

HOUSE OF ASSEMBLY

Tuesday 25 August 1987

The **SPEAKER (Hon. J.P. Trainer)** took the Chair at 2 p.m. and read prayers.

PETITION: NETTING

A petition signed by 1 568 residents of South Australia praying that the House urge the Government to ban netting from 1 May 1988 between Port Sir Isaac and Port Frenchman was presented by Mr Blacker.

Petition received.

QUESTIONS

The **SPEAKER**: I direct that written answers to the following questions on the Notice Paper, as detailed in the schedule that I now table, be distributed and printed in *Hansard*: Nos 10, 19, 25, 27, 33, 47, 50 to 62, 66, 83 to 85, 100, 101, 105, 109, 110, 113, 120, 134, 143, 145, 147, 153, 158, 173, 174, 179, 182, 183, 187, and 188.

PAPERS TABLED

The following papers were laid on the table:

- By the Minister of Transport (Hon. G.F. Keneally):
Department of Local Government—Report, 1985-86.
South Australian Health Commission Act 1976—Regulations—Linen and Laundry Services.
- By the Minister of Mines and Energy (Hon. R.G. Payne):
Mining Act 1971—Regulations—Fees.
- By the Minister of Education (Hon. G.J. Crafter):
Builders Licensing Act 1986—Regulations—Complaint and Domestic Building Relief.
Commercial Tribunal Act 1982—Regulations—Constitution, Forms, Service and Hearings.
Consumer Credit Act 1972—Regulations—Complaint and Non-compliance Fee.
Consumer Transactions Act 1972—Regulations—Constitution and Power of Registrar.
Goods Securities Act 1986—Regulations—Compensation Fee.
Land Agents, Brokers and Valuers Act 1973—Regulations—Refunds, Complaint Forms and Fee.
Landlord and Tenant Act 1936—Regulation—Application Fee and Notices.
Second-hand Goods Act 1985—Regulation—Complaint Forms and Fee.
Second-hand Motor Vehicles Act 1983—Regulations—Complaint and Fees.
Travel Agents Act 1986—Regulations—Form of Complaint and Application.
- By the Minister of Agriculture (Hon. M.K. Mayes):
Deer Keepers Act 1987—Regulations—Registration and Compensation.
- By the Minister of Fisheries (Hon. M.K. Mayes):
Fisheries Act 1982—Regulations—
Central Zone Abalone Fishery—Licence Fees.
Gulf St. Vincent Prawn Fishery—Licence Fees.
Southern Zone Abalone Fishery—Licence Fees.
Spencer Gulf Prawn Fishery—Licence Fees.
West Coast Prawn Fishery—Licence Fees.
Western Zone Abalone Fishery—Licence Fees.

QUESTION TIME

The **SPEAKER**: Before calling for questions, I inform the House that questions that would otherwise be directed to the Deputy Premier will be taken by the Premier.

TIMBER COMPANY

Mr OLSEN: Since the Minister of Forests received a report in April from the firm of chartered accountants that exposed serious financial difficulties faced by a New Zealand based company in which the South Australian Timber Corporation has a 70 per cent ownership, has the South Australian Government provided a further \$3 million in financial assistance to this company and, if it has, what security has it obtained for that loan?

The Hon. R.K. ABBOTT: There was a problem caused by deterioration in marketing conditions, significant exchange rates, and poor New Zealand management of the IPL's New Zealand operations. As a result of the Government's concern, I commissioned two independent consultants' reports to establish the exact financial position of the joint venture and to look at its long-term prospects. Only recently, I received a final report and business plan from Coopers and Lybrand W.D. Scott that will be studied in detail by the Government over the next few weeks. In general terms, questions dealing with the contract between the South Australian Timber Corporation and Westland Industrial Corporation Limited are the subject of complex legal argument, which is now before the Federal Court of Australia and therefore *sub judice*.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order!

The Hon. R.K. ABBOTT: Before answering any further questions I ask honourable members to place their questions on notice so that I can give detailed responses.

OVERSEAS INVESTMENT

Mr FERGUSON: Can the Minister of State Development and Technology inform the House whether his department has any information as to whether South Australian companies are ready to take advantage of a change in policy direction by the Federal Government in relation to allowing overseas companies to discharge their obligations by investing directly into venture capital investments in Australian companies, rather than having to provide Australian manufacturers with offset manufacturing in connection with defence contracts?

It was reported in the *Business Review Weekly* of 7 August 1987 that the Federal Government will allow companies with defence offset obligations to discharge this obligation by investing in Australian companies. The *Business Review Weekly* has suggested that the new policy will apply to direct investment by way of seed and start up finance in 'innovation products and technologies'. Both of these terms are subject to detailed definitions.

Mr Lewis: It's not a comment, is it?

Mr FERGUSON: It is a comment in the *Business Review Weekly*, which I have just quoted. Experience has shown that, if the larger States favour any move that the Federal Government makes, it is likely to succeed. It has been put to me that South Australian companies, especially those associated with new technology, would need to be on their front foot to capture the very large amounts of money—

Mr S.J. BAKER: On a point of order, Mr Speaker—

The SPEAKER: Order! I presume that the point of order about to be raised by the member for Mitcham is that the member for Henley Beach was entering the area of debate. If that is the case, I uphold the point of order. The honourable Minister of State Development and Technology.

The Hon. LYNN ARNOLD: I thank the honourable member for his question. The matter of offset arrangements and any changes to the policy—and there have been a number of changes over recent years—has been the subject of discussion between the Federal and State Governments. While it is clearly for the Federal Government to make the final policy decision, at all stages to date we have been involved. I anticipate that that will continue to be the case. In that context I understand that any proposed changes that the Federal Government now wishes to make would be discussed with us at officer level between the Federal and State Governments before and during the next meeting of the Australian Industry and Technology Council, due to be held in November this year.

This State will have a chance to put its view about what we consider are the impacts of the proposed changes. Before making any further comment on that, I point out that this Government has supported a widening of the offset arrangements. Traditionally, offset arrangements have included a requirement that a component of the product sold to Australia should be made in this country: so that door handles could be made on the plane, for example. More imaginative use of offsets since then have seen other arrangements whereby investments can be made in other kinds of products or for other purposes and they can be acquitted against the total bill for the purchase of the product. We have already seen a number in South Australia.

For example, some of the very up-to-date CAD/CAM hardware and software at the Regency Park College of TAFE is here as a result of an offset acquittal arrangement previously organised. I can assure the House that other such deals are being talked through at the moment. Whether that widening of the purpose of offsets should go further to include the possibility that overseas companies could invest in venture capital companies or companies needing venture capital requires more thought. It is certainly true that the venture capital market in this country is young and perhaps delicate.

I note that the honourable member asked a question earlier this year about a new way of raising venture capital in Victoria, and I am aware of his concern that there is an adequate flow of venture capital to those companies needing it. Whether or not that is answered by money being made available to offset arrangements will need further thought. I am not in a position to be able to supply that answer yet, because we have not given it the further consideration that it needs.

The size of the venture capital market is not just a function of the money available to it from investors; it is also a function of the demand by innovative companies wanting venture capital. There is some evidence for one to believe that there is a relatively stable situation between supply of venture capital that is available and the actual demand for it. This is evidenced by the fact that some venture capital companies are now starting to put money into other kinds of investment, not because they are worried about the venture capital areas that they have been in but rather because they cannot find enough useful investment opportunities in the venture capital arena.

An article in the issue before last of *Computer World Australia* also identified that some companies are a bit anxious about the proposal now being mooted by the Federal Government. As I say, as we receive more information

on the matter I will keep the honourable member and the House informed. However, I believe that the AITC meeting in November this year will be the one at which a full canvassing of the issue takes place.

TIMBER COMPANY

The Hon. E.R. GOLDSWORTHY: My question is directed to the Minister of Forests. How much money has the South Australian Government put into the New Zealand based timber company in which the South Australian Government has a 70 per cent ownership? Was \$3 million more recently made available?

The Hon. R.K. ABBOTT: As I indicated to the Leader, I am not in a position to answer any question relating to finances or questions of a legal nature.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order! The honourable Minister.

The Hon. R.K. ABBOTT: I do not wish to pre-empt the court decisions or the arguments that will be put in the court case which is before the Federal Court of Australia.

Members interjecting:

The Hon. R.K. ABBOTT: I am not prepared to mention any figures at all. We commissioned a report and recently received it. The Government is seriously considering the business plan. A number of initiatives have been taken already and the situation is vastly improved. We will be considering—

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order!

The Hon. R.K. ABBOTT: —the business plan on a long-term basis.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order!

CHILD-CARE CENTRES

Ms GAYLER: Will the Minister of Children's Services take up with the new Commonwealth Minister for Community Services the unworkable guidelines for occasional child-care centres which are pricing out of the reach of ordinary families important opportunities for respite child-care, particularly for families with more than one child under school age? I have had a number of representations from users of Kelly's Farm Occasional Child-care Centre which serves the north-eastern suburbs that the Commonwealth guidelines and fee requirements—

The SPEAKER: Order! It is extremely difficult for the Chair to hear the question of the honourable member for Newland because of the dialogue that is taking place between the two respective front benches. I ask the members involved to desist. The honourable member for Newland.

Ms GAYLER: The Commonwealth guidelines and fee requirements for occasional care at this centre are simply not workable. After more than a year of operation, the centre is unable to take a full complement of 17 children for each session and has run over budget on two occasions, much to the distress of the management committee. I am advised that fee levels for all but those on a pension or a benefit are \$13.20 for two children for three hours and \$19.80 for three children in a family for three hours. The management committee advises me that single income families on a low income with more than one child simply cannot afford to use the service which many of them so desperately need. The Department of Community Services has now asked the centre to reduce its hours of operation

from 30 to 20 a week—a 33 per cent reduction in services. It has been put to me that Kelly's Farm is the only occasional child-care centre in Australia operating under the Commonwealth guidelines, with other centres having more flexibility to charge a sliding scale of fees and to take children for longer hours of care.

The Hon. G.J. CRAFTER: I thank the honourable member for her question. She has touched on a matter of concern to us in the children's services sector in the State of South Australia, because it is felt that the guidelines established by the Commonwealth under this Commonwealth funded program are unsuitable for the needs of the South Australian community. I have made representations to the two former Ministers for Community Services and I raised this matter at the appropriate Ministers forum earlier this year. As a result of the decisions taken at that Ministers conference, it was decided to set up a Commonwealth-State working party on that matter of guidelines and a number of other matters of similar concern. I understand that that committee is meeting to consider this important matter. I confirm that it does cause particular problems for us in South Australia and I am hopeful that in due course we can iron out those problems.

TIMBER COMPANY

The Hon. JENNIFER CASHMORE: My question is directed to the Minister of Forests. What is the nature of legal proceedings which the Government has initiated against directors of the IPL Timber Company, based in New Zealand, in which the South Australian Timber Corporation has a 70 per cent ownership?

The Hon. R.K. ABBOTT: Action is being taken against certain directors of IPL New Zealand Pty Ltd through the Australian court. One hearing has taken place already and that has been adjourned. I would have to check the date. I am not exactly certain—

The Hon. Jennifer Cashmore: What is the nature of the proceeding?

The Hon. R.K. ABBOTT: The nature of our case is that there was a shortfall of assets regarding the joint venture entered into with the Australian Timber Corporation through IPL Australia and IPL New Zealand. That matter is currently before the court.

Mr Olsen: You were insolvent—

The SPEAKER: Order!

The Hon. R.K. ABBOTT: As I pointed out, financial matters are in question, and that is the reason I would appreciate it if questions were put on notice.

Members interjecting:

The Hon. R.K. ABBOTT: I can take legal advice.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order! I call the Leader of the Opposition to order.

SEACRAFT RADIO BEACONS

Mr HAMILTON: Will the Minister of Marine, in conjunction with his colleague the Minister of Recreation and Sport, investigate the feasibility of making it compulsory for all pleasure and business-going seacraft to be fitted with a radio emitting beacon or similar frequency emitting device? In my contribution in this House in the adjournment debate on Thursday last, I said:

It has been suggested that the Government should give consideration to making it compulsory for a radio beacon to be fitted to all craft that venture out into the sea or large expanses of

water. It has been suggested that, with modern technology available, it should not be too hard to have a piece of such equipment made available (if it is not already available) and for it to be installed in power boats and fishing vessels. That could save not only a considerable amount of money to the State Government but also make the life of our volunteer coastal protection people a lot easier. It is a worthy request and one that should be considered. I have noted over the years people venturing out on very calm days in kayaks—

Mr LEWIS: On a point of order, Sir, is it possible for the member currently asking the question to quote himself in the fashion in which he is in order to comment upon the question which he has asked in the course of giving an explanation? I do not mind, but it is just a waste of Question Time.

The SPEAKER: Order! The point of order raised by the member for Murray-Mallee is a vexed one. Debate and comment is clearly out of order. On the other hand, it is in order to quote from *Hansard* as the honourable member was doing. However, the honourable member was clearly quoting from *Hansard* in order to debate the question. On balance, I uphold the point of order of the honourable member for Murray-Mallee, because I am sure that any point that the member for Albert Park wished to establish has been established by now, anyway.

The Hon. R.K. ABBOTT: I thank the honourable member for his question, which he raised as a concerned patron of the West Lakes Canoe Club, of which he is a very strong supporter. I know that all members sympathise with the families involved in this tragic loss of life. There is merit in the suggestion by the honourable member and it is a matter that I, along with my colleagues, will investigate. This sort of equipment is currently in use on all fishing craft (or it should be) and is known as EPIRB, that is, emergency positioning indicator radio beacon. This device is used by Royal Australian Air Force air crews when they are forced to bale out. It was never envisaged that the radio equipment would be used on small craft such as canoes, as its indiscriminate use could create needless searches and put search parties at risk. That has happened with the senseless firing of flares. Not only does that put search parties at risk but it incurs great cost to taxpayers.

In situations similar to that which occurred last weekend, it would be desirable for canoeists to be accompanied by a power boat suitably equipped for rescue work. More importantly, canoeists and small boat operators should follow the advice given in the excellent safety boating booklets provided by the Department of Marine and Harbors. On that score, I will quote two small paragraphs from chapter 12 of one of those booklets under the heading 'Weather forecasts for small boats':

The Bureau of Meteorology has some potentially life saving advice for the thousands of boating enthusiasts who venture into South Australian coastal waters: keep an eye and ear on the weather and, if in doubt, don't go out.

Even with the most up to date equipment and a skilled, experienced operator, it is still the weather which will determine if a day's outing is to be safe and enjoyable or unpleasantly dangerous. The importance of being informed about likely conditions cannot be overstressed.

It is my desire and that of the Government to prevent accidents on our waterways. I am happy to take up with my colleagues the suggestion that the honourable member has made to see whether stricter and safer measures can be implemented.

TIMBER COMPANY

The Hon. B.C. EASTICK: Will the Minister of Forests confirm that the South Australian Government has com-

mitted a total of \$17.609 million to the New Zealand Timber Company since December 1985, comprising \$3.59 million in the purchase of shares in IPL, an advance of \$11.017 million and, more recently, another \$3 million?

The Hon. R.K. ABBOTT: I will endeavour to get that information and those figures for the honourable member. I do not have the figures on this matter in front of me, but I undertake to get them.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order! I call the member for Florey.

EXPORT MEAT

Mr GREGORY: Can the Minister of Agriculture inform the House of the effect (or possible effect) on the South Australian meat export trade of the current problem concerning pesticide residues in beef? Have any such residues been detected in meat exported from South Australia and what will the Government do to address that potential threat to our meat exports? We have heard and read reports of the possibility of beef exports to America being placed in jeopardy because of the presence of unacceptable levels of pesticide residue in meat, followed by Japan, Canada and other countries that import Australian beef examining their inspection procedures, which also may lead to the prohibition of Australian beef imports.

The Hon. M.K. MAYES: I am sure that most members are aware of the current difficulties encountered with residues found in some of the meat tested in the United States, and certainly the impact on what is a billion dollar industry could be quite devastating. Hopefully, the negotiating team representing the AMLC, the DPI and the Minister will be successful in Washington in negotiating an arrangement that will allow for the continuation of that export market.

The State Government has established a program, along with the Federal and other State Governments, to resolve this problem in a number of ways. We are tackling it with a combined industry and Government approach. Testing is quite important, and the situation is that it is being taken up by the industry through a levy arrangement. The increase in testing programs has been dramatic in the last few weeks. In addition, a national data bank will be established and funded by the Federal Government. Hopefully we will all participate. Currently a problem exists with Queensland's display of petulance in regard to the provision of information to the data bank, but it is essential that we all participate in providing information to the central data bank to meet the arrangements made between the department, the Federal Minister and the Americans as to the standards that are required of imported meat. The State Government has taken the step of announcing that there will be a ban on the use of organochlorins, particularly DDT, in the agricultural sense. The legislation required to amend the Agricultural Chemicals Act will be introduced as soon as possible. Cabinet has approved it and it will be introduced in the next few weeks in order to prevent the application of these organochlorins agriculturally.

The organochlorins affected particularly are DDT, Heptachlor, Aldrin, dieldrin and lindane, which will be phased out separately but there will also be immediate notice to the rural community that it will be phased out from this point. Collection is being organised through the Department of Agriculture. It was incorrectly reported that the Executive Director of United Farmers and Stockowners had stated that his organisation would set up a central collection point in the rural community for these organochlorins: that is not true. All Department of Agriculture officers have been briefed

on the handling of these chemicals. The location of central storage areas will be published in the media, with details of where the chemicals are to be deposited and how they are to be transported. If people have old containers that leak they should not move them but contact the Department of Agriculture, which we hope will be able to provide containers that will guarantee the safe transportation of those chemicals to the central collection point. The program will commence on 31 August and run until 31 October, when I hope that the department will see fit—

Mr Gunn interjecting:

The Hon. M.K. MAYES: Not necessarily, because we have given plenty of notice to the community. Over many years the department has urged the non-use of these persistent organochlorins. That matter has been discussed with the industry, which has accepted totally the Government's decision on this situation.

Mr Lewis interjecting:

The Hon. M.K. MAYES: It is interesting that the member for Murray-Mallee should start to interject. The matter is so serious that I would imagine there would be general agreement on the approach. We have seen a universal approach from the industry both in this State and nationally. Plenty of notice has been given of the phase-out. For example, DDT was banned from sale from June last year, and those people who have continued to use it (and there has been speculation that it has continued to be used especially in parts of the South-East) have done so, I believe, irresponsibly and without the support especially of the cattle industry. We will certainly have to deal with the problem of the persistent nature of the organochlorins. At Agricultural Council the States have agreed on a program that establishes the process of quarantine. Where there is identification, a trace-back program will go back to those areas of quarantine so that we can establish for the Americans a clear record of any meat affected, given the half-life of these persistent chemicals.

A State Government announcement which, having the support of Cabinet, I can reinforce today is that the ban will be instituted from 31 August. I ask the rural community and other people who have stored quantities of these chemicals in their back sheds to watch the press and contact the Department of Agriculture. There will be a collection point in the metropolitan area for people having these chemicals in whatever quantities.

TIMBER COMPANY

The Hon. H. ALLISON: Following the recommendation in a report by chartered accountants, which I believe was received by the Government in April, that the Government should ask a New Zealand solicitor to review the debenture covering its \$11 million advance in a New Zealand timber company, can the Minister of Forests say whether the Government has initiated that review and, if it has, whether the debenture is valid under New Zealand law? If it is not valid, does this mean that the advance is totally unsecured?

The Hon. R.K. ABBOTT: We acted on the report and a number of meetings have been held. The second report is now to hand and is currently being considered by the Government, and a number of decisions have been taken. There has been a reduction of some 40 personnel in the New Zealand operation, and the situation has vastly improved. The whole matter of whether or not this is a secure operation is being considered by the Government at the moment, and we have not made a decision on the business plan report. I am advised that the debenture was secured, but

that matter is in dispute at the moment and is before the Australian courts.

TRAINING PROGRAMS

Mr ROBERTSON: Is the Minister of Employment and Further Education aware of a submission to the working party on Commonwealth funding of technical and further education, prepared in June this year?

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order! I call the honourable Leader of the Opposition to order for the second time, and I call to order the honourable member for Coles. The honourable member for Bright.

Mr ROBERTSON: In that submission the South Australian United Trades and Labor Council pointed to deficiencies in the work training programs run by the Department of Employment and Industrial Relations and to the allegedly poor record of that department in the ATS programs. Is the Minister also aware of consequent assertions that some Federal funding deployed in DEIR programs might have been more productively used within the TAFE sector?

The Hon. LYNN ARNOLD: I am aware of the submission on this matter from the United Trades and Labor Council to the Commonwealth Government. That submission follows my submission to the Commonwealth Government on the same subject, the funding of technical and further education. My submission to the then Commonwealth Minister for Education and the Minister for Employment and Industrial Relations indicated my serious concerns at the moves indicated in the May economic statement to transfer some \$32 million from TAFE funding into the Department of Employment and Industrial Relations, with the possibility that some of that money could be clawed back by TAFE departments in the various States.

First, I was concerned about that issue as a general issue and the difficulties that that would mean in the flexibility of TAFE budgeting in each State. Secondly, I queried whether it was the correct way to go, knowing that the TAFE systems in Australia, and particularly the TAFE system in South Australia, have been effective users of money received from the Commonwealth Government.

Indeed, it is interesting to note how much of the moneys available for training from the Department of Employment and Industrial Relations (as it was then known) was received by TAFE in South Australia. In fact, it was the highest percentage—something like 80 per cent; in New South Wales the figure was about 50 per cent, I understand. The letter from the UTLC went further than that and criticised what was then known as the Department of Employment and Industrial Relations (now known as the Department of Employment, Education and Training) and in the process made some references to the Australian traineeship scheme.

There have been difficulties with that scheme, but it is not fair to attribute responsibility for those difficulties to the then DEIR (now DEET). The difficulties have been of a tripartite nature; that is, there have had to be lengthy discussions between the parties concerned. Those discussions have taken longer in South Australia, and I admitted that in this House on a previous occasion. Responsibility for that—and this is not an accusation—has rested with all parties involved in the tripartite discussions, including the employers, the unions and Governments. I am happy to say that, now that a number of Australian traineeship schemes are up and running in South Australia, given the amount of extra time put into those discussions, they are now running very well indeed. Even though we were slow

to start them, they are proving to be better than expected as a result of the extra time put in.

The question whether there is a more cost-effective method should be borne in mind against certain other parameters. Certainly some training schemes are cheaper per head of person trained within them, but you will never have a trainee program under the Government's training budget made up of only one scheme. You need a variety of training opportunities: for example, the apprenticeship scheme, the prevocational scheme and special employment training programs. The Australian traineeship scheme is included in that mix of training programs: it has a place there. It should not be the only training opportunity, but it certainly does have a place in the mix of training programs offered by the Federal and State Governments.

TIMBER COMPANY

Mr S.J. BAKER: My question is directed to the Minister of Forests. When the South Australian Government decided on 24 December 1985 to spend \$3.6 million buying shares in a New Zealand based timber company, and to lend a further \$11 million to that company, was the company insolvent?

The Hon. R.K. ABBOTT: The amalgamation of SATCO and WinCorp interests in plywood manufacture was a complex matter involving questions of—

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order!

The Hon. R.K. ABBOTT: —a technical and accounting nature—

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order! The Chair is unable to hear the Minister's reply.

The Hon. R.K. ABBOTT: In particular, it involved the treatment of future earnings for income tax purposes. In late 1985 we engaged Messrs Allert Heard and Company, an Adelaide firm of chartered accountants, to advise the Government on the best way to achieve the amalgamation and, further, to report on methods of valuing each business and, in the case of IPL (New Zealand), to review company records and, in particular, balance sheet items. The work carried out by John Heard in relation to verification of balance sheet items appeared to be thorough and adequate at the time. However—

Members interjecting:

The Hon. R.K. ABBOTT: Members opposite should listen. Subsequent investigations revealed that information supplied to John Heard by WinCorp representatives in New Zealand would have made it very difficult for him to discover the true net asset position of that company. This matter is now before the Australian courts.

WORLD SOLAR CHALLENGE RACE

Mr RANN: My question is directed to the Premier. Does the State Government intend to support the Darwin to Barossa World Solar Challenge Race—

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order! I call to order, for the third time, the Leader of the Opposition. The honourable member for Briggs.

Mr RANN: Does the State Government intend to support the Darwin to Barossa World Solar Challenge Race planned to be held later this year? In May I was introduced to the team in Detroit that is working on the solar powered vehicle

that General Motors will enter in the 1 900 mile race. General Motors officials told me that their vehicle will use technology developed from the space program, including solar panels used in satellites developed by the General Motors subsidiary, Hughes Aircraft, with Holden's Australia and Lotus providing logistic support.

General Motors officials said they expected that the race would generate worldwide publicity and that their involvement was a vote of confidence in the Australian car industry and Holden's \$300 million expansion program in Adelaide's northern suburbs, which the Premier will launch on Friday. They said that much of the development work on the car was secret and they hoped that it would lead to new technology breakthroughs in areas such as aerodynamic design, lightweight motors, solar cells and high efficiency batteries. I was also told that commitment to the race by the various teams was akin to an America's Cup challenge.

The Hon. J.C. BANNON: Many of us would be surprised at the size, scale and international attention that this solar car challenge is drawing. In fact, I was surprised, until the honourable member drew my attention to the fact that he wanted to ask a question about it. Of course, as he said in his explanation he came across this project through his visit to the technology centre of General Motors. GMH—that very big corporation with a great stake in South Australia and South Australia's future—is a key participant in this event.

At the other end of the scale, further South Australian participation comes through the Morphett Vale High School, which is in the District of Mawson. Just last week the member for Fisher, on behalf of my colleague the Minister of Education, launched the Photon Flyer (which is the name given to the Morphett Vale High School entry). This has been supported by a grant from the Education Department—one of its special program grants—and there has been an enormous amount of local fund-raising and community support for that entry. I hope that it goes well.

That indicates the range of companies, organisations and groups that are interested in this event. In fact, there are 24 entries from nine different countries. I understand that it will receive international television coverage from Japan, the United States and possibly West Germany. Various departments, including the Department of State Development and Technology, have been involved in the planning phases and in relation to advice on the race, which will go from Darwin and move south over the new Stuart Highway (which, I guess, has made such an event possible). All going well, the entrants, all solar powered, are expected to arrive in Adelaide on Saturday 7 November, that is, the beginning of the Grand Prix week.

After travelling through Adelaide the vehicles will proceed to the Barossa Valley. The race will finish at Seppeltsfield, and I guess that provides a good opportunity to advertise some of the tourist and wine industry attributes in South Australia. On Tuesday 10 November all the entrants who finish will travel in cavalcade to the city and will be received at the Town Hall by the Lord Mayor and me as part of the Grand Prix week activities.

Again, it is a nice connection between the highest level of internal combustion and orthodox engines (and they are part of a major industry in South Australia) and high technology developments in alternative car propulsion. Therefore, a lot of things are coming together in this event. As I say, not only the degree of participation in this event is surprising but also the degree of public attention and international coverage that it should gather.

TIMBER COMPANY

Mr GUNN: My question is directed to the Minister of Forests. Before agreeing to buy a 70 per cent ownership in the New Zealand based timber company IPL, what investigations did the Government undertake in relation to the assets and liabilities of the company? Who undertook those investigations?

Members interjecting:

Mr GUNN: Perhaps the Premier will allow me to continue—I know he does not like answering these sorts of questions. Will the Minister table all relevant documents, including an inventory of assets and liabilities at the time the contracts were signed?

The Hon. R.K. ABBOTT: I am not prepared to table those documents at this point in time.

Members interjecting:

The Hon. R.K. ABBOTT: I have pointed out repeatedly that that is *sub judice*.

The Hon. Jennifer Cashmore: It is not.

The SPEAKER: Order!

The Hon. R.K. ABBOTT: Well, I think it is.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order!

The Hon. R.K. ABBOTT: It is before the Australian court and I am not in a position to table those—

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order! I ask members on both sides not to try to participate in a dialogue. The honourable the Minister.

The Hon. R.K. ABBOTT: Mr Speaker, I think I answered the honourable member's question previously. This matter was gone into very thoroughly before the Government took the decision to enter into this joint venture. Subsequently, it became clear that the New Zealand operation was not functioning profitably. Some of the early reports indicated that there were quite significant losses and as a result we called for further investigations and reports. These reports are now under consideration by the Government.

The whole purpose of the Woods and Forests Department or SATCO's entering this joint venture was as a result of the 1983 Ash Wednesday bushfires and the significant loss of resources in South Australia, and we had an opportunity to join in that operation to try to meet the demand in South Australia, Australia and overseas. That was an opportunity which was investigated and we entered into it. I have admitted that there have been problems, but we have taken action to try to sort out those problems and I am sure eventually that it will all work out to be a profitable business organisation.

REYNELLA EAST SCHOOL WATER SUPPLY

Mr TYLER: Will the Minister of Housing and Construction investigate the situation at the Reynella East school campus which requires the whole campus to be without a water supply as a result of a single burst pipe? At this school every time a water problem occurs, which is five to six times a year, the whole campus—that is, 2 000 students and 150 staff members—is without the use of water, presenting an obvious health risk. After repeated requests to the Education Department, the matter has now been eased to the extent that a site plan is to be provided which shows the location of all known valves.

The Department of Housing and Construction has advised the school that this should avoid major inconvenience in the case of most water pipe bursts other than if a burst

occurs in the ring main surrounding the school, when the whole campus may be affected, as was the case on 14 May this year. This presents the school with the unpalatable choice to either close the school and have the danger of sending students home 'without notice' or keeping them at the school in an unhealthy sanitary situation. The school has requested the installation of an isolation valve so that in any event there would be a water supply to at least one section of the school campus.

The Hon. T.H. HEMMINGS: I thank the honourable member for his question. I am happy to be able to say that, as the member for Fisher said, the problems he refers to have already been partially addressed. The school already has 19 isolation valves and the problems arose partly because plumbers who attended breakdown calls did not know their precise location. Hence it was necessary to turn off the mains water in order to repair the burst water pipe. However, the isolation valves have been located now on a detailed plan which will be kept at the school. Plumbers attending the fault will be able to use the plan to quickly locate valves relating to the area requiring attention instead of turning off the mains supply.

The honourable member asked whether valves can be installed in the mains supply that runs in a ring round the perimeters of the schools. Given the length of the mains ring, a large number of isolation valves would have to be installed to be effective. The considerable expense that that would involve could not be justified given the low probability of a burst in the mains ring. These schools have, in fact, many more isolation valves than most schools. In a sense, they are more fortunate. The cost to the Education Department to remedy the problem on a State-wide basis would be prohibitive. On the member's last point, I indicate that it is Education Department practice to close schools if it is necessary to turn off the mains water supply. That makes sense when one considers the risk of fire and for health reasons.

ETSA FINANCING ARRANGEMENTS

The Hon. D.C. WOTTON: Will the Premier say what is the term of the lease that the Electricity Trust has negotiated for the Torrens Island power station? What is the name of the investment group involved, and what is the amount of the annual rental and management fee? If the Premier says that he cannot answer this question for reasons of commercial confidentiality, will he explain precisely what commercial difficulties this group would experience in having this information made public that would override the rights of South Australian power consumers to know what the Government is doing with assets that they have purchased?

The Hon. J.C. BANNON: The power consumers of South Australia will be very pleased indeed to know what the Government is doing with their assets. These transactions are saving those consumers many millions of dollars. The lease is identical to the Northern Power Station lease, which was outlined in ETSA's annual report for 1985-86, commented upon and detailed by the Auditor-General. In fact, I made a full statement to the House on 18 March in which I outlined the details of this sort of transaction. The total of this transaction is \$350 million over a term of 15 to 25 years. The benefits to ETSA (this is the crucial thing; the essential bottom line) will average about \$3 million to \$4 million per annum, and I defy any member opposite to try to deny that sort of advantage to the power consumers of South Australia. The transaction is an Australian dollar sale and involves major Australian financial organisations.

As I outlined to the House earlier, a company called Lashkar Limited is the legal entity that holds all the interests, the documentation and the legal responsibility. The directors of Lashkar are drawn from Babcock and Brown Investment Bank, but the actual investors in the project are confidential. Their names will not be put into the public domain just as shareholders in a particular company, debenture holders in ETSA or SAFA or any other group have their confidentiality in their business transactions respected. I would have thought that the Opposition, which used to have some passing acquaintance with business and business practices, would understand what I am saying. There is nothing that in any way affects the interest of the taxpayers of South Australia in the actual identity of those who choose to invest in this instrument.

They are the facts as I have set them out. The documentation has been completed. It is of enormous benefit to this State and, as I said on 18 March 1987 in this House, and as I will say on any other occasion, the more of these types of transactions we can find, the more we can minimise the cost of borrowings in the State and the more we will ensure that we have a viable power tariff over which we will be able to keep control.

Members interjecting:

The Hon. J.C. BANNON: We will not get caught as we did when the honourable member who is interjecting was Minister of Mines and Energy and sold out this State before the election with a scandalous short-term quick-fix, so that we had to intervene by way of legislation to try to correct it.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order!

MULTIPLE BIRTH FAMILIES

Ms LENEHAN: I direct my question to the Minister of Transport, representing the Minister of Health in another place. Will the Minister investigate the plight of multiple birth families with a view to providing some form of extra help or assistance? I was contacted recently by the Multiple Birth Association of South Australia, which has brought to my attention the fact that most States now recognise the increased financial, physical and emotional burdens facing multiple birth families. For example, the association has pointed out that in Western Australia and Tasmania—

The Hon. Jennifer Cashmore interjecting:

Ms LENEHAN: I am asking the question—you had the opportunity and you have not asked it.

The SPEAKER: Order!

Ms LENEHAN: I am sorry, Sir, but I cannot hear myself speaking.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order! I call the House to order.

Ms LENEHAN: Thank you, Mr Speaker. The association has pointed out that in Western Australia and Tasmania multiple birth families are provided with a mothercraft nurse usually until the children are two to three years old, but in some circumstances the support can be extended until school age. In Victoria local councils have the responsibility of providing support to multiple birth families. That has resulted in some councils providing good services whilst other are providing nothing at all. The Multiple Birth Association, however, does not recommend that South Australia follow the Victorian model but believes that extra support should be provided on a State-wide basis.

The Hon. G.F. KENEALLY: I will be delighted to refer the question to my colleague the Minister of Health in

another place. It is a very serious question, and I point out to the House that not so many years ago, when in Opposition, we had three Opposition members sitting almost alongside each other, each with two sets of twins. I thought that that was unusual. The Minister of State Development and Technology has asked me to make clear that there is no conflict of interest in this question so far as he is concerned. The member for Gilles and at least one member opposite, as well as previous members opposite, are parents of twins. In the Keneally household the children are so close together that everyone thought they were twins or triplets anyway. Families with multiple births experience considerable problems. The question that the honourable member has directed to me requires careful consideration, and I will ensure that that is given to it and bring back a reply.

JUBILEE POINT

Mr OSWALD: Will the Premier advise whether, in an effort to keep negotiations alive, the Government or he, as head of Government, has written to Jubilee Point Pty Ltd offering to absorb in perpetuity all ongoing costs involved in the dredging and sand management program that were initially expected to be paid by the Glenelg council from its rate revenue.

Members interjecting:

The Hon. J.C. BANNON: Do you want accurate information?

The SPEAKER: Order!

The Hon. J.C. BANNON: I am glad to see the honourable member getting off his fence and indicating that he is opposed to the project. I knew that he was waiting to test the wind before deciding which way to jump. He has decided to get off on the 'anti' side—and that is fine: I am glad to see that he has taken that attitude. As far as the Government is concerned, when Jubilee Point—or the consortium which subsequently formed the Jubilee Point plan—came to us, we said that, first, they would be required to comply with a full environmental impact study and the findings therein, that we would expect them to gain the support of local government and, indeed, at that stage it was without question because, then and subsequently (as recently as March of this year), the council was writing to the Government urging it to get on with the project and asking why we were hanging back and not giving approval.

There has been an interesting turnaround in the council, and I suspect that the honourable member has been monitoring that in determining his attitude. We said at that time that the Government would be prepared to facilitate the project if those conditions were met. I mentioned in March that council had said that we should get on with the project. On 10 April, we advised the council that the Government had agreed to the development proposal proceeding towards the stage of a draft indenture agreement subject to the resolution of certain matters. Negotiations then got under way to resolve those matters. On 23 April, council agreed in principle to give a formal commitment to the proposal and to participate in those negotiations.

In fact, the issue that then arose broke down into two parts: the aesthetics and environmental considerations of the project, and its financing. The Government took the view (and it still takes the view) that, as this project greatly benefited the Glenelg council, by improving its rate revenue and amenity considerably, the council should be an active and willing participant in the project, even financially. As discussions developed, the Glenelg council, whilst backing off from the project and its former enthusiastic endorse-

ment, raised questions of its financial involvement which we were putting to it on the basis of a revenue neutral proposition at least in the initial stages, moving into a profitable mode eventually. It all began to centre around this matter of sand management and who would pay.

The council took the view that it was unalterably opposed, in principle, to having anything to do with sand management: that that was something that the Government did up and down the coast at the expense of the taxpayer, and local government was not prepared to be responsible for it. That was the council's unalterable position in principle. In that instance the Government was prepared to say, 'All right, if you have a problem with contributing to that aspect of the project and you are concerned about the principle, we are happy to discuss with you some other way by which council can contribute to the overall project.' That is the context in which the honourable member is asking his question. However, that is as far as we were prepared to go. It was up to the developers and the council to hold discussions and to come back to the Government and say, 'We have been able to solve (or not to solve) the problems and concerns that you have, and we are prepared to go ahead with the project on that basis.'

My latest advice is that the council is now hopelessly deadlocked and in a state of considerable disarray over the issue. No clear indication can be gained from the council. In fact, it seems to me that at present the noes have the majority on any proposition, whether for or against. It makes it difficult indeed for any projects to be rationally considered and dealt with when local government cannot grasp the issues. I am not aware of any formal communication from the Glenelg council advising me of its latest position: I am simply told that the council is deadlocked, that it will not appoint anyone to facilitate the project, and that there will be no further negotiations that could yield any results.

The developers have written to the Government saying, 'Well, this is the position: we believe that we have met your objections, we believe that the finances can be sorted out, but we have not been able to get the support of the council. In this instance, what can the Government do?' The Minister for Environment and Planning, who has the major carriage of this matter, is conferring with me on what course of action, if any, the Government can take in the face of this deadlock. However, I must say that the whole process has been badly handled and that intimidation has certainly been used, in the opinion of some people, in relation to the attitudes of responsible local government. Frankly, if that same sort of impact were to manifest itself on the State Government, we would get nothing done in this State.

Having said that, I believe that we must address the problem sensitively, acknowledge the legitimate concerns of the developers who have put much money up front, acknowledge the impact that cancellation of the project will have on encouraging other people to spend money in South Australia (the member for Coles acknowledges that point, and I am sure that she is very much at odds over that with her colleague), and also look at the implications of going ahead, considering whether it is possible in the context of current public feeling on the project. That is the situation. I am pleased that the member for Morphett has put himself on record at least a little more clearly than he has done previously.

The SPEAKER: Call on the business of the day.

FISHERIES (SOUTHERN ZONE ROCK LOBSTER FISHERY RATIONALISATION) BILL

Adjourned debate on second reading.
(Continued from 13 August. Page 218.)

The Hon. P.B. ARNOLD (Chaffey): This Bill, which has been presented by the Government, rationalises the number of vessels in the southern zone rock lobster fishery. The Government has taken the decision, in conjunction with the industry, that 40 boats should be removed from the southern zone, together with a reduction of 2 400 pots. The Bill does not indicate whether such a course of action will be mandatory: it is a voluntary reduction in vessels and pots. The Bill contains no specific requirement that there be a reduction of one boat or of 40 boats, and only time will tell how many boats and pots will be reduced as a result.

The Minister will argue that 51.5 per cent of licensed fishermen in the industry have voted in favour of the proposal in the Bill, that a 51.5 per cent vote is a majority vote, and that, therefore, the Opposition should not even question the direction in which the Government is going. However, the Opposition has a responsibility not only to represent the majority view on any subject but also to see, above all else, that any minority view is properly canvassed in this place. That is precisely what the Opposition is doing in this case.

It is interesting to note, in making this point, that in 1980 or 1981, when I introduced a Bill in this place (at a time before the present Minister of Fisheries was even a member) to amend the Pastoral Act, the object of my amendment was to provide for what we referred to as a continuous lease whereby pastoralists, provided that they abided by the covenants relating to a lease, were assured that the lease would continue, either in their name or in the name of their family, so long as they complied with the rules and regulations laid down by the Lands Department concerning the maintenance of the property.

On that occasion I had not just 51.5 per cent support from the industry for the proposal: I had 100 per cent support. Yet the Deputy Premier, as a Labor Opposition member, decided that the then Opposition would oppose my Bill, even though it had 100 per cent support from the industry. At the time, the Labor Party succeeded in defeating my Bill in the Upper House even though, as I say, it had 100 per cent support from the industry. That was a vastly different situation from the 51.5 per cent support that the Government has for this Bill. I have told the Minister that the Opposition does not oppose the Bill, but it believes that the Bill should go to a select committee to enable minority views to be canvassed properly. That is the intention of Opposition members. We do not intend to hold up the legislation and we are more than happy to sit on a select committee either later this week or next week while the House is in recess.

Legislation cannot proceed while the House is not sitting. A select committee could sit next week, which would give people in the community who hold a minority view an opportunity to say what they believe should occur in this fishery. I believe it is an oversimplification to say that the removal of 40 boats and 2 400 pots from the fishery will solve the current problems. As I have said, there is no guarantee under this legislation that even one boat will leave the fishery, because the Bill does not contain a mandatory provision: it involves a voluntary withdrawal or a buy-back situation and, as such, there are many variables. As I have said, we do not oppose the Bill but believe that everyone

in the community should have an opportunity to make a contribution.

Back in 1980 or 1981, the present Deputy Premier argued that the pastoral lands of South Australia were a resource of the State and belonged to all the people. In the same way, I am pointing out that we should not lose sight of the fact that the fisheries of this State are also a State resource. Certain people in the community have a licence to fish that resource. In many respects the two resources are very similar. We should give the public an opportunity to make a contribution. I believe it is only commonsense that the Minister, unless he has something to hide, should accept my proposal. No-one has all the answers on this subject. I appreciate the expertise of departmental officers, but that does not mean that the department or the Minister of Fisheries are the fount of all knowledge and wisdom on this subject or any other subject including the agricultural and pastoral industries.

We want to give members of the public an opportunity to contribute to this debate. It does not necessarily have to be a fisherman: there could well be a marine biologist who has taken an interest in the fisheries of South Australia over the years, and he may have a contribution to make. The select committee and the Minister, who would be the Chairman, could assess any further information put to the committee and determine whether or not it should be incorporated into the Bill. After all, we have one responsibility above all others: to protect our resources. We also have a responsibility to protect the viability of those involved in the industry. It is certainly our responsibility, above everything else, to protect this resource. It is a State resource which belongs to all South Australians. We must ensure that this resource is passed on to the next generation in the same condition, if not better, that it is in today.

That should be the case with not only the fishery resource but also the Murray River, for example. We have a right to use these resources but we also have a moral obligation and responsibility to see that they are handed over to the next generation in far better condition (if that is possible) than the condition in which we inherited them. Over the past 150 years of white settlement in this State and the past 200 years of white settlement in Australia, we have seen many examples where that has not happened. My only concern is that this Bill does not necessarily achieve what the Minister hoped it would achieve.

As I have said, the Bill provides for a voluntary buy-back scheme and, as such, we have no guarantee as to whether we will see a reduction of one boat or 40 boats, or 2 400 pots. There is a wealth of knowledge and information in the community, and it may not necessarily be academic knowledge. The fishing and agricultural industries involve literally thousands of man hours and man years of experience: that experience should be tapped and utilised. As an example, I refer to the Noora salinity disposal scheme that was in train when my Party came to government in 1979 and I became Minister of Water Resources. I told the Director of the E&WS that the scheme was 50 per cent over-designed and the quantity of waste water involved would be only half of what the department had designed it for.

While I have no engineering expertise, I have had a lifetime of involvement in irrigation and appreciate what is involved in irrigation and improved irrigation practices. At that time, as no consideration had been given to improved irrigation practices in this State, there was little understanding of the benefits that could be derived from them. Today the E&WS Department is the first to acknowledge that the Noora scheme is 50 per cent over-designed and there is little likelihood that saline drainage water will ever reach

50 per cent of the quantity for which the scheme was designed. I am trying to highlight that there is a wealth of practical knowledge among people in the community, and the Government should make use of that knowledge.

I am quite sure that, if the Government agreed to the appointment of a select committee, valuable information would become available. My Party gives an absolute undertaking that we would facilitate the select committee's operation and would in no way hold up the Bill. I believe that the select committee could complete its work next week when the House is not sitting. In the following week the Bill could complete its passage through this Chamber and through the other place before the Budget Estimates Committees begin. That would give the department adequate time to implement the legislation. As I have said, the Opposition does not oppose the Bill: we merely seek to give members of the public an opportunity to contribute to the legislation and improve it. Unless the Government and the department have something to hide, the select committee's appointment can be only a plus in the interests of the fishing industry, a State resource and the people of South Australia.

Mr D.S. BAKER (Victoria): I support the member for Chaffey's remarks, and I make it quite clear—

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order!

Mr D.S. BAKER: I think it is fair to say that this Bill has caused a great deal of concern in the fishing industry in the South-East. There has been general concern amongst fishermen to improve the economic efficiency of the industry, but the methods used to improve that efficiency are the cause of great economic argument. Only now it is coming to the fore how divided the opinions are on what steps should be taken.

I now turn to the history of the industry which may have some bearing on the concerns felt by many fishermen. When the profitable rock lobster export markets became available in the United States just after the Second World War, the industry saw substantial development and became the most important sector of the South Australian fishing industry. For many years, with abundant stocks of fish available, it was relatively easy for fishermen to obtain large catches with minimum effort. Technology was nowhere near as advanced as it is today and the cost structuring was vastly different from today.

In recent years we have seen a tremendous improvement in technology, but the tonnages have been either static or falling. The tonnage of fish taken increased from just over 1 100 tonnes in 1949-50 to 2 800 tonnes in 1966-67. However, the amount of fish taken per pot lift fell from 10.4 kilograms in 1949-50 to 0.9 kilograms in 1966-67, and that has remained constant ever since. Because of the drop in kilograms per pot lift taken and the concerns expressed by the fishermen, the fishery was closed in 1967-68 and further boats were barred from entering the industry. Some academic economists (Professor Copes being one of them) believed that this was, according to his report, a 'judicious measure shielding the industry from a further drop in productivity that would undoubtedly lead to significant economic distress'.

In other words, Professor Copes was saying that the fishermen had to be protected from themselves, but he said nothing about how that was to be done. If only the industry had been able to rationalise itself in those days there might not have been a need for interference by countless people—academics, economists, bureaucrats and the Minister—as seems to be the case today. In fact, the course for the industry was already set by the Government as far back as

1967. If one looks at the terms of reference of the Copes report, which is considered in some academic quarters to be the bible of the fishing industry, it is interesting to note that it states:

If appropriate, to propose an operational form for such a buy-back scheme, making recommendations on means of financing as well as management aspects.

An earlier green paper, put out by the Government on 18 November 1974, stated that it was Government policy to:

Maintain a policy of reduction of pot numbers and a reduction of vessels in the rock lobster fishery to reduce fishing effort.

The Government had decided that the only way to reduce effort in the rock lobster industry was to close the fishery to outside boats in 1967, to maintain a policy of reducing pot numbers and vessels in 1974, and to confirm all of this by the terms of reference of the commissioned Copes report.

There appears to be little evidence, during this time, of extensive consultation with industry or of long-term conservation methods in the fishery. It appears that the Government, once set on course, come hell or high water (to coin a phrase) was going to reduce the number of vessels by buy-back, whether or not the industry wanted it. Regarding the economics of the fishery, Copes states:

The devaluation of the Australian dollar in November 1976, for instance, brought a sudden benefit to export sectors of the Australian economy, including the rock lobster fishery.

It appears to me that Copes considered that the devaluation in 1976 was a one-off thing, and I believe that he mistakenly believed that the industry would decline from that point on. Copes also contends that, because other fisheries which compared with the rock lobster industry in the South-East were based in the United States, they showed parallels in the cost price squeeze of the industry.

I believe that this is a fallacious argument, because all the rock lobster caught in South Australia is exported to the United States—that is, exported to a market where our currency has been devalued over the past 10 years. There has been a dramatic increase in incomes as the dollar has devalued. I believe that this has always kept the industry viable and that today the industry is in a healthier state than it has been for many years in terms of the dollars received per pot lift.

The third thing that Copes contended was that the industry should not be left to regulate itself. I have always believed that the industry should be left to regulate itself provided that the long-term interests of the fishery are protected. The Minister should not believe that he is the sole repository of all knowledge when market forces will quite adequately adjust the long-term viability of this now closed fishery. That is quite adequate to control it.

I believe (as the shadow Minister stated) that the long-term viability of the industry has to be looked at and that conservation methods have to be instigated. However, I do not believe that buy-back is the answer in relation to rock lobster fishermen. The fishermen know that it is not the answer; any practical person in business knows that it is not the answer. However, the course was set some 10 years ago when the Hon. B.A. Chatterton, in another place, as Minister of Agriculture, was determined to get eventual control of the industry, deciding how it operates and having a say in who operates in it. I am afraid that the experienced people in the industry have not been consulted since.

One only has to look at what has happened to other rural industries to see what happens when control is taken away from those people who have the practical knowledge of the industry and placed in the hands of those who live off the industry or the publicity they receive in that industry. The Copes report justifies the economic argument for buy-back. No other option for the resource management is seriously

considered. However, the overall aim of the section of the Copes report that deals with 'sharing the rent' is very clear, and I hope that all fishermen understand the long-term intention of this report which was accepted by the Government.

To sell buy-back as the only option, an updated report entitled 'An Economic Assessment of Effort Reduction Measures in the Southern Rock Lobster Fishery' was produced. This report was put out by Mr Andrew Staniford, of the South Australian Department of Fisheries, in June 1986. In part, it deals with the effort reduction scheme of December 1984, when it was agreed that a 15 per cent across the board reduction in pot entitlements be instigated, the minimum number of pots being 25 and the maximum being 80 pots per vessel.

Again, this was supposed to decrease the fishing effort, but this change has not allowed time for the industry to settle down or to practically weigh up the benefits of these changes. The overriding highlight of this report and of the Copes report is that the whole point and purpose of the people involved in the fishing industry, as with any business, is overlooked, and clouded by masses and masses of figures and graphs, which we suppose are accurate. An academic argument is propounded through the whole of both reports to justify a buy-back scheme.

The point is that the fishermen are one of the last bastions of private enterprise and they have similar ambitions to any other person in business. They have families to bring up; they have children to educate; they have boats to pay for; they have expenses to pay; and in all cases they have wages to pay. Fishermen are involved in a potentially risky venture. The effort they put into their fishing is tied very closely to their financial commitment, whether we like it or not. They are all self employed people who have a driving force to better themselves, and the loading of their licence system with the extra costs of a buy-back scheme will not reduce the effort one little bit. In fact, quite the opposite may occur. I believe it is time that the Minister realised that this is a very plain and pertinent fact.

The fishermen in this industry are confused about what has happened. They are unclear as to the ramifications of the measures that will severely affect their lives. They are unclear as to what will happen to their industry. No other methods—and I repeat, no other methods—have been canvassed seriously in either of the reports brought forward by the academics in relation to reducing the effort in the industry, and I do not believe that any measures that may increase and regenerate the stocks of the industry have been properly discussed. It is interesting to note that, in the update of the economic assessment, two very brief remarks are made about other measures that may make the industry more viable. One, of course, is individual transferable quotas, and that measure is touched on and discounted with one sentence, as follows:

The scheme would be extremely expensive to enforce. For this reason, it is not appropriate in this fishery.

The other thing that concerns fishermen greatly is the length of the fishing season. Many of the experienced and successful fishermen say that this is absolutely critical to their long-term survival but, unfortunately, the academics and those who are supposed to be the repositories of all knowledge disagree with this and have put their disagreement very firmly. In this discussion paper reduction of the length of the fishing season is dismissed with scorn and with one sentence, as follows:

It could encourage fishermen to fish on days when they would not normally fish due to poor weather conditions increasing the risks of fishing.

That is a lot of rubbish. The fishermen are entrepreneurial. They know the risks; they know the income they wish to derive. If people think that the shortening of the season will have that effect, what will be the effect of increased costs from buy-back schemes, which have variously been assessed as from \$5 000 to \$10 000 per annum?

I support the establishment of a select committee. I think it is very important that we give those people who have a contrary view the opportunity to put it before the committee. The industry must be given a chance to become more united not only in its purpose but also in its approach to control. At present, the industry is totally divided and people are totally dismayed about what is going on under this Bill. I hope that the Minister will agree to the establishment of a select committee and give those people a chance because, whatever happens at the end of the day, it is very important for the industry to control itself and for academics and the Government to keep their hands off it. The only reason why Government should interfere with the rock lobster industry is to ensure the maintenance of the fishery for the long term. In other words, the long-term viability must be protected. The day-to-day operation of that fishery must be left in the hands of the fishermen.

Mr LEWIS (Murray-Mallee): It is not my intention to repeat the remarks already made to the House by my two colleagues about this most important measure. Nor is it my intention to reflect upon or examine in detail the kinds of remarks which the Minister has made during his second reading explanation. However, it is my intention to make a contribution which I consider to be of some worth. No other member in this place nor, as far as I know, any other economist outside this place has suggested a way in which it would be possible for the industry, operating in the public domain as it does, to regulate the number of pots (if we want to use that as the measure of effort—and this Bill seeks to do that), used to catch the southern rock lobster.

I believe that, notwithstanding the machinations there have been year by year, it was recognised in the mid 1960s that increasing the effort—whether in the tonnage of vessels, the number of people, the number of pots or the horsepower of the motors which drive the vessels which take their crews and pots to the fishing grounds—would recover the yield. It had fallen to something less than a kilo per lift or per pot, whereas it had been about 10.4 kilos per pot some 1½ decades or more before that.

I believe that we should take into account the way in which supply and demand could determine the price paid for the right to enter the fishery and the extent to which they would enter the fishery. I believe the way to do that is to offer the unit used for harvesting the species—the pot—for sale at auction each year. A proportion of the total number of available pots could be offered, and the fishermen themselves, in the bidding, would decide what price they would pay for each of those pots.

The fishery is in the public domain. There is no freehold title on the high seas. It is not quite like a farm, in more ways than just that. The fisherman is in no way responsible to ensure the survival of the other species upon which the rock lobster depends for its sustenance. The fisherman is not responsible for the maintenance of enclosures for his animals: indeed, anything but. Simply, the fisherman invests in his boat after having acquired the skills to use it. He invests in his gear. He takes his boat with his gear and his acquired skills to the sea and goes hunting. He sets his pots in the spots where he considers it most likely to catch the southern rock lobster. In so doing, he is a risk-taker with what he invests to do that. Therefore, I can see no difficulty

in asking fishermen to take an additional risk in bidding, in opposition to everyone else who wants to enter that fishery, for the right to do so and to own the pot.

In the first instance, to get into this scheme, I suggest that one should divide the pots into eighths, say, and offer an eighth of the pot for eight years, another eighth for seven years, another eighth for six years, and so on, until the final eighth is offered for one year only and the price paid for each pot is according to what the fishermen decided it was worth for one, two, three or up to eight years. It should be possible to trade those licences quite freely on the open market so that, if a fisherman decided to leave the industry through ill health, physical injury or some other reason, he could offer his pot licence according to its residual age on the open market and take whatever was bid for it.

The beauty of the scheme that I have suggested is that, first, it does not preclude anybody who wishes to do so from entering the fishery. Secondly, it encourages innovation in the way in which technology can be developed and used to more efficiently and effectively obtain from that fishery the fish that are available; it provides a real incentive to do that. Thirdly, it ensures that the most efficient fishermen will exploit the fishery for the macroeconomic benefit of us all. The fewer the resources that we as a nation apply to harvesting that resource and the greater its efficiency, the greater will be the multiplier effect benefit in the total economy because it means that fewer people, fewer boats and less fuel are being used to get the same number of fish from the fishery.

When the scheme is in operation, the fishery managers can decide, when the first year's licences have run out and come up to be reoffered for sale in the public domain to all comers who wish to bid for them, how many of those pot licences are offered for sale. If it seems necessary, from data obtained over the recent history prior to the decision being made that year, that it is necessary to reduce effort, the number of pots being offered for sale by the managers of the fishery will be reduced according to scientific evidence. Naturally I would expect those managers to give account of their reasons for reducing the number of pots offered for sale.

It would mean that once this new era of management of the fishery was entered into, the funds derived from the sale of pot licences to the industry could be used to finance the research and, in all probability with this species, the seeding of juveniles in areas in which it is known they are most likely to grow most rapidly to harvestable maturity. If that approach is taken, I am sure that there will be less controversy and greater efficiency in the industry and greater satisfaction with the decisions that are made. In the final analysis, it will be simpler and never again so controversial to manage the extent to which the fishery is exploited, where it occurs (as it does) in the public domain, by the techniques that must be used.

The scheme has a number of other advantages, one of which is that it would result in it being possible immediately for fishermen to depreciate their pot licence against the income that they derive from it. If one has a licence that lasts for eight years, then an eighth of the cost of that licence in the year in which the income was derived as a proportion of what has been paid would be written off against that income. That is called depreciation, and I see no difference between the right to do the job and the machinery used in doing it. A depreciation written off against income of that kind would enable fishermen to establish a sinking fund that they could apply to the purpose of repurchasing more pots or arranging in a responsible way for their retirement from the industry. Moreover, there would be a direct link

between the price paid for the licences to operate the pots and the expected yield based on historical evidence. One fisherman using poorer techniques to place the pots than another fisherman could not afford to pay as much for the licence to own those pots. It is in that way, through this market mechanism, that greater efficiency would result. If that was not implicit in the earlier remarks that I made, I hope that my explicit explanation of it to the House now makes it more easily understood.

One thing that needs to be said in addition to the adoption of a plan of the kind to which I have referred is to elaborate upon the suggestion that there needs to be a more careful and thorough examination of the possible benefits to be derived from seeding the fishery with juveniles around the coast where the habitat is particularly conducive to rock lobster growth. I will explain that for the benefit of members of the House. Although it is well documented in articles and the journals of marine biologists, it is not well known by the general public that, during the nymphal stage of the southern rock lobster, that is, after the eggs have hatched, the nymphs float as plankton on the surface many miles offshore south of the Great Australian Bight and east of the South-East coast.

The vast majority of those nymphs never reach shore; they simply stay there, circulating in the currents and die when they get to the point of development beyond the nymphal stage. It is only a freak of nature that results in that current being disrupted by heavy weather passing through it and shifting those nymphs at that critical time onshore where, through their metamorphosis, they become more dense than water and settle out by chance in areas in which they can thrive. That very small fraction of a per cent of the total number of fertile eggs which ultimately become small adults (in recognisable form the same as adult lobsters taken for harvest) illustrates clearly the great benefits that would be derived if we were to seed or plant the young adults which have passed their nymphal stage into areas in which they are most likely to grow to maturity.

At this point, no attempt of which I am aware has been made to evaluate such a proposal and to put numbers on the cost of doing it. Whether that would be possible depends on the amount of money that fishermen would be prepared to pay for pot licences under the scheme to which I have referred. Moreover, the revenue so obtained from the sale of those pots under my scheme suggested would enable managers to investigate means by which we could re-establish the population of adult rock lobsters which resulted in the yield of 10.4 kilograms per pot per annum that was enjoyed in the 1950s or thereabouts. I am hopeful that the House will consider supporting the proposal to establish a select committee that can report in short order to Parliament and, in the process, determine exactly what needs to be considered further in devising the best way to resolve the problems presently confronting the industry.

One other thing is clear: it is neither sensible nor wise, even if it is possible, to simply ignore the concerns and feelings of the fishermen in the industry in bringing this legislation to fruition. If we do that, we will deserve the contempt that they feel for us as their elected representatives. We are the people charged with the responsibility for making laws that affect their livelihood without giving them an opportunity to express their opinions, give evidence and state views to us as their elected representatives. That is an essential part of the political process, and there is a distinct difference between making policy decisions as opposed to making scientific decisions.

On the one hand, scientific decisions are based on fact, while policy decisions have to take account of fact and the

effect they will have on the attitudes of people to laws that are made. Policy decisions are, by definition, political decisions. We, the politicians, are supposed to understand how other people feel and react when told what they must do, regardless of what they believe they know. We in turn, will earn the contempt of those people whom we are governing (that is, the elected who are here to represent the electors). We must be seen to be doing and understanding what they are doing and the way in which our decisions affect the lives of those who elect. A select committee is therefore imperative.

The Hon. H. ALLISON (Mount Gambier): I note with some pleasure that the Minister seems to have indicated his intention to agree to referring this matter to a select committee, and I applaud him for that. I also note that the shadow Minister of Fisheries, the Hon. Peter Arnold, has given an Opposition guarantee that the select committee will not be used by the Opposition to defer passage of this legislation, but more to clarify a number of points and issues which should have been clarified some considerable time ago, particularly when the vote was taken between fishermen of the South-East on whether or not a buy-back scheme would be acceptable. I believe that most of the opponents of the buy-back scheme—a little less than 50 per cent—were opposing because they were unaware of many of the implications. Also, they were advising me that they were voting as much in fear of what might happen as an alternative rather than voting in support of the measure put before them.

As the member representing Port MacDonnell, Blackfellow Caves and Carpenter Rocks in my electorate of Mount Gambier, I have had the greatest representation from the Port MacDonnell Professional Fishermen's Association which has, of its own accord, written to all members of Parliament over the past few weeks—I believe that four letters have been addressed to members—expressing their reasoned viewpoint. One of the major problems at Port MacDonnell is that it has the lowest rate of lobster catch each time a pot is lifted from the water—the lowest pot rate. Some cynics say that it is the lowest declared pot rate and I take great exception to such statements, as there is an inference that the Port MacDonnell fishermen are not declaring all the fish they catch. There is an additional inference that that simply does not happen (if it happens at all) in other parts of the South-East. We will assume, for the purpose of this debate, that fishermen are all equally honest and that the statistics available to the South Australian Department of Fisheries are all made in good faith by fishermen of the various ports.

The fishermen of Port MacDonnell are probably, through the lowest pot rate, open to having the lowest financial returns and therefore least able to subscribe to a buy-back scheme. A number of young fishermen have considerable debts, such as homes, purchasing their fishing licences, and so on. They desperately wish to remain in the industry but feel that the buy-back scheme will force them out rather than others who may simply, through age or being tired of fishing over the decades, be more ready and able to leave the industry. That is a distinct possibility, and I know that at least one young man has written directly to the Minister setting out his personal financial status. The Port MacDonnell fishermen have suggested alternatives such as utilising the new Government \$5 million marine laboratory for the breeding up to an age of some 10 months of lobster fry and then returning them to the reefs in the open seas. The Minister and his advisers have suggested that this is an impossibility, largely because of the complexity of the first year's breeding habits of the lobster.

Incidentally, one senior representative on the Government advisory committee in the Department of Fisheries suggested 10 or more years ago that one female lobster might be capable of populating a whole reef in the South-East rock lobster zone. We would not need many mature rock lobsters. I note that the Minister is consulting with the very advisers about whom I am speaking. They are regarding my comments with some humour, although at the time such comments were made, we assumed, in good faith. It is such an attitude that causes some fishermen to lose confidence in the advice of the Minister and his senior advisers. I hope that they take the matter seriously, because that is how the Port MacDonnell fishermen take it. They believed that they were getting advice in good faith.

Other issues that members of Parliament were requested to consider included the length of the season—an issue at which I hope the select committee will look. Another issue relates to whether the prawn buy-back scheme has been effective. I know that statistics have not been released of catches in the prawn industry since legislation was passed in this House last year, but certainly queries are running rife in the fishing industry that catches may have been low, that there may not be an ability in the prawn industry to pay back interest, let alone the principal, and therefore that some repayments may have to be deferred. It could therefore be 11 or 12 years, rather than 10, before the scheme achieves its aims.

Another question I would raise is that of the 15 per cent pot reduction brought into effect some three years ago. Many fishermen believe that that should be allowed to work its way through. It would take five years, because it is the maturation period of the juvenile rock lobster. Presumably, rock lobsters that were the result of the reduced pot allowance three years ago would not be caught as mature rock lobsters for another two years down the track. That scheme has not been given five years to work its way through the system and be proved.

I will not enter into the question of implied threats or more severe action that could be taken if this Bill were rejected but, as I said a few moments ago, fear certainly has been an ingredient in the consideration of the fishermen who voted only a few weeks ago on the buy-back scheme. The Victorian and South Australian joint licence holders (that is, fishermen in Port MacDonnell who hold both a South Australian and a Victorian licence) are being dealt with in a somewhat discriminatory fashion. Those who have purchased a Victorian licence will, under the new legislation, be able to retain their Victorian licence should they sell the South Australian licence. However, those who obtained Victorian licences under a grandfather clause and have still been fishing in Victoria—in some cases for decades within a family—and are still paying an annual licence fee to fish will, I understand, have to forfeit their Victorian licence if they sell their South Australian licence. So, a discriminatory clause is contained within the legislation against those who have a grandfather licence in the South-East. I have already mentioned—and other fishermen at Port MacDonnell have referred the Minister to the fact—that there will be a great effect on the livelihood of fishermen within the ports as well as other people.

There would be a reduction in trading and there could be a lower socioeconomic scale in the ports. Crews, ships chandlers and stores could be affected and normal services in ports could decline. In Newfoundland, where Professor Copes, a senior adviser to this Government, was responsible for advising that State Government, fishermen are regarded as being among the more impoverished sections of the community.

The Bill as it stands, although originally stated by the Minister to be a reduction of effort in the rock lobster industry, does not necessarily guarantee that reduction, because the fishermen, faced with additional bills of between \$6 000 to \$8 000 a year over 10 years, would also be faced with the problem of buying houses if they were the newer recruits to the fishing industry and of paying for boats and licences, as well as running costs—in addition to the payment of between \$6 000 to \$8 000 to which I have referred. In some cases, this would leave just a few thousand dollars for fishermen and their families on which to survive. Therefore, the alternative for people such as those and possibly for wealthier fishermen with more sophisticated gear would be to increase effort to pay for the buy-back scheme rather than reduce it over 10 years. So, the guarantee of reduction of effort is certainly not contained in the legislation.

Not all fishermen are fully aware of the facts and they certainly were not aware of the facts a few months ago when the vote was taken whether or not to have a buy-back scheme. That is confirmed by the number of fishermen across the South-East between Kingston and Port MacDonnell who have contacted my office, believing that I opposed the buy-back scheme. They sought from me additional advice that might more effectively have been sought from the Minister. They simply said that the advice that they sought pertained to the availability of funds, the interest to be paid, and the issues of what would happen if a participant in the buy-back scheme fell on troubled times over a year or two or even went bankrupt. They further said that such advice was not available to them at the time they sought it.

Those issues may have been resolved now, but they have not been widely publicised. I believe that such issues could probably be well and truly resolved by their being referred to a select committee over the next few days and by the fishermen obtaining from the Minister and his advisers this information subsequent to the select committee's report.

Other questions that have been asked by the fishermen include the following: can other measures be taken within the life of the buy-back scheme or does that scheme over a period of 10 years from the time that the 40 boats are taken out offer them complete stability? Alternatively, within that 10 years will additional measures be taken unilaterally by the Government? I quote a few possibilities: an October closure; a limited term for licences; an increased pot reduction; the setting of quotas by the Government; and a possible threat to those fishermen remaining in the industry should an emergency arise within the 10 years by further severe action taken to, on the surface, sustain the viability of the industry. In these respects, stability within the 10-year period is absolutely essential.

Other questions that have emerged from South-East fishermen include the following: Does the buy-back scheme favour the wealthier fishermen, those with everything paid for and security already within their grasp? Does it disadvantage the younger newer fishermen who face a long life in the industry? Does it militate against such younger fishermen remaining in the industry? Would licence fees increase greatly within the life of the scheme or would there be a guarantee that such fees remain at a reasonable level to ensure stability in the industry?

The Port MacDonnell Professional Fishermen's Association membership is substantial, bearing in mind the number of boats at Port MacDonnell compared with the number of the other ports combined. There has been a slight dissent with the Blackfellow Caves group who hived off recently from the Port MacDonnell association, but that still leaves Port MacDonnell as a substantial part of the association.

That group, which I represent strongly and will continue to represent, considers that it has not been fully heard either by the Minister and his advisers or by the association. Alternatively, if the groups say that they have been heard, there is a feeling in Port MacDonnell that not much notice has been taken of them. Unusual steps were taken against the President of the Port MacDonnell Professional Fishermen's Association at various meetings, actions which I felt were unreasonable and unsustainable. If for no other reason than that, I tended to err on the side of supporting strongly my major local port.

It is possible that the various complaints that have been addressed to the Minister by Port MacDonnell fishermen could have been answered by closer, more intimate negotiation, but that did not happen, so we have something of a stand-off situation which I would desperately like to see resolved by the reference of these problems to a select committee. I hold no animosity towards the Minister or his officers, for whom I have the utmost respect, but I do not consider that this matter has been handled in the best possible way.

I believe that issues that might emerge before the select committee include the highly increased sophistication of some vessels in the rock lobster industry which allows satellite navigation to enable boats to pinpoint reefs so that those reefs can be fished intensively rather than accidentally as happened in the olden days when boats were far less able to pinpoint accurately the location of rock lobster. Therefore, that factor alone—modern technology—has led to a far more intensive fishing of the southern rock lobster zone.

The Minister has informed me and South-East fishermen that there would be no assured success in a rock lobster breeding program over the first 10 months of the lobster's life. However, by the same logic, I can quote Mr B.V. Lilburn, one of the Federal Government's senior fisheries advisers, who says that there has been no evidence across the world of success in buy-back schemes. He gives his reason for such lack of success. So, there are points on both sides: both may be correct; both may be wrong; or other alternatives may be acceptable.

The Port MacDonnell Professional Fishermen's Association, under Ron Ollrich, has written directly to all members of this House. Those letters, responsible and reasonable, do not represent an attack either on the Minister or on his senior advisers. They are simply pleas to all members at least to consider their point of view and to realise that there are two sides to every problem.

I applaud the Minister's decision to refer this matter to a select committee and I will ensure that fishermen in South-East ports make responsible and informed representations to the committee. Like other members, I hope that by the time the committee reports this matter will have been resolved, so that decisions can be taken and fishermen who currently complain that they are under advised and under informed will by that time be well aware of all the alternatives and possibilities so that they can support the legislation when it is finally introduced by the Minister.

I wish this Bill a successful, if somewhat amended, passage and, rather than pre-empt anything that might happen before the select committee, I applaud the Minister's decision to refer this Bill to a select committee.

Mr GUNN (Eyre): I speak in this debate because, having been a member for a long time, I have taken part in many debates on the fishing industry. Such debates have always been controversial and there have always been people dissatisfied with the end result. Whenever Professor Copes has visited South Australia there has been a great deal of con-

troverly in relation to his visits and his findings. I am of the view that outside experts are not the answer to problems involving localised industry. I believe that the expertise required to solve these problems is available in South Australia, and that some of the recommendations and assumptions of people like Professor Copes leave a great deal to be desired. I am pleased that the Minister has agreed—albeit belatedly—to refer this matter to a select committee.

Since becoming a member in this House I have noticed that whenever legislation has been referred to a select committee it has been greatly improved. Normally, commonsense applies. However, I have also noted that most Ministers vigorously resist any matter being referred to a select committee. Some Ministers adopt the attitude that once they become Ministers all wisdom flows from them. From the amount of correspondence received by all members from people in the southern zone of the rock lobster industry it is quite obvious that there is considerable controversy about this matter in that part of the State.

It is difficult for members who are not familiar with this part of the State to make an informed judgment on the matter, and I believe that the member for Chaffey's approach is correct, even if it has provoked the Minister to some degree. A select committee will give people an adequate opportunity to put their points of view and voice their concerns or support for the measure, and the public of South Australia will have an opportunity to speak for themselves. I believe that, as a result of the select committee, the Bill will be altered, particularly if the committee is given enough time to properly consider the matters before it.

When we are dealing with legislation to remove some 40 vessels and 2 400 pots from the industry, obviously there will be a great deal of concern, particularly from those whose families have been in the industry for generations. I am concerned about one or two matters, and I refer, first, to clause 4 of the Bill, which deals with the reporting of the authority. I suggest to the Minister, and to the select committee, that this clause should be amended so that reports are tabled in both Houses of Parliament. I believe that there should be further clarification of the transferability provisions. I have strongly supported the transferability of fishing licences in this State, so I read these clauses carefully, because I believe it is the inherent right of fishermen—and also taxi owners, hoteliers and any other licence holders created by this Parliament through various instrumentalities—to be able to transfer their licences so that they can leave the industry with some dignity.

A number of questions about this legislation need clarification and answering. A select committee will enable those answers to be placed on the public record, and people will not then be able to claim that they have not been understood or that the legislation has not been implemented in the manner in which they thought it would be implemented. I have had experience in other areas of State Government administration where undertakings have been given before parliamentary committees and then the organisation in question has set out to implement certain regulations in a completely different fashion, which has required the committee concerned—for example, the Subordinate Legislation Committee—to remind the organisation of the undertakings it gave before that committee.

If much more legislation had to run the gauntlet of select committees, there would be a great improvement in the legislation which passes through this Parliament, and legislation would not have to be brought back before Parliament to be amended. That would be in the interests of all South Australians. I am aware that people in the fishing

industry have not always been as forthright and truthful as they could have been. Certain fishermen—

An honourable member interjecting:

Mr GUNN: I cannot speak for the South-East because I do not know a great deal about that area. However, I do have knowledge of other parts of the State where some fishermen engage in illegal and outrageous practices. I support the second reading of the Bill and commend the member for Chaffey for initiating its referral to a select committee. It has been interesting to watch the Minister perform. He has provided considerable entertainment for members on this side of the House in relation to his grudging acceptance of the Bill's referral to a select committee. I sincerely hope that the committee can go about its deliberations in a sensible fashion and that people have adequate time in which to put forward their submissions.

Mr S.G. EVANS (Davenport): I do not come within the category of the member for Eyre, who can say that he has some fishing activity in his area. I have lost from my area the Mount Bold and Happy Valley reservoirs, but I do have the Coromandel Valley dam and the Clarendon weir, neither of which contains lobsters, but they do have yabbies. I am impressed by the letter that we have received from Mr Ollrich, who speaks for the Port MacDonnell Professional Fishermen's Association and raises some points that we should consider. I suppose that we all feel inspired to support or reject the proposals that we put forward on behalf of our associations.

Some time ago it was decided to extend the lobster fishing period and bring back the season to earlier in the year, which means that lobster fishing occurs when females are carrying larvae. Surely commonsense would indicate that, if you destroy something before it has had time to leave the mother and have a chance at survival, you are risking the long-term supply of a commodity, whether it be bird, animal, vegetable or anything else. I do not know whether or not this is true, but the evidence given to me is that up until the first and second weeks of November females carry young which have the potential to grow and develop to commercial size, so surely it is ludicrous to suggest that we should be taking those females—

An honourable member interjecting:

Mr S.G. EVANS: I know that they cannot have any with larvae, but you are disturbing them and interfering with them from October. It is all right to say that you should not do that.

The Hon. P.B. Arnold: A lot are taken illegally.

Mr S.G. EVANS: I cannot prove that, but it is human nature. I once went out fishing with a recreational group of which I became patron, succeeding the Hon. Mr Millhouse. If members of the group caught a fish which was a quarter or half an inch under size, they threw it back. I point out that members of the group were children of about 10 or 12 years of age. I can assure the House that, if I had been their age, I would not have thrown back those fish.

I make the point that we should not be extending the season. There is no long-term benefit for the industry if we shorten the season. I believe the season was extended by a Liberal Government: I accept that, but whenever it was done I believe it was the result of bad judgment, and it is something that we should try to remedy under this legislation. I hope that the select committee gives that matter due consideration. I know that others will make representations on that point.

I congratulate the member for Chaffey on his endeavour to have a select committee set up. The Minister has shown commonsense in allowing people from the industry to give

evidence. I know that the Bill is what the majority of the industry asked for, but that majority was only a small and not significant majority. The opposite point of view needs to be put, and on a much broader base than has occurred previously. It is worth experimenting with the suggestion by some of the industry that we should try to breed the lobsters in a controlled environment and then release them after a few months in areas where research shows that the lobsters have a chance of growing to full adult or at least commercial size. This occurs in relation to other products and could be tried in this field also. We set up an institute costing \$5 million—

An honourable member interjecting:

Mr S.G. EVANS: An amount of \$1 million has been indicated to me, although someone has given me a greater figure. I accept that amount of \$1 million. However, I do not care whether it is only \$500 000. The institute has a purpose, and if it can be used for the purpose indicated by some people in the industry then let us use it. I admit that I am not knowledgeable about the fishing industry but some of those who stand aside can at times assess whether or not rushing into buy-back programs is best. More importantly, a select committee can decide that issue.

I note the comment made by the member for Mount Gambier which was a repeat of a comment by Mr Lilburn, who said that buy-back schemes seldom work. I support that view. I support the second reading of the Bill for the purpose of setting up a select committee. I hope that the select committee will look at all aspects of the industry, such as controlled breeding to develop the young for release but, more particularly, shortening the season so that there is no potential for interference with female lobsters until at least the first or second week of November. If some illegal rackets are going on, then by doing that we will provide a chance for lobsters to reproduce so that the industry can continue into the future. I support the second reading.

Mr PETERSON (Semaphore): I support the second reading and the proposal for a select committee. A couple of interesting points have been raised in this debate, including the annual lease system mentioned by the member for Murray-Mallee. This is a novel look at a problem that exists in most areas of aquaculture. I realise that the fishermen would not be too keen on it, but perhaps it could be looked at in the long term in relation to when current licence holders relinquish their licences. The matter certainly needs further investigation.

Mention was made of the small majority who voted for this Bill, and the Minister's explanation indicates that it was a majority of 51.5 per cent. I assume that all members have received a series of letters from the fishermen in Port MacDonnell, and they have presented their case very well. They felt that they had not had the opportunity to put their case forward, and this select committee will give them the opportunity to do that and will allow other interested parties to put their points of view. Another matter mentioned by several members was cropping in the sense of developing aquaculture. The operation of the marine research laboratory now allows us to look at the diminishing marine crops in this State, and there is no doubt that they are diminishing. Complaints are being received from fishermen all around the coast, both recreational and professional, of there not being enough fish. Complaints are made that professional fishermen take all the fish and do not allow recreational fishermen to share the resource. We are told that this affects tourism. It is a very complex intermeshing of the marine industries.

Crayfish is another diminishing resource, and the report clearly indicates that. In relation to the prawn fishery, as

far as I am aware the buy-back scheme seems to be working. I understand that the other gulf, through the management it set up, is managing quite well. Our State has problems with all fishery industry activities. The shark fishery has all but disappeared because it is overfished. The tuna fishery is down on quotas. It is a much larger problem than most people realise.

Management comes into all these fisheries. The fishermen at Port MacDonnell sent me some information about buy-back schemes, indicating that the gains will not be permanent, and that may be right. Perhaps the survey of fisheries in our State needs to be ongoing and reviewed annually. I realise that in some areas of the fishing industry the cost of buying licences and having access to the fishery is great. Now, with buy-back, it is very difficult for the fishermen to remain viable. I support the second reading and the setting up of a select committee. This will allow everyone concerned with the fishery—those who derive their livelihood from it and those with an interest in it—to put their cases forward, so that the committee can make a balanced decision.

The Hon. M.K. MAYES (Minister of Fisheries): I will be brief in responding to the comments made by members. It is important to note that some of the comments made by Opposition members, particularly in relation to consultation, need correcting. There has been extensive consultation between the department, together with the Government, and members of the industry through their professional bodies. I have attended meetings with industry representatives, both formally and informally, since I took responsibility as Minister of Fisheries. It is unfair to criticise the department for not consulting, and I cannot accept that consultation has not occurred. There has been an extensive information flow to members of the fishery at all levels, and it has certainly been directed through SAFIC and local organisations. Indeed, there has been so much consultation that if confusion has occurred it has occurred because so much information has been flowing to members in the fishery.

There has been a constant flow of information to members of the industry through their representation, that is SAFIC, as to costs and the structure of costs in the potential buy-back proposal. I absolutely deny that there has been any difficulty from the point of view of the Government or the department presenting information or that there has been any collusion to avoid providing that information, because it has been in the Government's interests to see that this industry plan is put in place. I am sure that were the leaders of SAFIC here today to vouch for their commitment to this program, they would assure members in relation to the flow of information and the intricate detail provided through the department.

A number of points were made in relation to other alternatives, and I want to touch on some of those comments. The member for Victoria referred to consultation. It is worth noting a resolution from a two-day seminar conducted in June 1986 in Millicent to which all of the industry representatives were invited. The resolution passed at that meeting reads as follows:

This conference supports immediate development of a buy-back scheme by SAFIC and the Department of Fisheries in close consultation with the industry and based on the directions from this meeting. If it is feasible, the scheme should be aimed at introduction by the end of the 1986-87 season.

That resolution was passed at a seminar workshop at Millicent involving all people interested in the fishery. To say that there has been no consultation and no liaison with the industry is to paint a misleading picture. Certainly, I would

not want anyone to go away with any view other than that there has been total consultation between the department and industry representatives, whose responsibility it is to communicate with all the fishermen. Any other suggestion is totally misleading in my opinion and smacks of a little bit of mischief on the part of the honourable member concerned.

Comments about a fisheries officer with regard to the possible seeding of the fishery some 10 years ago have also been taken out of their proper context. It is so easy to do, and I think the member for Mount Gambier achieved that. Perhaps he should find out what other comments were made in that two-hour seminar in which the officer concerned presented the various points. I am sure that, if the member for Mount Gambier contacted the leaders of the industry in his area, he would find nothing but overwhelming confidence in that officer. That officer was involved as a research officer for many years, monitoring the rock lobster industry, and part of this proposal is to introduce a monitoring program as part of the buy-back arrangement.

It is worth recalling what Professor Copes said with regard to liaison and relations between the Department of Fisheries, the Government and the fishing industry in this State. He compared this industry with all other industries with which he has had contact—and he has had extensive contact all around the world and he believes that this is an exemplary example of how liaison and relations between the industry, the department and the Government should be established to achieving the goal of a healthy resource, maintenance of the resource and incomes which warrant support and which do not result in exploitation of the resource in this State. It is worth recording his comments, and the document, which has been well publicised and which is available to the community, reinforces those comments.

Another comment was made in relation to the Victorian and South Australian licences and the argument about spooning. I think the member for Mount Gambier again used his parliamentary privilege to not give the full picture of what happened with the Victorian and South Australian licences. The fact is that in 1982, when the Leader of the Opposition was Minister of Fisheries, in consultation with the fishing industry—and I might say that the association strongly opposed dual licence holders being allowed to split their licences—he made that agreement. For the sake of the record, it is worth noting that, so that people do not get another impression from what the member for Mount Gambier has said. Mr Olsen back in 1982, whilst the Minister, was the one the industry negotiated with and, as a consequence, there was opposition to the concept of dual licence holders being able to split their licence.

In relation to the concept of seeding, to which the member for Murray-Mallee referred, some worthy points can be made from scientific evidence. Unfortunately, the honourable member is not here, but the general conclusion of scientists around the world is that the success of seeding is very limited. The circumstances in which seeding can be successful are very dependent on conditions which do not exist in this fishery, and this is my advice from the department and the specialists involved. It is quite clear that the industry itself has not supported this type of proposal, nor would it accept this functional support. The proposal was floated by a number of people before the member for Murray-Mallee contemplated putting it before this House. It is quite clear that there would not be industry acceptance of that type of proposal. I know that there has been significant correspondence, particularly from some of the fishermen in the Port MacDonnell area, with regard to that aspect.

The importance of this buy-back scheme is that it is designed to retain the resource, provide an economic base for the fishermen, and allow for the fishery to develop and not be exploited to the extent of extinction where we would see no fishery in the future. That is one of the sad options that we face unless the matter is addressed with all due haste. Given the consultation, discussion and debate that has taken place over the years, it is certainly important that we proceed as quickly as possible with this scheme and with the proposed Bill.

The other aspect that I want to address was raised by the member for Davenport, that is, the taking of spawning females. The advice I have is that that would reduce the season so significantly as to put the whole industry under severe stress. The economic stress would then reflect on physical stress which would be caused by heavy fishing and, with modern technology, pressure on the resource would be increased. It would probably reduce the season quite significantly; it would probably commence in late December. When members talk about reducing or delaying it until November, they really do not have their facts correct. The advice I have from the scientists involved is that we would not be able to start until well into December, and that would put severe pressure on the fishermen and reduce their period of catch from those months through to March and April. That is a very strong limitation, and I certainly do not imagine that the proposal would be supported by the fishermen. I am certain that the industry would have grave concerns about the adoption of such a proposal.

I want to finish with two points. The editorial from the *Border Watch* this week is a good point on which to close. But I would like to say that the purpose of the select committee, as has been said by members of the Opposition, is to provide an opportunity for everyone to have their say, and so on. That is quite interesting when some members opposite say that Parliament now has the right to make the determination. The Government is supporting the proposal put forward by the member for Chaffey purely to assist the industry. Fishermen know that there is another agenda, which has a political connotation, relating to the reasons behind the Opposition's moving this motion for a select committee. I am sure that the fishermen who are alert and aware will not miss that point. As Minister, I have responsibility for the industry and I am concerned to ensure that we establish this buy-back scheme as soon as possible for the sake of the industry and at least cost to members of the industry.

For that reason, I am prepared to support the establishment of a select committee from this House. If it ran the gauntlet, frankly, it would not worry me too much if it went to the other place but the delay would involve cost to the industry and to the fishermen in it. They know that, I have had discussions with them about it, and they appreciate the point. It would be no skin off my nose if it did go to the other place, because it would make some of those members think about the issue, and it might not be very easy for them to resolve it. Be that as it may, we will proceed with a select committee and the matter will be dealt with efficiently and effectively. The committee can report to the House and the buy-back scheme can be established so that the industry can benefit from it.

As I indicated, I will finish with the editorial in the *Border Watch*. It is very fitting and appropriate in view of what has been said today by some members of the Opposition. Headed 'Time for Unity', the editorial reads:

The word unity is described in one dictionary as ... 'being formed of parts that constitute a whole'. Unity brings with it strength of purpose, an ability to lobby governments, to put before

the public the concerns of an organisation. Such is not the current state of our region's coastal lobster industry.

I ask the member for Victoria to note the next point:

Despite years of informed debate, ballots, meetings and consultations, we now have a position where any apparent unified consensus on a buy-back scheme or any worthwhile alternative is under further attack—some operators possibly having yet another change of heart on what to do.

That the onus is on them to determine not only their own economic future but that of an industry vital to the South-East must be a daunting task. The danger in not having unity is that eventually the ruling Government of the day will make, decide and impose its own regulations.

The industry has, in the 80s, faced the threat of losing overseas markets through possible stock contamination resulting from the Finger Point sewage debacle—the current beef scare only highlights what a tenuous hold we have on international trade.

It is time lobster operators made a consensus decision that can be adhered to for not only their future well-being but that of the region and its people who rely on the lobster industry.

That is a fitting way to end this debate. The Government is endeavouring, through the consensus of the industry—the majority vote—to achieve a scheme that will allow for the economic well-being of the fishery and of the South-East.

Bill read a second time and referred to a select committee consisting of Messrs P.B. Arnold, D.S. Baker, and Gregory, Ms Lenahan, and Mr Mayes; the committee to have power to send for persons, papers and records, and to adjourn from place to place; the committee to report on 9 September.

LONG SERVICE LEAVE BILL

Adjourned debate on second reading.
(Continued from 19 August. Page 332.)

Mr S.J. BAKER (Mitcham): The Opposition cautiously supports this Bill, which represents a rewrite of the 1967 Act and, according to the Minister of Labour, will 'not place further financial burdens on business in this State'. It seeks to simplify the existing rules, remove sexist language and provide for an averaging of the previous three years work experience whereas existing rules require the leave to be calculated according to hours of work at the time of claiming long service leave. It also removes anomalies associated with different jurisdictions and award provisions. It clarifies the treatment of breaks in service including the removal of the provision that continuity of service for employees is deemed to have been broken if a person was not re-employed within six months of being stood down. The general penalties have increased from \$100 to \$1 000 and to \$5 000 for disobeying an inspector or refusing to cooperate. Other sundry matters covered include better record keeping and reverse onus of proof in disputes before the Industrial Commission.

Before spending time on the Bill itself, I ask members to cast their mind back to 1967, when a significant change was made to the provisions of the long service leave legislation that had operated in this State over the previous 10 years. At that time the provisions were that an employee had to serve 20 years before he was eligible for long service leave. A variety of provisions in awards and in other States were different from those applying in South Australia and it was deemed appropriate to rationalise long service leave provisions. Interestingly enough, the then member for Torrens, who was the appropriate Minister in the former Government, commented that the provisions went further than they did in any other State. I note also that the then Premier (Hon. Frank Walsh) said:

I make no apology for the fact that the entitlement to leave in this Bill, that is, three months leave after 10 years continuous service, is more advantageous to workers than the provisions in the other States, but that is the entitlement which the Government considers to be reasonable and appropriate.

That is an interesting comment, because at this time in this country the terms and conditions of employment are being considered. This year in the national wage decision the Arbitration Commission laid down certain guidelines, including a reduction in impediments to the number of hours of work put in on the job. It is important to reflect that, in the days of plenty, long service leave for continuity of service to the same employer, although something of a privilege, was written into legislation as a right. It may well have been appropriate in the 1950s and 1960s to make such provisions. Today the whole package of employment conditions must be looked at because they are the determinants of whether Australia will be competitive.

In this House today I do not intend to debate the relative merits of long service leave. Some groups in the community say that long service leave is an anachronism. It does not exist in other countries. Although I do not wish to enter into that debate today, I will reflect on some of the conditions that we enjoy in this country and State, and put them in the context of our international competitive situation.

Recently a list of the working conditions of a plumber, for example, in this State was supplied to me, and if the House will bear with me I will briefly outline them. If we take what are classed as normal standard hours, a person could conceivably work 38 hours per week for 52 weeks a year, which makes a total of 1 976 hours. That conceivable maximum figure is reduced by the following: sick leave of 80 hours, which must be provided by employers even if it is not taken; public holidays of 80 hours; annual leave of 160 hours; bereavement leave of eight hours, which may or may not be taken (it is not a high priority); and long service leave of 52 hours per annum. That totals 380 hours off the working year, so we are left with a maximum of about 1 600 hours that a person is expected to work if he is a plumber.

To look at it from an employer's situation, there is indeed a loss of some 15 per cent of available working hours and hours for which they can charge those people who are contracting their services. We reduce that by another 240 hours and get into a situation of 1 356 effective working hours in a year. This, I would contend, is lower than almost all Western developed countries, and reflects in some way some of the problems we are facing.

When we look at remuneration, we start off again with a calculation that blandly says that a plumber shall be paid \$10.75 per hour. In a standard working year we would expect a plumber to receive \$21 242. However, when we take leave loading into account we add \$285.95 to the bill; with rostered days off we add another \$86 to the bill; with pro rata long service leave we add \$531.05 to the bill, less the adjustment for long service leave. We then have a net figure of \$21 082.90. On top of that we also have payroll tax, workers compensation, public liability, long service leave levies, superannuation contributions, fares, tools and extras, travelling time and without even considering site allowances, we end up with a bill of \$27 739. Taking site allowances into account it is close to \$30 000. When we calculate that against the hours worked we finish up with an hourly cost exactly double that of the award rate. I am simply saying that we have some huge cost imposts hidden in our working conditions and, indeed, in the extras that employers have to pay.

The Arbitration Commission agrees that it is important—and it has been accepted by a number of elements within the employer and union communities—that we somehow

have to adjust our working and living conditions to the challenges of becoming internationally competitive. Long service leave is but one of a number of benefits that we have enjoyed over a number of years. It cannot be taken in isolation, but must be considered as part of a package that has considerably reduced our competitive situation. It is worth reviewing that situation. People must look at their working situation (and we see a continual drive to reduce working hours) and ask how long we really work effectively anyway. I do not know of many countries in the world where people work fewer hours than we do.

At the outset I said that the Bill generally represents a rewrite. Our support is conditional on the answers to a number of clarifying questions that will be raised during the Committee stage.

The Hon. FRANK BLEVINS (Minister of Labour): I thank the member for Mitcham for his expression of support for the Bill on behalf of the Opposition and for his assistance in its speedy passage.

Bill read a second time.

In Committee.

Clauses 1 and 2 passed.

Clause 3—'Interpretation.'

Mr S.J. BAKER: I have two questions, the first being on 'related corporations'. Will the Minister explain which companies would be additionally affected or would come in under the ambit of this Act although not previously covered by the Act? The provisions have changed. My other question relates to the inclusion of board and lodging as part of the long service leave payment.

The Hon. FRANK BLEVINS: In response to the first question, the position in relation to the people who are picked up relates to a circumstance that arises from time to time where there is transmission of business and a business changes hands. In most instances it is not a problem. Long service leave and all the entitlements workers have under the old name are carried on by the new employer. However, some employers have from time to time suggested that the long service leave start again from when they take over, and this causes certain unpleasantness on occasions. The employers agree completely that that is undesirable, and that is why they have agreed, along with the unions, to that amendment to the Bill. I do not understand the second question.

Mr S.J. BAKER: My second question relates to the provision of accommodation or the cash equivalent of the accommodation allowance covered under the previous Act and now repeated in this Bill. Are employers required to give a cash benefit when a person goes on long service leave and spends such leave at home with free board and lodging?

The Hon. FRANK BLEVINS: The answer, apparently, is 'Yes—people are compelled to pay.' As the honourable member says, it is not a new provision but one that has been there for a long time. It is agreed completely, as is every word and line in this Bill, between the employers and the unions. I am not implying that the honourable member has no right to ask questions simply because the Bill has been agreed to by every other party in South Australia.

Mr S.J. BAKER: When the Bill was passed originally someone did not pay a great deal of attention to this provision. No doubt exists that if a person spends leave at home the employer is not only continuing to pay for their free board and lodging but also is giving an additional cash benefit. I have not thought about it long and hard enough to suggest an amendment, but it is strange that employers would wish to pay twice for this working condition. It means that persons on long service leave will receive a higher level

of remuneration, if they were receiving free board and lodging from their employer, than when they are at work. I find it extremely strange, and perhaps it should be looked at in future.

The Hon. FRANK BLEVINS: The position is not quite as outlined by the member for Mitcham. Where a person is given, for example, \$300 a week plus board, board is an integral part of the award rate. Adjustment has been made to the award rate to take into account the fact that board is given so that when a person goes on long service leave the board component of the award rate is given not as board but as cash. The person must still find board and keep, so it does not mean an additional expense to the employer.

Clause passed.

Clauses 4 and 5 passed.

Clause 6—'Continuity of service.'

Mr S.J. BAKER: Under this clause, any type of leave can be counted as continuous service, whereas the existing Act provides that an employee must be re-employed within six months of being stood down if that employee is to preserve his or her long service leave rights by means of continuity of service. Under this provision, however, it would seem that a person, having been stood down for a period of even five or 10 years, could return to the company and be entitled to continuity of service for the purposes of long service leave. This seems a strange provision. Can the Minister explain it?

The Hon. FRANK BLEVINS: This provision is important: it is a question of fairness and equity. Where a person has been stood down through no fault of his own (say, because of a downturn in industry), then, properly, any time limit on continuity of service for the purpose of long service leave should be removed because the break in service is not the fault of the worker. Under such circumstances, long service leave should accrue in the normal way because it is the fault of neither the employee nor the employer. After all, industrial conditions have caused the break and it would seem unduly harsh and arbitrary to provide for a period after which the long service leave should not accrue. Therefore, the time limit provided in the existing legislation has been removed.

Mr S.J. BAKER: I take the Minister's point, but I should have thought that six months was adequate for the purposes of the legislation. However, as the Minister says that there is no dissension on this matter, I do not intend to pursue it so long as the employers are aware of it. Subclause (1) (i) provides:

A worker's continuity of service is not affected by—

(i) any other break in the worker's service brought about by the employer where the worker returns to work or is re-employed by the employer within two months.

Can the Minister say what kind of leave is covered by this provision? The other kinds of leave referred to in the subclause relate to illness or injury and other reasons. I had in mind an employee who was in prison, because the other paragraphs seem to cover all the other kinds of leave.

The Hon. FRANK BLEVINS: The clause applies to any kind of leave to which the worker has a lawful right, and I should not think that it is a widespread practice for employers to give a worker leave to go to prison! I have in mind what sometimes happens in this House when a member is given leave to attend a Commonwealth Parliamentary Association conference and, when that leave is given, the member's continuity of service is not broken. This provision merely means that the employee has a lawful right to take the leave or it would not be leave. For example, from time to time public servants are granted unpaid leave for an

extended period to do other work. The provision is designed to cover examples such as that.

Clause passed.

Clauses 7 to 11 passed.

Clause 12—'Inspector may direct employer to grant long service leave.'

Mr S.J. BAKER: This clause deletes one important word from the previous Act. Under that Act, no conditions were placed on employers, except that by agreement with employees they would determine the time at which long service leave should be taken or, if a person retired voluntarily or involuntarily, payment would be made in lieu. Under this Bill it appears that the Minister intends that the heavy hand of an inspector will come down and he will say, 'If you've been improperly refused long service leave, we can force an employer to let you take it.' This is the first time that that approach has been taken in this type of legislation. I can see that the previous provision was in the Act for those people who failed to meet their obligations. However, this clause suggests that there will be some legislative requirement to enable an employee to take leave when he feels like it and, if he feels aggrieved by the decision, he can take the matter to an inspector who will arbitrate. Perhaps the Minister can clarify that.

The Hon. FRANK BLEVINS: Clause 7 details when long service has to be taken. For a worker to obtain some redress under the previous Act he had to take some legal action. This clause is merely an attempt to obtain redress without requiring a worker to go to the courts. I do not anticipate, and nor do the employers or the unions, that this provision will be used frequently at all. Certainly, as Minister of Labour I would not want my inspectors tied up arbitrating on when a person should be allowed to take long service leave. I certainly do not see this as being a problem—in fact, quite the reverse. It is in the interests of both parties to do what they can to forestall litigation, because it is expensive and not always totally satisfactory. The employers are happy about this provision to replace the previous provision which was cumbersome and, as I say, not always satisfactory to all parties.

Mr S.J. BAKER: Some employers may be happy with this clause, but others may not be. I distributed copies of this Bill to many people, and at least one person expressed some concern about it. I do not really know how the provision worked previously and whether there is a need for change. Can the Minister explain what happened under the previous Act when a conflict between an employee and an employer in relation to the timing of long service leave required further action to be taken? I am not aware that that conflict has ever actually arisen. This clause takes away some decision making and flexibility which employers had under the previous Act.

The Hon. FRANK BLEVINS: It does not affect flexibility at all. The provision as to when one is entitled to take long service leave remains essentially the same. The clause deals with a dispute between a worker and an employer as to when long service leave should be taken. Under the previous arrangement a worker went to the Department of Labour and said, 'My employer will not give me my long service leave which I am entitled to under the Act', and the Department of Labour has had to consider prosecuting that type of employer. There is no other way to resolve the situation if an employer will not abide by the Act, and that is a totally unsatisfactory and unnecessary procedure. To my knowledge, the Government's proposal to resolve this situation has been unanimously supported by employers, and it is certainly supported by the unions.

If an employer or employer body disagrees with the proposal, I find it extraordinary that they have not contacted me so that we could try to work out something else. I have been assured by employers that they unanimously agree with this provision, but the member for Mitcham (as he does on virtually all industrial Bills) says that there is an employer who does not agree with it. If I had been aware that that was the case, I would have had discussions with that employer, and perhaps I would have been able to persuade him of the merits in the Government's proposal. If that employer wishes to contact me, I will be happy to go through the provisions of the Bill and the way that the Department of Labour intends implementing them. I hope that that will remove any fears held by the employer or employer body. Again, as I stated in my second reading explanation, this Bill has been before the Industrial Relations Advisory Council and, in fact, it was pretty well drawn up by that body which has representation from the principal employer bodies.

Clause passed.

Clause 13—'Failure to grant leave.'

Mr S.J. BAKER: I move:

Page 9, lines 3 to 13—Leave out subclause (3).

The Minister is quite aware of the Opposition's stance on reverse onus of proof provisions, which tend to become part of almost any form of legislation which this Government attempts to enact. In moving for deletion of this subclause it is recognised that currently the commission must weigh up on the balance of probabilities whether the facts put before it by an employer accord with the facts put before it by an employee. It is also recognised that in the absence of reasonable records the commission will feel more favourably disposed to an employee's argument.

This does two things: first, it provides that under all circumstances, if no adequate records are kept, it will rule in favour of the employee. That is a reverse onus of proof, and we think that the current provisions are adequate. They seem to have been adequate in the past. The commission is being paid to do a job and one of the jobs it has to do is conciliate or arbitrate on the facts put before it. We should not take anything away from that responsibility, and this provision does that.

This clause puts an employer in a double jeopardy situation. Not only are they fined for keeping inadequate records but they are hit for whatever claim the employee wishes to make. Subclause (3) states:

If in proceedings under this section it appears that the employer has not kept proper records relating to long service leave as required by this Act—

and it notes the various issues—

an allegation made by or on behalf of the worker as to the period of the worker's service or the average number of hours worked per week over a particular period will be accepted as proved in the absence of proof to the contrary.

This again puts the employer in a pre-empted position, and this was not the case previously. Those affected by provisions such as this are not the employers who keep adequate records, because they always have adequate proof; in many cases, they are people who run small businesses and work 60 or 80 hours per week. Their record keeping is not what one would call up to scratch in relation to what the Act requires, but they have to balance off their time constraints against their legislative responsibilities.

Under the existing Act the commission has power to look at each situation on its own merits and to determine whether the truth lies with an employee or an employer. Occasionally there are circumstances where the employer is obviously trying to reduce his liabilities, and there is adequate provision in the Act to take further action against that person.

What we are dealing with is a question of what is adequate record keeping. Adequate record keeping might well have been beyond many of the people we are talking about under this Bill who, instead of facing a fine of \$100, will now face a fine of \$1 000. Of course, if certain employees are aware of the deficiencies, they will exploit these provisions. The Opposition is generally opposed to the reverse onus of proof provisions and we believe that the current Act provides quite sufficiently for these circumstances.

The Hon. FRANK BLEVINS: I oppose the amendment. I also have some doubts, from time to time, about the reverse onus of proof, and I do not intend at this stage to launch into my usual speech—a very good speech—on this principle. However, I assure the honourable member and the Committee that using the reverse onus of proof in this situation is absolutely essential because we—and ‘we’ on this occasion means the Department of Labour—find that many employers, either through negligence or deliberately, do not keep adequate records, and previously the fines have been inadequate. As the member for Mitcham pointed out, they will be fined for that; that is a penalty on them. However, where does that leave the worker? If a worker is to be guaranteed—and I mean guaranteed—their proper entitlement under this legislation, then every worker will have to keep their own personal records, and I believe that that is unduly onerous on workers. If a person is in business and if they are incapable of keeping decent records, whether it is for the purposes of paying their employees, paying their tax (if indeed they pay tax) or for any other purpose, I wonder whether they ought to be in business at all. If they insist on staying in business when they are incapable of keeping records, it ought not to be the worker who pays because of the negligence, incompetence or fraudulent intent of that employer.

There is a legal obligation on the part of employers to keep these records and, if they do not, I believe that not only should they be fined but the worker should, in all cases, have the benefit of the doubt. The decent employers in this State agree with that completely. We should always remember, while we are claiming to support business, whether small or big, that if one allows some employers or some businesses to operate on a lower standard than the good employers and the good businesses, one gives them an unfair competitive advantage. I would have thought that members opposite would see that as undesirable. I oppose the amendment and strongly support the clause as printed. It is fair and gives equity to all the parties; it quite properly penalises the incompetent or those intent on fraud. All the employer bodies that I have dealt with in relation to this Bill completely support the Government in regard to this provision.

Mr S.J. BAKER: Without taking up the time of the House with a debate on what is fair and equitable, I point out that the system was fair and equitable under the old Act because the commission had to make up its mind on the basis of the records or lack of records put before it. Now we are putting the shoe on the other foot. I do not believe that that is appropriate. I do not believe that we should ever use the reverse onus of proof situation. Unfortunately, it has become a part of our legislation. The recommendations of the constitutional commission are totally opposed to it. The principles expounded by the Labor Party in that document totally oppose that proposition.

I reject the Minister's statement. If the commission was working properly it would have an opportunity to tell the employer that not only has he been slack in the way in which he has prepared his records but also on the law of probabilities it is believed that the employee is correct, if

that was the situation. Those who will be disadvantaged under this clause are the little people of this world who always get caught.

The Hon. Frank Blevins interjecting:

Mr S.J. BAKER: The Minister says that it is the crooks. I would say that the Minister obviously has not had much to do with small business people who are under an enormous amount of pressure, as we see from the bankruptcy figures and hear from the people who come through our door day after day. People are trying to keep a business going and are working from 60 to 90 hours a week, but they will be doubly penalised by this provision. I do not intend to pursue the matter. I note that the Bill increases the fines far in excess of inflation. Obviously, the Minister has his penalties up front. We are not here to debate whether or not the penalties are right or wrong, just to note that they have gone up in some cases as much as 10 times and in other cases as much as 50 times. Again, the Minister says that right will be on the side of the employee. That is a taking away of rights, as is shown by the recommendations of the constitutional committee.

The Hon. FRANK BLEVINS: I point out that the provisions have been recommended to me by the employer bodies, because the employer bodies do not support crooks. This provision will catch the crooks or, hopefully, will prevent them being crooked as regards this particular industrial provision. I am surprised that the Opposition holds a contrary view to the employer bodies—that the crooks ought to be protected. The Government has no intention of continuing to protect them and decent business people in this State do not want to protect them either, because they have to compete with them and they want a level playing field. They want everybody to be playing the game honestly.

Amendment negatived; clause passed.

Remaining clauses (14 to 17), schedule and title passed.

Bill read a third time and passed.

ADJOURNMENT

The Hon. FRANK BLEVINS (Minister of Labour): I move:

That the House do now adjourn.

The Hon. D.C. WOTTON (Heysen): I want to take this opportunity to speak about a couple of matters of particular concern to me. The first one was brought to my notice last week and involves an organisation in the Hills that has been putting a considerable amount of effort into educating young people of various ages in how to protect themselves. It is a martial arts organisation and I was privileged last year to be able to attend one of their activities when many hundreds of young people were involved. The gentleman who contacted me advises me now that they are looking after some 1 000 young people through their various programs. It is a program that I support very strongly indeed.

I am sure all members in this House would recognise the need for young people to be taught to protect themselves and to be cautious in so many various areas. The concern I have is that these people were organising a special two-night program catering for a number of young people and they invited the police to send along a couple of representatives from the Crime Prevention Unit. When they first made the contact, it was agreed that this should happen. As a matter of fact, the police indicated their strong support for the program and suggested they would be very happy to go along. It was at a later stage that the police notified my constituent that they were unable to do this because, as

a result of a cut in funds, the number of people involved in this unit had been reduced and they were unable to attend such functions. As it happened, because of the dedication of these people involved, a couple of police officers attended in their own time, when they were off duty. I commend them particularly for taking that action. Officially, they were unable to attend because there were just not enough officers to go around given their responsibilities in the force. That concerns me considerably.

This is a very worthwhile program involving young people who can be helped, and we all realise that it is good to be able to push home to these young people the fact that they have to be careful about where they go and how they conduct themselves. Some of the shocking situations that have occurred in this city in recent months would suggest that that is the case. This organisation is trying to help those young people and is doing it very successfully but when it seeks assistance from the police, regrettably and through no fault of the police at all, they are unable to assist purely because of the lack of officers resulting from a cut in staff.

I would like the Minister responsible for police to investigate the situation and bring down a reply for me setting out the current status of the unit. I am not quite sure how many officers were originally in that section of the force but I, and I am sure all South Australians, recognise the importance of the unit. I would like to know why the Government has determined a lower priority for that unit. I ask the Minister to take up this issue as a matter of extreme urgency. I have indicated to the constituents who have contacted me that I will get back to them and advise them of the current status of the Crime Prevention Unit within the Police Force and its responsibilities.

The other matter I refer to is the Mount Lofty Ranges Watershed Supplementary Development Plan which is presently before the Subordinate Legislation Committee. This plan has had a chequered career. Members would probably realise that it has been brought in twice on an interim basis. We have concluded the second 12-month period in which it is to be treated on an interim basis. The plan has been described as a 'cracking a walnut with a sledgehammer' type of plan. Considerable concern has been expressed over a period of time by local government and communities generally throughout the Mount Lofty Ranges. We have been told continually that it is an interim measure; it has been suggested for quite some time that further steps are to be taken. In the past month or so we have learnt that a special study is to be carried out into the Mount Lofty Ranges and that this study will be concluded within two years and will cost \$2 million.

The interesting thing about this study is that it was originally announced more than 12 months ago. The departments involved in putting the study together just have not got their act together and it has been necessary for the Minister to reannounce this proposal and indicate that he now hopes it will be concluded in two years. I suggest that it will not be concluded in two years; it will probably be more like four years before finalisation of this study. I can guarantee that it will cost a lot more than \$2 million. In the meantime, we are looking at a supplementary development plan that is extremely harsh in relation to any form of development in the Mount Lofty Ranges. It lacks statistics. The data is just not available. There is little factual information, for example, from the E&WS Department suggesting why such stringent regulations have to be brought down. Local government has very little say, if any, in the type of development that should take place outside township boundaries within the Mount Lofty Ranges and continues to express concern about this. On the one hand, over

a period of time we have been saying that local government should have more say in what happens in its area.

Now, however, as a result of this plan, such issues are taken out of the hands of local government and all development controls rest with the State Planning Commission. I would not mind, and I know that local government in the area would not mind, if this was just a temporary measure, but the second 12-month period concluded in June, and we are now in an extraordinary position of having to rush the plan with some amendments back through the Subordinate Legislation Committee. We have been told that it must be dealt with within 21 days. The Subordinate Legislation Committee cannot meet while the Estimates Committees are sitting, so there will be very little time for evidence to be taken on this plan.

That is not good enough, and it is important that somebody should bring to the notice of the House that it is totally unacceptable. I know that the Minister will recognise the number of submissions that will be brought forward and I hope that he will take that on board when the Subordinate Legislation Committee completes its hearing into this supplementary development plan. I only hope that the committee will bring down its findings as quickly as possible and that the Minister recognises the urgency in finalising this matter.

Mr De LAINE (Price): In the short time available to me, I will speak about and pay a tribute to a wonderful person, a long-time identity of the Port Adelaide area and former Mayor of that city who passed away recently after a very long and fruitful life. I refer to Mrs Anna Rennie, JP. Mrs Rennie was born on 12 July 1899 as Anna Moir Rogers in Mingary, in the north of South Australia. In her early childhood she moved with her family to Quorn and later moved to Adelaide, where she trained as a nurse at the Royal Adelaide Hospital and was subsequently employed by one of the specialist doctors of the day, a Dr Southgood. In August 1923 she married George Rennie and had four children by that marriage.

Her husband, who was well known as Scottie in the Port area and in South Australia, was President of the Millers Union and a very active member of the community and of the trade union movement. From 1923 to 1926 Mrs Rennie resided in Rosewater and then at 38 Langham Place, Portland, from 1926 until her death this year. In 1923 she joined the Australian Labor Party and remained an active member of that Party for the remainder of her life. She was always extremely proud to be a member of the Australian Labor Party and even in her years of public and community work she always was pleased to make her membership known.

I will now outline some of the marvellous achievements of Mrs Rennie. She was one of that select band of people who become legends in their own lifetime. She was largely responsible for starting the Port Adelaide school band, raising money for uniforms and instruments whilst a member of the school committee. During the depression of the late 1920s and early 1930s she campaigned vigorously for improvements to the ration relief scheme, covering such matters as additional firewood for cooking, the inclusion of butter in the diet, assistance in rent money and the right of Port Adelaide people to obtain their rations from retailers of their own choice. These seem to be fairly fundamental rights but, in those days, for some reason best known to people of the time, Port Adelaide people did not have that choice as did people in other municipalities.

Another facet of Mrs Rennie's life was that she received tremendous support from her husband Scottie. Her whole family was very active in community and charitable acts.

From time to time, the Rennie household provided temporary housing for families who had been evicted from their houses or who were stranded overnight. Quite often that meant that the Rennie family shared beds so that other families might use theirs.

Mrs Rennie regularly provided additional clothing and home-cooked food for boys in the South Australian reformatory. She worked day and night for charitable, sporting and church organisations in the Port Adelaide district. She was heavily involved and, in some cases, primarily responsible for the establishment of many facilities in the Port Adelaide municipality for the young, the elderly, the destitute and ex-service personnel. That work involved the establishment of kindergartens, Housing Trust units for pensioners, children's playgrounds and elderly citizens clubs.

Mrs Rennie also helped to establish Meals on Wheels in Port Adelaide and was its first secretary. She virtually begged for saucepans, other equipment and food during the formative years of that marvellous organisation. Over a period of many years she was a member of the Port Adelaide Women's Service Association, holding the offices of Treasurer, Secretary and President at various times. She actively assisted the Reverend Bill Johnston to establish the Archway facility in Port Adelaide for those suffering from alcoholism. In its formative years, she begged for and obtained considerable quantities of second-hand furniture and other equipment for this worthy organisation. Almost until her death she continued to assist fundraising activities for this marvellous organisation, which prospers today.

In 1936-37 Mrs Rennie was President of the Labor Women's Organisation and was a great fighter for the principles of equal pay for women, national insurance, Government funded medical benefits and the manufacture of higher standard and quality of clothing for women and children. During the Second World War, whilst working for the Ministry of Munitions, she was Vice-President of the Housewives Association of South Australia and regularly broadcast to women over station 5AD on a vast range of subjects. Her aim was to give a better life to women and to lift their morale during those troubled years. She did a tremendous amount for women's issues and helped to lay an important foundation for the debate that occurred years later.

Mrs Rennie was elected to the Port Adelaide City Council in 1950 and, in so doing, became the first female councillor in South Australia. She served continuously on the council for 19 years, the last five as Mayor—also a first for South Australia. In 1963 Mrs Rennie was chosen as Woman of the Year for Port Adelaide and was an ardent campaigner for tax relief for pensioners, for the direct allocation of petrol tax to road construction costs, for better public conveniences for women and children and for the removal of the Portland rubbish dump from the vicinity of houses and sports fields to the noxious trades area. She was a Justice of the Peace for many years and assisted materially in adoption cases, the finding of employment for others and the arranging of accommodation for the needy.

Mrs Rennie was a member, office bearer, president, patron, life member, secretary, or whatever for innumerable charitable, sporting, social, welfare, ex-servicemen's, religious or cultural organisations. She was an untiring worker for the people of Port Adelaide and the Port Adelaide area for over 60 years. She was very active in the area and much loved by all who knew her. She was a marvellous person who helped the working people of Port Adelaide and surrounding districts, laying the foundation for much debate on women's issues that came along in later years. Mrs Anna Moir Rennie passed from this life on 26 June 1987 aged 87 years. She was indeed a wonderful woman.

The Hon. P.B. ARNOLD (Chaffey): Earlier today the member for Albert Park posed a question to the Minister of Marine in relation to the tragedy that occurred on Lake Alexandrina over the weekend. I, with all other members of this House, extend my sympathy to the families of those who were lost in that tragic accident. In response to the question, the Minister of Marine said that consideration would be given to the need for rescue craft to accompany such expeditions. I wholeheartedly support that concept and hope that something in that direction will eventuate. Certainly the waters of Lake Albert, Lake Alexandrina and, to a lesser extent, Lake Bonney at Barmera (if not any lake), can be extremely treacherous under the type of conditions that occurred at the weekend.

My involvement in sailing and power boating extends over 40 years and I have spent a number of years as Commodore of the Yacht Club and as President of the Water Ski Club. My first encounter with the lakes goes back to when I used to sail about 30 years ago in State title heat championships in the class in which I happened to be sailing at the time. Certainly the conditions were not understated by a number of locals in the Goolwa area. The vastness of the lakes and the fact that they are so shallow means that disastrous conditions can eventuate within a few moments. Any number of canoes, or a flotilla of any form of small boat led by instructors and venturing into open waters from the confines and shelter of the banks and islands, should be accompanied by not so much rescue boats but at least a back-up power vessel in the event of any emergency arising.

Certainly, the yacht clubs of South Australia have had a remarkable history of safety. Youngsters who commence sailing at the early age of seven or eight have training drilled into them, including procedures for when a yacht capsizes. The same training goes into canoeing and sailing. The major difference is that on any occasion that a yacht club is sailing it has at least one or two powered rescue craft on the water keeping an eye on bodies that are racing, particularly on the junior sailors. That is paramount in the operation of any yacht club.

Obviously the President or Commodore of a club is ultimately responsible for youngsters sailing on any given day. Decisions are taken prior to any race on whether or not juniors will be allowed to sail. I quote an article in today's *Advertiser* containing comments made by local people:

The deaths of two boys and a man, possibly two men, on Lake Alexandrina on Saturday night did not surprise locals. Since 1970 the deceptive waters have claimed an average of a life each year. A Meningie man who has been fishing the lake professionally for 50 years, Mr Eric Hayward, said yesterday locals had learnt the hard way to heed Bureau of Meteorology warnings and to stay well clear of Lake Alexandrina and nearby Lake Albert if squalls were expected. Even when the water was flat calm a squall could be moments away.

Mr Hayward said he had not taken his 14-metre fishing boat out on Saturday because of weather bureau gale warnings. Lake Alexandrina was a vast, shallow expanse of water, which 'a puff of wind' could whip up into a battery of choppy waves. Mr Hayward said the lake was only six metres at its deepest point. There was about two metres of water where the nine Scouts and two leaders had come to grief. In shallow water the wind had whipped up waves in seconds; sharp, high waves which followed each other only a metre apart.

He said each of the Souts six kayacks would have been battling up to three waves at a time. The water was icy cold, and even with life jackets the victims could not have survived long. A Meningie Sailing Club official, Mr Ian Grills, said Lake Alexandrina was a beautiful spot—'so long as you respect the water'. He said a lot of people did not realise how quickly the placid waters could be stirred by gusts of wind into a frenzy of two-metre waves. 'There have been many times I have gone out in the local sailing club's rescue boat and seen people in canoes and little rubber rafts, and they are not even wearing life-jackets,' he said.

I believe that the approach announced or suggested by the Minister this afternoon has a great deal of merit and in the long term can only help to prevent similar tragedies from occurring in the future. Certainly the Opposition will lend support to any move in that direction.

Motion carried.

At 5.55 p.m. the House adjourned until Wednesday 26 August at 2 p.m.

HOUSE OF ASSEMBLY

Tuesday 25 August 1987

QUESTIONS ON NOTICE

JOB CREATION

10. **Mr OLSEN** (on notice) asked the Minister of State Development and Technology: How many jobs is it estimated will be created in South Australia as a result of the Submarine Construction Project and, using the same criteria for assessing this impact, how many jobs have been created so far as a result of the Roxby Downs Project and the Stony Point Liquids Project?

The Hon. LYNN ARNOLD: The replies are as follows:
Submarine Construction Project:

It is difficult at this stage to estimate exactly how many new positions will be created in South Australia. This will only become clear after the subcontracts have been decided through the normal tendering process. However, there is little question that South Australian companies, being located close to the construction facility, are well placed to compete for work. To a large extent, the number of new positions created in South Australia will depend on the ability of South Australian industry to respond efficiently and effectively to open tenders. Estimated employment in South Australia, including jobs created through induced economic activity, should exceed 3 000 persons.

Roxby Downs:

Over 1 200 employees on site as at 30 June 1987.

Stony Point Liquids Project:

At the peak of construction over 3 000 jobs were created. The project has led to the creation of over 500 ongoing jobs directly involved with the operations, plus additional jobs involved with management of the project.

Mr JOHN MITCHELL

19. **Mr OLSEN** (on notice) asked the Premier: Has Mr John Mitchell, formerly Director of Promotions with the

Calendar Years	Station	Northern Carpark	Hotel	Convention Centre	Office Building	Landscaping Festival Way	High Voltage Plant	Central Energy Plant
1985.....	29	26	21	2	NIL	NIL	NIL	NIL
1986.....	34	28	113	29	NIL	36	48	48
*1987.....	21	NIL	14	2	9	NIL	NIL	NIL

* Figures as at 12 August 1987

The provided figures are divided into individual work-site areas but are not necessarily exclusive. For example, the 1986 figures for the high voltage plant and central energy plant obviously centred on the same dispute. For that reason, no total figure should be quoted due to potential mis-interpretation.

ANNUAL REPORTS

27. **Mr OLSEN** (on notice) asked the Deputy Premier: In relation to the following reports—South Australian Metropolitan Fire Service, 1985-86, Engineering and Water Supply Department, 1985-86, and Department of Environment and Planning, 1985-86—

1—

- (a) how many copies were printed;
- (b) how many were distributed to State Government departments, agencies or authorities;
- (c) how many copies have not yet been distributed; and

Jubilee 150 Board, been awarded contract work for the board and, if so, has he resigned from the Public Service to undertake this work, does the work include writing a history of the Jubilee 150 and, if it does, was this work first put out to tender and, if not, why not and what is the estimated cost of this work, when will it be published and by whom?

The Hon. J.C. BANNON: No. Mr John Mitchell has not been awarded contract work by the Jubilee 150 Board; that organisation has been wound up and Mr Mitchell, in lieu of returning to the Department of the Premier and Cabinet, has been given leave without pay to enable him to undertake promotional work for the Australian Bicentenary Authority. He has a contract with the ABA which provides for part-time commitment to their work and allows supplemental private contracts to be undertaken.

The State Government is expecting a formal report from the Jubilee 150 Board for the year ending 30 June 1987 in accordance with its Act, but Mr George Mulvaney is doing that work free of charge. Some former Jubilee 150 Board members recently obtained permission to produce for sale a privately sponsored illustrated souvenir booklet of the Jubilee activities in the calendar year 1986. I have no knowledge as to whether they have engaged the services of Mr Mitchell in this connection or indeed of any other details requested.

ASER

25. **Mr OLSEN** (on notice) asked the Minister of Labour: How many working days have been lost due to industrial disputation on the ASER project site in each of the years 1983-84 to 1986-87?

The Hon. FRANK BLEVINS: Work on the ASER project commenced on 6 January 1985. Figures for 1983 to 1984 are obviously not applicable. It is also indicated that the figures below represent actual days lost through disputation and not man hours lost.

(d) what was the total cost of production including photography, writing, typesetting, design and printing?

2—If the report was printed by the Government Printer, were quotations for the work first sought from commercial printers and, if so, what were those quotations, and, if not, why not?

The Hon. D.J. HOPGOOD: The replies are as follows:

1—

(a) 400 (SAMFS), 1 050 (E&WS), 1 175 (E&P)

(b) 29 (SAMFS), 305 (E&WS), 1 115 (E&P)

(c) 5 (SAMFS), 260 (E&WS), 20 (E&P)

(d) \$6 272 (SAMFS), \$15 563.77 (E&WS), \$22 110 (E&P)

2—The reports for each of the three agencies were printed by the Government Printer. In each case no other quotations were sought due to Government guidelines requiring that printing work be directed to the Government Printer.

33. **Mr OLSEN** (on notice) asked the Minister of Mines and Energy: In relation to the following reports—Pipelines

Authority of South Australia, 1985-86, and Department of Mines and Energy, 1985-86—

1—

- (a) how many copies were printed;
- (b) how many were distributed to State Government departments, agencies or authorities;
- (c) how many copies have not yet been distributed; and
- (d) what was the total cost of production including photography, writing, typesetting, design and printing?

2—If the report was printed by the Government Printer, were quotations for the work first sought from commercial printers and, if so, what were those quotations, and, if not, why not?

The Hon. R.G. PAYNE: The replies are as follows:

Department of Mines and Energy

1—

- (a) 2 000 copies
- (b) 70 copies
- (c) 88 copies
- (d) \$12 316

2—

- (a) No.
- (b) No quotations were sought from commercial printers pursuant to Premiers Department Circular No. 18.

Pipelines Authority of S.A.

1—

- (a) 1 500 copies
- (b) 57 copies
- (c) 273 copies
- (d) \$8 594

2—

- (a) Yes
- (b) All tenders submitted are considered confidential and are therefore not available for publication.

GOVERNMENT VEHICLES

47. **Mr OLSEN** (on notice) asked the Minister of Labour: How many officers in the following departments have a 'permanent' or 'regular' allocation of a Government vehicle for travel between home and the office under the criteria detailed in Circular Number, 30 dated 16 June 1987, from the Commissioner for Public Employment: Department of Labour, Department of Personnel and Industrial Relations and Department of Correctional Services?

The Hon. FRANK BLEVINS: the reply is as follows:

Department of Labour 67; Department of Personnel and Industrial Relations 5; and Department of Correctional Services 17.

MINISTERIAL STAFF

50. **Mr OLSEN** (on notice) asked the Premier:

1. How many ministerial officers were employed in each of the Minister's offices in the years 1985-86 and 1986-87?
2. What was the total amount of salaries paid to those officers in each year?
3. What expenses were incurred by the Minister's staff in each of the years 1985-86 and 1986-87 in entertaining media representatives?

The Hon. J.C. BANNON: The replies are as follows:

1. and 2. See answers to question 292 in *Hansard* 14 April 1987, pages 4210 and 4211.

3. An allocation is made for entertainment expenses as part of each departmental budget and expenses incurred by Minister's staff is kept within that budget.

51. **Mr OLSEN** (on notice) asked the Deputy Premier:

1. How many ministerial officers were employed in each of the Minister's offices in the years 1985-86 and 1986-87?
2. What was the total amount of salaries paid to those officers in each year?
3. What expenses were incurred by the Minister's staff in each of the years 1985-86 and 1986-87 in entertaining media representatives?

The Hon. D. J. HOPGOOD: The replies are as follows:

1. and 2. See answers to question 292 in *Hansard* of 14 April 1987, pages 4210 and 4211.

3. An allocation is made for entertainment expenses as part of each departmental budget and expenses incurred by Minister's staff are kept within that budget.

52. **Mr OLSEN** (on notice) asked the Minister of Education, representing the Attorney-General:

1. How many ministerial officers were employed in each of the Minister's offices in the years 1985-86 and 1986-87?
2. What was the total amount of salaries paid to those officers in each year?
3. What expenses were incurred by the Minister's staff in each of the years 1985-86 and 1986-87 in entertaining media representatives?

The Hon. G. J. CRAFTER: The replies are as follows:

1. and 2. See answers to question 292 in *Hansard* of 14 April 1987, pages 4210 and 4211.

3. An allocation is made for entertainment expenses as part of each departmental budget and expenses incurred by Minister's staff are kept within that budget.

53. **Mr OLSEN** (on notice) asked the Minister of Lands:

1. How many ministerial officers were employed in each of the Minister's offices in the years 1985-86 and 1986-87?
2. What was the total amount of salaries paid to those officers in each year?
3. What expenses were incurred by the Minister's staff in each of the years 1985-86 and 1986-87 in entertaining media representatives?

The Hon. R. K. ABBOTT: The replies are as follows:

1. and 2. See answers to question 292 in *Hansard* of 14 April 1987, pages 4210 and 4211.

3. An allocation is made for entertainment expenses as part of each departmental budget and expenses incurred by Minister's staff are kept within that budget.

54. **Mr OLSEN** (on notice) asked the Minister of Transport, representing the Minister of Health:

1. How many ministerial officers were employed in each of the Minister's offices in the years 1985-86 and 1986-87?
2. What was the total amount of salaries paid to those officers in each year?
3. What expenses were incurred by the Minister's staff in each of the years 1985-86 and 1986-87 in entertaining media representatives?

The Hon. G.F. KENEALLY: The replies are as follows:

1. and 2. See answers to question 292 in *Hansard* of 14 April 1987, pages 4210 and 4211.

3. An allocation is made for entertainment expenses as part of each departmental budget and expenses incurred by Minister's staff are kept within that budget.

55. **Mr OLSEN** (on notice) asked the Minister of State Development and Technology:

1. How many ministerial officers were employed in each of the Minister's offices in the years 1985-86 and 1986-87?
2. What was the total amount of salaries paid to those officers in each year?

3. What expenses were incurred by the Minister's staff in each of the years 1985-86 and 1986-87 in entertaining media representatives?

The Hon. LYNN ARNOLD: The replies are as follows:

1. and 2. See answers to question 292 in *Hansard* of 14 April 1987, pages 4210 and 4211.

3. An allocation is made for entertainment expenses as part of each departmental budget and expenses incurred by Minister's staff are kept within that budget.

56. **Mr OLSEN** (on notice) asked the Minister of Transport:

1. How many ministerial officers were employed in each of the Minister's offices in the years 1985-86 and 1986-87?

2. What was the total amount of salaries paid to those officers in each year?

3. What expenses were incurred by the Minister's staff in each of the years 1985-86 and 1986-87 in entertaining media representatives?

The Hon. G.F. KENEALLY: The replies are as follows:

1. and 2. See answers to question 292 in *Hansard* of 14 April 1987, pages 4210 and 4211.

3. An allocation is made for entertainment expenses as part of each departmental budget and expenses incurred by Minister's staff are kept within that budget.

57. **Mr OLSEN** (on notice) asked the Minister of Mines and Energy:

1. How many ministerial officers were employed in each of the Minister's offices in the years 1985-86 and 1986-87?

2. What was the total amount of salaries paid to those officers in each year?

3. What expenses were incurred by the Minister's staff in each of the years 1985-86 and 1986-87 in entertaining media representatives?

The Hon. R.G. PAYNE: The replies are as follows:

1. and 2. See answers to question 292 in *Hansard* of 14 April 1987, pages 4210 and 4211.

3. An allocation is made for entertainment expenses as part of each departmental budget and expenses incurred by Minister's staff are kept within that budget.

58. **Mr OLSEN** (on notice) asked the Minister of Education:

1. How many ministerial officers were employed in each of the Minister's offices in the years 1985-86 and 1986-87?

2. What was the total amount of salaries paid to those officers in each year?

3. What expenses were incurred by the Minister's staff in each of the years 1985-86 and 1986-87 in entertaining media representatives?

The Hon. G.J. CRAFTER: The replies are as follows:

1. and 2. See answers to question 292 in *Hansard* of 14 April 1987, pages 4210 and 4211.

3. An allocation is made for entertainment expenses as part of each departmental budget and expenses incurred by Minister's staff are kept within that budget.

59. **Mr OLSEN** (on notice) asked the Minister of Housing and Construction:

1. How many ministerial officers were employed in each of the Minister's offices in the years 1985-86 and 1986-87?

2. What was the total amount of salaries paid to those officers in each year?

3. What expenses were incurred by the Minister's staff in each of the years 1985-86 and 1986-87 in entertaining media representatives?

The Hon. T.H. HEMMINGS: The replies are as follows:

1. and 2. See answers to question 292 in *Hansard* of 14 April 1987, pages 4210 and 4211.

3. An allocation is made for entertainment expenses as part of each departmental budget and expenses incurred by Minister's staff are kept within that budget.

60. **Mr OLSEN** (on notice) asked the Minister of Labour:

1. How many ministerial officers were employed in each of the Minister's offices in the years 1985-86 and 1986-87?

2. What was the total amount of salaries paid to those officers in each year?

3. What expenses were incurred by the Minister's staff in each of the years 1985-86 and 1986-87 in entertaining media representatives?

The Hon. FRANK BLEVINS: The replies are as follows:

1. and 2. See answers to question 292 in *Hansard* of 14 April 1987, pages 4210 and 4211.

3. An allocation is made for entertainment expenses as part of each departmental budget and expenses incurred by Minister's staff are kept within that budget.

61. **Mr OLSEN** (on notice) asked the Minister of Transport, representing the Minister of Tourism:

1. How many ministerial officers were employed in each of the Minister's offices in the years 1985-86 and 1986-87?

2. What was the total amount of salaries paid to those officers in each year?

3. What expenses were incurred by the Minister's staff in each of the years 1985-86 and 1986-87 in entertaining media representatives?

The Hon. G.F. KENEALLY: The replies are as follows:

1. and 2. See answers to question 292 in *Hansard* of 14 April 1987, pages 4210 and 4211.

3. An allocation is made for entertainment expenses as part of each departmental budget and expenses incurred by Minister's staff are kept within that budget.

62. **Mr OLSEN** (on notice) asked the Minister of Agriculture:

1. How many ministerial officers were employed in each of the Minister's offices in the years 1985-86 and 1986-87?

2. What was the total amount of salaries paid to those officers in each year?

3. What expenses were incurred by the Minister's staff in each of the years 1985-86 and 1986-87 in entertaining media representatives?

The Hon. M.K. MAYES: The replies are as follows:

1. and 2. See answers to question 292 in *Hansard* of 14 April 1987, pages 4210 and 4211.

3. An allocation is made for entertainment expenses as part of each departmental budget and expenses incurred by Ministers' staff are kept within that budget.

DISASTER PLAN FOR SCHOOLS

66. **Mr OLSEN** (on notice) asked the Minister of Emergency Services: Has the Government ensured that every school and kindergarten has a disaster plan incorporated into local and regional plans, as promised by the Premier in a statement on 16 February 1984 and, if not, why not?

The Hon. D.J. HOPGOOD: In early 1986, copies of a new standard emergency warning signal to be used on radio and television to precede a warning announcement of disasters such as bushfires, floods or release of hazardous chemicals, was distributed to all schools and kindergartens. In February 1987, a summary of the Joint Emergency Services State Fire Combating Plan was issued to all schools and kindergartens within the Education Department per the medium of the *Education Gazette*. The Independent Schools Board and the Catholic Education Office were also provided with a copy of the summary of the plan.

Most Kindergartens and Education Department Schools have, in conjunction with State Emergency Service Officers, undertaken basic fire and emergency planning. Some Catholic schools in the northern areas of the State have developed disaster plans. Currently all SES officers are working on detailed divisional counter disaster plans in which the specific requirements for all schools and kindergartens will be addressed.

ABORIGINAL EMPLOYMENT

83. **Mr OLSEN** (on notice) asked the Premier: In relation to the Premier's statement on 27 September 1984 that the Government would boost employment opportunities for Aboriginal people within the Public Service—

- (a) how many Aborigines have been employed within the Public Service since that statement; and
- (b) how many Aborigines are now employed in the Public Service and what proportion of total Public Service employment does this represent?

The Hon. J.C. BANNON: I refer the honourable member to the 1985-86 Annual Report of the Public Service Board.

EMPLOYMENT OF WOMEN

84. **Mr OLSEN** (on notice) asked the Premier: Following the Premier's announcement on 22 November 1983 that the Government would recruit an officer to promote and develop projects to employ women—

- (a) when did that officer take up the position;
- (b) which department has the officer been attached to; and
- (c) has the officer carried out a promotion campaign in metropolitan and rural areas to help sponsor and develop projects involving women, particularly in target groups such as youth, long term unemployed, Aboriginal, ethnic and disabled and, if so, how many such projects have been developed and what are the results?

The Hon. J.C. BANNON: The replies are as follows:

- (a) The officer commenced in the position on 9 January 1984. Cabinet subsequently approved a 12 month extension to the project, which expired early in 1986.
- (b) The Women's Advisers Office, Department of the Premier and Cabinet.
- (c) The officer conducted intensive and wide ranging promotion of women's participation in job creation schemes, in particular the Community Employment Program. As a result of the officer's work in mid 1984, the Premier publicly launched a State-wide publicity campaign to encourage women to join job creation schemes. (The participation level of women in the Community Employment Program rose from under 20 per cent to approximately 50 per cent.)

Projects established during the period included the highly successful Young Women's Sub-program. The third of these Young Women's Sub-programs is currently under way. Other target groups were successfully included in a range of Community Employment Program projects over the period. Visits were made to Whyalla, Port Augusta, Naracoorte, Mount Gambier, and surrounding areas as part of the project.

Women's participation in the Community

Employment Program (which is now being wound down), is being monitored closely by the Community Employment Program Consultative Committee chaired by the Department of Employment Education and Training. Since the expiry of the officer's contract, the interests in women have been represented in this committee by the Women's Adviser to the Premier and the Director of the Working Women's Centre. The participation of women in other employment training and job creation schemes is also now promoted and monitored directly by the Office of Employment and Training, which administers these schemes as part of the Youth Employment Scheme package.

ASER

85. **Mr OLSEN** (on notice) asked the Premier:

- 1. When the agreement for the ASER project was signed in October 1983, what was the estimated capitalised cost of the car park within the project?
- 2. What is the capitalised cost of the car park upon which the government rental is based?

The Hon. J.C. BANNON: The replies are as follows:

- 1. In October 1983 there was no separate cost estimate for the planned 800 car parking spaces in the ASER Project. All figures were incorporated into the total estimated cost of the Government listed components.
- 2. The final cost of the 1 217 car parking spaces now being provided is estimated to be \$16.9 million.

100. **Mr OLSEN** (on notice) asked the Premier: In relation to the ASER project and the estimate given in a letter to the Leader of the Opposition dated 29 March 1984 that seven years after the completion of the project, Kumagai's outstanding loan would be \$29 million, is this still the Government's estimate of Kumagai's outstanding loan and, if so, on what assessment of capital requirements and income expectations is it based and, if not, what is the latest estimate and upon what assessment of capital requirements and income expectations is this latest estimate based?

The Hon. J.C. BANNON: The \$29 million loan estimate provided in March 1984 related to an assessment of the Government's potential liability in respect of their guarantee of the Kumagai loan.

As advised on other occasions, no guarantee is now required by Kumagai, and the amount of any loan estimate is not known by the Government, nor is it relevant.

101. **Mr OLSEN** (on notice) asked the Premier: In accordance with clause 2 (d) of the Agreement signed between the Government, Kumagai Gumi Co. Ltd and the South Australian Superannuation Fund Investment Trust on 1 October 1983 has the ASER Property Trust asked the Government to sublease up to 11 000 square metres of office space in the commercial office building being constructed as part of the ASER project and, if so:

- (a) what is the estimated cost of the lease in its first year;
- (b) when is it expected that the building will be ready for occupation; and
- (c) which Government departments will be relocated to these premises?

The Hon. J.C. BANNON: Yes. The Government has subsequently advised ASER Nominees that it will not be taking up its option to lease space in the office building. The remainder of the reply is as follows:

- (a) Not applicable.

- (b) Mid 1988.
(c) Not applicable.

ELECTRICITY SUPPLY

105. **Mr S.J. BAKER** (on notice) asked the Minister of Mines and Energy:

1. What is the estimated cost of the capital infrastructure required to establish the electricity grid for power sharing with Victoria and how will this be financed?

2. What guarantees have been provided by way of written agreements concerning the supply of electricity during peak loads in South Australia?

3. Over the past three years, how many occasions have there been when the peak loads in South Australia have coincided with those in Victoria (including a range of plus/minus 100 megawatts from the peak)?

The Hon. R.G. PAYNE: The replies are as follows:

1. ETSA's estimated share of the cost of the project is \$83.9 million. The trust does not separately fund individual projects but rather establishes an overall capital works program with funds being provided from both internal sources and borrowings.

2. The basic agreement, and all arrangements made so far between the three States, is for opportunity interchange of energy which is of mutual benefit to each part in the transaction. Opportunity transfer permits electricity to be purchased by one authority from another when the first authority has capacity available to generate electricity for sale at a price lower than that at which the second could generate from its own available plant. There is no guarantee that electricity will be available for this purpose at any particular time but, on the occasions that it is, the savings are expected to be significant.

3. The peak electrical demand in South Australia generally occurs during the hot summer months, whereas Victoria's peak demand occurs in the winter months. The seasonal opportunities for interchange are therefore significant.

GRAND PRIX

109. **Mr S.J. BAKER** (on notice) asked the Premier: What was the final net cost to the State of staging the 1986 Grand Prix and how does this compare with 1985?

The Hon. J.C. BANNON: I refer the honourable member to the reports of the Australian Formula One Grand Prix Board for 1986, tabled on 12 August 1987; and for 1985, tabled on 25 March 1986.

PANORAMA TAFE

110. **Mr S.J. BAKER** (on notice) asked the Minister of Employment and Further Education: At the commencement of 1988, how many positions will be available in TAFE colleges for courses of fitting and machining and tool making and what will be the net impact of the closure of these courses at Panorama TAFE?

The Hon. LYNN ARNOLD: The department plans to maintain the current number of student positions in both courses State-wide in 1988. The 1987 student enrolment data is not yet available and consequently the department is unable to provide specific information as requested. The department is in the process of rationalising the number of locations at which fitting and machining and toolmaking

courses are to be offered. An indepth review has recommended the closure of fitting and machining and toolmaking courses at Panorama and the transfer of these resources to other colleges within the metropolitan area. It is planned to relocate the toolmaking course to Regency college and disperse fitting and machining courses at Regency, Elizabeth and Noarlunga colleges.

The relocation will enable the department to take advantage of economies of scale at the other three colleges, to replace some old equipment State-wide, to reduce annual major equipment costs, and to further utilise the high technology equipment available at Regency college. The department is confident educational standards will be maintained and believes that students will not be disadvantaged through the closure of these courses at Panorama. As part of its plan to upgrade fabrication education and training in South Australia the department will at Panorama college, as from 1 January 1988 replace the School of Technical Studies with the School of Fabrication Engineering. In keeping with its role as a special school—a centre of excellence in fabrication—the school will be allocated special funds to enable it to provide a State-wide focus in the area and play a major role in the preparation of skilled personnel for anticipated major construction projects.

LAND TAX REBATE

113. **Mr S.J. BAKER** (on notice) asked the Treasurer: What is the estimated revenue windfall to the Government in 1987-88 resulting from the removal of the land tax rebate?

The Hon. J.C. BANNON: The matter will be dealt with in the budget which will be handed down later this week.

ASER

120. **Mr OLSEN** (on notice) asked the Minister of Labour: How many working days have been lost due to industrial disputation on the ASER Project site in each of the years 1983-84 to 1986-87?

The Hon. FRANK BLEVINS: I refer the honourable member to the answer of question on notice No. 25.

SOUTH AUSTRALIAN ENTERPRISE FUND

134. **Mr OLSEN** (on notice) asked the Premier: How many jobs is it estimated have been created as a result of investments by the South Australian Enterprise Fund in each of the years 1984-85 to 1986-87 and, how much was invested by the fund in each of those years?

The Hon. J.C. BANNON: Following extensive study and consultation with industry and other interested parties the South Australian Enterprise Fund was established in 1984 as a public listed company, Enterprise Investments (South Australia) Limited. The Treasurer maintains a minority shareholding in the company which has made a number of investments in South Australian companies. The annual reports of the company are available from its registered office and these reports include the details requested of investments made.

STUDENTS' BUS PASSES

143. **The Hon. D.C. WOTTON** (on notice) asked the Minister of Transport: Why has it been necessary to intro-

duce a system where both the school is required to stamp, and parents sign, a student's bus pass before that pass can become operational?

The Hon. G.F. KENEALLY: The replies are as follows:

1.—

(a) Schools are required to stamp the pass as proof of attendance at an authorised educational institution.

(b) Students are required to sign as proof of identity, as the pass is not transferable.

(c) Parents are not required to sign the pass.

2. This system of application was introduced to reduce instances of abuse of student concessional travel.

further preserved or enhanced. Major changes will not be made to the boundary to accommodate urban expansion or new urban growth areas for metropolitan Adelaide because of—

1. the extreme bushfire hazards in the area;

2. the high costs of developing services in the area; and

3. the Government's desire to preserve the character and amenity of the area. The value of the hills face zone to the metropolitan area was probably best summed up in the 1962 development plan where it was stated:

The proximity of the ranges to a large population and the natural beauty of the face of the ranges visible from the entire metropolitan area provide Adelaide with its greatest natural asset.

BLACK HILL NATIVE FLORA PARK

145. **The Hon. D.C. WOTTON** (on notice) asked the Minister for Environment and Planning:

1. What is the precise role of the Black Hill Native Flora Park since being transferred from the National Parks and Wildlife Service to the Botanic Gardens?

2. How many people are currently employed at Black Hill and what is each person's position?

The Hon. D.J. HOPGOOD: The replies are as follows:

1. The Black Hill Native Flora Park has not been transferred to the Botanic Gardens, only the administration building, nursery complex and surrounding area now referred to as the Black Hill Flora Centre. The role of this centre continues as before. Research is being conducted into propagation of native species, the development of native plants as flowering pot plants, and investigation into problems surrounding the germination of seeds of native species. In addition, a large proportion of the routine propagation formerly undertaken at Adelaide Botanic Garden is now being done at Black Hill. Twice yearly plant sales will be held at Black Hill to allow the public, and industry, access to plants, both native and exotic, not normally available within the horticulture industry.

2. One Scientific Officer Grade III (Officer-in-Charge); one Technical Officer Grade III; one part-time Scientific Officer Grade I (until 31.12.87); two (2) Senior Plant Propagators; one Senior Gardener.

Two (2) Local Government Apprentices (learning propagation techniques);

One Junior Nurseryhand (appointed on a temporary basis through Commonwealth Government funding).

A member of the technical staff from the Adelaide Botanic Garden spends a small proportion of his time at Black Hill undertaking routine work on seed testing.

A part-time officer, under contract for one year is examining floral biology as a result of being the successful applicant for the board of the Botanic Gardens research grant.

HILLS FACE ZONE

147. **The Hon. D.C. WOTTON** (on notice) asked the Minister for Environment and Planning: Does the Government have any plans either by way of an inquiry or by any other means to amend the boundaries of the hills face zone and, if so, when will this occur?

The Hon. D.J. HOPGOOD: The Government does not intend to initiate another major inquiry into the hills face zone boundary similar to the Roder inquiry carried out in 1979-82. However, minor changes to the boundary will be implemented from time to time through supplementary development plans where the character of the zone can be

NEIGHBOURHOOD WATCH SCHEME

153. **The Hon. D.C. WOTTON** (on notice) asked the Minister of Emergency Services:

1. Which districts in the metropolitan area are currently involved in the Neighbourhood Watch Scheme?

2. Which country districts have—

(a) applies to become involved; and

(b) have become involved,

in the Scheme and when it is intended that those who have applied will be accepted?

The Hon. D.J. HOPGOOD: The replies are as follows:

1. Aberfoyle Park, Ascot Park, Blair Athol, Brooklyn Park, Brooklyn Park East, Christie Downs, Croydon Park, Edwardstown, Elizabeth Downs, Elizabeth East, Elizabeth North, Findon, Flinders Park, Gilberton, Glenelg East, Glenelg North, Goodwood, Hackham East, Hallett Cove East, Hallett Cove West, Henley Beach North, Henley Beach South, Ingle Farm, Kensington, Lockleys, Magill, Marion, Mile End, Modbury Heights, Morphett Vale, North Adelaide, North Haven, Parkside, Plympton Park, Prospect, Salisbury East, Salisbury North, Semaphore, St. Peters, Tea Tree Gully, Trott Park, West Lakes Shore, Woodville North.

2. (a) Murray Bridge, Port Augusta, Port Lincoln.

(b) The Murray Bridge scheme commenced with a public meeting on 29 July 1987 and is expected to be fully operational by late September 1987.

Both Port Lincoln and Port Augusta are well advanced in the planning stage, but no specific date has yet been set for the commencement of their respective programmes.

SOUTH AUSTRALIAN GOVERNMENT FINANCING AUTHORITY

158. **Mr BECKER** (on notice) asked the Premier: How much has the South Australian Government Financing Authority borrowed from overseas and what are the details of interest rates, terms and annual repayments?

The Hon. J.C. BANNON: I refer the member to the Annual Report of the South Australian Government Financing Authority.

ETSA

173. **Mr BECKER** (on notice) asked the Minister of Mines and Energy:

1. Did ETSA let a waste management contract in the preceding twelve months to a higher tenderer rather than the lowest tenderer and, if so why?

2. Did ETSA's Angle Park Depot complain to management about the services provided by the successful tenderer

during the previous period and, if so, why was the same tenderer successful again?

The Hon. R.G. PAYNE: The replies are as follows:

1. No. Although the selected tenderer submitted a price which was marginally higher for one aspect of the contract than another tenderer, his overall price was the lowest.
2. No.

HOME LOAN INTEREST RATES

174. **Mr BECKER** (on notice) asked the Premier: Is the Premier aware of the conflicting statements made by the Managing Director of the State Bank of South Australia reported in *Australian Business* 10 June 1987 saying "Housing loans should be totally deregulated" and the Minister of Housing and Construction in the September/October 1985 issue of *Housing Trust News* saying "A call for deregulation of home loan interest rates by the Housing Industry Association was illogical and morally wrong" and, if so, what is the Government's policy on the matter?

The Hon. J. C. BANNON: Yes, I am aware of the statements. The Managing Director of the State Bank of South Australia was speaking in his capacity as a banker, while the Minister of Housing and Construction was reflecting Government policy.

ACCESS CABS

179. **Mr BECKER** (on notice) asked the Minister of Transport:

1. Are access cabs insured as ambulances by SGIC?
2. Have all the relevant details of the operation of Access Cabs been given to SGIC as is now required by law and, if not, why not?
3. If an able bodied person is injured or suffers damage due to an accident caused by an Access Cab whilst it is operating as an ordinary taxi, will that cab be covered by insurance?
4. In the event of breaches of the disclosure provisions in insurance legislation, and if there is no insurance cover when an Access Cab is not acting as an "ambulance", will the Government underwrite "Access Cabs" and indemnify any third person?

The Hon. G. F. KENEALLY: The replies are as follows:

1. Access cabs are not ambulances. Access cabs are comprehensively insured at rates set by SGIC through private brokers.
2. Yes.
3. Yes.
4. Third party provisions are covered by comprehensive insurance.

SOUTH AUSTRALIAN MUSEUM MOTOR VEHICLES

182. **Mr BECKER** (on notice) asked the Minister for the Arts:

1. Has the matter of stolen equipment (including winches for a motor vehicle), stolen camping gear and the unnecessary and illegal use of motor vehicles assigned to the South Australian Museum been reported to the Police and, if not, why not?
2. How many persons have been reported to the Minister involving the stripping of equipment and illegal use of Museum motor vehicles and camping gear in the past 12

months and what action has been taken by the Department for the Arts over these incidents?

The Hon. J. C. BANNON: The replies are as follows:

1. Yes.
2. None. I understand, however, that one member of staff made three allegations against another in a report to the police. Each allegation was investigated and each was reported to be unfounded.

WAKEFIELD PRESS

183. **The Hon. B. C. EASTICK** (on notice) asked the Premier:

1. Has a contract been finalised and signed for the sale of Wakefield Press to the *Adelaide Review* and, if not, why not and, if so—

- (a) what are the precise terms of supply of goods by the Government Printer;
- (b) what are the precise terms of payment by the *Adelaide Review*;
- (c) what are the precise terms of commissions to the *Adelaide Review* and the Government Printer; and
- (d) what are the precise terms of payments expected to be paid by the Government Printer to the Government.

2. Has there been any adverse reaction to the sale of Wakefield Press to the *Adelaide Review* brought to the notice of the Government by—

- (a) authors of Wakefield Press owned books;
- (b) owners of agency books; and
- (c) resellers,

and, if so, what has been the nature of such reactions and the consequences?

3. Have any authors sought to buy their books from Wakefield Press ownership, depriving the *Adelaide Review* of sales and, if so, what titles, for what reasons and, what is the attitude of the *Adelaide Review*?

4. Have any owners of agency books withdrawn their books from sale by the *Adelaide Review* and, if so, what titles, for what reasons and, what is the attitude of the *Adelaide Review*?

5. Has any financial embarrassment caused to owners of agency books because of the sale of Wakefield Press been brought to the notice of the Government and, if so—

- (a) in relation to what titles and what are the details of such hardship; and
- (b) what action is being taken by the Government to alleviate the situation?

6. What capacity does the *Adelaide Review* possess for maintaining a continuing sales drive?

7. Does the *Adelaide Review* have the right to pick and choose titles it will handle for sale?

8. Has the Government considered withdrawing the sale of Wakefield Press from the *Adelaide Review* and, if not, why not?

9. What has been the effect on sales volume of the sale of Wakefield Press?

10. Has the Government considered the appointment of a second agent to operate in competition with the *Adelaide Review* and, if not, why not?

11. In relation to the requirement that the Government Printer is to store stocks, what are the precise financial arrangements to alleviate his costs on Wakefield Press and agency stocks, respectively, and are such arrangements sufficient to cover his total costs?

The Hon. J. C. BANNON: The answers to the honourable member's question are contained in my letter to him of 21 July 1987.

PUBLIC RELATIONS CONSULTANT

187. **Mr BECKER** (on notice) asked the Minister of Correctional Services: Does the Department of Correctional Services have a public relations consultant or similar person on its staff and, if so, why, what are the terms, conditions and annual salary and allowances of such appointee and when was the position first created?

The Hon. FRANK BELVINS: The Department of Correctional Services created the position of a coordinator of Public Relations and Publicity in May 1984. The incumbent is responsible for all aspects of public relations, publicity and communications for the department, including the preparation of the annual report, publications, arrangements for media coverage of departmental projects, arrangement of displays and exhibitions and selection of appropriate publicity methods to suit departmental needs.

The coordinator is required to devise, initiate and manage projects aimed at achieving a greater understanding of the role of the Department of Correctional Services by the

community at large. The officer is not a departmental spokesperson, and all media inquiries relating to matters which are Government policy are directed to the Minister's Office. The position of coordinator of Public Relations and Publicity for the Department of Correctional Services is gazetted as PP3, with an annual salary range of \$30 430 to \$33 034. There are no special conditions or allowances for the position.

CORRECTIONAL OFFICERS FUND

188. **Mr BECKER** (on notice) asked the Minister of Correctional Services:

1. What is the Minister's reply to Mr L. Eddie's letter of 6 August on behalf of the Correctional Officers Fund?

2. Why were the remarks made by a Mr T. Haley, an ex-prisoner, alleging the recent riot at Yatala was caused by officers not publicly challenged within 48 hours?

The Hon. FRANK BLEVINS: The replies are as follows:

1. Correspondence between my office and Mr Eddie is confidential and I suggest that contact be made with him to ascertain my reply.

2. Remarks made by Mr T. Haley were challenged within 48 hours.