

HOUSE OF ASSEMBLY

Tuesday 15 November 1988

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

ASSENT TO BILLS

His Excellency the Governor, by message, intimated his assent to the following Bills:

Appropriation,
Cultural Trusts Act Amendment,
Loans to Producers Act Amendment.

QUESTIONS

The **SPEAKER**: I direct that written answers to the following questions on the Notice Paper, as detailed in the schedule that I now table, be distributed and printed in *Hansard*: Nos 54, 55, 73, 86 and 93; and I direct that the following answers to questions without notice be distributed and printed in *Hansard*.

DISABLED PERSONS PARKING

In reply to **Mr TYLER (Fisher)** 16 August.

The **Hon. G.F. KENEALLY**: Registration renewal notices are prepared in a multi-seal format which prevents insertion of pamphlets. The forms also include facilities for notification of change of address and name and notification of sale, leaving little space for additional messages. Renewal notices for drivers' licences are posted every five years, therefore the impact of any pamphlet, as suggested, would take five years to reach the total driving community. It would appear that the main problem with this type of occurrence is one of enforcement, which rests with the authorities responsible for this.

POLICE CORRUPTION ALLEGATIONS

In reply to **Hon. B.C. EASTICK (Light)** 9 November.

The **Hon. D.J. HOPGOOD**: The South Australian Government and the National Crime Authority enjoy a good working relationship. The South Australian Police Department has extended every cooperation to the National Crime Authority to assist it with its investigations in South Australia. The liaison between the South Australian Police and the authority over the investigation into Barry Malcolm Moyle suggests nothing to the contrary. The South Australian Police Department did not delay in making information available to the authority on an internal investigation into Barry Malcolm Moyle.

The reference granted to the authority in May 1986 was generally in relation to the growing and distribution of cannabis in several States and associated criminal activity. While the reference was broad enough to enable the investigation of, amongst other things, the corruption of public officials, it was not known to the South Australian Police that Barry Malcolm Moyle was under suspicion by the authority until May 1987. At that time, the authority was advised of the previous investigation and the full investigation file was subsequently made available to the authority. In addition, the officer who had conducted the earlier inter-

nal investigation became the departmental liaison officer to the authority.

PAPERS TABLED

The following papers were laid on the table:

By the Minister for Environment and Planning (Hon. D.J. Hopgood)—

Department of Environment and Planning—Report, 1987-88.

By the Minister of Transport (Hon. G.F. Keneally)—

Corporation of Port Lincoln—By-laws—

No. 1—Repeal of By-laws.

No. 10—Public Health.

No. 15 Combustible and Flammable Materials.

No. 51—Penalties.

By the Minister of Education (Hon. G.J. Crafter)—

Accounting Standards Review Board—Report, 1987-88

Land Agents, Brokers and Valuers Act 1973—Regulations—Mortgage Financing.

By the Minister of Children's Services (Hon. G.J. Crafter)—

Children's Services Office—Report, 1988.

By the Minister of Health (Hon. F.T. Blevins)—

Food Act 1985—Regulations—Standards and Bread.

Sexual Reassignment Act 1988—Regulations—Certificates and Returns.

By the Minister of Fisheries (Hon. M.K. Mayes)—

Department of Fisheries—Report, 1987-88.

MINISTERIAL STATEMENT: Hon. C.J. SUMNER

The **Hon. J.C. BANNON (Premier)**: I seek leave to make a statement concerning arrangements that have been made to cover the absence through illness of the Attorney-General, the Hon. C.J. Sumner.

Leave granted.

The **Hon. J.C. BANNON**: As most members would be aware, during past weeks the Attorney-General has been placed under enormous strain by a series of unsubstantiated allegations, rumour and innuendo. In an effort to end these debilitating personal attacks, the Attorney recently decided to bring the issue into the open. In the Parliament he named himself as the subject of these rumours and offered to grant immunity from action for libel to anyone who had allegations to make or evidence to present. No such allegations were made; no evidence was presented. No apology was made by those who made allegations or by those who fuelled the rumours and innuendo.

This was a courageous move which the Attorney-General took because of his belief in the need to protect the integrity of his office. As a result of the strain that he has been under, the Attorney-General is suffering from exhaustion and severe stress and has sought, and is now receiving, medical care. This means that he has had to absent himself from his parliamentary and ministerial duties. An Executive Council meeting was held earlier today and Acting Ministers were appointed to administer the Attorney-General's various portfolios. I inform the House that the Minister of Education is now the Acting Attorney-General; the Minister of Health is now Acting Minister of Corporate Affairs and Minister of Consumer Affairs; and the Minister of Agriculture is the Acting Minister of Ethnic Affairs.

The strain of the past week has taken a heavy toll on the Attorney-General's personal life and has deeply affected his wife and children. That heavy toll has now fallen on Chris Sumner himself. He is paying a heavy price for having the courage to confront unsubstantiated rumour and innuendo. I expect that all honourable members would appreciate the

need now to give the Attorney-General and his family some breathing space and wish him a speedy recovery.

MINISTERIAL STATEMENT: ADELAIDE RAILYARD RESIGNALLING

The Hon. G.F. KENEALLY (Minister of Transport): I seek leave to make a statement.

Leave granted.

The Hon. G.F. KENEALLY: Members will be aware that the State Transport Authority has been progressively installing, since 1984, a \$45 million signalling and communications system for our metropolitan railway network. The equipment replaces a system that was installed between the years 1910 and 1915. Progress on the project is now reaching the stage where resignalling of the Adelaide yard is to take place. This can be done only when trains are not running. Consequently, the authority advises that it will not be able to operate certain services when this work is scheduled. Rail services will not be operating as follows:

- This coming weekend, Saturday 19 November and Sunday 20 November—all Belair and Noarlunga line services will not be operating.
- The following weekend, 25 November and 27 November—all Adelaide metropolitan services.

All Adelaide station tracks and platforms will have to close from the last service on Friday 25 November.

Rail commuters are advised that articulated buses will be operating on adjacent bus routes on the weekends to provide additional capacity required to accommodate those who would normally use trains. The authority, of course, regrets the interference with these two weekend rail services. Clearly, however, the resignalling project has to be completed in the interests of the continued safe carriage of rail passengers.

PUBLIC WORKS COMMITTEE REPORTS

The SPEAKER laid on the table the following reports by the Parliamentary Standing Committee on Public Works, together with minutes of evidence:

Noarlunga Hospital,

Reynella Primary School (Replacement).

Ordered that reports be printed.

QUESTION TIME

ADELAIDE CHILDREN'S HOSPITAL

Mr OLSEN (Leader of the Opposition): Will the Minister of Health indicate whether the Government has told the board of the Adelaide Children's Hospital that it will be asked to resign if it does not accept Health Commission guidelines to deal with the hospital's financial situation? The Opposition has been informed that the Adelaide Children's Hospital has a deficit of \$3.9 million. This position was discussed last night at a meeting of staff members. The meeting was told that, if the board did not accept a set of Health Commission guidelines relating to the hospital's finances, the board could be asked to resign. As a result, a working party comprising two Health Commission representatives and two board members has been established to inquire and report upon the position the hospital has been placed in by continued budget cuts.

I am informed that the hospital's problems stem from repeated funding cuts during recent years and a reduction

in hospital beds which affect the viability of the Adelaide Children's Hospital and place undue stress on patients and nursing and medical staff. This financial year, according to the Health Commission blue book, the hospital has been allocated a budget of \$49.5 million, which represents a real cut of \$4.4 million on the previous 12 months. During last financial year, the hospital was subjected to a special cut of \$700 000 on top of the .75 per cent budget reduction demanded of all metropolitan hospitals.

The Adelaide Children's Hospital now has 165 beds open on a daily basis compared with the 274 it was approved for when this Government came to office in 1982. The 1988 annual report of the hospital states:

... availability of staffed beds to meet the expectations of both the public and referring medical practitioners is frequently less than that which the hospital views as desirable.

The Hon. F.T. BLEVINS: To the best of my knowledge the board was not given an ultimatum that it would be asked to resign. Certainly, there have been some budgetary problems at the Adelaide Children's Hospital; there is no secret about that. I think that the Leader mentioned a \$3.9 million overrun. That is certainly incorrect. I think that there is potential, based on the figures for the first quarter of this year, for an overrun that may approach \$3 million, but there was certainly no \$3 million overrun in the first few months of this year.

There is no question that there are some problems at the Adelaide Children's Hospital. This Government has all Government units working to peak efficiency. We have no option. We have had a significant reduction in funds from the Commonwealth. We have constant calls from the Opposition talking about small government, cutting out waste and lowering taxes. All the health units, as well as every other unit in the South Australian public sector, are working very efficiently to a very tight budget. The Adelaide Children's Hospital is no different. The Leader was quite incorrect with his figures, and I will obtain the exact figures for him before the end of Question Time.

There has been no reduction in the Adelaide Children's Hospital's budget to take account of the 4 per cent efficiency pay increase. There were in other hospitals, but there were none at the ACH. The ACH had an \$800 000 overrun from last year, and that was debited to it this year by agreement with the board, as I understand it. Certainly, there was no requirement for it to make any efficiencies for the 4 per cent pay increase. Given the history of the Opposition in relation to the 4 per cent pay increase, perhaps the Health Commission ought to be condemned for that, although I am not quite sure. During debate on the 4 per cent pay increase the Opposition was quite firm that everybody had to accept some economies for it; that it could not be a further allocation from the Government to any of the public sector units; and that the 4 per cent had to be paid for.

In relation to the Adelaide Children's Hospital, we did not do that—not one cent was required to offset the 4 per cent wage increase. A committee has been established to look at the budget of the Adelaide Children's Hospital, and I am confident that in the way in which the Government operates we will, through cooperation, negotiation and discussion, sort out to the satisfaction of the board, the surgeons and, very importantly, the taxpayers, the problems at that hospital.

If the Opposition is suggesting that a blank cheque ought to be given to the Adelaide Children's Hospital, logically it should follow through and suggest that a blank cheque be given to every hospital and health unit in this State. However, if that occurred I would need several hundred million dollars extra in my budget. If there was to be a 10 per cent overrun in a \$1 billion budget, an extra \$100 million would

be required; for a 20 per cent overrun, an extra \$200 million would be required, and so on.

We will manage the Adelaide Children's Hospital in the same way as all other health units: it will be efficient but it will also be appropriate to the needs of the patients. I am very confident that the committee that has been established with the board and the Health Commission will come up with the appropriate answers to everybody's satisfaction.

SAFA GEARING RATIO

Ms GAYLER (Newland): Will the Premier advise the House whether the gearing ratio (the ratio of liabilities to assets) of SAFA is sound and within the normal limits of other major financial institutions in Australia? The Leader of the Opposition is quoted as expressing concern that SAFA is overgeared.

The Hon. J.C. BANNON: I thank the honourable member for her question and, like me, she must have been quite surprised to read the continuing assertions made by the Leader of the Opposition about SAFA, particularly in this context, which have no basis in fact. The Leader of the Opposition made a silly mistake at the time of the budget when he sought to beat up a story about this issue by incorrectly comparing different ratios from one year to the next and claiming that SAFA was facing some sort of financial difficulty in consequence. It was a mistake and a wrong comparison and I would have thought that the Leader of the Opposition, when the facts were put before the House (as they were) and made clear, would be prepared to say, 'Fair enough, that is the end of the matter.' Not a bit of it: in today's paper he has repeated the same charge based again, I suppose, on the same incorrect information.

The fact is—and let me put it before the House again—that SAFA's current gearing ratio (that is, the ratio of its liabilities to assets) stands at 80 per cent. This compares with the ratios of the major Australian banks that are well in excess of that. These are some of our key private financial institutions: Westpac at 96 per cent, ANZ at 95 per cent, CBA at 95 per cent, NAB at 94 per cent, and SAFA at 80 per cent. That is pretty extraordinary but, when one delves even deeper, one sees how well financed SAFA is. It has established reserves of \$218 million to assist it in dealing with any particular and temporary problems that it may face. Those reserves are at a level in excess of 60 per cent of SAFA's annual expected earnings. That is not a bad nest egg, as it were, and not a bad piece of probity in terms of a key financial institution.

Further, SAFA does not have a policy of widespread investment in share markets and it is therefore not subject to their ups and downs, which has been a criticism in a number of other instances in other parts of the country. I would see it as regrettable if the critics of financial institutions in this State simply imported claims that have been made about those in other parts of the country, because they are the very problems that we have sought to avoid, and this is one example. In fact, SAFA's current holding in equities is less than 1 per cent of its assets, and the bulk of those, where money is tied up, is in two historical portfolios or holdings—Sagasco Holdings and Enterprise Investments. There is a vast difference in scale in terms of the exposure in each of those.

To remind the House, I point out that Enterprise Investments was to be a market-based investment company to generate funds for high-tech industry, which it has done very successfully, and was launched by this Government in consequence of an electoral undertaking given to the people

and endorsed as part of our overall platform in 1982. While there have been a number of changes in the way in which Enterprise Investments has operated and in the structure of its portfolio, there was a conscious decision to ensure that start-up funds were provided in a situation where they were just not available. A number of extremely important frontier companies have been established and set on a sound base in consequence.

The major area of equity holding by SAFA is Sagasco Holdings. What does that comprise: 80 per cent is Government owned, given that the wholly Government owned South Australian Oil and Gas Corporation (SAOG) was merged with the South Australian Gas Company (Sagasco), a private company whose dividend payouts and therefore performance was limited, because of its unity connotation, by statute. This Government has freed up those two entities in an amalgamated, private sector driven Sagasco Holdings, which has appointed its first General Manager. Sir Bruce Macklin, the inaugural Chairman, will step down at the end of this year and a new Chairman will take up the role. The board is geared to ensure that it is competitive and commercial.

Apart from its utility operations, the Government component is South Australia's share of the Cooper Basin, that portion of that marvellous resource that we as a State—as a community—own. I challenge those opposite if their idea is to sell that off. Let us know when, how and under what conditions. I would have thought that they would welcome the way in which this Government has said, 'Let's put Sagasco together with SAOG to make an entity that will do things for South Australia.' In doing that, it is only appropriate that our central monetary authority—SAFA—should hold the equity for the time being.

PRISONER REMISSIONS

Mr BECKER (Hanson): Will the Premier confirm that the Governor can exercise the royal prerogative of mercy to reduce a prison sentence only on the recommendation of Cabinet and will he say whether it was the Minister of Correctional Services who recently recommended to Cabinet that remissions of up to 76 days be granted to prisoners at Port Augusta Gaol and, further, whether the Minister participated in Cabinet discussions and decisions relating to this matter?

The Hon. J.C. BANNON: Executive Council must approve any remission of sentences. A longstanding practice in the prison system, with which the honourable member is acquainted, provides for certain remissions in particular situations. They apply to prisoners overall, based on good behaviour during the period in question. They are not resisters of individuals in relation to where they apply or how they apply.

The usual practice in these situations is for the Department of Correctional Services to prepare the list of prisoners, effectively all those in prison affected, in this instance by industrial disputation, and to provide the automatic proposal for remissions. That is forwarded through the Minister of Correctional Services, and Executive Council makes the final decision. That practice has been in operation, as far as I know, for as long as the prison system has been in existence, in one form or another.

In the particular instance that the honourable member mentioned, I understand the implication of his question. It is that one of the names on the list of prisoners for a particular gaol happens to be that of a relative of the Minister. All members of Cabinet and Executive Council are

well aware of that, but we did not think it was appropriate to make a discriminatory issue in that particular matter. Provided the processing was in accordance with the standard procedures on the recommendation of the department and the list provided, absolutely nothing untoward occurred or could occur, and that is the case in this instance.

SOUTH AUSTRALIAN FINANCING AUTHORITY

Mr TYLER (Fisher): Will the Premier inform the House whether the implication that the activities of the South Australian Government and its financial institutions, particularly the South Australian Financing Authority, are shrouded in mystery, is correct? Articles in the *Advertiser* and the *News* today seem to imply that there is a lack of information about the activities of Government financial institutions, especially SAFA, and an argument that the Parliament and therefore the people of South Australia are not provided with adequate information on the activities of these bodies.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order!

The Hon. J.C. BANNON: This seems to be a question of whether you know or whether you want to know. In this State it has been acknowledged by independent bodies such as the Institute of Public Affairs, which is not the greatest fan or—

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order!

The Hon. J.C. BANNON:—supporter of Labor Governments in this country, that this Government puts before Parliament and ultimately the community the greatest range of financial information of any Government in the country. In another context, it was interesting to note that criticism was being made of the assets and liabilities of the State. We saw publicity of an exercise being undertaken in New South Wales that resulted in rash statements by the new Premier, and that briefly jeopardised the value of New South Wales securities overseas. That shows the risks that are involved in playing around politically with that. I was talking to a money market dealer in Britain who told me how this political statement by Mr Greiner, which was incorrect, came up on the screens and the markets responded furiously, much to the detriment of New South Wales securities. It took much explaining that in the political context of Australia these rash statements are made by Governments and Oppositions for particular purposes. In the case of Mr Greiner, the purpose was to try to point the finger at his predecessors in Government. He quickly retreated from that position and we have not heard any more about it.

In relation to the information that we provide, we were the first Government in that Treasury issue to set down our balance sheet, our assets and liabilities, as well as they could be ascertained at that stage, and the result was favourable. We have a good and strong financial base, and that is recognised in our overseas credit ratings, which are based on an analysis of material placed in the public domain. If we take just the capital outlays provided in 1982-83, we see that 39 per cent of capital payments only were passed through the Consolidated Account. Thus the residue of those payments was not subject in any way whatsoever to the scrutiny of Parliament. Due to changes that we made, in the 1987-88 accounts 86 per cent of those capital outlays were contained in the documents and subject to the scrutiny of this Parliament. That is a pretty dramatic change and indicates the way in which my Government moves.

One of the things used this morning in the Leader of the Opposition's attack on this so-called lack of disclosure

(apparently, the more we disclose the more he pretends that there is a hidden agenda) was that the Auditor-General could not audit the overseas activities of SAFA. True, the Auditor-General's Act does not run to the auditing of overseas companies, but the implication is that therefore these remain unaudited. That is totally wrong. Of course they are audited and those accounts must be satisfactory in terms of reportage. Even more importantly, however, let me remind the Leader of the Opposition of what the Auditor-General said in his report this year:

Arrangements have now been satisfactorily concluded with respect to Satco and the overseas companies of SAFTL. Those arrangements will come into effect for the 1988-89 financial year.

In other words, in response to the Auditor-General's saying, 'While my writ does not extend in this area, I would like to see more information and get more access to these accounts,' these steps in procedure have been set in train. The Auditor-General has acknowledged that and we will ensure that that continues to happen.

PRISONER REMISSIONS

The Hon. B.C. EASTICK (Light): In view of his reply to the previous question from the member for Hanson concerning the early release of prisoners, will the Premier say whether the record shows that the Minister of Correctional Services withdrew his chair when Cabinet discussed whether to recommend to the Governor remissions of 76 days for prisoners at the Port Augusta Gaol?

The Hon. J.C. BANNON: In this instance—and if I was not explicit I certainly implied this in my previous answer—because of the way in which the document and the remission system operates in this area, there was no need for the Minister to withdraw his chair. That would have happened only in an instance where discrimination or a particular or special favour (or whatever it might have been) was being recommended in relation to the individual concerned. That was not so in this case. Cabinet was fully aware that this individual's name was contained on the list of names, and he was being treated no differently from anybody else on that occasion or in the procedures of the past. Therefore, there was no reason or need for the Minister to withdraw his chair.

FORMULA HOLDEN

The Hon. R.K. ABBOTT (Spence): Can the Minister of Employment and Further Education report to the House on the performance of the new Formula Holden vehicle built by the Croydon Park College of TAFE which had its first public run during the Grand Prix carnival at the weekend? I believe that this racing car, which has been designed and built from scratch by the college as an educational project, made its public debut on Saturday in a demonstration of four vehicles which will compete in a new racing formula next year that will decide the Australian Drivers' Championship.

The Hon. L.M.F. ARNOLD: I am pleased to report to the House that, in the trial run of the Formula Holden involving four cars on Saturday at the Grand Prix race track, the *Shrike* (as it is called), built by staff and students with the professional engineering support of the Croydon College of TAFE, was the first to finish. It has proved an outstanding success. The engineering and work expertise that has gone into this project is a tribute to the eight post-graduate students and the staff of the Croydon Park College of TAFE, particularly Ted Noack (lecturer) and Peter Nor-

man (Vice-Principal), as well as Graeme Burton (a professional engineer) and Greg Mobbs (constructor) who both provided support in the design, construction and operation of the car in a new formula which will next year be a competitive formula on the Grand Prix circuit—and that is the Formula Holden.

Only four cars took part in this race on Saturday. The many weeks and months of effort by the staff and students of the Croydon Park College of TAFE was almost not successful because of the very late arrival of the engine. In fact, the Holden engine arrived on the Sunday morning before the race took place and the vehicle was not completed until the day before its first demonstration on Saturday. The fact that those people were able to translate those time lines into a finished product which performed exceptionally well, with a very impressive looking vehicle (a fact that was remarked upon by a number of people to whom I spoke at the Grand Prix), is a tribute to all involved. They did the best they could, but this was not a scored race, so to speak. There were four vehicles in the race and, as I say, in a non-race situation the TAFE vehicle came first—and that is a tribute.

It should also be noted that another two vehicles finished the race—and that is a tribute to those people involved—but the fourth vehicle did not finish; it did not even make the third lap but managed only two laps. Those who happened to be at the Grand Prix might have noticed a bit of entrepreneurial activity by the Liberal Party of this State. The vehicle that did not finish the race was sponsored by the Liberal Party and was emblazoned with a big L and the word 'Liberal' along the side, but it ran into the ground and did not finish the race. The one Formula Holden that did not finish was the one that the Liberal Party drove into the ground.

There is an old story that is sometimes read to children about the train that cried or died of fear or anxiety. Here was a car that cried itself into the ground, with the nomination that it had, and that was entirely symbolic of the attitude of the Liberal Party in this State—the best it can do is sponsor a car that cannot even finish the race. The staff and students of TAFE finished the race and finished it very well. I look forward to the success of this vehicle in competition next year and encourage companies and other people to join the Motor Trade Industry Association, which sponsored the vehicle, in also offering sponsorships next year.

REMISSIONS

The Hon. J.L. CASHMORE (Coles): My question is directed to the Minister of Correctional Services. When did the Government introduce the practice of giving prisoners four days remission for every day, or part of a day, on which they lose privileges; and does the Government not consider this to be unduly generous in view of other remissions on sentences available to prisoners? While the Premier has said that this practice has been followed for some time, the Opposition understands that it has not been applied with any consistency until very recently. Under the Correctional Services Act, prisoners already are eligible for virtually automatic release after serving two-thirds of their non-parole period.

An additional provision introduced by this Government in 1984 gives the permanent head of the department the discretion to provide another 30 days remission. This means that a prisoner at Port Augusta Gaol sentenced to a non-parole period of 11 months would have served less than

four months if he had been released with all the remissions available under the Correctional Services Act, as well as the 76 days granted for loss of privileges.

The Hon. F.T. BLEVINS: I thank the member for Coles for her question. She was somewhat coy in couching her explanation, and I would have thought much more of her if she had come straight out and said what was behind it. But, no, she used an example of 11 months because she did not have the guts to come out and say what she really meant. There is no-one in this Parliament or anyone listening who does not know what she means, so she may just as well have come out and said it and done the decent thing, if asking a question as specific as this can be considered the decent thing.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order!

The Hon. F.T. BLEVINS: However, the answer to the question is that I do not have a precise date but I will get it for the honourable member—it was some years ago. If the member for Coles believes that it is too generous, I suggest that she contact the Premier of New South Wales, who this very day is doing precisely the same thing—that has been the case there for many years—and the Premier of Victoria, who also is (and has been over many years) doing just the same as we have been doing and as we will continue to do.

The fact remains that when there is an industrial dispute the prison officers are using prisoners as hostages and the expectation of prison officers is that, because prisoners are deprived of exercise (or whatever the particular ban or strike imposes on them), they will play up, that this will put pressure on the Government and the Government will cave in to the industrial action. Certainly, that has been the history in the past and it has worked successfully. That is one reason why, particularly during the period of the previous Government, we had such a number of incidents in our prisons. That culminated in a Minister—the Hon. Mr Rodda—losing his job, to the good fortune of the Leader of the Opposition, and in the inquiry into the prison system by the Clarkson Royal Commission, which was a very effective royal commission. This Government will not be stood over by prison officers any longer in that way, and we have not been for a number of years.

Mr Becker interjecting:

The Hon. F.T. BLEVINS: I am glad the member for Hanson introduced this dispute into the debate, because I want to say a couple of words about that, too. Everyone should remember why prisoners in our prison system today are now receiving four days remission for every day the industrial dispute continues and their routine is significantly disrupted. The police have charged a prison officer with assault and two other prison officers have been charged by the department with assault. The police are also investigating those incidents.

Prison officers want me to intervene politically in that process of investigation. The Executive Director of the department has the authority and the obligation under the Correctional Services Act to take certain action. He has done so on the advice of the Crown Solicitor and the Commissioner for Public Employment. I will not interfere politically in that decision.

There is one other thing: there will be no violence in our prisons. There will be no violence of prisoner on prisoner, prisoner on prison officer, prison officer on prison officer, or prison officer on prisoner. If the institutions in this State ever reached a stage where people cannot be protected against violence because of the threat of industrial action, I hope that we would all be thoroughly ashamed of ourselves. I

will make it clear: irrespective of how long this industrial dispute lasts, it will not affect, one iota, the action of the police, the Ombudsman, the Department of Correctional Services, or the Government. We will not tolerate violence and we will not bow to the pressure of industrial action to inhibit, in any way, those investigations.

LIBERAL PARTY HOUSING POLICY

Mr HAMILTON (Albert Park): Will the Minister of Housing and Construction tell the House whether he has been 'deceitful' and 'dishonest' with respect to the Liberal Party's housing policy? A constituent approached me regarding an article in the *Adelaide News* of 7 November where Mr Downer claimed that the Minister was being 'deceitful' and 'dishonest' in his comments about the Liberal Party housing policy. My constituent claims that his previous contact with the Minister showed the Minister to be a reliable and scrupulously honest person.

An honourable member interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order! It is too late for the honourable member for Murray-Mallee to withdraw leave. The honourable Minister of Housing and Construction.

The Hon. T.H. HEMMINGS: I ask the honourable member to pass on my thanks to his constituent, who seems to feel that I am a fairly reliable person. It is quite correct that Alexander Downer, the Federal Liberal Party spokesperson for housing, said that I was deceitful and dishonest. It just goes to show that Mr Downer, like very many wealthy members of the Liberal Party, was born with a silver foot in his mouth. In a letter to the *Advertiser* Mr Downer claimed that more low income families could be properly housed for every \$1 million of public expenditure through home purchase and rental assistance rather than the provision of public housing.

In response to that letter I gave a considered analysis and said that if the Liberal Opposition's scheme went ahead it would result in rents soaring by more than 50 per cent and people in poverty would be pushed into welfare queues. Also, I said that about one in four South Australians have been housed by this Government through the South Australian Housing Trust, and that Mr Downer had served notice on Australia that the Liberals would end public housing as we know it and that would have disastrous effects. That was, as I said, a considered analysis. My view on Federal Liberal housing policy and the idiotic statements of Mr Alexander Downer was confirmed by the results of a public opinion hotline that was recently conducted by the *Australian*—

The SPEAKER: Order! Will the honourable Minister resume his seat. The honourable member for Alexandra has a point of order.

The Hon. T. CHAPMAN: I rise on a point of order, Sir; I understand that Standing Orders preclude a Minister or any member of the House from reflecting on another member in another place. In this instance the Minister's reference to 'idiotic behaviour' and so on with respect to a member of another place contravenes, in my view, that Standing Order.

The SPEAKER: Order! I cannot uphold the point of order. First, I do not think the honourable member quoted the Minister correctly because I do not think the Minister referred to an individual using the adjectives which he quoted; he mentioned statements made by that particular person.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order! Secondly, the protection that is given is applicable to members of another place that is in close proximity to this place. My understanding is that over the years that protection has not applied with respect to other Parliaments. The honourable Minister.

The Hon. T.H. HEMMINGS: As I say, I did not express that view about the Liberal Party's housing policy. It was reflected elsewhere and, in fact, it was highlighted by the results of a public opinion hotline conducted recently by the *Australian*. We all know that polls of this type are very susceptible to manipulation. We have heard many times, with regard to telephone polls, that people will sit down and continually ring up and vote either 'yes' or 'no' to obtain the required result. That is what makes the result of this hotline quite intriguing, because Mr Downer lost the poll. In fact, 57 per cent of callers voted against him and only 43 per cent supported him.

That suggests that callers who support the Liberal Party went against that Party's policies. In fact, the 57 per cent to 43 per cent result is even greater than the margin by which Dukakis lost to Mr Bush. I suggest that the Liberal Party should look at its housing policy, because it is not acceptable to the general public. The policy being put forward by the Liberal Party, generally, is idiotic and deserves to be condemned as it is totally anti-public housing.

ASH WEDNESDAY BUSHFIRE

The Hon. D.C. WOTTON (Heysen): I direct my question to the Premier. Has the South Australian Government obtained the approval of the Commonwealth to use funds allocated to the Local Government Grants Commission to help pay the damages bill for the 1980 Ash Wednesday fire as proposed yesterday by the South Australian Government? Has the Local Government Grants Commission approved this course of action, and what impact will it have on local government services and rates across South Australia?

Mr Tyler interjecting:

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

The Hon. D.C. WOTTON: The proposal announced yesterday includes the use of Commonwealth funds for local government distributed through the South Australian Local Government Grants Commission. These funds can be distributed by the commission only in accordance with principles agreed with the Commonwealth under the Local Government Financial Assistance Act. A further question raised by the proposal is the impact it will have on services and local government rates across South Australia. The Local Government Association has already stated that the diversion of funds distributed through the commission will put pressure on council budgets which may have to be met by cuts in council services, increased rates or a combination of both.

The Hon. J.C. BANNON: The answer to the question is 'No', that has not been accepted by the Grants Commission because the submission has still to be placed before it, as announced by the Minister. The Minister announced this as one of a series of initiatives that would be undertaken in this instance. The Secretary-General of the Local Government Association agreed to put before the association's executive the Minister's request for support for a Government submission to broaden financial responsibility within the local government community. I am aware of the honourable member's interests on behalf of his ratepayers; indeed, he is a resident himself, so he understands the impact that—

An honourable member: Has he withdrawn his chair?

The Hon. J.C. BANNON: He has not withdrawn his chair; he asked questions about it. Therefore he would understand the concerns and the impact that this particular award would have if it were to be the sole responsibility of Stirling council ratepayers. All sorts of stories have been generated that ratepayers' houses are to be commandeered and so on. All that is nonsense, and it was the intention of the proposals put forward by the Minister of Local Government to indicate quite clearly to the ratepayers that it was nonsense.

It is essential that the ratepayers pay the rates that have been legally levied by the council this year. That is the declared rate and it would be unacceptable to any level of government in attempting to solve a problem if that were not done. I would imagine that the honourable member is not a rate resister in this area and I would hope that he is making his best endeavours to encourage people to pay their rates to avoid any further cash crises or problem. Secondly, it must be conceded that local government as a separate level or the third tier of government has a particular role and responsibility, which is secured in the Constitution. Until the last Federal referendum, when they campaigned against its inclusion in the Federal Constitution, the Liberals supported that view, I understood. Therefore, local government must undertake certain responsibilities on a whole of local government basis in regard to particular problems.

One of the productive things that I hope, will emerge from this current crises with the Stirling council is a general long term indemnity or insurance fund, which will ensure that this sort of crisis does not occur in the future. However, it did not exist in this case; the council was underinsured. The damages award has been very big indeed. The financial package that has been put forward is an attempt to point out to ratepayers that they should pay what they owe but that they will not be required to meet escalating rate payments to defray all of those costs. There are other ways and means, working in conjunction with the State Government and, I hope, with the cooperation of the Federal Government, in which this can be achieved.

The Hon. D.C. Wotton: Everybody is expected to pay for it but the Government. The Government makes—

The Hon. J.C. BANNON: I presume the honourable member means the South Australian Government. He treats us as if we conjure our money from somewhere else. The money that we have and spend is raised and earned on behalf of the community of South Australia, as the honourable member knows, and the question of which pocket it comes from—

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order!

The Hon. J.C. BANNON: The honourable member is saying that the State Government, that is, the general community, should be responsible in some way, as if that was different from saying that the general local government community should be responsible. We are all talking about the same people and working towards a constructive solution. I would appreciate the honourable member's assistance in doing so because it is not a political issue. When this issue was first addressed by the Government of which the honourable member was a Minister, the response at that time was that the State Government did not and could not have liability in this area and that the Stirling council would have to pick up that responsibility. That was what was said then. The honourable member knows that is correct. I am suggesting to him that we are not involved in a political wrangle on this issue; we are involved in a serious financial

consideration and therefore I would appreciate the assistance of the honourable member, representing himself and his constituents, in getting a decent settlement in this matter.

WIND ENERGY

Mr ROBERTSON (Bright): Will the Minister of Mines and Energy provide the House with an update on progress of the South Australian wind energy program and the likely future direction of that important research? As I understand, as early as 1968 a report was prepared by ETSA into the future of wind energy potential in South Australia. Since that time, the issue has risen periodically and, at the time of the breakdown in the submarine cable to Kangaroo Island, I recall calculating that the island would require something of the order of a wind generator every 300 metres along the south coast to replace the cable. Nevertheless, South Australia is close to the roaring forties and I am advised that the efficiency of wet cell storage is increasing. It therefore seems appropriate to ask a question as to the current status of wind energy technology.

The SPEAKER: The last part of the honourable member's remarks is superfluous. The honourable Minister.

The Hon. J.H.C. KLUNDER: I thank the honourable member for his question. In the past, as a backbencher myself I asked a number of questions on this matter of the member for Mitchell when he was Minister and I am delighted to see that the member for Bright shares my interest. While I have so far received some sections of the report prepared by the Wind Program Committee, I can inform the House that the full technical report is nearing completion and that the Office of Energy Planning expects me to have it by the end of November. However, for those interested in this area of research, I point out that two papers reflecting in broad terms the findings of the Program Committee will be presented at the Australia and New Zealand Solar Energy Society Conference to be held in Melbourne from 17 to 19 November. Members will recall from previous reports to the House that an important element of our program has been the collection of data from a number of manufacturers and suppliers of wind turbines, both Australian and overseas based.

These sources have provided a large body of data on both the performance and cost of a range of turbines and this has enabled the program committee to complete computer simulations and delivered energy costings for South Australian conditions. These studies show that, where wind energy is delivered to the ETSA grid by a wind farm, it will not be competitive with energy delivered by conventional fossil fuel fired power stations in the foreseeable future. Secondly, where electrical energy is delivered to an isolated remote area electricity supply system, it may be competitive with energy delivered by a diesel generator in some situations in the near future and is anticipated to become more competitive over the expected 20 year life of the wind unit since the price of diesel fuel is expected to rise in real terms during that period.

At this stage, consideration is being given to several possible demonstration-evaluation options and we are currently examining such matters as wind turbine selection and siting, public access to the project, and the likely operating, maintenance and capital costs of a demonstration project. Funding sources for such a project are being examined and I shall be seeking financial support from the Commonwealth, through the National Energy Research Development and Demonstration Committee, in the November round of grants. A favourable response from that body would assist

the move to a demonstration phase of the wind energy program enormously.

INTEREST RATES

Mr S.J. BAKER (Mitcham): Can the Premier say whether the South Australian Government supports the Federal Treasurer's decision to force up interest rates or whether he will make urgent representations to Mr Keating for a review of this strategy because of the impact it will have on the South Australian economy, home buyers, and the State budget? The Federal Treasurer's decision to tighten monetary policy through a rise in the Reserve Bank's rediscount rate has pushed up interest rates across the board. In South Australia, rising interest rates will immediately affect returns on two of the State's largest export items, grains and wool, with the higher Australian dollar knocking 3½ per cent off export consignments now coming up for sale. Higher interest rates will also slow down industry restructuring at a time when the manufacturing sector has been gearing up to invest in new plant and equipment.

In the housing sector, South Australians already pay a higher proportion of their weekly wage in mortgage commitments than people in all States except New South Wales and Victoria, with the further interest rate rises over the last week taking the monthly cost of the average home loan in this State to more than \$640. Rising interest rates also affect the State budget and therefore threaten to force an additional cost on taxpayers with a 1 per cent change increasing recurrent spending by \$35 million in a full year. That is why this question is so critical.

The Hon. J.C. BANNON: I certainly do not disagree that interest rates are a critical factor in our economy and in the standard of living of ordinary people. When interest rates go up, those people hurt and it is most unfortunate that we are seeing at present this upward creep of home loan interest rates because that is having an adverse effect on people who own their own homes. I guess that the Federal Treasurer (and the question was directed to his policies) has a dilemma.

The fact is that the perception of the performance of the Australian economy, certainly *vis-a-vis* the United States dollar, is such overseas that we are seen as performing strongly indeed, and the growth rates in the Australian economy reflect that. If we were to believe the honourable member when he comments on the national and State economies, these things just are not so and Australia is not performing. However, if that were so, we would see our interest rates down considerably lower, but the problem is that we are performing extremely strongly. We cannot afford to be too successful in the current environment, as the honourable member should know. That has forced this upward pressure on interest rates.

The thing that I find difficult to accept is that in the housing market, for instance, the overheating in a particular region of Australia that is unrelated to the position of the industry in South Australia seems to be driving the general interest rate regimen. I believe that there should be some means of better assessing the performance of the regional sectors and of making some sort of allowance in terms of interest rates for that different performance.

In that case we would not see the same sort of upward hike. Unfortunately, that is not so easy in a national economy with national financial institutions, and even our local institutions are influenced by the price of money which they can get on their national operations. It is encouraging, however, to note that, for instance, this morning the Common-

wealth Bank announced that it was actually setting a lower rate than its national rate in part recognition of that. That is partly because, as the bank said, it has large national resources and is able to have a differential policy without affecting its overall portfolio, and that is to be welcomed.

I think it also has a little to do with the extraordinary competition being provided by our own State Bank, the State Bank which possibly some members opposite and those who support the privatisation of resources would see abolished from the scene, sold off and no longer providing that competitive edge. In fact, the State Bank and its performance has been a key to the competitive forces within our regional economy, and long may that remain so.

As to any representations I could make or effect I could have as a member of the Economic Planning Advisory Council, which is to meet shortly, I will have an opportunity to address these questions with the Federal Treasurer and other colleagues in both industry and unions, as well as people from two or three other States, and the views which I have just expressed will be put before that gathering.

POLYBUTYLENE PIPING

The Hon. R.G. PAYNE (Mitchell): Can the Minister of Water Resources say whether polybutylene piping is approved in South Australia for plumbing use in reticulating water in homes and buildings? If so, will the Minister further examine such approval? A recent segment on the *Probe* program illustrated quite graphically to viewers that in Queensland, where polybutylene has been used for the purposes I outlined, there have been major failures in a hydraulic sense resulting in damage to existing houses. Perhaps more importantly, it has also been suggested that formaldehyde, which is part of the polybutylene piping chemical makeup, is exuded into the water and thus represents a health hazard, because formaldehyde is toxic.

The Hon. S.M. LENEHAN: I thank the honourable member for yet again raising a very important and probing question. I will ask the Engineering and Water Supply Department to investigate the issue further. However, I understand that the producers of the *Probe* program contacted the department on this matter, and some background material has been provided.

Manufacturers of this type of pipe must comply with Australian Standard AS2642. While no test for toxicity is specified in that standard, it is a requirement that the product shall not impart any taste, odour or colour to the water or any constituent known to be hazardous to health. Responsibility in this regard clearly lies with the manufacturer.

I understand that the advantage of polybutylene is that it retains its strength when hot and is therefore appropriate in hot water installations. While polybutylene is an improved material for use in this State, no specific applications—that is, pipes and fittings—have been approved to date. However, two product applications are currently undergoing tests in this regard. Authorising material is only the first stage: a code of practice for installation would need to be drawn up to ensure correct procedures are available to plumbers. In view of the honourable member's concerns about the safety issues which he has discussed, I will ask my department for a detailed investigation into the matter. However, I repeat that at present no specific applications have been approved.

EXPORT INCOME

The Hon. E.R. GOLDSWORTHY (Deputy Leader of the Opposition): Will the Premier confirm a massive decline in

South Australia's export income from mining and agriculture over the past three years and say what strategies his Government has to help redress this deterioration?

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: The honourable Deputy Leader has the floor.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order! I call members on both sides to order. I particularly call the member for Bragg to order. The honourable Deputy Leader has the floor.

The Hon. E.R. GOLDSWORTHY: Thank you, Mr Speaker. I would like to explain the question.

Mr Tyler interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order! For the second time I call the member for Fisher to order. The honourable Deputy Leader.

The Hon. E.R. GOLDSWORTHY: There has been real growth in our manufacturing exports of 32 per cent over the past three years, as we saw emblazoned in the headline of the *Advertiser*—

An honourable member interjecting:

The Hon. E.R. GOLDSWORTHY: Yes, very happy; however, they are not quite so happy about some of the other results. Over the same period there has been a real decline in mining and agriculture exports of 34 per cent. Accordingly, the fact that the manufacturing sector is now our No. 1 exporter—

Members interjecting:

The Hon. E.R. GOLDSWORTHY: Don't you want to hear it?

The SPEAKER: I ask members on my right not to bait the Deputy Leader.

The Hon. E.R. GOLDSWORTHY: I appreciate your protection, Mr Speaker. The fact that the manufacturing sector is now our No. 1 exporter has as much to do with the decline in the primary sector as it has with its own growth. While the value of our primary exports has been affected by the decline in the terms of trade for grains and minerals in particular, policy decisions of this Government in areas such as assistance for farmers and disincentives to mineral exploration as outlined in the report to Parliament of the Director-General of Mines a couple of weeks ago also are holding back our export performance.

The Hon. J.C. BANNON: I congratulate the Deputy Leader on his ingenuity in trying to find fault with the manufacturing export figures and their performance. I will not congratulate him on the shallowness of his analysis—primary produce and mining remain very important elements of our economy and earnings—but I invite him to first look at seasonal conditions and the size of crops and production. I also invite him to look at prices—for instance, on the London Metal Exchange—over the period he is talking about for various products. Particularly with the coming on-stream of Roxby Downs and the improvement in those prices, there will be a considerable boost—a massive boost—in the revenue we can earn there. However, in no way should that detract from what has been a superb performance by our manufacturing sector. One can only hope that that will be extended and reinforced by the new investment proposals and by things such as the container shipping decision made the other day.

SITTINGS AND BUSINESS

The Hon. D.J. HOPGOOD (Deputy Premier): I move:
That the time allotted for all stages of the following Bills:
Technology Park Adelaide Act Amendment,

Industrial and Commercial Training Act Amendment,
Lifts and Cranes Act Amendment,
Children's Protection and Young Offenders Act Amendment (No. 2),
Criminal Law Consolidation Act Amendment,
Children's Protection and Young Offenders Act Amendment (No. 3),
Criminal Law (Sentencing) Act Amendment,
Summary Offences Act Amendment,
Births, Deaths and Marriages Registration Act Amendment,
Cooperatives Act Amendment, and
Powers of Attorney and Agency Act Amendment,
be until 6 p.m. on Thursday.
Motion carried.

TECHNOLOGY PARK ADELAIDE ACT AMENDMENT BILL

Adjourned debate on second reading.
(Continued from 9 November. Page 1395.)

Mr S.J. BAKER (Mitcham): The Opposition supports the Bill, which is a very simple proposition. It does two things. First, it changes the name of Technology Park Adelaide Act to Technology Development Corporation Act; and, secondly, it facilitates the Technology Development Corporation taking over responsibility for the new Southern Science Park. The Opposition is pleased that some effort is being made to establish the Southern Science Park. It will be of great benefit to a number of areas of activity in South Australia.

I do not wish to spend a lot of time on the Bill, but I would like to make a number of relevant observations. The Southern Science Park, with its biotechnology focus, will be an important part of our innovative sector, if I can call it that. Certainly, at Flinders University there have been a number of exploitable discoveries, whether at the university itself or at the Flinders Medical Centre. As the Minister pointed out, two firms have made a firm commitment to establish in the area, and the Opposition is delighted with that initial demonstration of faith. Certainly, members would be aware the State needs another focus of activity, particularly with respect to biotechnology.

I wish to reflect on Technology Park itself for a moment, because it is important. I hope that my comments will be taken by the Minister as being constructive. I have watched the development of Technology Park over a period. A number of exciting things have happened and, of course, there have been some losses of industry, as we would expect in any high-tech development. During the Estimates Committee the Minister said that from June 1988 to June 1989 employment was expected to increase from 650 to 750, so the House can see that Technology Park is continuing to expand.

However, there are questions that must be answered with respect to the future of Technology Park. I am not raising this issue in a negative fashion, but we must rationalise our desires for that park and determine where we want it to head. As mentioned during the Estimates Committee, and as is well-known to members, there have been failures at Technology Park and, of course, there will always be failures in this area because of the associated high risk. One cannot resile from the position that one cannot back winners 100 per cent of the time, particularly in the specific areas under discussion.

However, I believe that, given the phase of development that has been reached, there must be some rethinking in terms of where Technology Park goes from here. For instance, it may align itself with an industrial park concept rather than a technology park approach. I have mentioned to

several people over a period if it is to remain a technology park that perhaps it should set aside an area or facility to cultivate high achievers in the area of innovation. Certainly, I have noted exactly that type of activity in a number of overseas developments, where large common areas have been set aside to attract people with good ideas who need a phone and a desk and who can exchange ideas and thus grow with the people around them.

Already, two large firms dominate the park in terms of Disposable Products Pty Ltd and British Aerospace but, beyond that, we have reasonably small units of production and activity. It must now enter a different phase. Technology Park has been in a growing phase. It set out and achieved what was desired in the first place but, to be a real achiever, there must now be a rethink on the grand design. As I have said, my comments are not in any way designed to be destructive. I merely offer the observation that Technology Park somehow needs to rethink its direction. It cannot wander along in the hope that people will continue to congregate there because it has some special advantage.

Certainly, in discussions with a number of people at the park, it was indicated that they will be looking to go elsewhere, so we hope that there will be new ventures to replace them. My fear is that that may not be the case and that we may need a new catalyst within the park. One of the great advantages of the park is that it brings together a number of components such as the Adelaide Innovation Centre and the Adelaide Microelectronics Centre. From that point of view it presents some form of attraction to people involved in microelectronics. They are my brief comments on the Bill.

We fully support the concept of the change in name, although the Opposition emphasises that the change relates to technology development, and that the term 'development' relates to technology and not the corporation—certainly, we are not in favour of corporations running around doing their own thing. As the Minister would well know, we believe that Governments should be lean and should not go into entrepreneurial activities. From that point of view we believe that the name change is appropriate, with the emphasis being on technology development rather than on a development corporation. From the simple idea that Adelaide can be a major player in the Australian scene, at least in the area of biotechnology, I believe—and I hope all other members understand this—that it is important that we set up a centre of focus in the southern area to fulfil the dream that we all have for this area.

I do not wish to detail all the inventions and discoveries originating in Adelaide today, because they are many and varied. However, I know from discussions with Luminis and a whole range of other organisations that there are some exciting ventures. Certainly, in my role on the Flinders University Council I am aware of areas where the university will become an active partner in any developments in the Sturt triangle. For all those reasons the Opposition supports the Bill strongly.

Mr TYLER (Fisher): I, too, join with the member for Mitcham in strongly supporting the second reading of the Bill. I remind the House that in this place on 14 April 1987 I asked the Minister of State Development and Technology to approach the board of Technology Park to consider establishing a southern suburbs annex of Technology Park. At that time I pointed out to the House that Technology Park had been an outstanding success and that it was one of the fastest growing technology parks in the world. I pointed out to the Minister and the House at the time that many people

believed that there was now scope for a southern suburbs technology park that would encompass biotechnology. I indicated that the park could establish close links with Flinders Medical Centre and Flinders University in order to cross-fertilise research.

I pointed out to the House that in the southern suburbs we needed to introduce industries with a future for the region. With a young and rapidly growing population it was vital that the southern suburbs became more than just a collection of dormitory suburbs. I argued that the creation of long-term job opportunities was vital. At the time many people in this Parliament and in the southern region believed that my call was purely 'pie in the sky'. But I was delighted that the Minister of State Development and Technology took my suggestion seriously and approached the board of Technology Park and asked it to implement a feasibility study into this suggestion. Now, 18 months down the track, the Minister has introduced this legislation which is, I suppose, an enabling Bill to allow for the establishment of Science Park Adelaide.

The Bill seeks to make three amendments to the Technology Park Adelaide Act 1982. First, it seeks to change the name of Technology Park Adelaide Corporation to the Adelaide Development Corporation. Secondly, it seeks to increase the membership of Technology Park Adelaide Corporation from eight to nine members through the appointment of an additional member on the nomination of the Flinders University of South Australia. Finally, it seeks to delete reference to the park as a singular identity to enable the corporation to administer the proposed Science Park Adelaide that will be established on the Sturt triangle.

In originally suggesting this concept I envisaged that Adelaide would not have the ability or the scope to accommodate two science/technology parks competing with each other. I was interested to see whether we could extend the very successful Technology Park that was operating at The Levels and whether some of those benefits could be extended to residents in the southern part of Adelaide. I imagined, and suggested in my press release, that the technology park in the south would come under the umbrella of the Technology Park Adelaide Corporation. I am pleased to say that the feasibility study showed that that was the best option—and that is what will occur. I am also delighted that it will have very close links with the Flinders University of South Australia and will feature and focus on the important area of bio-technology.

It is interesting that last week two South Australian companies, Hamilton Laboratories and Mineral Control Instrumentations, applied to the Marion City Council for approval to establish at the Science Park. The council, to its great credit, voted to accept lodgment of their planning applications. Both companies planned their own freestanding purpose-built buildings to be sited in the triangle's northern corner adjacent to Sturt Road. Members will be aware that Hamilton is a world leader in the design and development of sunscreen protection products and research into the effects of the sun on skin.

Mineral Control Instrumentations manufacture scientific instruments for the mining and mineral processing industries. It is also moving into research into photochemical smog and air pollution monitoring. The decision by these two companies to locate at the Science Park will give this facility a flying start. They will bring a combined total of some 75 workers to the Science Park from the existing facilities in Adelaide in a move which will allow for expansion and enhance linkage with other researchers in the area. Both companies hope to begin construction in March next

year, provided they receive the appropriate planning approvals.

These companies are to be congratulated, because it is no good the Government saying that it will establish a Science Park in the southern area and have feasibilities to show it will work unless companies are prepared to put their money up front. These two companies have done that: they have made their commitment. I am delighted that we will have industries involved in the southern area that will give jobs with a future to our children. I am also thrilled that the Minister had the persistence and the initiative to not listen to the doubting Thomases and to take seriously the suggestion that was put to him. I know that in the future the many people who will be employed at this Science Park will be very grateful that we do have Ministers, like the Minister of State Development and Technology, who have vision as well as the ability to get the job done. It is with a touch of pride and great enthusiasm that I support the Bill.

Mr LEWIS (Murray-Mallee): I will not delay the House for very long, but I certainly cannot allow some members of the Government backbench to stand here and self-righteously and sanctimoniously claim credit for a whole lot of things that have been very much bipartisan in the way in which they have been supported over the years.

Members interjecting:

The ACTING SPEAKER (Mr Duigan): Order! I call the honourable members for Fisher and Mitcham to order. The honourable member for Murray-Mallee has the floor.

Mr Robertson interjecting:

The ACTING SPEAKER: Order! The honourable member for Bright is also out of order.

Mr LEWIS: Both the member for Bright and the member for Fisher need to reflect on the views they have expressed about themselves and their Party and consider that South Australia has, since the day it was first proclaimed a province, been a society which has, by virtue of a number of factors affecting it from that time to this, been innovative in the extreme. One only has to look at the way in which Light set about town planning. That established precedents that had simply not been contemplated previously. In fact, early on the province would not have survived had it not been for the capacity of these freethinking people who came from various places in Europe to settle here.

Classic examples of the application of some of their innovative skills include the invention of the stump-jump plough and Ridley's stripper. These and other similar devices made it possible for the economy to survive in harsh circumstances. They were harsh not only in terms of the climate and the lack of fertility in the soil but also the economic circumstances to which the new province was subjected early in its life as a consequence of the gold rush and the way in which able-bodied people were paid for their services. We did not use convict labour, as the member for Fisher may have forgotten. All the people who worked in the province of South Australia were paid for their labour. It developed faster as an economy in spite of the inadequacies and the lack of natural resources with which it was blessed—probably faster than the other States as they now stand (colonies as they were then). In more recent times it is no accident that it still persists because of those same factors.

I have not stood in this place and claimed credit for myself for the patents I hold in the development of plastic extrusion and irrigation systems design. Yet, were it not for the fact that I was confronted with the most severe of limiting factors in my market gardening operation (if you want to call it that) and a shortage of good quality water, I

would not have been provoked into thinking about those things and attempting to minimise the impact of the adverse aspects of the environment in which I had to operate—commercial as well as in terms of natural resources.

I also had to do that to maximise, as it were, the marginal physical product from each additional dollar invested in the overall program. Politicians have a part to play, but for goodness sake let us all remember that innovation does not come as a consequence of anything we may or may not do—we can only enhance it. It is stimulated by the surroundings which, as long as politicians stay out of the way—and notwithstanding adversity—help us to succeed. All we can hope to do is to make a stable society which has predictable functions going on day by day, year by year and decade by decade to enable everybody to depend upon the functions of financial institutions, communications and the fact that all of us will want to continue to abide by the law.

Once we have that, then we will have the climate in which innovation can develop and entrepreneurial application of those innovations can flourish with it and make us the richer and the better in responding to that adversity, rather than the poorer.

The Hon. R.G. PAYNE (Mitchell): I also support the second reading of this Bill. As has been mentioned, a good deal of credit is due to various persons with respect to the progress of the original Technology Park concept in our State. I envisage that, just as mining throughout the history of our State has played a very important part in our progress to this point, technology is likely to be of even greater importance in both the present and the future of our State. For that reason, I am very pleased to note that the proposed name change still retains the technological development aspect, which I think is extremely important.

As an older member of the House, I was interested to hear other members expressing their thoughts, and I fully support the member for Fisher. There is no doubt that he was very prominent in relation to the introduction of enabling legislation providing for the establishment of a science park in the area specified. I recall standing on the Sturt Road bridge in 1972 with the then Minister of Transport (Hon. Geoff Virgo) and the then Minister for Environment and Planning (Hon. Glen Broomhill) and putting to them that, whatever use was to be made of the triangle of land referred to in this legislation, the Sturt River section be not submerged (and I am not making a pun) or forgotten. I suggested that that last portion of river in the metropolitan area that is not a concrete drain would make an ideal area for what is now called the linear park concept, wherein the local residents and visitors to the area can pursue recreational activities.

I am very pleased to note the Minister's press release on this matter clearly indicates that that concept has not been overlooked and forms part of the plans for the proposed science park. I wish to refer to one other matter apart from my pleasure at being associated with the project proposed for this area, which is within my electorate: I trust that every care and consideration will be given to the fact that this project will be in fairly close proximity to the area of Mitchell Park that is being redeveloped (with the approval and agreement of the residents concerned) at present by the South Australian Housing Trust. The redevelopment is well under way and one section will be officially opened towards the end of this month. It represents an important milestone for the people living in Mitchell Park.

It was stated by another speaker that areas ought to be more than just dormitory suburbs, and anyone who is aware of Mitchell Park history would recall that the Housing Trust

built many houses there primarily to service the workers at the then Chrysler factory, now well known as Mitsubishi. The residents of that area have gone through a number of vicissitudes with respect to their lives, and the amenity of their suburb such as the loss of employment when Chrysler rationalised and the increase in movement through the area when the operations of the motor vehicle construction firm increased. As the local member, I can testify that, over a number of years, various matters in relation to the amenity of the area have been raised with me. The redevelopment by the Housing Trust has the full support of the residents, and, as I originally put to the trust, that should apply to any redevelopment. It involves some rearrangement of the roads so that the traffic will be less hazardous for local families and pedestrians.

I trust that the concerns I have put forward will not be overlooked in relation to development of the science park. Let no-one misunderstand me: I am not opposing it. I support the concept. It will increase employment opportunities in the area and it should improve the beauty of the Sturt River for the benefit of local residents and visitors. I am pleased to support the second reading of this Bill and commend the Minister for his actions in pushing this matter to the stage where this legislation is now before us.

Mr S.G. EVANS (Davenport): I will be brief. I support the proposition. I also support the intention to establish a type of technology park in the southern suburbs, perhaps of different orientation to the one in the north. When he replies, will the Minister inform the House what stage the committee work in the Premier's Department has reached in relation to negotiations with Japanese interests regarding the establishment of technological businesses or institutions in the south? Will that involve a significant number of Japanese workers or other workers with short-term permits, or will there be a potential for long-term workers, either from Asiatic or other countries, seeking permanency and requiring accommodation in the south in order to establish the technological institutions or work in them once established? We are all aware that a group of people in the Premier's Department are working in this area, and the Parliament should be told at this time what stage this committee has reached in its negotiations.

Mr ROBERTSON (Bright): Despite the baiting of the member for Murray-Mallee earlier, I intend to keep my comments brief, erudite and apolitical. I support the Bill. In 1977 I had the good fortune to travel in northern France for several weeks. It is quite usual to drive into a French town or medium size city and be greeted by signs pointing in various directions, one to *Ville Ancienne*, one to *Ville Nouvelle*, and one to *Ville Industrielle*. In other words, the French are used to the idea of separating their historic sections from those that are new or industrial. It seemed to me that that was not a bad way to plan towns.

Indeed, it has been taken up by Queensland, appropriately 20 years later, and if one drives into industrial cities such as Rockhampton, Townsville, Cairns, Mackay, Gladstone or Bundaberg, one will see the same kind of signs pointing to what the Queenslanders call their technology parks. Maybe the French got a bit closer than the Queenslanders have, and I believe that, more appropriately, those so-called technology parks ought to be called industrial estates. However, it seems to me that South Australia, in relation to its industrial park, not only has got closer to the concept of what an industrial park ought to be but has established the first and the best Technology Park in Australia and, arguably, in the Southern Hemisphere.

In welcoming the Bill before the House, I note that the new offshoot gives the appropriate science research focus to the southern park. Technology Park has fulfilled its role, and fulfilled it ably; however, there may be a need and a niche in the southern suburbs for a park that focuses more specifically on hard sciences and their offshoot industries. It also uses in a very intelligent way the science base already built up at Flinders University and, to a lesser extent, at the Sturt campus of the SACAE.

More importantly from the point of view of the Flinders University community itself, it gives increased emphasis to the expressed desire of that university to retain and build on that science and technology focus, which the new institution based on Flinders University is expected to have. Indeed, the Council of Flinders University has expressed the view many times that whatever institution comes out of the tertiary restructure, the institution based on Flinders should be one that retains and builds on its science base. The Bill before the House goes some distance towards meeting that need.

Mr RANN (Briggs): I support the second reading of this Bill. As one of the northern members, as one of the members whose electorate includes part of Technology Park, and in my role as a board member of Techsearch, which is the commercial arm of the South Australian Institute of Technology, I am a passionate supporter of the park. In 1986, when I first became a member of Parliament, on an overseas study tour I visited other technology parks: the Cambridge Science Park, technology parks at Fort Worth, the South Bank Technopark in London and the Discovery Parks in Vancouver. What amazed me was that, at each of those places, the chief executive officers and the scientists all knew about Technology Park Adelaide. At that stage, with only two years up and running, it had an enviable international reputation. It was recognised as being one of the fastest growing technology parks in the world.

It was interesting that the chief executive officers pointed out that we had benefited from their mistakes in a number of ways and were doing it well. They wished that they had continued their development in the direction South Australia took. That is because Technology Park Adelaide has been fussy. It has concentrated on top end technology, which has contributed to its prestige in attracting important investment awards establishing headquarters at the park. Technology Park Adelaide has not allowed lower grade technologies to infiltrate. It has not taken the easy route of quickly filling up the park with people interested in warehousing, simple manufacturing, middle grade technology or sales rooms or showrooms for overseas computer companies, all of which I have seen in other technology parks around the world. By being fussy, by saying that it must have the highest standards, that there must be a commitment to research and development, it has ensured its success because people know that Technology Park Adelaide equates with quality.

It is also important that, in the design and planning of Technology Park, the board of the corporation has insisted on excellence in the design of the buildings that have been established there, and that has contributed to its being a centre of excellence in marketing internationally. Of course, a number of companies there have been doing particularly well. British Aerospace is involved in research and development work on satellite technologies for European satellites. It was revealed on the ABC news last night that Austek Microsystems has made a world breakthrough in microchip design. Work is being done at Robotics on remote sensing. At Duntech, which has its headquarters at Technology Park,

what could be a major international break through has been developed, not only in the design of hi-fi equipment but in air collision avoidance systems.

It is interesting that this Bill is concerned with the establishment of a second technology or science park to service the southern suburbs. Some people in the northern suburbs have opposed this, saying that, in some way, the southern park will compete with the existing Technology Park, which will be to that park's detriment. I do not believe that to be the case. This second technology park will be complementary inasmuch as it will have a special relationship with Flinders University and Flinders Medical Centre with their special expertise in areas such as biotechnology. I remember while visiting the discovery parks in Vancouver—there are now four discovery parks—I was made aware of the importance of ensuring a complementary approach, not just duplicating what other parks were doing, which could cause confusion in both national and international marketing. Given what I have seen so far in the planning stage, we have been able to avoid those sorts of mistakes.

The member for Murray-Mallee said that we were being partisan in this respect. I do not believe that is the case. At every single function I have attended at Technology Park Adelaide, whether it be the opening of new buildings or new developments, the Minister of State Development and Technology or the Premier has acknowledged the work of Dean Brown in the initial stages of planning Technology Park Adelaide. The simple fact is that the Minister of State Development and Technology and the Premier have gone on to turn empty paddocks and a concept into action by applying energy and planning to that goal. This is an excellent development that should be supported by people throughout the State, and I have great pleasure in supporting the Bill.

The Hon. L.M.F. ARNOLD (Minister of State Development and Technology): I thank all honourable members for their comments this afternoon and their indication of support for the legislation. It is very heartening to see that raw support for the proposal before the House. That has typified the history of Technology Park from the earliest days and, as was identified by the member for Briggs, this Government has never been coy in acknowledging that.

The earliest days of Technology Park go back to the late 1970s when it was an idea pursued by Barry Orr, who reported to the Corcoran Government in its closing days. That idea was picked up by the Hon. Dean Brown, the former member for Davenport, who introduced enabling legislation into Parliament and arranged the acquisition of the necessary land, the construction of site works on that land to enable it to be available for sale, and the establishment of a corporation and a board. Under this Government since 1982, development has been taken further to the construction of multi-tenant facilities and the introduction of other companies onto the site.

We can take the credit in this Parliament for the support of all members, which has been critical for the proposal, but it would be remiss of me if I did not mention that the success really owes a tremendous amount to two other groups of people: first, Barry Orr and the staff at Technology Park, who have made a reality of the vision that was established by Parliament, by dint not only of their hard work but of their enormous imagination and vision in taking on that mission, creating the park and undertaking the work and providing the advice to enable it to develop so well. I also congratulate David Pank and members of the board of Technology Park Adelaide Corporation. They, too, have provided that important leadership in translating

the vision of Parliament into a reality, and that reality is that Technology Park Adelaide is one of the fastest growing technology parks in the world.

This legislation deals not just with Technology Park Adelaide at The Levels but with the proposal for a new science park, as we have been wont to call it, in the southern suburbs adjacent to Flinders University. A particular tribute must go to the work of the member for Fisher in this regard. I commend his leadership in promoting this concept at a time when there were those who doubted the wisdom of such a proposal. Indeed, he had his own knockers in the southern area who considered that this was a crazy idea and that this was not the right time for an expansion of the park. It is fair to say that, when I first heard of the idea, I wondered whether it was a little premature but, as the member for Fisher identified in his contribution, we proceeded with a feasibility study arranged through the auspices of Technology Park Adelaide Corporation, which found that the project was viable. The Government then proceeded with the proposal, but even then we were still not certain as to the exact time when it could take off successfully. Since then, however, we have had these two applications to which I referred the other day, from Hamilton Laboratories and MCI. It is worth noting as an aside that in the business pages of today's *News* there appears an exciting article concerning more business won by MCI in the export area. Those concerns have lodged applications with local government for approval for developments located at the Southern Science Park.

That support from the member for Fisher and other southern members (and it is acknowledged that members on both sides from the southern area have supported this proposal) has been critical, as has been the support of the Flinders University. The role of that institution in being forthright in its support of the project (not only by saying that it liked the idea and in giving that type of verbal support) was important because the university put its money where its mouth was by dedicating land within its control to the Southern Science Park. Indeed, that area forms a significant part of the land holding that becomes the Southern Science Park. I pay a tribute to that institution and to the Vice Chancellor (Professor John Lovering), the staff, and the council of that university. They have a number of foci which they wish to pursue there and which fit in well with the thinking that is proposed for the Southern Science Park. That is in such areas as biotechnology and certain micro-electronic applications.

In these subjects Flinders University has conducted preeminent research and at present discussions are being held between the Commonwealth Scientific and Industrial Research Organisation and the Flinders University to see whether it will be possible to locate the advanced micro-electronics research centre at the university. That proposal is receiving active support from the South Australian Government.

The member for Mitcham, in indicating support for the Bill, made certain comments and indicated that he was not knocking the proposal. Indeed, I did not take his comments in that fashion; I understood them to be in the way of constructive debate. He used the interesting word 'threshold' (the use of which I support) to indicate a particular time in the history of a company when it reaches certain levels of development. True, Technology Park has reached that next stage of maturity. Indeed, when I addressed a regional meeting of international science organisations in Adelaide in 1987 I said that Technology Park had gone beyond its first flush of enthusiasm, so to speak. As a significant number of companies come on-site and the first enthusiasm for new

ideas being commercialised is experienced, the park now comes to the next maturer stage, which requires that the park recognise the fact that in high technology everything is not successful and that there are failures. At this stage the strength of the park would be shown by its capacity to cope in terms of its momentum in the face of drop-outs. Some companies would be absorbed by others and some would disappear from the face of the commercial earth.

I was really saying that I was confident that Technology Park Adelaide had reached that stage and I have been proved correct. We have seen there the effluxion of companies. More companies have come on-site; some companies have left the park; and some companies have disappeared either by take-over or, in a couple of cases, by being wound up. The fact to be noted is that the failure rate of small, exciting, high-technology companies on the park is lower than the failure rate of smaller companies outside the park.

That is the reason why Technology Park is a worthwhile investment by the community. Not only is there the benefit of synergy of a technological nature whereby people can share ideas in a Technology Park: there is also the opportunity for support between companies. Indeed, some cases of commercial reorientation have resulted in the merger of companies both of which are located on the park.

The other point that should be made in this regard is that some people may have doubted the possibility of such synergy because these companies compete against each other. However, I have spoken to companies on this point and they confirm that they appreciate the technological synergy that has taken place. One company (Andrew Antennas), which is an exciting research unit of a major international company, made that point when it told me that it had the opportunity to share ideas with others in areas that are not of commercial competitive sensitiveness and also that it had the opportunity to piece together consortia to apply for commercial tenders. Indeed, they could do it more easily when co-located with like-minded companies at the park.

The member for Mitcham also suggested that the park should contain facilities that could cultivate achievement and innovation. My immediate response was to say that that already exists with the Adelaide Innovation Centre but, listening further to the honourable member, I realised that he was talking about a wider area than the AIC and that he was suggesting that perhaps there should be some kind of interchange mechanism where ideas could be almost brokered.

It is interesting that he raised that point, because some months ago I raised that point, with particularly the Centre for Manufacturing, a similar suggestion for the interchange of ideas. The role of a technology broker has already been in place in the Discovery Parks of British Columbia. Their role is that of acknowledgement by industry that not all of the technological achievements that they want will necessarily come from South Australia or Australia; indeed, they may have to come from other countries. We should not be chauvinist in this matter. We should not close ourselves off from international technological advances.

However, how do we get the best range of technological information to small companies that cannot scan the journals of the world or the patent indices of the world? Maybe a technology broker is the way to do that. In fact, the Centre for Manufacturing is looking precisely at that area. It has some of that capacity already: a small company that may wish to be technologically innovative but may not know exactly where the technology is available may seek the support of the Centre for Manufacturing. It is not a perfected system as yet, but the centre is looking to develop

such a system in a more consciously technology broker sense in the months to come. Nevertheless, we will note other ideas that may be taken up and I will draw them to the attention of the Technology Park Adelaide Corporation, very soon to become the Technology Development Corporation.

Certain other issues are worth noting. The focus point of the Southern Science Park has been mentioned. These concern particularly biotechnology and micro-electronics, but not exclusively. Provided that *bona fide* research and its development is the fundamental activity of any company applying to go there, any one of a range of activities can be followed, although naturally, when the park is finally full, it will be found that biotechnology and micro-electronics represent the bulk of the company activities there.

While that is happening, The Levels campus of Technology Park Adelaide is looking at further work in what foci it may develop. At present, some work is being done in the area of telecommunications and digital signal processing building on the significant achievements available in South Australia through the DSTO, the work of Austech, the geoscience capacity in South Australia, including Flinders University, and the South Australian Centre for Remote Sensing.

The member for Mitchell on many occasions reminded me of the need to preserve an area of Sturt Creek and was very keen to see that that happened. Certainly, that is to happen; it will be preserved. In fact, it will be enhanced by the linear park type of development. Various statements refer to it as the riverine development, but correctly it should be the riparian development. Nevertheless, it is an important part of the park development that Sturt Creek be beautified because one of the aspects that help make technology parks successful is the amenities in which they are located. That is not well done by large concreted drains: it is much better done by a beautified creek which adds to the general environmental quality of the area.

The member for Davenport mentioned the multi-function polis concept and asked what stage the discussions had reached. In short, at the Australian Industry and Technology Conference of Ministers (AITC) held in New Zealand last December, all State Ministers agreed with the Commonwealth Government to jointly fund a feasibility study on the multi-function polis proposal. The South Australian Government is a party to that agreement.

That feasibility study will, first, assess what this multi-function polis concept will be in reality—wherever it may be located in Australia—and, secondly, consider the area in which it might be located, if it only has one node of development: in other words, instead of being a multi-State development, if it were to be only a one State activity, in which State it would be situated. That work is still taking place and, when it is finished, if a particular State is nominated, a further feasibility study will have to be done jointly funded by the State in question and the Commonwealth Government.

I know that it is not the member for Davenport's intention to raise unnecessary fears and create anxiety, unnecessarily scaring people about the prospect of foreign investment in this area (because we could do enormous damage to this country if we created a paranoid image of ourselves overseas with respect to receiving investment) but some have attempted to do that with the multi-function polis proposal, for example, by raising anti-Japanese fears.

The point that has been made on a number of occasions by me and other members of the Government is that, quite apart from the fact that we are supported in this proposal by the Federal Government, the South Australian Govern-

ment's support for a multi-function polis is contingent upon its meeting certain criteria. One is that it will be a mechanism for the two way interchange of technologies from all parts of the world and Australia, not just from one particular part of the world. Secondly, the multi-function polis should not be a superimposed monolith occupying one enormous site that could also be termed a city. Rather, we have taken the archipelago approach that it should be a number of sites linked together. That is why the suggestion has been made that there could be a number of sites in the southern suburbs down to an area approaching the South Coast linking together different activities that might be related to the multi-function polis.

There are a number of overseas corollaries to this concept. One that is very much smaller, but nevertheless a research focal point for the interchange of ideas, innovations and technology, is the Wenner Gren Centre in Stockholm. I am sure that all people would actively support that kind of activity.

Likewise the feasibility study being done now will come up with concepts to meet the requirements and expectations of people in this country. We will want to be careful that this does not tunnel vision us into accepting only certain technologies. We will want to be open to accept technologies from whatever parts of the world they come and to provide the most fertile ground for Australian technologies to receive the best commercial opportunities in every part of the world. With those comments I once again thank members for their support, particularly the member for Fisher for his dedication in pursuing this project, and I look forward to the speedy passage of this legislation through all stages.

Bill read a second time.

In Committee.

Clauses 1 to 8 passed.

Clause 9—'Membership of the Corporation.'

Mr S.J. BAKER: The Opposition is delighted that the Government is saving on resources and not setting up an additional entity to oversee the science park: the Opposition appreciates and supports that proposition. Two matters arise from the proposed amendments: one is the targeting of Flinders University as the only organisation mentioned among all the corporation members; and the other relates to the position of Marion council on this corporation. There is always the danger—and I understand why the Minister has included Flinders University here—that by saying that one organisation should of right be included, omitting other organisations could create a difficulty. The Minister would be well aware that the membership of the corporation includes: the South Australian Institute of Technology, the University of Adelaide, the Salisbury council, the Department of State Development, the Department of Science and Technology and private enterprise representatives in the form of David Pank and Ian Kowalick, as well as the Manager of Technology Park.

In those circumstances, the Minister has deemed it appropriate to target Flinders University to be the only member included as of right, whereas the others will not, as of right, have representation on the corporation. The second matter relates to how the Marion and Salisbury councils will divide up what I presume to be one position on the corporation.

The Hon. L.M.F. ARNOLD: One of the benefits of having only one corporation is that the cost of two bureaucracies is saved and the taxpayer must therefore be better off. We can use those saved funds for any number of purposes, including more real support for technology in South Australia. The other benefit of having one corporation is that you do not have two competing against each other in the international marketplace trying to attract companies to

South Australia, conducting an unnecessary auction at a cost to the South Australian community. What we are doing here has not been done for the first time.

The Discovery Parks model in British Columbia has one umbrella organisation linking together all the research parks and institutions. Flinders University is the only institution that has actually invested in this facility. By virtue of the land that it is vesting in the Southern Science Park, the university is making a major financial investment. There is \$3 million worth of land involved, and the university is mentioned because it is a partner in this whole activity.

Certainly, we encourage all higher education institutions to be partners, and the Institute of Technology has been a very good neighbour of Technology Park Adelaide at The Levels. Techsearch works with a number of companies, as the honourable member knows, at Technology Park Adelaide. The last information was that about 10 of the companies at Technology Park Adelaide have used the services of Techsearch within the past 12 to 15 months, but they do not have an investment in the corporation as such; so, it is in recognition of the major investment they have made.

Until now we have had a representative of a higher education institution. In fact, it has been the Institute of Technology and, when the decision was made to conduct the feasibility into Tech Park, it was agreed that a representative from Flinders would attend by invitation in an *ex officio* capacity. That has now been formalised to allow that member to be on the committee in his or her own right. This will not be at the expense of any other higher education representation: another nominee on the board would still be representing higher education so that linkage between research and higher education and the institutions would take place.

With respect to Marion council, there has never been a denominated position on the board for local government. The history of this has been a little unusual. When the initial corporation was set up Salisbury council put a case that it should be formally represented on the board. That was not accepted at the time of the Hon. Dean Brown. Salisbury council nominated someone whom it wanted to be its representative. As the local member I took up the issue and supported that case. We were not successful and in retrospect I think it was wise that we were not.

The point being made at the time was that Technology Park Adelaide is not just simply the property of a particular local government area: it is South Australia's property. The then Minister did not accept the nomination of Salisbury council. However, in the spirit of compromise, he did appoint someone who happened to be an elected alderman, Mr Marti Meredith, to the corporation's board. I maintained that nomination when the time for reappointment of members came up. I maintained that even after Mr Meredith did not continue as an elected representative of Salisbury council. He is no longer on the corporation as a representative of the council because he is no longer a member of the council.

At the time, Salisbury council put a proposition to me that I should replace Marti Meredith with the Mayor of Salisbury—that was one name mentioned. Without any disrespect to her, I did not accept the proposition because I had come to the belief that it was not appropriate that there should be a particular local government representative for one particular council area. My view would be the same with respect to Marion council. At such time as Marti Meredith no longer continues, there is no guarantee whom the Government would wish to appoint in his place. That person could well have significant local government experience but need not necessarily come from either the Sal-

isbury or Marion council areas. We will measure those circumstances at the time.

Clause passed.

Remaining clauses (10 to 12) and title passed.

Bill read a third time and passed.

INDUSTRIAL AND COMMERCIAL TRAINING ACT AMENDMENT BILL

Adjourned debate on second reading.

(Continued from 2 November. Page 1162.)

Mr S.J. BAKER (Mitcham): The Opposition supports this Bill, which legislation does two things. First, it extends the rules regarding apprenticeships to traineeships operating under the Australian Traineeship Scheme. As members appreciate, traineeship agreements are not enforceable by the Industrial and Commercial Training Commission, nor are there settlement procedures for the handling of disputes or taking disciplinary action.

The second area tackled by the Bill relates to vocational recognition. The Bill will allow for examinations to determine competency in selective vocations, particularly in respect of hairdressing, but spread throughout a number of other areas. Practitioners who have been trained overseas or who have had some experience but who have never been through any formal training will be able to have their competency adjudged by examination rather than having their qualifications determined through a course of instruction. Certificates of recognition will be awarded, obviating the need for practitioners to become qualified by formal training courses.

The Opposition supports both those measures strongly. The Bill also provides a wider term of reference to allow the ICTC to keep a watching brief on training methods in areas other than formal apprenticeships so that the latest techniques can be used, and so that the qualifications derived and the teaching methods used are as appropriate and relevant as possible.

The one area that we have to question with a Bill of this nature is that it is an open cheque, so to speak: everyone who has read the Bill will see that the ICTC under direction from the Minister in certain circumstances can use the wide ambit, which has been even further widened in this set of amendments, in a way that could be subject to abuse. That has not been so in the past, but an act of faith is involved, in that the commission can impose any conditions that it deems appropriate in regard to apprenticeship and other training areas.

The Bill deals with traineeships and the recognition of qualifications. I do not intend to talk about apprenticeships as such but, it should be noted that recent publicity has been given in both the *News* and the *Advertiser* to shortages of skills in the marketplace. Members may well recall articles in the press relating to the metal industries, and I have made at least two releases this year about shortages in the metal trades.

The other area that has gained recent prominence is the building trade, where shortages are occurring. In Sydney those shortages have led to extraordinary wages being paid on building sites for relatively unskilled labour. That situation does not pertain in South Australia, where we do not have the heavy demand and, consequently, the extraordinary rise in above-award wages that exist in New South Wales.

When discussing a Bill of this kind it is useful to reflect on how well the training schemes we have in place today

meet the needs of the marketplace. Members will have noticed the dips in the apprenticeships figures that have been provided by the Minister over some time. When employers say that they cannot afford to employ apprentices, and when the Government has no apprenticeship scheme in operation, a shortfall is created in the marketplace and four or five years down the track there are fewer tradespeople.

It has been of concern to me for some time that, although we seem to turn out a large number of apprentices, they do not stay in our industries as long as I would expect them to. Employers have a responsibility to look at ways and means of improving the retention rate with respect to apprentices because training is very expensive, particularly when undertaken by the Government. For example, I note that the restructuring of the metal trades award will address promotion and skill upgrading. I believe that the tightness of our awards system and the shortsightedness of employers have led to this huge wastage of skilled tradespeople. I am as critical of the Government as I am of employers in this regard, but I am most critical of the awards system which I believe in recent years has failed Australia.

The Bill provides that the commission can have a contract of training which is agreed between parties, and that has benefits for everybody concerned and we support it. We are pleased about the commission's being able to write a certificate of recognition for someone who has reached the level of expertise that is required in their trade. The Minister's explanation notes that hairdressing—and I have spoken to hairdressers about this—is an area where people are often very skilful but they do not necessarily have a certificate to show that they possess that skill. That will be one of the first areas addressed by the organisation. I am pleased that this mechanism will allow people to take up their given vocation whereas previously they might have been restricted.

Quite often people who come to Australia do not, for a whole range of reasons, have their skills recognised in this country. In the tertiary area some very high walls have been constructed in front of people from overseas to stop them gaining recognition in our State. In fact, I have often heard the story of a first-class surgeon who finished up sweeping the floors at the Royal Adelaide Hospital; and it is a true story. There was no doubting this man's skills. He had a reputation that extended far beyond the borders of his native Czechoslovakia, and he was regarded as one of the world's most eminent surgeons.

When he came to South Australia his skills were not recognised and he had to take on manual work. That situation has been repeated many times amongst our migrant work force. It may be that a six-month refresher course, or whatever, would be sufficient to bring those people up to the standard required in Australia. In many cases their skills are well in advance of comparable skills in Australia, and it is ludicrous to suggest that they should go through a formal training exercise to reach the level of qualification that they already have.

The Bill, which the Opposition supports, contains two positive measures. I have an amendment which concerns compulsory unionism, and I will be pursuing that very vigorously during the Committee stage. I recognise that South Australia has not done as well as it should have in the traineeship area. I have supported this area strongly for a number of years, and I supported it well in advance of the Commonwealth Government's traineeship proposals. I saw how they worked in a number of European countries, such as England, Germany and Sweden. The traineeship area is a successful means of providing young people with work experience. In fact, I was so excited by its potential

that I told my Federal colleagues that it should be part of our policy that a traineeship is available to every school-leaver for one or two years after they leave school.

We note that the traineeship scheme has been slow in developing. It will still be a long time before school-leavers have, as a right, the ability to go into a learning experience on the job. I will be working towards the day when we can guarantee every school-leaver a minimum of one year's on-the-job experience as a form of training. That is as important for youngsters as it is for employers and Australia.

As part of his 1985 election policy the Minister promised that 1000 traineeships would be in place by the end of 1987. At the end of 1986-87 we had a lowly 237 trainees. Even in 1987-88 the figure rose to only 543. I was particularly perturbed that, whilst we were one of the first States to announce a traineeships policy and pick up the Commonwealth initiative, we have been one of the slowest to take up the opportunity that has been on offer. I believe that there are some marvellous opportunities to increase the scope and coverage of the traineeship scheme for the benefit of everyone concerned.

Mr PETERSON (Semaphore): In the press over the years articles have indicated shortages with respect to certain skilled people. A few years ago there was a shortage of trained people in the hospitality industry, and we established a college to cater for that. Only last week in the *Australian*, I think, an article called for some 500 overseas tradespeople to be brought to Australia to work in the building trades. This seems to be odd in a country where there is a high level of youth unemployment. I notice that some industries have approached the training of people from a different perspective.

In the metal trades area, for instance, primary training courses have been established in welding and metal skills. I believe that the timber trades have consolidated with respect to the number of people involved in the timber industry. They work from a basic qualification and progress until they achieve the level of competence of a tradesperson. We need to look at that more closely in this country. People need training experience so that they know whether or not they wish to pursue a particular trade or profession, and then they can graduate on to develop skills.

It seems to me that perhaps we should look at providing a little more training within our schools. We now have a very broad system of education, but it could be developed more, especially in the trades area, so that people leave school with some basic trade qualification. It is a long time since I was an apprentice but I remember that the basic trade education when I left school was very much complemented by my school education, and it seems to me that this basic training and exposure could be expanded much more today. Over the years many Government programs have enabled young people to obtain work, allegedly for work experience, but when they finish their job project it is found that they have no further skills at all.

If we are to spend money in this country to set up training boards or commissions, they must be of some worth to the people who attend. In the past 40 years in this country our tradespeople, supervisors and managers obtained their trades prior to, during or after the Second World War. They are the people who have been the basis of our total management structure for some years. The exposure to basic training and the options available to people after they obtain that basic qualification is important. It has been done before, when people were trained in a crisis situation, such as a war, and short-term courses produced tradespeople. This application

of short-term courses and exposure courses for trainees is very much required. Apart from that, I support the Bill.

The Hon. L.M.F. ARNOLD (Minister of State Development and Technology): I thank members for their contributions this afternoon, and I look forward to further debate in the Committee stage. With respect to the broad principle embodied in the Bill, I thank members for their support. I will make some comments. First, with respect to the member for Mitcham's question of ministerial direction of the ICTC, it is certainly within the ambit of the legislation that there can be ministerial direction to the ICTC. However, within the history of the ICTC it has never been applied. Indeed, one might almost suggest that it would be somewhat inimical to the operations of the commission. It would be one of the tripartite not really taking part in a *bona fide* tripartite activity. The Government always has the final right to accept or not accept aspects of the commission's recommendations by means of legislative power. If it wishes to override something, it can come back to legislation and it is then for Parliament to decide. The ICTC has been a very effective tripartite body. As long as it remains so, it would be a bad thing for ministerial interposing by way of direction to become the order of the day.

The issue of the skill needs in the community is well noted. The example of the doctor-turned-cleaner is also noted, along with other examples that have been quoted of doctors from other countries who have had to return to university to study to become approved doctors in this country. In fact, there are even doctors who had to study from textbooks (and I refer to those approved for use in this country) that they themselves wrote in another country, and it was not until they passed their own work that they received recognition in Australia.

With regard to traineeships, I wish to correct some of the figures quoted by the member for Mitcham, and I draw his attention to pages 505 and 506 of the Estimates Committee report. It will be seen that at 30 June 1988, there were 727 trainees and not 500. The figure of 543 mentioned by the honourable member is the number who completed traineeships during that financial year. However, at the end of the year the figure was 727, and we look to that figure being over 1 000 in the coming year. Nevertheless, the point is taken that growth in that area has been slower than anticipated.

Traineeships are not just the function of the Government fiat. A lot of actions are required before a successful traineeship program can operate. A fundamental part of the success of a traineeship program is its acceptance amongst all the players, particularly the employers and the unions. It is true to say that progress was stalled in a number of traineeship areas as a result of some genuine concerns on the part of not only unions but also employers. They stalled progress because they wanted questions answered. While we had a slower start, nevertheless the types of traineeship programs that we are coming out with now are better. The numbers have been slower, but I look forward to a much more solid growth rate in the years to come.

Today I had the pleasure to have lunch with members of the Engineering Employers Association of South Australia. It was one of its President's lunches, and I met with a number of people in the industry, all of whom I have met on previous occasions. We discussed various issues around the table and it was interesting how often training issues came up, along with concern about the possible shortage of skills and of apprentices not staying in industry for very long. The loss of apprentices from industry to go taxi driving (as stated by one of the people at the lunch) was endorsed

today by members who spoke in this debate, and it was also raised in the Estimates Committee.

Some weeks ago I submitted for inclusion in the *Hansard* supplementary volume a table of the apprentice loss rates from various trade categories over a period. The figures, which were released earlier this year, are based upon the 1980 ABS figures. Today at lunch I lamented the fact that a 1987 report had to use 1980 figures, which are not really relevant. However, as they are the only figures that I have, I incorporated them in *Hansard* because it was the best that I could do. Frankly, the figures do not reflect the issue of wastage from trades in 1988.

The comparative wage rates, for example, between trades and between trades and non-trades, and the working conditions between trades and between trades and non-trades, are different in 1988 from what they were in 1980. Nevertheless, the point is noted that there are loss rates. In the context of that discussion, Alan Swinstead from the Engineering Employers Association talked about the process that the metals industry is very keen to see adopted in terms of restructuring. We all know that the restructuring of the metal industry award is the subject of significant work between the employers, unions and the Government. The program is to collapse the present 348 classifications into 10, with three main streams—mechanical, electrical and fabrication—and to introduce eight to 11 career levels into industry, each having an agreed rate of remuneration and formal training. One of the outcomes will be a continuum from one end of the spectrum. In fact, Alan Swinstead spoke of 12 levels—from level 12 (the base level) through to level 1. Each area has its own special training requirements, but, rather than having wastage from any one area away from an occupation altogether, workers may be able to stay in the trade by upskilling and going to a higher level.

There are six broad categories, including base level engineering operatives, the craft trades area, the specialist trades area, the dual category of mastercraft and technician, and the professional area. Separate training opportunities presently exist for each category. In the engineering operatives area, there is the traineeship scheme; in the craft trades area the apprenticeship scheme; in the specialist trades area the post-trade courses or training programs; in the mastercraft and technician area the associate diplomas and diplomas; and the professional area is the degree level.

Up till now, many of those have been discrete units and the capacity for somebody achieving credit under one system to move to another has been minimal at best, and nil in most circumstances. The restructuring will also invite the very selfsame thing that is being asked for by industry throughout this country: mobility from one to the other. In other words, somebody who has entered a trade with an apprenticeship will be able to take credit for that apprenticeship plus credit for in-trade experience, combining the two together with some further studies that would enable him or her to get an associate diploma or a diploma, and carry on up to the degree level. It would have been heretical to suggest that a few years ago.

We are at a very exciting threshold point with respect to new areas of training and the restructuring of awards and, although it is one of the reasons, it is to be hoped that the outcome will be a lessening of the wastage of trainee potential in this country, that the effort going into training will see more people staying on through their working lives in those areas of endeavour and moving up the scale so they do not have to become apprentices-turned-taxi drivers, to quote a phrase used at lunchtime today.

In that context, the point was made that that provides the best solution for meeting the skills shortages that are

starting to show up in certain areas of industry in Australia today. It will not provide some of the short-term answers, but it will provide the stable, long-term answer to those skill shortages. The short-term answers require special responses such as increased resources for TAFE, which have been provided every year under this Government, and skills centres, which are being developed by industry in conjunction with training facilities and unions and employers. They all have equal roles to play.

As has been mentioned, the legislation has a couple of purposes, one of which is to enter into the legislation the concept of the Australian traineeship system, a scheme that has great potential for the years to come but which does not have any legislative coverage at the moment. The member for Semaphore mentioned competency based training. More and more is heard about this issue as people consider the appropriate length of time an apprentice should spend in an apprenticeship and determine whether an apprentice has successfully completed an apprenticeship. Is the prime determinant how many calendar months or hours of study the apprentice has spent or is it the competency level that the apprentice has achieved?

Even under the NOW program, benchmarks must be passed before an apprentice can be classed as skilled in a particular trade. The more important question, surely, is the competency that has been achieved rather than the actual hours clocked up. We are looking at the prospect of enormous change in that area in the years to come, and that will free up the resources committed to training in this country, providing more resources for an area in which they are desperately needed at the enterprise level and at our trainee institutions level, namely, in the post trade level of work. I thank honourable members for their support and look forward to the passage of this Bill.

Bill read a second time.

In Committee.

Clauses 1 and 2 passed.

Clause 3—'Functions of Commission.'

Mr S.J. BAKER: In my opinion it would be appropriate to include a definition of 'trainees'. Mention is made of it in other parts of the Bill, but not in the definition clause. I have discussed this with the commission and I make the point that, although contracts of training and apprenticeships are defined, there is no definition of trainees, and it is important that they be defined. Secondly, apart from hairdressers, what other trades will be affected primarily by the provision relating to the certificate of recognition? Is it known how many people in Australia do not have a piece of paper to say that they have reached a certain level of qualification, although they may have overseas qualifications of various types?

The Hon. L.M.F. ARNOLD: On the initial point, the Bill provides more flexibility to take account of developments that will occur over the years, negating the need to come back and insert a new definition every time a new program is arrived at. The honourable member will accept that the proposed amendment envisages the traineeship scheme by virtue of its being a system and method of training for trades and other declared vocations and to report to the Minister on such systems and methods. A moment ago I mentioned the comments by Alan Swinstead about development in the training area and the post trade area. At the moment there is no formal training in that area for many industries for many areas of award, but there may be. One thing that may come out of the metal industry award restructuring is some formalising of training in that area.

If we were to replace this with an insertion of traineeships and nothing else, we would have to come back to Parliament

with an amendment at some later stage. This is designed to take account of the fact that the world of training is changing and the industry—unions and employers—does not know where it wants to go but will do within the next few years.

With respect to overseas qualifications, the commission is to report to me and, ultimately, to the Economic Committee of Cabinet. I do not know of any speculation as to which trade areas may be taken into account. It all relates to the outcome of the award restructuring. I have mentioned the enormous changes taking place in metals but we do not know what will result, so I can give no more than a vague answer to that. When I have a report from the commission, I will be happy to keep members informed of developments as they are applicable under this provision.

Clause passed.

Clause 4 passed.

Clause 5—'Training under contracts of training.'

Mr S.J. BAKER: I move:

Page 2, after line 16—Insert—

and

(d) by inserting after subsection (15) the following subsection:
(16) Notwithstanding any other Act or law or any industrial award or agreement—

- (a) a person selecting persons for training under contracts or training is not under any obligation to give preference to members of any association composed or representative of employees;
- (b) a person seeking to become or remain a trainee under a contract of training may not be required to become or remain a member of any such association;
- (c) any condition of a contract of training or employment purporting to impose a requirement that a trainee under a contract of training become or remain a member of such an association is void and of no effect.

I move this amendment because I am concerned with the Government's actions recently. The Minister said that there had been no interference by the elected Government in the operations of the ICTC. I accept that fact, but in recent months we have seen a strong determination by the Labor Government to enforce compulsory unionism in certain shapes and forms. We have seen the disgusting behaviour of the Government in forcing people who wish to contract their services to the Government to guarantee, as part of their contract agreement, that all their employees are unionised. That has caused difficulties for people who have relied heavily on Government contracts in the past and who have been efficient providers of services to the Government. As far as I am concerned, that was the first nail in the coffin of the Government in this matter.

More recently, the Minister of Labour circulated a draft Bill wherein he sought to allow the commission to exercise a preference to unionists or compulsory union membership. The Minister wished this to be an industrial matter to be considered by the commission. Although we do not know the future of that legislation, the Opposition will resist it vigorously. In keeping with a breach of faith by the Government, I am moving to insert new subsection (16) to safeguard persons wishing to take up training or apprenticeships by ensuring that they have freedom of choice and are not compelled to join a union by ministerial action through the ICTC. Even though the Minister may say that that never happens, because of recent happenings I would not put it past the Government.

Secondly, we see too much of intrusion on the basic human rights of people. My colleague the member for Hanson can tell stories, as I can, to show that compulsory unionism is a fact of life through pure pressure on building sites and even at the Grand Prix where kids have union money taken out of their piggy banks to satisfy a closed

shop arrangement. That is disgusting, although members opposite would probably say that that is in keeping with their philosophy of 'starting them young', probably in accordance with the communist philosophy of 'if you start them young you have a chance of getting them'.

There must be a halt to the erosion of human rights that is being pursued by this Government. I am not amused by the thuggery on building sites and the enforcement of unionism that have gone unchallenged by the Government. Indeed, I imagine that this may be strongly supported by the Government. As a protest and as a meaningful contribution to the legislation, I move my amendment.

The Hon. L.M.F. ARNOLD: The Government opposes the amendment. After the constructive discussion that we had earlier today about the importance of training in our community, it is a pity that we are to be diverted by what I consider to be nothing other than jingoism. The ICTC is a tripartite organisation that brings together employers, unions and Government representatives to address the important training issues affecting everyone in the community. It has not involved itself in matters of industrial politics and, whenever a decision is made about training requirements, it adds the proviso that the conditions of employment shall be those required by the relevant industrial award agreement.

That is making the important statement that the ICTC, as a tripartite body, discusses the training issues involved and leaves for the appropriate industrial relations arena the discussion of conditions which may include preference to unionists. So, such issues can be argued in their own arena. This amendment takes away that opportunity by making a blanket statement covering all training agreements. It introduces an area of industrial politics into a tripartite body that is responsible for training.

The honourable member made known his views on this matter and I am happy to make known my views. I support preference to unionists and the principle that workers shall become union members in an area of employment, because history has proved the significant role played by unions in this country. It is acknowledged that in any area of human endeavour some people have been over enthusiastic, have gone overboard or have been downright wrong but just because that happens in every area of human activity does not damn the general area of human activity. After all, we do not damn the body politic merely because certain members misbehave sometimes and we do not damn the commercial world because of the misbehaviour of certain people in the commercial world from time to time. Nor should we damn the unions because of the misbehaviour of certain unionists from time to time.

It was offensive of the honourable member to say that this Government supports union thuggery: that is not the case. However, this Government believes that there is a right and proper role for unions in our community. Where unions have existed, they have offered the opportunity for the protection of the rights of individual employees rather than having them picked off one by one as they have been so often when unionism does not apply. That may not be something that is in the experience of members opposite in dealing with constituents, but probably no member on this side has not had constituents come to them worried about how they are being imposed on in a work site because of bad working conditions.

On a number of occasions as a local member I have heard cases of downright exploitation. Certainly, they represent only a minority of employers in this State but, nevertheless, they have been cases of exploitation. I often find that where that has happened either the area of work is not covered

by a union or those people are not members of a union, in a workshop that does not have union representation. In a small category of cases there may have been a union, but the worker has chosen voluntarily not to join it.

Those people came to me as their local member of Parliament asking what I could do to save them from the hardships they were suffering. That is precisely the role of a union. In this country we are seeing unions playing the appropriate role of ensuring that there is a minimisation of exploitation in the workplace. Over 95 per cent of employment situations will be justly dealt with, but there will always be some that will not and unions will be needed to fight those cases. The fact that the vast majority of cases are being dealt with properly is not only a function of the goodwill of employers but clearly a function of the existence of unions in this country.

I come back to the principal point: it is not within the arena of ICTC tradition for it to be involved in industrial politics or relations. Its job is to be concerned about industrial training. To accept this amendment would be to burden the commission and, to skew its capacity to address training needs, on which we in this Chamber all seem to agree. I therefore ask members to oppose the amendment moved by the member for Mitcham.

Mr S.J. BAKER: I will respond briefly and, on reflection, I indicate that I will not call for a division on this amendment. The two principles—that the ICTC is beyond politics and that because it is tripartite it has some special meaning—are broken many times in a year by the Government. We cannot say that, because the ICTC has traditionally made its own way in the world with no active interference, it will continue in that mode for much longer. The Government wanted to interfere in that mode by inserting preference clauses in the Industrial Conciliation and Arbitration Act.

One of the first areas affected would be the point of employment, when someone says, 'I want a contract of training' or, 'I would like to take an apprenticeship.' Everyone in this House would realise that that preference would be exercised at the point of employment, the point at which people get a job. That is the point at which I would hope everyone would have employment opportunities.

So, it is appropriate that we in this Chamber set down what we believe should be contained within the legislation. To say that the ICTC has not involved itself in the political process in the past is probably only telling half a truth because in matters of training there are always matters of politics involved. I know how much negotiation had to take place in the traineeship area before we could get traineeships up and running in this State. I also know that at times some of the efforts of the union movement were not constructive. So, politics does play an important part in the training process and can affect the final determinations of the ICTC.

On both grounds I believe it is important that legislation such as this, which could be a benchmark for all employment opportunities in this State five or 10 years down the track, should reflect the ideology that membership of an organisation shall be purely voluntary. If that organisation has a capacity to attract members, I am content. However, if it requires an umbrella of legislation to enforce that situation I am most unhappy. Whilst I accept what the Minister said regarding his personal preference for compulsory unionism, the Opposition has a distinctly different point of view on this matter. Having said that, I do not propose to call for a division on the amendment, but my colleagues in another place may do so.

The Hon. L.M.F. ARNOLD: I note the comments of the honourable member, who deliberately chooses to misrep-

resent my words. I indicated my very strong preference for preference to unionists, which the honourable member interpreted as a very strong preference for compulsory unionism. I would have thought that someone who purports to be the shadow spokesman in this area would know enough about the difference between these two concepts.

The point I make is that these are issues to be resolved in other arenas; they have nothing to do with this Bill. The Bill does not represent a discriminatory imposition against potential trainees or apprentices. Discrimination refers to something which takes place that is an intrinsic part of an individual and is used against them. Where, for reasons of personal conscience, people cannot belong to a trade union, the awards provide for conscientious objection. In other words, an act of discrimination would occur in those circumstances because they would be an offence to someone's personal views. However, in other areas it is really a decision of whether or not people will join an association that is designed to look after the best interests of employees in a particular industry.

One of the points I want to make is that in this country we are reaching a stage of maturity in relations between employers and unions which I would have thought this Parliament would want to foster. The metal trades industry restructuring that we have been talking about involved the most exciting cooperation between all parties. To accept an amendment such as this would be to throw a jingoistic spanner in the works, because it would be an attempt to try to stop the developments that are taking place. But, more importantly, as I said previously, it is irrelevant to this matter and the Government opposes the amendment.

Amendment negatived.

Mr S.J. BAKER: Regarding proposed new section 2 (c) of section 21, I suggest that it is probably a little unwieldy to gazette each determination of traineeship. It may be better, perhaps by amendment at a later stage, to incorporate an approval process that is far more practical. On each occasion the declared vocation may be the result of consultation when all the guidelines have been laid down. The first point at which a vocation is declared when an employer says, 'I will go into a traineeship agreement in this vocational area.' It would be unwieldy, on each occasion that this occurs, to gazette the declared vocation.

The Hon. L.M.F. ARNOLD: I thank the member for Mitcham for his comment and appreciate that he is trying to have us consider something that might be more expeditious. Parliamentary Counsel has advised that it is necessary to proceed in this way, that is, to list in the *Gazette*. I will have that matter further reported on, but I do not propose to make any alteration now. That information will be available to my colleague in another place when the matter is further considered.

Mr S.J. BAKER: There is no doubt that declared vocations must be gazetted. What concerns me is the timing of those declarations. The legislation should perhaps allow for vocations to be declared every six months. They might be in operation as long as the commission is empowered to undertake those contracts during that time.

The Hon. L.M.F. ARNOLD: Declared vocations are gazetted in batches, for ease and efficiency. Apparently that is a reasonable procedure that is sustained. It is happening at this stage in practice.

Clause passed.

Clause 6 and title passed.

Bill read a third time and passed.

LIFTS AND CRANES ACT AMENDMENT BILL

Adjourned debate on second reading.
(Continued from 9 November. Page 1399.)

Mr S.J. BAKER (Mitcham): The Opposition supports the Bill and the two amendments contained therein. The first deals with upgrading penalties and placing them in new divisions. Whilst we might have some difference of opinion as to the level of fines, we are into a mode where divisions are determined and it is appropriate that they be used in these circumstances. The second amendment is to remove a technical anomaly which occurred in the 1985 Act. That Act would have required all lifts and cranes still licensed when this measure comes into operation, which is to be 1989, to be reinspected before they could be relicensed. For some cranes it may have been only six months into the operation of the new Act and they would have required inspection before they were put permanently on the register. The proposition was that they should be placed permanently on the register and that, in a spirit of deregulation, more responsibility will be placed on the owners and operators of lifts, cranes and other elevating devices. The Opposition supports the amendments in the Bill.

The Hon. R.J. GREGORY (Minister of Labour): I am very pleased that the Opposition supports the Bill.

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

ADOPTION BILL

Returned from the Legislative Council without amendment.

ADJOURNMENT

The Hon. R.J. GREGORY (Minister of Labour): I move: That the House do now adjourn.

Mr D.S. BAKER (Victoria): I wish to quote from the Auditor-General's Report and then discuss a couple of matters, first, the Woods and Forests Department; and, secondly, the Timber Corporation. I wish then to discuss those organisations in the context of a seminar in Mount Gambier which received wide publicity last week throughout South Australia. I was interested to read in the Auditor-General's Report, under 'Audit Issues':

That approach should help to ensure that maximum value is obtained from the investment of taxpayers' funds, or that those funds are not placed unduly at risk. It is against that background that I again stress the importance of the inclusion of competent people with financial and management accounting qualifications, skills and practical experience as part of the executive management team of agencies. It is an important feature of most successful business organisations. It is no less important in the public sector—a factor recognised by the committee which reviewed and reported on Government financial management arrangements in 1984. As indicated in my report last year, I believe greater emphasis needs to be given to this important aspect of public sector management.

It is against that background of the Auditor-General's comments that I refer to the Woods and Forests Department. In the Estimates Committee the Minister went to great lengths to tell us that the assets of the department in South Australia exceeded \$600 million, and he went on to say that that was a wonderful investment for this State to have. However, although the income from those assets was \$107

million for the year, the commercial operations made a loss of \$1 million.

Here we have in South Australia \$600 million of taxpayers' funds making a commercial loss of \$1 million. In any context that is a disgrace. The \$107 million in revenue obtained by the department included \$30 million of forest revaluation, which was another controversial amount, as indicated by the Auditor-General, and in his opinion against Accounting Standard AAS10. That matter, which was debated at length in the Estimates Committee, should be looked at.

It is one thing for a commercial operation that makes large annual profits to include some increment in its balance sheet, but it is another thing altogether when a Government instrumentality includes \$30 million of forest revaluation in its net profit each year. It is time that we looked at the department's role, particularly in the South-East, and at its revenue-raising operations in South Australia. I would be the first to admit that, quite properly, it is the Government's right to grow trees and to encourage the growing of trees: I acknowledge the right of the State to have quite a large input in that area.

However, as soon as the forest has matured and it comes to harvesting, I am afraid that the State has a disastrous record in relation to turning that operation into a profit. As members would know, the South Australian Timber Corporation has been a complete and utter disaster. Some \$35 million of taxpayers' money has been poured down the drain over the past few years, and it continues to make significant losses. We now see that SAFA is taking over some of its operations and that Woods and Forests Department is taking over 16 per cent of it and SAFA is converting loans into equity. As members with a business background would know, turning equity into shareholders' funds only cuts down the interest bill, it does not help make a profit or manage the business in a better fashion.

Some of the scandals in the Timber Corporation have been the subject of questions in this House and are presently the subject of an inquiry in the other place. When the results of that inquiry are reported in the near future members will see some of the rorts and the disgraceful management practices that were allowed to take place. I hope that the Government will then come to its senses and say, 'Enough is enough. It's time we did something about it.' Machinery to the value of \$600 000 that was bought from the Shepherdson and Mewett Timber Mill sat on the wharf for 18 months doing nothing. Now, the new Minister says that new equipment has to be put into the operation—forgetting about the second-hand equipment that was bought in quite a dubious fashion—and the Government is spending some \$13 million to re-equip mills in the South-East. Against that background it is time the Government looked at the commercial operations of both those organisations with a view to rationalising them.

The Mount Gambier paper, the *Border Watch*, contained an article which was attributed to Eric Roughana, the General Manager of CSR Softwoods, who spoke at an Appita conference on the future of sawn timber in the Green Triangle area. There is no question that the Green Triangle area of the South-East of South Australia and Western Victoria has a tremendous future for producing not only timber but also wealth generally for this State and for the State of Victoria. Those who have taken the time to leave Adelaide and see what is going on will know what a vibrant area it is. In the article Mr Roughana said:

... there has already been some rationalisation of the industry in the region which has provided a degree of economy of scale through higher productivity and the opportunity to use the latest world technology to improve sawn recovery and raw material

utilisation . . . Eight major mills are operating in this region, which is just three mills less than the other regions throughout Australia put together.

That is a disgrace. The inefficiencies and lack of economy of scale are severely hurting operations generally in the area. The lack of commercial experience in the Woods and Forests Department and the Timber Corporation means that the Government is blindly going ahead investing taxpayers' money, merely making the industry less efficient and increasing overhead costs, in the belief that it may be providing employment.

It is a well known fact that when one rationalises an industry it does not mean losing skills at the coalface (or in the mills): much of the rationalisation will take place at the management level, and that will increase overhead efficiencies and net profit at the end of the day. But this Government hangs on and says, 'Fancy the member for Victoria bringing up the ticklish point of rationalising the sawmilling industry in the South-East; his electors will revolt against him.' I assure members that they will not. It is time that that rationalisation occurred. People in the commercial field want to purchase the Timber Corporation. Unofficially this Government has approached them to purchase it, but it has all been done under the lap. It is about time that the Government said, 'We've made some disgraceful financial mistakes down there but let's get private enterprise to take over and get it working.' That would not be to the detriment of the South-East, and it would help the timber industry in that area become more efficient. It is fine for the Government and the Woods and Forests Department to grow the timber, but the track record after that point has been an unmitigated disaster. It is now time to bite the bullet.

Mr DUGAN (Adelaide): I wish to declare my categorical and unequivocal support for an entertainment centre in Adelaide. An entertainment centre has been on the agenda for a long time, and few people in the community believe it is not needed. The evidence is there for all to see. The difficulty lies in two major areas: first, the choice of a suitable location; and, secondly, the way of financing it. The fact that an entertainment centre is needed is attested to by the large audiences turning up at the many and varied functions being staged in various centres in metropolitan Adelaide. Over the past months quite a few of these centres have accommodated a number of major attractions.

While these recent performances by top overseas acts have focused attention on the need for an international standard entertainment centre, it is important to acknowledge that even though the facilities are not of a top international standard we have not been missing out on the acts. Over the period of a few months the Festival Centre will have staged the production of *Cats* and a performance by Randy Crawford; the Apollo Stadium is the venue for the Harlem Globetrotters and Robert Palmer; there have been recent concerts at Thebarton Oval by Mick Jagger and Jimmy Barnes; Thebarton Theatre has been the venue for David Lee Roth and the Robert Cray Band; Bryan Ferry played at the Festival Theatre, while the Moscow Circus and Torvill and Dean performed under canvas in the west parklands; Sting and INXS played at Memorial Drive; and Wayville Showgrounds was recently the venue for the Army Tattoo.

Over the past two months Adelaide has attracted a wide variety of performances, and they have played in a number of centres, many of which were less than adequate for those performances, and it is necessary for this State to decide on the need for a top class international standard entertainment centre. There has been no shortage of claims in relation to the establishment of an entertainment centre. Over the past

couple of years proposals have been put forward for covering Memorial Drive, utilising the basketball stadium, Morphettville Racecourse (the SAJC was involved in looking at tentative plans for the better utilisation of those facilities), Football Park, and Wayville Showgrounds. Proposals have also mentioned a central city location which, while it would be attractive to me because of its proximity, would obviously be a very expensive option. A centre was proposed for the ASER site on North Terrace as an alternative to the proposed exhibition hall. However, the space available on that site is probably not adequate for the international standard facility that is required.

There is also the major commitment already made by the State Government to an entertainment centre on land which it has developed and aggregated at Hindmarsh. The commitment of the Government to an entertainment centre is more than mere rhetoric or electoral posturing. The commitment made at the 1985 election has resulted in a number of substantial moves being taken by the State Government. They are, first, to aggregate substantial land at Hindmarsh in the area bounded by South Road, Port Road and Adam Street; secondly, to commission a feasibility study for the building of an entertainment centre able to cope with about 12 000 patrons; and, thirdly, to institute a number of inquiries into the other demands by centres competing for attention from the Government.

As an article by Tim Lloyd in the *Saturday Advertiser* of 5 November points out, there is no doubt that an entertainment centre of the capacity needed and the style that would be satisfactory to the major performances that have been attracted from overseas will require Government financial support. There is no way that it could proceed without it. That is not just financial support for the aggregation of land which has already happened in respect of the Hindmarsh centre—there will need to be an added injection of funds. What needs to be understood also is that any entertainment centre must be done well or not done at all.

The Premier, on a number of occasions, has made the same points mentioned in the Tim Lloyd article about the problems faced by other cities that have developed their own entertainment centre. The construction of other entertainment centres has been completed in a cheer-chasing exercise to respond to the demands made by various members of the community, resulting in problems. In his article, Mr Lloyd points out a number of them. With respect to the Victorian Arts Centre, he states that, even in the best of seats, people are likely to be more than 50 metres from the stage, and that centre cost \$86 million. With respect to the highly successful Brisbane Entertainment Centre, Mr Lloyd points out that it is 15 km from Brisbane in an area not readily accessible.

That centre had to be split into two parts, so that part of it could be used as a sporting complex and a main stadium for music performers. That centre was also very expensive. The centre in Western Australia has its own problems. Every city is now living with the problem of an over-hasty decision with respect to the placement of its entertainment centre.

We must not repeat any of the disadvantages that have been experienced by the centres in Victoria, New South Wales, Queensland and Western Australia. We must do it properly. We must ensure that matters such as the economy and accessibility are correct, and we must ensure that the facility will be able to accommodate both artistic and sporting performances. It must be acoustically sound. Its management must be independent and able to accommodate not only a variety of acts but a variety of performances, and that all promoters of special events in Adelaide must

be able to use it. It must be safe, and it must have the modern facilities that everyone is demanding. There is no doubt that the entertainment centre is important. I believe that the State Government is committed to it and I hope that the State Opposition, which is also involved in the entertainment centre debate, tells us where it stands.

The ACTING SPEAKER (Hon. T.M. McRae): Order! The honourable member's time has expired.

Mr OSWALD (Morphett): In the few minutes available to me, I would like to cover several subjects, particularly those raised by various constituents who have asked me to bring matters of concern to the attention of the Government. I will first bring to the attention of the Government and the House a letter that I received from England.

There has been much discussion in the media about the question of giving free heroin in single dose disposable syringes to heroin addicts. In the long term, I believe that this matter will need to be handled in a bipartisan way. The member for Kingston (Mr Bilney) has been reported in the media several times advocating this procedure and there has been some discussion within Federal and State Government ranks.

The rationale behind that discussion is that, if we accept that about 80 per cent (which I believe is fairly accurate) of breakings and enterings or robberies with violence occurring presently in Adelaide are initiated by would-be criminals to satisfy a drug habit, then, so the theory goes, if these drugs were provided freely through registered outlets, those people would not have to commit these crimes. Also, so the theory goes, if the people who undertake the robberies to satisfy their drug cravings are not criminals but are medical patients, they should be treated as medical patients. I have some sympathy for that argument. As a former pharmacist, I am still trying to resolve in my mind whether this is the right direction in which to proceed. As we read in the press, all members are wrestling with the question of whether we should embark on this plan or whether, in the long term, we will just leap from one disaster to another.

In May this year I contacted the British High Commission in Canberra to see whether I could be put in contact with a senior officer of the Department of Health in Britain who could advise me on these schemes. Someone stated that one of these programs had been attempted in Birmingham. I will read the letter in full so that any honourable member who is interested in the subject and would like to contact the writer can do so. I am sure that she would be only too happy to enter into correspondence. Also, anyone in the Health Commission who reads *Hansard* might be interested in the detail of the letter. As I said initially, this aspect really must be approached in a bipartisan way. I welcome the involvement of all members as to how we should tackle this matter and whether it should be adopted as a community policy.

The letter, from the Department of Health and Social Security, Alexander Fleming House, Elephant and Castle, London, SE1, 6BY, England, states:

Dear Mr Oswald, Thank you for your letter of 23 May about the prescribing of heroin in the UK. Under the regulations of the Misuse of Drugs Act 1971, the major drug legislation in the UK, only doctors who hold a special licence approved by the Home Secretary, and with endorsement by the Chief Medical Officer, may prescribe heroin, cocaine and dipipanone, in the treatment of addiction. These doctors are of consultant status, or junior doctors working under their direct supervision, the majority of whom work in the NHS. The decision to prescribe any of these three drugs in the treatment of addiction is a clinical decision, taking into account the individual patient's needs. However, the prescription of heroin is not widely used by our drug specialists. Only a very small minority of patients will receive heroin. The most commonly prescribed drug in the treatment of opiate add-

iction is methadone, most usually in an oral liquid form. There have been no experimental programs providing free heroin in single dose syringes. Amongst our drug specialists, since the advent of AIDS, there has been a trend to more flexible prescribing, including longer term prescribing of methadone. However, I should stress how and what to prescribe is a matter of clinical judgment, and is not laid down by regulation. It has always been a principle of our drug policy that competitive prescribing may be an element of control, in that if drug users have access to monitored controlled prescribed drugs, they may be less likely to buy illicit drugs on the black market with consequent criminal activities. If you feel I can be of any further help, please do not hesitate to contact me again.

Yours sincerely, Dorothy Black, Senior Medical Officer.

It appears that, in Britain, as in Australia, they are breaking new ground. I refer members to that letter and I am sure that they could write to the department in England for further information. I let the matter rest other than to urge members to exercise their mind on this policy because, at some time or other, we will have to decide whether we are to hand out single dose syringes. It is a fact that about 80 per cent of burglaries of our homes are effected by people in order to satisfy a drug craving. Most of them are not criminals: they are medical patients, and we should start to look at them in that way.

The next matter to which I refer was raised with me by Mr George Adler and it concerns housewives on jury duty. Although I have not had time to verify the figure, I assume that it is correct that people are paid \$20 a day for jury service. Mr Adler pointed out that, bearing in mind jury duty is compulsory, by the time housewives pay for child minding and car parking, they are out of pocket in doing jury service. It is also difficult to find baby-sitters. He pointed out that small business people find it hard to get replacements at short notice. He believes that both those groups in the community are greatly disadvantaged and would like the Government to address the situation of how much a person is paid for jury service when they are out of pocket as a result of performing that service.

The next matter of concern was raised by Mrs A.J. Towers of South Plympton. Her request of the Government is that people be given 90 days to pay their excess water account. In June this year Mr and Mrs Towers received an E&WS bill totalling \$400. They paid \$66, being the quarterly bill, and also paid \$50 off the excess. Recently they received a termination notice from the E&WS and Mr Towers promptly contacted the department to complain about receipt of that notice. He was told that a mistake had been made. He was not particularly impressed with the attitude of the departmental officer, but I will not read out his comment in that regard. The situation has been sorted out, so there is no need for the department to react to my speech today. However, the Government should take on board that, if members of the public are in difficult circumstances, on occasions consideration could be given to the extension of payment for the excess water account and, as this particular constituent requested, perhaps 90 days would not be unusual.

The next request was raised by Mr J. Martin of Glenelg East. He brought to my attention a notice from the South Australian Superannuation Fund under the heading 'A special notice to all persons receiving a benefit from the State Superannuation Pension Scheme: new superannuation arrangements from 1 July 1988'. He drew my attention to paragraph 1.2.5, which reads:

Persons who commenced pension before 1 January 1987: The Superannuation Board understands that the Government intends later this year to allow persons receiving pensions of less than \$12 000 per annum (except invalid and retrenchment pensioners under age 60) to commute a further amount of the pension they are receiving. Should this option become available, it is proposed to individually contact all persons in this group.

Mr Martin would like the Government to speed up that option, and I commend that particular request to the House. I regret that time does not allow me to enlarge on what Mr Martin requested, but I will submit to him by mail what I have said.

Motion carried.

At 5.46 p.m. the House adjourned until Wednesday 16 November at 2 p.m.

HOUSE OF ASSEMBLY

Tuesday 15 November 1988

QUESTIONS ON NOTICE

REMOTE SENSING UNIT

54. **Mr BECKER (Hanson)**, on notice, asked the Minister of Transport: What visits overseas did officers of the Remote Sensing Unit make in the past financial year, in what capacity, for what reasons, what was the outcome of these visits and how was the cost of \$73 820 made up?

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

- Date: 14.8.87-3.9.87
- Who: Scientist and Technical Officer
- Where: Papua New Guinea-Port Moresby
- Why: Participate in a Land Information System/Remote Sensing Seminar at invitation of Qld Key Centre for Land Information Systems. Joint Australian marketing opportunity.
- Outcome: Contacts with Government agencies were made.
- Cost: \$6 397.
- Date: 8.8.87-26.8.87
- Who: Director, SACRS, Solicitor from Crown Solicitors Office
- Where: Ethiopia
- Why: Ethiopian project negotiations
- Cost: \$22 343
- Date: 26.10.87-30.10.87
- Who: Director, SACRS
- Where: Thailand
- Why: Present paper at water resource management seminar.
- Cost: \$1 135 (approximately another \$1 000 funded by State Development).
- Date: 28.11.87-12.12.87
- Who: Scientist
- Where: Ethiopia
- Why: To complete a contract for a feasibility study of establishing a national remote sensing centre for Ethiopia.
- Cost: \$8 690
- Date: 22.11.87-20.12.87
- Who: Director, SACRS
- Where: France and Ethiopia
- Why: Participation in workshop in France as a principal investigator for the new generation SPOT satellite. Ethiopia project negotiations and feasibility study.
- Cost: \$12 977
- Date: February, 1988
- Who: Director, SACRS
- Where: Ethiopia
- Why: Ethiopian project negotiations
- Cost: \$12 557

Total overseas trips total \$64 099. The remainder was carried forward expenditure from travel to Ethiopia in May/June 1987, as all bills and costs had not been settled.

REMOTE SENSING EQUIPMENT

55. **Mr BECKER (Hanson)**, on notice, asked the Minister of Transport: What capital equipment was budgeted for to cost \$1 375 000 for the year 1987-88 and what is the reason for \$60 000 in this year's budget for remote sensing equipment for the Department of Services and Supply?

The Hon. G.F. KENEALLY: The 1987-88 capital equipment budget of \$1 375 000 was made up as follows:

| | |
|--|-------------|
| | \$ |
| Carryover 1986-87 Image Analysis System .. | 505 000 |
| NOAA Receiving Station Upgrade | 300 000 |
| Image Analysis System Upgrade | 100 000 |
| Ink Jet Plotter | 200 000 |
| GSAR Radar Software Package | 200 000 |
| Stereo Pack Software | 70 000 |
| | \$1 375 000 |

1988-89 capital equipment budget is for likely necessary expenditures to maintain services to operations supportable by revenues:

| | |
|--|----------|
| | \$ |
| Disk upgrade for image analysis system | 55 000 |
| Minor office equipment | 5 000 |
| | \$60 000 |

CASUAL EMPLOYEES

73. **Mr BECKER (Hanson)**, on notice, asked the Minister of Correctional Services: Why are casual employees required by the Department of Correctional Services and does the Department propose to engage more in future and, if so, why and how many?

The Hon. F.T. BLEVINS: Casual officers are employed in several different areas by the Department of Correctional Services, and generally work less than 15 hours per week either on a temporary or permanent basis, or for a period not exceeding one month. The categories where casual staff are employed are:

1. Weekly paid or Government Management and Employment Act institutional staff:

A number of weekly paid positions require only a few hours attendance per week to perform cooking and cleaning duties. People employed under the Government Management and Employment Act 1985 (i.e. clerical officers, class I) are often employed while another employee is on extended absences such as recreation or sick leave.

2. Community Service Officers and Supervisors:

These people are employed in the Community Corrections Division of the Department of Correctional Services. They are required to work from Tuesday to Saturdays inclusive and receive an allowance for working on a Saturday.

3. Correctional Officers:

Most casual correctional officers are employed at the Sir Samuel Way Courts complex. However, several of the smaller institutions also employ these officers to assist in maintaining staffing levels and security for short periods of time where women prisoners are incarcerated. The casual staff employed at the Sir Samuel Way Courts complex are required to assist in the transferring of prisoners to and from the court holding cells to the courtroom, where they remain with the prisoner during the trial.

If these casual employees were not used the level of security and staff equilibrium at these locations would be affected, as other officers would be required to perform these duties. As the requirement for this function is not ongoing, institutions are not staffed with full-time officers to provide this service. It is more efficient and less costly to engage casual staff as and when needed.

The department may be required to employ further people as casual officers in the categories previously listed. However, the number required can only be determined by demand at any point in time.

ADELAIDE GAOL

86. **Mr BECKER (Hanson)**, on notice, asked the Minister of Correctional Services: What savings have been made upon closing Adelaide Gaol and how is the amount made up?

The Hon. F.T. BLEVINS: This Government is very proud of its achievement in attaining the closure of Adelaide Gaol as a correctional facility in South Australia. The closure of

the antiquated and inadequate institution enabled the transfer of prisoners from inhumane conditions to more appropriate accommodation at Yatala Labour Prison's new E Division and at the new medium security prison at Mobilong. The complexity and the transfer of staff and prisoners to new locations, thus facilitating the closure of Adelaide Gaol, has impacted widely upon the operations of the Department of Correctional Services—the precise cost of which cannot be determined. The following costs have been assessed so as to give an 'order of magnitude' reply to the question (in 1988-89 values):

| | |
|---|--------|
| Estimated recurrent cost in 1988-89 | \$m |
| Mobilong Prison | 7.2 |
| E Division, Yatala Labour Prison | 2.5 |
| | <hr/> |
| | 9.7 |
| Less assessed cost of Adelaide Gaol ... | 7.8 |
| | <hr/> |
| Net Cost | \$1.9m |

EMPLOYMENT AND TRAINING OPPORTUNITIES

93. Mr **BECKER (Hanson)**, on notice, asked the Minister of Housing and Construction: How many capital works or maintenance projects in or near Aboriginal communities created employment and training opportunities for Aborigines, how many were so employed in the year 1987-88 and how do these numbers compare with the previous year (Program Estimates and Information, page 313)?

The **Hon. T.H. HEMMINGS**: During 1987-88, 19 Aborigines worked on a range of projects in various Aboriginal communities for some 208 weeks in total. For 1986-87 five Aborigines were employed in total for some 20 weeks.