

HOUSE OF ASSEMBLY

Wednesday 14 September 1988

ESTIMATES COMMITTEE B

Chairman:

The Hon. T.M. McRae

Members:

The Hon. R.K. Abbott
 Mr S.J. Baker
 The Hon. T. Chapman
 Mr K.C. Hamilton
 Mr E.J. Meier
 Mr K.H. Plunkett

The Committee met at 11 a.m.

Labour, \$13 525 000

Witness:

The Hon. R.J. Gregory, Minister of Labour.

Departmental Advisers:

Mr H. Bachmann, Director, Department of Labour.
 Mr A. Dangerfield, Assistant Director, Industrial Affairs.
 Mr G. Billett, Manager, Administration and Finance Branch.
 Ms Gay Thompson, Women's Adviser.
 Mr C. Mickle, Chairperson, Occupational Health and Safety Commission.
 Ms J. Powning, Deputy Chairperson, Occupational Health and Safety Commission.

The CHAIRMAN: I declare the proposed expenditure open for examination.

The Hon. R.J. Gregory: As the previous Minister of Labour advised this Committee last year, 1987-88 saw the successful implementation of the Occupational Health, Safety and Welfare Act 1986. That legislation, together with the establishment of WorkCover under the Workers Rehabilitation and Compensation Act 1986, has resulted in significant improvements in the rights and conditions of both employers and employees in South Australia. In this regard, the 1988-89 budget provides an additional \$263 000 for the Occupational Health and Safety Commission. This covers two additional staff and increased operating funds for publicity and promotion. It is vital that all areas of the work force are fully aware of both their rights and responsibilities regarding all aspects of occupational health and safety matters contained in the new legislation.

The budget provides ongoing funding for the 18 inspectorial and support staff provided in 1987-88. The 1988-89 budget also includes \$1.2 million for the administration component of the Government Insurance Service Program. Previously this was shown only in the PPB papers. This program now brings together the three areas of compensation, prevention and rehabilitation, and includes \$121 000 for an additional four staff and \$213 000 for a major upgrading of computer facilities. It also highlights the strong efforts being made to dramatically reduce the high cost of compensation for Government workers in South Australia. Initiatives, such as the Alan Bruce Risk Management Program, introduced in 1987-88, have already made a signifi-

cant impact in this area. Other initiatives are planned for other major Government agencies in 1988-89.

Other significant developments proposed for 1988-89 include: the provision of a further \$80 000 grant to the United Trades and Labor Council of South Australia to co-ordinate the training of job representatives in occupational health and safety, the provision of an additional \$16 000 for the continuation of the Social Justice Outworkers project, two additional staff for the Industrial Court and Commission to monitor and receipt transcript fees introduced in 1988-89, and the continued development and implementation of the Justice Information System. Using the JIS, it is estimated that the costs to produce the *Industrial Gazette* have been reduced from \$280 000 in 1987-88 to \$100 000 in 1988-89.

The mainstream functions performed by the department are continually monitored and developed to respond to changes in legislation and the impact that this has on all areas of the workplace. In addition, as part of the overall budget process, some operations of the department will be rationalised in 1988-89. These include the amalgamation of the eastern and central regional offices and their relocation to Kent Town and the transfer of the Gas Act program to the Department of Mines and Energy.

In summary, the \$13.5 million allocation for the Department of Labour in 1988-89 as shown in the Estimates of Payments includes: salaries and on costs, \$8.5 million; accommodation and service costs, \$1.5 million; general operating expenses, \$1.6 million; reporting services \$0.7 million; *Industrial Gazette* \$0.1 million; grants—Occupational Health and Safety Commission, \$0.6 million, and various organisations, \$0.15 million; office machines—departmental, \$20 000, and the Workers Compensation Office, \$213 000; the Workers Compensation Tribunal and medical review committees, \$25 000; and overseas visits, \$10 000.

However, in comparing these details with the Program Estimates, members are reminded that they do not include other payments made by and on behalf of the department, such as: special Acts relating to the Minister and judges and magistrates of the Industrial Court, \$0.7 million; the Long Service Leave (Building Industry) fund, \$3.3 million; the Government Insurance Fund, \$38.2 million; interagency support services such as debt servicing and maintenance by the Department of Housing and Construction, \$338 000; and the transfer of the silicosis fund to WorkCover and other minor deposit accounts, \$6.26 million. The impact of these areas increases the total 1988-89 recurrent expenditure for programs under the Department of Labour as shown in the Program Estimates to \$62.3 million.

Mr S.J. BAKER: In relation to program 1 on page 159 of the Estimates of Payments under the heading 'Industrial/occupational licensing and/or regulation', can the Minister explain the over-expenditure on salaries and wages in 1987-88?

The Hon. R.J. Gregory: I will ask Mr Bachmann to respond to that question.

Mr Bachmann: That situation was brought about by the impact of salary increases, which occurred during the year, and staffing variations in that program.

Mr S.J. BAKER: Every department has to cater for wage increases and variations. Can the Minister be more specific as to why the budget was overshot by more than 25 per cent?

Mr Bachmann: I can be no more specific than refer the honourable member to salary increases during the year. Such increases are not included in the budget, they come out of a separate figure, which is a round sum allowance and added on. In other words, the voted figure accounts

for current salaries rather than potential increases during the year. The staffing variations are where vacancies sometimes occur and are not accounted for in the figures. They are accounted for in salaries voted in each year's budget to cater for vacancies that may occur during the year. We do not know at the beginning of the year where those vacancies will occur.

Mr S.J. BAKER: I can only make the comment that this is one of the few areas where the voted line was exceeded. I think that there is only one other area in relation to this department—that of interagency support—in which the vote has been exceeded. I asked the question because I thought there must have been a very good reason for this situation and I am still mystified.

Can the Minister explain the increased costs of accommodation expected to be borne in the industrial/occupational licensing area for 1988-89? I preface the question by saying that I made a calculation on accommodation and service costs and, leaving out the regulation of gas supply, which is no longer applicable in this area, and the State Government Insurance Service, because that is a new line, the cost of accommodation has risen across the board by over 12 per cent. In some areas there have been substantial savings and other areas there have been substantial increases. Can the Minister explain what has happened in the program 1 budget?

The Hon. R.J. Gregory: Accommodation costs in Adelaide generally have increased and SGIC has increased its charges for the accommodation that the department has in its building. There is some small amount for relocation costs, also.

Mr S.J. BAKER: As a supplementary question, what was the relocation cost?

The Hon. R.J. Gregory: I will ask Mr Bachmann to respond.

Mr Bachmann: There has been some adjustment in all of our accommodation costs which are adjusted each year according to the total expenditure for accommodation allocated for the programs on the basis of the staff involved in those programs. There will be adjustments from time to time within accommodation costs to cater for people when switches in programs are made. It is one of the difficulties in breaking down total expenditure into allocations to each program. In the end it is a somewhat arbitrary assessment based on the full-time equivalents we have had working in that program.

Mr S.J. BAKER: On page 500 of the Program Estimates, reference is made to extended trading hours. Will that be an area of pursuit during 1988-89 and, if so, what initiatives are envisaged?

The Hon. R.J. Gregory: The debate within the community in the past 12 months has demonstrated the diverse attitudes with respect to shop trading hours in South Australia. We, as a Government, have maintained a decision that we will not move to make changes to the Shop Trading Hours Act unless there is a consensus between retailers and the relevant unions. We will continue to seek a consensus between those two bodies.

Mr HAMILTON: What is the incidence of industrial disputation in this State in comparison with the national average and how does it compare with some of the other major industrial States, say, New South Wales and Victoria?

The Hon. R.J. Gregory: The incidence of disputation in South Australia is considerably lower than it is in other States. I have seen figures recently but I cannot recall them accurately, and I would not want to provide answers to the Committee off the top of my head. I assure the Committee that the level of industrial disputation in South Australia is

markedly lower than in the eastern States. We have maintained that record in this State.

Mr HAMILTON: As a supplementary question, can the Committee be provided with details for incorporation in *Hansard*, because it is very important that this be placed on the public record.

The Hon. R.J. Gregory: We could do better than that. When we resume this afternoon, in all probability I could advise the Committee because those statistics are readily available. I have them in another folder.

Mr HAMILTON: On page 504, the Program Estimates, with reference to 'Protection of persons, their right and property—public safety', states:

Identify needs and develop model courses and promotional strategies for training participants at all levels of the occupational health and safety system.

It is further stated:

In conjunction with WorkCover and relevant agencies, to establish a statistical data base and information system as a basis for analysing occupational injury and disease in the South Australian workforce.

What is happening with the Alfreda Rehabilitation Centre at Royal Park? What will be done in terms of occupational health and welfare rehabilitation? I understand that these discussions are currently under way in the Department of Health but it certainly involves the occupational health and welfare area.

The Hon. R.J. Gregory: The Alfreda facilities for rehabilitation would be I believe a contract provided to WorkCover. WorkCover, unfortunately, is not a matter for debate here today. However, I will undertake to get from WorkCover details of the use of Alfreda in workers rehabilitation as I have known for a long time that individual doctors refer people to it for rehabilitation. I will provide the Committee with a detailed response to the member's question.

Mr HAMILTON: I refer to page 502. What is the time delay in bringing section 31 workers compensation and industrial cases before the Industrial Court and Commission and what steps are being taken to reduce these delays?

The Hon. R.J. Gregory: For the matters going to trial, the position is being monitored constantly and the honourable member should bear in mind that that is a significant advance on what was happening previously when there would be a months delay before matters went to trial.

Mr MEIER: I refer to page 500 of the program estimates where the statement is made, under 'Broad Objectives':

To ensure that retail traders observe closing times for shops as set by the Shop Trading Hours Act.

The Minister's predecessor knew of problems that have occurred, particularly at Easter time and on the Saturday after Christmas in some rural areas, where some shopkeepers were not allowed to open. At Easter I was able to help a shopkeeper who did not see the gazettal notice in time. Through urgent representation to the department we managed to get the necessary paper work done. However, last Christmas one shopkeeper, who runs a supermarket and hardware store, had taken the trouble to ring the Department of Labour quite some weeks earlier to ascertain whether Saturday 26 December would be a designated holiday.

He was informed that he would be able to open. However, only a few days before that Saturday a fellow shopkeeper pointed out to him that that day was a designated day (according to the *Government Gazette*) so that he would have to seek special permission to open his shop. He contacted me immediately, and I contacted the department and was told that that shop could not be opened unless the Minister gave personal approval. However, the Minister was not available over the Christmas break and in those circum-

stances the shopkeeper could not open his shop. Will the Minister take action to ensure that these irregularities are resolved? The shops in some towns can open regardless of the official ruling, whereas the shops in other towns seem to come under a different section of the Act and the owners must obtain permission to open their shop. This situation continues to disturb shopkeepers and it certainly does not make my life any easier when I am asked, usually a matter of days before the shopkeeper wants to open his shop, what I can do. If I can do anything, that is fine, but on Saturday 26 December it was not possible to do anything about it.

The Hon. R.J. Gregory: I take it that the member for Goyder was asking whether the Minister would undertake to remove anomalies relating to shopping hours. That is an interesting question from a member of a political Party that did its best to avoid the reorganisation and liberation of shopping hours when the matter was debated in the House of Assembly on two occasions.

The Hon. T. CHAPMAN: The Minister is becoming Party political.

The Hon. R.J. Gregory: No, I am not. In some areas of South Australia shops are exempt from the shop trading hours legislation; the people have made an agreement in that regard. In the areas where problems occur and exemptions are required, the people have been unable to reach agreement. Our Government would welcome from the Liberal Party a commitment to the relaxation of shopping hours so that all shopkeepers could trade without disadvantage.

Mr MEIER: Supplementary to that, I point out that the shops in some towns are exempt from the Act whereas the shops in other towns are not exempt. I was not advocating an amendment to the Act that would apply to the metropolitan area, but I do see anomalies whereby the shopkeepers in some towns do not have to seek exemptions under the Act whereas the shopkeepers in other towns must seek exemptions. What action can shopkeepers or other people take to address this situation? For example, shopkeepers in Moonta and Yorketown do not have to seek exemptions, but shopkeepers in Wallaroo, Maitland and Ardrossan must seek exemptions. Why do those anomalies occur?

The Hon. R.J. Gregory: In some shopping districts there is no control on shopping hours because the shopkeepers and residents in that area have agreed that there will be no controls. In the areas where exemptions must be sought, restrictions apply and, thus, an agreement or an understanding is required. My advice is that a poll of the people in those areas should be held to determine whether they want to be free of restrictions on shopping hours. I make the observation that, if members opposite want to reach an arrangement whereby there is a general relaxation, I am quite sure that the Government would consider the matter.

Mr MEIER: I take it, therefore, that if the retail traders association in a particular town or towns decided to ascertain what the people and the traders in the town want, and if the outcome was submitted to the Government, it would be highly likely that the shops in that town would be exempted.

The Hon. R.J. Gregory: It would have to be done in conjunction with local government, but I can assure the honourable member that if he wants to initiate any of that action officers of my department will give him all the assistance he needs. However, it will have to include shopkeepers, local government and the residents of the area, and they will have to have a poll.

Mr MEIER: I notice on the same page that the second item is to routinely check as many shops and employment agencies as resources allow. It follows, I assume, from the

previous statement that there has been a 90 per cent success rate in the resolution of complaints, and I also assume it relates to the general licensing or regulation provisions. If there is to be an increase in routine checks on shops and employment agencies, it will require extra staff. To what extent has the Minister considered using shop employees to feed information back to his department, rather than increasing staff for checking on shops and employment agencies?

The Hon. R.J. Gregory: I understand that the honourable member is raising two matters: first, the use of employees in the shops actually to undertake departmental work in ensuring that the shops either close at the appropriate time or do not open and, secondly, whether the department will increase the staff in its inspectorial section.

Mr MEIER: The comment is to routinely check as many shops—

The Hon. R.J. Gregory: You want to know what we are going to do?

Mr MEIER: I am asking whether you have considered the option of using shop employees as the equivalent of inspectors, rather than increasing your inspectorate.

The Hon. R.J. Gregory: There is a very clear statutory responsibility for people who are inspectors of the Department of Labour. I can assure the honourable member that I would not approve of delegation of authority of departmental employees to employees who are not responsible to the department, and it would be unfair to ask shop assistants to undertake the role of employees of the department in this role of ensuring that the conditions applying to shops and shopping hours are maintained. They are not trained to do it. It is a reasonably skilled function. When the officers detect breaches, they must conduct themselves appropriately in gathering evidence which can then be presented to court coherently to bring a successful prosecution.

It is not the department's habit to prosecute willy-nilly on the basis that we will prosecute whether we win or not; it must be reasonable. Most of the work of the inspectors in this area involves inspecting premises on complaints from shop assistants. As the member for Goyder would understand, there is a limit to the number of people employed in the Public Service, and if he wants more people employed in this area to enforce the shopping hours we will consider that, although his Leader is always saying that we have too many people in the Public Service and should have fewer.

Mr MEIER: I do not know why the Minister indicated that I might be seeking more public servants. The whole thrust of my question was to see whether fewer could be employed, but you have answered that part. My third question relates to page 504 of the Program Estimates. Under Issues and Trends is the following statement:

The incidence of occupational injuries and disease continues to increase and new risks are emerging.

That statement surprises me, because I remember some five years ago when I had to fight for one of the businesses in Goyder to remain open because the Department of Labour inspectors were putting great pressure on the employer to have certain safety standards complied with within a relatively short period of time. My approaches were to the then Minister (Hon. Jack Wright), and I put to him that it would not be possible for this employer to carry out those safety provisions within that short period of time, and that he would need more time, otherwise he would have to close his business.

Whether it was due to the Minister or simply the kindness of the department, I am not sure, but extensions were given. However, the then Minister stated very clearly to me that the department was determined to bring in full

safety regulations within a very short time to all industries which had bad safety records. This industry was an engineering business. Given that so many years have elapsed since then, and knowing that many other businesses have told me from time to time that they have been forced to bring in various safety measures and put guards and so forth on machines which normally did not have them, can the Minister say why the incidence of injury continues to increase when I would have thought that there would be a significant decrease?

The Hon. R.J. Gregory: I will answer in two parts. The line referred to occupational injuries and diseases, and I am sure that the member for Goyder appreciates that injury is traumatic and easily visible, such as amputation of fingers or limbs, blows to the head and so forth. Blood is there, the injury is seen and can be fixed immediately. With industrial diseases it is not quite like that. The best analogy I have ever read was in a book prepared by a person in Canada which referred to the incidence of lung disease among the hard rock miners mining uranium at Lake Elliott.

He said that if the amount of disease and reduction of the use of the lungs was measured by the amount one cut off a person's arm, there would have been so many one-armed people walking around Lake Elliott that something would be done about it. I am sure members will agree with me that people with emphysema and lung diseases resulting from exposure to asbestos look like normal, healthy people until they want to exert themselves, and they find that they cannot do that. That is why not much attention is sometimes paid to industrial disease. We have the situation where asbestos is well known as causing asbestosis and melanomas in the lung. This is something proved beyond all reasonable doubt, yet only recently there was the incidence of a company being particularly careless in the protection of people working to clear up loose asbestos.

Even in the past week inspectors had to visit the place and remove a licence. We also have the current controversy over the use of fibreglass insulation. I am sure that the honourable member would be aware that recently the Metal Workers Union raised the matter of lung damage caused by the short fibres from fibreglass, and this is not something fanciful. Two or three years ago I read that small dogs living in houses which had fibreglass insulation were actually dying from their lungs being impregnated with small fibres.

If any members are hi-fi buffs, they will know that some people have used fibreglass insulation as a dampener inside the speaker cabinets. Wondering why there is a deterioration of the sound they have opened up the back and found a bundle of the stuff lying in the bottom of the cabinet, because the vibration has caused the glass to break. In respect of traumatic injury and its cost, the other aspect is that there is an increase in the number of people employed. In my opinion there is also an increase in the number of unskilled managers in this area, and I believe that the recent introduction of the Occupational Health, Safety and Welfare Act, along with WorkCover, has brought increased attention to occupational safety.

I was privileged to be involved in an inquiry into workers compensation and rehabilitation in 1978-79, and in discussing workers compensation at that time with practitioners they said that the best thing that ever happened was the 1974 Act, which brought about increased costs and which made managers and boards of companies examine what they were doing in the area of work caused injuries in order to reduce those costs.

Some companies had significant advances in reducing injury rates, which brought about a reduction in costs. However, not all companies are that far seeking in what

they do in respect of industrial accidents. The member for Goyder would recall that when the House met last Thursday I made reference to the number of companies that WorkCover had been able to identify in just nine months as its worst performers. WorkCover has been able to identify these people. One had a 300 per cent accident rate—that means that every employee of that company suffers an injury at least three times per annum. Several other companies had injury rates of 100 per cent—that means every employee would have an injury per annum. It has also identified that costs are very significant. The costs paid out to the employees in those 40 companies works out to just over \$6 million. The revenue from those companies is just over \$2 million.

The total cost collected from employers over the period referred to was about \$134 million. Thus, one can see that those 40 small companies have a very disproportionate share in relation to this outlay. WorkCover, by its very nature, encompasses all companies—and over 50 000 registered companies are now with WorkCover. WorkCover is very able to quickly identify, with its computer, the companies that are not performing well in regard to accidents. I am not sure of the exact number of insurance companies that were operating prior to the introduction of WorkCover, but I think there are about 46. Previously they would not even tell each other what their injury rates were; they would not even tell each other what was happening with some of the employers. Consequently, with poor reporting, people just did not know of these high injury rates.

Another aspect of this involved bad management. I am quite confident that as WorkCover penetrates this secret, if you like, area of high injury rates, and reduces them and, once reports are available, an officer can go out to those factories involved and ensure that the appropriate action is taken and accordingly the injury rate should come down. I do not think there is anyone in this Parliament or any responsible person in the employing areas who would approve of an employer operating a factory in which people get injured. In fact, in relation to the place with a 300 per cent injury rate, that is literally like having a licence to wound people. If anyone were to injure people on the street like that, that person would soon be arrested and locked up—yet, here this is occurring in the operation of a factory.

We cannot approach this harshly; a change of attitude is needed. We need to change the attitudes of the managers of these factories, so that they must understand that if they want a profitable factory, with good returns on investment, they have to have a safe factory. Workers must be trained to understand that it is in their best interests to work safely. We all know that as youths we pooh-poohed some things at times and dismissed them with a 'She'll be right'. However, in occupational health and safety matters there is no such thing as 'She'll be right', because a person might be hurt.

The other factor is the trade union movement. I am confident that over the next two or three years we will see a dramatic change in South Australia in the attitude taken to occupational safety, health and welfare and that we will see a far healthier work force and a far safer one, with fewer people being injured. The spin-off from that is that businesses will be more profitable and more people will be employed.

The Hon. R.K. ABBOTT: At page 129 of his report, the Auditor-General refers to action being taken in an attempt to reduce the cost of workers compensation. It states that the success of the risk management and rehabilitation program introduced in the Department of Marine and Harbors in 1986-87 is reflected in net workers compensation pay-

ments falling from \$1.1 million in 1985-86 to \$600 000 in 1987-88. It is noted that three or four other Government departments have introduced this program. Does the Government intend to encourage all departments to introduce that type of program?

The Hon. R.J. Gregory: The member for Spence would know about that program in the Department of Marine and Harbors because he was the Minister who introduced it—and I thank him very much for doing it. There has been a marked change in that department in respect of occupational safety and health. Yesterday I was present at the signing of an agreement between the department, the workers and the trade union movement for a fairly significant structure to ensure that the risk management program and occupational safety and health at the Department of Marine and Harbors continues and that the injury rate continues to be reduced. In 1986, Alan Bruce, a risk management consultant from Melbourne, was contacted by the coordinating committee to set up a pilot program in the Department of Marine and Harbors, with a view to reducing the cost of workers compensation and ensuring that the department is a safe and healthier place to work for all of its employees.

The program has produced tangible benefits and reduced payments, as referred to in the Auditor-General's Report. It has enabled management to find suitable duties for 17 of the 19 employees who were off work on workers compensation at the commencement of the program, and reduced the average number of lost time accidents per week within the department from 16.2 in 1985-86 to 12.3 in 1986-87, and to 10.3 in 1987-88. It has also resulted in a reduction in the average monthly expenditure on workers compensation, including resource inputs, from \$93 700 in 1985-86 to \$62 600 in 1987-88. It has enabled managers and supervisors to act morally and legally in rehabilitating workers injured at work back into the workplace, and it has ensured that legal requirements provide a safe and healthy workplace, and that safe work procedures have been substantially met.

The risk management rehabilitation program, which was trialled in the Department of Marine and Harbors, was introduced in the Engineering and Water Supply Department, the Department of Housing and Construction and the Department of Technical and Further Education in 1987, and in the Department for Community Welfare in 1988. As a result of these actions, the level of worker absence has decreased in two of the three departments in which the risk management program was introduced in 1987. The Department of Technical and Further Education has been monitored to ensure an improved performance in 1988-89. It is essential that similar programs be introduced into other departments, as time permits. There is a systematic program for doing that.

The Hon. R.K. ABBOTT: I refer to the Long Service Leave Building Industry Fund and to Program 4 on page 503 of the Program Estimates. What was the balance of the Long Service Leave Building Industry Fund and how was that invested?

The Hon. R.J. Gregory: The balance of the State Long Service Leave Building Industry Fund as at 30 June this year was \$17 575 431.99. Investment was as follows: the State Government Financing Authority, \$82 000; Electricity Trust of South Australia, \$1.78 million; the ANZ Banking Group, bank bills, \$4.84 million; the National Bank, bank bills and term deposits, \$2 million; the State Bank of South Australia, inscribed stocks, CCD and term deposits, \$4.5 million; Mitchel NDB Limited, term deposits, \$2 million; Chase AMP, \$1.9 million; and the balance of the trust fund

of \$367 000 goes to Treasury (that is like the working account).

The Hon. R.K. ABBOTT: How many workers received long service payments from the Long Service Leave Building Industry Fund in 1986-87 and in 1987-88? What was the total amount paid? In addition, what was the contribution rate paid by employers to the Long Service Leave Building Industry Fund?

The Hon. R.J. Gregory: In 1986-87, 408 workers were paid \$1.7 million; in the following year 514 workers were paid \$2.3 million; and the present rate, which is the lowest in Australia, is 1.5 per cent of payroll, having applied since May 1986.

The Hon. T. CHAPMAN: My questions arise out of matters raised by the member for Goyder. In relation to shop trading hours, can the Minister provide me—at some convenient time, if not now—with a list of townships, municipalities or community centres in Alexandra District which are subject to the Shop Trading Hours Act early closing provisions or any other encumbrances—that is, if any locations within the district of Alexandra come under that category? In asking that question I recognise that retail butchers premises are covered independently and are therefore not part of my general question in relation to shop trading.

The Hon. R.J. Gregory: I will provide the Committee with the information that the honourable member requires. I cannot do it right now, but it will be done as soon as practicable, and I will send a copy to the honourable member. If the member for Goyder would also like one for his electorate, the department can oblige.

The Hon. T. CHAPMAN: My second question relates to the WorkCover subject, which has been widely canvassed this morning. Is registration of a workplace a requirement before employment can occur on those premises and, in turn, will proper employee cover prevail? In raising this question I cite a circumstance where a new business is commenced, purchased or established for the first time. The employer may consider initially that he or his family members can run the business in their own right without the need to employ outside labour. However, without notice the owner/operator of the premises finds that he needs to employ someone, albeit on a casual basis. What is the situation in that set of circumstances? Before casual employment can occur, does registration of the business need to be facilitated or does WorkCover provide for the same situation in such temporary, interim or casual employment cases, isolated and on short notice as they may be, as the Workmen's Compensation Act previously did?

The Hon. R.J. Gregory: There are two components to the question raised by the member for Alexandra, the first of which is in respect of the Occupational Health, Safety and Welfare Act, which requires employers to register their places of work. Whilst WorkCover is not covered in the budget papers, I advise the honourable member that section 59 (1) of the Worker's Rehabilitation and Compensation Act provides:

Subject to subsection (2), an employer shall not employ a worker in employment to which this Act applies unless the employer is registered by the Corporation.

The word 'shall' is obligatory. It is very much like the example of a person driving a motor car without a licence. He could do it, but he could be apprehended and prosecuted heavily. In this case the penalty is \$10 000 for each worker so employed; so, it is a very substantial penalty. I urge the member for Alexandra's constituent to make every effort to contact the WorkCover office to ensure that he conducts himself in such a way that he does not incur the wrath of the courts.

The Hon. T. CHAPMAN: Having identified that obligation in that context, do I take it that—referring again to my original question—a person entering or establishing a business for the first time cannot commence to employ, even on a casual basis, unless the business is first registered?

The Hon. R.J. Gregory: They can do things, but they should ensure that they are legally registered before they employ people.

The Hon. T. CHAPMAN: I ask a supplementary question. Since the introduction of WorkCover, has the department prosecuted in the circumstances that I cited by way of example? I preface my question with the words 'since the introduction of WorkCover', because the point made by the Minister that he extracted in isolation from the Act is quite different from the principles applicable to an employer's obligations under the previous Workmen's Compensation Act. In the circumstances that I cited—that is, a person establishing a new business on the premise that he will not employ, as in a family situation, and then finding that he needs to employ casual labour—am I right in assuming that under the Act he cannot commence to employ a casual worker unless he first goes through the registration process?

The Hon. R.J. Gregory: Perhaps we should carefully choose our words. The honourable member says 'cannot', but I think he means 'legally'. I think that the member for Alexandra would appreciate that people can do all sorts of things, but if they transgress the laws they incur the wrath of the courts. However, if one employs people without registering the workplace under the Occupational Health, Safety and Welfare Act, and without ensuring that one is registered for WorkCover, one will be subject to penalties if apprehended. The penalties are different, but under the previous Workmen's Compensation Act one was obliged to be insured. If you were not insured and you employed somebody for however short a time, you suffered quite severe penalties.

Under the WorkCover Act the same situation applies. You cannot employ someone for half an hour or an hour; you need to get advice. The Government has a small business bureau which provides that advice to people. The department also provides advice, and any departmental officers would ensure that people were properly advised. The other aspect is that the Department of Labour does not administer the WorkCover Act; it is administered by the board established by WorkCover. WorkCover has offices throughout the State and agencies conducted by SGIC, and it is well publicised amongst employers. Any person who wishes to set himself up in a business is able, if he is a member of the appropriate trade or employer organisation, to seek advice from that organisation, which is fully informed of the requirements. I urge people to do so.

The Hon. T. CHAPMAN: In relation to health, safety and welfare, does the Minister or his department consider himself or itself responsible for industrial sites that float as well as those on the land and, if so, are the Minister and his department satisfied that the working conditions for the crew and the safety aspects of the facilities installed for the passengers on the *Island Seaway* are adequate? If so, when was the department's last inspection of that State-provided facility carried out and, if it is not the responsibility of the Minister or his department to handle the safe working conditions and other welfare aspects in relation to the facilities on the *Island Seaway*, whose responsibility is it?

The Hon. R.J. Gregory: A long time ago I happened to get onto a dredge operating in the Port River, and it was a very crude affair with unguarded machinery. Much to my annoyance at the time, I found that it was not covered by any safety Act, whether it be the Industrial Code applying in South Australia or any of the Marine Acts that were

applied by the State or Commonwealth Government. It involved an area of work that was not covered by any Act. From the subsequent input that I have had to the Occupational Health, Safety and Welfare Act, I have been assured, when referring to these floating pieces of machinery, that they would be covered. The *Island Seaway* is covered under other Acts and by other regulations which are usually administered by the Department of Marine and Harbors.

Mr HAMILTON: Page 502 of the Program Estimates, under the heading '1987-88 specific targets/objectives', states:

The development of the Justice Information System continued and the project is well advanced with the system expected to be operational towards the middle of 1988 in terms of the awards data-base, the publication of awards and the calculation of rates.

Can the Minister say whether the publication of awards and calculation of rates have all been completed and, if not, what are the reasons for the delays and when it is likely that this will be completed?

The Hon. R.J. Gregory: The Department of Labour now has four operational projects on the Justice Information System. Maintenance and inquiry on the text of industrial awards became operational in November 1987. This was followed by electronic mail in March 1988. The State wage calculation project became operational in June 1988, followed by the award publication project in August 1988. The first project in the industrial regulation area is expected to be operational from December 1988. This is the registration of dangerous substances. This date is subject to availability of programming and analysis resource from the central Justice Information System. Other types of registration will follow. Projects involving case administration and judgments in the Industrial Court and commission are scheduled over the three years.

The industrial award publication project has been implemented and is expected to result in benefits of about \$100 000 per year from reduction in costs incurred in the printing of the South Australian *Industrial Gazette*. This is a major portion of dollar benefits expected for Department of Labour projects on the Justice Information System. Partial people benefits in streamlining industrial award maintenance and inquiry procedures has freed resources to cope with an increasing workload. The State wage calculation project has reduced the cost and time required to recalculate wage rates after a State wage case order. Given that there is a period in which old and new systems overlap, during which staff become familiar with new procedures, roughly a half of the identified benefits are in the process of being achieved.

Mr HAMILTON: Can the Minister say when the review of legislation dealing with employment agencies will take place?

The Hon. R.J. Gregory: We will review the provisions of the Employers Registry Office Act with a view to raising appropriate amendments during the 1988-89 legislative year.

Mr HAMILTON: Can the Minister say what is the role of the women's adviser in the Department of Labour and how this relates to other programs within his department?

The Hon. R.J. Gregory: I will ask Ms Gay Thompson to advise the Committee on her role.

Ms Thompson: One of the five objectives of the department is to eliminate unjustified discriminatory work practices. This means that all areas of the department incorporate this objective as one of their parameters for activity. The women's budget details on pages 77 to 82 instance how departmental programs incorporate equal opportunity objectives. These include, in the long service leave area, an examination of the portability of long service leave in predominantly female industries such as cleaning. In the industrial democracy and in the employer/employee information sharing area, one issue being examined is the adequacy of

the representation of women in union and tripartite structures.

With regard to the national and State wage case submissions, account is taken of the impact of particular systems on women's wages. Within this context, the women's adviser functions mainly as a facilitator to other areas of the department and the general industrial community in addressing relevant issues. Ways in which this occurs include the provision of information about specific issues to union and employer organisations, consultation on their priorities for women, and involvement in relevant working parties and committees such as the Outworkers Project Management Committee and the Women's Advisory Committee of the Occupational Health and Safety Commission. The women's adviser is a member of the executive management of the department, and this facilitates her involvement in and advice on all aspects of departmental activities as necessary.

Mr S.J. BAKER: I was pleased to note the question about employment agencies because I was also going to raise that issue. A number of complaints have been received through my office about the licensing procedures and the need for standard charges when some employment agencies can offer discounts depending on the amount of time that a contracted employee is with another employer. It is quite impossible to list the charges adequately, but the agencies have had to fall in line with the regulations which are really quite nonsensical. I will be looking with great interest at any amendments to the Employment Agencies Act.

I will head into the more important areas and then catch up on some of the less important areas later in the day, or put them on notice. The question of unfair dismissal is raised with me on a number of occasions, the comment being made that the system now is totally unfair in the way it operates. For instance, on Monday of this week I was telephoned by a lady asking what she could do. She had been before the Commissioner. An employee had been dismissed for a number of reasons, one of which was that her area of activity was closing down because the employer was facing financial problems. The other reason was that the employee had been pinching from the till and the Fraud Squad was involved.

When the case was taken before the commission there was some suggestion that the commission could not hear anything in relation to possible fraud because it was in a criminal jurisdiction and therefore it was not competent to rule on that matter. We are now finding that the commission relieves itself of proceedings in other areas but they might be very pertinent to the question of whether someone has been unfairly dismissed. I have had a number of complaints about this over time. A number of members of the legal fraternity are saying, 'Bail out and pay up because it is too expensive to go further, even if you are likely to win the case.' I pointed out these problems when the legislation came before the House of Assembly, and they seem to be increasing. I understand it now takes three months to have the matter arbitrated. Will there be reform in the area so that we get some balance back into the system and so that it does not disadvantage one party or the other?

The Hon. R.J. Gregory: No.

Mr S.J. BAKER: I thank the Minister. He is not prepared to assist anyone.

The Hon. R.J. Gregory: I think the person could assist themselves if they joined the appropriate employer organisation.

Mr S.J. BAKER: That is a fascinating response. Obviously the only way to get protection is to join the union. I was referring to the imbalance felt by employers. There is also the case of employees not represented. How many section

31 cases have been before the commission in 1987-88 and how does it compare with the 1986-87 figures? How many cases proceeded into the Industrial Court?

The Hon. R.J. Gregory: The number of applications lodged in 1986-87 was 680 and in the following year '724. At a later time we will provide answers to the second question.

Mr S.J. BAKER: My second question relates to days lost. I know that the member for Albert Park asked about the good industrial record of South Australia and this State is far better than any other State in terms of the amount of industrial disputation. Given that the department keeps records of notifications, can we be provided with the number of working days lost on industrial issues on the ASER site over the past four years, and how many days have been lost on the safety issues on the ASER site over the past four years? The Minister would be well aware that the cost of the ASER project has possibly reached \$300 million or more. It is very difficult to find out from the Premier because he always says that it is commercially confidential. The original cost of the project was \$185 million and we know that industrial disputation has had a very detrimental effect on that project. Will the Minister provide the information that I request?

The Hon. R.J. Gregory: The difficulty we have with respect to disputes on the ASER project and dividing them up into classes is that we need to get information from the company concerned. If it is willing to provide it, I will undertake to advise the Committee. If it is unwilling to provide it, there is not much I can do about it.

Mr S.J. BAKER: My third question relates to the charging for transcripts. The question has been raised about the program for the Justice Information System. I was stunned to find that the cost of providing industrial awards and gazettes had dropped from \$200 000 to \$100 000. I can only presume that typesetting costs would not be 50 per cent of the total cost of producing these publications but rather that the number of awards and publications made available will decrease significantly.

A matter of concern raised with me is the cost being charged for transcripts of proceedings. There is now a \$2 page charge for the transcript of proceedings from the Industrial Court or commission in comparison with the federal agencies, which do not charge for their service. The Minister would know that the State wage case, following the national wage case, ran into some 200 to 300 pages of transcript. The employers who would normally have ordered a copy of that transcript are no longer ordering it. They simply say that it is too expensive to order this material because they cannot recoup from their clients, as there is often no direct client in many cases. Will the Minister explain why he is charging \$2 per page for transcript while the Federal Industrial Court is not charging anything?

The Hon. R.J. Gregory: Are you sure about that?

Mr S.J. BAKER: Yes.

The Hon. R.J. Gregory: The charge has been determined by Cabinet and we are going to charge it. Perhaps, for the information of the member for Mitcham, I will refer to transcript charges in other jurisdictions. In the Australian Conciliation and Arbitration Commission it is \$2 per page or part thereof for the first copy of transcript and 10c per page or part thereof for subsequent copies of transcript to the same purchaser. I understand that they have waived the charges for the first copy and we know that they would not photocopy it. In New South Wales, transcript is available at \$2.10 per page with a minimum charge of \$12. Copies of judgments are available at a cost of \$1 per five pages with a maximum fee of \$5. In Victoria, parties are charged

approximately \$2.70 per page before commencement and approximately \$7.62 per page after commencement for the first copy. So, if you order before the proceedings start you benefit and if you order after commencement you pay for it.

In Tasmania, parties receive a free copy of transcript and thereafter \$10 for every 10 pages or part thereof. In Western Australia, parties are charged \$1 per page. In Queensland it is \$1.70 per page for the first copy, \$2.55 for the second and \$3 per page for the third copy. It has a minimum charge of \$5.20. There are to be increasing costs at the commencement of the financial year and we do not have those details. So, we are not the only ones who charge.

Mr S.J. BAKER: As a supplementary question, will the Minister consider taking the same stance as the Commonwealth and provide the first copy free of charge?

The Hon. R.J. Gregory: We will consider it.

Mr HAMILTON: Is the Minister prepared to provide a comparable study of time lost on State issues between 1979 and 1982 under the Tonkin Liberal Government and 1982 to 1985 under the Bannon Government? It would be of great interest to many people and, in the interests of impartiality, we would like to see the figure for industrial disputes. In view of the increased number of workers who are covered by the Occupational Health, Safety and Welfare Act 1986, what steps have been and will be taken to ensure that both employees and employers are aware of the new legislation?

The Hon. R.J. Gregory: We will endeavour to provide the statistics at a later date. There has been a wide range of information and promotional activity, including the production of pamphlets. To date, the Commissioner has produced five information booklets: *What You Need to Know About the OHS&WA*; *A Guide to Health and Safety Policies*; *A Guide to Health and Safety Committees*; *Guidelines for Health and Safety Representatives*; and *Resolution on Health and Safety Issues*. A booklet in eight main community languages is in production entitled *Your Work Place Health and Safety—What You Need to Know About the OHS&WA*. As part of the regulatory review process, issues requiring new pamphlets or guidelines are being identified.

The commission produces a bulletin on a quarterly basis. It is producing display materials and has participated in suburban displays to date. All commission staff contribute to a regular, comprehensive program of speaking engagements across a wide range of industry and occupational groupings. These include the rural industry; TAFEs and colleges; public sector agencies and workplaces; employer organisations; hospitals and health services; the insurance industry; and conferences and general seminars.

The commission has a policy of accepting speaking engagements which are strategic in terms of the number and range of people who benefit potentially. A sum of \$67 620 has been allocated for promotional activities and \$20 000 has been allocated in 1988-89 for promoting new regulations and codes of practice. This will be directed largely towards promoting the new regulation and code of practice for safe manual handling. Additional funding will be sought.

The commission has developed new guidelines for approved health and safety representative training courses and will monitor representatives' access to the courses. A survey on quality and quantity of courses for supervisors and managers is being undertaken in conjunction with WorkCover. Information seminars on specific topics will be held during 1988-89.

Mr HAMILTON: Will the Minister provide information on the introduction of the Alan Bruce Risk Management

Program and tangible evidence of the benefits of the program?

The Hon. R.J. Gregory: I have already provided that information in reply to a previous question.

Mr HAMILTON: What is the women's employment strategy and when can we expect further information on the strategy?

Ms Thompson: At present there are two women's employment strategies, a national and a State strategy, the distinction between the two not always being clear. The national women's employment strategy consists of a series of common goals for improving women's employment options. These goals have been agreed by the State and Federal Governments, and progress will be monitored against a number of performance indicators. Consultations will occur as part of the monitoring process and in order to identify areas in which improvements are required. The South Australian contribution to the strategy was developed jointly by the Office of Employment and Training and the Department of Labour. It identifies a number of initiatives that will be undertaken to further progress the goals that have been adopted. The national women's employment strategy will be considered by the Ministers of Labour at their November meeting.

The South Australian women's employment strategy arises from the Government's policy on women whereby there is a commitment to the development of a women's employment strategy. Goals for the strategy and an implementation proposal are being developed by the Women's Adviser to the Premier following discussions with officers of relevant agencies, including the Department of Labour. The proposal will be considered by the economics committee of Cabinet on 19 September this year. The Department of Labour will continue to contribute to the development and implementation of the strategy when it is approved, particularly through its departmental head and the Women's Adviser.

Mr HAMILTON: How many judges, industrial magistrates and commissioners are working in the Industrial Court and commission at present?

The Hon. R.J. Gregory: There are currently seven judges, two of whom are temporary, four commissioners and two industrial magistrates.

The Hon. T. CHAPMAN: I asked a question previously about the obligations of a potential employer, and the Minister kindly drew my attention to the requirements under the Act. I also asked whether or not the department had taken action by way of prosecution or the application of penalties where employers failed to register prior to their first attempt to employ, and I gave an example. If that is the case, can the Minister provide details of those prosecutions in relation to WorkCover and occupational health and safety?

The Hon. R.J. Gregory: I will provide information on WorkCover later. There have been no actions in relation to occupational health and safety in the past 12 months of which we are aware. I believe that, if an inspector found that a workplace was not registered and, if the employer offered to register and follow the correct procedures, the workplace would be registered, but if that person refused to comply and behaved in an objectionable manner, the department would prosecute. I have been advised that that was to happen with respect of a professional person who was self-employed, but apparently his association provided him with details on the consequences of his refusal and he promptly registered.

The Hon. T. CHAPMAN: People who have not previously been employers may establish a caravan park, a small business or even a small dairy farm and, notwithstanding

the department's efforts to circulate material, someone who is not in the caper will disregard information in the newspaper and brochures on the subject. Must a householder, say, a widow or aged pensioner, who wishes to have their garden cultivated, their flowers trimmed or their lawn cut register with WorkCover and/or abide by the occupational health and safety requirements? What steps should one of my aged and isolated constituents in Victor Harbor take on the rare occasions when they wish to have such work carried out?

The Hon. R.J. Gregory: In regard to having a lawn cut, as long as the lady employs a contractor there is no obligation whatsoever. That is in respect of any work that people may have done on a house. If they are contractors, they are self-employed and undertake to do a course of work. However, in the case of people who may employ a person to do the ironing or cleaning (or the gardening, in the case of someone infirm) on either a regular or an irregular basis, provided that the income to these people is less than \$5 000 per annum they are not required to register. The Act was recently amended to ensure that that class of employee was covered by WorkCover.

From the introduction of the WorkCover Act the State Government Insurance Commission advised all its policy holders who had workers compensation cover for people employed in the domestic area—and it is usually two people: one person inside and one outside—that the rate of \$21.60 per annum would provide them with an insurance cover against liability for anything incurred by these people. I understand that that is available only through the SGIC to its policy holders and not to other people.

In respect of WorkCover, if the amount is less than \$5 000 per annum they need not bother. At the same time, I suggest that if they are insured with SGIC they have discussions with one of its senior officers to arrange for this additional coverage, because I honestly believe that people should be properly covered in these areas. If any injury or accident occurs, the results could be financially devastating.

The Hon. R.K. ABBOTT: I refer to program 5 on page 504 of the Program Estimates. Management, trade unions and worker action groups have become significantly more aware of and more vocal about occupational health and safety issues. How many of the elected health and safety representatives have attended the basic training course?

The Hon. R.J. Gregory: Since 1 December 1987 the Occupational Health and Safety Commission has received notifications from 815 female and 2 687 male health and safety representatives, a total of 3 502; and from 37 female and 104 male deputy health and safety representatives, making a total of 141. The Commission has approved four basic training courses for health and safety representatives: the United Trades and Labor Council (UTLC), the Trade Union Training Authority (TUTA), the Chamber of Commerce and Industry, and the National Safety Council of Australia. Between 1 December 1987 and 31 July 1988, 2 057 health and safety representatives were trained. The UTLC has trained 1 002; TUTA, 665; the Chamber of Commerce and Industry, 183; and the National Safety Council of Australia, 207.

The Hon. R.K. ABBOTT: What is the current situation regarding outworkers in South Australia?

The Hon. R.J. Gregory: I ask Ms Thompson to answer that.

Ms Thompson: Most workers in the clothing industry are covered by the provisions of the Federal and State clothing trades awards. A grant of \$20 000 has been made to the Working Women's Centre to enable the conduct of an information and publicity campaign regarding these new provi-

sions. Unions, employers and the department have representation on the management committee for this project. The situation of outworkers in other areas will be addressed in the forthcoming amendments to the Industrial Conciliation and Arbitration Act. These will bring some outworkers into award coverage and pave the way for coverage to be obtained for the balance. An amount of \$16 000 has been allocated for the purpose of an information campaign relating to the forthcoming amendments.

The Hon. R.K. ABBOTT: I now refer to page 506 of the Program Estimates, program 5. By how much did the income from workplace registrations increase in 1987-88; what is the estimate for 1988-89; and where is this money going?

The Hon. R.J. Gregory: The estimates for 1988-89 are as follows: in 1986-87 under the old Act there were 686 registrations. There was an income of \$840 000 and it is estimated that in 1988-89 it will be \$890 000, involving an increase of \$50 000. Within Government departments it will go from \$105 000 to \$410 000, and others will go from \$536 000 to \$1 million. The totals are an increase in 1987-88 from \$1.48 million to \$2.3 million. The fees offset costs in the following areas: in specific allocations there is a grant of \$80 000 to the UTLC for occupational health and safety trainers; to the Occupational Health and Safety Commission of \$616 000; additional inspectors and clerical staff provided for in 1987-88 at \$445 000; making a total of \$1.141 million. In general allocations there is a subprogram, safety on commercial and industrial premises, based on a percentage proportion of inspectors' time, involving \$76 000, making a total of \$2.2 million.

Mr S.J. BAKER: According to page 503 of the Program Estimates, you received 1 400 claims concerning award breaches. How many of these were found to be justified, and will the Minister provide the Committee with a breakdown of the industries affected?

The Hon. R.J. Gregory: We do not have that detail here. That will be provided to the Committee in due course.

Mr S.J. BAKER: This is supplementary to a previous question I asked about ASER, when the Minister said that he was not sure whether the employer could supply the information. I understand that the department keeps specific records on industrial disputation that form part of its statistics on industrial disputes. Did the Minister indicate that he would actually provide the industrial disputation statistics for ASER? I understand the difficulty about the safety statistics.

The Hon. R.J. Gregory: The Department of Labour in this State does not collect statistics; they are collected by Commonwealth departments and provided to the people of Australia by those departments. As I indicated earlier, we will endeavour to provide the Committee with the appropriate statistics as requested. However, with the difference between industrial and safety issues we would have to rely on information from the employer. If the employer did not wish to give it to us, we would have some difficulty getting it from him.

Mr S.J. BAKER: I note that the Long Service Leave Building Industry Fund, referred to in a question asked previously, actually funded the stand at the Royal Adelaide Show. Can the Minister, at a convenient time, provide an estimate of the cost of that extraordinary stand as well as the cost of the associated servicing of that stand with labour?

The Hon. R.J. Gregory: We can supply that. I want to know why it is extraordinary.

Mr S.J. BAKER: We have already canvassed matters in relation to health and safety, but I refer now to funding for United Trades and Labor Council trainers for the courses. Does the Government intend to be even-handed in its

approach and follow the example of the Commonwealth Government, which indeed funds both the Confederation of Australian Industry and the ACTU in relation to their safety training activities? On the same tack, the Minister would be aware that some of that funding from the ACTU filters down to the UTLC. On the same tack again, has the Minister been provided with any audit concerning in what areas the funding has actually been spent by the UTLC? Has the Minister done an independent check on the courses to see whether they are of the required standard? I note that there are four accredited courses.

The Hon. R.J. Gregory: In respect of the Commonwealth, we do not slavishly follow what the Commonwealth does, and we will continue to do what we have been doing. In respect of the audit of the United Trades and Labor Council of South Australia, I understand that the Auditor-General has never required a certificate which states that the money has been spent. However, the department is securing for me as Minister an audited statement from the United Trades and Labor Council and an audited certificate which states that the money has been spent in accordance with the grant. A report to the previous Minister of Labour dated 28 July 1988 from the United Trades and Labor Council of South Australia reads as follows:

The UTLC's Occupational Health and Safety Unit has trained a total of 846 worker safety representatives during the year commencing 1 July 1987 to 30 June 1988. The total number of representatives trained under the Worksafe grant for the 12 month period was 566.

The number of representatives trained under the South Australian Government grant for a six month period from January to June 1988 was 280. Please find enclosed the Activities Report containing the full breakdown of all courses held during the year.

For the benefit of the member for Mitcham, the details of the Activities Report are as follows:

ACTIVITIES REPORT
Training for Period July 1987 to June 1988

Title of Course	Location	Size of Audience
State Government Department	Adelaide	11
SANTOS	Adelaide	19
State Government Department	Adelaide	11
ATWU	Adelaide	22
Vehicle Industry	Adelaide	17
General	Adelaide	10
Building Industry	Adelaide	15
State Government Department	Adelaide	18
Tea Tree Gully Council	Adelaide	16
State Government Department	Adelaide	24
Vehicle Industry	Adelaide	17
General	Port Pirie	9
Telecom	Adelaide	22
Air-conditioning Industry	Adelaide	12
State Government Department	Adelaide	23
BHP	Whyalla	20
BHP	Whyalla	20
Total number of union representatives trained from July 1987 to December 1988		286
State Government Department	Adelaide	15
General	Adelaide	18
ETSA	Adelaide	23
BHP	Whyalla	22
General	Adelaide	16
ETSA	Adelaide	23
Building Industry	Adelaide	16
Building Industry	Adelaide	19
Building Industry	Adelaide	13
BHP	Whyalla	19
BHP	Whyalla	12
State Government Department	Adelaide	15
ETSA	Adelaide	29
BHP	Whyalla	15
General	Adelaide	19
	Port	
ETSA	Augusta	20
Storemen and Packers	Adelaide	20

Title of Course	Location	Size of Audience
General	Mount Gambier	26
State Government Department	Adelaide	27
PSA	Adelaide	27
Rubber Industry	Adelaide	28
RANF	Adelaide	21
General	Adelaide	37
Building Industry	Adelaide	32
Hospital Employees	Whyalla	21
AWU	Adelaide	27
Total number of union representatives trained from January to June 1988		560
Total number of safety representatives trained under the Worksafe Grant (12 month period)		566
Total number of safety representatives trained under the South Australian Grant (6 month period)		280
Total number of safety representatives trained (12 month period)		846
Total number of courses held	43	
Average attendances per course	20	

Mr S.J. BAKER: I thank the Minister for his response. He would be aware that, in terms of safety representatives, there is some difference of opinion as to who should train whom. The Minister would also be aware that the UTLC is insisting—and one would presume with the Minister's backing—that people who belong to trade unions must be trained through the UTLC or TUTA. Given that the Minister does not want to be even-handed with his funding of organisations in South Australia, as distinct from the situation in relation to the Commonwealth, will he indeed endeavour to resolve this ludicrous dispute which exists at the moment.

The Hon. R.J. Gregory: Which ludicrous dispute?

Mr S.J. BAKER: The dispute concerning the UTLC's insinuation of union members going to UTLC courses.

The Hon. R.J. Gregory: I do not see it as a problem that needs resolving—I do not see it as a problem.

Membership:

Mr Groom substituted for Mr Plunkett.

Mr HAMILTON: I note the following comment in the Program Description for the Department of Labour (page 502 of the Program Estimates and Information 1988-89):

Parties have been encouraged to use non-ambiguous and non-sexist language in award clauses by means of common form prescriptions, thus potentially reducing the need for award interpretations, claims and disputes and providing a basis for greater equality of employment opportunity for workers and job applicants.

Can the Minister provide the Committee with information of how successful or otherwise this prescription is?

The Hon. R.J. Gregory: I ask Ms Jan Powning to advise the Committee on this matter.

Ms Powning: This is a matter in relation to which progress is still to be made. The report of a working group to review discriminatory provisions in awards and agreements was released in August 1987, and this was subsequently forwarded to employer and union organisations. Since then, representatives of the United Trades and Labor Council in the Working Women's Centre have visited all unions concerned to discuss the issues with them. Progress will be reviewed on a regular basis, and a report is due about now for them to determine the extent to which changes have been made. The department considers that the restructuring of awards, which will result from the latest national and State wage case decisions, affords an opportunity to remove discriminatory provisions from awards, and this matter will be explored with the parties.

Mr HAMILTON: Who are the members of the Occupational Health and Safety Commission?

The Hon. R.J. Gregory: The Chairperson of the commission is Mr Colin Meikle and the Deputy Chairperson is Ms Jan Powning. Other members from the Department of Labour are Mr Bachmann, the Director, and Mr Ford, the Assistant Director, Occupational Safety and Health.

The nominee of the Chairman of the South Australian Health Commission is Dr M.J. Lewis, the Director of Occupational Health and Radiation Control. Dr R. Gunn, his deputy, is the Senior Lecturer of the Department of Community Medicine. An employer representative is Miss R. Key, the finance director of Key Industries. Mr R.G. Roy, her deputy, is the industrial advocate of the Engineering Employers Association. A further employer representative is Mr Pope, who is associated with the Master Builders Association. His deputy is Mr P.J. Hampton, the manager of industrial relations of the South Australian Employers Federation. Mr B.W. Flood is the State Manager for Boral Cyclone. His deputy is Miss K.M. Ahmer, the Senior Industrial Adviser of the Chamber of Commerce and Industry.

An employee representative is Mr. D. Duffy, an organiser of the Federated Miscellaneous Workers Union. His deputy is Miss H. O'Connor, a school teacher. Another employee representative is Mr Wortley, an organiser with the Federated Gas Employees Industrial Union. His deputy is Mr R. Clarke, the General Secretary of the Federated Clerks Union of Australia, South Australian Branch. Another employee representative is Mr C.D. White, the Assistant Secretary of the United Trades and Labor Council of South Australia. His deputy is Mr K.G. Purse, who is employed by the United Trades and Labor Council of South Australia. The person experienced in the field of occupational health, safety and welfare is Mr J.W. Williams, the Prevention Manager of WorkCover. His deputy is Dr. A. Jones, the Managing Director of Amdel Care Pty Ltd.

Mr HAMILTON: I refer to page 505 of the Program Estimates, specifically 'Protection of persons their rights and property' and 'Public safety' when dealing with, in particular, dangerous substances. It says in part:

The review of explosives regulations has begun and contacts identified to allow wider discussions when issues are reviewed from time to time. A national committee is reviewing transport

requirements for explosives. Implementation of additional storage regulations has not been completed although action was initiated to amend the legislation.

The Minister would know of my interests in this area. The document goes on to say:

The review of the Emergency Response Plan by the South Australian Dangerous Substances Standing Committee identified several key issues which are being resolved. The review is continuing.

What are the several key issues which are being resolved?

The Hon. R.J. Gregory: Discussions are taking place between the agencies for implementation of the plan and the key issue is to resolve who is responsible for what. Those discussions will settle that question so that those people in the agencies who are responsible for this area will know exactly what they have to do.

Mr S.J. BAKER: Can the Minister provide as soon as possible the breakdown of the health and safety representatives that have been registered with the commission according to sex, Aboriginal descent, those who cannot understand English at all or with difficulty, union representation or whether they are a member of a union, and the type of industry in which they are involved?

The Hon. R.J. Gregory: I am advised that that information can be provided. It is not on computer and will take some time to compile, but I will endeavour to provide that material as soon as practicable.

Mr S.J. BAKER: I thought that because it was on the notification form it would have been on computer, but I presume that that is still to come. My next question relates to the budget of the Occupational Health and Safety Commission. I note that \$616 000 has been provided for the commission to spend in this financial year. I also note that 10 employers are listed for the 1988-89 budget period. Can the Minister provide to the Committee the full breakdown of other costs to be incurred by the commission, including costs of conferences, leave and various other items which may be of interest?

The Hon. R.J. Gregory: I seek leave to have this material incorporated in *Hansard* without my reading it.

The CHAIRMAN: Is it of a statistical nature?

The Hon. R.J. Gregory: Yes, Mr Chairman.

Leave granted.

OCCUPATIONAL HEALTH AND SAFETY COMMISSION—INTERIM BUDGET ESTIMATES 1988-89 (CONTINGENCIES)

Expenditure	General Operating	Standard Setting	Act and Administration	Publicity and Promotion	Resources and Information	Education and Training	Total
<i>Travel and Accommodation</i>							
Taxi Fares	2 000	—	—	—	—	—	2 000
Car Pool Hire	1 400	—	—	—	—	—	1 400
Car Park (Chairperson)	1 800	—	—	—	—	—	1 800
Air Fares							
interstate	5 000	—	—	—	—	—	5 000
intrastate	—	800	800	800	—	—	2 400
Accommodation and Meals	3 000	—	—	—	—	—	3 000
Overseas Conference	6 500	—	—	—	—	—	6 500
	19 700	800	800	800	—	—	22 100
<i>Office Requisites</i>							
D of L Administration	10 000	—	—	—	—	—	10 000
Minor Equipment	3 000	—	—	—	—	—	3 000
Photocopy Charge	6 000	—	—	—	—	—	6 000
Repairs/Maintenance	1 000	—	—	—	—	—	1 000
Stationery	3 000	—	—	—	1 000	—	4 000
	23 000	—	—	—	1 000	—	24 000
<i>Publications and Reference</i>							
Text/Ref/ Library Books	1 500	—	—	—	—	—	1 500
Acts/Regs/Standards	500	—	—	—	—	—	500
CD Room	800	—	—	—	1 500	—	2 300
	2 800	—	—	—	1 500	—	4 300

Expenditure	General Operating	Standard Setting	Act and Administration	Publicity and Promotion	Resources and Information	Education and Training	Total
<i>Postage and Telephone</i>							
Postage	900	—	—	7 000	—	—	7 900
Fax and Viatel	1 100	—	—	—	500	—	1 600
	2 000	—	—	7 000	500	—	9 500
<i>Incidentals</i>							
Conference Regs.	1 000	—	—	—	—	—	1 000
Staff Training	1 000	—	—	—	—	—	1 000
Seminars and Forums	—	—	—	1 000	—	—	1 000
Consultancies	—	2 500	—	—	—	—	2 500
Courier Costs	800	—	—	—	—	—	800
Legal Costs	4 000	—	—	—	—	—	4 000
Committee Exp	1 000	—	—	—	—	—	1 000
FET	1 400	—	—	—	—	—	1 400
	9 200	2 500	—	1 000	—	—	12 700
<i>Publicity and Promotion</i>							
Advertising	—	20 000	—	10 000	—	5 000	35 000
Printing and Art Work	—	—	3 500	36 000	—	—	39 500
Translations	—	—	—	15 000	—	—	15 000
Displays	—	—	—	5 900	—	—	5 900
Photography	—	—	—	720	—	—	720
	—	20 000	3 500	67 620	—	5 000	96 120
TOTAL	56 700	23 300	4 300	76 420	3 000	5 000	168 720

Mr S.J. BAKER: My next question relates to the role of the Occupational Health and Safety Commission as it is empowered by Parliament. Can the Minister explain whether the commission has any right to insist that deputy safety representatives receive training? I cannot find any reference to this matter in the Act. What role does the commission play in the settlement of work group disputes when there is a difficulty in determining what should make up a work group? I have read the Act carefully and I remember it very well. I have been given examples of members of the commission exceeding their authority as provided under the Act. Can the Minister inform the Committee whether he intends to change the Act to give the commission power to deal with these areas or whether certain officers are breaching their responsibilities?

The Hon. R.J. Gregory: I will deal, first, with the training of deputy safety representatives. Deputy safety representatives can only be trained on the approval of the employer. The commission encourages deputy representatives to be trained. I think that any employer who refuses to train a deputy safety representative is being short-sighted and foolish because the more people who are trained as safety representatives in any workplace means that more people are safety conscious and know what safety procedures are about, know how to work in a safe manner and therefore would encourage their fellow workers to work in a safe manner.

Mr S.J. BAKER: To clarify that point: the commission has no role in directing anyone to send a deputy representative for training?

The Hon. R.J. Gregory: They encourage it.

Mr S.J. BAKER: That is where it starts and ends. My other point related to the settlement of disputes about what makes up a work group. There are certain procedures to be followed in work group settlement which seem to be a little different to procedures followed by one or two officers of the commission. Can the Minister inform the Committee whether the commission should live by the Act or whether something will be done to amend the Act?

The Hon. R.J. Gregory: In respect of work groups, one can only require people to comply with the requirements of the Act. I understand that the honourable member is referring to a particular instance in which the Commissioner advised both parties of their rights.

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

The CHAIRMAN: By agreement, we will interpose the line, 'Personnel and Industrial Relations, \$8.024 million'. We will complete that and then go back to the 'Labour' line.

Personnel and Industrial Relations, \$8 024 000

Chairman:

The Hon. T.M. McRae

Members:

The Hon. R.K. Abbott
Mr S.J. Baker
The Hon. T. Chapman
Mr T.R. Groom
Mr K.C. Hamilton
Mr E.J. Meier

Witness:

The Hon. R.J. Gregory, Minister of Labour.

Departmental Advisers:

Mr A.J. Strickland, Commissioner for Public Employment, Department of Personnel and Industrial Relations.
Ms S. MacIntosh, Director, Policy and Support Services Division.
Mr M. White, Senior Administrative Officer.

The Hon. R.J. Gregory: The key priorities for the Department of Personnel and Industrial Relations in the 1988-89 financial year reflect the Government's commitment to the social justice strategy. There are two major social justice initiatives where additional funding has been provided and augmented by a redirection of departmental resources.

These initiatives are, first, to improve opportunities for Aboriginal people. Approximately \$470 000 will be spent on supporting entry and recruitment programs for Aboriginals, training and development programs, and support for Aboriginal employees. Secondly, a base grade clerical job redesign team has been established to assist agencies in the process of job redesign at the base grade level.

The job redesign project aims to encourage individual effort, competence and merit; to ensure that employees are used efficiently and individual flexibility is enhanced, and to reduce repetitive work and time spent on keyboard work. Additional funding of approximately \$113 000 has been made available for this task. The continuing expenditure restraint required from departments in 1988-89 will have an impact on the Public Service workforce as salaries and wages represent about half of all recurrent payments.

Since June 1987 there has been a decline in Public Service employment levels and further reductions are expected during 1988-89. To maximise the deployment of existing resources, restrictions on Public Service recruitment will be retained. The Commissioner for Public Employment has the authority to approve external recruitment. Workforce measures designed to facilitate mobility and flexibility in the public sector, particularly in Government departments, will be further promoted and enhanced in 1988-89. For example, the opportunity for Public Service employees to preserve rights under the new superannuation scheme will encourage greater mobility.

Other workforce measures likely to encourage mobility and flexibility include a greater emphasis on training and development, and use of schemes such as redeployment, retraining and voluntary early retirement. In 1987-88 the Department of Personnel and Industrial Relations Redeployment Unit made 391 placements. Given the overall budgetary situation for 1988-89, an increase in redeployment activity is anticipated.

During 1987-88 the 4 per cent second tier pay rise decision for Government Management Employees Act staff resulted in a series of departmental steering committees being established to identify productivity and efficiency opportunities across the Public Service. This review process has been very successful, with numerous internal and service-wide opportunities being identified. Many of these improvement opportunities are already being implemented. The productivity and efficiency review process will continue until the end of March 1989 with the implementation of improvement opportunities scheduled for completion by July 1989.

The recent national wage case decision provided for wage increases to a maximum of 3 per cent no earlier than 1 September 1988, and \$10 per week no earlier than six months after the date of operation of the first increase. The increases are available to unions who give a commitment to industrial tribunals to cooperate in a review of awards to give effect to the new structural efficiency wage principle. The measures to be considered under this wage principle include a fundamental review of awards with a view to implementing measures to further improve the efficiency of industry, and provide workers with access to more varied, fulfilling and better paid jobs.

Because of the need to provide advice and support on the implementation of those decisions, the resources devoted to the program 'Industrial and Employee Relations' will be maintained in 1988-89 at the same approximate level as in 1987-88. As part of the overall budget process some areas of the department will be reduced or rationalised. These adjustments will occur mainly in the support services area to ensure service delivery to clients is maintained in all other major programs of the department.

In summary the \$8.024 million allocation for the Department of Personnel and Industrial Relations in 1988-89 as shown in the Estimates of Payments reflects a maintenance of all key areas of departmental activity at the 1987-88 level, as well as additional funding for two initiatives as part of government's social justices strategy. These special

initiatives are included in the programs 'Staffing of the Public Service', 'Personnel Management Improvement', and 'Equal Employment Opportunity'.

Mr S.J. BAKER: In yesterday's Estimates Committee a question was asked about the consultancy paid to the former State Premier, Mr Don Dunstan, and the explanation was given that this was handled under the DPIR. I note that there is a line in the Equal Opportunity budget for \$37 000, and there is no amount budgeted in the same area for 1987-88. Also, there was a big boost in payments to consultants in the inter-agency support services during 1987-88: I presume that the consultancy has been moved over here. How much was paid to that honourable gentleman in 1987-88, and how much will be paid in 1988-89?

The Hon. R.J. Gregory: Last year, nothing was paid to the person to whom you were referring, and this year it will be \$25 000.

Mr S.J. BAKER: As a supplementary question, how many hours of employment does that \$25 000 consultancy relate to?

The Hon. R.J. Gregory: Approximately 33 days.

Mr S.J. BAKER: Voluntary early retirement is signalled on page 516. I note your opening comments about 391 redeployees. How many people took up voluntary early retirement during 1987-88; what was the approximate age distribution, and the approximate package on offer at the time of taking up voluntary early retirement?

The Hon. R.J. Gregory: Are you talking about the amount of money each worker got?

Mr S.J. BAKER: Yes, in total statistical terms rather than individual terms.

The Hon. R.J. Gregory: You want it in averages?

Mr S.J. BAKER: I can work out an average.

The Hon. R.J. Gregory: Do you want 1987 or just 1988?

Mr S.J. BAKER: 1987-88.

The Hon. R.J. Gregory: The offers are as follows: Housing and Construction, 37; Agriculture, 3.

Mr S.J. BAKER: Total Public Service will do fine.

The Hon. R.J. Gregory: I thought you wanted a detailed answer. Lands, 2; Highways, 5; Mines and Energy, 1; Woods and Forests, 3; Community Welfare, 2; Correctional Services, 2; Employment and Training, 1; Tourism, 1; Premier's, 3; total, 60. The acceptances to the end of the 1988 financial year are as follows: Housing and Construction, 27; Agriculture, 3; Lands, 2; Highways, 4; Mines and Energy, 1; Woods and Forests, 3; Community Welfare, 0; Correctional Services, 2; Employment and Training, 1; Tourism, 1; and Premier's, 3; total 47. With respect to the amount of money paid to these people, that is on an agency line and we would not know it. If the member wants to know it, he should ask a question on notice about the various departmental people.

Mr S.J. BAKER: Given the DPIR's overall role in staff management of the State Public Service, can the Minister provide—not necessarily today but as soon as possible—the total number of persons and the total salary costs associated with the equal opportunity program in each department and for the Equal Opportunity Office as a separate item so that we get some idea of the total cost of the equal opportunity program?

The Hon. R.J. Gregory: On page 512 of the Program Estimates, under 'Equal Employment Opportunity', the number of people and the costs are listed. A sum of \$373 000 is proposed in 1988-89, and in 1987-88 the actual expenditure was \$358 000. The costs with respect to other departments are listed in the document. The Department of Personnel and Industrial Relations staff could extract that

for you, but that information is in that book. I will undertake to get that as a total amount.

Mr HAMILTON: What savings have been made by the DPIP in response to the second tier review process?

The Hon. R.J. Gregory: The cost of the 4 per cent increase in DPIP for a full year is approximately \$160 000. The department has established a Productivity Improvement Committee that has identified a number of projects that are expected to realise actual savings in 1988-89 of approximately \$200 000. Examples of savings opportunities identified are: first, introduction of a new service wide vacancy notice to include GME Act, weekly paid and statutory authority vacancies; secondly, revised approach to regional coordination and assistance to regional managers; thirdly, review of departmental library services to improve central agency access; fourthly, review of organisational arrangements in the department's classification unit; fifthly, introduction of electronic funds transfer using the Austpay system; and finally, recoup of service costs, that is, staff development unit. A full breakdown of all savings items can be made available. I would be happy to provide these further details if they are requested.

Mr HAMILTON: They are so requested. What progress has been made by departments in response to the second tier productivity and efficiency review process?

The Hon. R.J. Gregory: A total of 34 departmental steering committees were established following the decision of the President of the South Australian Industrial Commission, (Mr Justice Stanley) of 26 November 1987 to identify productivity and efficiency opportunities in each agency. The review process is to continue until March 1989 with the implementation of improvement opportunities scheduled for completion by July 1989.

Individual agencies have not been asked to quantify opportunities identified at this stage; however, 26 committees have indicated that they expect to realise productivity improvements and efficiency gains equal to or in excess of the cost of the pay increase in their agency. A significant and positive benefit to the Public Service has resulted from the close cooperation that has developed between management, employees and union representatives through the review process.

Departmental committees have also identified a large number of issues considered to have service wide productivity and efficiency benefits. These items have been referred to the Office of the Government Management Board for assessment, review and implementation. Significant examples include: improved accommodation, staff and resource sharing between agencies; improved air travel and accommodation booking arrangements; establishment of an inter-departmental survey depot; establishment of a Central Revenue Collection process; establishment of an improved courier service; computerisation of file/docket indexing; introduction of a major equipment register; electronic transfer of information to Government Printer; introduction of improved purchasing delegations; improved regional coordination and support to regional managers; improved monitoring and management of long term vehicle hire; development of an improved personnel management package—Austpay; amalgamation of departmental regional accommodation; and the establishment of \$1 million productivity fund, which will provide loans to agencies of up to \$100 000, with a maximum term of three years, to enable the implementation of productivity improvement initiatives which otherwise may be delayed as a result of the annual budget process.

Mr HAMILTON: Which groups have not received a second tier increase?

The Hon. R.J. Gregory: The only groups of Government employees who have not completed negotiations for a 4 per cent second tier wage increase in accordance with the provisions of the 1987 State wage case decision are as follows: correctional officers, commissioned police officers and visiting medical specialists. Negotiations are continuing with unions representing commissioned police officers and visiting medical specialists. Negotiations in respect of correctional officers are not active at present.

Mr S.J. BAKER: The Minister of State Development and Technology recently commented that the Public Service is aiming to have 1 per cent of its work force of Aboriginal descent. At page 577, the Program Estimates state that the target will be reached by the year 2000, which the Minister did not mention. How many Aborigines were employed as at 30 June 1988 and what is the target to be achieved by 30 June 1989?

The Hon. R.J. Gregory: At 30 June 1987, 370 Aborigines were employed in administrative units, that is, .6 per cent of employees in Government departments. The number of Aborigines in administrative units as at 30 June 1988 was 409, which is .8 per cent of employees in Public Service departments. Aboriginal Government Management Employment Act employees at this stage comprise 1.09 per cent of GME Act employees in administrative units. The number of Aboriginal GME Act employees has increased by 32.5 per cent over the past year. We hope that by the end of this financial year we will have increased the employment percentage to over 1 per cent of Government employees.

Mr S.J. BAKER: Total Government employees?

The Hon. R.J. Gregory: Departmental and not the expanded Government that your Leader sometimes talks about.

Mr S.J. BAKER: Will the Minister provide details of the age profile of Public Service employees compared with the general age profile of the employed labour force including a mean and a median age to determine whether the Public Service is representative of the labour force at large?

The Hon. R.J. Gregory: We will endeavour to provide that answer, but I can give no guarantee that we will.

Mr S.J. BAKER: I refer to page 517 where I note that the sexual harassment program has been downgraded quite considerably. Does that suggest that sexual harassment has disappeared as an issue within the Public Service?

The Hon. R.J. Gregory: No.

Mr S.J. BAKER: By way of supplementary question, I note a significant reduction in the moneys made available for sexual harassment programs and the provision of employment in that area. Is the process complete?

The Hon. R.J. Gregory: I answered 'No'. We still have a priority of reducing sexual harassment. The reason for the variation in the department's budget is that agencies have a responsibility in this area and it has been transferred out to them.

The Hon. R.K. ABBOTT: How will the recent 3 per cent and \$10 national wage case decision affect the Public Service?

The Hon. R.J. Gregory: The Government has supported payment of the increases to all public sector employees, operative from the earliest possible dates, provided unions give a commitment to agree to cooperate in a review of individual awards to give effect to the new structural efficiency principle, before the appropriate industrial tribunal. The new structural efficiency principle will enable fundamental reviews of awards with a view to implementing measures to improve the efficiency of industry and provide workers with access to more varied, fulfilling and better

paid jobs. In the public sector, awards will be reviewed and measures such as broadbanding, multiskilling, work patterns and the conditions under which work is performed, examined.

The Hon. R.K. ABBOTT: What is the current policy in the Public Service on smoking in the workplace?

The Hon. R.J. Gregory: The current policy is contained in circular No. 24 issued by the Commissioner for Public Employment. In the circular the Commissioner recommends 'that all chief executive officers provide and maintain a safe working environment by taking action to reduce the risks of employees health associated with tobacco smoke'. The Commissioner suggests that a consultative approach be adopted whilst recognising that some organisations may wish to apply some restrictive measures. It is suggested that whatever strategies are pursued the following points be taken into consideration:

- (a) that smoking is prohibited in lifts, near flammable substances, food preparation areas, etc. (all required under specific legislation);
- (b) that care be taken to avoid staff morale problems in what is often an emotional issue. Consultation with staff on this matter is encouraged;
- (c) that in situations where a smoke-free zone in a public waiting or reception area may be a source of increased stress for members of the public, other options, such as exhausting of the smoke, should be pursued.

Further, the following action should be taken (or reviewed) in each administrative unit in regard to smoking in the workplace. First, there should be the development of a policy which clearly states management's intention to reduce exposure by non-smokers to tobacco smoke in the working environment. It would be appropriate to communicate such a policy to staff.

Secondly, there should be development of practical procedures and processes in accordance with management's policy on this matter by the Occupational Safety and Health Committee established under the code of general principles.

Some agencies have already adopted a smoke-free working environment. However, the Commissioner is currently reviewing the policy and consideration is being given to the Public Service as a whole moving to a smoke-free work environment.

The Hon. R.K. ABBOTT: How many promotion and grievance appeals were dealt with in the Public Service in the past 12 months?

The Hon. R.J. Gregory: The Presiding Officer of the Promotion and Grievance Appeals Tribunal, Mr J.J. Betts, will submit the annual report in September. The report will include the following statistics in relation to the number of promotion and grievance appeals dealt with by the tribunal. The tribunal came into existence in May 1987 following the appointment of Mr Betts as Presiding Officer. It is not possible therefore to take comparisons of the number of appeals heard last financial year with any previous year. Promotion cases received and dealt with are as follows:

Carry-over from 1986-87 (i.e. appeals lodged in 1986-87 but not heard)	79
New cases received in 1987-88	167
<hr/>	
Total appeal cases to be dealt with	246
Cases heard in 1987-88	76
Cases lapsed during 1987-88	99
<hr/>	
Total of appeal cases dispensed with	175

Carry-over of appeal cases into 1988-89

71

The number of appeal cases carried over (71) involve 303 appeals.

Note: The above figures include merit appeals and selection process appeals.

Grievance appeals received and dealt with are as follows:

Grievance appeals carried over from 1986-87 (i.e. appeals lodged in 1986-87 but not heard)	7
Grievance appeals received during 1987-88	22
<hr/>	
Total	29
Grievance appeals withdrawn during 1987-88	8
Grievance appeals heard during 1987-88	5
Grievance appeals declined to review	1
Grievance appeals lapsed (various reasons)	3
<hr/>	
Total of appeal cases dispensed with	17
<hr/>	
Grievance appeals still unresolved	12

Mr MEIER: At page 518 the Program Estimates refer to 'Continued shortages in some specialised employment categories, for example, computer systems officers, financial managers'. Why have shortages occurred and what does the Minister propose to do about it?

Mr White: The main reason for the shortages is market conditions. Computer systems operators and staff who specialise in this area are extremely hard to recruit on the open market. In effect, the South Australian public sector is a trainer in this area, because we have a very large Government computing centre that specialises in IBM equipment and as the staff who are trained there are attractive to people elsewhere, we have a high turnover in the area; and that is a problem.

We also have a problem recruiting, because other people are in the marketplace competing against us. Last year we came to a specific arrangement with the South Australian Institute of Technology whereby we took 20 officers who had some skills in project management areas, but not necessarily in computing, and put them through an intensive training program to bring up their skills in this computing area. After a series of placements, they are now in a position to apply for those specialised computing jobs. We will review that program to see whether it is worth continuing with it in the future.

Mr MEIER: Supplementary to that, could it be said that the salaries which the Public Service pays are not compatible with the private sector, and that that is one reason why we are losing our top quality computer operators?

Mr White: We certainly keep a very close eye on the private sector salary movements for these positions. We believe that we are very competitive at the lower levels, not quite so competitive at the middle levels and, probably, not at all at the very high levels. We do have some constraints in the higher areas, of course. The public sector as a whole tends not to pay as well as the private sector and, in fact, is well behind, but from time to time we have reviewed the remuneration packages for computer systems officers, who have moved more favourably than many other categories within the Public Service within the past three years.

Mr MEIER: Is it possible to identify for this Committee the salary range from the lower grade officers to the higher grade salaries that the Public Service would pay?

Mr White: In the actual classification system the highest would be equivalent to an AO5, which is approximately \$43 000 to \$45 000 per annum as a basic salary. In a few specialised positions we have actually used the negotiated conditions which the Commissioner for Public Employment can use under the Government Management and Employment Act to offer specific and special packages for certain people whom we find hard to attract otherwise. We have done that for some particularly difficult and involved jobs in this area. If we go down to the lower end, the starting salary is in excess of \$23 000 and up to \$30 000.

Mr MEIER: The first statement under 'Issues and Trends' says:

Continuing high demand for redeployment and retraining services exists for staff employed in low priority services.

I was under the impression that people employed in the so-called low priority services normally would have received on-the-job training. In other words, they come in at a lower level, learn how to accommodate themselves in that department and, hopefully, receive promotion accordingly. Is that the main method used or does specific retraining occur and, if so, is that through special programs? If that is the case, about how many weeks a year would the average lower priority employed person expect to be able to spend in retraining?

Mr White: Some standards are put out in the Commissioner's circular in relation to training and staff development programs, whereby people are allowed a certain amount of time off for improving their capacity to do jobs. That varies from area to area and circumstance to circumstance. In terms of these lower priority areas, some of that is up to the individual and some is up to our redeployment unit, which advises people what they should be getting into to increase their saleability, in a sense, around the service.

Also, we have quite deliberately encouraged certain low priority area staff to translate themselves into other things. One was the computer systems area to which I have just referred; another involves weekly paid staff who are surplus in some areas. We have retrained some of those into clerical-type jobs and as correctional service officers. Correctional officers are in an area in which, as the honourable member would be aware, there has been a fair bit of expansion in the past few years.

We have had a number of staff in lower priority areas applying for and receiving training programs for that area. We are always looking out for other areas. We are hoping to do something in the future in accounting and financial management. Last year we ran a pay clerk special retraining program and had many people in low priority areas training as pay clerks, because we had some shortages there. In a sense, we adopt what we can when we can, but we leave a fair bit of it up to the individual as well.

Mr HAMILTON: What progress was made in 1987-88 in respect of the implementation of recruitment programs for young people?

The Hon. R.J. Gregory: Despite restrictions in recruitment, this year saw the further development of special programs for young people. The youth recruitment program emphasised structured on and off the job training components considered essential to develop a multiskilled, flexible and adaptable work force. This new element aims to ensure that the Public Service is staffed and trained according to its future skills and needs. The youth employment program for 1987-88 resulted in the placement of 240 young people in the 15 to 19 year age group in the employment of Government departments. Seven of these were employed as part of the school leaver program, and an additional 50 young people were engaged as State public sector clerical trainees as part of the Australian trainee system. Forty-four who successfully completed the scheme gained ongoing employment. The 1988-89 program will include and expand on the training elements.

Mr HAMILTON: What progress was made in 1987-88 with respect to the implementation of recruitment programs for people with disabilities?

The Hon. R.J. Gregory: Although there have been staffing restrictions on recruitment during the year, the Government maintains its commitment to the employment of people with disabilities. In particular, 38 persons with disabilities were recruited into mainstream positions during 1987-88. A further two were selected as part of the traineeship program. Seventeen training placements were arranged under

the vocational training scheme for disabled persons, and 14 of these people have gained ongoing employment.

Mr HAMILTON: What special efforts are being made to assist persons from non-English speaking backgrounds?

The Hon. R.J. Gregory: A pilot 'English in the workforce' program has been running for two years. By the end of 1988 it is estimated that more than 20 courses will have been conducted in the South Australian Health Commission. In addition, two courses have been conducted in the Department for Marine and Harbors and the Engineering and Water Supply Department may establish courses during 1988-89. A review of the 'English in the work place' program is being conducted at present to determine whether wider application is warranted.

A booklet containing profiles of a cross-section of 20 public servants from non-English speaking backgrounds is being produced in conjunction with a film which aims to increase the awareness in the public sector of the benefits of a multicultural work force.

Mr S.J. BAKER: I am pleased that the Minister provided some background information on those two areas, because I was going to follow up the matter. Perhaps the Minister can provide information of what his target is in 1988-89 for the disabled persons element within the Public Service. For how many people will the Government attempt to provide programs? Further, what is the 1988-89 target for Australian traineeships? It would seem to me that most of the recruitment effort seems to be going into specific programs for which some funding is now provided by the Commonwealth. That certainly reduces the burden on the State Public Service in terms of its training, but it would also appear to me that a lot lower level of external recruitment is involved. This means that, while there are specific target areas, and there is the general traineeship, the overall level of recruitment has decreased quite significantly.

The Hon. R.J. Gregory: In respect of the first question, the answer is, 'As many as we can get,' and in respect of the second question, 'Fifty.'

Mr S.J. BAKER: In response to a question that I asked last year or the year before about the long service leave overlap, I was told that the information could not be provided. I want to know how many people who have been in the Public Service for over 10 years have a considerable credit of long service leave—given that a directive from the Commissioner of Public Employment was that long service leave should be taken, as far as it is possible, when it is due, so that we do not have this build-up in the system. The response that I received to this question previously was, 'Sorry, we don't have the records.' Does the Public Service now have the records to provide that information?

The Hon. R.J. Gregory: No. The details should be in each agency.

Mr S.J. BAKER: I thank the Minister for his response. The reply that was given at the time suggested that I would be struggling to get such information from most agencies, unless they went through each individual record. I guess this leads to the next question, which concerns the paucity of records on human management, which was highlighted by the Auditor-General in his report. Since the Minister cannot speak for other agencies, despite the overall responsibility for staffing in the Public Service, can the Minister provide the details for his own department of the total amount of sick leave taken by employees? How many of those days leave were not covered by a medical certificate, and, of that second group, how many of the sick days occurred on a Friday or a Monday?

By way of further explanation, as members here would be well aware, I spent some time in the Public Service

before becoming a member of Parliament. That was over a period of 20 years, during which time I had management responsibilities in a number of areas. I did not find that sick leave was abused in those areas. On one occasion where one person under my control took long weekends that person was told to submit a leave application or to think about retiring. Can the Minister provide the details for which I have asked?

The Hon. R.J. Gregory: A total of 1 046 days of sick leave were taken by Department of Personnel and Industrial Relations staff in 1987-88. That includes unattached and redeployed employees, but not school leavers, trainees and HETA employees. The average number of full-time equivalent employees for 1987-88 was 141.8. The average number of sick days per full-time employee was 7.4. A total of 369 single sick days were taken by the Department of Personnel and Industrial Relations staff in 1987-88. That accounted for 35 per cent of all sick days taken. The average number of single sick days per full-time equivalent in 1987-88 was 2.6 days, and the average number of single sick days on Monday or Friday was 1.2 days per full-time equivalent.

Mr S.J. BAKER: That was a well prepared answer.

The Hon. R.J. Gregory: It is a nitpicking thing—'Go after the workers,' and one expects it from people like the honourable member.

Mr S.J. BAKER: I will ask the same question when dealing again with the Labor vote: I was hoping that the Minister could provide details for the whole of his labour portfolio, not just the DPIR segment.

The Hon. R.J. Gregory: They are different departments.

Mr S.J. BAKER: But under the one ministerial portfolio. My next question is a standard one, and I am sure that the Minister will have the answer. How many cars permanently or regularly available to DPIR employees for travel between work and home have been or are to be fitted with private registration plates?

The Hon. R.J. Gregory: One.

Mr S.J. BAKER: Have all the departments completed their equal opportunity plans, or are we still missing some?

The Hon. R.J. Gregory: The answer is 'No.'

Mr S.J. BAKER: Further to that, which departments have not succumbed to the Government's requirement?

The Hon. R.J. Gregory: Nobody has succumbed to anything. I take it that the honourable member wants to know who has not completed plans in this respect.

Mr S.J. BAKER: Yes.

The Hon. R.J. Gregory: Then the honourable member should ask accordingly. We can provide that information to the Committee at a later date.

The Hon. R.K. ABBOTT: Why is there a growth in the 1988-89 financial year expenditure on consultants?

The Hon. R.J. Gregory: A consulting brief was let to Miller Simon & Co. to conduct a feasibility study for an operational and information management system for the Industrial Relations Division. The need for an urgent review of the information management needs of the division became apparent during the second tier negotiations in the first half of the financial year. The new wage principles place on the division new information management requirements which cannot be satisfactorily met without radical changes to existing information systems.

The Hon. R.K. ABBOTT: Further to a question asked earlier by the member for Goyder, how will the Aboriginal programs on recruitment, employment and career development be coordinated?

The Hon. R.J. Gregory: The department has established a four-person Aboriginal employment unit, which will coordinate a range of direct entry programs as well as career

and development programs for Aboriginal people within the State public sector.

The Hon. R.K. ABBOTT: What was achieved in 1987-88 in the area of advancement of Aborigines, and how will this change in 1988-89?

The Hon. R.J. Gregory: Aboriginal employment was a major area of focus in the past financial year. As at 30 June 1987, 317 Aborigines, or .6 per cent of employees, are employed in administrative units in Government departments. The number of Aborigines employed in administrative units as at 30 June 1988 was 409 or .8 per cent. Aboriginal Government Management and Employment Act employees to this date comprise 1.09 per cent of all GME Act employees in administrative units. The number of Aboriginal GME Act employees has increased by 32.5 per cent over the past year.

There were 36 mature age Aboriginal people recruited into mainstream positions. As part of the school leaver program, eight young people gained positions and five gained positions as part of the traineeship program. There were 24 people placed into Commonwealth-funded training placements with a high probability of subsequent placement in ongoing employment. There were two special programs approved by Cabinet and gazetted, which are currently being implemented and provide for the recruitment of two cadets annually in professional categories and up to 15 people a year in specially designated positions.

In conjunction with the Government Management Board, senior Aboriginal management programs were held to develop knowledge, skills and experience of senior Aboriginal Public Service staff. In 1988-89 it is anticipated that there will be a career development for Aborigines from CO1 to CO5 levels.

Aboriginal Affairs seminars are being run as part of increasing public sector Aboriginal awareness, that is, making departments aware of the needs and aspirations of Aboriginal employees. Now that there are significant numbers of Aboriginal people being recruited each year, the important issue of addressing the retention of these recruits will be picked up in this current financial year. Of even greater significance will be the establishment of the four-person unit, to which I have referred, and specifically to achieve equality with regard to the employment of Aboriginal people in the public sector by encouraging the recruitment of Aborigines and ensuring their advancement within the State public sector to provide: specific career and development programs for Aboriginal public sector employees; awareness and development programs for supervisors and middle managers responsible for Aboriginal employees; and to assist line managers in significantly improving their retention of Aboriginal employees in State public sector employment. Targets have been set in the clerical and administrative traineeships, cadetships and weekly-paid areas. In addition, significant effort will be generated to provide career development training opportunities for current Aboriginal employees.

Mr S.J. BAKER: Can the Minister provide in tabular form the distribution of employees according to gender at AO and EO levels within the Public Service?

The Hon. R.J. Gregory: I can supply the Committee with a statistical breakdown of the gender and classification grouping of employees of the Public Service. I seek leave to incorporate in *Hansard* two tables of a statistical nature.

Leave granted.

TABLE 7—GME ACT EMPLOYEES IN ADMINISTRATIVE UNITS BY CLASSIFICATION AND GENDER, JUNE 1986 TO JUNE 1988

Classification Group (1)	June 1986			June 1987			June 1988		
	Male	Female	Total	Male	Female	Total	Male	Female	Total
Administrative Officers	734	99	833	754	108	862	718	112	830
Architects	61	4	65	56	5	61	47	5	52
Artists	18	39	57	29	24	53	30	25	55
Building Officers	122	0	122	118	0	118	112	0	112
Clerical Officers (2)	2 633	3 720	6 353	2 554	3 934	6 488	2 539	3 912	6 451
College Resource Officers	20	233	253	17	253	270	25	252	277
Computer Systems Officers	208	40	248	233	54	287	244	52	296
Correctional Officers (3)	555	64	619	650	71	721	684	80	764
Court Reporters	7	51	58	7	47	54	6	51	57
Education Officers	127	41	168	122	49	171	113	47	160
Engineers	472	3	475	453	4	457	438	5	443
Executive Officers	225	12	237	210	10	220	193	16	209
Trainee Finance, Computer Systems and Project Officers	41	40	81	36	33	69	26	32	58
Geologists	76	5	81	78	5	83	74	8	82
Guidance Officers	43	26	69	42	29	71	32	28	60
Inspectors	184	4	188	174	2	176	230	2	232
Legal Officers	65	30	95	60	36	96	49	42	91
Librarians	39	182	221	41	188	229	43	161	204
Printers	181	38	219	176	43	219	168	50	218
Rangers	94	4	98	93	4	97	96	5	101
Scientific Officers	398	31	429	477	57	534	461	54	515
Social Workers	429	435	864	419	454	873	410	446	856
Surveyors	61	1	62	62	0	62	62	1	63
Technical Assistants	255	134	389	297	135	432	246	119	365
Technical Officers	1 180	85	1 265	1 089	77	1 166	1 125	94	1 219
Valuers	79	1	80	71	1	72	74	1	75
Veterinary Officers	25	1	26	24	0	24	26	2	28
Other	993	237	1 230	940	179	1 119	850	204	1 054
TOTAL	9 325	5 560	14 885	9 282	5 802	15 084	9 121	5 806	14 927

- (1) Principal or substantive classification
- (2) The manipulative group has been included in the clerical group
- (3) Includes Correctional Industry Officers

TABLE 23—GME ACT EMPLOYEES IN ADMINISTRATIVE UNITS BY CLASSIFICATION, STATUS AND GENDER AT JUNE 1988

Classification Group (1)	Permanent			Temporary			Total		
	Male	Female	Total	Male	Female	Total	Male	Female	Total
Administrative Officers—AO-1	303	58	361	14	8	22	317	66	383
AO-2	111	7	118	5	0	5	116	7	123
AO-3	133	17	150	4	3	7	137	20	157
AO-4	103	12	115	3	1	4	106	13	119
AO-5	42	4	46	0	2	2	42	6	48
Total AO	692	98	790	26	14	40	718	112	830
Agricultural Officers—General	21	0	21	17	1	18	38	1	39
Agricultural Officers—Technical	59	7	66	30	6	36	89	13	102
Architects	46	3	49	1	2	3	47	5	52
Artists	26	22	48	4	3	7	30	25	55
Building Officers	109	0	109	3	0	3	112	0	112
Clerical Officers (2)—CO-1	659	2 439	3 098	102	445	547	761	2 884	3 645
CO-2	448	517	965	5	25	30	453	542	995
CO-3	369	221	590	20	10	30	389	231	620
CO-4	380	134	514	12	17	29	392	151	543
CO-5	424	83	507	8	18	26	432	101	533
CO-6	109	3	112	3	0	3	112	3	115
Total CO	2 389	3 397	5 786	150	515	665	2 539	3 912	6 451
College Resource Officers	20	170	190	5	82	87	25	252	277
Computer Operators	27	31	58	6	2	8	33	33	66
Computer Systems Officers	236	50	286	8	2	10	244	52	296
Correctional Officers	565	64	629	47	13	60	612	77	689
Correctional Industry Officers	70	3	73	2	0	2	72	3	75
Court Reporters	6	48	54	0	3	3	6	51	57
Education Officers	110	42	152	3	5	8	113	47	160
Engineers	435	4	439	3	1	4	438	5	443
Executive Officers—EO-1	60	4	64	1	1	2	61	5	66
EO-2	56	3	59	0	0	0	56	3	59
EO-3	37	3	40	3	0	3	40	3	43
EO-4	12	1	13	1	0	1	13	1	14
EO-4Z	3	0	3	0	0	0	3	0	3
EO-5	6	3	9	0	0	0	6	3	9
EO-6	14	1	15	0	0	0	14	1	15
Total EO	188	15	203	5	1	6	193	16	209
Geologists and Geophysicists	74	8	82	0	0	0	74	8	82

Classification Group (1)	Permanent			Temporary			Total		
	Male	Female	Total	Male	Female	Total	Male	Female	Total
Guidance Officers	31	23	54	1	5	6	32	28	60
Inspectors—Various	224	2	226	6	0	6	230	2	232
Legal Officers	46	38	84	3	4	7	49	42	91
Librarians	37	140	177	6	21	27	43	161	204
Metal Trades Related Officers	68	0	68	1	0	1	69	0	69
Printers	166	50	216	2	0	2	168	50	218
Publicity and Promotion Officers	20	14	34	1	1	2	21	15	36
Rangers	93	5	98	3	0	3	96	5	101
Scientific Officers	416	37	453	45	17	62	461	54	515
Social Workers	383	413	796	27	33	60	410	446	856
Surveyors	56	1	57	6	0	6	62	1	63
Technical Assistants	218	93	311	28	26	54	246	119	365
Technical Officers	1 107	84	1 191	18	10	28	1 125	94	1 219
Trainee Finance, Computer Systems and Research Officers	20	25	45	6	7	13	26	32	58
Valuers	73	1	74	1	0	1	74	1	75
Veterinary Officers	22	1	23	4	1	5	26	2	28
Other	575	112	687	25	30	55	600	142	742
TOTAL	8 628	5 001	13 629	493	805	1 298	9 121	5 806	14 927

(1) Principal or Substantive Classification

(2) The manipulative group has been included in the clerical group

The Hon. R.J. Gregory: I am advised that the annual report of the Commissioner for Public Employment, which is due to be tabled within two weeks, will contain most, if not all, of the information sought by the member for Mit-cham.

Mr S.J. BAKER: There has been a significant increase in expenditure on management advisory services and special review consulting and development initiatives. I note on page 512 of the Program Estimates an increase of four staff. Can the Minister explain in which program those employees will be involved and how he measures the effectiveness of the programs on personnel management? How is the effectiveness of the dollar that is being spent measured?

The Hon. R.J. Gregory: I think it is appropriate for the Commissioner to answer this question.

Mr White: I will start with the last question in relation to measuring the effectiveness of these programs. I am sure that the honourable member knows that that is not an easy task. One of the major responsibilities of the Commissioner for Public Employment is to monitor the acceptance and use of the personnel principles outlined in the Government Management and Employment Act throughout Government departments.

Each year we have a program of monitoring personnel practice in departments. In the past year we looked at such topics as sexual harassment, selection procedures and the application of the merit principle, and the use of staff development in Government departments. We did this in a number of ways: by holding specific meetings where employees could come along and discuss with our staff things that concerned them about those areas; by undertaking specific investigations—in particular, selection processes and procedures; and by undertaking a certain number of phone-ins, especially on sexual harassment and merit issues. Employees could call in and then the department provided feedback through the weekly notice of what was found. Our whole approach was to try and encourage good personnel practice in these kinds of areas.

So, that is the major way in which the department measures the effectiveness of these programs and from year to year it will look at specific topics as they arise. This year it will be looking at the whole question of sick leave because it has become an issue and that seems to be the sensible way to go about it.

In respect of the reason for the variation in those lines in the Program Estimates, the increase is due to the setting up of the clerical barrier job redesign team. I think you will

recall that the Minister in his opening statement mentioned that the job redesign team was a major part of the Government's social justice strategy for this coming year and the unit to assist departments to make that job redesign of clerical areas falls within this area. So, that is the reason for the increase as shown in the budget estimates.

Mr S.J. BAKER: My last question relates to page 164 of the Estimates of Payments. Can the Minister explain the increase in the administrative expenses of the intra-agency support service? In 1987-88, \$267 507 was spent and it is proposed to spend \$445 000 in 1988-89.

The Hon. R.J. Gregory: The outcome in 1987-88 is affected by amendments to existing accounting structures resulting in actual expenses for computer charges of \$98 400 being debited against program staffing and Public Service, whereas budget allocation was shown against inter-agency support services, thus accounting for the shortfall in expenditure. In the 1988-89 proposed budget, as opposed to the actual result for 1987-88, there is a proposed increase in expenditure of \$177 000, which is mainly the result of restoration of computer charges being debited against inter-agency support services, and provision for training expenses for redeployees of \$35 000 and for unattached persons of \$15 000, making a total of \$50 000.

Mr HAMILTON: Can the Minister say how successful has been the Government's policy of reducing administrative overheads in 1987-88?

The Hon. R.J. Gregory: Since 1985, ceilings have been prescribed for all the administrative units with respect to EO, AO and equivalent position numbers in an attempt by Government to reduce the administrative overheads and support services. From time to time adjustments are approved to those ceilings by the Budget Savings Coordinating Committee to take into account new Government initiatives, salary movements, and other necessary situations. The number of actual EO, AO or full-time equivalents in administrative units has grown from 2 939.2 in 1985 to 3 030 in June 1988—a growth of 90.8 or 3.1 per cent.

However, the Children's Services Office's current 45 EO, AO and equivalent full-time positions have only been included as administrative units since 1987. If that number is excluded from these figures, then the number of EO and AO actual full-time equivalents in administrative units excluded from the CSO has increased by 45.8 or 1.6 per cent between June 1985 and June 1988. The number of EO and AO equivalent full-time positions in administrative units, excluding CSO, has been steadily decreasing since

June 1986. Between June 1986 and June 1988 it has decreased by 82.2 or 2.6 per cent.

As regards progress during 1987-88, in June 1988 the number of EO and AO equivalents in administrative units, including CSO, was 3 030—a decrease of 46 or 1.5 per cent over the 12 months to June 1988. Reductions in actual EO and AO and equivalent numbers, including CSO, have been realised across the categories between June 1987 and June 1988. The number of actual EO positions has decreased by 18.7 and the number of actual AO positions by 50.5. The actual full-time equivalents have decreased by 21.9.

Mr HAMILTON: Over the years persons have come to my electorate office seeking employment in Government departments. Can the Minister say whether delays caused by the Government's restrictions on external recruitment are justified and whether the quality of recruitment is being adversely affected by such restrictions?

The Hon. R.J. Gregory: The Government's strategy on the filling of Public Service vacancies requires administrative units to adopt stringent internal processes in determining the need for positions and requires them also to justify the need for external recruitment with the Commissioner of Public Employment, except for those categories of employment specifically exempted by the Commissioner: that is, specialised health industry positions. This strategy ensures that excess or under-utilised employees are given the best opportunities for relocation and it avoids unnecessary expenditure on external recruitment.

Mr HAMILTON: Can the Minister say whether the Work Force Planning Committee, which was established in 1987, has reported as yet and, if it has, what are the key findings and/or recommendations of that report?

The Hon. R.J. Gregory: The Work Force Planning Committee has recently forwarded to my office for consideration a report on work force planning and major work force trends. The report contains 14 major recommendations to be developed in order to provide and facilitate improved work force planning, encourage mobility and flexibility, address and remove structural rigidities, and encourage fairness and equity in the public sector. The range of strategies and actions recommended in the report to achieve those objectives represents a significant achievement made possible by public sector management and union participation in developing a report. I intend to forward to Cabinet soon an implementation of strategy to carry into effect the major strategies outlined in the report.

Mr HAMILTON: In what way has the Commissioner of Public Employment addressed the need for all public servants to work free from sexual harassment?

The Hon. R.J. Gregory: The Commissioner has issued circular 15, which addresses the right of all public servants to work free from sexual harassment. The circular includes a draft policy which some agencies have chosen to adopt without alteration, while others have written their own agency's specific policies. At the end of 1987-88, sexual harassment policies had been adopted in 29 out of the 35 agencies. This number includes four agencies that chose to adopt more general freedom from harassment policies.

Training programs have been progressively organised for offices and agencies that have responsibilities for handling complaints of sexual harassment. The Equal Opportunities Branch of the department has been advised of two sexual harassment cases during 1987-88 and most instances are handled within the agency.

The CHAIRMAN: Does that complete questions on the Personnel and Industrial Relations line? If it does, I declare the examination of the line completed and thank the officers

for their attendance. We will now return to the main proposed Department of Labour vote.

Labour, \$13 525 000—*resumed*

Witness:

The Hon. R.J. Gregory, Minister of Labour.

Departmental Advisers:

Mr H. Bachmann, Director, Department of Labour.

Mr A. Dangerfield, Assistant Director, Industrial Affairs.

Mr G. Billett, Manager, Administration and Finance Branch.

Ms G. Thompson, Women's Adviser.

Mr C. Mickle, Chairperson, Occupational Health and Safety Commission.

Ms J. Powning, Deputy Chairman, Occupational Health and Safety Commission.

The CHAIRMAN: It is best that we start another round of questions. The honourable member for Goyder.

Mr MEIER: On page 503 of the Program Estimates, under the heading '1988-89 Specific Targets and Objectives', there appears the following statement:

To maintain the success rate in resolving industrial complaints of at least 90 per cent and to routine check as many work places as possible within available resources to ensure compliance with awards.

To what extent need work places be checked as against circularising them to ensure that they are fully aware of the regulations to which they must adhere? As an example of what I am referring to, at a service station-cum-restaurant in my electorate a couple who ran the restaurant were approached by a lady in the town who wanted to get some extra work.

The couple said, 'We cannot afford to employ you. We would have to pay you \$7 an hour' (or something, which was the award rate), but the person did not give up and kept coming back, saying, 'I do not want the \$7 an hour; I am happy to work for less than that.' Finally, she said, 'I am happy to work for \$2 an hour; I just need some work.' Finally, the restaurant proprietor employed the person for \$3 or \$3.50 an hour. Some months later the wage went up to \$5; I think that it even got up to \$6 after a year or so.

However, there was a disagreement between the employer and the employee and the employee was put off. Some months later the proprietors were informed by the Department of Labour that a complaint had been made against them for not having paid award wages and that they were liable for some thousands of dollars. At that stage, they asked me to assist. My secretary contacted the Department of Labour: it seemed that the employee would lose out because her husband was on a benefit of some sort and she would be liable to pay considerably increased taxation. All in all, she would not do herself a service and, additionally, it looked as though the restaurant people would go through the hoop because they could not afford that extra expense. They said to me, 'Why isn't there provision for such hiring agreements if a person is prepared to work at a lower rate?'

Secondly, if that provision is not available why are employers not made aware of it and clearly given full details of what will happen to them if they transgress that award? I have spoken with various people from time to time who have also worked at a lower-than-award rate. They have said that they have not worried about it: they wanted work and could not get it unless they took the smaller rate.

The Hon. R.J. Gregory: It is a fairly easy question: it is not complex at all. The member for Goyder, having been

a member of Parliament for nearly as long as I have, would appreciate and understand that laws cannot be abrogated by people saying, 'I do not wish to be covered by that law.' There are laws of the State. The awards of the Industrial Commission in this State have the same effect as do the laws. No employee can enter into an agreement with an employer to abrogate the obligations and rights of the award. That award determines that the rate of pay for an hour or part thereof of work is a certain amount of money: it varies from time to time. Members of this place and the other place of this Parliament are aware of the demands of workers for wage increases. It is flexible. It is not the Government's policy to introduce amendments to the Act to provide for this flexible working or opting out of award conditions because it would mean that we would be agreeing to the principle that people can opt out of the application of certain laws. We will not do that.

In my understanding, the department endeavours to circularise all employers concerning their obligations. I know that the Motor Traders Association has a very active section in the area of service stations: I have seen its trade journals, which constantly have pieces that advise people of their obligations as employers. If these people were members of that association they would in all probability have been aware of it.

I know that employer associations also, at the time of wage and award changes, advise their members in extensive detail of these changes. I do not know whether these people were in the appropriate employer organisation, but if they were not they did themselves a disservice.

It is unfortunate that people agree to allow other people in essence to break the law: that is precisely what happened in this case. The department does what it can. If we were able to have more regular inspections these people would have been inspected and found to be paying the inappropriate wage rate, and would have been consulted on how to overcome that deficiency. If they had argued about it, they would eventually have been prosecuted.

Mr MEIER: On page 507 under 'Issues and Trends' the statement is made:

Existing legislation does not adequately cover outworkers. As such, they do not have access to the same rights and protection as other workers.

Will the Minister explain in further detail the types of workers whom he sees as 'outworkers'? More importantly, on what rights and protections are they missing out?

The Hon. R.J. Gregory: If ever there was a group of people who do work for reward and who are exploited with no protection provided it is people who work in their homes and who are known as outworkers. It is not a recent phenomenon: I had occasion recently to study a report which has been in the archives of the library of this Parliament since 1895 and which described the conditions of outworkers in Victoria. In my previous job as a union official I saw reports on the conditions of work of outworkers in South Australia prior to the turn of the century. If one talks to anybody who knows people in the ethnic communities in the western suburbs, one will know that some women work for as little as \$1.50 and \$2 an hour, sewing: this exploitation of workers takes place mainly in the clothing or rag trade.

Mr S.J. BAKER: Not too many these days.

The Hon. R.J. Gregory: The member for Mitcham makes that assertion, but if and when he starts investigating this he will find that there is more of it than people choose to see. People ignore this: they do not have the protection of any of the Acts with respect to working in safe and sanitary conditions; there is no protection in respect of workers compensation or awards. These people are classed as contractors. They work for as little as \$1.50 to \$2 an hour. I

have personally refused to assist people in getting training on sewing machines because I thought that that was what they were going to do. It is the grossest exploitation of people that I have ever come across. The officers of my department who are involved in this are being urged constantly by me to do what they can. The department will support any activity to reduce this level of exploitation of these people. It is an obscenity that we cannot allow in this country.

Mr MEIER: On page 508 under 'Broad Objectives', it says:

To encourage better cooperation between employers and employees in the work place.

How does the Minister see this eventuating?

The Hon. R.J. Gregory: If the member thinks about it it is the aim of the Industrial Commission and of the Industrial Relations Advisory Committee.

Mr MEIER: How do you intend to do this?

The Hon. R.J. Gregory: By constant talking. People complain about the aggravation that goes on from time to time. We intend to encourage people, through IRAC and the Industrial Commission, to talk. We have been very successful on that in this State because the level of industrial disputes is low. The honourable member may recall that earlier in the day I responded to some detailed requests about industrial disputes. The average number of days lost per 1 000 employees in this State from 1979-82 (I am sure that the honourable member knows who was in government then) was 243, and from 1983-87 it was 80.

So, this Government has been very successful in that area of consultation to avoid industrial disputes. Also, cooperation and what have you is measured by the number of days lost through accidents. It is obvious that the Labor Government has been very successful in that area and we will continue to do it. If we do not do it and adopt a confrontation approach as advocated by some other people, all we will do is see our manufacturing industry slide further down the drain. That means the standard of living of Australian people, and South Australians in particular, will slide down the drain. Unless we take initiatives in that area, we will not ensure that the wellbeing of the South Australian community as a whole is enhanced.

Mr MEIER: As a supplementary question, I do not dispute the fact that cooperation between employers and employees is essential. In fact, I was reading in relation to the new model Holden that apparently General Motors has come up with a much better management program concerning its workers, at least in this State, anyway (and I will not comment on another State because from reading the paper I believe there is an industrial dispute). The Minister said he will continue to initiate better ways. Can he be more specific or is it just a general broad policy and nothing actually is happening from the Government's point of view?

The Hon. R.J. Gregory: It is not that nothing is actually happening; it is constant talking and encouragement. We are doing that as a Government. If you had been lucky enough to work at Holdens, like some of us, in the good old days and you then saw what car manufacturing was today and how people were treated, you would not need to be too much of an Einstein to work out that workers are treated as a very valuable piece of Holden's plant and equipment. In my days, they were not. If any production foreman had spoken to me as they used to speak to migrant workers on the assembly lines in those days, assaults would have been committed. They were just downright rude and arrogant. However, there has been a change.

That is why cars produced today by Mitsubishi and, I imagine, Holdens will be a far superior product to that

brought in by the Japanese because our workers are being consulted, trained and being advised of what the company is doing. They have confidence in the company's future. They are consulted about their job design so, when they work on these things, they produce an excellent product. I know from experience and am confident that Australian workers can produce better articles than anybody else in the world. We have done it before and we will do it again, but we have to constantly talk to unions and employers. There has to be constant consultation with the workers as well. If you do not want to be involved in any part of that, you might as well kiss our manufacturing industry goodbye because employers who advocate confrontation are people who selfishly want to look after their own ends and not worry about the wellbeing of Australia.

Mr HAMILTON: Earlier this year a report appeared in the *Sunday Mail* about the erection of houses on properties in Hendon. It was stated in that article that those houses were erected on properties that previously belonged to a skin processing firm which subsequently relocated out of the area. People eventually took up residence in that area. My concern is that it was alleged in the article that arsenic was present in the soil and that the workers who had built those units may well have been affected by the toxicity from the arsenic. I have been briefed but I will not provide that information to the Committee and I will not breach that confidence. However, I am sufficiently concerned that there seems to me to be a lack of consultation between Government departments and the local council that enabled such an occurrence to eventuate.

I express to the Committee my concern about the keeping of past records of those employees in such establishments. Whilst appreciating the cost of keeping records of such persons involved in the past, and the maintenance of those records for some time in the future, will the Minister take this matter to his Cabinet colleagues to discuss what I consider to be a very important issue, because I fear that, unless this question is properly addressed, how can we as a responsible Government assist those persons who could well have been adversely affected by the incidence of similar chemicals? As I understand it, no record has been maintained of the location of those persons be it within the State or outside, and the Minister would be well aware as a former union official, and given his record of statements on this matter, of the importance of such an issue in terms of the working class of this State.

The Hon. R.J. Gregory: I have been advised that the Occupational Safety and Welfare Unit is commencing a collection and coordination of this information so that we can continue into the future to have these records. With respect to past records, I will take that on notice and advise the Committee at a later date.

Mr HAMILTON: When reading an article in *Worksafe Australia*, I noted on page 6 a statement about the problems with the immune systems of people. The article refers to the projects being carried out looking at mixture toxicity, the effects of chemicals on liver functions and the links between carcinogenic exposure and damage to the immune system. The article further states:

With solvents such a current concern, they recently began a project looking at the effect on bile acids of tetrachloroethylene, a chemical commonly used in dry cleaning.

Experiments like this may tell us that some of these solvents are affecting the liver at levels we didn't realise, and offer a useful technique for biological monitoring.

Is the Minister aware of this situation? If so, what monitoring is being carried out in South Australia, not only in terms of the tetrachloroethylene used in dry cleaning but

also on mixture toxicity which has been a matter of concern for many years?

The Hon. R.J. Gregory: I am not sure about the solvent tetrachloroethylene. I think that is a solvent and, if you are actually smoking and inhale the fumes, it can turn into the gas that was used in the First World War to kill and disable people. The use of any of these chemicals in industry is becoming more apparent. Some have considerable side effects on the health of people. Unfortunately, it is not the sort of information that our occupational safety people have at the moment. It is available from the Health Commission and I will undertake to request my staff to secure the appropriate information as requested by the member for inclusion in the record at a later date.

Mr S.J. BAKER: I refer to the appointment of safety representatives. I asked about the registration form. How many departments have not fully complied with the Occupational Health, Safety and Welfare Act by the appointment of safety representatives and a safety committee where appropriate?

The Hon. R.J. Gregory: I am advised that, to the best of the knowledge of the Director of the department, all departments have done so.

Mr S.J. BAKER: I understand that there are still some problems in the education area, and there may be others. I refer to compliance with the Act and the extent to which the Act is being used for industrial disruption. I note the Layton case where there was some dispute about whether or not a hoist was safe and, because the union refused to operate the hoist, the inspector could not test it. I also note a number of examples where safety has been used with impunity as an industrial issue, to the extent that the ASER site was pulled off at one stage because somebody deliberately dropped a piece of wood from the third floor. Toilets have been abused or water has been turned on, and even with a toilet 50 metres away the site has been pulled off. Other examples have been reported to me. What action will be taken to ensure that safety is a priority and that it is not abused for industrial purposes? If there is not enough power within the Act to prosecute people who use this area for industrial purposes, will the Minister initiate changes to the Act to ensure that it is possible?

The Hon. R.J. Gregory: My advice is that the instances given happened some time ago. In one instance the intervention of the Secretary of the Building Workers Industrial Union resolved the dispute, in which it was alleged that a safety issue was used for industrial purposes. It is not the intention of the Act that that should happen, but it is understandable that some people in a conflict situation will use other excuses to cover a reason. I assure the honourable member that in my experience sometimes it is necessary to take people off work to ensure that a workplace is made safe, because employers are totally intransigent to demands for safe working conditions. However, the instances raised occurred some time ago, and the matter has been resolved by the commission.

Mr S.J. BAKER: As a supplementary question, when such examples occur, does the Minister intend to take action?

The Hon. R.J. Gregory: The Minister will uphold the Act that he is required to administer and, if there have been breaches of the Act in which a prosecution can be successfully launched, that will happen.

Mr S.J. BAKER: I refer to page 504 of the Program Estimates relating to the Lifts and Cranes Act. There has been no reduction in employment even though the responsibilities in that area have changed significantly. I should have thought that there would be a reduction, given the lower level of responsibility now placed on the department

in that area. I refer also to page 496. Some time ago I wrote to the Minister about the notification of crane usage where the cost of that process is more than the fee being collected. Will the Minister say whether there will be some changes more in keeping with the new legislation?

The Hon. R.J. Gregory: What changes do you want? Do you want a reduction in staff?

Mr S.J. BAKER: When we were debating the Bill it was made quite clear that the involvement of the department's inspectorial staff would be considerably lower, that the prime responsibility would be placed on the people operating those lifts and indeed that some prime responsibility would be placed on lift manufacturers. With that change of emphasis, with which I happen to agree, one would have expected employment levels to diminish. I refer also to the related area of crane notification, where a small crane is used for a matter of hours and the paperwork and cost involved far exceeds the benefit being derived.

The Hon. R.J. Gregory: A number of matters have been raised. If the honourable member had been receiving copies of the *Government Gazette* he would have noticed that the amendments to the Lifts and Cranes Act have not yet been proclaimed. I hope that shortly they will be proclaimed, as there has been a problem with the drafting of regulations. Since the introduction of the Bill, which amended the Act to provide for some self-regulation in this area, an increased number of lifts have been installed in Adelaide.

I never cease to wonder at the number of buildings put up with lifts established in those buildings, all needing to be inspected. The onus is on the manufacturer of the lift and the building owner to ensure that the lift is maintained properly—a course that some people question. It was likened to asking the inmates at Yatala also to be prison officers: you need somebody to ensure that they are doing their work. The Act envisaged the department's inspectors checking to ensure that the manufacturers and building owners properly maintained lifts in a safe condition. The honourable member would also be aware that in circumstances where the building owner, manufacturer or maintenance people signed false declarations, the penalties were quite heavy if those involved were apprehended.

The Hon. R.K. ABBOTT: Why has funding almost doubled for the Occupational Health and Safety Commission? In 1987-88 actual payments were \$353 000, and for this financial year an amount of \$616 000 has been proposed.

The Hon. R.J. Gregory: The first allocation of money was an estimate—very much what is known as a seeding grant. The current amount is the actual amount of money that is needed to enable the unit to operate effectively.

The Hon. R.K. ABBOTT: How many health and safety representatives have been elected?

The Hon. R.J. Gregory: The number is 3 502, and I gave the detailed answer earlier today. There are 815 females and 2 687 males, making a total of 3 502, and there are 37 female and 104 male deputies, making a total of 141.

Mr S.J. BAKER: One of the problems that I have come up against is the fact that the Department of Labour no longer operates a noise control unit. Some questions were asked about safety in schools, and the DLI assisted those schools to identify various hazards, including fumes from their laboratories, noise from their machinery workshops and a range of other areas in which the DLI played a very important role in this respect. More than one school in this State has asked for assistance from the Department of Labour to look at noise levels in particular areas, mainly in workshops. However, the department has said that it no longer operates the unit and referred the schools to the Department of Health.

The Department of Health says that it is not its responsibility, so no-one is taking the responsibility. Why was the unit closed down? Why was the expensive equipment which they had no longer utilised, and where do people such as school principals go if they want advice on noise control?

The Hon. R.J. Gregory: The expensive equipment referred to has been transferred to the Department of Environment and Planning. It is the responsibility of employers to operate a safe workplace. It is not a Government responsibility to pay for the expensive testing required. Employers should be paying for that. If employers want to know what measures they can undertake in respect of noise in the workplace, they need the proper engineering advice so that noise emission from machinery is reduced to a level which does not cause noise induced hearing loss. The engineering characteristics of most machines are well known to engineering people, who also know what needs to be done to that machinery to reduce noise levels.

One of the problems with noisy machinery is that some of the processes produce a large amount of noise. In others the poor machinery design creates the noise. Proper machinery design can mean that people can work in a very quiet environment without suffering noise induced hearing loss. The best example I can give of that is to see someone operate what is commonly called an air-operated jackhammer, which one can hardly hear. One can hardly hear the hammer or the compressor yet, if the muffler was taken off the air-operated jackhammer and the insulating material was taken away from the compressor, there would be an awful racket.

That is a measure of engineering skills being properly applied. In industry some employers must replace machinery. They are loath to do that, and they need to take other measures.

Mr S.J. BAKER: Specifically, what does a school do in those circumstances?

The Hon. R.J. Gregory: The Department of Environment and Planning has a Noise Control Unit. Whether you or anyone else have problems with excessive noise, that unit can measure it. If the school wants to have the noise levels reduced, it needs to take the appropriate action through the Education Department.

Mr S.J. BAKER: The Minister reported in the Parliament (and I notice that publicity has been given to the fact) that 40 firms have been identified by WorkCover as being particularly bad in terms of their injury record. From that, I presume that the Minister has a very close working relationship with WorkCover. Will the Minister be able to take up a number of concerns that I have about the operations of WorkCover?

The Hon. R.J. Gregory: If the honourable member wants to ask questions about WorkCover, they will be referred to WorkCover and answered in the appropriate way here, if we can do it in time. If not, it might be better to ask those questions on notice in the Parliament.

Mr HAMILTON: It has been put to me that many buildings in Adelaide, particularly old buildings, have little or no effective sprinkler systems. What action, if any, is being taken to address this problem?

The Hon. R.J. Gregory: I am advised by the Director that it is not a matter which comes under the purview of the Department of Labour, but I know that there are building regulations which require certain fire safety standards to be maintained. A building may be erected at a particular time to meet all the fire safety standards and, provided that nothing is done to it, that building can stay like that until there is a regulation which insists that something be done. Usually, the upgrading is achieved when there is a desire

to refurbish the building, as that building must then comply with the current safety requirements.

I share the honourable member's concern about sprinkler systems, particularly in multi-storey buildings. It may be a matter for the Minister of Local Government. We can undertake to ascertain that and supply the Committee with the answer.

Mr HAMILTON: On page 502 of the Program Estimates, relating to offsetting the cost to Government of the continued provision of services, it is stated:

Prepare the *Industrial Gazette* on the Justice Information System, enabling the text and layout of each *Gazette* to be sent to the Government Printer on floppy disc, thus creating significant budgetary savings and efficiencies in the use of staff time.

What are the savings and efficiencies in that area, particularly in relation to staff time?

Mr Bachmann: The JIS system now has all the awards of the South Australian Industrial Commission on its system and on floppy disc. When variations are made to awards, the variation is made through that system and transmitted to the Government Printer, from where the *Industrial Gazette* is printed directly. Prior to that, there was what was called a cut and paste system, and amendments to the award were done by hand. They were then typeset at the Government Printer, sent back and checked with the original cut and paste job, and then sent down for publication. Those processes have been eliminated, so there are savings of time in the court and the commission in relation to the editing of the *Industrial Gazette*, and the Government Printer has saved staff costs in typesetting all the material for publication. We estimate that use of this new system will result in a cost saving of at least \$100 000 in this coming financial year.

Mr HAMILTON: Can the Minister provide details of the incidence of RSI in Government departments and of what specific action has been taken to address this problem? I know that RSI is perhaps not the proper terminology but I cannot think of the alternative at the moment. What practices have been instituted and what action has the Government taken across Government departments in an effort to reduce this problem?

The Hon. R.J. Gregory: Whilst we are unable at this time to give advice as to the exact number of people suffering from what I know as RSI—and perhaps we should continue to use that terminology in this Committee so that we know what we are talking about—the incidence of it has been reduced, principally through the efforts of the Public Service Association and the Occupational and Radiation Health Branch in relation to reducing the incidence of injury. For instance, those of us who take note of what happens in our electoral offices would know that ergonomic chairs are now in use and that special attention is paid to the position in which our clerical assistants sit when using a typewriter. Members would know that in Government departments and in many places in private business tables for computer work stations are now made and designed so that they can be raised or lowered, and operators can raise or lower their chairs so that they sit in the optimum position.

Discussion with keyboard operators in the Public Service indicates that they are now rotating and are not working eight hours or a full shift at the keyboard. A discussion that I had with a keyboard operator indicated that what the operators thought was a very unlikely piece of wood on which to rest their wrists has proven to be of great benefit. One of the keyboard operators explained to me how the artisans from Netley had spent some time at the request of the operators reshaping the fixture to get it exactly right, and they were very grateful for that. All these little things have meant that people working at keyboards are not suf-

fering this very debilitating injury, an injury which often means that people will never work again. Some people cannot even do the things that they want to do at home and are very restricted. The incidence of this is being reduced and, with the proper attention over the next two or three years, I hope that it can be totally eliminated.

Mr S.J. BAKER: As to WorkCover, one of the big concerns of employees concerns late payments. I received a call about two weeks ago from a nurse who asked me about the conditions pertaining to permanent disability. Her circumstances were such that she had been working at a casual rate with a hospital but no payment had been received for seven weeks and she had no money in the bank. The Bankcard had run out and the wolf was at the door, and the kids were not getting fed. She went back to work but in fact permanently injured herself and will never work again. That is an extreme situation, but I have been told a number of stories from various people who do not have very much money in the bank and who rely on their wage packet. Can the Minister find out from the WorkCover people how many claims are there for which WorkCover is not meeting its obligation to pay immediately beyond that first seven days? As the Minister would understand, the Act provides that after the first seven days—which is the responsibility of the employer—it then becomes the responsibility of WorkCover to provide for continuation of payments whilst the worker is injured. Can the Minister ascertain in how many cases WorkCover has been unable to meet that obligation?

The Hon. R.J. Gregory: I will ask the WorkCover people to provide the information. I have a feeling that I have heard about this woman before—but it was more than two weeks ago. I think that most of the problems to which the member for Mitcham referred arose very early in the piece. I want to make the point that WorkCover is dealing with some 50 000 employers; it is dealing with thousands of applications each week and with thousands of payments each week. What has happened is that, whilst WorkCover cannot oblige employers to pay that amount of money involved, it has entered into many agreements and arrangements with employers to pay and they have been reimbursed. What I find peculiar about this whole matter is that the same system applied when the insurance companies were involved in this. It is obvious that the same employers never had the problems about paying—because the insurance companies are also very slow in paying. They were very slow in paying workers, and in many instances it was more than just a couple of weeks—it was months.

The other aspect of WorkCover is that it is settling claims very quickly, in the majority of cases. At the moment it takes a couple of weeks to settle a claim on WorkCover, as opposed to the weeks and months it would have taken to settle claims under the old Workers Compensation Act. I think there has been a very concentrated campaign by a few people in this State to denigrate the efforts of WorkCover. WorkCover has meant that people are receiving their money more quickly and that claims are being settled more quickly. It means that people are getting back into the work force more quickly, and it means that people who previously would never have gone back into the work force are now going back and performing useful work.

As I illustrated when talking about the Alan Bruce Risk Management Program, people are being found positions. The rehabilitation system which has been encouraged and used by WorkCover is putting people back into the work force. For the first time, when doctors are writing out their certificates they understand what is happening with people going back to work to undertake what is commonly termed

in the workplace 'light duties'. All these things are adding up to a better workplace. It is also adding up to less cost to the employers. We have those famous worst 40 employers, but I am confident that after WorkCover has undertaken proper consultation with those employers, has provided consultants to work with them, and has shown and demonstrated what happens in other places which have better safety records, we will see a drop in the injury rate. I am pleased that in less than 12 months WorkCover has picked up a system of insurance that provides cover for hundreds of thousands of employees in this State—with 50 000 employers and with payment of most of the claims being made on time. In fact, it is a payment record that would leave the insurance companies for dead.

Mr S.J. BAKER: Did the Minister or any member of the Government authorise the use of tape recorders within WorkCover? I will explain the situation that relates to this. There have been a number of circumstances where perhaps employers have done the wrong thing or where there has been some question mark about certain claims, in relation to which people who have been interviewed by WorkCover have been told that, if a tape recorder is used they will have a very quick interview while if a statement has to be taken down they will be there for a long time. Can the Minister confirm whether he or any other member of the Government authorised the use of tape recorders in those circumstances?

The Hon. R.J. Gregory: I cannot confirm it. The honourable member is querying the use of tape recorders. They are used in the Industrial Commission; they are used in this building; they are used in all sorts of places. If the people do not want to be interviewed on tape they can refuse. The latest development in relation to tapes is that the police want to videotape interviews, and particularly the defence people want to use that so that we can overcome some of the allegations that are raised.

Mr S.J. BAKER: By way of clarification: my question relates to whether anyone in Government authorised the use of tape recorders.

The Hon. R.J. Gregory: I do not know.

Mr S.J. BAKER: I would certainly query the use of tape recorders in the circumstances that have been described to me. The examples that the Minister has given are probably of a somewhat different nature to what I am discussing here. But, again, that is a matter of interpretation. How many people are working in WorkCover and the corporation and how many WorkCover employees are contracted from Drake personnel? I understand that a large part of the WorkCover work force is employed on a temporary basis.

The Hon. R.J. Gregory: I will ask WorkCover, but I do not understand the import of the question.

Mr S.J. BAKER: Are there any injury statistics from the records of the Department of Labour for 1987-88 compared with 1986-87, given that accidents are supposed to be reported to the Department of Labour at the same time as they are reported to WorkCover?

The Hon. R.J. Gregory: I think the member for Mitcham is well aware, as he has worked in the department, that accidents are reported on the basis of three days or more whereas WorkCover is developing a statistical basis for all injuries reported to it. I will ask WorkCover for that information, but I remind the Committee that WorkCover is a statutory authority managed by equal numbers of employer and employee representatives. It does not use Government funds; no money is provided in the current budget for WorkCover, it is entirely self-funding and is administered by employers and employees for the benefit of the people who work in South Australian industries.

Mr S.J. BAKER: I take the point that the Minister is making, although we could have an argument about who is responsible. I was trying to find out whether there was a comparison available and what are the latest statistics.

The Hon. R.J. Gregory: It might be more appropriate if the honourable member puts these questions on notice in the normal Notice Paper of the House of Assembly. Appropriate attention could then be paid to those matters as they are not really questions for the Estimates Committee. These questions require accurate answers and we have yet to receive the annual report from WorkCover.

The CHAIRMAN: I uphold the Minister's point because the honourable member could not go on asking these questions without me having to rule that they are out of order. As the honourable member for Mitcham intends to pursue another area, I do not need to worry about it.

Mr S.J. BAKER: In relation to dangerous goods and substances, daily we see on television reports of a horror spill or smash somewhere in the world. How many reports has the department received for the years 1986-87 and 1987-88 of possible breaches of safety which has meant that some risk has been involved with either the transport or the storage of dangerous goods and substances?

The Hon. R.J. Gregory: I am advised that incidents of failure to store dangerous goods safely are not reported to the Government. The department employs inspectors to inspect the premises and ensure that these goods are properly stored. Where breaches are observed and appropriate action is not taken to correct the situation, the department will prosecute. There have been two cases in the past financial year.

Mr S.J. BAKER: How many in the previous financial year?

The Hon. R.J. Gregory: That information will be provided in writing.

Mr S.J. BAKER: The security of an explosives factory was an issue about 18 months ago when somebody said that you could almost get in there with a nail file. This raised questions about the safety of the surrounding residents if someone should put a match to or detonate those factories. Has the Minister received any further information on the responsibilities of Government factories?

The Hon. R.J. Gregory interjecting:

Mr S.J. BAKER: There is a Commonwealth Government explosives factory, I think.

The Hon. R.J. Gregory: I have been assured that it is safe and that one needs more than a nail file to break in. I think the honourable member is talking about something somewhere else.

Mr S.J. BAKER: I think that there is a Commonwealth establishment in Adelaide.

The Hon. R.J. Gregory: The honourable member has been a member of this House for nearly as long as I have and he ought to know that the laws of the Commonwealth override the laws of the State. Whilst I might appear to be duck shoving, and as much as I might want to interfere in the affairs of the Commonwealth, I cannot, and the honourable member should know that and should not be asking me questions about Commonwealth functions over which I have no control.

Mr S.J. BAKER: I refer to page 505 of the Program Estimates. What key issues have been identified by the dangerous substances committee?

The Hon. R.J. Gregory: This question was asked earlier. It is to do with coordinating functions of interdepartmental agencies and determining the functions that they ought to undertake in this matter. The honourable member will appreciate that sometimes there is duplication of functions.

The department will ensure that people know exactly what they are required to do and do not overlap.

Mr S.J. BAKER: I understood that, but I thought it went beyond that. It is really just a matter of coordination and they are the key issues. In relation to the topic of air pollution, dust, smoke and asbestos, how many instances has the Department of Labour inspectorate discovered where the levels of pollution or the presence of asbestos have been unsatisfactory in the past financial year compared with the previous financial year?

The Hon. R.J. Gregory: That answer will be provided in writing.

Mr S.J. BAKER: Can the Minister tell the Committee how many workplaces were registered as at 30 June 1988?

The Hon. R.J. Gregory: I refer the honourable member to a table on page 506 of the Program Estimates. In 1983-84 the figure was 16 334; in 1984-85, 16 900; in 1985-86, 17 000; in 1986-87, 16 045; in 1987-88, 29 756 and it is estimated that in 1988-89 it will be 50 000 as indicated by WorkCover.

Mr S.J. BAKER: I was well aware of the table to which the Minister referred. The table refers to the period 1987-88 rather than to the period ended 30 June. How does the figure of 29 756 compare with current WorkCover registrations?

The Hon. R.J. Gregory: We estimate that the figure will be 50 000 for the coming financial year. There are 20 000 that have not been previously registered. As the honourable member would know from his experience in the department, there is never enough staff to go to every place in the area and there never has been.

Mr S.J. BAKER: Can the Minister confirm that 20 000 workplaces have still not been registered and will face a considerable fine when they do register?

The Hon. R.J. Gregory: What I can confirm is that if, when people are approached by our inspectors, they behave themselves properly they will not be prosecuted. If they refuse the advice and direction of the inspectors and refuse to cooperate, they will be prosecuted. Earlier, I said that one person had bucked the system but that, when someone had told him what would happen to him, he had decided to register his work place.

Mr HAMILTON: The Minister would be well aware of the problems associated with the railway industry. Can he say what actions are being taken by his department in respect of psychiatric counselling and compensation for engine crews, especially drivers, who are involved in fatalities or in circumstances where people with psychiatric problems have committed suicide? I am reminded of this because of an article in today's *News* which tells of a push in New South Wales for compensation for employees in respect of this matter.

I recall raising the subject in the House some years ago when I asked about the impact that it had on employees. As an ex-railway man myself and one with a son who is an engine driver, I am especially interested in learning what actions the Government has taken and what consultation there has been with the appropriate railway unions in this State.

The Hon. R.J. Gregory: The honourable member has raised a question that involves fundamental issues. One issue is that at present no railway crew driver is an employee of the State Transport Authority: they are all employees of Australian National at present. Certain people are made available to STA and that authority is undertaking a course of action that will encourage those employees who have been made available to become direct employees. When they do, STA will have the responsibility.

The problem referred to is real. I have worked with railway workers who have, unfortunately, been driving a locomotive when someone has walked out on the track in front of them and they could not stop the engine which has run over the top of the person on the track. That is devastating and the driver has required counselling and psychiatric care. It is part of the risk management of people with work-caused injury that all the appropriate care and counselling shall be provided as soon as practicable so that they do not suffer long-lasting psychological damage. In this regard, our department will encourage any of our sister departments and statutory authorities to take appropriate action whenever such an unfortunate happening affects any of their employees.

Mr HAMILTON: Other departments have employees for whom the Minister is directly responsible. What programs are in place to address this problem in respect of employees covered by State awards and working in State departments?

The Hon. R.J. Gregory: No specific program is prescribed. The problem concerns the rehabilitation of people injured at work and a special program must be designed for each worker concerned. This is a WorkCover responsibility in respect of rehabilitation. Certain general principles are laid down and people act in a certain way. However, people suffering from a psychiatric illness as a result of a fatal accident over which they have no control must be given specific treatment. I am advised that in the Metropolitan Fire Service a counsellor is employed especially for this purpose.

Mr S.J. BAKER: Concerning duplication of effort, we have been told that people have been hassled by having to fill out more forms and pay more money to the Government in order to register their work place. Does the Minister intend to change the system so that employers are called on only once to provide information? Surely this would reduce the paperwork involved. The Liberal Opposition has difficulty regarding the cost of getting everyone to register. Whereas under the old scheme certain manufacturing and other establishments believed to be risky were on the register, now everyone is required to be registered, perhaps for revenue rather than safety purposes. Will the Minister cut down the waste and duplication which exists in the present system and which causes much ire among employers?

The Hon. R.J. Gregory: I am not sure who was responsible for ensuring that WorkCover should not share its information with other people. However, knowing the desire of the Liberal Party to ensure privacy of information, I should not be surprised to learn that the Liberal Party and the Australian Democrats ensured that WorkCover should not disclose information. However, if there has been a change of mind on the part of the Liberal Party and it would now approve WorkCover sharing information with the Department of Labour so that employers would not have to fill out two lots of forms (one to register with WorkCover and the other to register the work place), the Government will be only too happy to amend the Act to reduce the duplication of work.

Mr S.J. BAKER: Earlier, the Committee was told that efforts would be made by the Occupational Health and Safety Commission during 1988-89 as regards manual handling. Can the Minister say what will be done in this regard?

The Hon. R.J. Gregory: The commission will release for public comment a paper on manual handling. There have been changes in this area and some dispute whether women should be able to lift the same weight as men. This paper will be published for comment and, once those people interested have commented on it, the tripartite commission,

which has an appropriate number of employer and employee representatives, will make a decision.

Mr S.J. BAKER: Then the major thrust of manual handling will be to allow women to participate in handling rather than a consideration of the more important issues of safety?

The Hon. R.J. Gregory: The problem concerning lifting is that, prior to efforts being made to remove gender discrimination from awards, a limitation was imposed on the weight that women could lift, but that provision was never really honoured. One has only to see the incidence of back injury in the nursing profession to realise that many female nurses (and nursing is predominantly a female occupation) were constantly lifting weights heavier than they should have been required to lift.

The thrust of removing the gender provision is to ensure that all people working in industry are not lifting weights that will cause injury. One of the most difficult injuries to treat successfully is the back injury and one way to avoid back injuries is to ensure that people do not have to lift over-heavy weights in unsafe lifting positions. One has only to consider some of the trucks driving around the city to realise that most have a mechanical lifting device, whereas previously people had to lift and carry heavy weights off the truck. What happened in the past was that people got injured and they just went home and died.

Mr S.J. BAKER: I noted the comments made about the outworkers situation. The only thing I can add is that whilst the Federal and State awards now provide coverage of the clothing trades, there has been some objection by a number of female workers because of the minimum hours prescribed under the Act. That seems to be the major area of contention. It was inserted there to disadvantage a large number of workers in this State, many of whom were in fact being treated more than fairly in terms of conditions because they had very good employers but, because of the nature of the work, they were not interested in doing 20 hours or more per week. That has caused a loss of income for a number of women working. Would the Minister be willing to review that situation if I brought it to his attention?

The Hon. R.J. Gregory: It is an award matter. I can advise the member that I will review anything but, at the same time, it does not mean to say that I will agree with what he puts to me.

Mr S.J. BAKER: The Minister refers to international industrial issues. Has the Minister any specific area in mind?

The Hon. R.J. Gregory: That program refers to the work the department is doing in conjunction with the Commonwealth with respect to the International Labor Organisation's programs.

Mr S.J. BAKER: I noted that a number of working days were lost within the State Government area as reported here. Can the Minister provide a breakdown identifying the departments in which those industrial disputes took place?

The Hon. R.J. Gregory: We will provide that information.

Mr S.J. BAKER: I ask for the same information concerning the Department of Labour as I asked for in relation to the Department of Personnel and Industrial Relations concerning sick leave in the various categories.

The Hon. R.J. Gregory: We will endeavour to provide those answers before the deadline.

Mr S.J. BAKER: How many departmental people will have their car plates changed or have already had them changed?

The Hon. R.J. Gregory: One person in the Department of Labour. I draw attention to the Premier's announcement in the Parliament recently that a very limited number of

chief executive officers have been given permission to have a motor vehicle with the normal number plate on it.

Mr S.J. BAKER: I was interested to see in the Government insurance services and within various reports a considerably lower pay-out than expected for workers compensation. Indeed, the number of new claims has decreased. We always love cost savings. Can the Minister explain this lower payment? Is it that the old claims have been slower to settle than was first envisaged? Secondly, when counting claims, are they being counted on the same basis? Are we talking about the same statistics? The Auditor-General's Report states that new claims decreased from 6 707 in 1986-87 to 5 740 in 1988-89. That is a very significant drop but are we actually talking about the same measure in that regard? Is it in fact a diminution?

The Hon. R.J. Gregory: The best way to answer this question is to say that, with the introduction of WorkCover and the risk management program by the Department of Labour, more attention has been paid to the costs of workers compensation. This has meant that the costs have gone down because we have not had to pay out so much. In many instances, it has also meant that people who have received injury have gone back to work a lot earlier than normally. That was the whole object of the WorkCover Act, that people who suffered a work-caused injury were not left lying around trying to convince the Industrial Court or the Supreme Court five to eight years after the incident that they were totally prostrate, unable to move, and consequently deserved a large sum of money.

The WorkCover encourages people to return to work as soon as practicable. It allows them to perform useful work, sometimes in an entirely different category, and people are trying to perform different work. I find that a more acceptable way of overcoming the injury because I and my colleagues believe that work provides people with dignity. If people are not working, they just lack the dignity that one gets from working. Consequently, the introduction of WorkCover and the risk management program has had beneficial effects. It reduces costs that we have had to pay out as a Government. It has also meant that more people are performing useful work and they feel they are being useful. If we did not have this program, we would still be providing for people who are crippled because of work-caused injuries.

Mr S.J. BAKER: I thank the Minister for his political statement about that. We might have some disagreement about certain of the premises he has raised, although we would have no disagreement with some of the feeling behind it. I was trying to ascertain whether the incidence of claims actually decreased on the same measurement criteria. For example, is the standard three days or are all claims involved? What claims were and are actually counted in the old and new systems? There was a very large provision in the current budget for workers compensation payouts. We know that initially the new scheme will be cheaper but, in the long run, it will be more expensive because of the nature of the payments. We would have expected the new workers compensation payouts to be less than the old ones, but we expected the older ones to be coming onstream. That is why I thought more would have been provided in the budget. Despite the Minister's explanation, two items remain unanswered.

The Hon. R.J. Gregory: In respect of the claims performance, there were 6 728 in 1985-86; 6 396 in 1986-87; and 5 740 in 1987-88.

Mr S.J. BAKER: Is that the same measurement criteria?

The Hon. R.J. Gregory: That is my advice, yes. The numbers are down. Despite what the member might think,

WorkCover and risk management do work to stop people from being injured, even though the number of people in employment may have slightly reduced. Just because it was a political statement does not mean it is not a true factual statement in respect of people being injured at work. It is not something to laugh about. It was a damn serious question.

Mr S.J. BAKER: The question about the provision in the budget was still not answered but I will put it on notice to be quite specific about what I am asking. I notice that the Minister is now enforcing a 21 day period within the public sector as the period in which Government departments shall be responsible for the payments to injured workers out of their own budget, and the rest will be picked up by premiums.

Will the Minister explain to the Committee the reason for this, given that the Act provides for seven days in principle. We know that the Government is an exempt employer. Why has this been brought to pass?

The Hon. R.J. Gregory: I ask the Director of the department to respond to that question.

Mr Bachmann: The 21 business days are related back to WorkCover. WorkCover has decreed that that will be the time for rehabilitation purposes and it will need to be advised of incidents that cause absence beyond that time. The Department of Labour, with the Government's blessing endorsed that approach for Government workers so that each agency will manage the first 21 business days of any claim. It will then become the joint responsibility of the Department for Labour for rehabilitation purposes as well as of managers within the agency.

Mr S.J. BAKER: I note that the Government is now applying for exemption from the levy to WorkCover. Given that all other exempt employers are required to contribute, depending on their arrangements, a considerable amount to meet their obligations for the administration of the scheme and for rehabilitation, why is the Government trying to pull out of its obligations?

The Hon. R.J. Gregory: I will take that question on notice.

Mr S.J. BAKER: I notice that only \$146 000 has been allocated within the budget for the rehabilitation provided under the Government insurance line. Does that relate only to Department of Labour people, or does it involve rehabilitation across the board? It seems an extraordinarily paltry sum.

The Hon. R.J. Gregory: It is for rehabilitation within the Department of Labour. That also supplements rehabilitation in other Government departments. Previous advice to the Committee in response to questions on this matter was that the agencies themselves were assuming considerable responsibility for rehabilitation. The four employees in this area will also be overseeing, assisting and advising other departments. It is not a paltry sum if you take into account all the money that is being spent by all other departments—it is considerable.

Mr S.J. BAKER: I question whether \$146 000, even under the circumstances outlined by the Minister, is adequate. I know of some bills that are being incurred under the rehabilitation program for WorkCover for the simplest thing such as losing the top of a finger. I have seen bills of \$5 000 notched up for rehabilitation programs. I presume that the \$146 000 is meant to pick up areas that are not within the province of departments. Does the Minister believe that it is adequate under those circumstances?

The Hon. R.J. Gregory: In response to the last question, 'Obviously yes'.

Mr S.J. BAKER: I noticed in the Auditor-General's Report an analysis of workers compensation claims and the breakdown for 1987-88. The stressful work place is becoming more important. Will the Minister provide an analysis of how categories have changed over the past three years? Specifically, whilst I can guess which departments would be subject to over-exertion, I am interested in the incidence per capita in areas such as the stressful work place and harmful substances areas. The Minister has provided information on areas of increasing incidence of workplace injury. Long term diseases were being created because of certain atmospheres and other matters. Stress is also difficult to measure. Will the Minister provide us with an analysis of how the compensation area is changing with respect to the State Government, particularly in departments which fare worse in those areas?

The Hon. R.J. Gregory: As much as I would like to oblige the honourable member, I cannot. The information has been in a computer for only a year and, until we got the program, we could not provide this sort of information. I am sure that next year the honourable member will await with great delight the publication of this sort of statistical information and in time will build up an experience that only the computer will allow us to build up.

The CHAIRMAN: There being no further questions, I declare examination of the vote completed.

Marine and Harbors, \$47 285 000

Chairman:

The Hon. T.M. McRae

Members:

The Hon. R.K. Abbott

The Hon. P.B. Arnold

The Hon. T. Chapman

Mr T.R. Groom

Mr K.C. Hamilton

Mr E.J. Meier

Witness:

The Hon. R.J. Gregory, Minister of Marine.

Departmental Advisers:

Mr E.J. Phipps, Director, Department of Marine and Harbors.

Mr K.R. Freeman, Director, Administration and Finance.

Mr M.G. Travers, Chief Finance Officer.

Captain R. Buchanan, Director, Ports and Marine Operations.

Mr W.T. Bateman, Manager, Forward Planning.

Mr J.J. Leask, Acting Director, Engineering.

The CHAIRMAN: I declare the proposed payments open for examination.

The Hon. P.B. ARNOLD: Page 146 of the Auditor-General's Report refers to the *Troubridge* being replaced by the *Island Seaway*. Who currently owns the M.V. *Troubridge*?

The Hon. R.J. Gregory: Once the vessel was sold it ceased to be the department's responsibility, and we have no real interest in who owns it as long as the present owner pays the wharfage. I am advised that the vessel is owned by Gold Copper Incorporated.

The Hon. P.B. ARNOLD: When did that company purchase the vessel?

The Hon. R.J. Gregory: I am advised that the Department of Marine and Harbors never owned the vessel. The Department of Transport was the department which sold it.

The Hon. P.B. ARNOLD: It is listed in the Auditor-General's Report under marine; consequently, we were seeking that information.

The Hon. R.J. Gregory: I am advised that there is an interagency responsibility for the *Troubridge*. I will endeavour to secure from the Minister of Transport the information required by the member for Chaffey, and that will be provided to the Committee at a later date.

The Hon. P.B. ARNOLD: Who is currently paying the wharfage on the vessel while it is in Port Adelaide?

The Hon. R.J. Gregory: Her Majesty the Queen in right of the State of South Australia does not own the M.V. *Troubridge* and ceased to own it some time ago. We sold it.

The Hon. P.B. ARNOLD: I understood that once a vessel was sold the registration had to be changed within 21 days. I am also advised that at the beginning of this month in the Australian shipping register of the Department of Transport the vessel was still registered as being owned by the South Australian Government.

The Hon. R.J. Gregory: That is a matter for the Commonwealth Registrar of Shipping to take up. We do not own it.

The Hon. P.B. ARNOLD: There is also the requirement that within 21 days of a vessel being sold the ownership of that vessel must be registered with the Department of Transport in the name of the new owner; otherwise, the vessel is no longer insured.

The Hon. R.J. Gregory: I do not know what this has to do with this department and my Ministry, because the vessel no longer belongs to Her Majesty the Queen in right of the State of South Australia. Consequently, we have nothing to do with the damn thing. It is tied to a wharf: we are receiving the wharfage or the appropriate fees and the owner is required to take the appropriate measures to register the vessel. Perhaps the member for Chaffey ought to advise the Commonwealth Registrar of Shipping that the shipping register has not changed and take action in that way, or is he suggesting that we as the State Government—

The CHAIRMAN: Order! So that we have some order in these questions, I have treated the member for Chaffey as having asked two substantial questions. In fact, he has asked six or seven. I will ask him to address his questions more formally through the Chair from now on. I will treat him as having asked two questions to date, and invite him to ask his third.

The Hon. P.B. ARNOLD: All my questions were supplementary, in effect, because as yet we do not have an answer to the first one. I am trying to ascertain the fact that there is a responsibility and a requirement for the previous owner of the vessel to notify the Registrar within 21 days of its disposal.

The CHAIRMAN: I have to rule that it is for me to determine what is supplementary and what is not. I have been extremely generous to the honourable member in that I have allowed a number of supplementary questions, flowing from his second question. I am not trying to direct the honourable member as to which topic he should now turn—he may stay with the existing topic or ask about something else. All I am saying is that I will treat his next question as his third substantive question.

The Hon. P.B. ARNOLD: I prefer to stay on this question until it is answered. I have been led to believe that there are certain responsibilities involved and that, since the South Australian Government is possibly still the registered owner of the ship according to the Australian Shipping Register, it is still subject to this requirement. Is it that we just do not worry about formalities such as the requirement to

advise the Registrar within 21 days of the disposal of a vessel? However, according to the information with which I have been provided the vessel is still registered as being owned by the South Australian Government. I understand that there are some insurance problems associated with this matter. Someone up the back is shaking his head—I do not know whether he can shed any light on the matter.

The Hon. R.J. Gregory: I preface my remarks by saying that I do not deliberately mislead people, in this place or anywhere else. I have told the Committee that the State Government does not own the *Troubridge*. I have been advised that the Highways Department has advised the Department of Marine and Harbors that it is not the registered owner anymore. The Minister of Transport has told Parliament during Question Time that it has been sold. I am advised that it has been sold to Gold Copper Incorporated. I also indicated to the Committee earlier this afternoon that I will endeavour to get from the Minister of Transport the details that the member for Chaffey has sought in respect of the *Troubridge*. Those matters are properly within his purview at this stage. Those details can be supplied to the Committee later. I can do no more than that. We do not own the vessel; someone else owns it. I am advised that we receive tonnage for the vessel being tied up there alongside the Birkenhead Bridge—and not wharfage. We receive a fee; it is not that large, but it is a regular fee and is helping the Department of Marine and Harbors' balance sheet.

Mr HAMILTON: I note at page 537 of the Program Estimates that the department has introduced a commercial accounting business unit reporting system. Can the Minister provide the Committee with more details regarding this accounting system and say what benefits will accrue from that system?

The Hon. R.J. Gregory: The Department of Marine and Harbors is operating within a highly commercial and competitive environment, and with increasing pressures from industry and Government to maintain the operation of ports in the most cost efficient and effective manner. To meet this challenge the department has developed a commercial accounting and business unit reporting system, which has segregated the operations and associated capital infrastructure into two financial structures—commercial activities relating to the operation of the State's commercial shipping ports and associated industrial estates, and the community service activities that the department undertakes.

These are activities that do not operate on a full cost recovery basis. The activities reflect the department's statutory responsibilities to the State's maritime authority and services which are provided to the public for recreational purposes. Within these structures the operations of the department have been segregated into functional business units. Each business unit has been defined by specific activity or service provided within the physical location and includes: total fixed assets relating to the completed operation of that business unit, total revenue from cargo and shipping activities, all operating maintenance and shipping costs, and indirect costs relating to the provision of technical, administration, promotional and executive services.

Mr HAMILTON: On the same page of the Program Estimates I note that the cost of workers compensation has been reduced considerably over the past three years, as has the average monthly lost time for injuries. Will the Minister comment on those results?

The Hon. R.J. Gregory: As I indicated earlier today, the previous Minister of Marine, the member for Spence, was instrumental in the establishment of a program of optimum

occupational safety and health in the Department of Marine and Harbors, and yesterday I witnessed the signature of the agreement by departmental people, an agreement which will have far-reaching effects within the department. Throughout the financial year the medical and induction training rehabilitation and management information elements of the department's risk management program has been operating, in addition to a safety committee structure, comprising a central health and safety committee, and 16 local health and safety committees have been meeting on a regular basis to discuss means of improving the working environment.

In 1987-88, the focus of programs has been on refining the elements already in operation and on implementing the hazard convention component, that is, involving hazards, housekeeping inspections, check lists, recording and investigation of accidents. Since the introduction of the Alan Bruce Risk Management Program, the department has seen a considerable reduction in the number of accidents and associated work time loss. The following indicators highlight the significant cost savings which have been achieved since the department introduced the risk management program in the Department of Marine and Harbors. The average monthly medically-treated injuries in 1985-86 were 27; in 1986-87, 24.5; while in 1987-88 the average number was 12.8. Further, average monthly lost time injuries in 1985-86 were 16.2; in 1986-87, 12.3; while in 1987-88, 7.6. The expenditure on workers compensation on a monthly average basis over that period of time was, in 1985-86, \$91 229; in 1986-87, \$96 904; and in 1987-88, \$50 427.

Mr HAMILTON: I was pleased to read recently of the decision of the Japanese Shipping Conference to call at the port of Adelaide on a fortnightly basis in future rather than on a monthly basis. Can the Minister advise the Committee when this service will commence and what additional revenue will accrue to the Department of Marine and Harbors as a consequence of these changes? In saying that, I want to pay credit to the previous Minister of Marine (Hon. Roy Abbott), the member for Spence, for his involvement in this area. I think all members would agree with those sentiments.

The Hon. R.J. Gregory: In response to that unsolicited question, we do accord credit where it is due. In relation to the first fortnightly call, we hope that the first ship will call next Saturday morning. In May of this year, a fortnightly service call by the Australian Northbound Shipping Conference between Japan and the port of Adelaide was announced. Discussions concerning this fortnightly call commenced in 1978, and followed detailed case studies being presented to the conference in 1981, 1984, 1986 and 1987. These studies demonstrated that a fortnightly direct shipping service to Port Adelaide would provide an adequately frequent service for South Australian importers and exporters and that substantial benefits would accrue to the conference, the State of South Australia and the shippers. The studies that were undertaken indicated that the increased value-added economic output for the State's economy as a direct result of the fortnightly service was estimated at \$3 million per annum. This should increase economic activity and expand and develop new trade and investment opportunities in South Australia.

The announcement of the fortnightly call will further boost the growth in business cooperation, which has been increasingly evident over recent years, between Japan and the State of South Australia. The first fortnightly service call is expected to occur on 17 September 1988. As I said, that will happen on Saturday, with the arrival at Port Adelaide of the *Arafura*. The estimated increase in direct revenue to the Department of Marine and Harbors as a result of this

fortnightly call is \$620 000 in a full year and \$520 000 in the current financial year.

The Hon. T. CHAPMAN: May I be permitted to make a brief observation before I ask my first question?

The CHAIRMAN: As long as it is reasonably brief.

The Hon. T. CHAPMAN: The Minister has kindly provided some details in relation to the ownership of the *MV Troubridge* following a series of questions by the member for Chaffey. Rather than wasting questions on the second part of the subject referred to on page 146 of the Auditor-General's Report—as long as this is not considered to be my first question—can the Minister outline the period of ownership or at least direct responsibility by the department for the *Island Seaway*, when that responsibility ceased—if it has—and, if so, whether the ongoing maintenance and refurbishment costs are being processed and administered by the department? If I can have an explanation of that area of ownership and administrative authority, it might save wasting questions on that area, as my colleague the member for Chaffey did during his period of obtaining basic information.

The Hon. R.J. Gregory: I do not mind my officers answering any question that they can, but I have been requested to ask the member for Alexandra to concisely repeat his question. The officers of my department will answer it to the best of their ability.

The Hon. T. CHAPMAN: When did the responsibility for the building of the *Island Seaway*—that is, the replacement for the *MV Troubridge*—commence within the ambit of the Department of Marine and Harbors? When did it conclude, if it has? If the department's responsibilities for the *Island Seaway* have concluded, have they concluded absolutely as far as the involvement of administration and/or payments for any ongoing refurbishment or replacement costs associated with the vessel are concerned?

The Hon. R.J. Gregory: One of the answers will be given by myself and it is this: Cabinet will determine who will take responsibility to look after the *Island Seaway* from time to time. At present it is not the responsibility of the Department of Marine and Harbors. It may be in the future, and it may not. My departmental officers will provide the answers as to if and when the department commenced having responsibility and when that responsibility was concluded. If the responsibility was not concluded they will advise the department's present ongoing responsibility. It is a confused area where the department's expertise is called on from time to time.

Mr Phipps: As to when responsibility commenced for the construction of the *Island Seaway*, there are a number of answers to that question. Perhaps one answer would be that the letter of intent to construct the vessel, from my understanding of the records, was issued to the contractor in December 1985. However, before that period the Department of Marine and Harbors, as project coordinator for the involvement of the various parties, would have carried out coordination work between the designer, the Government and various other parties. So, it can be seen that the Department of Marine and Harbors was involved in the pre-construction phase, but the formal time at which the letter of intent was issued to the contractor was December 1985.

The Hon. T. CHAPMAN: Can I clarify a point, Mr Chairman?

The CHAIRMAN: Yes. The member for Alexandra.

The Hon. T. CHAPMAN: It is my understanding that it has been the practice in this Committee for a precis of the proceedings to be recorded as applies in ordinary Committee procedures in the respective Houses and that a full transcript of questions and answers is not necessarily

recorded in the *Hansard* record of these meetings. Is that the case?

The CHAIRMAN: No, on the contrary, questions and answers are fully recorded.

The Hon. T. CHAPMAN: This subject is important so far and, indeed, in the Opposition's view, it will be very important as we progress through this series of questions. I would appreciate it if the full answers are recorded rather than, as is the practice in other committees, a precis.

Mr Phipps: I think the second question was: when does the Department of Marine and Harbors' responsibility for the supervision of the construction of the *Island Seaway* conclude?

The Hon. T. CHAPMAN: I will canvass the question. The first part of my question so far was: when did the Department of Marine and Harbors' responsibility for the construction of the *Island Seaway* commence; when did it conclude—if it has concluded—and if it has not concluded, is it responsible in the absolute sense for the ongoing maintenance and repair cost activities that have been incurred in recent times?

Mr Phipps: As I said, the letter of intent of construction was issued in December 1985 and at that time the Department of Marine and Harbors had the responsibility for coordination of the project. There was a lead time leading up to that period in December 1985, I believe of several years of investigation, in which various departments were involved with the user community to determine desirable design parameters for the vessel. So, there was a lead time leading up to the finalisation of the design which became the subject of the contract letter of intent in December 1985.

With regard to the second part of the question, which concerns the conclusion of responsibilities, the issue date of what we call the final certificate for the vessel is expected in the next month or so when the contractor has completed warranty responsibilities.

The Hon. T. CHAPMAN: My next question is supplementary to the question that I have just asked. The officer said that it was expected that the department's responsibility would conclude within the next month or two so as to coincide with the completion of the warranty period of the builder—or words to that effect. Does that mean that the department is still absolutely responsible for the vessel?

The Hon. R.J. Gregory: My understanding is that the *Island Seaway* is operated by the Department of Transport at present. Certain warranty provisions are associated with the *Island Seaway* the same as with every other large engineering project. This ship has a period of warranty. The Director of the department has advised that, when the warranty has approximately concluded, Eglo has ceased to have any responsibility as regards the vessel. The Department of Transport, I suppose, has a responsibility in overseeing the operation of the vessel by Howard Smith; R.W. Miller is the agent; and the Highways Department also has an oversight. The Auditor-General's Report states that the vessel has been sold: we do not own it any more.

The Hon. T. CHAPMAN: I appreciate the tolerance that has been extended, but the Minister has now thrown a spanner into the works by saying that we do not operate the vessel but that it is operated by the Department of Transport. Last week in Parliament, however, the Minister of Transport told the House that he was not the Minister responsible.

The CHAIRMAN: Order! Perhaps the Minister should be allowed to clarify his remarks if he wishes to do so. I will ensure that the position of the honourable member for Alexandra is protected.

The Hon. R.J. Gregory: I have said that Howard Smith operates the vessel, that R.W. Miller is the agent, and that the Highways Department has a responsibility of oversight. At page 107 of the Auditor-General's Report, the following statement appears:

The department's main activities are . . . subsidising the operators of MV *Island Seaway* for the provision of a sea transport service.

The Hon. T. CHAPMAN: Is the Minister satisfied that Eglo Engineering at Port Adelaide has concluded its responsibilities in accordance with the contract? If it has, will he confirm that? If it has not, will he identify the shortfall in the contractual responsibilities that apply at present?

The Hon. R.J. Gregory: Mr Phipps will respond to that question.

Mr Phipps: I understand the question to be whether the department has completed its responsibilities as regards overseeing the contractual responsibilities of Eglo. The answer is 'Almost'. Some minor variations or financial matters are to be decided between Eglo and us, and I emphasise that they are minor. Also, as the project coordinators, we are in communication with Eglo on the timing of fulfilling its responsibilities within the warranty period.

The Hon. T. CHAPMAN: As a matter of clarification, I ask whether the last sentence in the third last paragraph on page 146 of the Auditor-General's Report embraces the matter that the Minister's officer last reported to the Committee. The report states:

The final cost of the vessel is dependent upon the final cost of modifications and completion of contractual matters outstanding between the parties to the construction contract.

Does that sentence embrace the last point drawn to the attention of the Committee by Mr Phipps concerning minor matters yet to be resolved?

The Hon. R.J. Gregory: I ask Mr Phipps to respond to that question.

Mr Phipps: I assume that the reference is to the completion of contractual matters outstanding between the parties to the construction contract. In contractual matters there are discussions, agreement and, finally, an exchange of letters, but I understand that only fairly minor matters are outstanding.

The Hon. T. CHAPMAN: I ask the officer, through the Minister, whether the matters related to the Committee by Mr Phipps were embraced in the last sentence that I quoted.

Mr Phipps: The answer is 'Yes'.

The Hon. R.J. Gregory: Concerning the question on the *Troubridge*, asked by the member for Chaffey, I draw to the attention of the Committee the following statement on page 110 of the Auditor-General's Report:

Sale of MV *Troubridge* \$436 000.

The Hon. T. CHAPMAN: In view of the statements made this afternoon by Mr Phipps on behalf of his Minister, that is, those statements that relate to apparent unfinished work and/or unpaid accounts between the department and Eglo Engineering and in view of the fact that the reference in the Auditor-General's Report was produced prior to 30 June—that is at the time of printing the report, presumably some weeks before 30 June—what then is the current total public expenditure on the *Island Seaway* to the end of August, or the nearest date to which the Department of Marine and Harbors has actually identified a public costing in this facility?

In mentioning a public costing, I would like incorporated the \$1.7 million accrued interest on capital debt; I would like the Minister to include the \$3.4 million initial contribution from public funding by the Commonwealth apparently direct to the contractor for Australian shipbuilding subsidy purposes; I would like him to include the \$16.5

million identified in the Auditor-General's Report as being the primary capital figure involved in the cost of the vessel; and I would like him to include finally the figure representing that picture painted by Mr Phipps this afternoon—that is, the figure representing the outstanding accounts with Eglo Engineering and/or any other costs outstanding as relate to the construction, refurbishing and provision of the facility *Island Seaway*. All those factors have been referred to in recent months in the House in isolation from one another. What we want today is a statement by the Minister collectively parcelling up and presenting the total public cost so far or to the nearest date to which his department has done that exercise.

The Hon. R.J. Gregory: I presume what the member for Alexandra wants us to do is to verify statements, some quite misleading, that were made by his Leader in respect of the cost of this vessel.

The Hon. T. CHAPMAN: I object to that. My question was directed to the Minister referring to page 146 of the Auditor-General's Report and my only reference to the House was in relation to some figures given to us in relation to those costs when questions were asked on this report.

The Hon. R.J. Gregory: I will just make another comment before I ask Mr Phipps to go into some detail. It is the first time I have ever come across a business person who adds tax benefits into their costs, and that is what the member for Alexandra was asking the department to do. It has received a tax benefit and he is asking us to put that into our costs. I notice that John Elliott, the President of the Liberal Party and Managing Director of Elders IXL, does not put all his tax benefits into the costs of his company. They are things paid out in dividends to the shareholders. After making that brief political statement, I ask the Director to respond.

Mr Phipps: I understand that the question requires me to provide information on the costs of the vessel to date and the final estimated cost. If I can just explain the situation, Eglo had certain responsibilities under the contract. We are aware that modifications have been carried out on the vessel, so the information that I provide is our best estimate of the total cost of the construction of the vessel. I interpreted the question to be requesting that any other benefits which might have come to the State of South Australia by other Governments be added on. I think the member might have been referring to bounty or taxation—I am not sure. As the project coordinators for this project, the only cost that we are interested in is the net cost to the State of South Australia.

The Auditor-General stated in his report that the actual expenditure on the design and construction of the vessel to 30 June was \$15.5 million. At that stage, there was quite an amount of money outstanding in invoices. When Cabinet approval was given for the design and construction of the vessel some two years ago, the budget was approximately \$16.5 million. The estimated final cost of the vessel at this stage, given that the amount of contractual matters outstanding are quite minor, is within that amount.

The Hon. T. CHAPMAN: Can I raise another matter?

Mr HAMILTON: On a point of order, the member for Alexandra, who has been questioning the Minister at the table from 5.10 until 5.50, has had more than a fair shake of this Committee. This Committee, particularly the Government side, has been more than fair in trying to accommodate the member for Alexandra. The member well knows that the supplementary questions he has been asking have been to harass the Minister at the table. From this side we object.

Members interjecting:

The CHAIRMAN: Order! I ask all members of the Committee to come to order. There is no point of order by the member for Albert Park and no point of order on the part of the member for Alexandra. I call on the member for Spence.

The Hon. R.K. ABBOTT: I refer the Minister to the preliminary report from the interstate commission on the waterfront investigation released by Senator Ray last Wednesday. Also, a press release was issued by the Federal Treasurer last week that was determined to achieve efficiency on all Australian coastal shipping services. What are the implications of that report for the South Australian ports system?

The Hon. R.J. Gregory: The investigation being carried out by the interstate commission is a wide-ranging one. From the preliminary report, it is clear that the interstate commission sees the prime objective to be the achievement of reliable, cost effective transport service for exporters and importers. The South Australian Government, through the Department of Marine and Harbors, made a comprehensive submission to the commission and reference to the South Australian Government's evidence can be seen in various places in chapter 3 of the preliminary report. The major purpose of the preliminary report is to stimulate responses to the preliminary findings and proposed strategy. It is proposed that the next round of hearings be held in October. The final report of the commission is presently expected some several months after those hearings.

The interstate commission has identified seven main elements to be developed in its waterfront strategy. These comprise the following: first, effective management and well motivated work force with particular emphasis on stevedoring; secondly, strengthening the influence of exporters and importers; thirdly, increased industry transparency and accountability; fourthly, improved industrial relations and dispute settling procedures; fifthly, ensuring market oriented provision of infrastructure and services; sixthly, general removal of anti-competitive practices; and, seventhly, establishment of a body to manage implementation of the strategy. As far as the South Australian ports system is concerned, I feel that as with other States we will have much to gain by continuing to actively participate in the reform agenda, and we are well on the way in South Australia.

It should be remembered in general that the industrial relations performance in South Australian ports and at the largest of our ports, Port Adelaide, is by far superior to that in the other main interstate ports. Consultative arrangements between the Department of Marine and Harbors and port users are well established through the South Australian Port Liaison Advisory Committee and the South Australian Shipping Users Group. The Department of Marine and Harbors is following a commercial approach in its operation with the production of commercial accounts and a forward planning approach which emphasises sound financial performance and effective scientific marketing to attract new shipping services to Port Adelaide. This Government appreciates the important contribution to the State economy made by effective management of our ports system. We welcome the report of the interstate commission and we will continue to participate in the formulation of this national action plan for the waterfront.

The Hon. R.K. ABBOTT: It is an important report and we will hear much more about it. I refer the Minister to the July/August edition of the journal *Port Development International*, and in particular to an article on Port Adelaide which states:

A pay-off to the Port of Adelaide's commitment to securing an increased service frequency from conference shipping services is imminent. The Japan/Australia conference is now about to intro-

duce a second monthly call, but clearly this is not enough for Adelaide. It is now looking for a similar new commitment from the European conference.

What is the basis of South Australia's case to the European conference for increased frequency of calls?

The Hon. R.J. Gregory: The first point to understand is that representations to the international Australia/Europe shipping conference are being carried out jointly by industry and Government. Industry involvement is being carried out by the South Australian Chamber of Commerce and Industry and the South Australian Shipping User Group. The second point is the level of cargo being exchanged between Europe and South Australia. This level of cargo is sufficient to justify twice monthly import calls and twice monthly export calls to Port Adelaide. The third point relates to the market share position of the Australia to Europe conference.

Our data shows that the conference is steadily losing market share and if they do not increase their frequency of calls to Port Adelaide their market share will further decline. The risk for the conference is that outsiders will be able to deliver lower freight rates and capitalise on dissatisfaction with the service provided by the conference.

The fourth element concerns financial analysis. The Department of Marine and Harbors has detailed ship cost models of every ship operating in the conference. The Department has been able to estimate that the conference will save some millions of dollars by calling into Port Adelaide rather than exchanging South Australian cargo in Melbourne.

The fifth point concerns South Australia's excellent industrial relations performance. If we look at Port Adelaide in particular and disputes involving waterside workers, the hours lost per thousand hours worked at Port Adelaide is less than half the average figure for the other capital city ports.

The sixth point concerns the superior service and lower risk that shippers experience through being able to use ships at Port Adelaide rather than having to rely on the port of Melbourne some 800 km away.

The other initiative is that last night I farewelled our Commercial Director, who left today to go overseas to commence this round of discussions with the people in Europe, to be followed later by people from the department and the Chamber of Commerce and Industry. We hope that out of that we will be able to achieve the fortnightly calls for the European conference. With the Japanese or Asian conference calling into our port, it will mean an extra \$620 000 in revenue for the department. We expect similar sorts of returns with this.

The Hon. R.K. ABBOTT: I refer to page 145 of the Auditor-General's Report where it mentions that the opening balance of the Department of Marine and Harbors capital liability is reduced by \$2.6 million due to the transfer of land and property. Will the Minister outline more detail regarding such transfers?

The Hon. R.J. Gregory: The department has transferred significant holdings of land and property to other Government agencies. The Port Adelaide inner harbor has seen a significant change in its operational usage since the advent of containerisation over the past decade. In conjunction with this trend for shipping to use other berths within Port Adelaide, particularly those at Outer Harbor, has been the increase in interest in the port from a historical viewpoint. During the year therefore, the department transferred responsibility of No. 1 shed and the adjacent land to the Department of Premier and Cabinet for use as a maritime museum. The transfer was arranged through Treasury and the Valuer-General assessed the market value of this property to be \$1.5 million.

A deed dated 12 May 1987 between the Premier and the Australian Submarine Corporation included an incentive package in the event the Australian Submarine Corporation was successful in being awarded the contract by the Commonwealth for the construction of submarines and associated support requirements for the Royal Australian Navy. That incentive scheme provided that the necessary land and services would be provided by the State. Throughout the year therefore the relevant land was transferred to the Australian Submarine Corporation at a market value of \$1.1 million.

[Sitting suspended from 6 to 8 p.m.]

Membership:

Mr Robertson substituted for Mr Groom.

Mr MEIER: I wish to put on record my thanks to the former Minister of Marine (Hon. R.K. Abbott) for the work he was instrumental in having done to a number of jetties in the electorate of Goyder on Yorke Peninsula. I seek information particularly in relation to the Wallaroo wharf. A storm in early to mid 1987 caused considerable damage to that wharf, and the Department of Marine and Harbors has undertaken most of the repairs to the pilot boat pen and to the retaining wall. What has been the cost to date of the repairs to the Wallaroo jetty, particularly to the pilot boat pen and the retaining wall, and when is it anticipated that the repairs will be completed?

The Hon. R.J. Gregory: Following major storm damage to the pen last year, it has been necessary to reconstruct it, and this has included significant strengthening and redesign of the structure at a cost to the department of \$270 000. It is virtually complete; only the planking has to be put in place. The pen is already occupied by the pilot vessel.

Before we proceed further, earlier this afternoon the member for Chaffey was asking some questions about the M.V. *Troubridge*. Prior to the break I was advised that on 5 April 1988 the company paid, by transfer to the Highways Department, the amount of money agreed for the purchase price, and the ship was transferred to Gold Copper Incorporated on 6 April. The Registrar of Shipping advised on 13 April 1988 that he had received the notification from the department. I understand that the honourable member could have contacted the Commonwealth Registrar of Shipping and for \$20 all this information would have been made available.

Mr MEIER: Supplementary to the last question, is the Minister also able to provide information as to the cost of repairs to the jetties at Port Rickaby, Port Victoria, Marion Bay and Port Giles? Following from that, I continue to be very concerned that the pilot boat *Yorke* is no longer stationed at Wallaroo. The Minister's officers would be aware that the pilot boat *Yorke* was specifically built and commissioned to operate from the port of Wallaroo, and it has been very disturbing to the people associated with marine activities in that area that the *Yorke* has now been transferred, I believe, to Port Lincoln.

Currently, the pilot boat stationed at Wallaroo is the *Tarooki*, which is 35 feet long compared to the *Yorke's* 47 feet. I am informed that the *Tarooki* is doing a satisfactory job. It is not in the same class as the *Yorke*, but the disturbing information that I have is that there is some talk of replacing the *Tarooki* with the *Carina*, which is only a 28ft pilot boat. I seek an assurance from the Minister that this will not occur—that the *Carina* will not replace the *Tarooki*—and that the *Tarooki* will at least stay, and that the Minister will give consideration to bringing back the *Yorke* as the pilot boat to operate out of Wallaroo.

The Hon. R.J. Gregory: The member for Goyder asked a number of questions. As regards jetty repairs, in the last financial year the cost of repairing Port Rickaby jetty was \$22 000, including \$5 000 for storm damage; Port Victoria cost \$32 000; and Port Giles, which cost just over \$1 million, has been finished. In respect of the pilot boat *Yorke*, I understand that when the negotiations took place for large Japanese tankers to go to Point Bonython to pick up crude they originally wanted to pick up the pilot off Wallaroo. That is why a large vessel was purchased. It has subsequently been found that they want to pick up the pilot from Whyalla. Consequently, the large asset of the *Yorke* was being wasted at Wallaroo, and it is now at Port Lincoln, with better use being made of the asset, as the vessels at Wallaroo are adequate for what is required. I am sure that the member for Goyder would agree with me that it is a proper use of assets to have them where they are most appropriate rather than having large assets in a small port not being adequately used.

Mr MEIER: I also asked whether there was any truth in the rumour that the *Tarooki*, the boat that is there currently, might be replaced by the *Carina*, a much smaller boat. I seek an assurance from the Minister that that is not the case.

The Hon. R.J. Gregory: The *Carina* is a newer vessel than the *Tarooki*, and slightly smaller. It is the same size as vessels that have been operating in Wallaroo prior to the *Yorke* being put there. It is adequate for the work that is required and will continue to be used. Wallaroo is not being downgraded.

Mr MEIER: The Minister said that it will continue to be used. It is now being operated out of Port Adelaide or Outer Harbor, and I wonder whether there is any suggestion that it be moved to Wallaroo.

The Hon. R.J. Gregory: It is undergoing a survey in the Port dockyard. When that is finished, it will go to Wallaroo.

Mr MEIER: My last question relates to the future of Wallaroo jetty and wharf. As the previous Minister knows, there was a deal of to-do about getting a harbourmaster reappointed to Wallaroo. Thankfully, that was done, and I thank the previous Minister. The current harbourmaster has been there about six months. What is the situation with respect to the future of the harbourmaster at Wallaroo, particularly since he also services Ardrossan and Port Giles? I do not know whether his title is 'harbourmaster' or whether he is simply a pilot who lives at Ardrossan: he could be getting near retiring age. What are the thoughts for the future in that respect? I also extend this to the future of Wallaroo port as a whole, because a lot of material has been put before us on the possible use of Wallaroo as a major port and the upgrading of Wallaroo to that condition. It appears that that will not happen in the immediate future. Yet, if Wallaroo is to continue to be a suitable port for the export of grain, the Department of Marine and Harbors needs to look at its future upgrading, perhaps in association with CBH. Will the Minister comment on the future of Wallaroo as a whole over the next year or two?

The Hon. R.J. Gregory: In the next year or two, and in the foreseeable future, Wallaroo will continue to be used as a port. The harbourmaster will be at Wallaroo. The harbourmaster currently at Wallaroo will do pilotage duty at Port Giles and Ardrossan when he is available to do it.

Mr MEIER: And in the future?

The Hon. R.J. Gregory: I said 'in the foreseeable future'. We have no intention of pulling it down or taking it away. I do not know what rumours the honourable member has heard.

Mr MEIER: Supplementary to that, if the pilot at Ardrossan, who also occasionally services Port Giles, should retire, would it be envisaged to use the harbourmaster from Wallaroo to service the whole of the Peninsula?

The Hon. R.J. Gregory: I said that the harbourmaster, who also does pilot work at Wallaroo, will do the pilot work at Port Giles and Ardrossan when required and when available: one cannot have one man in two places at the same time. There is no pilot at Ardrossan: my advice is that the person to whom the honourable member refers is a clerk.

The Hon. R.K. ABBOTT: Of the 43 recreational jetties around the State's coastline how many are leased to local councils for the purpose of maintenance sharing, and when is it expected that all recreational jetties will be covered by lease agreements?

The Hon. R.J. Gregory: On 28 July 1980 Cabinet approved the following policy for the repair and management of recreational jetties: that all jetties remain the responsibility of the Minister of Marine; that leases of recreational jetties and associated reserves be offered to local councils for a nominal rental, with the councils to be responsible for maintenance and day-to-day repairs; the Minister to reimburse councils for the cost of repairs up to 80 per cent of the cost; and some reserves, at the discretion of the Minister of Marine, to be placed directly under the care, control and management of councils under the provision of the Crown Lands Act. The Minister of Marine is to be free to demolish or partly demolish jetty structures as is fit or if a local council declines a lease. In respect of leased jetties, the department shall examine the structures periodically and submit recommendations for repairs to the lessees; carry out repairs to the order of the lessee; where applicable make appropriate reductions in any account for usage by professional fishermen; and bear the cost of the above.

In addition to the above, the department is also responsible for the repair of all jetties subject to storm damage. Last year (the 1987-88 program), I have recently referred to Port Rickaby and Port Victoria. Second Valley had \$36 000 storm damage work done to it. Port Noarlunga also suffered storm damage and the repairs amounted to \$18 000. Brighton had storm damage and the repairs amounted to \$5 000. Port Lincoln had \$7 000 work, and Robe \$6 000. The routine inspections and minor maintenance cost \$63 000. In the 1988-89 program, it is proposed to spend \$86 000 at Murat Bay, \$16 000 at Port Elliot, \$84 000 at Port Vincent, and \$39 000 at Stansbury. At Haslam, Robe and Stansbury that will be subject to consultation and appropriate funding arrangements with the relevant local district councils. Between 30 and 35 of the current 43 jetties are leased to local government organisations.

The Hon. R.K. ABBOTT: Supplementary to that, the sharing of maintenance other than storm damage is on an 80-20 basis. Does the department contemplate any approach to achieve a more equitable sharing of those costs, or has any consideration been given to more equitable sharing by local government?

The Hon. R.J. Gregory: Since that decision was made in 1980 nothing has been contemplated to change it. We must bear in mind that councils have to pay the full costs of day-to-day repairs and maintenance of a jetty. When it comes to major structural work the department pays its 80 per cent. If one takes into account the day-to-day repairs it comes out at a fairly equal partnership.

The Hon. R.K. ABBOTT: Only one oil spill occurred during the past financial year, which was a vast improvement on previous years. Was any prosecution involved in that oil spill?

The Hon. R.J. Gregory: There was no prosecution.

The Hon. R.K. ABBOTT: Following the upgrading of Outer Harbor No. 2 berth, which was developed in order to attract back a lot of the live sheep trade that we lost to Portland over the past 18 months to two years, can the Minister inform the Committee as to the amount of pick-up in the live sheep export trade?

The Hon. R.J. Gregory: There has been a 23 per cent increase in the 1987-88 financial year over the 1986-87 financial year. Considering the very tough competition from Portland, the department's officers are to be congratulated for achieving this increase.

The Hon. R.K. ABBOTT: There has been a good deal of pressure for the *Island Seaway* to berth at No. 25 berth. Is that any closer than it has been in the recent past?

The Hon. R.J. Gregory: Berth 25 is being considered for use by the *Island Seaway*. At the moment it is used for roll-on roll-off ships and is currently under lease to ANL. If possible, it is proposed to bring in a New Zealand service to use berth 25, but we are not sure that we can get that service. It is estimated that it will cost \$300 000 to rework the loading system so that the *Island Seaway* can use it because that vessel loads at two levels and this berth is currently designed to load at one level.

The Hon. P.B. ARNOLD: Can the Minister indicate the cost to date of the modifications to the *Island Seaway* and who will pick up the tab for those modifications? What is the total cost to date of all modifications and are they at Government expense or that of the builder or the designer of the vessel?

The Hon. R.J. Gregory: I will ask Mr Phipps to answer that question.

Mr Phipps: The cost of the modifications is being executed out of the financial amount approved by Cabinet a couple of years ago. The Minister indicated earlier in answer to a question that the estimated cost of the vessel will be about \$16.4 million, which is within the amount approved by the Government. The cost of modifications, such as skegs at the aft of the vessel, ventilation and lifeboats, will be met out of that budget figure.

The Hon. P.B. ARNOLD: Is the Director saying that at this stage there is absolutely no overrun in the original approved expenditure on that vessel?

Mr Phipps: That is correct.

The Hon. P.B. ARNOLD: Can the Minister indicate when the report from the study that is being undertaken in relation to tank testing of the vessel is likely to be issued? When that report becomes available—and in the event of a recommendation that there be major modifications to the vessel, perhaps in relation to the engines and the hull—who will be responsible for the costs involved in adhering to the recommendations of that report, considering that they could be quite significant?

The Hon. R.J. Gregory: It is a hypothetical question—I suppose we could put wings on it and watch it fly. The report may be available within four weeks; we certainly hope it will be.

The Hon. P.B. ARNOLD: Who is responsible for those costs?

The Hon. R.J. Gregory: As I said, it is a hypothetical question. There may be no costs and there is no need to go attending to things that may not happen.

The Hon. P.B. ARNOLD: So, the Government is not prepared even to face up to the likelihood that there could be modifications involved?

The CHAIRMAN: The proceedings will have to be formalised to a certain extent. If the Minister has taken the point that this is a hypothetical question, then it is—there

is no doubt about that. I will treat it as a supplementary question and call the member for Chaffey again.

The Hon. P.B. ARNOLD: It would appear to be a waste of time trying to get any information about the vessel and I will wait until the report comes out and deal with the matter in another place.

The Hon. R.J. Gregory interjecting:

The Hon. P.B. ARNOLD: Whatever place you like, but we will deal with it one way or another. I now turn to page 526 of the Program Estimates. Under the heading 'Broad objectives' the following statement is made:

... the need exists in many parts of the State to provide adequate boat mooring and launching facilities ...

Can the Minister indicate where the boat moorings have been provided and to what extent? I take it that in referring to moorings he is talking about actual moorings that visiting boats can pick up; in other words, safe moorings, not anchorages, that can be picked up by visiting boats at various spots along the coast.

The Hon. R.J. Gregory: To which class of vessel is the honourable member referring—big ones or little ones?

The Hon. P.B. ARNOLD: I am referring to page 526 of the Program Estimates, under the description 'Water recreation—recreational boating facilities'. This subject is of considerable interest to recreational boating people to enable them to go into various small ports along the coast of South Australia and pick up a safe mooring rather than having to ride at anchor. I support wholeheartedly the concept. To what extent has that objective been developed?

The Hon. R.J. Gregory: I understand that the question refers to moorings for small vessels. I take it that the member for Chaffey is talking about pleasure craft.

The Hon. P.B. ARNOLD: Recreational boats.

The Hon. R.J. Gregory: In July this year the department outlined, in a letter to the President of the Boating Industry Association of South Australia, what the Government has done in relation to this matter and I think it is important that I should read it. The letter states:

Having regard to your comments it should be noted that a number of important actions have been taken by the Government to facilitate the orderly development and implementation of marina proposals in South Australia.

First, the appointment of the Marina Assessment Advisory Committee in March 1987 has brought together within Government the expertise necessary for comprehensive assessment and advice on proposals. The responsibilities of the committee are to assist developers through the planning process, and to establish clear guidelines for the planning and development of marinas in South Australia.

Secondly, in April last, the Government through the Marina Assessment Advisory Committee issued a comprehensive set of guidelines for the planning and development of marinas in South Australia. The major purposes of the guidelines are to assist developers in their formulation of proposals and to provide a consistent framework for planning assessment of proposals.

Thirdly, a consultant investigation on behalf of the Marina Assessment Advisory Committee into the supply/demand situation for marinas in South Australia was completed last April.

Fourthly, a marina site suitability study on potential marina sites along the east side of the Gulf St Vincent has been completed and released.

In parallel with this activity assessment of current marina proposals has been continuing. As you are probably aware, the South Australian Planning Commission has already granted conditional approval to the Wirrina marina proposal.

On the matter of funding, the Government's general policy approach is that any marina development needs to be economically viable without financial contributions from the Government.

You will be well aware that, with the responsible tight fiscal policy being practised by the Government, spending on capital works has decreased. Notwithstanding, the Government continues to provide funds for smaller recreational boating facilities. Expenditure in 1987-88 totalled approximately \$150 000.

Certainly this level of expenditure is not sufficient to fund projects of the size of O'Sullivan Beach and Lincoln Cove as

previously funded by the Government. Nevertheless, it represents an important contribution to smaller facilities.

The following is a list of the recreational boating projects for 1987-88:

	\$
Encounter Bay	
Boat ramp	65 000
Car park	32 500
Marion Bay	
Boat ramp improvements	7 000
Port Julia	
Boat ramp extension	5 000
Port Minlacowie	
Boat ramp	7 500
Murray River	
Navigation aids	7 200
Christmas Cove	
Boat ramp improvements	12 200
Port Neill	
New boat ramp (part funding)	10 000

The Hon. P.B. ARNOLD: I appreciate what the Minister has said, but I asked a comparatively simple question about ports such as Kingscote, American River, Port Vincent and Edithburgh. What is to be provided by way of actual moorings in those small harbors? Is the intention of the objective that is stated on page 526 of the Program Estimates to create, say, 10 or 20 moorings to be available for recreation, for instance, to a person sailing to American River or Port Vincent who may wish to book such a mooring from the department or from anyone else?

I do not suggest that such moorings should be provided free, but the owner of a recreational boat such as a yachtman would welcome the opportunity to sail into any of those harbors and the tourist trade would benefit if he could sail into port and book a mooring. The provision of moorings at a price to the boat owner would return part of the capital cost to the department or to whoever had provided the mooring and also contribute significantly as a recreational facility. My original question referred to adequate boat moorings as a simple facility, not a boat ramp.

The Hon. R.J. Gregory: I thank the honourable member for clarifying his question. At this stage the Government does not intend to provide fixed moorings at recreational spots such as those referred to by the honourable member. Apparently, no request has been received from the appropriate boating association or any yacht club, and I understand that boats usually carry anchors with which to moor on a temporary basis. Extreme difficulty would be created if such moorings were hired out because someone would have to be in attendance all the time to ensure that a boat owner did not come in overnight and use the facility free of cost.

The following work is being carried out by the department this year. At Port Neill, construction will continue on a small boat ramp at a total estimated cost of \$48 000. The actual cost to 30 June 1988 is \$10 000 and the estimated cost for the current financial year is \$38 000. At Encounter Bay the department will dredge the channel and upgrade navigational facilities for safe use of the boat ramp at an estimated cost of \$20 000. Continuation of the department's policy of upgrading navigational aids to ensure the safe use of the State's waters by the recreational boating public is estimated to cost \$50 000. The estimated cost of minor works that may arise throughout the year is \$42 000. I understand that the department prefers to license areas for use by others, such as the yacht squadron.

Mr HAMILTON: What pollution management control equipment is available in this State? How does the standard of this equipment compare with that of standards in other States and overseas? Of what does the equipment consist? Where is it stored? For instance, is it all stored at the one location? How readily available is the equipment in terms

of the time factor so that it may be used to control an oil spill along the metropolitan foreshore?

The Hon. R.J. Gregory: I will ask Captain Buchanan to answer that question.

Captain Buchanan: A substantial quantity of equipment is held in this State to combat oil pollution. Much of it is held by us on behalf of the Australian national plan to combat oil pollution. We have two catamaran boats, one at Port Adelaide and the other at Port Pirie. We have a substantial quantity of back-up equipment such as booms, schooners and small dinghies, as well as a range of other hand gear for cleaning beaches. Mobile equipment held on trailers is available at various ports throughout the State. Most of the equipment is held in the metropolitan area, which has been the area subject to most of the pollution.

Mr HAMILTON: Is the equipment stored in the one location?

Captain Buchanan: Some of the equipment is stored at Port Stanvac, some at the Port Adelaide oil berths, and a substantial amount is held by us at No. 5 shed in Port Adelaide.

Mr HAMILTON: How readily available is the equipment? For instance, if there was a spill at Port Stanvac, how quickly can the equipment be made available at that site?

Captain Buchanan: At Port Stanvac work boats are on duty and fitted with equipment. There is also equipment on shore, so an immediate response can be made in the case of an accident at Port Stanvac. At Port Adelaide and at the other ports, we have our own crews exercised in pollution combat and we can mobilise them quickly, immediately during the day and within about 30 minutes outside working hours.

Mr HAMILTON: What training is available to those employees in respect of containing oil spills? How many employees have been trained in that area and what ongoing training and exercises are carried out by those employees?

Captain Buchanan: Most of the staff that float on our craft throughout the State are trained in oil pollution combat procedures. It is an ongoing program. Exercises are carried out in various areas as we identify the needs. To expand on the training side, the training starts from major spills where we have officers attend courses interstate to see the latest procedures for cleaning and they in turn impart their knowledge to our crews and to the employees of oil companies and other interested departments including fisheries, environment and planning and the police. We generally have a major exercise in the State at least once a year, but frequently smaller paper exercises are conducted. We had a paper exercise earlier this year which involved quite a lot of resources, so it is something that we keep very much to the fore. The incidence of oil spills in this State has decreased markedly in recent years.

Mr HAMILTON: To what extent is the State Government provided with financial assistance from the Commonwealth and/or other areas in terms of training and recoupment of costs regarding spills?

Captain Buchanan: I cannot answer all of the question but the Commonwealth's equipment that we will be receiving this year will be in excess of \$80 000, a good portion of the national plan equipment budget for the year. The Commonwealth covers the cost of training of our staff interstate and we cover our own costs within the State. If the Commonwealth wants to mount a training program within the State, it covers the costs, and officers for other States come to this State to do the exercise. That is covered by the national plan through the Commonwealth.

The Hon. T. CHAPMAN: There has been an acknowledgment of some sensitivity in relation to the *Island Seaway* subject, and I want to place on the record that it is an area of sensitivity, more particularly to my constituents—indeed, the whole population of Kangaroo Island. It is not something that has just occurred in recent months or recent years. We cannot entirely blame any Government, let alone the current Government, for the shortcomings of that facility. In answer to an earlier question of mine, the Director (Ted Phipps) intimated that planning for that vessel took place for a period of a few years leading up to the contract with Eglo to construct the ship in December 1985.

Indeed, discussions about the replacement of M.V. *Troubridge* were quite positively undertaken as far back as the early 1970s. Over that period, all sorts of ideas and designs were kicked around by the various parties interested in the subject. When it became a matter of serious consideration by the Government in the early 1980s, and more particularly in the 1982-84 period, there was a persistent effort by the Government through the Department of Marine and Harbors to replace the *Troubridge* with a ship capable of carrying produce and passengers. That persistence prevailed right through to the point of a contract being issued to that effect, albeit with a ship of a new modular type design in construction, but to provide for the multi services that I have mentioned.

Notwithstanding the very positive efforts and calls upon the Government formally in the Parliament, on deputation and by other means, to have it reconsider its position right up to the eleventh hour and only build a ship of a no frills freight kind that could service Kangaroo Island with a freighting service that that community of the State deserved, the Government persisted and, without too much support from Kangaroo Island, I can assure the Committee, it set out to build the multi service that we have. There is no question about the quality of services of that ship for the purposes of carrying passengers, even though it is over a seven-hour voyage, given the speed of the engines and the output that the vessel can provide.

It has killed Kangaroo Island, as has been alleged by the business sector, and the community at large. Indeed, from the very time the decision was taken to mix passengers with livestock, such as sheep, cattle, pigs and whatever—

The Hon. R.K. ABBOTT: It was your own fault, too.

The Hon. T. CHAPMAN: Well, I was on deputation to the former Minister about the very subject on a number of occasions requesting a no frills freight ferry. However, it is the only freight ferrying service of its kind in the world that carries regularly—and not too regularly with this particular ship, but it is scheduled to carry regularly—livestock and passengers, attempting to cater for the two together. It is an absolute disaster! It has not only killed the Island in its irregularity of service but, over the period and from the very commencement, it killed the best airline service that the community has ever had, Airlines of South Australia. Mick Connolly, the State Manager of Airlines of South Australia, said, 'If the Government proceeds with its idea of providing a passenger service of the ilk that it has been tendering to the media, it will cause us as an organisation established in that community for many years to withdraw our services entirely from Kangaroo Island.'

The CHAIRMAN: Order! I must ask the honourable member for Alexandra to formulate a question. I have again been most generous in this leadup. I ask him to formulate the question.

The Hon. T. CHAPMAN: My first question is: will the Minister provide to this Committee a copy of the contract that the South Australian Government entered into with

Eglo Engineering to build the *Island Seaway*? In the meantime, will he provide the salient content of that contract? For example, will he include in his answer the date of completion for that contract, the price that the Government incorporated in that contract to build the ship, and the tenor of the obligations for failure to meet the objective in relation to the building date, and the capacity for the ship to perform?

The Hon. R.J. Gregory: I have heard some nonsense from time to time and I reckon I have just heard some this evening. The *Troubridge*, when it operated, carried a passenger cargo mix very similar to the cargo passenger mix of the *Island Seaway*.

In fact, if its being used as an argument that the *Island Seaway* caused Airlines of South Australia to collapse, I find it astounding. The *Troubridge* had the capacity to carry more people than the *Island Seaway*. On that basis they ought to put on two more areoplanes, as the *Island Seaway* carries fewer people. I also refer to business confidentiality in respect of contracts. My answer to the questions about the contract is 'No, we will not supply them.' If the member for Alexandra wants to see those things he can ask Eglo if they want to show him—it is a party to it. It is surprising that members who say that they have business acumen and are from a Party that knows all about business acumen, whereas the Labor Party does not, do not understand these fundamental rules about contracts. Who would want to go into a contract with the Government knowing that the next day it would be flashing around the details?

The Hon. T. CHAPMAN: You, Mr Chairman, said you have no control over the questions asked and no control over the answers. It is clear that the Government is continuing with its snowing of answers on this very important subject. On the one hand by interjection from the former Minister we have heard that he provided that information 12 months ago when in fact he did not. The current Minister said that he will not provide the information at all.

The CHAIRMAN: I ask the member for Alexandra to formulate his next question so that the Committee can go on with its business.

The Hon. T. CHAPMAN: I come back to the first question and ask the Minister to reconsider his answer. If he refuses to provide a copy of the contract, is he saying that he refuses to disclose any of the relative content of that contract, which is a public document involving public money for a public facility? Whether or not it be still owned by the Department of Marine and Harbors, it was under the responsibility of that department, under the former Minister, to build the ship on behalf of the State. For the Minister to continue to give us all this crap about what the State has spent on the ship to date in answer to questions on how much the ship has cost is more than frustrating. It is not right for one to dodge the question to the extent that it has been dodged so far. Every time I have asked how much the ship has cost, I get the reply (and I have had the same reply for four months) that the ship has cost the State Government \$16 million or thereabouts, in accordance with its original commitment two years ago.

The Minister gave me a specific answer four months ago that that was how much the Government had spent so far. He gave the House of Assembly that figure about three weeks ago. Tonight, in September, well into the first year of operation, we are still being given exactly the same figure. Notwithstanding the consistency of the figure given by the Minister over that time, it is not the answer to the question. I raised tonight an ingredient of cost of that ship that was input from the Commonwealth by way of bounty—nothing to do with tax or subsidy but a bounty contribution, because

the ship was built in Australia from public funds, albiet Commonwealth funds, listed in the State Auditor-General's Report. Yet, the Ministers of this State refuse to incorporate it as a cost of the ship when in fact it was. So, too, the interest on the capital transferred in the meantime is a cost of the ship.

To try to dodge those matters of fact is not only snowing this Committee but also serving a real backhander to the Auditor-General, who has picked up that material. I cannot understand why the Minister refuses to answer my question about the real cost that the ship has incurred so far. He will not give us the cost figure in the contract; he will not give us the costs in the meantime; he will not give us the costs of the amounts disputed so far and, still, nine months after the ship has gone into commission with the original builder. It is absolutely outrageous.

The CHAIRMAN: Order! I ask the honourable member to formulate his second question.

The Hon. T. CHAPMAN: The question, I repeat, is 'What was the cost figure in the contract between the State and Eglo Engineering to build the ship?' I am not asking for tender figures or matters of ordinary business confidentiality. That is a public matter and the job has been completed. The ship is on stream, albiet only sometimes. What was that figure?

The Hon. R.J. Gregory: I am wondering whether the member for Alexandra is disputing the Auditor-General's Report. I repeat what I said earlier: I will not be the Minister who starts throwing around details of contracts because we will then have a situation where people will not want to tender for Government projects. I notice that when the two members representing the Opposition on the Committee were Ministers they did not do that. They would not have done it because they have had enough astute business dealings to understand that they would limit the availability of private enterprise to tender to Government. They understand how business people want things confidential when tendering. It is not 'Open Sesame'.

The cost of the vessel to the State of South Australia is spelt out quite clearly on page 146 of the Auditor-General's Report with respect to Marine and Harbors. If the member for Alexandra thinks that that is wrong, I suggest he take it up with the Auditor-General himself. The Director of the department has indicated that when the matter is finally closed it is anticipated that the cost will be about \$16.5 million. The amount at 30 June 1988 was \$15.5 million. If the member for Alexandra thinks that the Auditor-General is wrong and that somebody is pulling the wool over his eyes, it is a problem he has with the Auditor-General. From time to time members of his Party allude to the Auditor-General's Report as being a factual statement of what is happening in departments. They occasionally use the report to criticise the Government. Today they are saying that there is something wrong with it because it does not add up to a certain figure. I have answered the question as far as I am prepared to answer it. I cannot understand what more the honourable member wants. Does he want to get fanciful figures from somewhere?

The Hon. T. CHAPMAN: The Minister is quite improperly quoting the Auditor-General. He has used a series of figures from the Auditor-General's Report. He has overlooked the \$3.4 million that the Commonwealth put into the ship. The question was not how much the State has spent but how much the ship has cost. One of the cost factors picked up by account of the Commonwealth in the form of a bounty was \$3.4 million. We have another figure of \$15.5 million and yet another of \$1.7 million interest on capital accrued in the meantime. The three figures men-

tioned by the Auditor-General added together come to over \$20 million.

The CHAIRMAN: I ask the member for Alexandra to formulate his third question.

The Hon. T. CHAPMAN: I ask the Minister to come clean with the Committee. If he does not want to indulge in an argument about interpreting the content of the Auditor-General's Report on this occasion, can we have an answer to the line where the Auditor-General says, quite apart from the figures cited by him in his report that 'there is another factor'. He said:

There is another factor. The final cost of the vessel is dependent upon the final cost of modifications and the completion of contractual matters outstanding between the parties to the construction contract.

We had the Director this evening tell us two or three times in his reply—I do not know why—that only minor moneys were involved in that line. Goodness knows why the Auditor-General should utter a sentence in isolation about contractual matters yet to be resolved if they were minor, but that is another issue. The thing is that this report was printed three months ago. Quite apart from what the department and others in the community know, and quite apart from what the dogs are barking in Port Adelaide about the subject, I know that hundreds of thousands of dollars have been spent on this vessel in that three months.

What we are asking is not a repeat of some of actual figures identified by the Auditor-General, but those figures which represent expenditure since this report was produced and the figure which, according to the Director, is still a matter of dispute between the Government and the contractor. In my view they are fair questions; they are public questions; they are of public import; and they ought to be able to be publicly exposed without any humiliation or any breach of business confidentiality and all this other rubbish to which the Minister has referred. It is really a joke to suggest that Governments do not disclose the name of a successful tenderer to build a bridge, for example, and the price of that bridge. It is done in private as well as public business and, more particularly, it is the right of the community at large to know the public expenditure in relation to a Government decision.

It is quite unheard of, of course, to disclose details of tenders before contracts are cemented and signed but, having done so, it is a matter of public note and ought to be publicly available. What does the Government have to hide? It certainly cannot legitimately hide behind this claim of breach of business confidentiality. What is confidential about it when the Auditor-General ultimately has access to it and produces a public document? Does that mean that he is breaching business confidentiality? What a load of rubbish! I would particularly like the answer to that unknown factor cited in the Auditor-General's Report. He had this report printed three months ago and, in the meantime, I would have expected that the Minister would have the answer in readiness for this Committee.

The Hon. R.J. Gregory: I draw the attention of the member for Alexandra to the front page of the Auditor-General's Report, which says that it was printed on 6 September this year—not three months ago. That works out to eight days ago. The other thing I am advised is that the account in respect of the Department of Marine and Harbors relating to this business was finalised 12 to 14 days ago. I have already answered the questions that the member has asked in respect of the *Island Seaway*. I do not know what he is looking for: perhaps he is looking for something of which we and the Auditor-General are not aware. Perhaps he wants to do other things: I do not know. Everything in respect of the cost of the *Island Seaway* is stated on page 146 of the

Auditor-General's Report. I have answered to the best of my ability, as have the members of my department, and I am leaving it there.

Mr ROBERTSON: On page 526 of the Program Estimates, in the specific targets for 1987-88, is a reference to the dredging of O'Sullivan Beach marina. My intention is to seek some further details about that operation, and to ascertain when the marina may need to be dredged again, given the rate of sand movement from the northern end of Christies Beach into the northward drift system that feeds the metropolitan beaches, and, as a subsidiary question, whether, given that the marina has just been dredged, a possible role is envisaged for the O'Sullivan Beach marina following the report of the Marina Advisory Committee.

That report indicated that O'Sullivan Beach might be one of the second generation marinas on the Adelaide coast. In that context, I remind the Chair that four locations emerged from the Marina Advisory Committee report: the Port River, Westcliff, the northern end of Maslins Beach and Wirrina resort. The advisory committee recommended that there should be a spread of sites and that they should be half a sailing day's distance apart. The four sites are half a day's sailing distance apart and also have the advantage of fitting nicely into the dynamics of sand movement along the coast. Also they might be expected to be built without any major environmental impact, particularly on the movement of sand and the breeding of fish, crustacea and the like.

In the second generation of recommended sites were such sites as Rapid Bay and, I understand, O'Sullivan Beach. Given that that was recommended by the Marina Advisory Committee Report (which, incidentally, seemed to vindicate the Government's rejection of Jubilee Point and Kingston Park as possible sites on the grounds of sand movement, fish breeding and the like), might the Government ultimately consider some form of joint venture with private enterprise if O'Sullivan Beach is to be developed as a commercial marina, or would consideration be given to allowing private developers to develop that site if it should ultimately be chosen for a future marina development?

The Hon. R.J. Gregory: In respect of the O'Sullivan Beach marina dredging, the last piece of work that was done to clear the entrance cost \$45 000. It is looked at annually and work is done every few years, if not annually, depending on sand drift. In relation to the matter of funding, the Government's general policy approach is that any marina development needs to be economically viable without financial contributions from the Government.

Mr ROBERTSON: Page 529 of the Program Estimates gives figures for the current number of registrations of boats and licensed boat operators in the section relating to the safety of recreational boating. The figures reveal that there are currently 46 918 licensed power boats and 120 747 operators. The same figures reveal that the rate of increase in boat licences is 2.1 per cent per year and, in licensed operators, 7.6 per cent. Do those figures represent a real growth rate in recreational boating, or might they prove to be more a reflection of changes in the law and the way in which that law is enforced?

In other words, the argument of the recreational boating organisations in favour of marinas has leaned very heavily on information of this kind which indicate that recreational boating in South Australia is a growth industry. Are some of those figures a little inflated in the light of the changes to the law or its enforcement, or do they represent a true growth in recreational boating?

The Hon. R.J. Gregory: It is a true growth, because the enforcement of the Boating Act has not changed for some time.

Mr ROBERTSON: On page 532, in the sea transport planning section, reference is made under the 1988-89 specific targets/objectives to the Government seeking improvements in shipping arrangements between South Australia and Northern Asia, New Zealand, the East Coast of North America and Europe. How is that to be done, and how quickly can one expect to see the results of any promotional activities undertaken by the department?

The Hon. R.J. Gregory: Ian Lovell, the Director (Commercial), has left South Australia. He is going to Europe, the Soviet Union and Hong Kong. I was speaking to him last night because it was the last time that he would be in South Australia and I was at the department farewelling him. The purpose of his current trip is to try to convince the European Conference of ships that ply from Europe to Australia to call in to the port of Adelaide fortnightly to pick up and deposit containers. This is a fairly extensive exercise. The department's officers have gathered together extensive information, which points out the financial viability of using the port of Adelaide, its low incidence of industrial action, the cheaper cost to shippers and importers of using the port of Adelaide instead of off-loading in Melbourne and railing to Adelaide, and the dependability of being able to come in to the port of Adelaide, which is a very safe harbor, and leave without having to wait.

A high grade mission is being undertaken. Ian Lovell is leading it: he will be the first person to arrive. He will sort out the ground and talk to people. He will be followed by the President of the Chamber of Commerce and Industry (Allan Crompton) and its Manager, Lindsay Thompson, who will be overseas, in Europe, Leningrad and Hong Kong. That will be the high powered portion of the group of people who will make these approaches.

I am confident that in the long run we will succeed because I have been advised by people who have been recipients of the material from our departmental officers that in the area of international trade our people put in very good submissions. Their submissions are based on cost, and on cost alone we would win any contract or get any service. We have other considerations to overcome, and I am confident that in the long term we will.

On Saturday morning the *Arafura*, the first of a fortnightly call from Japan, will call in to the port of Adelaide. That is the result of negotiations and discussions extending from 1982, in which the previous Minister for Marine (Roy Abbott, the member for Spence) was principally involved. He had two trips to Japan over it. They are not easy things to achieve, but our department has been working very hard on this and has been making gains. I am confident that in the long run we will be successful with this European Conference as well.

Mr MEIER: In the Estimates of Payments book on pages 166 and 167 there are some figures on which I would seek further explanation. I noticed that last year the voted amount for program 1, Water Recreation Boating Facilities, was \$80 000, and yet the amount spent was \$149 000. Why did that significant increase occur? Secondly, an amount of \$284 000 was voted as available for recreational jetties. I remember that the then Minister said, 'We would love to be able to fix up your jetties a bit better, but we are very limited in funds.' I think of the Port Rickaby jetty, which had to have the end section cut off, yet only \$149 966 was spent. Was more money available? Why did not certain people associated with recreational jetties push for the full reconstruction? Likewise, in program 6, Assistance to Commercial Fishing Industry—

The Hon. R.J. Gregory: Can we have one at a time?

Mr MEIER: I am sorry. The first is program 1 and then program 2.

The Hon. R.J. Gregory: The first one that you are talking about relates to increased survey work for maintenance caused by storms. The honourable member may recall an earlier answer in which I indicated the work that had been done at Port Rickaby due to some thousands of dollars of damage caused by storms. The Director will answer the second question that the honourable member asked in respect of the reallocation of money.

Mr Phipps: I understand that the question was, why the lower level of expenditure compared with the budget on operating maintenance? It is due mainly to the fact that our work force services both our capital new projects expenditure and our maintenance expenditure. In this area there was a heavy commitment of our work force on the Port Giles reconstruction, so a major amount of our manpower effort had to go into that, which left a lower level of manpower resources to carry out maintenance work. This happens in our program from time to time: the annual expenditure varies on maintenance due to these fluctuating factors, but in the medium term we maintain a steady trend to achieve the desired level of maintenance. I think that the honourable member was also asking why the relatively larger figure on interest on borrowings.

Mr MEIER: No, but that is a very good question.

Mr Phipps: It is just an accounting convention that is now being used by the Treasury to directly allocate the interest on capital.

Mr MEIER: It is the first time?

Mr Phipps: Yes.

Mr MEIER: Supplementary to that, do I take it from your answer that you had so many men employed on the Port Giles jetty, which is under a different heading for repairs, that you did not have so many men available for other maintenance works and that therefore, the amount of \$284 000 could not be used because the manpower was not available?

Mr Phipps: That is correct. If the honourable member looks at the same line under that program he will see the lower level of wages expenditure as compared with the vote. From that he can see that there was a lower level of manpower employed. That carries with it the per person contingency expenditure; materials, plant, etc. are accordingly lower because there is a limit to the productivity that one can get out of each person in terms of related expenditure. So, the figures bear out what I have said.

Mr MEIER: I realise that the Department of Marine and Harbors has a responsibility to undertake regular surveys of fishing and other commercial vessels to ensure that safety standards are maintained. I am interested to know how often, or on what basis, these regular surveys are undertaken. Hand-in-glove with that question, I refer to the Estimates of Payments program 6, where I notice that operating and maintenance expenses decreased from an actual expenditure of \$403 000 for last year to a voted amount of \$376 000 for this year. Similarly, does the slight reduction in salaries and wages mean that less emphasis will be given to regular surveys of fishing and other commercial vessels, that there will not be so many inspections?

The Hon. R.J. Gregory: The honourable member has asked two questions: one relates to the survey of vessels and the other to maintenance of permanent facilities for fishing vessels. I will ask Captain Buchanan to respond to the survey question and Mr Phipps to respond to the question about program 6 and the variations there.

Captain Buchanan: I understand that the question began by asking for the frequency of surveys for fishing vessels. Fishing vessels are surveyed every two years in this State.

Mr MEIER: One does not have a choice; every vessel is surveyed every two years, or is that just an average?

Captain Buchanan: It is mandatory every two years.

The Hon. R.J. Gregory: Mr Phipps will respond to the second question.

Mr Phipps: Program 6 does not cover the survey of fishing vessels. The decline in operating and maintenance expenses in program 6 is due to one factor only: the completion of road dredging. For the time being that has caused the drop. The survey of fishing vessels is allocated under program 3 'Maritime safety'. If one looks at the level of salaries and wages, goods and services, the expenditure as achieved was virtually identical to that budgeted.

Mr MEIER: As I ran around the River Torrens this afternoon I was interested to see a sign on the bank which said 'polluted water'. Realising that I was coming to the marine Estimates Committee later this day, and realising that the Department of Marine and Harbors has to consider pollution in the sea, I wondered whether the department takes account of the polluted water in the River Torrens running into marine waterways and, if so, what action will it take in the future to curb any negative effect of such pollution?

The Hon. R.J. Gregory: I will ask the Director to respond to that question.

Mr Phipps: I am not completely sure of the facts, but I will give the best information that I can. In such a situation, if the pollution was coming down a watercourse into the sea, the department has only a statutory responsibility in relation to the entrance into the sea where there is, say, a harbor facility. There are regulations to control what happens there. I suspect that, in the instance that the honourable member is talking about, the responsibility for controlling the quality of the water down to the coastline would rest with the Engineering and Water Supply Department. As far as I am aware, once it gets into the sea I am not aware that the Engineering and Water Supply Department or the Department of Marine and Harbors have any responsibility in the matter. I think that the real control is over land-based discharges into the watercourse en route to the sea and that the control over the quality of water entering the sea would come under general Government policy; that is, is the quality of water entering the sea tolerable or acceptable?

Mr MEIER: I think it is an interesting question and I will be interested to see which department accepts responsibility for trying to clean up the pollution.

Mr HAMILTON: The question about water quality control raised by the previous speaker is a vexed question, of course. As one who lives in what might be called a catchment area—and it is not my intention to canvass the miscellaneous lines, but I hope that I will have an opportunity before the night is out to raise matters with respect to stormwater and the impact that it may have on a certain body of water within my electorate—this matter certainly causes considerable concern, not only in relation to the Torrens but also the Patawalonga and many other rivers and estuaries throughout South Australia. What improvements are being made to control boats in the light of complaints from the excessive fumes of outboard motors?

The Hon. R.J. Gregory: I will ask Captain Buchanan to respond to that question.

Captain Buchanan: Modifications are being made to the existing patrol boats in order to minimise the level of gases

to the accepted criteria. Our new boats are being modified as they come into service.

Mr HAMILTON: When will these modifications be carried out? Will they be completed by the end of the year? How many boats are involved?

The Hon. R.J. Gregory: The work will be done in the next two or three months.

Mr HAMILTON: With the advent of jet skis on bodies of water, both inland and on the sea, complaints have been made to the police throughout the State about the way in which these skis are being used. In the past, criticism has been levelled that the use of jet skis, especially along our metropolitan foreshore, endangers not only the lives of swimmers but also those of wind surfers and other people in non-motorised craft. Can the Minister say what action is being or may be taken to zone these jet skis so as to provide safe areas where people can either swim or wind surf in safety, and what discussions, if any, have been held with local councils to this end?

The Hon. R.J. Gregory: The Boating Act applies to the operators of ski jets the same as it does to other boat operators: they must not sail within 30 metres of swimmers. Departmental officers will keep an eye on the operators of ski jets and ensure that they are counselled and eventually prosecuted if they do not mend their ways.

Mr HAMILTON: Have any people using jet skis been prosecuted in this State? How many injuries, if any, have been caused by the users of jet skis on the metropolitan foreshore and inland waters of South Australia?

The Hon. R.J. Gregory: The details required by the honourable member could more appropriately be supplied later in written form.

The Hon. P.B. ARNOLD: Has the department considered reviewing the effectiveness or otherwise of the existing provisions of the Boating Act concerning the issue of licences to boat operators? One can obtain such a licence merely by answering the necessary questions without ever having been on a boat or having had any practical experience on one. In years gone by, a motorist could obtain a drivers licence by passing a simple written test, but the State would certainly not go back to issuing a drivers licence without the applicant having undergone a practical test. Are practical tests feasible? Has the department considered upgrading the requirements for the issue of a boat operator's licence?

The Hon. R.J. Gregory: At present, practical tests are required of people under the age of 16 years who seek a boat operator's licence, although I understand that few such tests are conducted. As to whether the Government is considering changes to the Boating Act so as to require applicants for a licence to pass a practical test, the answer is 'No'. As to whether the Government has considered such a requirement, the department's view at present is that practical testing is inappropriate because of the high cost involved compared to the return to the Government in licence fees. The conduct of practical tests would require a significant increase in licence fees and there is no intention at present to introduce such tests.

The Hon. P.B. ARNOLD: Having in mind the safety aspect, I asked my question in all sincerity because the ability to answer questions as a parrot does not indicate practical experience in handling a boat. How many inspectors are there at present throughout the State and what vessels do they use? Is the Government in the process of upgrading or replacing the boats used by inspectors?

The Hon. R.J. Gregory: There are nine inspectors. Three replacement boats have been ordered; one has been delivered while two are to be delivered. The other six are being upgraded.

The Hon. T. CHAPMAN: The Public Works Standing Committee Act requires public expenditure on items of construction to be referred to that committee when those expenditure items exceed \$2 million. Why was the *Island Seaway*, as a State construction project, not referred to that standing committee? It is the committee to which the Department of Marine and Harbors is currently putting a case in relation to very important installations for fire safety at Port Adelaide, and it has done it with similar constructions, expenditure and extensions of services and facilities in and around the Port, as have all other departments of the State which are required to refer such matters for consideration.

The Hon. R.J. Gregory: My advice is that the Government acted as intermediary for the building of this vessel. Crown Law advice was sought and the Government was advised that there was no need to refer it to the Public Works Standing Committee.

The Hon. T. CHAPMAN: As a supplementary question, could I ask for a copy of the Crown Law opinion? I do not know that there is any breach of business confidentiality in that question.

The Hon. R.J. Gregory: We will provide a written response to that question.

Mr ROBERTSON: I wish to take up the point on jet skis raised by the member for Albert Park and ask, almost as an adjunct to his question, what action is currently taken to ensure that drivers of hired jet skis (and there are a number of commercial operations along the metropolitan foreshore which hire jet skis to ostensibly anyone who comes along) are licensed. Do the commercial operators who hire out those jet skis have any way of screening prospective hirers to ensure that they are licensed? Where does the obligation lie if they hire out a ski to an unlicensed driver? By way of explanation, it is almost facile to point out the stupidity of having a missile capable of being driven at 35 or 40 km/h when the driver has neither the experience or the qualification to drive it.

The Hon. R.J. Gregory: People who operate power vessels, irrespective of how the vessel is acquired, are required by the Boating Act to have the appropriate licence. If they do not have that licence and are apprehended, they are subject to prosecution and the penalties under the Act. It would be hoped that any person who hired out a power vessel capable of exceeding the horsepower rating and the length as determined by the Act would ensure that the person who hires the vessel would have the appropriate boating licence. However, the principal responsibility rests with the operator to ensure they are appropriately licensed for the craft they want to hire.

Mr ROBERTSON: At page 533 the Program Estimates state that the Federal Government has ratified the MARPOL convention for the protection of pollution from ships. The objective states:

Pollution of Waters by Oil and Noxious Substances Act to be brought into operation following Australia's ratification of the MARPOL convention.

How will that be done? Further, how is the Environmental Protection (Sea Dumping) Act of 1984 proposed to be brought into operation and what effect will we see when both Acts are brought on stream?

The Hon. R.J. Gregory: I ask the Assistant Director to answer that.

Mr Freeman: The Pollution of Waters by Oil and Noxious Substances Act passed the House on parts of the MARPOL convention. We are waiting to sort out with the Commonwealth the actual regulations that are to come in with that Act. I expect that it will be brought into operation within the next few months. In effect, the Commonwealth legis-

lation applies until our State legislation is brought into being. With the Environmental Protection (Sea Dumping) Act, again the Commonwealth legislation applies until our own legislation is brought into operation. Presently that is delayed, as there are disagreements between all the States and the Commonwealth concerning how the State legislation will be brought into operation and what will be the relationship between the State and the Commonwealth in approving sea dumping applications. That may take some time to resolve itself.

Mr ROBERTSON: According to the Estimates of Payments, \$2.4 million is set aside in the 1988-89 financial year for the provision of infrastructure for the Australian Submarine Corporation submarine site. Will the Minister provide details regarding the services to be provided to ASC and what will be the total cost of the project to his department?

The Hon. R.J. Gregory: A deed dated 12 May 1987 between the Premier and Australian Submarine Corporation included an incentive package to the Australian Submarine Corporation in the event that the company was successful in being awarded the contract by the Commonwealth for the construction of submarines and associated support requirements for the Royal Australian Navy. That incentive package provided that the State would provide at no cost to Australian Submarine Corporation such roads, storm-water drainage, electrical, water and sewer services to the site as may be reasonably required to effectively and efficiently use the site for its intended purpose.

Total Cabinet approval for the provision of these services is \$3.061 million and has been allocated in the following manner:

	\$
Roadworks	965 000
Stormwater drainage	1 158 000
Electrical supply	134 000
Water	334 000
Sewer	470 000

Actual cost to 30 June totalled \$502 000. The budget allocation for the 1988-89 financial year is \$2.4 million.

Mr ROBERTSON: As a supplementary question, the estimates of receipts note that the Department of Marine and Harbors public undertakings are expected to increase by \$2.257 million over the level earned in the 1987-88 financial year. What increases in rates relate to shipping and what is the amount of additional revenue associated with those rate increases?

The Hon. R.J. Gregory: The bulk of the revenue of the Department of Marine and Harbors stems from charges for wharfage, tonnage rates, conservancy dues and pilotage levied on shipping and cargo pursuant to the Harbors Act. Over recent years it has been the practice to review these port charges on an annual basis to enable tariff increases to be contained to a manageable level.

As from 1 October 1988, charges for wharfage, pilotage, conservancy dues and some minor charges will increase by 4 per cent, while charges for tonnage rates will remain constant. The retention of tonnage rates at their present level effectively means that shipping charges (that is pilotage, conservancy dues and tonnage rates) will only increase by a weighted average of 2.2 per cent. In approving these rate increases several factors were taken into account, including: extent of cost recovery; consumer price index increases; the competitive position of interstate ports and thus the level of their charges; and economic factors relating to individual commodities; the views of the South Australian Chamber of Shipping, the South Australian Shipping Users Group and the South Australian Ports Liaison Advi-

sory Committee. These groups considered that the increases were at an acceptable and responsible level. The approved rate increase will attract additional revenue of \$620 000 in the current financial year and \$900 000 in a full year.

The CHAIRMAN: There being no further questions, I declare the examination closed.

Minister of Marine, Miscellaneous, \$1 440 000

The CHAIRMAN: I declare the proposed payments open for examination.

The Hon. P.B. ARNOLD: My question relates to preliminary investigations on projects not proceeded with. What were the projects not proceeded with which cost \$76 000?

Mr Phipps: With some capital projects it is necessary to carry out thorough investigations, and not every project proceeds to the point where a commitment is made to continue with it. An example of that would be the major amount in that figure, which is the Port Adelaide oil berth. We carried out study and design work relating to a new oil berth and fire suppression facility associated with it in the vicinity of the existing inner harbor site. In the end, the Government decided to put to the Public Works Standing Committee a proposal which involved only the fire suppression capacity and not the new berth, so the preliminary conceptual design investment was written off.

There were other small projects, such as those in connection with Outer Harbor No. 7, where we carried out some feasibility study work. From time to time we review the investigation expenditure which is being capitalised against particular project numbers, then when it becomes obvious that the project will not proceed in the foreseeable future we write off the investigation costs. These are the major two items.

The Hon. T. CHAPMAN: I want to place on record my apology for a remark earlier this evening when I referred to the document before me, which is a copy of the Auditor-General's Report, and said that that report was printed prior to or as at 30 June. I was corrected quite properly by the Minister after the cover of the document was drawn to his attention.

I acknowledge that this final document prepared by the Government Printer was printed on the date the Minister said it was and not on the date that I had earlier claimed, even though my references up to that point had been in relation to the content of the document and the preparation of that content by the Auditor-General's Department prior to 30 June and that, in fact, its total content contained material that ended and clipped off at 30 June. I apologise for the reference that I have now placed on the record, albeit as minor as it may be.

Mr HAMILTON: Will the Minister provide me with information as to what works will be carried out on the West Lakes revetment works? In what specific areas will that be carried out? What amount of money will be spent? What is the timetable, if possible, for that operation? What water quality surveys are to be carried out, or is that part of the ongoing water quality survey work?

The Hon. R.J. Gregory: On water quality, samples are taken from specific locations at regular intervals by the Engineering and Water Supply Department and are analysed by the department's laboratories. The results are then made available to the West Lakes Water Quality Control Committee. Generally, the waters of the lake are satisfactory for primary contact water sports but, as predicted by the original West Lakes Pollution Committee, there are occasions

following heavy stormwater intake when the quality deteriorates in the vicinity of drain outlets for short periods, up to three days.

Mr HAMILTON: I am well aware of that. I just want to know whether that is included under the Miscellaneous column and whether that was what it was all about.

The Hon. R.J. Gregory: Yes.

Mr HAMILTON: The other question was about the revetment works: what work was carried out and in what areas?

The Hon. R.J. Gregory: It was projected to spend \$80 000 on that revetment work in this current financial year. We will also spend \$30 000 on gate maintenance and \$8 000 on general maintenance. If the member for Albert Park wants to know where that will be spent we can provide written responses to that.

Mr HAMILTON: I would appreciate that and I will take up that offer.

The CHAIRMAN: There being no further questions, I declare the examination completed.

Works and Services, Department of Marine and Harbors,
\$10 500 000

The Hon. P.B. ARNOLD: I am not sure whether this question comes under 'Capital' or what, but in the South Australian Government Financing Authority documents,

page 32, under 'The Minister of Marine', it refers to \$28.3 million in 1987 and a further \$8.2 million in 1988. Did the funding coming from SAFA largely go into the *Island Seaway* project? Where did the funding that was received from SAFA go?

Mr Phipps: The major investments were the financing of the *Island Seaway* construction and the financing of the construction of the big Elders wool store at Gillman. That project aimed to bring more South-East wool into Port Adelaide.

The Hon. P.B. ARNOLD: Does that account for the amounts of \$23.8 million and \$8.2 million?

Mr Phipps: There may be some other minor items and the department will have to provide a reconciliation for the honourable member. For example, in relation to the funding of Port Giles, the department invested with SAFA the money provided to carry out that project and it would have advanced some of that back to us.

The Hon. P.B. ARNOLD: I would be quite happy if I could be provided with the details of expenditure of the \$23.8 million and the \$8.2 million.

The CHAIRMAN: There being no further questions, I declare the examination of the vote completed.

ADJOURNMENT

At 9.56 p.m. the Committee adjourned until Thursday 15 September at 11 a.m.