HOUSE OF ASSEMBLY

Wednesday 24 August 1988

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

PETITION: HOUSING TRUST RENTALS

A petition signed by 465 residents of Port Lincoln praying that the House urge the Government to reject the proposed rental increases for tenants of the South Australian Housing Trust was presented by Mr Blacker.

Petition received.

QUESTION

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

MURRAY RIVER

In reply to the **Hon. P.B. ARNOLD** (18 August).

The Hon. SUSAN LENEHAN: Over the next three years it is estimated that a total of $1.085 million is to be spent on salinity investigations as follows:

	($'000)		
	1988-89	1989-90	1990-91
Waikerie	220	220	—
Loxton	160	180	—
Private Irrigation Areas	60	60	60
Chowilla	80	—	—
Ranfurly Wargan	45	—	—
	565	460	60

Each of the three States will contribute one-sixth of these costs with the Commonwealth contributing the remaining 50 per cent. The estimated contributions for salinity investigation over the next three years are as follows:

	($'000)		
	1988-89	1989-90	1990-91
Commonwealth	282.5	230	30
New South Wales	94.17	76.67	10
Victoria	94.17	76.67	10
South Australia	94.17	76.67	10
	565.01	460.01	60

During the same period it is anticipated that, subject to normal investigation and approval processes, including environmental assessment, a total of $28.375 million will be spent on the following salinity construction works:

	($'000)		
	1988-89	1989-90	1990-91
Murray Cliffs	500	2 000	—
Baronga	80	—	—
Mildura/Merbein	250	565	—
Woolpunda	6 000	8 000	8 700
Waikerie	—	—	2 000
Chowilla	—	—	—
Loxton	—	—	280
	6 830	10 565	10 980

For these works each of the three States and the Commonwealth will contribute one-quarter of the costs. The estimated contribution to construction works is as follows:

	($'000)		
	1988-89	1989-90	1990-91
Commonwealth	1 707.5	2 641.25	2 745
New South Wales	1 707.5	2 641.25	2 745
Victoria	1 707.5	2 641.25	2 745
South Australia	1 707.5	2 641.25	2 745
	6 830	10 565	10 980

Consequently, the total estimated financial contributions for salinity investigations and construction over the next three years are as follows:

	($ million)		
	1988-89	1989-90	1990-91
Commonwealth	1.99	2.87	2.775
New South Wales	1.80	2.72	2.755
Victoria	1.80	2.72	2.755
South Australia	1.80	2.72	2.755

JOINT PARLIAMENTARY SERVICE COMMITTEE

The SPEAKER: I advise the House that, as Chairperson of the Joint Parliamentary Service Committee, I have received advice from Mr K.C. Hamilton of his resignation from the Joint Parliamentary Service Committee.

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

That, pursuant to section 5 of the Joint Parliamentary Service Act 1985, Mr M.R. De Laine be appointed as a member of the Joint Parliamentary Service Committee in place of Mr Hamilton (resigned); that Mr P.B. Tyler be the alternate member for Mr De Laine; and that a message be sent to the Legislative Council informing it of the foregoing resolution.

Motion carried.

QUESTION TIME

HOSPITAL FUNDING CUTS

Mr OLSEN: Will the Minister of Health confirm that the Federal budget has cut funding to South Australian public hospitals by well over 30 per cent in real terms and, if so, what will be the impact on service delivery and particularly on the mounting waiting lists at public hospitals? An examination of the Federal budget papers reveals that Commonwealth payments to the South Australian public hospital system last financial year totalled almost $363 million. This year, they have been reduced to just under $281 million, and there is no evidence in the budget papers of major offsetting grants for health in other areas. The reduction in real terms is about 34 per cent when over the past four years already waiting lists have grown by almost 100 per cent and more than 300 beds have been removed from the State's public hospitals and the public hospital system will come under even more pressure with the steep decline in membership of private health insurance funds.

The Hon. FRANK BLEVINS: No, I cannot confirm that: it is incorrect. Full details and figures will be supplied to the House at the appropriate time. I merely point out for the purposes of answering the question, that I thought that the Federal budget was an excellent one: it was a good budget for Australia and for South Australia and a credit both to the Federal Government and the Federal Treasurer who brought it down, as well as a credit to the Australian

Labor Party, which put that Government there. I merely wish to refer to a few examples of the benefits from the budget that South Australia will get in this area, for example—

Mr Olsen interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order! I call the honourable Leader of the Opposition to order and ask the Minister not to respond to the Leader's out-of-order interjections by displaying papers. The honourable Minister.

The Hon. FRANK BLEVINS: If I am only displaying papers, I am not doing too badly. I have an extensive list, but I will not now go through it for the benefit of the House. I merely point out that in capital payments alone there is an enhancement program for the State's hospitals of $2.08 million, which will go a considerable way.

Mr S.J. Baker interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order! I call the member for Mitcham to order. The honourable Minister.

The Hon. FRANK BLEVINS: It will go a considerable way to assisting the steady progress that we are making in reducing our hospital waiting list. There are additional payments for women's health screening, teaching hospital equipment, blood transfusion, health and community care, waiting list reductions, and the AIDS program. There is a huge list of benefits that this State will get from the Federal budget. The full financial details are now being analysed and I shall be happy to give them to the House extensively when the figures have been compiled. However, I assure the House that the health services provided in this State will not only be maintained at their present excellent level but will be improved by additional funds that the Federal Government has made available. Further, when the State budget is brought down tomorrow, I believe that everyone in this State will find it equally as invigorating and interesting as the Federal Treasurer's budget last evening.

INDUSTRIAL DEVELOPMENT

Ms GAYLER: Can the Minister of State Development and Technology say, given the importance of the manufacturing sector on the development of this State's economy and its very real impact on the employment opportunities for my constituents, what the State Government has done to generate growth in this sector and what are the forecasted trends for the future?

The Hon. LYNN ARNOLD: Mr Speaker—

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

Mr OSWALD: Mr Speaker, I ask you to rule this question out of order because it raises a question of policy that is too large to be dealt with within the limits of the question. Indeed, if it is to be answered properly, that will take up so much of Question Time as to take away the Opposition's opportunity of question and answer.

The SPEAKER: Order! I do not uphold the point of order. The honourable Minister.

Mr OSWALD: On a point of order, Mr Speaker, on what grounds? Clearly, the instructions to this Chamber provide that questions raising policy matters that are too comprehensive to be dealt with in Question Time will be ruled out of order.

The SPEAKER: Order! The Chair will try to ensure that the honourable Minister does not consume an undue proportion of Question Time.

The Hon. LYNN ARNOLD: I thank you, Mr Speaker, for permission to proceed on this question. I note the point of order of the member for Morphett, and I will endeavour to be as brief as possible. As the member for Morphett has quite rightly acknowledged, there is much to say on this matter from the Government's point of view, and the Government has done so much to assist the manufacturing industry that I could well be in danger of taking up the entire Question Time. I will prune out many of the things that we have done on this matter and keep my points as brief as possible, knowing that they will be questioned in the extreme by all members of this House during the Estimates Committee (when I will be happy to further inform members of all the figures that I am unable to provide on this occasion).

Over the past 15 years the manufacturing industry in this State, until about a year ago, showed a downward employment trend, but an upward productivity trend. We had a net decrease in employment in manufacturing between the period of about 1973 to 1987. I am happy to inform the House that that trend seems to have been broken. From May 1987 to May 1988 there was a net increase in full-time jobs in the manufacturing sector of some 3 400, which is a 4.3 per cent increase. In many ways that is evidence not only of the significant efforts of the manufacturing industry in this State but also of the support that it has been offered by the South Australian Government.

For the first time in a great many years, if not in the recorded economic statistic history of South Australia, manufacturing exports comprise the largest single sector of exports from South Australia to overseas destinations. In fact, it is larger than the agriculture and services sectors. That has been brought about by a number of things. First, industrial relations in this State are excellent; indeed they continue to be the best within the Commonwealth and, in fact, they are much better nowadays than they were under the Tonkin Administration by a factor of about four. But, even in those days they were better than the Australian average. We have seen a contribution to a number of sectors. The South Australian Development Fund in 1987-88 provided $14 million worth of support to individual companies which in turn invested some $160 million into this State.

We have seen some very significant investments. The Holden's Motor Company at its Elizabeth plant has invested some $300 million to $500 million. I had the pleasure of seeing something of that investment on Sunday, as did the member for Mitcham. I know that he will draw attention to that impressive investment as an indicator of the vitality of manufacturing in this State. I look forward to hearing his positive comments on that matter, unlike his negative comments on so much that affects South Australia. Further investments by private industry in the manufacturing sector include: Kimberly-Clark, $145 million; BHAS, $58 million; Mitsubishi, $90 million; Bridgestone, $40 million; Borals at Angaston, $17 million; and Email, about $20 million. Of course, there are also the significant investments of Roxby Downs and the submarine project.

During the period of the Tonkin Government we saw a less than impressive growth rate in capital expenditure by private enterprise. However, since 1982 fixed capital expenditure in South Australia has grown by some 104 per cent, which is a larger percentage than for any other mainland State.

An honourable member: Nonsense!

The Hon. LYNN ARNOLD: That is not nonsense. They are the available figures, and they are on the public record. Indeed, the member for Mitcham says—

The SPEAKER: Order! The honourable Minister is starting to wander away—

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order! The Chair would appreciate the cooperation of members on both sides of the House when attempting to give a ruling or instruction. I ask the Minister to wind up his remarks.

The Hon. LYNN ARNOLD: I note your comments, Sir, and I will endeavour to be as brief as possible. I repeat that the public record shows that private fixed capital expenditure in South Australia, since the coming to power of this Government, has grown by 104 per cent, which is the largest increase of any mainland State. That can also be supported by figures given by private sector organisations. I quote from the quarterly business trend surveys of the Engineering Employers Association, the private sector group which represents engineering employers within Australia. In the latest survey identifying the figures in South Australia—

Mr S.J. BAKER: A point of order, Mr Speaker. In your ruling of 11 August, Sir, you said that there is no excuse for longwinded replies. I also refer you to Erskine May where the determination was made in 1924 that such answers should be circulated rather than taking up Question Time. I ask you to rule accordingly.

The SPEAKER: Order! The Chair has asked the Minister to wind up his remarks and, if the Minister does not do so immediately, I will ask him to resume his seat. The honourable Minister.

The Hon. LYNN ARNOLD: I will be as brief as possible in quoting pertinent statistics from the Engineering Employers Association, which states that 78 per cent of respondents to its trend survey indicated either 'busy' or 'very busy' levels of production activity; 84 per cent of respondents considered their order book position to be either 'satisfactory' or 'very good'; and 49 per cent of respondents anticipate that they will expand their employment in the near future. With respect to export growth, the strongest performance exhibited was from South Australia with a 53.8 per cent growth. The increase in employment exceeded the national rate—

The Hon. JENNIFER CASHMORE: On a point of order, Mr Speaker, at least six sentences ago you asked the Minister to wind up in one or two sentences. Clearly, he is defying the Chair and I ask you to rule accordingly.

The SPEAKER: The Chair calls on the Deputy Leader of the Opposition.

PAYROLL AND LAND TAXES

The Hon. E.R. GOLDSWORTHY: My question is directed to the Premier. As South Australia currently has the highest unemployment rate of the mainland States and our employment growth is only half the national average, will the Premier guarantee payroll and land tax relief in his budget tomorrow in view of the fact that the South Australian tax on a payroll of $1 million is higher than in any other mainland State and, for example, is more than 25 per cent higher than in Western Australia, while land tax collections, since his Government came to office, have risen by 198 per cent, the highest of all States?

The Hon. J.C. BANNON: A number of the statements made by the Deputy Leader in his explanation are quite inaccurate. Turning to the question of payroll tax, first, I understand that we are the only State in Australia, with the exception of Tasmania, that does not impose some sort of payroll tax levy. In fact, overall, our rate is one of the most competitive in the country. Secondly, he made a number of quite incorrect assertions about unemployment and employment growth.

I think that they would be better dealt with tomorrow in the budget—and they will be, at some length—when both the answer to the honourable member's question and the true facts about the state of our economy will be set out very fully, indeed.

HOUSING TRUST RENTS

The Hon. R.K. ABBOTT: Has the Minister of Housing and Construction received any correspondence regarding a public meeting to be held on Thursday 25 August 1988 in the electorate of Hanson? Yesterday, under the letterhead of the member for Hanson, I received a copy of an invitation regarding a public meeting to be held in Camden Park on the subject of Housing Trust rents. The letter asks people to come along at 8 p.m. to express their views and make history. It also states that tea, coffee and biscuits will be provided at 9.30 p.m.

The Hon. T.H. HEMMINGS: I thank the honourable member for his question. I have received only one item of correspondence about that meeting as described by the honourable member. I can assure the House that it was not an invitation for me to attend but, in line with what the member for Hanson said in his personal explanation yesterday, I will attend that meeting to record this Government's achievements in its housing policy and, also, I hope to expose the latest Federal Liberal Party policy on housing which would, in effect, herald the demise of public housing as we know it here in South Australia.

The letter which I received I think is very pertinent to the whole issue of trust rents and I would like to inform the House of its contents. At the same time, I would like to draw members' attention to an article which appeared in today's *News* and which, in effect, removes the hype from the whole issue of trust rents of which the member for Hanson has been very guilty. Both trust tenants and those people struggling to buy their own homes on low incomes have put the whole matter of trust rents into perspective. Following what that paper wrote yesterday, I was very pleased to see that the *News* had the decency to print that article today. The letter that I received from a constituent of the member for Hanson states:

Dear Mr Hemmings,

Enclosed is a letter I received from Heine Becker. I object to his very rubbery figures; my rent has only increased 4 per cent. I also object to him inviting me to make complaints to him about an organisation I think does a reasonably good job.

There are avenues in the trust to make complaints and if a tenant were to get out of these surely he or she would risk dire consequences. Also, after sending a semi-formal letter I do not like the gall of Mr Becker asking for a donation to the Liberal Party. It is no wonder they are in Opposition.

Yours respectfully,

Members interjecting:

The Hon. T.H. HEMMINGS: I know that I should not answer interjections, Sir, and I will try not to do that.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order! I call the member for Bragg to order for continuing to interject. The honourable Minister.

The Hon. T.H. HEMMINGS: I have contacted the gentleman in question and I am sure that he will give me permission to table that letter, and I hope to be able to do that shortly. Getting back to that part of the letter to which the member for Hanson's constituent objected regarding the donation, a leaflet was included with the letter. The leaflet states:

Heini Becker, MP,
Member for Hanson,
Cr Jim Buckingham, President and Committee Members of the Liberal Party Hanson State Electorate Committee
cordially invite you and your friends to join them at the Glenelg Cinema Centre . . .

And for the low, low price of $4.50—which I think is not too bad—people were invited to morning tea, scones and yeast at 9.45 am. The film is *Overboard*, and I think that that sums up the member for Hanson's complete attitude to the sole area of housing—

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order!

Mr OSWALD: On a point of order, Sir.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order! I ask the honourable member whether he wishes to pursue his point of order in view of the fact that I am about to call on the member for Coles?

Mr OSWALD: If you, Sir, would be prepared to withdraw leave for the Minister to give such a ridiculous reply, I would withdraw too.

The SPEAKER: Order! There is no point of order. The Minister has concluded his answer.

The Hon. T.H. HEMMINGS: No, Sir, I have not.

The SPEAKER: No, the Minister has concluded his answer. The honourable member for Coles.

Members interjecting:

The Hon. JENNIFER CASHMORE: Mr Speaker, my question—

The Hon. B.C. Eastick: It's long overdue.

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

The Hon. E.R. Goldsworthy: You'd be very pleased with the ruling.

The SPEAKER: Order! I call the Deputy Leader to order. Would the member for Coles please resume her seat for a moment. I point out to the Deputy Leader that there is no protocol that requires a given number of calls to order to be made before a member is named. The honourable member for Coles.

COORONG CARAVAN PARK

The Hon. JENNIFER CASHMORE: Will the Minister of Employment and Further Education ask the Storemen and Packers Union to provide to the Auditor-General all its files relating to the Coorong caravan park?

The Opposition has received a letter from a Mr R. S. Richmond of Hyde Park. In his letter, Mr Richmond reveals that he offered $160 000 for this caravan park when it was put up for sale in May, four years after the union had received Government money of $180 000 to develop the park. The Opposition has established that Mr Richmond's offer was a *bona fide* one. It was made to an agent at Nuriootpa acting on the union's behalf.

The agent informed Mr Richmond that he would put the offer to the union. When Mr Richmond did not hear from the agent, he wrote to the secretary of the union, Mr George Apap, repeating his offer. He received no reply from Mr Apap. The Opposition has reason to believe that this park may have been sold for as little as one-third of the amount offered by Mr Richmond for reasons which could be revealed by an examination of Mr Apap's files. It has been pointed out that, if this is so, it would reduce very considerably the ability of the Government to recoup the taxpayers' money invested in this project.

The Hon. LYNN ARNOLD: A couple of points must be made on this whole matter. As I indicated, from my perusal of all the records available in the Office of Employment and Training, all CEP guidelines and instructions were adhered to by all the parties concerned.

Mr Lewis: Piffle!

The Hon. LYNN ARNOLD: The member for Murray-Mallee says 'piffle' to that.

The SPEAKER: Order! The honourable member for Murray-Mallee is out of order. The honourable Minister.

The Hon. LYNN ARNOLD: But, nevertheless, because the matter has been raised again in Parliament I have willingly forwarded the matter to the Auditor-General. Yesterday I commented on subsequent comments made by the member for Coles on this matter and, indeed, I will repeat some of those comments, namely, that this matter should not be interfered with in a political way. The matter has been referred to the Auditor-General. I am not about to tell the Auditor-General how he should do his job. It will be within his power and his will to call on whatever records he wishes to see, using the power that he has. Any records that are within my power to control are certainly available to him.

Indeed, as I understand it, all dockets on this matter that are held within the Office of Employment and Training have been forwarded to the Auditor-General. If there are any other dockets within my ministerial control—

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order!

The Hon. LYNN ARNOLD: —that he wishes to see, they are certainly available to him at his immediate request.

The Hon. Jennifer Cashmore interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order! I call the member for Coles to order. The honourable Minister.

The Hon. LYNN ARNOLD: The member for Coles has conducted a witch hunt against the Storemen and Packers Union for as long as can be recalled on this matter and this is just more evidence of that. However, I simply say that I respect the Auditor-General and I believe he will do his job credibly. I know that he will seek out whatever information he believes he needs to complete the inquiry that has been forwarded to him by me as Minister of Employment and Further Education.

CELTAINER LTD

Mr HAMILTON: Is the Minister of State Development and Technology aware of the problem facing a company in my electorate, namely, Celtainer Ltd of Royal Park, which faces a serious threat to its viability due to a planned slashing of tariffs on imported shipping containers? The Industries Assistance Commission has recommended that the duty on imported containers be reduced from 30 per cent to zero, or to 15 per cent if that can be justified. I am informed that this would have serious consequences for Celtainer, which relies on the local market to maintain a sufficient quantity of orders to compete in markets overseas.

The Hon. LYNN ARNOLD: Celtainer Ltd is a very exciting company which has done a lot for trade promotion in South Australia and which has been very eager to seek out international markets. The company is an example of an engineering firm that is out there trying to improve the competitiveness of this country. Indeed, the figures which I was starting to quote previously and which I will quote later in the adjournment debate today, so that the Opposition still gets the opportunity to hear the good news on engineering employment figures, will be indicative of that.

Nevertheless, Celtainer is facing a problem in the immediate future with respect to the tariff proposal. Indeed, I can say that I am concerned about this matter and have already written to Senator Button expressing my concern. I am pleased that the Federal Government gave us the opportunity to comment on this proposal before it was considered

by the Federal Cabinet. We have put a point of view to the Federal Government on behalf of that company and on behalf of economic opportunity in this State—on behalf of South Australians—and we expect a decision within the next month or two.

To give an indication of how important this issue is, I point out that Celtainer is an innovative, outward looking company, looking to world markets, and it has shown dramatic growth over recent years with revenue increasing from $2.1 million to $11.8 million and export sales jumping from $700 000 to $4.5 million. Indeed, Celtainer was one of the companies that participated in the trade mission that I led to China last year and it will also participate in the trade mission that the Premier will lead to Sweden later this year.

That activity has had an immediate employment impact, which I know will please the member for Albert Park; the employment level has doubled from 56 to 130. The company is confident that its turnover will reach $60 million over the next five years due to expanding exports.

However, we come back to the tariff issue. There are two issues of concern: one is the proposed reduction in tariffs on foreign made containers, and the other is the plan to remove sales tax from being applied to containers which come in with cargo. The application of sales tax if the container remains in this country beyond a year is aimed at ensuring that shippers do not avoid the tariff regime. Removal of tariff barriers and the sales tax aspect would seriously jeopardise Celtainer's capacity to compete in the world market at a time when it is moving strongly, with job growth, into that market.

As the honourable member said, without a base of local sales, Celtainer would be jeopardised in its capacity to compete against much larger foreign producers which have far greater economies of scale, despite the fact that Celtainer's product is regarded internationally as innovative and competitive in other respects in container shipping. I have written to John Button and look forward to his early reply.

MARINELAND

Mr BECKER: I ask the Minister for Environment and Planning: because union bans on the Marineland development are jeopardising a Government guarantee which could end up costing taxpayers several million dollars, what action will he take to have the bans lifted? With your leave, Mr Speaker, and that of the House, I seek leave to explain.

The SPEAKER: Order!

The Hon. D.J. HOPGOOD: I understand that the honourable member has a Question on Notice on this matter directed to the Minister of Labour.

Mr Becker: It is not the same question, nor is it related to the Government guarantee.

The SPEAKER: Order! The Chair will reserve a ruling on that while I consult the Notice Paper. The honourable member for Hayward.

FOUNDATION SOUTH AUSTRALIA

Mrs APPLEBY: I direct my question to the Minister of Labour—sorry, I apologise, Sir.

Mr Becker interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order!

Mrs APPLEBY: I apologise, Sir.

The SPEAKER: Order! The honourable member for Hayward will resume her seat. It is difficult for the Chair to reprimand the honourable member for Hanson when he is immediately alongside the Chair, but he should know that he is not—

Mr D.S. Baker interjecting.

The SPEAKER: Order! I warn the honourable member for Victoria. The member for Hanson should know that all interjections are out of order, but it is particularly out of order to interject while walking down the centre of the Chamber towards the Chair. The honourable member for Hayward.

Mrs APPLEBY: I direct my question to the Minister of Health. Can he provide the House with information on the attitude of the Sports Promotion, Cultural and Health Advancement Fund to the suggestion that recipients of the fund should display the anti-smoking 'Quit' badge? In a question to the Minister of Health on Wednesday 17 August, the member for Bragg alleged that the Sports Promotion Fund had sought to impose on the Olympic Council the requirement that South Australian members of the Olympic team display the anti-smoking 'Quit' badge in return for the $100 000 donation and, further, that all other clubs that received money from the fund would also have to display the 'Quit' badge.

The Hon. FRANK BLEVINS: In this matter, I did, as I always do about any allegations of this nature, make very prompt inquiries. I even do the member for Bragg the courtesy of taking him seriously and following his questions through, despite the constant disappointments that I have. I was pleased to receive a letter today from the South Australian Sports Promotion, Cultural and Health Advancement Trust, which is now known as Foundation South Australia. I know that the House will be interested if I read the letter, which was addressed to me, as follows:

Re: Comments by Mr Ingerson, MP, in the House of Assembly on Wednesday 17 August 1988.

I refer to Mr Ingerson's comments (as attached) concerning the recent donation of $100 000 to the South Australian Olympic Appeal from the Sports Promotion, Cultural and Health Advancement Fund.

Mr Ingerson's information is totally incorrect. It is regrettable that it was put forward in the House without any attempt to check its accuracy with either the Olympic Appeal or the Sports Promotion, Cultural and Health Advancement Trust.

The initial negotiations concerning financial support for the South Australian Olympic Appeal were carried out between Foundation South Australia's Acting General Manager, Dr Michael Court, and the Secretary of the Olympic Appeal, Mr John Rodda, who is also the South Australian executive member of the Australian Olympic Federation. Later discussions also involved myself and Mr David David, Chairman of the foundation.

Both Dr Court and Mr Rodda have assured me that there was absolutely no mention at any time of South Australia's Olympic team members being asked to wear 'Quit' badges on their uniforms for any purpose whatsoever.

As for the Olympic Council 'refusing to agree', neither Dr Court nor Mr Rodda is aware of any involvement of the council in regard to the donation, which was made direct to the Olympic Appeal.

I can also assure you that the suggestion that all clubs which receive money from Foundation South Australia will have to wear 'Quit' badges has never been raised in trust discussions.

The information provided to Mr Ingerson is, in other words, a total and complete fabrication.

Yours sincerely,

(Signed) Jim Jarvis for SACCHA Trust.

No further comment is really required after reading that letter. It just confirms the history that the member for Bragg has built up of coming into the House and making scurrilous accusations under parliamentary privilege, such accusations inevitably being found to be completely incorrect. Even though the issue could have been cleared up by a simple telephone call if someone had approached him about it, the honourable member continues to come into the House and make this kind of accusation and, when it is proved false,

he does not even have the decency to apologise to the individuals concerned.

WORKERS COMPENSATION

Mr S.J. BAKER: Does the Minister of Labour support the attitude of the Waterside Workers Federation in respect of medical reports sought for workers compensation claims and, if he does not, what action will be taken? I have in my possession correspondence which recently has been exchanged between this union and an Adelaide specialist who examined a union member claiming workers compensation. In a letter dated 18 July the Secretary of the union (Mr McKechnie) asked the specialist to forward his report and account to the union only if the specialist found that the union member had a work-related injury. I quote the relevant part of Mr McKechnie's letter:

> Should this be correct, would you please forward your report and account direct to this office. If on the other hand Mr X—

I will not embarrass the individual concerned by using his name—

> is not suffering—

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order! I call members on my right to order. I call the honourable member for Albert Park to order. The honourable member for Mitcham.

Mr S.J. BAKER: I repeat:

> If . . . Mr X is not suffering from industrial deafness, then no report is required and we would be obliged if you would inform Mr X of his good fortune.

The union has also refused to pay the cost of the medical examination.

The Hon. R.J. GREGORY: I am not aware of the matter referred to by the honourable member, but I will inquire and report later to the House on the facts.

WORKCOVER

Mr DUIGAN: Can the Minister of Labour say what action has been taken to ensure that ministers of religion are protected under WorkCover? It has been brought to my attention that a Baptist minister has recently had difficulty in having his workers compensation claim processed, even though his church was registered as an employer under WorkCover.

The Hon. R.J. GREGORY: I thank the honourable member for his question. This issue was raised recently when a pastor of the Baptist Church had a claim rejected by WorkCover. The problem arose because it was not clear whether a religious minister's 'employment' fell within the definition of a worker for the purposes of the Act. The rejection of the claim was based on separate independent legal opinions provided to the Uniting Church and WorkCover both of which opinions suggested that ministers were not 'workers'. WorkCover is not legally empowered to provide cover for persons whose engagement does not meet the definition of a worker under a 'contract of service'.

Foremen insurers had some discretion in this area and offered to cover any employer who wanted protection for those who may not have fitted the definition of a 'worker'; that is, ministers of religion, taxi drivers or umpires who are quite specifically excluded from the legislation. I might add that these other areas are currently also under consideration.

This inability to offer the security of WorkCover is against the spirit of the legislation which is designed to cast a wide net of protection for people in employment. As a result, the Government, on the recommendation of the WorkCover Board, has decided to draft regulations to guarantee security to cover such church organisations. It is proposed to declare that ministers of religion are deemed 'workers' under the prescribed class of work as provided in section 3 definition of 'contract of service', unless the religious organisation can establish that the minister would not otherwise be regarded as a worker. This would allow churches to be excluded from the prescription if they believe it appropriate and they have legal grounds to support that exclusion. Mr Speaker, it is expected that those regulations will be tabled in the House in the very near future.

MARINELAND

Mr BECKER: What action is the Minister for Environment and Planning taking to protect taxpayers' funds given under a Government guarantee to Tribond Developments Pty Ltd to redevelop Marineland at West Beach? In November last year, the Government gave its guarantee to a bank loan of $9 million taken out by Tribond Developments Pty Ltd to redevelop Marineland. The conditions of the guarantee are such that, if the company defaults on its loan repayments to the bank, taxpayers become liable for them.

I understand that the company recently wrote to the Minister expressing concern about bans imposed by the Building Trades Federation which stopped work on the project a month ago and asking what the Minister intended to do to ensure that the project could proceed in the manner agreed with the Government. I further understand that, if this matter is not resolved within the next few days, the entire project could be shelved and the Government guarantee called upon to pay money already spent on the project.

The Hon. D.J. HOPGOOD: I understand that the financial aspects of this matter are being handled by the Department of State Development and Technology. What I find interesting about the whole thing is that neither party to the industrial dispute—if indeed there is an industrial dispute—has attempted to activate any of the mechanisms available to it under the legislation which is committed to the Minister of Labour.

There are a variety of ways in which an industrial dispute can be resolved and they are available to either party—be it, on the one hand, the union, which may be involved in some sort of ban or strike or, on the other hand, the developer or employer who may be the subject of that action. So far as I am aware—and I was aware of the question which the honourable member put on notice; so, I took an opportunity to find out what I could about the matter—neither party at this stage has endeavoured to activate that mechanism. I imagine that the honourable member would find that as bizzare as I do and I advise either party, if it really wants a reconciliation, to take advantage of the legislation that is available.

NATIONAL COMMITTEE ON VIOLENCE

Mr RANN: My question is to the Minister of Emergency Services. What progress is being achieved to establish a national committee of inquiry into violence and does the South Australian Government support such a move? Following December's gun summit in Canberra, which involved the Federal Government and the States, it was proposed that a national committee of inquiry into violence be established. I understand that such a committee would conduct

an audit of the contemporary state of violent crime in Australia, examine changing trends and look at the causes of violence in order to develop a comprehensive national strategy designed to curb violence in our society.

The Hon. D.J. HOPGOOD: The Prime Minister has written to the Premier about the membership of the committee and its terms of reference. The membership is broad and includes representation from the areas of psychiatry, community welfare, health workers, women, media and the police. The draft terms of reference are comprehensive. The committee will be asked to examine the causes of violence in Australian society and recommend methods of prevention.

In preparing its report the committee will be asked to examine particular issues including, as I understand, the contemporary state of violent crime in Australia: socio-economic and psychological aspects of violence; the impact of the mass media; including motion pictures and videos; violence in the use of illicit and licit drugs; vulnerability of particular groups; and the need for victim support.

This Government supports the Commonwealth in this matter. We believe that it is a very worthwhile step to come to grips with this important social issue. We have made a number of suggestions to the Commonwealth in relation to the committee's terms of reference and membership. We are also keen to avoid any duplication, so we have suggested that studies already undertaken under the auspices of the Australian Police Minister's Council, the Standing Committee of Attorneys-General and the Health Ministers be reviewed as part of the overall thrust of the report.

ISLAND SEAWAY

The Hon. P.B. ARNOLD: Will the Minister of Marine investigate whether current rescue equipment on the *Island Seaway* fulfils the requirements of the Marine Act? I understand that rescue equipment on the *Island Seaway* currently comprises two rafts with water-cooled motors which cannot be started until they are dropped into the water. There is concern that, in rough weather, it would be extremely difficult, if not impossible, to start these motors. As a result, it has been decided to spend a further $340 000 on the vessel to provide two platforms for effective life rafts. The Marine Act spells out requirements relating to seaworthiness and safety equipment and the Minister has the responsibility to ensure that these requirements are followed by all vessels operating in South Australian waters.

The Hon. R.J. GREGORY: My advice is that the *Island Seaway* would not have been registered for use in South Australian waters if it did not have adequate lifesaving equipment.

HORTICULTURAL PRODUCTS

Mr ROBERTSON: I direct my question to the Minister of Agriculture. What progress has been made in the preparation of a brochure to promote South Australian fruit, vegetables and horticultural products in South-East Asia? Some two years ago a constituent came to see me and agreed to assist the department in putting together a brochure aimed at encouraging further exports of South Australian agricultural and horticultural products to South-East Asian markets. In the interim, her company has used Derek Whitelock's latest book entitled *Adelaide, A Sense of Difference—Colony to Jubilee* as a promotional tool. I understand that, in the meantime, the Department of State Development and Technology has produced a grant to help put the brochure together. What progress has been made in this area?

The Hon. M.K. MAYES: I thank the honourable member for his question. Along with the honourable member and his constituent (who is prominent in the horticultural industry in this State), I did attend a meeting.

Mr Gunn: What about grain regulations?

The Hon. M.K. MAYES: You had better talk to Mr Elliott about that. This is a very important issue to the horticultural industry, because a number of major trade promotions are looming on the horizon. The Government and the department want to see the promotion of our South Australian horticultural products actively supported. In the explanation to his question the honourable member hinted that some money has been set aside for this project. The South Australian Horticultural Export Development Committee will make moneys available for that brochure, which I hope will be ready for a major international trade fair which is to be held in Tennessee in the United States of America in October. I am sure that my officers, in particular the Senior Horticultural Export Officer (Mr Ian Lewis), will consult with the honourable member's constituent. Further, I am sure that the industry, the department, the Government and the State will be very proud of the final result.

I am confident that we will be able to use the brochure in many of our international marketplaces through Department of State Development and Technology agents in those particular countries, particularly in Asian countries, and also through the promotion of Austrade. I imagine that this brochure will promote the very good quality products that we have in this State. Further, I believe that their potential will be further enhanced in years to come by this brochure. I look forward to working with the honourable member's constituents in regard to this development, and I am certain that that contribution has been of assistance.

SAMCOR

Mr GUNN: My question is directed to the Minister of Agriculture. Following the Government's decision to sell the pig and sheep yards at Gepps Cross and, at this stage, to make no alternative arrangements for future sales, and because of concern being expressed within the industry about the Government's general attitude to the future of Samcor, will the Minister give an unequivocal guarantee that the Government is not planning to close down or dispose of the current Samcor operations at Gepps Cross, which are currently valued at about $50 million?

The SPEAKER: The honourable Minister.

The Hon. M.K. MAYES: Thank you, Mr Speaker.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order! The honourable member for Eyre was given leave of the House to ask a question, not to start making a speech at the top of his voice. The honourable Minister.

The Hon. M.K. MAYES: Thank you, Mr Speaker. It is interesting to have the lead in to, in fact, two questions. The saleyards issue involves a very commercial situation and the operation is related very much to what the industry does. The question of whether a Government should be involved in the operation—

Members interjecting:

The Hon. M.K. MAYES: I am attempting to answer your question. If you continue to interrupt, I will just stay here longer.

The SPEAKER: Order! The honourable Minister must direct his remarks through the Chair.

The Hon. M.K. MAYES: The situation with the saleyards is that I have met with representatives of the industry. I have explained to them that the Government sees this primarily as a commercial operation and one for which the industry has a direct responsibility. Whether Governments should be involved in the activity of saleyards and so on is perhaps something that the community would like to consider in view of the Government's commitments to other projects. Certainly, from my point of view as Minister, I think it is primarily the responsibility of the industry, and I have said so to the industry. I have indicated that I would be happy to meet with industry representatives, and they are considering their options with regard to relocation of the saleyards. So, in effect, the industry is coming back to me to further discuss this issue and I hope that it has a very firm view of where it should be when the saleyards are closed in late 1990.

With regard to the Samcor operation, I have made quite clear to the board of Samcor and to the community at large that the policy adopted by my predecessor with Cabinet and Government support involved the commercial operation of Samcor. I am delighted to say, having received the triennial review and given the management recommendations that were adopted by the board, that that organisation is operating very successfully. Hopefully in the next few weeks there will be a public announcement from the board about the success of that operation. It must be restated that the Government's approach towards Samcor is on the basis that it should maintain a commercial profile and be successful in its operation.

CHILD ABUSE INTERVIEWS

The Hon. D.C. WOTTON: Does the Minister—

Mr Gunn interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order! The honourable member for Heysen has the call, not the member for Eyre.

The Hon. D.C. WOTTON: Does the Minister of Community Welfare endorse a directive from her department that tape recorders are not to be used during interviews with children in alleged child sexual abuse cases because such tape recordings could, and I quote, 'damage the department's case', and does she agree that such an instruction is contrary to the department's statutory obligations that the interests of a child are paramount and not the interests of the department?

I refer to branch head circular No. 1904 of the department, in which the Deputy Chief Executive Officer instructs that 'such recordings could in fact damage the department's case'. Section 25a of the Community Welfare Act provides that the principles to be observed by the department in dealing with children require that a person 'shall regard the interests of a child as the paramount consideration'. The Attorney-General has indicated that 'there is no problem with the audiotaping of statements from witnesses in the child abuse area and that there may well be considerable advantage in it'.

The Hon. SUSAN LENEHAN: I thank the honourable member for raising what I believe is an incredibly important issue, namely the way in which the department deals with the sensitive and emotional issue of child sexual abuse. I have not personally seen that circular, but I will—

Members interjecting:

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

The Hon. SUSAN LENEHAN: I remind the House that I have been the Minister of Community Welfare for just over one week. I will certainly ask my department to bring that circular to my immediate attention. I will also pursue this matter vigorously with the Acting Head of the Department for Community Welfare.

Having given that undertaking, I would like to say that I am deeply aware of some of the issues involved in the area of child sexual abuse. I am also aware of some of the remarks that have been made very recently within the Children's Court system and I realise that I cannot comment on them. I believe very much that it is the department's primary responsibility to look after the care and welfare of children. I also believe that my department is doing that and I will have the matter investigated thoroughly.

UNDERGROUND FUEL TANK

Mr De LAINE: Can the Minister of Labour inform the House of the current situation in relation to safety aspects of the revolutionary Broer underground fuel tank anti-evaporation valve? This unique, locally developed and manufactured valve is currently being sold in more than 30 countries throughout the world, including the United States and the United Kingdom. Oil companies in Australia will not allow fuel retailers to use the valves, using the dubious argument that they are unsafe.

The Hon. R.J. GREGORY: Most members would be aware of this product and some of the issues surrounding its use in Australia. The valve appears to have the potential to save considerable mounts of fuel stored in underground tanks by inhibiting evaporation. However, the Department of Labour is not convinced about certain regulatory testing requirements relating to the valve in existing tanks. Further, some petrol companies appear to doubt the performance of the valve. However, I am happy to outline the most recent actions taken by my department and the Office of Energy Planning in liaison with Broer Enterprises Pty Ltd. There are two major considerations facing the department when—

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order!

The Hon. R.J. GREGORY: —assessing whether the Broer pressure vacuum valve ought to be approved for use on underground fuel tanks in South Australia, namely, work place safety under the Occupational Health, Safety and Welfare Act, and the integrity of the storage tank as it relates to dangerous substances legislation.

In regard to safety issues, the use of the Broer valve at various petrol retail stations will result in the need for supply tanker drivers adopting different work procedures while filling underground tanks. All safety issues are currently being attended to by the Department of Labour and Broer Enterprises and a draft set of procedures will soon be put to the petrol companies, petrol retailers and unions concerned.

In regard to storage integrity, the three main areas to be considered relate to venting capacity of the valve, the pressure vacuum settings for the valve and tank testing procedures. To clarify these issues, officers from my department and the Office of Energy Planning recently met with representatives of Broer Enterprises to clarify specific aspects of the Australian standards which need to be addressed when using the pressure vacuum view. Matters relating to venting capacity and pressure vacuum settings should be resolved with minimum difficulty. In regard to tank testing, Broer Enterprises has approached Amdel to assist it and the department in establishing a testing procedure that complies with the relevant standard.

On more general issues I am advised that Broer Enterprises, through Amdel, has applied for a National Energy Research Development and Demonstration Council grant from the Federal Government to prove the matters relating to evaporation losses from underground fuel tanks and the effectiveness of the Broer pressure vacuum valve in reducing these losses. The grant application has been supported in principle by the South Australian Energy Research Advisory Committee. If the safety aspects are resolved satisfactorily, any device which has the potential to conserve liquid fuels should be invested thoroughly. I understand that Broer Enterprises is most happy with the efforts of the South Australian Government in resolving the marketplace difficulties it encountered earlier this year.

The SPEAKER: Order! The Chair is of the view that the amount of detail that the Minister has gone into might have been better dealt with in a ministerial statement. I ask the Minister to wind up his remarks.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order! I call the honourable member for Bragg to order for the second time.

The Hon. R.J. GREGORY: At this stage, the issue of petrol companies' acceptance of the valve is being held in abeyance until the regulatory requirements are detailed and accepted. If the research studies prove Broer's claims, it is hoped that it will lead to another successful manufacturing and export company firmly establishing itself in South Australia.

CHILD ABUSE REPORT

Mr OSWALD: When will the Minister of Community Welfare release the long-awaited report commissioned by the Government 18 months ago into the protection of the children of teenage parents? Is she aware of concerns among welfare professionals that the report by Dr Lesley Cooper has been suppressed by the Government because its findings are critical of the department's policies in cases of alleged child abuse?

The Hon. SUSAN LENEHAN: I am aware of the report by Dr Lesley Cooper. It has not been in the pipeline for 18 months, as the honourable member has implied. As I understand it, my predecessor received that report in July: it is now August.

Members interjecting:

The Hon. SUSAN LENEHAN: It is a very comprehensive and lengthy report.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order!

The Hon. SUSAN LENEHAN: I have been asked a question, Mr Speaker, but obviously the Opposition does not wish to hear the answer. It is a very detailed and comprehensive report. I cannot remember the honourable member's words, but there has certainly been no attempt by the Government to cover up the report. I am attending to the matter as Minister, and I will be making an announcement in the very near future as to whether or not the report will be released. I remind the honourable member that I have now been Minister for one and a half weeks and that—

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order!

The Hon. SUSAN LENEHAN: It might be amusing—

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: I call the Deputy Leader of the Opposition to order and warn him that repeated obstruction of the workings of the House will lead to his being named. The honourable Minister.

Members interjecting:

The Hon. SUSAN LENEHAN: I am finding this rather amusing because—

Mr Hamilton interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order! The honourable member for Albert Park is out of order for the second time.

The Hon. SUSAN LENEHAN: Unlike some members of the Opposition, I take the contents and subject of the report most seriously. I will be looking at the report in great detail and, as I have said, I will be making an announcement regarding its release in due course.

MOUNT BARKER ROAD

Mr FERGUSON: Will the Minister of Transport say what additional arrangements, if any, have been made to alert motorists on the Mount Barker Road to hazardous conditions ahead? I refer particularly to Highways Department roadworks and accident emergency requirements on this road.

The Hon. G.F. KENEALLY: I commend the honourable member for his continued interest in road safety, which is a subject about which I would have thought all members of this House would be concerned and interested.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order!

The Hon. G.F. KENEALLY: I am surprised that members opposite find this whole question a matter of considerable amusement.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order! I call the member for Heysen to order.

The Hon. G.F. KENEALLY: I hope that the honourable member for Heysen, who is interjecting, is not making light or making fun of traffic conditions or road safety on Mount Barker Road. I point out that, on this occasion, his colleague the honourable member for Davenport seems to be very interested in what I have to say in response to the question. The Government is always concerned to ensure that vehicular traffic on Mount Barker Road is as safe as it can be. As part of the short-term improvements to Mount Barker Road, the Highways Department, in consultation with the Police Department, and with its approval, will install a number of signs, three on the down lane and three on the up lane, on frangible poles that will be activated when there is an emergency, which will be determined by the Police Department.

In addition, motorists will need to be alerted to such works being carried out on that section of the road by the Highways Department. The sign will be large (about 9ft by 6ft) and the letters will be big enough to be capable of being read slowly, and that will cater for the honourable member for Heysen. Most motorists will be able to see the sign very readily: it will be lit and it will be very obvious when an emergency has occurred or roadwork is under way. The sign will be activated by the police. It will fold over and lock away. When the police believe that it is appropriate to have the sign displayed to the public, it will be unlocked and that will activate the lighting system. We should then have signs that will assist in achieving the safest possible record on that road. This is a sensible development that—

Members interjecting:

The Hon. G.F. KENEALLY: I am continually surprised that, when members on this side of the Chamber are dealing with important and sensitive issues, members of the Opposition want to make fun and interject.

Mr Gunn: You're getting a bit old and—

The Hon. G.F. KENEALLY: I am old and cantankerous but I have been around the place long enough to know when people are serious and when people are making fun, and Opposition members are making fun on this occasion. This is a serious and commendable effort by the Highways Department and the police to ensure that traffic on Mount Barker Road is as safe as it can possibly be.

PERSONAL EXPLANATION: MOUNT BARKER ROAD

The Hon. D.C. WOTTON (Heysen): I seek leave to make a personal explanation.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order!

Mr Duigan interjecting:

The SPEAKER: I call the member for Adelaide to order. Leave is granted.

The Hon. D.C. WOTTON: In his reply, the Minister implied that I was not concerned about people from my constituency and from the rest of the State who travel on Mount Barker Road. I point out that I am currently awaiting replies from the Minister, who is just leaving the Chamber—

The Hon. G.F. Keneally interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order! The Minister is out of order in interjecting as he is walking through the Chamber. The honourable member for Heysen has the floor.

The Hon. D.C. WOTTON: A number of pieces of correspondence on my concerns about Mount Barker Road have not been answered by the Minister of Transport. I make the point that I am pleased by the initiative that he has announced today and I remind the House that I took up that matter with the Minister during a deputation three years ago.

The SPEAKER: Order! The honourable member has been given leave to make a personal explanation whereby he can indicate his grievance about having been misrepresented. However, he cannot begin to debate the subject matter.

The Hon. D.C. WOTTON: I remind the House that I am very concerned about those people who travel on Mount Barker Road, and I will continue to be so until the Government carries out its promised commitments—

The SPEAKER: Order! Leave is withdrawn.

The Hon. D.C. WOTTON: —and until we have appropriate representation on that matter.

The SPEAKER: Order! Leave was withdrawn from the point at which the honourable member began to again debate the matter.

NATIONAL CRIME AUTHORITY (STATE PROVISIONS) ACT AMENDMENT BILL

Received from the Legislative Council and read a first time.

TELECOMMUNICATIONS (INTERCEPTION) BILL

Received from the Legislative Council and read a first time.

PUBLIC WORKS STANDING COMMITTEE

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

That pursuant to section 18 of the Public Works Standing Committee Act 1927 the members of this House appointed to that committee have leave to sit on that comittee during the sittings of the House tomorrow.

Motion carried.

LOANS TO PRODUCERS ACT AMENDMENT BILL

The Hon. J.C. BANNON (Premier and Treasurer) obtained leave and introduced a Bill for an Act to amend the Loans to Producers Act 1927. Read a first time.

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

That this Bill be now read a second time.

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

Leave granted.

Explanation of Bill

The purpose of this Bill is to amend the Loans to Producers Act 1927.

The Loans to Producers Act authorises the Government to make loans to cooperative societies and landholders with the object of encouraging rural production and to persons and associations for purposes associated with fishing. The Act is administered by the State Bank as agent for the Government.

Regulations have been made under the Act prescribing purposes for which loans may be made, the form of applications and the particulars required to be supplied with applications. These regulations have been reviewed under the Government's deregulation program.

The State Bank has advised that lending under the Act is still very active. However, apart from the requirement to prescribe the purposes for which loans may be made, which is a matter for Government determination, the remaining matters covered by the regulations are of an administrative nature and could be left to the bank's discretion.

The bank is fully supportive of the proposal to allow discretion in administrative matters. This would give the bank greater flexibility in administering the Act thereby enhancing customer service.

The amendments to the Act contained in this Bill are to remove those provisions requiring various matters to be prescribed by regulation.

Clause 1 is formal.

Clause 2 amends section 5 of the principal Act which provides for loans to producers. The amendment removes the need to prescribe by regulation the security on which loans are to be granted and gives the bank a discretion to choose such security as it thinks fit.

Clause 3 repeals section 6 of the principal Act and substitutes a new provision. At present this section requires an application to be made in the form prescribed by the regulations, to contain such particulars as are prescribed and to be supported by such evidence (if any) as is prescribed or as the bank requires. The new section provides for an application to be made in a form approved by the bank and to contain such information and be supported by such evidence (if any) as the bank requires.

Clause 4 amends section 7 of the principal Act which deals with loans by instalments.

Clause 5 amends sections 8 and 8a of the principal Act and substitutes a new provision. At present section 8 requires a loan to be secured by way of mortgage, lien or a form of

security prescribed by regulation. The new section requires a loan to be secured by mortgage, lien, bill of sale or such other form of security as the bank thinks fit.

Clause 6 repeals section 14 of the principal Act and substitutes a new provision. This is the regulation-making power.

Mr GUNN secured the adjournment of the debate.

STATUTES REPEAL (AGRICULTURE) BILL

The Hon. M.K. MAYES (Minister of Agriculture) obtained leave and introduced a Bill for an Act to repeal certain Acts relating to agriculture. Read a first time.

The Hon. M.K. MAYES: I move:

That this Bill be now read a second time.

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

Leave granted.

Explanation of Bill

The purpose of this Bill is to repeal:

(a) the Chaff and Hay Act 1922;

(b) the Tobacco Industry Protection Act 1934;

and

(c) the Veterinary Districts Act 1940.

The objective of the Chaff and Hay Act 1922 was to prevent the adulteration of chaff and hay with unwanted seeds and to control and regulate its sale. At the introduction of the legislation there was a large market for chaff and hay required to feed horses that were then used on most farms to pull agricultural equipment.

Hay and chaff contaminated with weed seeds posed a serious risk of spreading weeds between farms and districts. Weed control is now managed by the Animal and Plant Control (Agricultural Protection and Other Purposes) Act 1986.

Hay and chaff were sold by weight and not volume and there was opportunity for unscrupulous dealers to increase the weight of their product by adding moisture. The legislation set an upper limit of moisture content that was acceptable. With modern technology and the reduction in the number of working farm horses to almost nil, use is now made of baled hay as stock-feed. The sale of chaff is now almost totally confined to the limited market of recreational and thoroughbred horses and does not need legislation to control quality.

The need for the legislation has lapsed. The United Farmers and Stockowners Association has given support to repealing the legislation. The Tobacco Industry Protection Act 1934 was introduced in November 1934 to provide for the control of disease in tobacco plants. The object of the Act was to require every person growing tobacco plants to completely destroy all plants before 31 July each year. This was considered necessary to prevent the spread of disease from one season to the next. The Act also contained provisions for control of the sale of tobacco seeds and seedlings. The tobacco growing industry was never successful in South Australia mainly due to a combination of unsuitable soil types and poor climate. In or about 1939, the Australian tobacco industry declined and since that time South Australia has not been involved in the commercial growing of tobacco.

It is extremely unlikely that the tobacco growing industry will ever be re-established in South Australia and therefore the need for the legislation has disappeared. The Veterinary Districts Act 1940 was introduced to provide for the establishment of veterinary districts with the power to raise funds from stock owners with the aim of encouraging veterinarians to establish rural practices throughout the State, at a time when veterinary services in South Australia were restricted. The legislation has had very limited use, and the need for it now has been overtaken with the independent establishment of rural practices throughout the State sufficient to service the needs of the community. The South Australian Veterinary Association and the United Farmers and Stockowners Association have given their support to repealing the legislation.

Clause 1 is formal. Clause 2 repeals the Acts set out in the schedule.

Mr GUNN secured the adjournment of the debate.

ADVANCES TO SETTLERS ACT AMENDMENT BILL

Adjourned debate on second reading.

(Continued from 10 August. Page 118.)

Mr GUNN (Eyre): The Opposition supports the Bill, which is of a minor nature. The original legislation was passed many years ago to help producers on Crown lands, but the amendments inserted in 1986 virtually made it unnecessary for the legislation to remain in force. However, it has been explained to me that a number of loans are still extant and the State Bank has been given authority to administer the mortgages. In relation to some of those mortgages, the properties are divided and it may be necessary for the bank to renegotiate those loans.

The only question concerning the Opposition (and we would like the Premier to respond briefly on this matter) is that in renegotiating an existing mortgage the mortgagee will not be disadvantaged: that is, his existing rights determined when the mortgage was originally negotiated should be maintained. The Opposition has no problem with the involvement of the State Bank in administering these schemes. Indeed, we think that that is a good idea, because the State Bank has been set up with the expertise and has had experience in dealing with these matters.

While we are discussing this Bill and the need for this sort of legislation, I wish to refer to a related matter. Because of the ceiling that has been placed on advances to agricultural producers by way of special assistance, it is obvious that the State Government will not be able to provide any money, as I understand the current arrangement, because disaster relief cannot be provided from a State until $7 million has been spent by it. However, the State may not have $7 million to spend, so that in future legislation may need to be examined in respect of special assistance.

I draw to the Premier's attention the difficulties that I outlined in my question to him in the House yesterday. It has been estimated that for $500 000 people could agist their sheep outside South Australia. In my electorate I was discussing certain problems with a senior official from another department and he expressed grave concern about the difficulties of primary producers west of Ceduna in having to sell their stock at reduced rates, thus making a difficult situation even worse. When the Premier responds in this debate, or after he has examined these matters soon, I trust that he will bear these difficulties in mind, because that part of the State is an area where substantial loans will have to be made by the State Bank, which has been the prominent bank in that part of the State, especially in its

early development. I believe that there will be a continuing need for special funds to be provided for those people.

So, with those few remarks, the Opposition supports the Bill. We have had discussions with the United Farmers and Stockowners, and I thank the officers who briefed me on this legislation. The Opposition is always pleased to help the Government so that legislation such as this receives a speedy passage through the Parliament where that is warranted.

Mr LEWIS (Murray-Mallee): I do not intend to speak at length. The member for Eyre has said almost all that needs to be said. I do not take exception to anything that he said: I simply underline the fact that this affects a number of my constituents in the same way as it affects those of the honourable member. What I want from the Premier in more explicit terms than the honourable member asked for is an assurance that, when the State Bank sets about establishing the documentation of its mortgages with anyone affected by this legislation, it will in no circumstances use this opportunity to increase the interest rate, in respect of the loan that applies, to something different, probably higher, in the ensuing mortgage or mortgages sought by the occupier and indeed the mortgagee. If that were to be so, I should be disappointed in the Government and appalled by the State Bank's indifference to what I regard as its legitimate and reasonable responsibilities in these circumstances.

The Hon. J.C. BANNON (Premier and Treasurer): I thank those members who have spoken for their support of the Bill. Effectively, this is an administrative matter: convenience in administration is involved here. Certainly, there is no intention to affect rights under the Act or existing arrangements. I can give the member for Eyre and the member for Murray-Mallee that assurance.

This Bill seeks to allow the bank to use its own forms and prescriptions, rather than to establish regulations and find the necessity to change them, if changes are warranted, in Parliament. The 1958 regulation deals with fees payable in respect of new advances. It has no application, so it quite clearly lapses. The 1953 regulation, which is very detailed, can also be allowed to lapse so that the modern mortgage document forms can be used. We are talking about forms and procedures, not the conditions under which these loans are granted, such as interest rates and things of that nature.

Bill read a second time and taken through its remaining stages.

RURAL ADVANCES GUARANTEE ACT AMENDMENT BILL (No. 3)

Adjourned debate on second reading.
(Continued from 10 August. Page 118.)

Mr GUNN (Eyre): The Opposition supports this measure which is normally referred to as the 'RAG' Act. It has provided valuable assistance to people wishing to extend their agricultural organisations or their farming involvement. The Opposition clearly understands that this is a hangover from the days when the Lands Department administered all rural finance. It is appropriate that the Director-General of Agriculture should be responsible for providing the necessary information before the Treasurer's guarantee is made. It is not an inappropriate role for the landlord. In fact, I believe that there is no role for the landlord whatsoever and the sooner we get rid of that the better; but that is not the matter that we are debating today.

I understand that 212 guarantees have been approved since the legislation was introduced in 1963. It is another of those far-sighted measures for which the Playford Government was responsible (and there are many on the statute book). It is a credit to the far-sightedness of the then Premier and his Government. Currently, there are 33 guarantees in existence and I believe that it is appropriate for the Premier to indicate whether the Government will look favourably on providing further guarantees because, if there was ever a time that certain sections of the agricultural industries needed some confidence and help, it is now. Guaranteeing some of these people through a most difficult period may assist them to obtain loans at a more reasonable rate than they currently pay. The Premier would be aware of the correspondence and media publicity in recent times with respect to the urgent need to provide adequate finance at a reasonable rate to people involved in the agricultural and pastoral industries. With those comments the Opposition is pleased to support the Bill.

The Hon. J.C. BANNON (Premier and Treasurer): I thank the honourable member for his support of the Bill, which again is one of simplifying procedures rather than substantially rewriting or reworking the original intention of the Bill. As stated in the second reading explanation, new loans under this legislation are rarely made. There are various other financial instruments which are more appropriate and it is only in some limited situations, where applications for deferment of loan repayments and so on are made to existing loans, that the Act itself is called in. There are 33 guarantee applications under this Act still current. Under this legislation there is certainly no preclusion on such guarantees being given in the future. As I say, it has been found that different financial instruments are more appropriate.

All this Bill seeks to do is, in a sense, eliminate the middleman. It is a fiction, if you like, that the Treasurer is advised on these matters by the Rural Assistance Branch through the Director of the Department of Agriculture, then through the Land Board to the Treasurer. The Land Board does not perform any function in this chain of events and it is far better that reports are made directly from the department to the Treasurer, who has carriage of the Act. That is all that we seek to do. Of course, the status of those currently in receipt of guarantees under the Act will not be changed.

Bill read a second time and taken through its remaining stages.

UNAUTHORISED DOCUMENTS ACT AMENDMENT BILL

Adjourned debate on second reading.
(Continued from 10 August. Page 119.)

Mr S.J. BAKER (Mitcham): The Opposition warmly supports the principle involved in this Bill, which seeks to provide a mechanism to allow the Government to declare a State commercial emblem by regulation and then to prevent its use except under licence approved by the Minister responsible for the Act. Whilst we approve of the principle involved, we see some real problems and questions, and we would appreciate some answers either at this stage or during the Committee stage.

There is no doubt that the Jubilee 150 logo for our sesquicentenary celebration was brilliant. I believe that most members of this House have worn a badge or tie with that

logo. In fact, they would have worn it with some pride because it is quite exceptional. There is no reason whatsoever, if the State Government (or somebody under contract to the State Government) produces something of merit, why the State should not take advantage of that and commercialise it or gain some benefit to the State from it. In so doing, the State reaps some financial reward, but it also has the opportunity to put its expertise on display. We believe that that is very positive. In the past, State and Commonwealth Governments have been involved in a number of areas where they have taken initiatives, new inventions and new ideas out of the confines of the Government enterprise and into the commercial sector.

There are many examples of where this has occurred and this is another of them. Members will note that I have amendments on file, and there are a number of questions as to how this particular proposition, in terms of application, will actually work. I have looked at the Commonwealth Acts concerned and it has been suggested that there may well be a conflict with the Commonwealth Trademarks Act and with the Copyright Act. I wish to satisfy myself and this House that answers can be provided to those questions.

Are the royalties which would accrue to the original designer of the logo still appropriate? The Act goes a little further and allows the State to adopt other common emblems. I see no difficulty with this proposition, provided that what we are doing with this legislation will stand the test of law. As I understand the situation, there may well be some difficulty with the Commonwealth Trademarks Act and the Copyright Act. Should this legislation be seen to override Commonwealth legislation, it may well be declared null and void.

Other issues are also involved associated with whether people outside the State use the emblem and the ramifications that that may have in terms of whether this emblem will be registered under Commonwealth copyright. Further, there are some problems with the Bill itself in terms of the penalties imposed under the legislation. Members will have noted that the legislation allows for confiscation of goods if the emblem is used illegally. That may be unduly harsh, because the emblem may be only a very small part of the total value of the goods concerned. Therefore, we will ask the Government to modify its approach on that matter.

Seizure of goods can be a very expensive penalty for someone who is involved in manufacturing. If it is just sent out under letterhead, there are no real difficulties, because the printer has only to change the letterhead. So, in the service area, there may be very minor penalties in the form of seizure as the action taken. However, when we refer to goods and the things on which we would like to see such things as a commercial State emblem displayed, seizure becomes a very harsh penalty. It is a very complex issue. I do not pretend to understand Commonwealth or State law sufficiently to enable me to make a judgment as to whether this legislation could be in conflict with Commonwealth determinations. I would be pleased if the appropriate Minister could satisfy my curiosity on the subject. The Opposition supports the principle involved in the legislation, but we would appreciate some answers on possible difficulties that may arise.

The Hon. J.C. BANNON (Premier and Treasurer): Effectively, what we are doing with this Bill is simply repeating the protections which the jubilee legislation previously conferred on the logos involved. The reasons why we want to do that have been well canvassed and I appreciate the support given to that object by the honourable member. In relation to its effect, it has the same scope as the previous legislation. That was found to be adequate during the period leading up to the jubilee year and in the year itself when, obviously, if offences were to occur or problems were to arise with the legality of the Act, they would have been tested because, at that time, one could see the logos having very high commercial application. So, our experience there encourages us to believe that this amendment, which translates those protections into an existing Act, will be quite adequate in any situation which may arise in the future.

There may well be some questions as to copyright, patents and the impact of that law, but our experience has been that that has not caused any major problem and the protection that we seek here is not meant to be draconian. Indeed, policy generally is to try to encourage the use of these logos as they publicise the State. However, where commercial advantage can be gained from that, clearly, it is in the State's interests, if you like, to have a share of the action, whether it is by way of licence or direct marketing itself. As such, I believe that the legislation is appropriate as it stands. The penalties contained in the Act are the standard penalties relating to forfeiture, and so on. They are not likely to be exercised, except in some fairly extreme case of defiance. I am sure that most of the issues that would arise would be well solved by negotiation because, if there is a breach, it is usually inadvertent and it can be rectified by discussion.

In relation to royalties to the designer, I understand that there was outright purchase of the design, so no residual rights are left with the designer. I think that there was a commissioning of a variation on the logo following the end of the jubilee year in order to make it an ongoing logo which would apply to any situation, but that would have been done on a fee-for-service basis, so all rights reside with the Government and are seen to be so. This Bill simply clarifies those rights as far as the State Government is concerned.

Bill read a second time.

In Committee.

Clauses 1 and 2 passed.

Clause 3—'Use of State commercial emblems.'

Mr S.J. BAKER:

Page 2, lines 12 to 21—Leave out subclauses (7) and (8) and insert:

(7) Where—

(a) goods are seized from a person under subsection (6); but

(b) (i) proceedings for an offence against this section in relation to the goods are not instituted within three months after their seizure; or

(ii) proceedings for such an offence are instituted within that period but the defendant is not found guilty of the offence,

the person from whom the goods were seized may, by action in a court of competent jurisdiction, recover from the Minister the goods, or compensation for any loss arising from their seizure, or both.

(8) Where—

(a) goods are seized from a person under subsection (6); and

(b) proceedings for an offence against this section in relation to the goods are instituted within three months after their seizure,

then—

(c) if the defendant is convicted of the offence—the court may order that the goods are forfeited to the Crown and the goods may be disposed of in such manner as the Minister directs;

or

(d) if the defendant is found guilty of the offence but no order is made forfeiting the goods—the person from whom they were seized may, by action in a court of competent jurisdiction, recover from the Minister the goods, or if they have deteriorated or been destroyed, the market value of the goods at the time of their seizure.

That is the first block of our proposed amendments. The Bill provides power for the police to seize goods that they suspect on reasonable grounds have been, are being or are intended to be supplied in contravention of this section. If there is a conviction, the goods are automatically forfeited to the Crown. This may well be very harsh, and that is what the Opposition maintains. The clause does not provide the discretion that we would like. Proposed new subsection (8) provides:

Where a person is convicted of an offence against this section in relation to the supply of goods, the goods are forfeit to the Crown, and may be disposed of in such manner as the Minister directs.

There is a clear indication that the Crown is required to seize and forfeit the goods. We do not believe that that is appropriate; there should be some discretion. Further, if a case is not taken against the accused, or if the accused is not convicted of that offence, that person should not suffer material loss in the form of goods and trade. These are very important principles. I know there are further protections than are applied here, and they can be found under the Fair Trading Act. It is inappropriate for a Bill of this nature to provide heavy handed penalties. Obviously we wish to dissuade people from exploiting our resources without paying the price, but the penalties and the mechanisms laid down here are unduly harsh. I commend the amendments to the Committee for the reasons I have specified.

The Hon. J.C. BANNON: I can see the point that the honourable member is driving at and aspects of his amendment clarify the procedure that would be involved, but it departs from the normal provision that governs these things in other legislation. In the interests of uniformity, I am not prepared to accept the amendment. I do not think it does anything other than add to or clarify the existing clause. No doubt this matter will be looked at again in another place and it may be that after the Bill is passed in this Chamber and before it is debated in the other place some agreement can be reached. At this stage, I do not think it would be appropriate to depart from the standard. We have done that on some occasions previously with fairly disastrous consequences in legislation, so I err on the side of caution.

Mr S.J. BAKER: I am very disappointed at the Premier's attitude. The Bill is unduly harsh. It is not uniform legislation, as the Premier would have us believe, because there are provisions in other Acts—and I mentioned the Fair Trading Act—where alternatives are available should it be proved that a person has committed an offence. There are protections for people whose goods have wrongfully been seized. When we are talking about goods and services, it is very important to remember that it would be unduly harsh if a car with a logo or emblem on it was seized, but proposed new subsection (8) provides:

Where a person is convicted of an offence against this section in relation to the supply of goods, the goods are forfeit to the Crown . . .

No discretion is allowed under this provision. I believe it involves bad drafting or bad intention. I hope that the Premier will reconsider the matter. As he said, it will obviously be considered in another place if it is not accepted here today.

Amendment negatived.

Mr S.J. BAKER: I move:

Page 2, line 35—After 'by' insert ', or with the permission of,'.

There is a difficulty with proposed new subsection (12) which provides:

This section does not . . . affect the use of an emblem by a person who, before the commencement of this section, would have been entitled to prevent another person from passing off . . . goods or services as the goods or services of that person.

This ought to allow any licensing or supply arrangements which may have been entered into by the first person. Therefore, I recommend that the words 'or with the permission of' be inserted.

The Hon. J.C. BANNON: I am happy to accept the amendment in that form.

Amendment carried.

Mr S.J. BAKER: Will the Premier inform the Committee whether the J150 logo is currently protected by copyright, and is it intended that the new commercial State emblem shall be protected by copyright?

The Hon. J.C. BANNON: Certainly our protection by Act within the State is valid and remains. But, at this stage it is not intended to renew the copyright nationally. As I understand it, that would require registering the logo as a trademark. We do not intend to do that. We do not think that the expense is warranted. The protection, based on our experience with the previous logo, will be appropriate. Obviously if there are problems we can move to provide that added protection.

Mr S.J. BAKER: Am I correct in assuming that any goods manufactured outside the State which use the commercial Jubilee emblem would, indeed, not be subject to the provisions of this Act, nor would they receive any protection under Federal legislation?

The Hon. J.C. BANNON: If they are wholly produced outside South Australia they would not be covered by this Act, nor could they be sold within the State. In other words, if any of those products came into the State they would be caught under the Act.

Mr S.J. BAKER: Is it intended that further common emblems be so described, or covered, under this legislation? Members would be aware of the position of the State emblem, which is not used in a commercial capacity, but there are invariably entrepreneurs who design things for government. Are there any emblems on the drawing board at the moment which will be covered?

The Hon. J.C. BANNON: No. The Government believes that protection for the State emblem and the official coat of arms of the State is provided in their commercial and public recognition and by their association with the Jubilee. There is no intention to introduce or extend that to other devices or emblems. That is not to say that in the future it might not be appropriate to do so, but certainly in the current phase of marketing we do not see any need for that.

Clause as amended passed.

Title passed.

Bill read a third time and passed.

CRIMINAL INJURIES COMPENSATION ACT AMENDMENT BILL

Received from the Legislative Council and read a first time.

OMBUDSMAN ACT AMENDMENT BILL

Adjourned debate on second reading.

(Continued from 18 August. Page 380.)

Mr. S.J. BAKER (Mitcham): The Opposition supports the proposition before the House. The Bill contains two amendments to the Ombudsman Act. The first upgrades the penalty for offences against the Act from $500 to $2 000. These penalties have not been increased since 1972 and, by my calculations, the penalty of $2 000 under this Act is just about right when we consider the inflation that has taken place.

The other amendment involves the creation of a new offence of hindering or obstructing a person in or preventing a person from making a complaint under the Act. It has been suggested that officers of certain authorities have dissuaded people from making complaints to the Ombudsman on the basis that, if the complaint is made, the next time those people approach the authority they may receive less than favourable treatment.

Of course, there are more outrageous examples of hindering or obstructing with quite significant threats being made to people. That tends to prevent the Ombudsman from making an inquiry because the complaint would never be lodged. The addition of this provision is, indeed, quite a healthy move. It signals to all those departments and officials of the departments covered by this Act that they should not put any pressure on people to stop them from making a complaint to the Ombudsman.

Members may well recall the speeches that were made when the legislation was brought before this Parliament in the early 1970s. The desire of the Parliament—and it was a unanimous desire—was that the office of the Ombudsman should be able to investigate and report on the activities of Government without fear or favour. I believe that the office of the Ombudsman has generally done a sterling job in bringing to the attention of the public and the Parliament areas where servants of the public have not performed appropriately.

From my own observations, I believe that, when Mr Bakewell was Ombudsman, we had a very interesting time in that he really did report to the Parliament without fear or favour. On occasions both Parties felt his venom and, indeed, the effects of his lucid explanations of the wrongs that were being wrought in the public sector.

Mr Duigan interjecting:

Mr S.J. BAKER: Well, I was going to say that I believe that the current incumbent does not have the same style as the previously mentioned gentleman. He seems to be more intent—

The DEPUTY SPEAKER: I interrupt the honourable member and remind him that, although he is speaking under parliamentary privilege, I caution him in that any public servant to whom he refers does not have the right of reply. I caution him to remember the situation he is in.

Mr S.J. BAKER: Thank you, Sir. I am well aware of that situation. I was not going to say anything that would cast any reflection on the current incumbent. I was saying that the current incumbent is less forthright in the way that he—

Ms GAYLER: On a point of order, Mr Deputy Speaker, the person being referred to is, I believe, an officer of this Parliament or, at the very least, appointed by this Parliament, and it would be inappropriate for the honourable member to continue on this line.

The DEPUTY SPEAKER: I cannot uphold the point of order because of the parliamentary privilege situation. However, I take the point that the honourable member is making. I believe that every member of this House must realise his or her own responsibility in respect of making comments about public servants who are not in a position to reply.

Mr S.J. BAKER: I hope that I will be allowed to continue because I do not think that I have reflected on past or present Ombudsmen. If members opposite are getting a little sensitive, they should wait until I say something that makes them sensitive. If they do not mind holding back for a little longer, perhaps they can comment at a later stage and contribute to the debate. The point that I make is that the current incumbent is more conciliatory: he attempts to determine where the fault lies and to conciliate the matter.

An honourable member: That's a good thing.

Mr S.J. BAKER: Just hold on a second. That means that the responses from the present Ombudsman take somewhat longer than previously but I do not believe that the results are any less effective.

Ms Gayler interjecting:

The DEPUTY SPEAKER: Order! Interjections are out of order.

Mr S.J. BAKER: If the honourable member for Newland wants to make a contribution to this debate, she can do so at the appropriate time. I am drawing a comparison between the way the Ombudsman's Office operated previously and the way it operates today. I do not think that anyone in this House should get distressed about what I have said. I have not received replies in some cases for a considerable time because the processes have been followed very meticulously. However, on several occasions I desired a more prompt response.

The issue of hindering or obstructing is a vexed one and a question of degree. What happens in the case of an officer who receives a complaint from an unhappy person off the street who says that he or she will go to the Ombudsman? If that officer should say, 'I can fix it up here; don't go to the Ombudsman', does that constitute obstruction or hindrance? This matter has been canvassed at length in another place and I recommend that members follow that debate. The only way that we can appreciate the extent to which this provision can be used is by example. This is a very short, simple Bill, which provides further support for the Office of the Ombudsman.

Mr S.G. EVANS (Davenport): I support the Bill. As the person who brought this concept to Parliament, I have a great respect for the office and I look to its working in a satisfactory manner to ensure that, at least in the eyes of those who lodge complaints, justice appears to be done. The community does not necessarily trust responses from politicians, Government departments or local authorities and finds another umpire useful. The Ombudsman has been given that task in South Australia, similarly to the provisions in most, if not all, of the other States in the Commonwealth.

The person who takes on the task must be enthusiastic and must forget that he or she ever belonged to the Public Service or the Parliament, if that should be the case. If anything, the person concerned must lean towards the complainant in carrying out the initial investigation although he or she must come down with a just decision in the end. On 12 July 1969, Don Dunstan said that it would be an unnecessary appointment, and the Premier of the day (Mr Steele Hall) said that he would ignore Parliament because he did not want to appoint a super inquisitor to intimidate public servants. I was disappointed and it took a change of Government to bring about the creation of the Office of Ombudsman.

Without reflecting on other officers, I believe that the best Ombudsman so far was the first Ombudsman (Mr Gordon Combe). Maybe that was because he sat in this place for so long acting as adjudicator in trying to bring about fair play and in advising the Speaker and his Deputy on how Parliament should operate. The private sector could

use the services of an Ombudsman to look at bank, insurance and finance complaints. I will not take that concept any further, although I have sown the seed of thought for the Government and others because there is a need to promote that viewpoint.

This Bill seeks to stop a person who obstructs or hinders others lodging a complaint with the Ombudsman or his or her officers (and we did have a female for a short time). I support that concept wholeheartedly but Parliament and the Government would be wise to get away from people who have served in the Public Service, especially the Attorney-General's and Solicitor-General's offices. I know that it is difficult to find people who can respond quickly and sort the wheat from the chaff, although with some complaints it does not matter if it takes a while to get a response. However, with others a quick response is necessary.

I have lodged a complaint with the Ombudsman concerning the Government's decision to supply word processors to some members of Parliament and not to others. That is totally unfair and unprincipled, and the Ombudsman should have power to step in and tell the Government to get its act together. It should not give the privilege of extra services to a few MPs and not to others so that they can exploit the system of keeping electoral contact. I do not care whether Liberal or Labor MPs have received word processors. However, I have not received a satisfactory response from the Ombudsman on this issue, so I do have a complaint. The Ombudsman's operation is approved by Parliament, and this is the only place in which we can raise such an issue.

This is the sort of injustice that the Ombudsman's Office was created to try to solve because, as an MP, I have nowhere else to go. I have been to the Minister and to the Minister's officers. I was an Independent member at the time and I believe that others have lodged complaints, although I cannot confirm that. However, the practice continues. As an MP, I cannot get a response from anyone to the effect that it is an injustice and the Government has been advised of it. No-one could honestly stand up and say that it is not an injustice. It is a scandalous injustice wherein, with a system in which all members of Parliament are elected to represent their constituents, one group of members are given more facilities in the way of money and equipment to keep records, etc., than others.

In supporting this Bill I merely say that I would give the Ombudsman every help in making sure that the office operates efficiently and effectively without illegal and unjust hindrances in its inquiries and investigations, but every person who lodges a complaint, whether that person be a politician or the poorest or richest member of the community, should receive fair consideration. I hope that the office, for which I fought through two Parliaments and which was rejected by the Leaders of the major Parties at the time but supported by members of the ALP and some Liberal members against my Party Leader's wishes and those of his Cabinet, can be strengthened. The operation should be speeded up and attempts made to ensure that the office is divorced from political philosophies and pressures of Government departments, the Government and those who initiated the selection of the Ombudsman. I support the Bill.

The Hon. G.J. CRAFTER (Minister of Education): I thank the Opposition for its support of this measure which, although minor, is an important amendment to the Act, as it provides further strengthening to the arm of the Ombudsman so that he may not only carry out the investigations required of him under the Act but also be unhindered in receiving those representations, submissions and requests that come to his office from the community. So, this Bill will put beyond doubt those circumstances which have, unfortunately it appears, arisen in the past and which have not seen proper complaints being lodged with the Office of the Ombudsman.

I note with some concern the comments made by members opposite on behalf of the Opposition about the present incumbent in that position. I can only put a generous interpretation on the comments made by the member for Mitcham later in his speech on the Bill, although it is of concern to me that words such as 'not forthright' were attributed to that office. However, I put it in the light that the honourable member conveyed to the House.

I wish to place on record my own appreciation of the work done by the Ombudsman's Office over the years since its inception and indeed by the present incumbent of that position. The Ombudsman is an eminent lawyer who has, with distinction, served the State in the Crown Law Department for many years in a wide variety of areas of the law. I believe that he has brought much knowledge, experience and wisdom to his position, has performed his onerous task with great dignity and distinction, and has served the community of this State well indeed. I seek the support of members for this measure.

Bill read a second time and taken through its remaining stages.

RACING ACT AMENDMENT BILL

Returned from the Legislative Council without amendment.

LOTTERY AND GAMING ACT AMENDMENT BILL (No. 2)

Returned from the Legislative Council without amendment.

TELECOMMUNICATIONS (INTERCEPTION) BILL

Second reading.

The Hon. LYNN ARNOLD (Minister of State Development and Technology): I move:

That this Bill be now read a second time.

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

Leave granted.

Explanation of Bill

In 1987, the Commonwealth Parliament enacted the Telecommunications (Interception) Act Amendmment Act which *inter alia* contains provisions enabling State Police Forces to apply for the issue of warrants authorising telecommunications interception. The Act provides that the power to obtain interception warrants is available only to State agencies which have been 'declared' by the Commonwealth Minister on the basis that the Minister is satisfied that the State has legislation making satisfactory provision regarding matters set out in section 35 of the Act.

This Bill makes provision for the matters set out in section 35 of the Commonwealth Act. These matters relate to the following:

the retention of warrants and instruments of revocation by the Commissioner of Police;
the keeping and retention of proper records relating to interceptions, the use of intercepted information and the communication and destruction of intercepted information;
the regular inspection of records by an independent authority (the Police Complaints Authority) and for the reporting by that authority to the Attorney-General of the results of each inspection;
the furnishing of reports by the Attorney-General to the Commonwealth Minister of all reports by the independent authority;
the furnishing by the Commissioner of Police to the Attorney-General of copies of all warrants and instruments of revocation and, the reporting to the Attorney-General within three months after the expiration or revocation of a warrant, on the use made of intercepted information and the communication of that information;
the furnishing by the Attorney-General to the Commonwealth Minister of copies of all warrants and instruments of revocation; and
for the destruction of irrelevant records and copies of intercepted communications.

The Commonwealth Telecommunications (Interception) Act 1979 provides the framework for intercepting telecommunications. It establishes the offences for which interception warrants may be obtained; the grounds on which warrants will be issued by a Federal Court judge; and the use that may be made of information obtained as a result of an interception.

The offences for which warrants may be obtained are repeated in clause 3 of this Bill. There are two classes of offence. Class 1 offences are murder and kidnapping and class 2 offences are those punishable by imprisonment for life, or a maximum period of at least seven years, involving loss of life or serious personal injury, or the serious risk of such loss or injury; serious damage to property in circumstances endangering a person's safety; trafficking in narcotic drugs; serious fraud or serious loss to the revenue of the State. In addition, aiding, abetting, counselling, procuring or conspiring in relation to any of the above.

In determining whether to issue a warrant in relation to a class 1 offence, the judge must take into consideration *inter alia* the extent to which other methods of investigation have been used, how much information would be likely to be obtained by such methods and how such methods would be likely to prejudice the investigation. In relation to a class 2 offence, the judge must also have regard to *inter alia* the privacy of persons likely to be interfered with by the interception and the gravity of the conduct constituting the offence being investigated.

Information obtained as a result of an interception can only be used in court proceedings or passed on to another eligible agency if it relates to an offence under the law of the State of that eligible agency, or relates to proceedings for confiscation or forfeiture of property, or may give rise to policy disciplinary proceedings or involves misbehaviour or improper conduct of an officer of the State. Intercepted material is inadmissible in court proceedings if it is not obtained in accordance with the provisions of the Commonwealth Act.

Under the provisions of the Commonwealth Act, the State police are to obtain their own warrants from a Federal Court judge. All interception warrants are to be executed by the Telecommunications Interception Division of the Australian Federal Police and all interceptions are to be conducted through Telecom except where a judge specifically authorises the AFP to intercept independently of Telecom on being satisfied that Telecom cannot assist for technical reasons, because its facilities are not available or its assistance might jeopardise the security of the operation.

The Government believes that telecommunication interception is a cost effective means of combating serious crime. It also recognises that telecommunication interception is a particularly intrusive form of investigation and should be used only in special circumstances where other less intrusive methods would be ineffective. By restricting the authority to make use of interceptions to serious crimes, by requiring judicial authorisation for warrants, by providing for ministerial review of all warrants issued and by providing for independent inspection of police records, the Government is satisfied that the proper balance has been obtained between the protection of the community against criminal activity and criminal injury on the one hand and the privacy of the individual on the other.

This Government has already done much to further its resolve to protect the community against criminal activity and injury—to mention some measures already taken—the National Crime Authority legislation, the revision of drug offence penalties and the confiscation of profits of crime legislation. The present measure will further enhance the community's protection against criminal activity.

Clause 1 is formal. Clause 2 provides for commencement on proclamation. Clause 3 provides a series of definitions the majority of which are, of necessity, straight copies of definitions in the Commonwealth Act. The definitions of 'ancillary offence', 'Class 1 offence', 'Class 2 offence', 'prescribed offence' and 'serious offence' are all required for the purposes of clause 6 of the Bill which obliges the Commissioner of Police to give very detailed reports to the Attorney-General. Subclause (3) provides that any expression not defined in this Act has the same meaning as in the Commonwealth Act.

Clause 4 requires the Commissioner of Police to keep copies of all interception warrants issued to the police force of this State, copies of each notification given to the Federal Police Commissioner as to the issue of a warrant pursuant to a telephone application, copies of all revocations of warrants, copies of certain evidentiary certificates that the Commissioner of Police is empowered to give under the Commonwealth Act, copies of written authorities given by the Commissioner to police officers authorising them to receive information obtained by interceptions, and copies of all records made under clause 5 of the Bill.

Clause 5 requires the Commissioner of Police to make written records of a wide range of matters relating to warrants and their revocation or refusal under the Commonwealth Act, to the movement of records of interceptions into and out of the hands of the police force and to the use made of information obtained through interceptions.

Clause 6 requires the Commissioner to give the Attorney-General a copy of each warrant or revocation of a warrant as soon as possible after its issue. The Commissioner must also report to the Attorney-General, not later than three months after a warrant ceases to be in force, on the use made and communication of any information obtained pursuant to the warrant. An annual report must also be given to the Attorney-General setting out detailed information and statistics generally relating to the whole area of warrants, arrests and convictions made on the basis of information obtained through interceptions and the types of offences involved in such proceedings.

Clause 7 requires the Commissioner of Police to keep restricted records (that is, records, whether audio or tran-

scripts, of interceptions) in a secure place that is not accessible to persons other than those who have lawful access to them. The Commissioner is also obliged to destroy such records once they are no longer needed.

Clause 8 requires the Police Complaints Authority to inspect the records of the Police Commissioner at least twice a year in order to ascertain whether or not the requirements of this Act as to the keeping and making of records (sections 4 and 5) and the security and destruction of restricted records (section 7) are being complied with. Not later than two months after completing such as inspection the authority must give a written report of the results of the inspection to the Attorney-General. If certain other offences come to light during such an inspection, the Authority may include that information in any such written report.

Clause 9 gives the authority and any authorised officer of the authority powers of entry onto police force premises and the right to inspect all police records and require any member of the police force to give information relevant to the inspection. A person is not excused from giving such information on the ground of self-incrimination, but any such information is not admissible in evidence against the person (except in proceedings for an offence against section 10).

Clause 10 establishes the offences of refusing or failing to comply with requirements made under section 9 and of hindering an inspection or giving false or misleading information. Clause 11 prohibits the Police Complaints Authority and its officers from divulging information obtained pursuant to this Act except, of course, as may be required or authorised by this Act. Clause 12 provides that the above offences are summary offences. Clause 13 gives immunity to the Police Complaints Authority and to such of its officers as may be acting under its direction or with its authority, when acting in good faith under this Act. Clause 14 obliges the Attorney-General to give a copy of all warrants, revocations and reports received under this Act to the relevant Commonwealth Minister. Clause 15 is a regulation-making power.

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

NATIONAL CRIME AUTHORITY (STATE PROVISIONS) ACT AMENDMENT BILL

Second reading.

The Hon. LYNN ARNOLD (Minister of State Development and Technology): I move:

That this Bill be now read a second time.

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

Leave granted.

Explanation of Bill

The Commonwealth National Crime Authority Act 1984 established the National Crime Authority. The National Crime Authority (State Provisions) Act 1984 gives the authority power to investigate offences against State laws.

In 1987, section 31 of the Commonwealth Act was amended to give the authority power to apply to a judge of the Federal Court for a warrant to arrest a person, in relation to whom a summons has been issued to appear before the authority, where there are reasonable grounds to believe that the witness has absconded or is likely to abscond, or is attempting or likely to attempt to evade service of the summons. The amendment also provides that a warrant may be executed notwithstanding that the warrant is not at the time in the possession of the person executing it.

Before this amendment the authority had identical powers under the Commonwealth and State Acts. It is desirable that this situation should continue in order to avoid confusion where the authority is undertaking a joint Commonwealth-State investigation. The power to arrest an absconding witness is, in any event, a desirable one. At the time the National Crime Authority was established, concerns were expressed about its likely effectiveness as well as about its coercive powers. It was accordingly decided that the authority should be established for an initial period of five years when its operation could be reassessed.

There can be no doubt that the authority has been an effective force in the investigation and prosecution of serious crime, and legislation was introduced into the Federal Parliament on 24 February 1988 to repeal the sunset provision in the Federal Act. To ensure that the authority can continue to investigate offences against State law, section 35, the sunset provision, needs to be repealed. I commend the Bill to members.

Clause 1 is formal. Clause 2 amends section 20 of the principal Act. It extends the power of a judge of the Federal Court to the issuing of a warrant for the apprehension of a person who has been summoned under section 17 (1) to appear before the authority to give evidence where the judge is satisfied by evidence given on oath that there are reasonable grounds to believe that the person has absconded, is likely to abscond or otherwise attempts, or is otherwise likely to attempt, to evade service of the summons.

A new subsection (2a) provides that a warrant can be executed notwithstanding that it is not, at the time of its execution, in the possession of the person executing it. Clause 3 repeals section 35 of the principal Act, which is a sunset clause.

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

ADJOURNMENT

The Hon. J.H.C. KLUNDER (Minister of Mines and Energy): I move:

That the House do now adjourn.

The DEPUTY SPEAKER: The honourable member for Mitcham. I beg your pardon. The honourable Minister of State Development and Technology.

Mr S.J. Baker interjecting:

The Hon. LYNN ARNOLD (Minister of State Development and Technology): Thank you, Mr Speaker. As the member for Mitcham rightly points out, I will now finish the figures that the Opposition wished not to hear during Question Time earlier today. I can say here that these figures contain good news about the manufacturing sector in this State and I can understand why the Opposition does not wish to hear them.

Picking up these points, the report on the national survey of the Metal Trades Industries Association on business conditions and industry outlook, released in March 1988, from which I was quoting earlier today, has further figures which are worth reading into *Hansard* and to which I draw the honourable member's attention. That survey showed that South Australia recorded the second best growth rate (13 per cent) in sales and that a 36 per cent growth was expected in South Australian investment in manufacturing in 1988, while South Australia also recorded the strongest performance in export growth (53.8 per cent).

Increases in employment in this State (3.7 per cent) exceeded the national rate of 1.2 per cent, while for the remainder of 1988 the respondents expected employment to grow in South Australia at the rate of 3.3 per cent. The same survey showed that there was a 38 per cent increase in investment in new buildings in the manufacturing sector since 1986 ($8.6 million to $11.3 million) and that investment in new plant and equipment increased by 60 per cent between 1986 and 1988 ($38.6 million to $66.5 million), again, among those responding to the survey.

In addition to the Metal Trades Industries Association figures, I can also quote figures, as I said during Question Time, from the Engineering Employers Association quarterly surveys, the CAI-Westpac June 1988 survey of industrial trends, and the South Australian Chamber of Commerce June 1988 survey. As I said earlier, for the first time manufacturing exports have become the biggest single sector, exceeding agricultural exports. Other figures also worth noting with respect to manufacturing are as follows: during the most recent period of the survey, 52 per cent of our total overseas exports were in manufactured goods, with 41 per cent for agriculture and 1.8 per cent for mining.

In the three months to June 1987, the latest year for which figures are published, there was a 26.7 per cent increase, in nominal terms, in manufacturing exports. The State's growth in manufacturing exports has exceeded the national growth rate in this area. It should be noted that the growth rate for the high technology manufacturing industry was 57 per cent compared with the low technology industry growth rate of 25 per cent. Why should that be so? It is so for a number of reasons, some of which are related to Government performance. Of course, others are clearly related to the attitude of the manufacturing industry in this State in that it is prepared to take on the world and go out there and sell competitive high quality products.

Another factor that gives us an advantage is our industrial relations record. This State has consistently had a much better industrial relations record than other States. Our figure is between 70 and 90 days per 1 000 employees per year lost to industrial disputation compared with a national figure of between 240 and 270 days. I remind members opposite that, in the period of the Tonkin Administration, between 200 and 320 days were lost in industrial disputation per 1 000 employees, compared with the present figure of 70 to 90 days.

Mr Becker interjecting:

The Hon. LYNN ARNOLD: The honourable member for Hanson says that that is not correct. I suggest that he looks closely at what the situation has been.

Mr Becker interjecting:

The Hon. LYNN ARNOLD: The honourable member claims that the Tonkin Government was sabotaged. I suggest that the performance of that Government indicates that it shot itself in the foot, if one wants to talk about where the sabotage occurred. Another advantage that this State has is the amount of reasonably priced industrial land close to major transport nodes. This city has more industrial high quality land which is reasonably priced and close to the major international shipping, airport and trans-national rail facilities than any other capital city within the nation. Likewise, our labor costs are much lower than any other city. Indeed, on average, wage rates in this State are between 7 to 11 per cent lower than wage rates in other cities.

Figures like those were pointed out last year to a major interstate-based industrialist who has a manufacturing facility in South Australia, but he did not believe them. He went away to do some homework on his own enterprises in New South Wales and South Australia, determined to prove that our figures were wrong. He had the good grace to come back to us with the results of his own calculations based upon his manufacturing plants in Sydney and Adelaide. We had told him that our labour costs in the manufacturing industry were 11 per cent cheaper than New South Wales. He said that we were wrong because his Adelaide factory was 13 per cent cheaper than his Sydney factory. So, our estimate had been conservative.

We also have the advantage of a broad range of manufacturing in this State. We are second only to Victoria in the number of ASIC industry codes that are represented in the manufacturing sector. Our total output is third in the country, but we are second in diversity. We have a skilled work force and we also have industry infrastructure. We have heavy, medium and light industry and a tooling capacity which other States do not have.

The support that is available for industry includes such things as Technology Park; the Centre for Manufacturing; the Advanced Technology Enterprise Centre at the Regency College of TAFE; the Surface Technology Centre at the Levels Campus of the South Australian Institute of Technology; the Micro-Electronics Application Centre based at Technology Park; the Adelaide Innovation Centre (part of SAGRIC International), also based at Technology Park; the Whyalla Technology and Enterprise Centre, which is presently under construction; and the NIES program run in conjunction with the Centre for Manufacturing.

This State also has the advantage of lower transport costs to service a national market, if South Australia is chosen as the manufacturing base. Studies show that, if one container of product was exported to each capital city in Australia from Adelaide, Melbourne, Sydney or Perth, Adelaide is the cheapest place from which to export, based on container freight rates. If one takes Perth out of that calculation—given that we have an unfair advantage in terms of shipping to Perth—Adelaide is equally the cheapest in terms of servicing Sydney, Brisbane and Melbourne. In addition, we have the attractive lifestyle that exists in this State.

Between the coming to power of the Bannon Government and now, the Australian growth rate for fixed capital expenditure for selected industries was 65.1 per cent. South Australia led the mainland States with 104 per cent, followed by Western Australia on 82 per cent, Victoria on 71 per cent, New South Wales on 45 per cent, and the much vaunted Queensland down at 38 per cent. They are the sorts of figures that are real, and they are proven in industry surveys. They are the sorts of figures that the Opposition should heed, and it should be proud that that is what is happening in South Australia.

This State needs more manufacturing investment and more growth, but it has turned the corner with respect to the situation between 1974-75 and 1984-85 when there was a decline of 24 per cent in manufacturing industry employment and a decline of 9 per cent in value added. In that same period labour productivity increased by 15 per cent. That labour decline has now been arrested and value added is growing, as the manufacturing sector is back on a healthy footing and going in the right direction. It will need to continue in that way if our economy is to remain strong. This Government is committed to supporting the manufacturing industry in this State and its future growth.

Mr INGERSON (Bragg): I want to talk about an issue involving the Adelaide Hebrew Community in the development of a synagogue, preschool and primary school on land at Glenside. Some six months ago senior members of the Adelaide Hebrew community told me that they would like my support, which I gave, as their local member for

the development of a new synagogue, a preschool and primary school development and, possibly, a future secondary school development on the same site. Initially, these discussions related to a piece of land on the corner of Greenhill and Fullarton Roads on the northern corner of the Glenside Hospital site. That site turned out to be too difficult to develop because it is on the corner of a very busy intersection, so it was consequently withdrawn from discussion.

At a later date another piece of land fronting Flemington Road, on the southern side of the Glenside Hospital site, was suggested as a possible development site. At that time I decided to write to the Minister of Health asking him whether there were any future development options for the Glenside Hospital site because I had been approached by the Adelaide Hebrew congregation and the Burnside council which, for obvious reasons, having already developed a retirement village on that site (in consultation with, and the support of, the State Government) was very interested in any future land at that site that may be made available by the Government. Also at that time the Shadow Minister of Health (Hon. M.B. Cameron) in another place asked the then Minister of Health whether a major redevelopment was planned for the Glenside site. It is interesting that the then Minister of Health denied that there would be any development of significance on that site.

I have had discussions with the City of Burnside, where I supported the possible development of that site by the Adelaide Hebrew congregation. It became obvious that there were several major issues of concern relating to the procedures which have occurred in the possible granting of that land to the Adelaide Hebrew community. When I say 'granting', I do not mean that it has been granted in the sense that no payment has been made, because there is no question that the Adelaide Hebrew congregation will have to pay a commercial rate. Only this morning I discovered that an option had been granted to the Adelaide Hebrew congregation, again without any notification at all to the Burnside City Council.

I now turn to the major issue of concern, that is, the setting out of guidelines for the purchase of Government lands by councils. On 13 January 1988 the Burnside council received a letter from the Department of Lands and it states:

Surplus State Government Properties Notice

Take notice that the properties described on the attached schedule have been declared surplus to the requirements of various State Government departments. The Department of Lands is required to ascertain any other Government interest in acquiring this property at market value prior to offering it for sale on the open market. Any Government department or agency including local government authorities having interest in the acquisition of these listed properties should contact the Department of Lands within 14 days of this circular.

The Hon. R.K. Abbott: That information is available to everybody.

Mr INGERSON: Yes, I know. The Burnside council was, and is continually, interested in any land available for sale within that rectangle of the Glenside Hospital. As a consequence, Burnside council wrote to the Department of Lands expressing interest in that land. The Department of Lands informed the council that its interest had been noted but then, on 24 February, it received another letter from the Department of Lands, as follows:

Re Flemington Street—Glenside.

Further to our recent correspondence in relation to the above land, I advise that this land together with adjoining land which form part of the Glenside Hospital is currently under negotiation in relation to the Minister of Health's requirements.

You are therefore advised that this land has been withdrawn from offer pending resolution of these negotiations.

The Adelaide Hebrew congregation had been promised this land and, at the same time, the Burnside council had also been asked to express some interest in that land.

Burnside council is concerned about Cabinet's principle that surplus Government land should be offered to local government for purchase, giving it at least the right of first refusal. I recognise in a comment made by the previous Minister that it is not the first right but that it has a right in a pecking order to say 'Yes' or 'No'. Because Burnside council was not satisfied with the communication it was receiving from the Department of Lands, it wrote to the Premier on 24 February and said that it wished to express interest in any surplus land. It requested from the Premier any background information which would enable it to be involved in any future land negotiations.

On 4 May, the Burnside council Town Clerk again wrote to the Premier as follows:

I understand that at a function late last week to celebrate the 40th anniversary of the founding of the State of Israel it was announced that some two acres of land in the vicinity of Glenside would be transferred to a local community group. I would appreciate your response to my original letter . . .

That letter set out the current state of play. The letter continues:

I feel sure that the council will be disappointed if a decision has been made without consultation and, if this is, in fact, the case would appreciate your advice as to the planning procedure to be followed in respect of the proposed development.

The Burnside council was concerned that it had the option to discuss possible purchase, and then it was refused, seemingly with no explanation at all. It then ascertained that the whole issue of the possible granting of the land and a commercial payment involving the Adelaide Hebrew community was continuing without any consultation with the council. So, on 4 July the Mayor wrote to the Premier and asked him whether he could clearly set out that, in future, any sale of land in that Glenside Hospital rectangle would be offered to the Burnside council, because it has a very significant interest in the development of that site.

As I said, in the community interest, the council has already developed an excellent retirement village and, obviously, it is interested in future development on that site. On 4 July the council wrote to the Premier asking him whether the future position as it related to the Burnside council could be put in writing. A portion of the letter states:

The Glenside site is of vital importance to the city of Burnside. Sale of part of the Glenside site in the absence of an acceptable plan relating to the site as a whole is not acceptable, particularly given council's prior expression of interest in surplus land going back for a number of years. I would anticipate considerable community support once the issue reaches the public area as it must once a formal planning application is received. However, I am sympathetic to the aspirations of the Adelaide Hebrew congregation—

as I said earlier, I also support their proposal. In finishing, I request of the Premier a clear statement to the Burnside council.

The Hon. R.G. PAYNE (Mitchell): A few days ago during an adjournment debate I dealt with the Leader of the Opposition's highly selective use of statistics when he made a quite unwarranted attack on the Electricity Trust. I demonstrated that his arguments contained no substance, no real foundation, and no basis in fact. I point out that he complained of an increase of 600 employees in ETSA during the period 1982 to 1988, which of course is the period of office of the present Labor Government. I think that his approach could only be described as very careful, and one could almost say studious. He did not mention that, during

the Liberal Party's three years in office, which was just prior to the six year period with which he dealt, the ETSA work force increased by 176 employees. In effect, that was the first, as I said then, sin of omission that he practised in order to give that false impression and to make an unwarranted attack on ETSA.

His whole line of reasoning was that ETSA had been profligating by increasing the work force; that it was not taking economic needs into account; and, therefore, a review was needed, which in some way would lead to a reduction in the work force. At no time when he put those arguments did he give any real consideration to ETSA's expansion of activities during the period concerned. That expansion of activity led to the increase in numbers and is quite supportable when one examines the expanded activities. I think that he should have been aware that, during the period to which he was referring, a review of ETSA and its activities has already been undertaken by Cresap, McCormack and Paget, which is a utility group of world-wide standard and which is based, in the main, in the United States of America. The board employed that group, with my full knowledge as the Minister, to conduct a review of ETSA. The review encompassed the number employed in the work force, the organisation, and the responsibility chains which existed, to see whether there was any need for a change or whether any improvement could be effected.

What did that review recommend? It recommended an increase in the work force, the very opposite of what we were told by the Leader of the Opposition. He said that a review should be instituted and that such review would result in a reduction in the work force. On the contrary, there were some recommendations on rearrangement at middle and senior management levels within ETSA, and there was also a recommendation for an increase in the total work force of about 32 persons. So much for the argument, if one could grace by that term the rubbish put forward by the Leader, in support of his quite unwarranted attack!

What other statistics did the Leader quite purposely overlook—because that is the only construction one can put on it? From the 1987 ETSA annual report, which the Leader must have studied in order to obtain the statistics that he produced selectively, he could also have ascertained (because it was staring at him in black and white) that there had been other increases in ETSA's activites. I am pleased that the member for Eyre is present in the Chamber, and I thank him for his presence, because one activity that resulted in an increase in ETSA's work force was the taking over of all the separate private electricity undertakings on the Eyre Peninsula and the West Coast; the member for Eyre had been clamouring for that year after year, even during the time of the Liberal Government—but had got nowhere. It was the Labor Government which recognised the merit of the arguments of the member for Eyre and took the necessary steps to put the consumers of electricity in that area, who had always paid a 10 per cent premium, on the same footing as other consumers. That occurrence resulted in an increase in the ETSA work force. Those facts would have been known also to the Leader, but there was no mention of them whatsoever.

The report cites other statistics on electricity undertakings that even lay people of the calibre of the Leader could or should understand. The report states that underground route increased from 3 195 kilometres in 1982 to 5 370 kilometres in 1987, or just under 68 per cent. I presume that the Leader realised that that increase might well require more staff not only to install the line but to continue the servicing for customers at the other end. On the very same page, from the most casual inspection, one can see there has also been an increase in the overhead line circuit from 60 023 kilometres in 1982 to 68 500 kilometres in 1987, or in excess of 14 per cent.

What was the Leader trying to argue—that all of these things can take place, that increased work can be carried out and that maintenance can continue with fewer people? It sounds fine, but in practice we are not dealing with sausages or puddings or whatever; we are talking about the delivery of electricity, of electrical energy, to business and industry consumers, and the attendant safety that must accompany that at all times. That means that there must be qualified personel, and an adequate number of personel, to ensure that those standards are maintained and that the public and consumers are protected in a way which we would all expect. ETSA has a good reputation in that regard, and that will continue. That report was readily available.

In addition, a simple phone call—and we heard about that today in regard to other matters—to ETSA would have adduced that 245 of the 600 new staff during that five year period were employed in the distribution section (to which I have just referred) and customer services. As the former Minister, I had a number of approaches from members of the Opposition to get ETSA to provide an additional service, a speedier connection to the network, to take care of faults or meet customer requirements in all sorts of ways. Of course, ETSA recognised that, and so did I. There was a necessity for additional people to provide that high level of customer service, and it has been provided.

One can look at almost any area. As I said, with only one phone call (and a member would not even have to pay for the call if he phoned from Parliament House), one could find out that there were 140 additional linesmen, and there was a need for that increase. A lot more work has to be done as a result of the 1983 bushfires and, clearly, the safety requirements involved extra persons. Surely after listening to my contribution every member in the House would fully understand that there was no substance to, or guts about, that attack at all. Members opposite had nothing else to do so they said, 'Let's have a go at ETSA,' but they could not substantiate any of the claims when it came to the crunch. I trust that the Leader will not make that sort of silly foray in the future and I thank members for listening to the facts that I have put before them.

Motion carried.

At 4.47 p.m. the House adjourned until Thursday 25 August at 11 a.m.