised by the member for Hart was in relation to penalties that might occur in the future. As he is aware, the EPA sets the rules in terms of management of effluent and any odour problems, and it is up to the independent authority, the EPA, to make that decision. I am quite sure it will, independent of this Government and the Opposition in this State.

EMPLOYMENT

Ms GREIG (Reynell): Will the Minister for Employment, Training and Further Education advise what new employment initiatives are being put in place to complement the successful $30 million youth employment strategy?

The Hon. D.C. KOTZ: The employment partnership between employers, the community and Government at the local level is certainly one of the most important pieces of strategy developed by this Government in optimising job

opportunities for South Australians. The Government is in the process of implementing the local employment partnership project which identifies at the planning stage the training and job opportunities which exist in major urban development projects, particularly in areas where there is already entrenched unemployment.

Agreements are already in place for the Seaford Rise project—which I am sure the honourable member will be pleased to hear—with the State Government working with the City of Happy Valley, the City of Noarlunga and the City of Willunga and participating private firms to ensure that locally unemployed people have a greater opportunity to gain jobs and training. This is necessary because regional strategies often do not address more localised pockets of unemployment. There is a second project (The Parks project) which is a redevelopment initiative being considered by the Housing Trust, the City of Port Adelaide Enfield and others, and it has also been targeted by my employment division.

Today's job figures indicate that this State is well on track, with a fall in the overall unemployment rate and the youth unemployment rate. Full-time employment in South Australia rose by an impressive 8 500 jobs in June—its highest level in a period of 18 months. Youth unemployment has now fallen for two consecutive months—this month by .9 per cent—which gives great encouragement to the job creation policies undertaken by this Government. That means that 7.7 per cent of youth are unemployed, compared with 8.6 per cent last month and 10.6 per cent the month before.

I am well aware that the Opposition will continue with its empty rhetoric and, I have no doubt, will still continue to look for the negatives. But this Government is doing the hard work, fixing the mess that was left by the Opposition, and providing real jobs for young South Australians.

Mr MEIER: I rise on a point of order. Mr Speaker. Could you clarify the situation concerning the use of television cameras in this House, as far as where they are supposed to be pointed, and at what time?

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order! The rules are quite clear and precise.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order! I warn the Deputy Leader of the Opposition. There will be no breaches. I request the media to comply with the rules. They are all aware of them, and I do not wish to have it drawn to my attention again. The Chair showed some latitude yesterday but no further latitude will be given. There is also a camera in the gallery which is not in the right position for taking photographs. I request that the rules be completely complied with, or I will clear the gallery.

BOLIVAR SEWERAGE PLANT

Mr FOLEY (Hart): Will the Minister for Infrastructure inform the House why there were no proper controls by United Water to alert SA Water and the Environment Protection Authority that primary sewage was being diverted to the stabilisation lagoons for nine months from September 1996 to May 1997, and is the Minister satisfied that the water contract is being properly supervised? The Hartley report states:

> The signs of unintentional primary effluent bypassing evident in the biofilter performance data were unrecognised because trend plots were not maintained.

The Hon. G.A. INGERSON: In my ministerial statement I made special reference to those trend plots and, whilst all of the data has been collected at Bolivar, the trend plots that should have been done have not been done. It is my advice that they have not been done for the past five years, either. So, let us go back through the whole process.

An honourable member interjecting:

The Hon. G.A. INGERSON: You were in one of them. It is not acceptable that they were not done: Mr Hartley has clearly pointed that out. It is an issue of risk management, as far as SA Water is concerned, and an issue in terms of management, as far as United Water is concerned. As I said in my ministerial statement today, changes have already occurred, and there will be continuing monitoring by both SA Water and United Water in the future. As I said, United Water has accepted, and publicly said, that it did not manage the issue as well as it should have. That should be accepted and put behind us, and we should get on with the job.

SA WATER

Mrs HALL (Coles): Will the Minister for Infrastructure advise the House of the significant financial turnaround in respect of the SA Water Corporation?

The Hon. G.A. INGERSON: It is interesting that members of the Opposition laugh—and particularly the member for Hart and the Leader of the Opposition—because we all know about our $4 billion debt and the $1 million a day interest that we are paying. However, not enough South Australians know about the disaster that SA Water (and the old EWS) was in terms of its contribution to the State budget versus what is there today. In the last two years that the ALP was in office, the EWS lost $70 million. In 1993-94—

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order!

The Hon. G.A. INGERSON: —SA Water contributed $27 million to the budget; in 1994-95, $60 million; in 1995-96, $40 million; and last week we processed a cheque to the Government for $91 million, which is part of the dividend of $107 million—a total contribution of $238 million to the budget by SA Water, and Treasury is very happy about that. I ask members to compare that performance to the $70 million loss in the last two years of the former Labor Government. We should never forget that the State Government is still paying $1 million a day in interest because of the State Bank debt. So, despite all of that, we are still able to turn around the financial disaster that the ALP left, in relation to the EWS versus SA Water today. It is one of the real success stories in terms of the State Government's contribution in dollars to the Treasury. It is something that every South Australian should be proud of, instead of the $1 million in interest that we are copping every day because of the Labor Party.

BOLIVAR SEWERAGE PLANT

Mr FOLEY (Hart): My question is directed to the Minister for the Environment and Natural Resources. Given that the Hartley report dismisses weather conditions as playing any significant part in the pong over Adelaide in April and May this year, on what basis did the EPA announce—and I quote from the *Advertiser* dated 31 April 1997, under the heading, 'Pong police sniff out new culprit':

> The cause of the smell is an atmospheric condition known as an inversion layer which traps the city's normal domestic and industrial emissions close to the ground.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: I warn the member for Custance.

The Hon. D.C. WOTTON: In respect of the Labor Party's pong report, I would suggest that the member for Hart reads the report, because the—

Mr Foley interjecting:

The Hon. D.C. WOTTON: Come on. You have read the whole report?

Mr Foley interjecting:

The Hon. D.C. WOTTON: You just said that you read the report.

The SPEAKER: Order! The Minister for the Environment and Natural Resources has the call, and courtesy dictates that he is given the opportunity to answer the question.

The Hon. D.C. WOTTON: I point out to the member for Hart that it says quite clearly in the report that there were sources of odours other than Bolivar that led to the problem that this report addresses. So, I would suggest that the member for Hart read the report.

HOME BUYERS PROGRAMS

Mr WADE (Elder): Will the Treasurer outline the success of this Government's programs to assist home buyers in South Australia?

The Hon. S.J. BAKER: Considerable publicity has been given to the $8 million investment this Government made into giving the home building—

An honourable member interjecting:

The Hon. S.J. BAKER: It is a good tie, isn't it? Considerable publicity has been given to the $8 million investment into boosting the home building industry in this State and the success that has achieved. Another success which I believe deserves considerable publicity is the extended stamp duty concession for first home buyers. As members would know, this scheme commenced on 1 February, and we can see from the figures that are coming out through the system now that it has also been a great success. Last month, 750 people were successful in achieving that concession compared with 503 in June of the previous year. The figures for March, April, May and June show significant movement in the number of people who are signing a contract to buy a new home.

From the Government's point of view, I would also like to put on the record that this was a David Tonkin initiative in November 1979, and that, to date, $170 million in first home concessions has been paid out. This initiative has given an enormous boost to the home building industry and home ownership of South Australians. As I said, $170 million has been spent over the past 18 years. It has had an enormous impact, and I congratulate the Tonkin Government for introducing this scheme. With the Government's extension of that scheme we are now seeing a significant lift in the number of people in the marketplace.

Members would also know that this is not normally a top time of the year for buying and trading in houses, but there has been a significant lift in the marketplace as a result of this initiative. The figures are coming through and we will see an improvement in home values as a result. This is yet another initiative of the State Government which is working very well.

FINANCE MINISTER

Mr ATKINSON (Spence): Does the Premier agree with the stood down Minister for Finance that it does not 'matter a stuff what is in the Anderson report', because the Premier will make the decision on his future as a Minister?

The Hon. J.W. OLSEN: I will not give credence to the question from the member for Spence by responding to it.

RURAL TRAINING SCHEMES

Mr ANDREW (Chaffey): Will the Minister for Primary Industries provide a current update on the training and education program that he instituted last year including the response from the farming community of South Australia and, in particular, how this and other schemes introduced by the Government have helped the profitability of primary producers in South Australia?

The Hon. R.G. KERIN: I thank the member for Chaffey for his intelligent question. Following the launch late last year, the uptake of RAS training grants has been excellent. Over 2 000 South Australian farmers have taken part in this initiative which comprises a wide range of programs, which focus not only on technical training but also on the important areas of risk management, financial management, information technology and computer skills, and rural leadership courses have also been planned. The cooperation of the Advisory Board of Agriculture and SAFF has helped to bring about this success.

This Government has also promoted a number of other schemes which have helped to put money into the pockets of our farmers. Industry development boards have been set up to influence the strategic direction and growth of the primary industries sector. We established the SQF2000 quality certification system for growers and small businesses. A new product development program has been established for the lamb industry. PISA's Grain Gain crop monitoring program has resulted in the adoption of improved agronomic practices and technologies, increasing farm profitability by a measured $3.3 million; and 80 Right Rotation workshops have improved crop yields.

The Eyre Peninsula regional strategy was introduced to improve agronomy, land management practices and, hopefully, the long-term profitability of Eyre Peninsula farmers. Our property management planning program has been adopted nationally. The State revegetation strategy, which has been released, shows that the benefits of revegetation are not only important for land care but make sound economic sense for primary production. These strategies have all helped to underpin a turnaround in the trading position of farmers in this State. Our farmers have become extremely productive, and I am sure that the House will join me in hoping that the next week or so will see sufficient widespread rain to greatly improve the outlook for the coming season.

FINANCE MINISTER

Mr ATKINSON (Spence): I ask the Premier: will the South Australian Police receive the full Anderson report on the allegations into the stood down Minister for Finance as well as the documents, information and transcripts of evidence that were given to Mr Anderson QC?

The Hon. J.W. OLSEN: The Opposition wants to make a broad sweep. As this House well knows, the ACB has had all the information put before it, and it has released its

findings in that respect. The Opposition, not satisfied that the matter has been investigated and the member for MacKillop cleared, wants to put it back before the court. The Opposition might want to carry on with its witch-hunt, but I will not be a party to it.

HEALTH, EMPLOYMENT OPPORTUNITIES

Mrs ROSENBERG (Kaurna): Will the Minister for Health tell the House whether health services can contribute to the development of job opportunities in South Australia?

The Hon. M.H. ARMITAGE: I am delighted to answer this question from the member for Kaurna because health services present one of the most exciting economic development opportunities in South Australia. I would like to highlight one particular area in which South Australia is acknowledged as leading the nation, and that is in terms of the expertise of the public hospital pain units, particularly at the Flinders Medical Centre and the Royal Adelaide Hospital. I will focus for a moment on the Flinders Medical Centre Pain Management Unit, which has been particularly active in the development and use of oral morphine in the treatment of cancer pain. The unit was a major contributor to the locally-based international company F.H. Faulding Co. Ltd in the development of a sustained release oral morphine preparation.

The unit provided the clinical expertise and Faulding provided something which is quite unique and which is known as drug delivery technology. This value-added product is now being sold in more than 15 countries worldwide, bringing millions of dollars to South Australia annually. Products of this nature enabled Faulding to consolidate and grow its development and manufacturing base in South Australia. This is a classic example of public health facilities collaborating with the private sector to develop products which create a whole range of benefits for South Australia. Those benefits include, obviously, better health care but they also include manufacturing jobs, research jobs, development jobs and export income.

In recognition of the fantastic service provided by the pain units, for the first time the Government is introducing site specific funding allocations to the pain units within the case mix system, and this will provide $645 000 to enable the pain units to provide outpatient programs. So, the Government is committed to quality health care, quality pain management, quality anaesthesia services, and so on, and it is also committed to ongoing close collaboration between the public and private sectors to continue the development of those services.

Our policy is clear, and it is demonstrably successful. I contrast that with the Opposition which has no policy direction. When in Government during the dark years, the Opposition let dozens of contracts to private sector organisations, yet in Opposition it constantly opposes partnerships with the private sector. The Opposition spokesperson has promised that Labor will 'Clearly define the scope of the public and private sectors in the delivery of health services', yet there is a total vacuum, nothing is being released. In fact, the Opposition is lacking in direction, probably because it has no idea where it is going.

SA WATER

Mr FOLEY (Hart): Will the Minister for the Environment and Natural Resources advise whether the EPA will investigate taking action against SA Water for breach of its licence conditions under the Environment Protection Act in view of the failures identified in the Hartley report? The Opposition understands that at a press conference today the Chairman of the EPA, Mr Stephen Walsh, indicated that the EPA is considering taking action against SA Water for potential for criminal prosecution and for a fine of up to $1 million being imposed.

The Hon. D.C. WOTTON: It is important that I stress the independence of the Environment Protection Authority.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order!

The Hon. D.C. WOTTON: I refer to a statement released today by the Chairman of the EPA. It is important that the Opposition know exactly what was said. He made the point that at a special meeting of the EPA convened yesterday the EPA resolved that, subject to further legal advice:

> (a) an environment protection order be issued to require the development of appropriate operational procedures for the biofilters within one month of the issue of the order; and,
>
> (b) an environment protection order be issued to require a review of the design, condition, maintenance and operation of the biofilter recirculation system, and that such steps be taken by SA Water and United Water as necessary to ensure that the future operations of the systems are consistent with world's best practice.

That is the official statement made today by the Chairman of the EPA.

MOUNT LOFTY

Mr BASS (Florey): Will the Minister for Environment and Natural Resources say whether he believes it is appropriate to refer to the Mount Lofty Summit development as a 'caff'? I and other members of the House have noticed that whenever the Deputy Leader of the Opposition refers to the Mount Lofty Summit development he describes it as a 'caff'.

The Hon. D.C. WOTTON: I would not wish to denigrate any of the owners or operators of any of the fine cafes we have in South Australia. Like many members on this side of the House, I am sure that we enjoy many of the opportunities provided to eat out at many of these fine cafes.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order!

The Hon. D.C. WOTTON: The Deputy Opposition Leader thinks it is a bit of a laugh to refer to this $4 million complex as a 'caff'.

Members interjecting:

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

The Hon. D.C. WOTTON: The fact is that this architecturally designed building holds not only a fine world-class restaurant but also the State's most advanced visitor information facilities. As part of its services as a window to South Australia, it provides advice and points to attractions north, south, east and west in this State. Playing down its significance to South Australia may seem rather amusing to the Deputy Leader, but I suggest that it only serves to make the Deputy Leader look rather small—I will rephrase that: rather inferior. It would—

Members interjecting:

Mr ATKINSON: On a point of order, Sir, is the Minister for the Environment and Natural Resources responsible to the House for what the Deputy Leader calls a certain private development?

The SPEAKER: The member for Spence is correct. The Minister for the Environment and Natural Resources is not responsible for comments which the Deputy Leader of the Opposition may or may not have made.

Mr Foley interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order! However, the Minister for the Environment and Natural Resources is responsible for responding to questions properly put to him, which he is now doing.

The Hon. D.C. WOTTON: It does the Deputy Leader no credit at all to belittle any development that leads to a considerable number of new jobs in this State, particularly when developments such as the Mount Lofty complex are greeted with such enthusiasm by local, interstate and, I suggest, international visitors. On the other hand, I suppose I can understand why the Opposition is embarrassed by this development, because once again I would remind the House that it took some 14 years before any development appeared on the summit.

Members interjecting:

The Hon. D.C. WOTTON: For the full time that the Labor Government was in office we saw nothing but a disgrace as far as the summit is concerned. I suggest that it would be appropriate for the Deputy Leader of the Opposition to accept that this is a fine development at the Mount Lofty summit and one enjoyed by people who visit it from local areas, various other parts of the State, interstate and overseas.

SA WATER

Mr FOLEY (Hart): Will the Minister for Infrastructure advise whether, following the announcement today by the Chairman of the EPA that a fine for criminal prosecution of $1 million could be levied against SA Water, he will require United Water to reimburse SA Water for the fine?

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order! This question is getting very close to being hypothetical. I suggest that the Minister briefly respond. The Chair will no longer allow members to get away with asking hypothetical questions.

The Hon. G.A. INGERSON: I understand that Mr Walsh said at the press conference today that the possible fine could be between $250 000 and $1 million. I understand that he qualified it with the words 'if there was any breach of the Act'. The reality is that the EPA is an independent authority, and I would hope that the Opposition would respect the fact that it is independent and that it should make that decision in the full light of its independence.

HINDMARSH SOCCER STADIUM

Mr LEGGETT (Hanson): Will the Minister for Tourism advise why it has taken so long to get the Hindmarsh Soccer Stadium redevelopment under way and indicate what impact it will have on soccer in South Australia? I understand that in 1988 a former Labor Government Minister announced a redevelopment of the Hindmarsh Soccer Stadium. This promise was restated in 1991 by the then Minister for Recreation and Sport. It is now 1997, and the soccer community will finally have a modern stadium.

The Hon. E.S. ASHENDEN: The honourable member is quite right in indicating that back in 1988 the then Labor Government announced that it would undertake a redevelopment at the Hindmarsh Soccer Stadium. It said it again in 1991. Anybody who cares to take a drive through Hindmarsh at the moment will see that the stadium is undergoing redevelopment and there is now a magnificent facility there—a completely new grandstand—for fans to be able to enjoy seeing their favourite team playing. Again we have a perfect example where in 1988 Labor promised something, and again in 1991, but it did nothing. This Government came to power and already we can see the new grandstand, which is almost complete.

Come October of this year that grandstand will be open and 15 000 soccer fans will be able to go along and enjoy first-class soccer facilities, being able to watch the sport under much better conditions than has been possible in the past. Not only will it be of value to the soccer community but rugby union has indicated that, with a new grandstand, it will certainly be looking to utilise the facilities. We have had the Rugby Sevens down there, and I have no doubt that because this Government has not just talked but acted and provided a facility for the soccer community—something which the previous Government merely talked about—come October we will be able to go down there, sit in a new grandstand and enjoy soccer with the advantage of much better facilities.

FAMILY AND COMMUNITY SERVICES, FINANCIAL MANAGEMENT

Ms STEVENS (Elizabeth): Will the Minister for Family and Community Services confirm that accountants Ernst and Young have been engaged by the Department for Family and Community Services to deal with serious deficiencies in the department's financial controls? What matters have been referred to the consultants, and what is the cost of this consultancy? Last week, the Minister confirmed to the House that the Auditor-General had been working for months in the Department for Family and Community Services, because of serious deficiencies in accounting procedures.

The Hon. D.C. WOTTON: The member for Elizabeth has answered her own question in the first part. I confirmed last week that that was the case, and I will get the rest of the details on notice.

YOUTH EMPLOYMENT

Mr CUMMINS (Norwood): Can the Minister for Industrial Affairs advise the House on how successful the WorkCover component of the youth employment State initiative has been since its implementation in December 1996?

The Hon. DEAN BROWN: Late last year the State Government announced a package of measures that will encourage employers to take on unskilled and unemployed young people. That scheme has been particularly successful so far. In the first six months to 30 June, 1 087 workers have been employed under the scheme, receiving the WorkCover subsidy, that is, an exemption from WorkCover for up to 12 months, depending on the category of the people involved. The sum of $9.6 million has been set aside over a three-year period for this scheme. Of the 1 087 new workers, 642 employers are involved, so we can see that it has been dispersed very widely among employers; 289 of the young people employed have been school-leavers; another 559 have been unemployed young people under the age of 21; and 239 have been young unemployed people between the ages of 21 and 25.

The Government is giving an incentive to these employers amounting to about $467 a year per employee so far. That is a significant advantage to those employers and a real incentive, particularly for those employers in smaller businesses, to take on additional young unskilled and unemployed people in this State. I might add that one reason we moved in terms of the unfair dismissal provisions was to

add another component to this package to encourage more employees to be taken on. That is why, if these people are working for a small business, in the first 12 months they are regarded as being probationary employees. Therefore, it is even more attractive, because there is less risk for the employers, but only in the first 12 months. The scheme has been successful in creating jobs for over 1 000 new young people who otherwise would be unemployed.

WEBBER, DR R.

Mr FOLEY (Hart): Can the Premier tell the House what business connections were established for South Australia as a result of an overseas trip taken by Dr Webber, the former head of the MFP Australian/Asia business consortia in March and April 1996, and indicate what was the total cost of this trip? The Opposition has been informed that Dr Webber, accompanied by his wife, left Australia on 31 March 1996 for Jakarta, where he stayed for three days to meet one appointment. The Opposition has been further informed that Dr Webber and his wife then travelled to Bangkok for five days and stayed at the Oriental Hotel over Easter without any appointments. The Opposition has also been told that Mrs Webber travelled to the United States while Dr Webber visited Japan for three days where he stayed at a Tokyo hotel at a cost of $700 per night.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order!

The Hon. J.W. OLSEN: This question was asked of me in Estimates Committees, and I indicated that the information will be collated and made available, and it will be.

YOUTH EMPLOYMENT

Mr BROKENSHIRE (Mawson): Will the Minister for Employment, Training and Further Education advise the House of any further programs to be developed through the $30 million State Government grants youth employment strategy?

The Hon. D.C. KOTZ: This House has come to recognise that, when I rise to my feet, I talk about jobs as being the priority for this State Liberal Government.

Members interjecting:

The Hon. D.C. KOTZ: They had plenty of chance over a decade but never came up with anything. It is extremely frustrating to have to rebuild the employment foundations that were destroyed by the previous Government. The $3.1 billion loss to the State as a result of the State Bank debacle would have been sufficient to keep every young unemployed person in this State in full-time work earning $570 a week for 12 years and nine months. However, in stark contrast to Labor's appalling performance, this Government continues to build on our employment programs, which provide real job opportunities and real job outcomes. Recently this Government has developed the State Government employment partnership which makes job creation a key focus in all areas of Government activity. New initiatives in this partnership include employment strategies for urban developments, a skills audit—

Members interjecting:

The Hon. D.C. KOTZ: I suggest to the member for Spence that, if he wants to indulge in a battle of wits, he come in armed. As I was saying, new initiatives in this partnership include employment strategies for urban developments, a skills audit for industry starting with the defence and food and beverages industry, and a new work force and labour market advisory service. We have a policy, we have the programs and, indeed, we will reap the rewards, which is more than I can say for the Leader of the Opposition, who supervised the transfer of some 900 workers a month to the dole queues while he held the employment portfolio.

MULTIFUNCTION POLIS

Mr FOLEY (Hart): What action will the Premier take to ensure that recruitment and termination costs of the MFP's executive staff are cut following revelations today by the Economic and Finance Committee Chairman, the member for Peake, that more than $1 million had been spent on recruiting and then getting rid of eight executives in just two years? The Liberal member for Peake, as Chairman of the Economic and Finance Committee, said:

> To date, the MFP has yet to deliver on any of its key projects.

The member for Peake said that, of eight executives who had left the MFP in the past two financial years, five had accumulated $445 000 in termination payments and superannuation. He added that more than $380 000 had been spent in recruiting executives, half of which had been spent on only three staff employed for periods of only two to three years.

The Hon. J.W. OLSEN: The member for Hart knows full well that what we have been doing in the course of the past 18 months, as we have been doing with a whole range of an inherited mess of contracts from the former Administration, is unwinding them—and as we have been doing in the case of the MFP. There is a 30 per cent reduction in the number of executives on more than $100 000; and there is a 30 per cent reduction in the size and cost of the operation of the board. All these initiatives will be put in place when, first, we are able to change the board appointed by the former Labor Administration; secondly, change the Executive Director appointed by the Leader of the Opposition in the former MFP; and, thirdly, unwind the contracts that were put in place by the Labor Party when in Government.

The member for Hart is criticising his Leader and the former Labor Government, because we are dismantling the contracts we inherited from that Government. That is what we are doing, and we are getting it right. As to when it will start delivering, it started at 11.30 this morning, with the dozers cutting out the first of the Mawson Lakes 3 700 construction sites. It is delivering for South Australians. There will be a return for taxpayers for their money invested—unlike the formative years of the MFP under the former Labor Government. Nothing was delivered by the Party opposite, but it has been turned around by us and will earn a return for taxpayers in South Australia.

PARKS AGENDA

Mr LEWIS (Ridley): Mr Speaker—

Mr Atkinson: Good member!

Mr LEWIS: I have no quarrel. My question is directed to the Minister for the Environment and Natural Resources. What has been done about the problems of feral animals such as cats, foxes, koalas, dingos, hares, blackbirds, mynas, starlings and weeds such as St John's wert, South African daisy, South African boxthorn, Nagoora burr, Bathurst burr, salvation Jane, soursob and skeleton weed in our parks system? I note that in the Government's parks agenda brochure it states:

[in] more than 60 per cent of the 300 parks we have significant pest plant infestations, and more than half of them are severely affected by feral animals.

The SPEAKER: The Minister for the Environment and Natural Resources, briefly.

The Hon. D.C. WOTTON: Mr Speaker, I would be happy to refer to each of those species one by one if the member for Ridley would like. I thank the member for Ridley for his extended question. The member is quite right and, as I have said in this House on a number of occasions, there are more than 20 million hectares of parks and reserves in this State. If we get that down to something people can understand a little more clearly, it is the equivalent of 10 Adelaide Ovals for every man, woman and child in the metropolitan area. It is far too great an area for any Government to actively and effectively manage on its own and that is why we have gone out with the parks agenda in seeking community support.

I am delighted with the response we have had to the launch of that initiative because, unlike the previous Government which did virtually nothing about these problems in our parks, we have really been tackling them and, for instance, I am sure the member for Ridley would be interested to know that in the Flinders Ranges National Park we have an excellent program which has eliminated 90 per cent of the feral goats. Likewise, rabbits have been eradicated from 8 000 hectares and over 85 per cent of the Flinders Ranges National Park is baited to control foxes. At the same time, rock wallaby populations are increasing quite significantly.

We have boosted resources to our parks management through the parks agenda with an extra $2.5 million this year, including more rangers on the ground, which is more that the previous Labor Government did, and on the promise of a six year $30 million commitment to the parks agenda. One of the main thrusts to the agenda is a community partnership harnessing the enormous goodwill among South Australians to help deal with the threats of feral animals and weeds in the parks. This is another example of this Government getting on and doing something that the previous Labor Government refused to tackle, and I am delighted with the progress being made in our parks as a result of these initiatives.

FAMILY AND COMMUNITY SERVICES, FINANCIAL MANAGEMENT

Ms STEVENS (Elizabeth): Can the Minister for Family and Community Services explain the break-down in financial procedures in the Department for Family and Community Services that resulted in 167 people being authorised to sign cheques at seven offices? The Opposition has been given a copy of an interim report by the Auditor-General which reveals serious deficiencies in the control of cheque signatories in FACS. The report lists seven offices with a total of 167 signatories, including one office where the receiver of revenue both paid into and out of the department's account?

The Hon. D.C. WOTTON: If there are any problems in this area, it is as a result of the system set up by the previous Government and we are trying to overcome those problems.

Mr Clarke interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order! The Deputy Leader is now officially warned for the second time. He knows the consequences. The Chair has been very tolerant to certain members today.

AQUACULTURE

Mr CONDOUS (Colton): Will the Minister for Primary Industries outline what measures are being taken to enhance the development of aquaculture in South Australia?

The Hon. R.G. KERIN: The impact of aquaculture and fishing industries in South Australia is particularly significant and nowhere more so than in the regions. Certainly, the State Government has a world class marine research centre at West Beach, which is one of Australia's premier marine and fresh water research facilities. It underpins a growing aquaculture industry, which is now worth more than $130 million and provides 840 jobs. South Australia's aquaculture industry will continue to develop and complement the coastal environment. Aquaculture plans now protect the South Australian coast from Elliston in the west to the South Australian/Victorian border in the South-East.

This Government certainly wants the aquaculture industry to be an example of ecologically sustainable growth. We can predict that the number of jobs within aquaculture could treble within the next 10 years. Most of the growth and the new jobs will be in regional areas of South Australia, and certainly we can improve on the numbers by working not only on our value adding process but also by making sure that we open up as many export markets as we possibly can for that product.

A recent report indicates that direct employment generated in the Eyre region by tuna fishing and farming alone was almost 250 in 1994-95. The flow-on employment to other sectors in the region amounted to almost 400 in areas such as trade, business services and transport. Anyone who is aware of these regional economies will realise that having productive industries such as tuna farming and other aquaculture has many spin-offs for both existing businesses and allows us to set up new businesses.

Certainly, there is a huge interest in aquaculture: in 1995-96 we had 707 licensed operators, and in 12 months that figure had risen to 852 operators. There is certainly continuing interest, and PISA has four staff dedicated to study applications at the moment. We will continue to review the aquaculture management plans that have been put in place. Certainly, our aim is to have a sustainable process and a method by which the coastal resource is correctly allocated to aquaculture users while still taking into account other traditional users of our coastal areas. The Government and industry will certainly work together to achieve sustainable growth in the industry and we will continue to create additional employment, particularly in regional areas.

FINANCE MINISTER

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

Leave granted.

The Hon. J.W. OLSEN: I advise the House that the Government has received and I have considered the report of Mr Anderson QC, following his independent inquiry pursuant to the terms of reference announced by the Government on 7 April this year. By these terms of reference Mr Anderson was directed to concentrate solely on establishing the facts surrounding allegations of conflict of interest relating to

former Primary Industry Minister, Mr Dale Baker. His role was not to make a judgment on whether or not a conflict of interest had arisen. Mr Anderson was to set out the facts as he found them to enable a determination on conflict of interest to be made by me as Premier.

I received a copy of Mr Anderson's report at the beginning of this week. I waited to release the findings until today, to enable Mr Baker and his counsel, and myself, the time to carefully consider them. In the past few days I have carefully examined the sequence of events and the facts as found by Mr Anderson. I have met with Mr Baker and I have explained to him my conclusions reached from those facts and the action which I believe was appropriate in the circumstances. Those facts relate specifically to Mr Baker's family business interests and the attempted purchase during 1994 of part of 'Gouldana', a property of 850 hectares located 80 kilometres south-west of Naracoorte. It is therefore my decision, based on the facts as set out by Mr Anderson, that Mr Baker will not be returning to the ministry either now or, should we be returned to Government, following the forthcoming election. I would now like to explain why.

Mr Anderson's findings lead to a conclusion that Mr Baker did during 1994 find himself in a conflict of interest arising out of his public office as Minister for Primary Industries, which included responsibility for the then Woods and Forests Department, and his interest in one of his family business ventures, The Banksia Company, which grows flowers for export. Within this process, there seems some doubt about whether such conflict arose through carelessness, accidentally or was known and ignored. Arguments have been put to me that, as there is doubt, Mr Baker ought to be able to resume his position as Minister. However, I have chosen to resolve this by taking a stand which I believe is in the public interest.

Mr Anderson's findings do indicate that during 1994 Mr Baker was in breach of the ministerial code of conduct as a result of conflict of interest. This is despite the fact that Mr Baker believes he acted within the guidelines of the ministerial code of conduct, particularly by resigning as a director of his companies and by removing himself from the day-to-day running of them. Mr Anderson's inquiry followed an extensive police investigation into the events surrounding the attempted acquisition of part of Gouldana by Mr Baker's family business at the same time as Mr Baker's department was negotiating to purchase the property.

The Director of Public Prosecutions, Mr Paul Rofe QC, advised the Government on 1 April this year that there was no evidence of criminal behaviour on the part of Mr Baker regarding Gouldana and Mr Anderson's inquiry has considered all the information that was provided for the police investigation. I do not believe that Mr Anderson's inquiry has uncovered anything which would warrant further police investigation. However, Mr Anderson's inquiry does make a series of findings of fact which lead to the conclusion that there was a conflict of interest.

In the interests of public accountability, I now table the findings of fact made by Mr Anderson. I am not tabling the background information provided by Mr Anderson upon which these findings are based. Much of this information came from witnesses, some of whom had stated that they would not make themselves available for interview unless they were given an undertaking that their interview would remain confidential.

The Hon. M.D. Rann interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order! I will name the Leader if he again interjects.

The Hon. J.W. OLSEN: Mr Anderson indicates, and I quote:

> At the commencement of each interview, I advised the persons attending that Mr Baker would be informed of any matters which might give rise to facts capable of supporting an adverse finding against him. All persons interviewed were informed, firstly, that the transcript of their interview with me would remain confidential but, secondly, that the Minister would be informed by me of matters potentially adverse to him.

In that part of the report which forms the basis for the findings, some witnesses are referred to by name where they are not referred to in the findings themselves. On the basis of what I have indicated is my decision in relation to Mr Baker's future, and on the basis that it is not necessary to have the names of those witnesses brought into the public spotlight, and to respect the principle of confidentiality, I have taken a decision not to table that part of the report.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order!

The Hon. J.W. OLSEN: I think it is extremely important to ensure that if we are to expect the public to assist us during these sorts of investigations then we must exercise discretion about identifying them publicly. I cannot hide that it is a painful duty for me to have to state that I am unable to welcome Mr Baker back to the ministry. I do not think there would be anyone in this House who could honestly dispute his commitment to this State. It should be recognised that neither Mr Baker nor his family company nor trust have benefited from the Gouldana episode. Mr Baker remains adamant that his recollection of these events is correct and that no conflict of interest arose.

Conflict of interest is a vexed and grey area that increasingly creates a lot of difficulty and grief, in both Government and the private sector. It is rarely clear-cut and the situation with Mr Baker appears to be no exception. However, Australians need to have confidence in the accountability of the political process. Governments must at all times be seen to be above reproach. We must never ignore nor seek to hide from conflict of interest allegations, nor from alleged breaches of our own ministerial code of conduct. We set our ministerial code of conduct in place before we won Government in 1993. It was a promise of clean Government to the people of South Australia. Society has rules; politics as part of this cannot be any different.

Having dealt with the specifics, there are some important explanatory points I would like to make by way of clarification of Mr Baker's position. There is also a stark contrast between the way in which Mr Baker and I have dealt with these allegations and the way the previous Labor Government Administration dealt with allegations of conflict.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order!

The Hon. J.W. OLSEN: The House will recall that when a Minister in the former Government was the subject of conflict of interest allegations she did not stand down from the ministry. The Premier, John Bannon, refused to make her do so. In this Government, Mr Baker stood down willingly; he did not have to be asked. Nor did the Labor Government insist that the Minister involved (Ms Wiese) should resign when an inquiry did, in fact, establish that she had been in three conflict of interest situations. This Government, unlike the previous Government, has had the courage to practise

what it preaches, and for that Mr Baker has paid a very high price, as has South Australia—

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order!

The Hon. J.W. OLSEN: —because the State has lost a Minister who knew how to make a difference to this State's future. I now refer to some explanatory points. Mr Baker continues to dispute some of Mr Anderson's findings. In this situation and to ensure fairness to Mr Baker, I now table his response to the Anderson findings.

As members will recall, Mr Anderson was also asked to inquire into certain allegations made about a visit to Hong Kong by Mr Baker. In relation to this matter, Mr Anderson has informed us that he has not been able to report any findings of fact. There is also the question of a Minister misleading Parliament. Within the context of Mr Anderson's findings of fact, it could be construed that Mr Baker mislead the House.

In conclusion, Mr Baker's position in Cabinet will not be filled between now and the next election. With a police inquiry, followed by the independent Anderson inquiry and today's statement, we believe that the Government has done all that is appropriate and necessary to ensure a full investigation. We also believe that by the Government's actions we are upholding a high standard of accountability to this Parliament and the public of South Australia.

The SPEAKER: Order! I direct that the rules in relation to filming in the gallery be strictly adhered to, otherwise action will be taken. Everyone is fully aware of the further warning I gave today, and the Chair takes the strongest exception to people who ignore those warnings. I do not want to have to speak to the management of the television stations involved.

BOLIVAR SEWERAGE PLANT

The Hon. G.A. INGERSON (Deputy Premier): Earlier today in a ministerial statement I neglected to say that I wished to table the report in relation to Mr Hartley, and I do so now.

GRIEVANCE DEBATE

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

Mr BROKENSHIRE (Mawson): I rise to speak about two issues that I have been very proud to be involved with over the past few years in my electorate. Both of them really revolve around volunteers and their commitment to further improve the amenity of the locality, the safety and general benefits that the electorate of Mawson now offers its constituents. Particularly, I want to speak about Neighbourhood Watch and Rural Watch.

Before coming to office, I was well aware of the enormous backlog of Neighbourhood Watch and Rural Watch requests for groups to be set up in the electorate of Mawson. Whilst I understand that back in 1993 there were approximately 200 applications for different Neighbourhood Watch areas to be set up, I have been lucky enough to be involved in the launch of seven Neighbourhood Watch groups and one Rural Watch group in my electorate.

The important and significant factor with respect to these programs is that this is the community getting involved in looking after its own community safety and interests. If you think about Neighbourhood Watch and Rural Watch and the concept behind it, it is something that is not new. It has been in the rural areas in which I have lived ever since I was a youngster. It is really the principle of keeping an eye on your neighbour's property and welfare. It is something that has been adopted right across the State and has been clearly shown to be of benefit to the community.

If members look at the insurance premium reductions now available, and the crime statistics put out by the Attorney-General's Office of Crime Statistics, they will note that, where these Neighbourhood Watch and Rural Watch areas are set up, there is a reduction in crime of up to 8 per cent, which is very important. In my electorate, with the great support of the local police and what was the Noarlunga City Council and now the City of Happy Valley, Noarlunga and Willunga, and committed community members, we have seen a magnificent improvement in not only community safety observance through Neighbourhood Watch but also in building up community pride and spirit in the region.

I have a lot of new, fast growing areas such as Woodcroft in my electorate, where people from all ages and walks of life come together, so it is very important that we have a peek body to help direct that community spirit and development. I have been able to witness barbeques and support for the provision of a trailer which I hope the regional Neighbourhood Watch will be successful with in the very near future, and generally the community looking after the development of their own interests.

I also commend the police officers who are coordinators. They do this in their own time as volunteers. Police officers are not out there just to get a salary. They are committed professional people who get out and often work beyond and above the call of duty. I know that my colleagues, including the member for Newland, agree with me in terms of the extraordinary efforts that police officers have put into Neighbourhood Watch and Rural Watch for some time, often finishing a week of night shift and returning the next night to spend time with the community.

I also congratulate the area coordinators, an unpaid but very important position. Also there are the zone leaders and the walkers, those people who distribute the newsletters month after month. People need to realise that, whilst we need to continue to improve policing and as we get our State debt down, even more will happen. We have the great news that an additional 165 police officers will come in over the next 12 months, and in particular 25 officers will come to the South Coast Police Station, formerly known as the Christies Beach Police Station, and the $2.7 million upgrade. However, the bottom line is that the police cannot be everywhere all the time.

Whilst some members in this House are deliberately misleading in relation to how long it takes police officers to respond to call outs, I know that police officers in my electorate are extremely diligent and vigilant when it comes to emergency calls. The community knows that. We have a great community down south, and Neighbourhood Watch and Rural Watch are definitely part of that. The final point I raise is the success we have had with graffiti wipe-out programs—a three tiered approach through State Government, council and community members. I congratulate them on their efforts.

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

Mr CLARKE (Deputy Leader of the Opposition): I will read into *Hansard* a letter I received from the Secretary of the Australian Manufacturing Workers Union in response to allegations made earlier this week in this place under privilege by the member for Reynell. It states:

Thank you for the *Hansard* extract of chamber proceedings of 8 July 1997. What could be fairer than the member for Reynell highlighting inequities and attacks upon social justice? After all, the Party she represents is largely responsible for both. Equally I will not debate the members views upon the abuse of taxpayers funds or corruption, again deferring to her apparently superior acquaintance with such issues. I appreciate how confronting fact may be for the member. However, my union and its members deserve better than her contribution which suffers as it must as a reeking concoction from the garbage of others.

The AMWU National Council, Ralph, as you are aware (upon which is represented all divisions of the union) has determined to support Labor at the next State election and a contribution to that support will be financial assistance. I make the following points:

1. Such donations are not, nor may they be, drawn from the union contributions of AMWU members, but rather are the consequence of a separate and voluntary contribution to a political fund by law externally audited and subject to reporting and scrutiny requirements of both the Funding and Political Contributions Act and the Workplace Relations Act. Democracy and transparency—you may have to repeat this part several times, Ralph.
2. The AMWU is determined to target marginal seats, and the member for Reynell must surely by now have noticed that she and her Party have managed to create far more marginal seats than the four she suggests. If current levels of electoral disenchantment continue, the meagre contribution of the AMWU must be as loaves and fishes.
3. While the AMWU is not, in South Australia, currently an affiliate of the ALP, it has always had the opportunity to have its targeted contributions coordinated through the Party's funding mechanisms and for reportage purposes alone may choose to do so.

I am uncertain as to whether Ms Greig's comment on the temptation to prostitute to a union is rhetorical or given her likely information source is self inquiry. However, how like a pimp, albeit parliamentary, to raise the question.

The member takes the opportunity to make some observations about myself, at least to the extent of one incident that I would have thought was sufficiently public (including the apologies extended to me by a State and national newspaper for similar excesses in their reportage of the matter) to at least have considered, however alien the concept may have been, innocence. An abuse of parliamentary privilege, already evident, could of course extend to seeking ministerial assistance to, although improperly, further and better inform herself on the matter.

I do note that in regard to this issue Ms Greig admits that, whilst not knowing me personally, my reputation exceeds me. In the matter of her immediate interest, she is correct. In other matters, I am not quite so modest. The major disservice the member for Reynell does, of course, is to very deliberately question the viability of the union in this State which I am privileged to lead and which stands between workers and the excesses of her Party. Again in ignoring fact Ms Greig did not bother with the simple expedient of accessing the audited reports and financial statements of the union which are a matter of public record. Nor could it be expected she would understand the collectivism and unity of purpose underpinning a national trade union.

I commend to Ms Greig the recent reportage on financial affairs of the AMWU in the *Financial Review*. When the present State Government is able to show the same financial responsibility to South Australian taxpayers and electors as the AMWU does to its members' hard earned money, the member for Reynell may be better placed to offer criticism.

To the promotion of wage claims, I plead guilty, whether inflated is a matter against whose they are valued. The claims are those of the very workers, the focus of Ms Greig's purported concern. I note the powers of precognition of Ms Greig in her comments upon union elections. Given as yet no election has been called, I am left to assume either her potted piece was delivered a little early, or is an announcement of her campaign status for what she describes as the alternative to my leadership. I can imagine that Ms Greig, her Party and the alternative have much in common. Ms Greig may be assured that the future viability of South Australian car plants, as with large elements of remaining industry in this State, relies upon and will be delivered by the combined action of workers with their unions and parliamentary comrades.

Finally, in referring to the *Hansard* extract, for probably the only time, I agree with the comment of the Deputy Speaker, 'The honourable member's time has expired'.

Yours in solidarity,

(signed) Mick Tumbers, State Secretary.

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

Mr LEWIS (Ridley): I wish to address two matters today, the first of which is the subject of fuel pricing in Murray Bridge and elsewhere in my electorate. The other matter to which I wish to draw the attention of the House is that of the iniquitous levy which we impose upon people who live well below the poverty line in order to collect revenue to maintain the dog fence in the north.

On the first matter, for some time the Australian Competition and Consumer Commission, along with ministerial officers in South Australia, have been monitoring the pricing position in Murray Bridge, in particular, and other places in my electorate in general. I now call on them to do that formally, and no longer leave it to informal consideration. I am well satisfied that they have a matter of grave public importance to investigate, in that it is my belief that the oil companies, without any spoken or written agreement between each other, have, nonetheless, in the classic fashion of cartels, arrived at a position where they will not engage in a price war with each other. In other words, they maintain higher wholesale pricing arrangements of supplies delivered to those markets without the competition that otherwise applies in the metropolitan area.

Indeed, it is a fact that the oil companies are subsidising their price discounting war in the metropolitan area from the profits they make from country people in towns like Murray Bridge. It is a fact that they are making substantial profits, per unit volume sales, in those markets in rural South Australia in general, and in Murray Bridge and other places like it in particular, which enables them to engage in a price war in the metropolitan area. How is it otherwise that the State Government forgoes the licence franchise fee on fuel delivered to the distributors and the service stations in Murray Bridge of something close to 5¢—indeed, in the case of Murray Bridge, 4.7¢ a litre—and it costs only 2¢ a litre to get the fuel to Murray Bridge?

Why is it that the retail price in Murray Bridge is consistently 10¢ to 15¢ a litre higher? Why is that considered to be fair and reasonable competition in the marketplace? Clearly, it is not. Someone somewhere ought to stand up and say so. I have done so, but I have waited for a long time for the retailers to stand up and say, 'We are being screwed.' They have failed to do that, so I now do it on their behalf, and any of them who would deny it can say so. I would be quite happy for them to stand up and say that they are not paying those exorbitantly high prices for the fuel they get at wholesale levels. If it is good enough to have discount wars in the metropolitan area, it is equally fair and good enough to pass on the same kind of competition for the consumer dollar to places like Murray Bridge.

Mr Venning: Hear, hear!

Mr LEWIS: I am grateful for the indication of support that I have in that matter from my neighbour, the member for

Custance. I now wish to draw attention to a problem that exists in the Mallee area, where it is not possible to make a living from anything less than about 2 500 acres (which is about 1 000 hectares, or 10 square kilometres). Yet, if you own one square centimetre over 10 square kilometres in the Mallee—barely enough to make a living—you must pay a levy towards the maintenance cost of the dog fence, whereas your carrying capacity, if you are running stock, is very much lower than the South-East, Lower Eyre Peninsula, the Mid North, Yorke Peninsula and the Hills where they do not pay any levy. More particularly, many farms in the Mallee do not own livestock—there is no livestock on those farms. The situation is so stupid that in Coonawarra, where the vineyard area owned by one company exceeds 1 000 hectares, they must pay a levy to keep dingoes out of the inside country. How quaint!

The Hon. R.B. SUCH (Fisher): Today I would like to acknowledge the support given recently by the Minister for Education and Children's Services (Hon. Robert Lucas) in providing $157 000 towards the expansion of The Hub Library in my electorate. That money is most welcome, and it will add to the $558 000 provided by the former Happy Valley council, which is now part of the soon to be called City South—and I trust that it will get its genuine name shortly, but it is currently called the City of Happy Valley, Noarlunga and Willunga. The money was also supplemented by $190 000 provided by the friends of that library. It is a joint use library, shared by the school and the community, and it is a wonderful example of the school and the community working together.

However, the library has become far too small for the demands placed upon it. In my electorate, as members would know, the constituents are above average in occupation and education, and that is reflected in their intensive use of the library. The time has come when the library needs to be expanded. I would like to pay tribute to all of the people involved. Whilst it needs formal ratification by the new council—and I trust that in the not too distant future it will agree to that package provided by the Hon. Rob Lucas—I believe that we are in sight of seeing a wonderful expanded facility in my area. There has been some suggestion that the old council chambers be used instead of a new expanded facility, or an expansion to the current library. I totally reject that, as does the high school community, the friends and the wider community. In fact, that suggestion, in my view, is a red herring, a furphy, and it should be ignored.

I would like to pay tribute to the Chief Librarian, Sue Perkins, for her contribution and that of all her staff in supporting this project; Mr Alex Smith, who chairs the Friends of The Hub Library; Mr John Gregory, the Principal of the Aberfoyle Park High School; Mr Mark Leahy, the chairperson of the school council; Mr John Christie, the former CEO of Happy Valley council; Mr Trevor Fletcher, the former Mayor of that council; and the elected members. With all those people working together, we have been able to obtain a significant grant from the Minister, which will go towards that much needed facility.

Members would appreciate the value of libraries, and I believe that in our society, with the move towards information technology, it is important that we continue to upgrade those sorts of facilities to ensure that they are available to the whole population. In an area which is predominantly made up of young people, we nevertheless have an increasing number of retired people who wish to access the library and, therefore, extra room and facilities are needed to cater for their needs. It has been somewhat of a long process—and I know that funds are always difficult to secure from any Government—but in recent weeks the Minister has written to me, indicating that he will make available $157 000.

The matter of the airconditioning has still to be resolved. Whenever you add to an old building, you have the problem of integrating the old with the new. Currently DECS is responsible for the airconditioning in the old, and that raises the issue of who pays for the integration with the new. I believe we can overcome that little hiccup with a bit of sensible discussion, and I trust that the matter of the airconditioning and the shared costs relating to that can be sorted out in the very near future.

I mentioned City South earlier, the name for the southern council. That has been subject to a temporary delay. I believe the council wants to use that name, and I believe that its wish should be acceded to. I was delighted to see Ray Gilbert, the Mayor of the new council (the former Mayor of the City of Noarlunga) visiting Parliament today. I wish that new council, its staff and all elected members the very best, as it constitutes the largest council in this State, representing something like 10 per cent of the population of South Australia.

Whilst it will mean further travel for me, I believe that it is a very enlightened decision that reflects highly on the people involved in the process who put the public interest before their own selfish interests and were prepared to look at the bigger picture and approach this matter with a vision for the south, culminating in the creation of the new council.

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

Ms STEVENS (Elizabeth): Today, during Question Time I asked the Minister for Family and Community Services to explain a breakdown in financial procedures in relation to 167 officers of his department being authorised to sign cheques at seven offices. The Opposition has received a copy of an interim report of the Auditor-General. In the section relating to cheque signatories, the report states:

> External confirmation of the department's cheque signatories of all bank accounts revealed:
>
> - numerous instances where terminated employees had not been removed as cheque signatories;
> - instances where officers registered as cheque signatories had subsequently transferred to other areas within the department where they were no longer required to remain as cheque signatories;
> - officers from the concessions section were still listed as cheque signatories of bank account 52008-0 notwithstanding the concession cheques ceased being disbursed from this account in September 1995;
> - excessive number of officers listed as cheque signatories. Examples include: Marion, 46 officers; Port Pirie, 30 officers; Murray Bridge, 24 officers (as at 22 February 1996); Gawler, 21 officers; Adelaide, 21 officers; Port Augusta, 13 officers (as at 23 December 1996); and Enfield, 12 officers.
> - inadequate segregation of duties: receiver of revenue (ROR) is a cheque signatory of advance account two as well as being responsible for the banking of moneys into the advance account; and advance account reconciliation officers are recorded as cheque signatories.
> - Manager, Accounting Services is signing cheques on advance account two notwithstanding that the officer was not recorded as cheque signatory on the confirmation received from the RBA.
>
> Recommendation: The department needs to review all aspects of establishing and monitoring cheque signatories. This should include:
>
> - establishing a complete and accurate listing of all cheque signatories of all bank accounts utilised by the department;

- only necessary officers being nominated as cheque signatories;
- adequate segregation of responsibilities between cheque signatories key finance responsibilities;
- terminated employees being removed as registered cheque signatories on a timely basis.

It was interesting that when I put the question to the Minister, from memory, he simply said that any concerns that exist now relate to the time of the Labor Government. It is timely for us to remember that this Minister and this Government have been in office for nearly four years. So, that stock reply of this Minister and many other members of this Government is wearing a bit thin. It is time for members opposite to take responsibility for the events and actions that have occurred while they have been at the helm.

In his last two reports, the Auditor-General indicated concern with the Department for Family and Community Services in a whole range of areas regarding financial controls. In last year's report, the Auditor-General states:

> Despite the department allocating further resources to the performance of a reconciliation, it had not been achieved as at 30 June 1996.

I look forward to reading the Auditor-General's Report this year, because I understand that at this time he has refused to sign off on the department's finances. I hope that the Minister gets his house in order immediately.

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

Mr ROSSI (Lee): I must pick up on the previous speaker's comments on the way in which the Department for Family and Community Services is being run. The honourable member should realise that public servants are full-time employees and they have various supervisory positions from the Minister down. The Minister does not always know everything that is happening in the department. The Minister relies on trusting public servants to use their authority properly, and most of those officers in positions of authority were appointed by the previous Labor Government. The Opposition is attacking members of its own union (the Public Service Association) and, if members opposite wish to criticise departmental activities, let them do so without the hypocrisy they have been displaying.

My predecessor Mr Kevin Hamilton seems to tickle me when I am asleep. In the electorate I represent Mr Hamilton stood as a councillor for the Charles Sturt Council. He regularly puts out newsletters which confuse me as to whether he is a councillor or still a member of Parliament. He makes assertions in those newsletters stating how the youth of the west have been badly treated by the Liberal Government. The Minister for the Ageing will report to me regarding some of the questions posed in those newsletters.

In the spring of 1993, Mr Hamilton commented in a pamphlet about a children's park opposite 63 Gordon Street, Albert Park, which is just behind the SABCO premises and just before the old Philips complex. In the winter of 1995, the residents of Albert Park and the council had a meeting at the Lutheran Church in Botting Street. The residents decided that they wanted to establish a playground on the old indoor cricket premises at the corner of Glyde Street and Malin Street, Albert Park. The Mayor, John Dyer, took the recommendations of the residents back to the council. Nothing has been heard since.

The council was due to publish a report on the whole Hindmarsh Woodville council area following consultation with the residents on the zoning they required. This report was supposed to be handed down in July 1996. It was then supposed to be handed down in September 1996 after the Chief Executive Officer had reviewed the report. Until now, I and the residents of the former Hindmarsh Woodville city council have not seen the report, and it has not been tabled.

When I contacted the council, I was told by the Chief Executive Officer that the whole report would be published as soon as the residents of the amalgamated Henley and Grange and Hindmarsh Woodville councils (now known as the Charles Sturt Council) had been consulted and a survey undertaken of the whole area. In the meantime, whilst this has been going on, land at the corner of Murray Street, which originally was vacant with gravel ground cover, has been sold for a semi-trailer parking depot.

The council did not act quickly enough to satisfy the residents of Albert Park, who have been without a children's park for over 35 years. In the meantime the Hindmarsh Woodville council has sold small parcels of land and put that money into general revenue instead of channelling it back into the community for new and bigger parks with playground equipment. Most of the parks available in the Seaton and Woodville West area have no playground equipment, and it is about time the council got out of the Taj Mahal it built on Woodville Road and started representing the people and doing things in the best interests of the residents of Charles Sturt.

RETAIL SHOP LEASES AMENDMENT BILL

Consideration in Committee of the Legislative Council's message—that it had disagreed to the House of Assembly's amendments.

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

> That the House of Assembly's amendments be insisted upon.

We have had a long and vital debate in this House about the issue of retail leasing and the time at which the new arrangements should take place. It is now appropriate for that matter to be considered at a conference.

Mr CLARKE: The Opposition strongly supports the amendment made by another place, but nonetheless recognises that all parties' interests would be best served if a conference of both houses can be arranged as quickly as possible.

Motion carried.

LIQUOR LICENSING BILL

Consideration in Committee of the Legislative Council's message—that it had agreed to amendment No.1 and had disagreed to amendments Nos 2 and 3 made by the House of Assembly.

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

> That the House of Assembly's amendments Nos 2 and 3 be insisted upon.

The two amendments we believe are appropriate, vital and germane and should be included in the Bill, whose effect will suffer if it is not passed with those amendments contained therein. We therefore insist upon our amendments.

Mr CLARKE: Again, the Opposition supports the position put by another place with respect to the amendments

and likewise believes that it is best resolved through a conference of both Houses of Parliament.

Motion carried.

MOTOR VEHICLES (FARM IMPLEMENTS AND MACHINES) AMENDMENT BILL

Received from the Legislative Council and read a first time.

ROAD TRAFFIC (EXPRESSWAYS) AMENDMENT BILL

Received from the Legislative Council and read a first time.

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

A quorum having been formed:

STATUTES REPEAL AND AMENDMENT (DEVELOPMENT)(ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT STATEMENTS) AMENDMENT BILL

The Hon. S.J. BAKER (Minister for Housing and Urban Development) obtained leave and introduced a Bill for an Act to amend the Statutes Repeal and Amendment (Development) Act 1993. Read a first time.

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

That this Bill be now read a second time.

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

Leave granted.

The *Development Act 1993*, together with the associated *Statutes Repeal and Amendment (Development) Act 1993*, and related regulations came into operation on 15 January 1994 setting in place a new integrated development assessment system.

Last year the Government sought to make a series of important changes to the *Development Act* in order to provide a greater certainty and better outcomes for proponents and the community at large, especially in relation to the assessment procedures for Major Developments and Projects. These changes were included in the *Development (Major Development Assessment) Amendment Act 1996*, which was assented to by the Governor in August 1996 and came into operation on 2 January 1997.

Under the new provisions for the assessment of Major Developments or Projects the Minister responsible for the *Development Act* must make a declaration in the *Gazette* pursuant to section 46 to trigger the assessment process. This differs from the original provisions of the *Development Act*, which allowed the Governor to make a similar declaration in specified circumstances pursuant to the former section 48 but did not provide for any Ministerial declaration.

Transitional provisions were included in the *Development (Major Development Assessment) Amendment Act*. These were intended to give the Governor the power to determine proposals begun under the *Development Act* in the years 1994 to 1996 without the need to recommence the assessment process under the new provisions.

Unfortunately, the transitional provisions passed by Parliament last year have recently been identified by the Crown Solicitor as inadequate. This is because they do not make provision for the continuing processing of a proposal in circumstances where an Environmental Impact Statement was requested by the Minister under the former section 46 of the *Development Act* and there was no declaration by the Governor in the *Gazette* under former section 48.

The transitional problem relates specifically to two proposals, both of which have been the subject of the preparation and public exhibition of Environmental Impact Statements as requested by the Minister under the former section 46 provisions. These are the Inkerman Landfill Depot (proposed by Path Line Australia Pty Ltd) and the Dublin Northern Balefill (proposed by IWS Pty Ltd). Since no declarations were made by the Governor under former section 48 for either of these proposals prior to the new assessment procedures coming into operation earlier this year, there is currently uncertainty as to the relevant authority to determine them.

This omission is proposed to be rectified in the Bill by technical amendments to the Statutes Repeal and Amendment (Development) Act 1993 clarifying the Governor's transitional decision making powers. The amendments will ensure that the Governor can determine both the Inkerman and Dublin proposals, once the relevant documentation has been completed.

The Government has also taken the opportunity in the Bill to correct a typographical error in the *Statutes Repeal and Amendment (Development) Act*. The Bill also clarifies existing sections of that Act relating to the determination of proposals where an EIS has been officially recognised under the repealed *Planning Act* and there is a subsequent amendment to the EIS under the *Development Act*. Several proposals begun under the *Planning Act* have the potential to come within this category.

The purpose of this Bill is solely to clarify technical matters and correct an oversight in the transitional provisions relating to the determination of Major Developments. It does not introduce any new policy initiatives or alter the manner in which Major Developments or Projects are to be assessed.

Explanation of Clauses

Clause 1: Short title

This clause is formal.

Clause 2: Commencement

The Act will be taken to have come into operation on 2 January 1997, being the day on which the *Development (Major Development Assessment) Amendment Act 1996* came into operation. The retrospective operation of these provisions is appropriate to ensure that there is no uncertainty as to the status of any environmental impact statement or development assessment process since 2 January 1997 and on the basis that these amendments are technical amendments intended to address and clarify issues that have arisen since the commencement of that amending Act.

Clause 3: Amendment of s. 18—Transitional provisions—Environmental impact statements

This clause contains various amendments relating to the recognition of environmental impact statements and the assessment of developments that are subject to environmental impact statements.

Paragraph *(a)* is a minor wording correction.

Paragraph *(b)* makes it clear that section 18(3) includes in its operation an environmental impact statement that has been amended under the *Development Act 1993* (a position that is entirely consistent with the scheme under the *Development Act 1993*).

Paragraph *(c)* provides for an amendment to ensure consistency with proposed new subsection (7).

Paragraph *(d)* is intended to avoid any argument that the amendment of an environmental impact statement under Division 2 of Part 4 of the *Development Act 1993* will somehow then exclude it from the operation of the Division.

Paragraph *(e)* will comprehensively address other relevant transitional issues concerning environmental impact statements following the enactment of the *Development (Major Development Assessment) Amendment Act 1993*. New subsection (6) will complement section 18(2) of the principal Act and section 14(1) of the *Development (Major Development Assessment) Amendment Act 1993* to provide expressly that a requirement for an environmental impact statement under section 46 before the commencement of that amending Act will continue in force and effect as if it were a determination of the Major Developments Panel (and then be subject to the operation of the new provisions).

New subsection (7) will make it absolutely clear that a development that is the subject of an environmental impact statement will be assessed under section 48 of the *Development Act 1993* in all circumstances.

Ms HURLEY (Napier): This is retrospective legislation that clarifies some transitional provisions with the Development Act. Prior to 1993, a Planning Act was in force and when that was replaced by the Development Act 1993 there were certain transition provisions. Subsequently in 1996, the major project section of the Development Act was put in and, again, transitional provisions applied. There is now some query as to whether major developments under the 1993 Act are then assessed and decided upon under the arrangements for major projects under the Development Act 1996. This legislation has been introduced to allow a smooth transition

between those two Acts. In particular, an EIS which was determined by the Minister under section 46 of the 1993 Act is now, under the Development Act 1996, able to be treated as though it was an EIS determined by the major development panel, and the decision making runs according to that formula.

The Opposition supported the inclusion of the major projects section in amended form. The amendments were to safeguard public interest and allow sufficient public consultation. Basically, the Opposition approved the section which seemed to us would allow major projects in the State to be developed in a responsible and orderly way and not be held up unduly by having to do a full EIS or being unduly trammelled by too much regulation and time spent in bureaucratic procedures. Having made that decision to support the major projects section, we have carefully considered this legislation since it is retrospective, but, on the basis that it is only to clarify the transitional provisions, we are prepared to support the amendment to the Statutes Repeal and Amendment (Development) Act such that the major projects section will be allowed to give its proper force with existing projects only.

The Hon. S.J. BAKER (Minister for Housing and Urban Development): I thank the member for Napier for her comments. I appreciate the accommodation provided by the Opposition on this matter. At the time of the 1996 Act it was believed that there was no need to provide this sort of transitional provision, which we are now placing within the Bill, to enable projects to be considered. The only difficulty with that assumption is that it was wrong. A number of EISs that had been commenced under declaration by the Minister had not gone through Executive Council, and that placed those projects at risk, because they did not conform to the 1996 Act and, of course, the 1992 Act was no longer relevant. The Government suddenly discovered that it was not possible to continue the process commenced previously without being inconsistent with the 1996 Act. There was an oversight at the time; it has to be repaired.

There are at least two areas involved. Rubbish dumps, for example, demand an EIS; we have to have an EIS for a rubbish dump. They were called in under the previous Act. They are not necessarily major developments as such, but they are now under the major developments section. In these areas it is a right of natural justice that, if the will of the Parliament was consistent with what it wished at the time, it is appropriate to ensure that the rights and responsibilities that were implied or given at the time are carried out. Our legal advice is that there was no transition provision which allowed those items that were subject to an EIS to be considered under the new Act. The EIS provisions are under the major development section of the Act. It is appropriate to put in transitional provisions that will cater for that. That means that those already in there do not have to go through a whole new procedure under the new Act. I appreciate the accommodation by the Opposition in this regard.

Bill read a second time.

In Committee.

Clauses 1 and 2 passed.

Clause 3.

Ms HURLEY: I want to clarify a couple of points in paragraph (e). What are the different provisions regarding new subsections (6) and (7)? New subsection (6) allows the assessment to continue in force as though it were a determination of the major developments panel. Does that apply to developments commenced before the 1996 Act came into effect?

The Hon. S.J. BAKER: Yes.

Ms HURLEY: In relation to new subsection (7), by virtue of the operation of section 46 or 48 of the Development Act 1993, a development that is the subject of an environmental impact statement is assessed under section 48 of the Development Act. Why is it that section 48 of the 1993 Act cannot be used to assess that development?

The Hon. S.J. BAKER: Yes, that section was repealed on 2 January; therefore, one of the problems is that we cannot use it any more.

Ms HURLEY: Are there any transition provisions in place that allow a section 46 determination to be determined anywhere else under the 1996 Act?

The Hon. S.J. BAKER: The answer clearly is 'No.' That is why we have to go through this process, and I appreciate the consideration by the honourable member. In my second reading contribution, I was referring to the 1993 Act and not the 1992 Act when I responded to the honourable member.

Clause passed.

Title passed.

Bill read a third time and passed.

JOINT COMMITTEE ON LIVING RESOURCES

Adjourned debate on motion of Hon. D.C. Wotton:

That the final report of the Joint Committee on Living Resources be noted.

(Continued from 8 July. Page 1814.)

Mr CLARKE (Deputy Leader of the Opposition): The member for Torrens was a member of the committee and would have liked to be here today to comment on the report. Unfortunately, due to ill health, she is unable to be with us; however, she has supplied me with notes so that I can convey her views to the House. As has been said already, the committee first met in May 1994 and it was intended to report in December that year. However, the committee quickly realised the task before it was far greater than imagined or expected and more time was required to allow for broader consultation with community and industry groups if the committee were to do proper justice to the task. I interpose by saying that anything to do with the Minister for the Environment and Natural Resources would move at a glacial pace.

The committee's interim report has been expanded upon into the final report, which is a very comprehensive and detailed document. Members should take the time to read the report, which was developed after considerable discussion and sensible compromise by members of the committee. The member for Torrens wanted to convey her gratitude to the many individuals and groups who gave evidence to the committee and she thanks them for their time because often their evidence, she informs me, opened up other avenues for discussion which also took up further time of the committee but did assist it greatly in its deliberations. The member for Torrens also advises me that she looks forward to the committee's recommendations and guidelines being taken up.

Like all of us, the member for Torrens recognised that our future and that of our children depends on our protecting and being mindful of our environment. We all hope that this report will do so by recognising the value of our natural environment in a more educated and informed way. The member for Torrens asked me to convey her gratitude to the

staff and researchers, who worked with the committee over the exceptionally long period for the report to be published, for their exceptional work, patience and understanding. I add my comments to those expressed by me on behalf of the member for Torrens.

The Hon. D.C. WOTTON (Minister for the Environment and Natural Resources): In closing the debate I would like to thank those members who have contributed. I regret that the member for Torrens was not able to participate in the debate, but I thank the Deputy Leader for speaking on her behalf. The member for Torrens, along with all members of the committee, contributed significantly to the committee. As I pointed out in my opening statement, the committee was set up as a result of the Liberal Party's environment and natural resources policy and the commitment in that policy to facilitate the development of a strategy for the conservation and development of the State's living resources. As I said before—and it is not my intention to go through all of the points that I raised—it was very pleasing, recognising that we had members from all of the Parties that make up both Houses: Government, Opposition and Democrat members. No votes were needed during the entire proceedings of the committee as everything was determined by consensus. I am very pleased with the report's contents. I commend the report to the House and I thank those members who contributed significantly. I thank the people who gave evidence to the committee and again I would like to acknowledge the significant commitment made by Dr Jackie Venning, Research Assistant, Mr Malcolm Lehman, Parliamentary Officer, and Mr Andrew Valentine, from the Bills and Papers Office, for their strong support.

Motion carried.

RETAIL SHOP LEASES AMENDMENT BILL

The Legislative Council requested a conference, at which it would be represented by five managers, on a House of Assembly amendment to which it had disagreed.

The House of Assembly agreed to a conference, to be held in the King William Room at 4.45 p.m. today, at which it would be represented by Messrs Atkinson and S.J. Baker, Ms Hurley, Messrs Oswald and Venning.

LIQUOR LICENSING BILL

The Legislative Council requested a conference, at which it would be represented by five managers, on the House of Assembly amendments to which it had disagreed.

The House of Assembly agreed to a conference to be held in the King William Room at 4 p.m., Monday, 21 July, at which it would be represented by Messrs Atkinson, S.J. Baker, Brindal, Clarke and Scalzi.

ADJOURNMENT

At 4.59 p.m. the House adjourned until Tuesday 22 July at 2 p.m.

HOUSE OF ASSEMBLY

Tuesday 8 July 1997

QUESTION ON NOTICE

JULIA FARR CENTRE

14. **Ms STEVENS:**

1. What is the agreed position with the board of the Julia Farr Centre concerning the implementation of the recommendations of the Ernst and Young Report?

2. What are the details of the timetable for implementation of the agreed recommendations?

3. What are the details of progress to date?

The Hon. M.H. ARMITAGE:

1. Consultants, Ernst and Young, undertook a two stage optional review of Julia Farr Services. The first stage of the review, completed in September 1993, involved an analysis of the organisation's operations and the identification of immediate strategies to improve effectiveness and efficiency. The second stage of the review, completed in April 1994, was concerned with further long term opportunities for such improvements and the development of a long term operational plan for the organisation. The second stage of the review outlined 47 recommendations aimed at achieving these two objectives.

As part of the Ernst and Young Review, the proposed future role and function of Julia Farr services was defined as 'providing short term rehabilitation and long term care and support fo adults with acquired brain injury and adults with significant disability arising from degenerative neurological conditions.' This role was agreed with the board of Julia Farr Services and the Disability Services Office of the South Australian Health Commission.

The recommendations from the Ernst and Young review will result in significant net savings to Julia Farr services. These savings are targeted to expand services to people with a disability living in the community.

Many of the recommendations from the Ernst and Young Review have been superseded by the introduction of Options Coordination Agencies. These agencies focus on helping people with a disability obtain services specific to their needs.

2. The Ernst and Young Stage Two report was endorsed by the board of Julia Farr Services, the Disability Services Office and the South Australian Health Commission in July 1994. An implementation schedule was developed with a view to the implementation of the 47 recommendations from the report by December 1995. An evaluation of the phase 1 implementation was then to occur over the ensuing six months, with a view to detailed planning for phase 2 to commence from June 1996.

By the end of October 1996, all residents at Julia Farr Services under the age of 65 years were contacted by an options coordinator to determine their preferences for relocation and to discuss with them their options for the future.

Initial details of service requirements for those clients have been collated by options coordination and individual support plans are being prepared for all residents who wish to be relocated to alternative community-based accommodation.

3. Following the implementation of a number of recommendations from the Ernst and Young Review, over $490,000 in recurrent savings were achieved during the 1994-95 financial year. A further $2 million in savings was achieved by 30 June 1996. Over $1.6 million of this amount relates to the internal relocation of residents and the resultant closure of three wards at the Fisher Street site.

Recommendations 5, 11, 12 and 13 from this report were concerned with a review of nursing practices now in place at Julia Farr Services, particularly in relation to issues such as rostering arrangements, shift patterns, staffing numbers and skills mix of nursing staff.

In cooperation with the Disability Services Office, Julia Farr Services arranged for an independent review of its nursing services based upon other successful nursing models used within other health units funded by the South Australian Health Commission. The board of Julia Farr Services has accepted, in principle, the recommendations of the review and asked that the chief executive officer of Julia Farr Services develop an implementation strategy, including consultation with relevant unions, to achieve full implementation during 1997.

KPMG Consultants were engaged to verify the savings achieved to date by Julia Farr Services, following the implementation of phase 1 of the Ernst and Young operation review stage 2 report, and to ascertain the capacity for further savings. This report was completed in November 1996. This review identified savings of $8.4 million.

A number of meetings have been held between the management of Julia Farr Services, representatives from the South Australian Health Commission Human Resources Division, the Disability Services Office and the Australian Nurses Federation to identify the process required to implement the recommendations of the Nursing Review. As at the 31 December 1996 there had been a reduction of 169.48 full-time equivalents in the number of nursing staff employed at Julia Farr Services mainly through natural attrition.

To assist Julia Farr Services in implementing the recommendations further, and to ensure the speedy development of alternative services in the community, the Disability Services Office has developed (in conjunction with Julia Farr Services and the Options Coordination agencies involved) a detailed planning interface document that outlines the tasks and responsibilities required for determining future service arrangements with Julia Farr Services, including the JFS residential services.

All residents from Julia Farr Services under the age of 65 years have been contacted and offered the opportunity to discuss their choices in relocation to the community with an Option Coordinator (with the exception of one or two new admissions).

Priority is being given to the 19 residents who are anxious to leave Julia Farr Services as soon as possible, and Options Coordinators are currently developing comprehensive support plans for these individuals.

A second group of approximately 35 residents, who have indicated a willingness to move soon, will have support plans completed during 1997.