

HOUSE OF ASSEMBLY

Tuesday 14 February 1989

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:

Adoption,
 Australian Formula One Grand Prix Act Amendment,
 Births, Deaths and Marriages Registration Act Amendment,
 Boating Act Amendment,
 Building Act Amendment,
 Children's Protection and Young Offenders Act Amendment (No. 2),
 Children's Protection and Young Offenders Act Amendment (No. 3),
 Co-operatives Act Amendment,
 Criminal Law Consolidation Act Amendment,
 Criminal Law (Sentencing) Act Amendment,
 Dangerous Substances Act Amendment,
 Election of Senators Act Amendment,
 Firearms Act Amendment (No. 2),
 Fisheries Act Amendment,
 Hide, Skin and Wool Dealers Act Repeal,
 Judicial Administration (Auxiliary Appointments and Powers),
 Justices Act Amendment (No. 2),
 Lifts and Cranes Act Amendment,
 Local Public Abattoirs Act Repeal,
 Mining Act Amendment,
 Powers of Attorney and Agency Act Amendment,
 Racing Act Amendment (No. 2),
 Roseworthy Agricultural College Act Amendment,
 Statutes Amendment (Companies, Securities Industry and Futures Industry—Penalty Notices),
 Statutes Amendment (Criminal Law Consolidation and Summary Offences),
 Statutes Amendment (Local Government),
 Statutes Amendment (Workers Rehabilitation and Compensation),
 Summary Offences Act Amendment,
 Summary Offences Act Amendment (No. 2),
 Technology Park Adelaide Act Amendment,
 Trustee Companies.

SUPERANNUATION ACT AMENDMENT BILL

His Excellency the Governor, by message, recommended to the House of Assembly the appropriation of such amounts of money as might be required for the purpose mentioned in the Bill.

PETITION: CHRISTIE DOWNS TRAFFIC LIGHTS

A petition signed by 969 residents of South Australia praying that the House urge the Government to install pedestrian activated traffic lights on Dyson Road, Christie Downs, north of the Gulfview and Flaxmill Roads intersection was presented by the Hon. D.J. Hopgood.
 Petition received.

PETITION: ARID LANDS BOTANIC GARDEN

A petition signed by 64 residents of South Australia praying that the House urge the Government to establish an Australian arid lands botanic garden at Port Augusta was presented by the Hon. D.J. Hopgood.
 Petition received.

PETITION: COURT COSTS

A petition signed by 181 residents of South Australia praying that the House take the necessary action to reverse the decision made by the Government to pay costs for the Hon. J.R. Cornwall and consider legislation that would permit citizens to appeal against such administrative decisions was presented by Mr Becker.
 Petition received.

PETITIONS: RURAL ASSISTANCE

Petitions signed by 721 residents of South Australia praying that the House urge the Minister of Agriculture to declare Eyre Peninsula a drought area for the purposes of Federal Government national disaster funding were presented by Messrs Blacker and Gunn.
 Petitions received.

PETITION: PRISON CHURCHES

A petition signed by 38 residents of South Australia praying that the House urge the Government to construct a multi-denominational church building at Yatala and Mobilong Prisons and Cadell Training Centre was presented by the Hon. T. Chapman.
 Petition received.

PETITION: NATIONAL PARKS AND WILDLIFE SERVICE

A petition signed by 137 residents of South Australia praying that the House urge the Government to provide additional staff and resources for the National Parks and Wildlife Service was presented by Mr Ferguson.
 Petition received.

PETITION: MELROSE PARK

A petition signed by 365 residents of Edwardstown praying that the House urge the Government to ensure that the name Melrose Park be reinstated for their suburb was presented by the Hon. R.G. Payne.
 Petition received.

PETITION: PENALTIES

A petition signed by 5 346 residents of South Australia praying that the House urge the Government to review current penalties applying to crimes of child molestation and murder was presented by Mr Plunkett.
 Petition received.

QUESTIONS

The **SPEAKER**: I direct that written answers to the following questions on the Notice Paper, as detailed in the schedule that I now table, be distributed and printed in *Hansard*: Nos 29, 47, 74, 90, 127, 141, 146, 148, 149, 152, 153 to 162, 164 to 167, and 170 to 174; and I direct that the following answer to a question without notice be distributed and printed in *Hansard*.

GRAND PRIX TICKET SALE ARRANGEMENTS

In reply to **Mr INGERSON (Bragg)** 16 November.

The **Hon. J.C. BANNON**: The Grand Prix Board has reviewed ticket prices and policies for next year and has decided that ticketing arrangements for the 1989 event will be similar to those operating in 1988 with the only increase being in chicane prices from \$300 to \$320. Ticketing prices and policies must be set 18 months prior to each event and tickets for 1989 are already on sale through mail bookings.

PAPERS TABLED

The following papers were laid on the table:

- By the Premier (Hon. J.C. Bannon)—
 - Unauthorised Documents Act 1916—Regulations—Commercial Emblems.
- By the Treasurer (Hon. J.C. Bannon)—
 - South Australian Superannuation Board—Report, 1987-88.
 - Land Tax Act 1936—Regulations—General.
 - Loans to Producers Act 1927—Regulations—Tanks and Catchments.
- By the Minister for Environment and Planning (Hon. D.J. Hopgood)—
 - Native Vegetation Authority—Report, 1987-88.
 - Planning Act 1982—Regulations—Minor Development.
- By the Minister of Employment and Further Education (Hon. L.M.F. Arnold)—
 - South Australian Institute of Technology—Report, 1987.
 - Fees Regulation Act 1927—Regulations—Hairdressing Fees.
 - Industrial and Commercial Training Act 1981—Regulations—Hairdressing.
 - Industrial and Commercial Training Commission—Report, 1987-88.
- By the Minister of Transport (Hon. G.F. Keneally)—
 - Building Act 1971—Regulations—Council Fees.
 - Local Government Act 1934—Regulations—
 - Assessment Record.
 - Certificate of Liabilities.
 - Declarations.
 - Financial Management.
 - How to Vote Cards.
 - Members Allowances.
 - Parking Expiation Fees.
 - Prescribed Municipalities.
 - Qualifications Committee.
 - Valuations.
 - Metropolitan Taxi-Cab Act 1956—Regulations—
 - Age Limit on Cabs;
 - Fees.
 - Motor Vehicles Act 1959—Regulations—Number Plate Fees.
 - Road Traffic Act 1961—Regulations—
 - Kapunda Hospital and Noarlunga Health Services;
 - Seat Belts and Restraints.
 - Corporation By-laws—
 - Brighton—No. 48—Parks and Reserves.
 - Port Lincoln—No. 16—Flammable Undergrowth.
 - District Council By-laws—
 - Berri—No. 10—One-Way Streets.
 - Mannum—No. 5—Caravans and Camping.

- No. 7—Depasturing and Droving.
- No. 8—Animals and Birds.
- No. 9—Bees.
- No. 10—Dogs.

Morgan—No. 1—Dogs.

- By the Minister of Education (Hon. G.J. Crafter)—
 - Hairdressers' Registration Board of South Australia—Report, 1987-88.
 - Credit Union Stabilization Board—Report, 1987-88.
 - South Australian Ethnic Affairs Commission—Report, 1987-88.
 - Local and District Criminal Courts Act 1926—Rules—
 - District Court—Criminal Injuries Compensation.
 - Local Court—Service of Documents and Trial Lists.
 - Commissioner of Statute Revision—Schedules of Alterations—
 - Electricity Trust Act 1946.
 - Murray-Darling Basin Act 1983.
 - Prices Act 1948.
 - Local Government Act 1934.
 - Road Traffic Act 1961.
 - Classification of Publications Act 1974—Regulations—Common Films.
 - Companies (Acquisition of Shares) (Application of Laws) Act 1981—Regulation—Offences and Penalties.
 - Companies (Application of Laws) Act 1982—Regulations—Offences and Penalties.
 - Cremation Act 1891—Regulations—Permit Fee.
 - Criminal Injuries Compensation Act 1978—Regulations—Costs.
 - Criminal Law (Sentencing) Act 1988—Regulations—Enforcement of Bonds.
 - Education Act 1972—Regulations—Trespassing.
 - Fair Trading Act 1987—Regulations—Hairdressing.
 - Fees Regulation Act 1927—Regulations—Cremation Permit.
 - Futures Industry (Application of Laws) Act 1986—Regulations—
 - Commonwealth Application.
 - Offences and Penalties.
 - Hairdressers Act 1988—Regulations—Qualifications.
 - Juries Act 1927—Regulations—
 - Attendance Fee.
 - Remuneration.
 - Land Agents, Brokers and Valuers Act 1973—Regulations—Prescribed Financial Institutions.
 - Landlord and Tenant Act 1936—Regulations—
 - Port Dock Museum.
 - Port Dock Museum Agreement.
 - Liquor Licensing Act 1985—Regulations—
 - Liquor Consumption—
 - Adelaide and Glenelg.
 - Thebarton Oval (Amendment).
 - Securities Industry (Application of Laws) Act 1981—Regulations—Offences and Penalties.
 - Subordinate Legislation Act 1978—Regulations—Exemptions from Expiation.
 - Summary Offences Act 1953—Regulations—Expiation Fees.
 - Trade Standards Act 1979—Regulations—Toy Safety.
 - By the Minister of Aboriginal Affairs (Hon. G.J. Crafter)—
 - Royal Commission into Aboriginal Deaths in Custody—Interim Report.
 - Maralinga Lands Parliamentary Committee—
 - Report, 1988.
 - Minutes of Proceedings and Evidence.
 - By the Minister of Housing and Construction (Hon. T.H. Hemmings)—
 - Housing Improvement Act 1940—Regulations—South Australian Housing Trust Constitution.
 - By the Minister of Health (Hon. F.T. Blevins)—
 - State Clothing Corporation—Report, 1987-88.
 - South Australian Health Commission Act 1976—Regulations—
 - Compensable Patient Fees.
 - Kalyra Hospital.
 - Recognised Hospital Fees.
 - Wallaroo and District Hospital Inc.—By-laws—Parking.
 - By the Minister of Agriculture (Hon. M.K. Mayes)—

- Noxious Insects Act 1934—Regulations—Grasshoppers.
- By the Minister of Fisheries (Hon. M.K. Mayes)—
Fisheries Act 1982—Regulations—
Coorong and Lakes Netting.
Exotic Fish, Farming and Diseases—Undesirable
Species (2).
Mulloway Fishery.
- By the Minister of Recreation and Sport (Hon. M.K. Mayes)—
South Australian Trotting Control Board—Report, 1987-88.
Racing Act 1976—Rules of Trotting—
Breeding Season.
Post Mortems and Electronic Timing.
Prize Money.
Sire Registration.
- By the Minister of Lands (Hon. S.M. Lenehan)—
Surveyors Act 1975—Regulations—Lefevre Peninsula.
- By the Minister of Labour (Hon. R.J. Gregory)—
South Australian Occupational Health and Safety Commission—Report, 1987-88.
Lifts and Cranes Act 1985—Regulations—Registration and Certificates of Competency.
Occupational Health, Safety and Welfare Act 1986—Regulations—Electroplating.
Lifts and Cranes Act 1985—Codes of Practice.
- By the Minister of Marine (Hon. R.J. Gregory)—
Harbors Act 1936—Regulations—Quarantine Waste.
Marine Act 1936—Regulations—Survey Fees.

MINISTERIAL STATEMENT: STATE SUPPLY ACT

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

The Hon. G.F. KENEALLY: The State Supply Act 1985 was proclaimed to be effective on and from 30 September 1985. The passing of this Act was part of an extensive modernisation of the Government's supply function. As a means of ensuring that this supply legislation continued to meet the objectives of Government, the Act contains provisions, in section 23, which require that the Minister shall cause a report on the operation and effectiveness of this Act to be prepared within three months after the third anniversary of commencement of this Act; the report shall be prepared by persons not involved in the administration of the Act; and the Minister shall cause a copy of the report to be laid before each House of Parliament within 14 sitting days of that House after his receipt of the report.

The review team sought written submissions from the public through press advertisements and from chief executive officers throughout the State public sector. Interviews were conducted with client agencies, suppliers' representative bodies, agencies exempt from the Act, board members and members of Parliament. In addition, the review team examined alternative public sector supply models in other States, the Commonwealth and New Zealand. The review team concluded that the objectives of the Act, as specified in the second reading stage of the Bill, have been achieved. However, the review team considers that, with the change in emphasis in public sector management towards agency autonomy and accountability, there is a need for the objectives of the Act, and in fact the Act itself, to have a broader focus. They feel that there should be direct applicability to agencies as well as the board, and a greater recognition of supply as a means of facilitating the service delivery of agencies and Government.

Also, the review team considers that the State Supply Act should continue to provide the framework for supply operations in the public sector and the State Supply Board

should continue to provide the focus for Government supply matters. This review has confirmed the effectiveness of the State Supply Act 1985 in the management of the public sector supply operations. Recommendations 1 to 14 refer to the review of the operations and effectiveness of the Act. Recommendations 15 to 24 refer to the operations of the State Supply Board. The Government will examine the recommendations made in the report and determine what action it will take. I table the review report.

MINISTERIAL STATEMENT: RADIO STATIONS

The Hon. M.K. MAYES (Minister of Recreation and Sport): I seek leave to make a statement.
Leave granted.

The Hon. M.K. MAYES: On 12 October 1988 the member for Bragg asked me whether the Government had sought advice on the potential for conflict of interest or possible breaches of the Broadcasting Act in the case of Mr Harry Krantz in his capacity as a member of both the board of Festival City Broadcasters and the board of SGIC Nominees Pty Ltd (which has a 30 per cent interest in the new 5DN holding company, First Radio Limited). On 1 November 1988 I advised the House that I had received advice from the Crown Solicitor in relation to Mr Krantz's board memberships and that I would report to the House following consideration of that advice.

On 20 December 1988 I wrote to the Chairman of the South Australian TAB, Mr Harry Doyle, requesting him to draw to the attention of Mr Krantz the advice I had received from the Crown Solicitor and to inform me of the outcome of his actions in this regard. On Monday 13 February 1989 Mr Doyle advised the Chief Executive Officer of my department that, at a special meeting of the directors of Festival City Broadcasters held on that day, Mr Krantz tendered his resignation from the board. His resignation was accepted.

NEW MEMBER

The SPEAKER laid on the table the minutes of proceedings of the assembly of members of the two Houses for the election of a member to fill the vacancy in the Legislative Council caused by the resignation of the Hon. J.R. Cornwall.

PUBLIC WORKS COMMITTEE REPORTS

The SPEAKER laid on the table the following interim reports by the Parliamentary Standing Committee on Public Works:

- Ceduna Police Complex (Revised Proposal),
- Tea Tree Gully College of Technical and Further Education (Stage I).

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

- Flaxley Research Centre,
- Millicent College of Technical and Further Education.

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

- Ceduna Police Complex (Revised Proposal),
- Tea Tree Gully College of Technical and Further Education (Stage I).

Ordered that reports be printed.

QUESTION TIME

EQUITICORP INTERNATIONAL

The Hon. J.L. CASHMORE (Coles): My question is directed to the Premier. How much has the State Bank lent to the Equiticorp International group, when was the loan made and what advice has the Premier received from the bank on the amount of loss it faces following the Equiticorp collapse? Does the Government consider that it was prudent for the bank to make this loan?

The Hon. J.C. BANNON: I welcome the question, the first from the—let me consult my brief—economic spokeswoman, apparently. The Leader of the Opposition has provided us today with a new definition of 'front bench'. I am reminded of meetings at which everyone crowds to the back of the room; apparently the idea now is to crowd to the front.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order!

Members interjecting:

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

The Hon. B.C. EASTICK: On a point of order, Sir, what relevance have these comments to the question asked?

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order! It has been traditional for small amounts of extraneous material to be used—

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order!—by Ministers of all Parties as part of their introduction to replies. It is possible that, had the Premier continued to pursue the line he was following at that stage, it could have perhaps been deemed to be irrelevant at a further stage. However, I do not yet believe he has infringed in that way to this stage.

The Hon. J.C. BANNON: Thank you, Mr Speaker. To turn to the question: obviously, the honourable member is referring to press reports that the State Bank is one of those banks that has been exposed as a result of the financial difficulties of Equiticorp. It is certainly true that the State Bank has, along with—I forget the number—I think some 20 or so other banks, done business with Equiticorp and has therefore, because of the collapse of Equiticorp, some money at risk in that. I can assure the House that it is far less than the \$100 million that has been quoted. I refer the honourable member to a statement that was in fact made today on this subject by the Managing Director, Mr Clark, in which he quite rightly points out that the exact nature of the loan to Equiticorp, that is, the size of it, and so on, along with all those other institutions that are involved with Equiticorp, must be protected in terms of their commercial operations.

I think that that is quite appropriate because, first, I as Treasurer am not involved in, and nor does the legislation allow involvement in, the day-to-day commercial operations of the bank. I think it would be quite inappropriate. Incidentally, I know other people who think it would be inappropriate, too, namely, the Leader of the Opposition and his cohorts. When the relevant Bill was before the House they insisted that that should be so, and that is certainly the case. It is a commercial operation, making commercial decisions under its statute. If I was involved in those decisions I would certainly be guilty of political interference.

I also point out that the State Bank, as a commercial operator—a commercial entity—like any other bank or financial institution, must be involved in risk management, and indeed it will suffer loss in certain transactions in its

portfolio. That is of concern only if two things happen. The first is if the bank itself is not performing adequately, if its profit performance and other operations do not ensure that there is an extremely profitable bottom line, and the second is if the bank's management of risk debt is in some way exposing it, long term. In both those instances the evidence is abundantly before us that the bank is performing superbly. It is ironic that we get this question today, a day after the bank has announced an extraordinarily good profit performance for the last half year. It is amazing that—

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order! Question Time is not a period put aside for continuous interjection. The honourable Premier.

The Hon. J.C. BANNON: It is interesting to hear this attack on the State Bank launched by the Opposition. I think many of the citizens of South Australia and a lot of people doing business here will be very interested in this attitude. The State Bank has announced that record profit performance. In fact, it has been contributing large sums of money to our budget. Last year it contributed \$46 million to the State budget. The benefits, for instance, in relation to restraints on interest rates to home loan borrowers and others are absolutely unarguable. It is quite extraordinary that the Opposition wants to attack it. I am glad it is doing so, because if that is to be its target that simply indicates how bereft and irrelevant the Opposition is.

Let me turn to the second point, which relates to risk management. As to the ratio of bad debts to profit, I repeat that all financial institutions have some risk portfolio and bad debts. Indeed, we have been told, for instance, of difficulties in relation to a certain section of the portfolio on the West Coast. I would be interested to hear questions from the honourable member about how much the State Bank, and indeed others, have at risk in relation to the West Coast. The answer there, of course, is that that is fine, that they should lose even more, that they should be doing even more propping up, and that the State Government should be directly contributing to this. Well, we happen to believe that we should be assisting in that area—and indeed we are—but I notice the double standards there.

Mr D.S. Baker interjecting:

The Hon. J.C. BANNON: Here is the new spokesman for agriculture, the not quite front bench spokesman, trying to show how macho he is—the man who would see half his constituents out of work in the forests or the State because he refuses to see Government investing properly.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order! I call the member for Victoria to order, as well as the Minister of Health and the member for Briggs.

The Hon. J.C. BANNON: In the case of ratio of bad debts to profit, the State Bank figure is below that of any of its major competitors. Let me give figures: Westpac, 29.4 per cent; ANZ, 22.2 per cent; NAB, 36.7 per cent; and the State Bank of South Australia, 9.24 per cent. Indeed, the State Bank is an extremely prudent and carefully run institution; it is a greatly expanding one, and it has affiliates such as Beneficial Finance which in their area are among the best performers in the country, delivering tremendous benefits to the group and therefore to the people of South Australia. It is the people's bank—owned by you, me, and every other South Australian—which, although performing for us, is being undermined and attacked by members opposite.

The Leader says that the State Bank should not be involved in these expanded functions and should not have the affiliates and subsidiaries that all the other banks have. The

Leader says that the State Bank should compete with one arm tied behind its back and not be involved in that sort of thing. That makes a nice contrast; of course, we are used to the short-term memory of the Leader of the Opposition as regards statements he has made and positions he has taken in the past, last week or even yesterday. We know how, if the opportunism of the moment strikes him, the Opposition will change immediately. The Leader wants the State Bank restricted. Oddly enough, when we were debating the Bill, we were subjected, in fact, by his deputy to quotations from a speech that he had made about this new institution when he said that its size and strength should be such as to enable it to expand or move into new services.

The Leader said that the corporation should be enabled to compete more equitably with other banks represented in Adelaide in such areas as corporate banking, including management of consortium loans in local and foreign currencies; that is, an involvement in just the sort of thing that the Equiticorp deal involved. The Leader of the Opposition referred to investment services, including nominee registrar services and portfolio management. He said that all those things should be done by this new institution, as well as other services, including a more comprehensive travel service. Indeed, I thought that travel services were something that the private sector only could be involved in, yet here is the Leader of the Opposition in 1988 urging the State Bank to get involved in travel agent and travel service business. He has had a bit of a turnaround over the last two or three years. The Leader referred to migrant advisory services, economic research, and so on.

The Hon. E.R. Goldsworthy interjecting:

The Hon. J.C. BANNON: The Deputy Leader of the Opposition does not like it and, as usual, he steps in to protect his Leader. You are doing a good and loyal job, Roger.

The SPEAKER: Order!

The Hon. J.C. BANNON: Sorry, Mr Speaker. The Deputy Leader is doing a very good job. It is good to see that he survived the every-player-wins-a-prize shuffle.

Members interjecting:

The Hon. J.C. BANNON: There is hollow laughter on the other side because this is the concept we were told the Leader of the Opposition had for this institution: a merged bank would have the expertise and strength to raise offshore funds for financing, resource and other projects in South Australia, and so on. It is indeed interesting that, confronted with an institution that more than surpasses that brief and is more than delivering its value, we get the sort of criticism that we have had. I think that I have adequately and appropriately covered the situation as we have it.

Yes, the State Bank is exposed in Equiticorp, along with a whole number of financial and other institutions of the highest reputation and financial probity. Yes, there may be some loss, but it will be far less than that which has been reported. That loss, nonetheless, is within the parameters which the State Bank itself has set in terms of its prudent lending policies. It will not affect the profitability of that bank and the return to the people of South Australia, and it will not affect the housing portfolio which the State Bank administers. They are the answers to the questions.

RURAL ASSISTANCE

The Hon. R.G. PAYNE (Mitchell): Will the Minister of Agriculture state what steps he has taken to ensure that farmers on Eyre Peninsula who need financial assistance are aware of the help available from the Rural Assistance

Branch of the Department of Agriculture? Over the past few months Opposition spokespersons—including, I think, the new 'Clayton's' front bench—the United Farmers and Stockowners Association and other farmers groups have demanded more financial help for farmers in trouble on Eyre Peninsula. We heard that again today. The Minister has said on several occasions that he believes that many farmers are not aware of the existing programs available to provide help.

The Hon. M.K. MAYES: I am sure that members opposite will be interested to hear what we have done to communicate the packages we are offering to the Eyre Peninsula farmers. In particular, it is worth recording that there has been a good deal of effort on the part of the Rural Assistance Branch, officers of the Department of Agriculture and, of course, other services on the West Coast to provide information not only about finance but also about social facilities available through the Department for Community Welfare and other departments, such as the Health Commission. Both my colleagues, the Minister of Community Welfare and the Minister of Health, have been involved in discussions to provide additional services to the people of Eyre Peninsula.

For the benefit of the House I will detail what has been done in terms of advertising and the provision of information to the West Coast region. Apart from visits by the Regional Director and his staff on Eyre Peninsula, which have taken place seven days a week, and apart from all the field days and other events during which information has been disseminated to the community, a good deal of information has been provided by other means. A half-page advertisement was taken in the *Advertiser* on 19 January. A leaflet was sent out in the last week of January to all Eyre Peninsula clients of the Rural Assistance Branch outlining all the services available. Approximately 800 people received a copy of that leaflet.

On 27 January 1989 a seminar was held for the United Farmers and Stockowners and the Advisory Board as to details of the rural assistance package and how it compares with natural disaster relief. It is very important to record the type of service and assistance available, apart from the financial assistance, the information about which is basic. The proposal the Government has come up with, in addition to its rural assistance package which is being further relaxed—and I know that the new shadow spokesman for the portfolios including agriculture will have a briefing within the next day or so—

An honourable member: He can't get one.

The Hon. M.K. MAYES: The honourable member has been vocal in the media in condemning the package, and now he is seeking a briefing on it. It seems that the horse has well and truly bolted.

Members interjecting:

The Hon. M.K. MAYES: Indeed not!

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order! For the second time I ask the member for Victoria to cease interjecting, and I ask the Minister not to respond. This is Question Time, not dialogue time.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order!

The Hon. M.K. MAYES: The Government package, in addition to all the flexibility provided through the rural assistance package, involves considerable financial assistance, millions of dollars, to the people on Eyre Peninsula, based on loans up to \$150 000 being available for those people in financial difficulty at an interest rate of 8 per cent, with flexible terms offered over a 15 year period. We

believe that that package addresses the fundamental issue—the debt problem of those people on Eyre Peninsula—and not only the people whose units would be classified as viable. All farm management units are being considered carefully by the Rural Assistance Branch, and within the next few weeks I hope that the individual banks will address individual clients.

The package addresses the debt problems. It divides debt into two categories: a primary and a secondary debt. An interest rate subsidy is available on the primary debt and the proposal that we put forward to the banks and about which we have substantial agreement with a number of banks is that the secondary debt component—

Members interjecting:

The Hon. M.K. MAYES: The member for Eyre had his chance last year. He asked me two questions on this issue concerning the growth of this disaster, as he has been calling it, in that year. He may have missed the boat. The ball has been passed to his colleague, the member for Victoria, and we will see how he goes with it. The question that we have to address is relief for that secondary debt in 1989, and that matter will be reviewed. In fact, in our package we are providing a situation where the debt is split into two categories and the debt as a secondary category will not earn any interest in that period. That is part of the proposal.

Also, there is a package involving carry-on finance, which would also enjoy a subsidy from the State Government so that those people who wish to continue farming on the basis of their activities on Eyre Peninsula will be able to do so. It has been popularly spread around by people on Eyre Peninsula that the package talked about would not assist more than seven farmers. The discussions that we have had with the banks (and I must respect the confidentiality of the banks in respect of the confidence they must keep with regard to their clients and shareholders) indicates that this package would obviously address those people who have been deemed by various financial institutions or assessors as being in the non-viable category. It will address their problems.

As the Premier has said, it would be cynical for us to embark on a promise to people who are in a hopeless financial situation, and there are such people, but I hope that they will be in a minority. We believe that the package negotiated with the three major banks at this time—we are still negotiating—will address the significant problems for those people in the majority who are in a non-viable situation at the moment. They may look to be in a non-viable situation in the short term, but by applying this package to them with the assistance of the banks we believe that we can assist those people.

The State Government is doing a great deal on the West Coast; indeed, it is committed to doing this. I make the following comment with regard to the national disaster situation, because I have indicated to this House that I regard it in a different situation. As the member for Victoria will ascertain when he has his briefing, whenever it is organised (I emphasise that I have agreed to it), he will learn that the natural disasters agreement between the Commonwealth and the States does not assist and would not assist farmers categorised to be in a non-viable situation. That is clearly the situation we are addressing in respect of rural assistance which is much better than could be implemented under the agreement with the Federal Government.

The debate may relate to what the agreement stands for, but the situation is that the Federal Government becomes involved only on those terms, and those conditions are fixed between the Federal Government and the States. That situation has to be put clearly on the record so that rural

assistance can address the 1 800 to 1 900 farmers in particular and the package that we are looking at is for farmers who fall into the non-viable category but who will be assisted through these banks. That is the best possible mix that we can come up with. It involves millions of dollars of risk, with South Australian taxpayers committed to millions of dollars of risk because of the situation on Eyre Peninsula. In addition, it involves millions of dollars of subsidy from taxpayers, which is a strong commitment from this Government to people on Eyre Peninsula.

Mr TERRY CAMERON

Mr S.J. BAKER (Mitcham): Following serious allegations put before the House last April of improper practices in the building industry involving the present State Secretary of the Labor Party, Mr Terry Cameron, and the Premier's undertaking to have those allegations investigated, has the Government received any report on its investigations and, if so, what did the report conclude and will the Premier table it in the House?

The Hon. J.C. BANNON: I am just checking it out again. This is the public sector administration helper in action.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order!

The Hon. J.C. BANNON: I just have to get it clear, Mr Speaker. We will get there in the end. There is no basis for the allegations that were made, and they are certainly not a matter which is of public moment to the House. It would not be appropriate for me to table any report or any further information on this matter. It is purely a private matter.

SUBMARINE PROJECT

Mr FERGUSON (Henley Beach): Will the Minister of State Development and Technology inform the House of the significance of the announcement of a new submarine battery manufacturing facility at Port Adelaide? Earlier this month it was announced that a \$60 million facility would be built at Port Adelaide to manufacture batteries for the submarine project. This joint venture between the Australian Submarine Corporation and Pacific Dunlop would create 40 jobs and, according to the director of the joint venture, would lead to many more financial spin-offs for the State. However, the Opposition's new economic spokesperson described it as 'too little too late'.

The Hon. L.M.F. ARNOLD: I thank the honourable member for his question because it has been a very significant announcement relating to the submarine project—significant because of its own particular size and because of what it means in terms of the total submarine contract. The honourable member is quite correct in identifying that apparently the Opposition spokesperson rushed to the press saying this was 'too little too late' and that the number of jobs were outnumbered by the 40 times as many that had been lost over the last 12 months in South Australia.

The reality is that the submarine project represents a significant impetus because of the actual hull construction at the submarine site itself, and there are many hundreds of people involved in the construction there and 700 people will be actually involved in submarine construction when that site is completed. The other significance particularly highlighted by the Pacific Dunlop contract, which is \$60 million and 40 jobs, is that there are many more jobs to be had out of the other subcontracting works that are required to go into building pieces that go into the submarines. The

hull is an important but not the only part of the submarine project.

The winning of this battery factory is very important indeed. It identifies yet again that we have the infrastructure, technology and capacity to make this type of business succeed. Just yesterday the Premier identified another contract of a similar magnitude that is out for tender at the moment for another part of the componentry of the submarine, and we look forward to winning that tender as well. I hope that the Opposition, rather than simply nit-picking and trying to talk down this whole project, would realise that it is a significant investment and it is not 'too little too late' but is more along the road of South Australia's economic growth.

As for the allegations that we have lost 40 times as many jobs over the past 12 months, I draw the member's attention to the actual figures produced by the ABS. In January 1988, 607 000 South Australians were employed. In January 1989, 635 000 South Australians were employed—an increase of 28 000. So much for the 40 times 40 reduction that the honourable member sought to misrepresent to the press. With respect, it is worth noting again that in the past 12 months, our manufacturing jobs grew at three times the national average growth rate. In the last six months, \$3 billion worth of contracts, representing 2 300 permanent jobs, were announced or commenced. That is what Pacific Dunlop typifies and symbolises. That is its significance and importance. It is important that the newly created maybe frontbench spokesperson on economic matters in fact gets behind this and supports it rather than derides it.

Mr TERRY CAMERON

Mr OLSEN (Leader of the Opposition): My question is directed to the Premier. Why have no charges been laid against the present State Secretary of the ALP following his involvement in improper practices in the building industry? I have in my possession a copy of a report compiled by the investigation officer in the Department of Public and Consumer Affairs, Mr K. Smith. I point out to the House that this is not purely a private matter as the Premier suggested; it is a public matter. I am dealing with a report prepared by a Government officer. It is dated 27 May last—six weeks after the Opposition first raised this matter in the House.

Mr Smith reported to the Acting Registrar in the Builders Licensing Section of the department that Mr Cameron had been 'heavily involved' in the building industry since 1976 in at least three council areas, even though Mr Cameron had never at any time held a builder's licence. It asserts that, in the Willunga council area alone, approximately 50 homes were built by Mr Cameron and/or partnerships and incorporated companies with which he was, and still is, associated, and that the majority of these houses 'were not built or supervised by the holder of a general builder's licence.' Further, Mr Cameron 'used a builder's name and licence number without that person's consent and there was not any written contracts between the parties.'

The report also refers to threats made against inspectors of the Builders Licensing Board by persons associated with Mr Cameron. While the report names companies involved in these activities in which Mr Cameron held directorships, it also states that, on checking with the Corporate Affairs office, there was no evidence that the various names and partnerships mentioned on council applications were registered.

In summary, this official report maintains that Mr Cameron has been involved in a range of breaches of law intended

to protect the public against shoddy and corrupt practices in the building industry. The report was compiled almost nine months ago as the basis for a more comprehensive investigation of Mr Cameron's activities, but the Premier has been unable to give the House today any assurance that such an investigation has been undertaken, but rather has suggested that it is a private matter and not a public matter simply because the gentleman concerned happens to be the State Secretary of the Australian Labor Party. Great cover-up!

The Hon. J.C. BANNON: Great cover-up! What nonsense.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order!

The Hon. J.C. BANNON: What absolute nonsense!

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order! I ask the Premier to resume his seat. I call the Leader of the Opposition to order. The House heard his question in silence and with courtesy. It would be anticipated that the same courtesy and silence be extended to the Premier.

The Hon. J.C. BANNON: I have learnt to treat any of these 'shock, horror' matters put before the Parliament by the Opposition with a great deal of caution. We therefore need to look at the material put before us by the Leader of the Opposition. I am quite happy to do that, but I can make no further comment at this stage.

CENTRAL LINEN SERVICE

The Hon. R.K. ABBOTT (Spence): Will the Minister of Health explain to the House why the State Government has crept into the laundry business? Last week the Opposition Leader said that the community should be concerned about the creeping incursion of Government into the private sector. He said that it was time to seriously question what business the South Australian Government had, for example, in operating a laundry.

The Hon. F.T. BLEVINS: I thank the member for Spence for his question. The Central Linen Service is, of course, in the District of Spence and a very valuable part of the infrastructure of that very fine electorate. I was rather surprised when I read the quotation from the Leader of the Opposition that we were creeping into the laundry business. The Leader of the Opposition obviously does not know too much about Liberal Government history. If anyone crept into the laundry business in this State it was a former distinguished Premier, Sir Thomas Playford.

It was Thomas Playford in the 1950s who established the Central Linen Service. He was a very far-sighted man. He introduced into this State a number of Government enterprises and he worked on a number of areas where he thought the Government should intervene on behalf of the people of this State and also in relation to probably the foremost statutory authority in South Australia, namely, the Housing Trust. I do not pretend that the Central Linen Service is on a par with the Housing Trust, but nevertheless it is a great organisation in this State which is servicing the State and which is making money for South Australia, and it is also keeping the private sector honest. After all, that was Premier Playford's philosophy.

What would Premier Playford say today if he saw this sorry lot? As to all the progressive things that were introduced during that era, and by some great Liberal statesman beforehand, this Opposition wants to tear them down and sell them off cheaply to its mates. Buyers can always be found if something is sold cheaply enough—Mrs Thatcher

has proved that. That is what they want to do. There have been laundries in the hospitals of this State since the hospitals were established, and it was only under Sir Thomas Playford that they were brought together and established under the Central Linen Service. At that time, of course, Flinders Medical Centre and the Queen Elizabeth Hospital were on the drawing board or on the forward projections list, and someone as farsighted as Playford saw that there was a great opportunity for the community to be involved and for it to gain a benefit. That has happened.

It has been estimated, and I think quite fairly and conservatively, that since the restructuring of the Central Linen Service in 1983 close to \$20 million has been made through profits earned and price increases forgone for this State. The Central Linen Service has been able to operate more efficiently and with a higher productivity than any other laundry in South Australia. No laundry in the private sector has been able to operate anywhere nearly as efficiently as has the Central Linen Service. That is why it is winning orders throughout South Australia. That is what it is doing, I was interested to hear an interjection from the member for Victoria, in response to a reference made by a speaker on this side to the Woods and Forests Department. The member for Victoria said, 'We would run it better with private enterprise.' So, it is not just the Central Linen Service; apparently, it is also the Woods and Forests Department, an agency which has been established for possibly I would think 100 years. If the spokesman in this area is saying that the Liberals consider that the Woods and Forests Department would be run better by private enterprise, then I think the people of the South-East ought to know about it.

Mr D.S. Baker: I am very happy to tell them.

The Hon. F.T. BLEVINS: The member for Victoria says that he is very happy to tell them that the Woods and Forests Department would be better run by private enterprise. I am delighted to hear it.

Mr D.S. Baker interjecting:

The Hon. F.T. BLEVINS: I am delighted to hear the member for Victoria tell the truth, to see him stand up and quite honestly tell the truth and say that he would run the Woods and Forests Department under private enterprise. I think the member for Mount Gambier will have something to say to him a little later. However, to refer back to the Central Linen Service, I point out that the Central Linen Service, along with a whole range of Government organisations, some of which I will refer to in future Question Times is, in effect, a monument to Tom Playford, a monument to the vision that that man had. I am not ashamed to want to continue to be associated with many areas associated with that vision. Electorally, I thought the man was a crook; his electoral legislation was as bent as you could get but, nevertheless, having said that, I believe that the vision he had in the areas to which I have referred was absolutely tremendous. I am very pleased to be associated with it. In many areas he was, in effect, a great socialist. I do not know what he would say—but I can guess—if he saw his successors today. He worked for 50 years in this State, toiled and laboured, and at the end of it what did he get?

Mr TERRY CAMERON

The Hon. E.R. GOLDSWORTHY (Deputy Leader of the Opposition): Will the Premier table all the Government files in connection with any Government investigations into the activities of Mr Cameron in his activities in the building industry? The question is subsequent upon that of the Leader.

The Hon. J.C. BANNON: I understand that. The answer is 'No'.

ENTERTAINMENT CENTRE

Mr DUIGAN (Adelaide): Will the Premier say whether the Government's decision last week to proceed with an entertainment centre at Hindmarsh was a definite and unequivocal one? Further, can the Premier provide the House with any broad outline of the timetable for the construction and completion of the centre? It has been brought to my attention that, following the Government's announcement, there were moves in the Adelaide City Council regarding the relocation of the site from Hindmarsh to some other place in the Adelaide central business district. The council is reported to have decided at its most recent meeting that it would seek discussions with the Premier and the Government with a view to having the centre relocated to an as yet unspecified area in the city.

The Hon. J.C. BANNON: The answer is 'Yes, the commitment is definite and, in respect of any suggestions of new locations, new proposals, and so on, we will not consider them.' I guess that we could have anticipated that, the firm decision having been announced, some people would come forward and say, 'We have a better proposition or another idea of financing it or of a proposal regarding relocation.'

However, for two years those opportunities have been available. It has been open. When we made the decision initially that we could not afford the proposal that was before us, I said that we had the site reserved and identified. We were open to suggestions, recommendations, or offers from the private sector or elsewhere in terms of constructing an entertainment centre and, whether it was on that site or some other site that appeared to be better, we were prepared to look at it. That process went on and no-one could come up with a proposal that was sustainable. We now have a sustainable proposition. There have been hundreds of propositions.

An honourable member: Football Park.

The Hon. J.C. BANNON: Yes, Football Park was one of them. However, none of them was in fact able to be sustained ahead of the proposition that we have at present. We have made our decision and I believe that the site itself is ideal. That is where the entertainment centre will be.

MARINELAND

Mr BECKER (Hanson): Will the Minister of State Development and Technology say what commitments amounting to \$4.5 million will have to be met by taxpayers following the collapse of the Marineland project? The Government's guarantee of a \$9 million loan for this project was intended to cover the entire cost of new equipment and buildings at Marineland. However, half this guarantee is now to be called upon, even though there has been no substantial spending on equipment and buildings.

There is speculation that some of this money will have to cover breaches of contract and compensation arising from union bans on the project. The Minister's statement yesterday did not add up in another vital respect. It emphasised problems with the viability of the Marineland complex, but the Opposition has documents which demonstrate that union interference with the project was a greater problem.

For example, correspondence from the Essington group in August last year demonstrated its interest in proceeding with both the Marineland development and a West Beach country club resort hotel, provided that assurances could be given against further union interference over the issue of keeping dolphins in captivity. I understand that the Essington group has spent hundreds of thousands of dollars on feasibility studies and remained seriously interested in developing both Marineland and a hotel complex until yesterday's announcement.

In letters to the Department of State Development and Technology dated 16 and 23 August last year, Tribond rejected a departmental reassessment of the viability of the project and, instead, listed continuing union bans, uncertainty over ALP policy on keeping dolphins, insurance cover and delays in finalising agreements with the West Beach Trust as the outstanding matters to be resolved. I also refer the Minister to his reported comments in the *Advertiser* of 3 February when, in response to my public prediction that Marineland would be scrapped as the cost of appeasing union and ALP demands over keeping dolphins in captivity, the Minister said my statement had no basis.

With yesterday's vindication of my statement, I seek from the Minister on behalf of the taxpaying public a full explanation of why it will cost the Government \$4.5 million to cover the cost of the collapse of the Marineland project, when none of the purposes for which this guarantee originally was given have been fulfilled. Has there been massive bungling of this project, or is hush money being paid to prevent a public outcry over the role of certain trade union officials in this fiasco?

The Hon. L.M.F. ARNOLD: The reality is that, as recently as 10 days ago, Zhen Yun, the Hong Kong company which is now investing at the Marineland site, advised that it now wished to change its proposal to include only a hotel and conference centre. In fact, while the member for Hanson was speculating publicly about the Marineland component being dropped, that was not the case with the proposal before the Government.

At the particular time when the member for Hanson was speaking, Zhen Yun was still seriously contemplating a Marineland component. It was doing so because advice had been given by the Government late last year and again early this year that the commitment with respect to permits to take dolphins still applied. However, the company had done its own costings and, while it felt that the hotel and conference centre components were realistic, it was not convinced that the same viability existed in relation to the Marineland component. The honourable member has referred to another potential investor who, according to his statement, still believes that there is viability in the Marineland proposal.

We have been involved lately in discussions with two principal groups (as well as other groups), and no-one could point to anything other than, at the very best, the most marginal viability for the Marineland portion of the project. Essentially, what comes out of this entire project is that the hotel and conference centre and any other facilities that may be built present the bottom line for the investors, the West Beach Trust and, as a consequence, the South Australian community.

The project that has now been agreed upon will represent, in 1989 dollars over the 50-year life of the project, \$100 million in lease payments alone, in addition to the significant employment opportunities for some 300 people in the hotel and conference centre, plus the construction jobs. The guarantee referred to by the honourable member, which came from a bipartisan committee of the Parliament (the

Industries Development Committee), provided for a Government guarantee for debts incurred by Tribond. Those debts, in the last part of last year, involve no equipment at all but simply keeping the dolphins alive. I have no shame in saying that, because there was no money in the kitty for that, I permitted the use of some of that guarantee to keep those dolphins alive.

The Tribond Corporation was not able to mount a viable financial proposition for the creation of a Marineland at that site. It was advised in about September 1988 (that might not be the exact month) that it had a few more months to firm up a definite proposition, with someone signing on the bottom line, otherwise the guarantee would simply have to be cancelled to stop the Government's exposure growing any more. That did not eventuate. What has eventuated is a project for South Australia which will give very real investment opportunities. It does have in the medium term a cost, because of the guarantee which had been committed to date being called upon. The final determination of that amount is up to the receiver. An official receiver was appointed yesterday to manage the affairs of Tribond, and we are not yet sure what the bottom line will be.

Certainly, the receiver will attempt to obtain the best deal for the creditors of Tribond, but the best deal in all the circumstances will be sought by all parties. That loss to the State Government in meeting the cost of those guarantees is pitted against the lease payments that will be received by the West Beach Trust for the purposes of that particular area, plus the other economic benefits which themselves will return funds to the State Government coffers.

I am advised that, considering various accounting aspects, one would look at a period of eight years for recouping the money being paid out at this time. When we have more information from the receiver as to the exact amount of those payments and where they are going, that information will be made available: there is no reason to hide any of that. We have been attempting to get the best possible project up and running in that area for the benefit of the South Australian community.

SAWMILLS

Mr ROBERTSON (Bright): Has the Minister of Forests had an opportunity to analyse the speech made by the Leader of the Opposition to the Mount Gambier Chamber of Commerce last week? If so, can he outline to the House the details of the Government's alleged 'creeping incursion into the private sector', at least as it relates to sawmilling? As I understand it, the Leader suggested sawmilling as one of the areas in which the Government had made investments without the public realising it, and it was time the Government stopped running things in which it had no business.

The Hon. J.H.C. KLUNDER: If the Leader's speech was an illustration of the benefits to be gained from the latest Opposition reshuffle, perhaps the cards should be thrown up in the air again. Even the most junior member of his own Party should have been able to tell the Leader that every one of the Woods and Forests Department's three sawmills—at Mount Burr, Mount Gambier and Nangwarry—were in fact established under the Playford Liberal Government. In fact, the question I have is very similar to the question which has just been answered by the Minister of Health regarding the Central Linen Service.

It is, of course, possible that Liberal Party philosophy has changed over the large number of years since the Playford

era, and that what we are seeing is a massive rebuttal of the Playford era. That, in fact, is not the case with the sawmills at those three locations, because only in 1980 the then Minister of Forests (the now member for Alexandra) had some glowing words to say in a departmental publication to mark his opening of the new Mount Gambier green mill. I will quote the honourable member at length. He said:

The achievements of the South Australian Woods and Forests Department must surely exceed even the most ambitious hopes of our far-sighted forebears who initiated the department's afforestation programs more than a century ago. Ever since 1875, State Governments of all political Parties have recognised and reaffirmed the importance to South Australia of having its own renewable lumber resource. Today, with increasing demands upon the world's forests, this resource is of rapidly increasing value to the State, with the Woods and Forests Department's softwood plantations being the most mature and productive in Australia—and he is absolutely correct. He goes on:

The department in all its activities works closely with private forestry and sawmilling enterprises. More than half of the department's total log harvest is processed in privately-owned wood processing plants.

One wonders where the other half is being processed. He goes on to say:

Woods and Forests Department research-led innovation in forestry and sawmilling has profited, not only its own commercially-oriented activities, but also those of private enterprise.

We have this statement that the State Government needs to be in sawmilling to benefit everyone else, but he goes on:

This has furthered the long established feature of the South Australian forestry and timber industry of Government and private enterprise working successfully together in a common interest for the State.

Members interjecting:

The Hon. J.H.C. KLUNDER: As soon as the yapping stops, I will continue. This is an indication of the working together of private and public enterprise, and nothing has changed. The forest is still there, the mills are still there: the only thing that has changed is that this lot over there are now on the Opposition benches and they have grown sour and nasty about it all. I further quote the member for Alexandra, as follows:

The modernised Mount Gambier mill sets new standards in efficiency and flexibility, and its opening exemplifies once again the department's leadership in softwood forestry sawmilling, further reinforcing the significance of the department as a contributor to State revenue.

That is the end of the quote, but that is merely the foreword. With those enthusiastic words the member for Alexandra then and today makes a nonsense of the Leader's words on the subject. Perhaps now we have an explanation of the member for Alexandra's refusal to participate in the shadow Cabinet and take up his current role as the spokesman for not very much at all. Perhaps it has taken nine years for him to fully reverse his point of view. However, that is not all that the Leader said in his Mount Gambier speech. He drew attention to the department's loss on commercial operations last financial year and questioned its efficiency.

Not once, as has been his wont, did he acknowledge the problems caused by Ash Wednesday in 1983, nor did he acknowledge the poor market conditions prevailing in 1987-88 which affected sawmilling companies throughout Australia. In fact, the department has been in a recovery phase since the disastrous fires and it is succeeding in that recovery without compensation and no special assistance from Government, apart from a three year interest holiday on a fully repayable \$11 million loan from the Federal Government.

Members interjecting:

The Hon. J.H.C. KLUNDER: It has been done for lots of other people in the Liberal Party who, every time they

get into trouble, forget their principles and come straight to the Government for a hand-out. The Woods and Forests Department is now repaying that loan, with interest, and it has met all its other interest payments throughout the rebuilding process without calling on the public purse.

The Leader should also be aware that a program of major capital improvements is under way at departmental installations across the South-East, with increased efficiency and profitability as the major objective. The Leader has conveniently forgotten that the department's commercial operations over the years have contributed more than \$56 million to State revenue, excluding interest payments. The Leader is obviously completely unaware of the major turnaround in the department's sawmilling operations this financial year, with a profit of \$2.62 million in the first six months. The overall departmental position is likewise quite strong, with profits in the first six months up 47 per cent on the same period of the previous year.

RURAL ASSISTANCE

Mr GUNN (Eyre): In view of the serious and deteriorating situation on Upper Eyre Peninsula which culminated in the rally at Wudinna on Sunday attended by more than 1 000 people, why will not the Premier accept the invitation to visit the affected areas issued by the Chairman of the District Council of LeHunte, Councillor Gerswich, on behalf of the councils of Murat Bay, Streaky Bay, LeHunte, Kimba, Franklin Harbour, Cleve, Elliston and Tumbly Bay, so that he can see first hand the devastation and the continuing poor seasonal conditions and the effects on individuals, families, businesses and local communities, and also so that the Government can reconsider its decision not to have it recognised as a disaster area and explain to those people in that part of the State how finance can be made available to sow a crop for the forthcoming year?

The Hon. J.C. BANNON: I realise the delicacy of the honourable member's position and I have some sympathy for it on the West Coast, but I do not believe that he does his constituents, even in the difficult circumstances that he has, any service by approaching this matter with questions framed in that way.

Members interjecting:

The Hon. J.C. BANNON: In favour of—

Mr Olsen interjecting:

The Hon. J.C. BANNON: I thank the Leader of the Opposition. I did at the end of 1987 familiarise myself closely with conditions there. Therefore, I am well aware of the deterioration—

Members interjecting:

The Hon. J.C. BANNON: The member for Eyre would like to hear the answer to his question. He has a genuine interest, and not a political grandstanding interest, in these people.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order! The Chair cannot tolerate or encourage a dialogue between the Leader of the Opposition and the Premier. The Premier has the call.

The Hon. J.C. BANNON: At the end of December 1987 I did familiarise myself closely with that situation.

Mr Olsen interjecting:

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

The Hon. J.C. BANNON: At the end of December 1987 I did familiarise myself with that position and, therefore, I need no convincing or further visit to know, in the light of the seasonal conditions that have prevailed through 1988,

how dire the situation is and how infinitely worse it must be now. I assure the member for Eyre that I am well aware of that, and that I am extremely sympathetic. I have had telephone conversations with people over there to discuss those circumstances. My colleague the Minister of Agriculture has visited the area on a number of occasions. More recently the Minister of Water Resources was in the area also assessing the situation first hand.

So, it is not because we do not understand the gravity of the situation by reason of not having gone over there. What the honourable member is complaining about is that he would like (perhaps there is some emotional satisfaction in this), certain formal national disaster regulations, by agreement between State and Commonwealth, triggered in this particular instance. The Minister of Agriculture has made it abundantly clear that, far from improving or assisting the situation, that may prove a detriment to it. A detailed briefing was provided to the UF&S which, having first accepted that as being a reasonable proposition, then started saying, 'No, it is not reasonable,' under pressure, of course, from those on the West Coast, and it had a full briefing.

I do not know what the response to that briefing was but, if one looks at the facts and figures, one sees that a formal declaration of the sort the member for Eyre requests would be worse than useless: it would be mischievous, and misleading almost, to the people there. What is needed is what is happening: a systematic and careful analysis of the financial prospects of each and every individual there as to whether they have a hope of surviving, even if there is a good season.

I had a full meeting, which the honourable member was instrumental in having set up in November with his colleague the member for Flinders. It was a productive, useful and fruitful meeting, and since then the Minister of Agriculture has intensively taken up financial arrangements in an effort to ameliorate the situation of individuals over there. The meeting collectively failed to achieve anything. The response was that I then wrote to each bank and said, 'This is not good enough; I would like to meet with each of you and go through the package again to see what can be done.' As the honourable member knows, we are not on about propping people up in situations where, in the end, there is going to be nothing for them. That would be cruel and disastrous. Look at the soil degradation and all the other problems that would occur if that was the case.

Our collective aim surely is to keep that area of South Australia productive and to ensure that it is supporting a population, families and stock and cropping procedures that will keep it going long term. That has to be done on a case by case and a careful basis. I can understand the concern of a meeting of 1 000 farmers, but it is well known that the position of those farmers differs greatly. About 80 per cent of the 2 000 or more farmers in that area are viable and are able to continue in profitable long-term occupation.

There is no question of that, but there are about 400 or so who are facing very severe problems. Of that group, there are some whose problems are so severe that everyone can see—some publicly, others only privately—that they will not be able to survive. The Government's task is to ensure that as many as possible survive. The talks with the banks, which have still not concluded, have been aimed at doing just that. The Government has over \$35 million over there to attempt to assist the financing in that area. We stand ready to do a whole series of other things and we are working with packages through the banks, so it is not visits that are required: it is a close, careful assessment and analysis with consultation and counselling of all of those involved in big trouble, and that is being done.

SITTINGS AND BUSINESS

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

That the time allotted for all stages of the following Bills: Business Franchise (Petroleum Products) Act Amendment, Motor Vehicles Act Amendment (No. 2), Market Acts Repeal, North Haven Trust Act Amendment, and Tertiary Education Act Amendment

be until 6 p.m. on Thursday.

Motion carried.

PASTORAL LAND MANAGEMENT AND CONSERVATION BILL

The Hon. S.M. LENEHAN (Minister of Lands) obtained leave and introduced a Bill for an Act to make provision for the management and conservation of pastoral land; to repeal the Pastoral Act 1936; and for other purposes. Read a first time.

The Hon. S.M. LENEHAN: I move:

That this Bill be now read a second time.

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

Leave granted.

Explanation of Bill

This Bill introduces landmark provisions for the care, control and management of pastoral lease land in South Australia. The management of Crown land in South Australia has been under review for many years and has been the subject of intense scrutiny by many private and public organisations and individuals. The Bill is the culmination of public debate, comment and extensive consultation. While the process has been lengthy it has ensured consideration of the varying and sometimes conflicting interests in pastoral lease land. The history of pastoral lease administration and review provides an understanding of the central features of this Bill.

Review of the management and administration of pastoral land in South Australia can be dated back to at least 1972. During this time the central questions have been the appropriate form of tenure, the area or type of land to be controlled and the controls which should be applied. South Australia is not alone in considering appropriate forms of tenure for Crown lands. Over the past eight years there have been inquiries into land tenure for pastoral land in most Australian States and the Northern Territory. A common report of the various inquiries has been that freehold is inappropriate to the management of extensive pastoral areas.

The most recent inquiry held in Western Australia (Cameron 1986) found that: 'In view of the political/social/cost implications freehold title should not be implemented for pastoral areas . . . the Government should continue to be the owner and landlord of the arid and semi-arid rangelands of the State with the rangeland being used for pastoral purposes by lease agreement.' The most significant inquiry into the South Australian Pastoral Act was undertaken by a committee chaired by Mr J. Vickery (1981). This committee reported that: 'Submissions from both pastoralists and the public have indicated that controls over land use are necessary and are best administered through a tenure system which enables lease-by-lease control. For all of the above reasons this group is strongly opposed to the introduction of either perpetual lease or freehold tenure.'

The retention of a form of lease tenure for pastoral areas has remained an integral part of Government policy. How-

ever, the question has then been the most appropriate form of tenure and the areas of land to be included in that tenure. Perpetual tenure has been advocated by some interests on the basis that this provides increased security for financiers lending to pastoralists. However, no evidence has been presented of pastoral tenure being a restriction on borrowing. The rationale for lending appears to be based on the pastoralist's ability to repay which is further based on individual ability to apply effective land management techniques.

Risk is another factor to be considered in relation to leasing. The willingness to allocate resources to develop a pastoral lease is related to the risk involved in securing a return on investment. Risks in the pastoral industry are related to market fluctuations and climatic factors. Neither of these risks will be minimised by the form of tenure. The establishment of land management techniques which contribute to the preservation of the land and conservative stocking levels are seen as the most effective means of cushioning this risk.

A further question has been whether these legislative controls should be applied to all rangelands or merely to existing pastoral leases. The distribution in November 1987 of a draft Crown Land Management and Conservation Act canvassed the identification of areas of 'ecological sensitivity' and the establishment of a Crown Land Council and a Land Administration (Sensitive Land) Board. Public comment on that draft highlighted concerns about the consolidating of essentially diverse tenure systems and the potentially cumbersome administrative arrangements. The Government has chosen to treat separately the administration of pastoral lease land and all other leased land which forms part of the Crown estate.

A key objective of the Bill is to enshrine land conservation principles in the management and use of pastoral lease land. This unique land is part of the heritage of South Australia and must be preserved for both current and future generations. The Government is a signatory to the National Conservation Strategy and this Bill ensures that the benefits of land utilisation are considered in tandem with the policy goal of land resource conservation. In so doing, it is acknowledged that tourist and recreation activities are valid adjuncts to pastoral utilisation.

The Government recognises that care of pastoral land is a two-fold responsibility. Pastoral lessees have direct responsibilities for the daily and long-term management of the land. At the same time Government itself must accept responsibility for planning and the administration of pastoral leases to achieve effective conservation. The specific designation of duties of the Minister, the Board and pastoral lessees is a recognition of this dual responsibility. The continuation of leasehold tenure is an important component of the Government's strategy for pastoral land management. It is the clear intention of this Government that lands used for pastoral activity remain within the Crown estate.

The membership and composition of the Pastoral Board has been extensively debated. On the one hand there have been claims for wider representation and on the other hand comprehensive arguments for the selection of expert members. The two views are not considered to be mutually exclusive. Certainly the expanded executive role of the board calls for knowledge and understanding of conservation and rangeland management principles. At the same time the interests of lessees must be protected. This has been achieved through the inclusion of a pastoral industry representative while the interests of the general community are met by the inclusion of a conservation movement representative. The establishment of a representative board will enable all interests to be covered. The Government intends that the rep-

resentation by ministerial nominees will provide expertise in the areas of soil conservation, environmental management and land tenure.

The assignment of rent setting to the Valuer-General reflects the objective of achieving an independent assessment of fair market rentals. The provision for annual rental is consistent with this approach. Annual rentals will be based on productivity and this will allow rentals to fluctuate with the productivity of each individual lessee, having regard to market prices and stock management decisions. To cushion the impact of rental increases, the Government will direct the Pastoral Board to phase in new rental receipts over a period of three to five years. Rentals will continue to be set retrospectively by the Valuer-General, but the board will develop a program for progressively increasing payments (as a portion of set rental) to enable pastoralists to plan their financial commitments over this period.

The introduction of a lease assessment and monitoring process is a major innovation. Using documented and replicable approaches a body of objective evidence will be developed concerning the condition and trend in condition of land held under pastoral lease. It is important to note the scientific basis of this approach. The Department of Lands has committed resources to the development of an assessment technique which can be applied to all pastoral leases. After refinement this technique will be available as an on-going reference for lessees, the general public and members of public and private organisations. The process involves two components. First, a land description in which the principal land types in a region are defined and mapped (at 1:250 000 scale) by the Crown, and the attributes of relevance to pastoral land management described. Secondly, a lease-by-lease land assessment is undertaken by the Crown, in consultation with the lessee. This latter process involves the establishment of permanent 'photopoint' sites in the smallest management unit (the paddock) in which changes in the land resource can be determined over time and related to season and livestock use.

The need for an objective assessment process is further highlighted by the use to which these assessments will be put. Prior to both the initial grant of a lease and subsequent extension, lease assessment will provide information about land condition which will be used to develop land management conditions over the lease. Additional to these regular reviews the Department of Lands will implement a continuous process of lease monitoring and report to the Pastoral Board. This monitoring will enable the Pastoral Board to fulfil its responsibilities for the prevention of degradation and the rehabilitation of pastoral lease land.

The Bill also introduces a new concept in determining the length of lease tenure. Previously, pastoral lessees had a finite tenure of 42 years and were faced with the insecurity of leases 'winding down' towards the end of the lease period. An extendible lease offers security to pastoralists whose land management practices comply with the objects of the Act. Provisions for lease assessment and extension every 14 years mean that the majority of pastoralists will never have less than 28 years of lease tenure. As an incentive to improving land management practices pastoralists whose leases are not extended have the opportunity to remedy their actions and apply for a reinstatement of the term of their lease back to 42 years.

The lease document will clearly specify the management decisions that will be subject to review, negotiation and appeal by the lessee. It is important to differentiate between those land management conditions which will be subject to regular review and those conditions which set out fixed obligations (for example, payment of rent and compliance

with other Acts and regulations). The concept of property planning is another innovation in pastoral lease management. In line with the underlying thrust of this Bill to assist rather than hinder pastoralists, property planning is promoted as a technique to facilitate land management. Put simply, a property plan is a statement of lease management objectives and strategies for the achievement of those objectives. The Government believes that lessees will benefit from the production of property plans. To encourage their development discussions have been initiated with representative pastoralist groups on the content of property plans. Experienced staff in the Department of Lands will be able to provide continued assistance to lessees who voluntarily prepare property plans.

The setting and variation of stocking levels is the major management mechanism within the Bill. The Government acknowledges that the pastoral industry has in the past accepted stocking and destocking actions as an essential component of land management. The provision for destocking has been further strengthened in this Bill through inclusion of the power to order a muster to verify stocking levels. It is important to note that capricious exercise of this power is checked by the proviso that the Crown bears the cost of muster where a muster ordered by the Pastoral Board confirms the reported stock level.

The declaration of reference areas is a further strengthening of the land management and conservation aspects of the Bill. While the assessment process will provide a documented record of land condition and trend, reference areas will provide on-the-ground evidence of the effect of pastoralism on particular classes of land under comparable seasonal and climatic conditions.

Sections on access serve to clarify the rights of Aborigines, members of the public and pastoralists. The specific declaration of the rights of Aborigines is consistent with the Government's policy of supporting the maintenance of traditional pursuits for the Aboriginal people. Access routes will be established by the Pastoral Board after notification and consultation with members of the public.

The identification of these routes has been deliberately left to this consultative process to ensure careful consideration not only of the direction of these routes but also the length and width appropriate to the particular terrain. It is intended to have wide community participation, including Aboriginal, tourist and recreational groups.

Concern has been expressed over the question of a lessee's liability to persons who exercise a right of access under the Act. It is the Government's policy that the one set of laws should apply throughout the State in relation to occupier's liability (see the recent amendments to the Wrongs Act in this regard). The ordinary rules of negligence will apply. It should be noted that public access routes and stock routes will have the same standing as a public road and so will not form part of the leases over which they are established.

The establishment of a Pastoral Land Appeal Tribunal is a further step forward in pastoral lease administration. For the first time lessees will have the right to appeal against a range of decisions affecting their management of their leases. The institution of a compulsory conciliation process is a further aid to resolution of grievances and concerns.

The transitional provisions in this legislation are particularly important because the Government is committed to a gradual rather than automatic conversion of leases. A planned process of lease conversion has two major benefits. First, it will enable the Government to complete the lease assessments which will subsequently be used to determine lease conditions. This will ensure a base for good land management practice and monitoring by the Pastoral Board

and is an essential component of the Government's strategy. Secondly, a planned conversion will enable the Government to commit resources efficiently and effectively. The resource implications of assessing more than 300 leases over five years rather than one year will be immediately apparent.

It should also be noted that the Government has chosen a two-step process to allay the uncertainty of pastoralists about their future under this new legislation. The first step of what might be termed a 'desk top' study will identify those leases for which a new pastoral lease will not be offered. This determination will involve assessment of the suitability of the land for pastoral lease, considering alternative use and viability. It is important to note that assessment of viability will be based only on the criterion of land condition, not the individual lifestyle and finances of lessees. At the end of this review existing lessees will be advised whether they will be granted a new lease or an alternative form of tenure if they are not to be granted a new lease. The second step of lease assessment will then determine conditions for those new pastoral leases. Each of these processes is governed by a legislative timeframe to further ensure that pastoralists are not left in doubt about their lease future.

As I have previously stated, this Bill has been prepared after extensive consultation. There has been a heartening degree of cooperation and consensus in developing provisions which will enable the rationalisation of administrative procedures under the previous Act and the introduction of new concepts of land management and conservation. I should point out that a Bill to amend the Crown Lands Act to make various consequential amendments will shortly be introduced. I accordingly commend this Bill to honourable members and seek leave to insert into *Hansard* the detailed explanation of the clauses.

Clause 1 is formal.

Clause 2 provides for the Act to come into operation by proclamation. Subclause (2) provides that the requirement for at least one woman appointee to the Pastoral Board will not come into operation for six years.

Clause 3 provides the necessary definitions. The definition of 'Aborigine' follows the definition recently inserted in the National Parks and Wildlife Act. Definitions are provided of 'degradation' and 'rehabilitation' as both these definitions relate to the effect that man has had on the land. The definition of 'stock' makes it clear that the board can permit any species of animal to be farmed on pastoral land.

Clause 4 deals with the fundamental principles of the Act. The overall objects of this Act which all persons must abide by in administering this Act is to ensure that pastoral land is to be properly managed, effectively monitored, rehabilitated if damaged and generally kept in a condition that ensures its yield is sustained. It is also an object of this Act to provide a clear system of access to pastoral land not only for Aboriginal people (who may continue to follow all traditional pursuits on the land) but also for the community at large who have an interest in the unique environment of the arid lands of this State.

Clause 5 provides that the Minister and the board must adhere to the above objects. Subclause (2) requires that land assessments must be thorough and scientific.

Clause 6 sets out the general duty for all pastoral lessees. A lessee must use good land management practices in running his or her pastoral business. A lessee must prevent degradation of the land and must endeavour to improve the condition of the land where possible.

Clause 7 provides that the Crown cannot grant a tenure over land that is to be used for pastoral purposes other than

a pastoral lease under this Act. If the Governor determines that pastoral land should be used for some other more appropriate purpose then any other form of tenure (including a fee simple grant) may be granted.

Clause 8 sets out a power of delegation for the Minister.

Clause 9 provides that the Minister may appoint authorised officers for the purpose of this Act.

Clause 10 establishes the Pastoral Board. The board will consist of five members one of whom will be selected from nominations of pastoral organisations and another of whom will be selected from nominations of organisations representing conservation interests. Deputies to the latter two members will be appointed in the same way.

Clause 11 sets out the usual conditions of office for members of the board.

Clause 12 provides for allowances and expenses.

Clause 13 sets out board procedures. It should be noted that the person chairing the meeting does not have a casting vote as well as a deliberative vote.

Clause 14 provides for abstention from voting and attendance at meetings if a board member is in a situation of conflict of interest. The provisions of this clause follow to a large extent the conflict of interest provisions relating to local councils.

Clause 15 gives the responsibility for the administration of this Act to the board with the usual qualification that, in carrying out this function, the board is subject to the control and direction of the Minister. The other primary functions of the board are to advise the Minister on all policy matters and to give the Minister advice on any other matter when requested.

Clause 16 gives the board the power to delegate but only with the consent of the Minister.

Clause 17 gives the Minister the power to grant pastoral leases over Crown land on conditions determined by the board. Generally speaking, Crown land that is to be taken up on pastoral lease will be offered in an open competitive process. This will not apply if the land is to be added to an existing holding.

Clause 18 provides that pastoral leases cannot be granted if the Governor has determined that the land should be used for some other more appropriate purpose and cannot be granted unless the board is satisfied that the land is suitable for pastoral use and an assessment of the condition of the land has been made.

Clause 19 provides for the signing of pastoral leases and gives the Minister the right to refuse to grant a lease if it is not properly signed within the specified time.

Clause 20 provides that the rent under a pastoral lease is to be payable annually and will be an amount determined by the Valuer-General.

Clause 21 provides that the initial grant of a pastoral lease will be for a term of 42 years, except where the grant follows surrender of existing leases.

Clause 22 provides for the extension of the term of a pastoral lease by a period of 14 years at the end of each 14 year period of the term. The land must be assessed before each extension. The board has the power not to extend the term of a lease if it is satisfied either that the lessee has intentionally breached a condition of the lease or that the lessee has failed to discharge the duty imposed by clause 6. However, a lessee can apply at any time for extension of the term after any such refusal to extend. If the board grants an extension in this situation, it may do so so as to bring the balance of the term to 42 years.

Clause 23 empowers the board to vary the conditions of a pastoral lease at the end of each 14 year period of the lease after the condition of the land has been assessed. If

the lessee does not accept the varied conditions the term of the lease will not be extended. It should be noted that there is a right of appeal against the variation of lease conditions.

Clause 24 provides that pastoral leases are exempt from stamp duty.

Clause 25 repeats the present restriction on transfer of or other dealings with pastoral leases. No such transaction can take place without the prior consent of the Minister. Sub-clauses (4) to (7) deal with surrender of pastoral leases.

Clause 26 provides that where there is an agreement to transfer a pastoral lease the agreement expires 12 months after its execution if the parties have not obtained the Minister's consent to the transfer.

Clause 27 provides that share dealings that would result in a change in the control of the company cannot be effected without the consent of the Minister. This provision does not apply to changes in ownership effected by wills.

Clause 28 gives the Minister the power to alter boundaries similar to the powers for alteration to be found in the existing Pastoral Act.

Clause 29 gives the Minister the power to resume pastoral land by notice in writing in the *Gazette*. This provision is similar to the existing provisions in the present Pastoral Act that deals with resumption. The lessee is of course entitled to compensation if resumption occurs.

Clause 30 gives the board the power to cancel a pastoral lease if satisfied that the land subject to the lease has been abandoned by the lessee.

Clause 31 provides for the removal of property left behind after a lessee has vacated pastoral land. The Minister is given the ultimate power to remove and dispose of such property if not claimed.

Clause 32 provides for the payment of penalties if rent or other amounts due under a pastoral lease remain unpaid.

Clause 33 gives the board the power to waive breaches of lease conditions in special circumstances. Waiver can be subject to conditions.

Clause 34 provides for the action that may be taken if a lessee breaches the conditions of the lease. First, the board may impose a fine of up to \$10 000. Fines are to be paid into the General Revenue of the State and may be recovered by the board from the lessee as a debt. Secondly, the board has an option to cancel a lease for breach of conditions. (There is a right of appeal against either action.) The board may award compensation to a lessee whose lease has been cancelled.

Clause 35 gives the board the power to cancel leases that are improperly obtained.

Clause 36 gives the board the power to require a lessee to submit a property plan to the board for approval if the board thinks that the land is in danger of damage or has already been damaged, whether through natural causes or as a result of the lessee's actions. Property plans will detail how the land is to be managed over a specified period of years. The board may reject a plan or may impose its own property plan for the land. In the latter case, the cost of preparing the plan may be recovered from the lessee. Failure to implement an approved property plan constitutes a breach of the lease. The board can also require property plans to be revised from time to time. Soil conservation authorities must be consulted when a property plan is being prepared.

Clause 37 obliges a lessee to furnish the board annually with a statutory declaration as to stock levels on the land. The board may require such a declaration to be furnished at any other time, and may also require the lessee to muster stock for the purposes of official counting of numbers. If such a muster proves that the lessee was accurate in the last statutory declaration, the cost of the muster will be

borne by the Crown. Failure to comply with this section, or with a notice issued under this section, constitutes a breach of the lease.

Clause 38 gives the board the power to require a lessee to destock the land or to take other specified action, if the board thinks that the land has been or is likely to be damaged. If a lessee fails to comply with such a notice, the board may cause the required action to be carried out, and recover the cost of so doing from the lessee. Again, failure to implement a notice constitutes a breach of the lease.

Clause 39 gives the board the power to create reference areas on pastoral land. A reference area will be created for the purpose of ascertaining the effect the grazing of stock has on the land and will be maintained by the Minister. It is an offence for the lessee to allow stock within a fenced reference area or to deliberately cause stock to enter an unfenced reference area. The lessee is also obliged to inspect a reference area on his or her land and report to the board if the board directs. Compensation is not payable to a lessee on whose land a reference area is established, but a rent reduction may follow.

Clause 40 provides for the establishment of public access routes and stock routes by dedication. The former are created by notice published in the *Gazette* by the board, the latter may be created either by notice in the *Gazette* or may be established by reference in the regulations to a particular plan (for example, the public map). Full consultation with pastoralists, soil conservation authorities and interested organisations must occur before a public access route or stock route is dedicated, and the public will also be given an opportunity to comment on each such proposal. Sub-clause (7) provides for the temporary closure of public access routes and stock routes. A public access route or stock route is vested in the care, control and management of the Minister and the lessee's rights over the land comprised in such a route cease. The Minister is not obliged to maintain a public access route or stock route. A lessee will not be compensated for the establishment of a public access route or stock route on the land, but a rent reduction may follow.

Clause 41 deals with the right to travel stock across pastoral land. This section is virtually the same in substance as the corresponding provision in the existing Pastoral Act. Stock routes must be used, but if no such route exists, either the lessee's directions must be followed or the shortest practicable route taken. Stock must travel a minimum distance each day. The lessee must provide gates.

Clause 42 gives Aborigines the right to enter, travel across and stay on pastoral land for the purpose of following the traditional pursuits of the Aboriginal people. The only restriction on this right is that it does not extend to camping within a kilometre of a homestead or other buildings, or within 500 metres of dams or other man-made stock watering points.

Clause 43 gives an unrestricted right to travel across and camp temporarily on public access routes and stock routes. A right to travel across and camp temporarily on pastoral land is given to persons on foot, provided that the lessee is notified. A right to travel across and camp temporarily on pastoral land is given to persons in motor vehicles or on horses or camels, provided that the consent of the lessee or the Minister is first obtained. If the lessee refuses consent, the Minister may grant consent and must notify the lessee of that consent. The rights conferred by this section do not extend to camping within a kilometre of a homestead or other building or within 500 metres of a dam or other man-made stock watering point. Camping is temporary if it does not exceed two weeks or such other period as may be

prescribed by the regulations in respect of a particular piece of land.

Clause 44 creates an offence of obstructing a public access route or stock route. If pastoral land is fenced, the lessee must provide gates where the fence intersects public access routes, and must keep the gates unlocked.

Clause 45 establishes the Pastoral Land Appeal Tribunal. The tribunal will be comprised of three people, one being a District Court Judge, the other two being chosen from a panel of experts established for the purpose.

Clause 46 provides that the Judge will determine questions of law arising before the tribunal and that the tribunal is not bound by the rules of evidence.

Clause 47 sets out the usual powers to summons etc., and provides the usual offences of misbehaviour before the tribunal, failure to answer questions, etc. The tribunal has no power to allow third parties to intervene in any proceedings before the tribunal.

Clause 48 provides for a system of compulsory conferences between the parties to an appeal.

Clause 49 gives a right of appeal to the tribunal to a lessee who is dissatisfied with a decision to vary lease conditions, a decision not to extend the term of the lease or a decision to impose a fine or cancel a lease for breach of conditions. The period to lodge an appeal is three months. An appeal will be conducted as a review of the matter.

Clause 50 provides that decisions remain in force notwithstanding rights of appeal or institution of appeals. However, a decision to impose a fine or cancel a lease cannot be enforced or implemented until all appeal rights have been exhausted or appeals determined or withdrawn.

Clause 51 gives a right of review by the Valuer-General and of appeal to the Land and Valuation Court to a lessee who is dissatisfied with a decision to increase rent or a determination of the value of improvements (for example, when compensation is being awarded on resumption). A review will be conducted by a licensed valuer as if it were a review under the Valuation of Land Act. A right of appeal against the outcome of a review lies to the Land and Valuation Court.

Clause 52 creates an offence where certain behaviour occurs on pastoral land without lawful authority or excuse. The onus of proving lawful authority or excuse lies on the defendant.

Clause 53 requires a person who proposes to muster stock on pastoral land outside the dog fence to give notice of the muster to adjoining occupiers.

Clause 54 provides a statutory right for certain persons to take water from pastoral land. A person exercising a right of access under the Act (an Aborigine, a traveller or camper or a drover) may take sufficient water from the land for his or her personal or domestic needs. Travelling stock may have access to water, subject to compliance with the lessee's directions. Holders of mining tenements may take water for both mining and domestic or personal purposes, but must get the approval of the board first and must pay compensation for the water to the lessee.

Clause 55 gives authorised officers the power of arrest of any person reasonably suspected of having committed an offence in relation to pastoral land.

Clause 56 provides a right of entry and inspection of pastoral land for authorised officers, board members, the Minister or persons specifically authorised by the Minister for the purpose. This right may be exercised at any reasonable time and prior notice must be given to the lessee except where it is not practicable to do so or where offences or breaches of lease are involved. The right to seize and

impound trespassing animals to be found in the present Act is given to authorised officers.

Clause 57 provides the usual offences of hindering or assaulting persons exercising powers under this Act.

Clause 58 gives persons administering this Act the usual immunity from personal liability for acts done in good faith. Liability for such acts is borne by the Crown.

Clause 59 obliges the Registrar-General to make all necessary registrations and endorsements for the purposes of this Act.

Clause 60 provides that costs that may be recovered by the board from a lessee are a charge over the pastoral lease ranking in priority over all other charges (other than Crown charges).

Clause 61 provides that written notices may be served personally, or by leaving them at a place of business or residence with someone over 16, or by post or, if the whereabouts of the person to be served is unknown, by leaving them in a prominent position on the land or by publishing them in a newspaper.

Clause 62 sets out various evidentiary aids for proving technical matters.

Clause 63 provides that offences against the Act are summary offences. A defence of 'no negligence' is provided for persons charged with offences.

Clause 64 is the regulation-making power. Regulations may be made prohibiting certain activities on pastoral land, thus enabling specific regulation of areas that are particularly vulnerable. Standard lease conditions may be fixed by regulation.

The schedule repeals the Pastoral Act 1936 and provides for transitional matters. All existing leases must be reviewed by the Minister within the first year of operation of the new Act to assess whether the land is still suitable for pastoral use. Those that are seen as not suitable will be allowed to expire. Those that are still suitable will remain in force for no longer than a further five years, during which time the present Act will continue to apply, with certain exceptions. The new Pastoral Board will be substituted for the old board. The power to establish public access routes and stock routes may be exercised over any such lease. If such a route is established over an existing lease, then Part VI of the new Act will apply and all conditions and reservations in the lease relating to access will be deemed to have been revoked. Within the five year period, the condition of the land subject to existing leases must be assessed, so that the board may determine the conditions that will be inserted in the new leases to be granted to the lessees.

There is a right of appeal against a decision that land is no longer suitable for pastoral use and against the conditions proposed for a new lease. However, if a lessee does not accept the new conditions, a lease will nevertheless be granted to the lessee on those conditions when all rights of appeal have been exhausted or determined. (Of course, if the conditions are varied on appeal, those conditions as so varied will be incorporated in the lease.) The intention therefore is that by the sixth anniversary of the commencement of the new Act, all existing pastoral holdings that are to continue will be under the new Act.

Mr GUNN secured the adjournment of the debate.

NORTH HAVEN TRUST ACT AMENDMENT BILL

Adjourned debate on second reading.
(Continued from 30 November. Page 1773.)

The Hon. D.C. WOTTON (Heysen): The Opposition supports the second reading of this Bill. The aim of the Bill is to amend the North Haven Trust Act 1979 so that the North Haven Trust is constituted of the Minister for Environment and Planning. The Bill also provides for the trust to hold its property for and on behalf of the Crown. The North Haven Trust Act 1979 has been brought before this House on a number of occasions for amendment. The trust was established as a result of the Bill being brought down. On a number of occasions I have taken the opportunity to commend those people who have been involved as members of the trust. All of those people have carried out their responsibilities very well indeed and, as a State, we should be proud of the project as we see it today.

It was in 1983 when the decision was made to sell off much of the project, and it has now gone to areas of private enterprise. Part of the project has gone to the Department of Marine and Harbors, particularly the harbor section and the responsibility for keeping clear the entrance to the harbor. Since 1983 the members of the trust have gradually been working to finalise their major activities and to facilitate the eventual repeal of the North Haven Trust Act. In fact, in the amending legislation of 1986, provision is made for the North Haven Trust Act 1979 to be repealed, but that should not happen until a date to be fixed by proclamation.

The Crown Solicitor has apparently advised the Minister that certain risks are associated with the repeal and effective winding up of the North Haven Trust. As I understand it, the particular concerns relate to the complexity of the arrangement entered into by the trust. There is also concern as to whether such repeal may affect enforcement of the deed or sale or other agreements existing between the developers and the trust. Some time ago, during the term of the previous Liberal Government, I recall a similar situation occurring where, when trusts were established as part of the National Parks and Wildlife Service responsibility, and when it was determined that those trusts had fulfilled their duties, it was suggested by the members of the trusts that the trusts be wound up.

It was only at the time of receiving advice from the Crown Solicitor that we found similar problems under those circumstances to those pointed out with regard to the legislation currently before the House. The Crown Solicitor has suggested that the North Haven Trust should be retained as a statutory corporation, at least until the development obligations of the respective parties have been complied with and that the North Haven Trust Act 1979 be amended so that the North Haven Trust is constituted of the Minister for Environment and Planning. We have no major problem with that concept: it seems sensible.

Certainly it is not practical for the trust to continue to meet. As I understand it, the members of the trust have requested that it be wound up and consultation that we have had with a couple of the members of the trust has supported that action. I cannot see any point for the members of the trust to continue to meet or retain office space if the trust has no responsibilities. I am not quite sure what is the current situation but I know when it had a greater responsibility its members had their own offices and staff. If the trust has no responsibility now, I see no point in those people being called together, so we support the proposition. With the Minister being constituted as the North Haven Trust, will he or the Government continue to receive any revenue?

I am not quite sure whether the revenue raising responsibilities of the trust have concluded. I presume that they have. I understand that some \$500 000 is in the kitty cur-

rently and that that money is to be made available to the Department of Marine and Harbors to enable it to continue the work to which I referred earlier. Will the Minister clarify that situation and advise whether in fact the revenue raising responsibilities of the trust have concluded, that there will be no revenue raised by that trust now constituted in the form of the Minister?

The Opposition has concerns about the time that will be taken for the major activities to be completed. I would have thought that those responsibilities could be completed in a relatively short time, but I will refer to that issue later. With only that one question, the Opposition is pleased to support the second reading of the Bill.

Mr PETERSON (Semaphore): I support the Bill. Following on from the comments made by the member for Heysen about dredging, I admit that it is one of the problems. The North Haven harbor is a magnificent development and adds greatly to the State's facilities. However, the dredging is one of the problems.

The Hon. D.C. Wotton interjecting:

Mr PETERSON: The member for Heysen has a long memory in recalling the debate and discussions we have had on seaweed and the North Haven Trust. However, he was always helpful, as is the current Minister. The problem with Semaphore is that it is at the end of a long stretch of metropolitan beaches that everyone enjoys, but the drift lodges at the end. We have a problem that is not recognised by the enjoyers of the beaches along the metropolitan coast. They do not care where the seaweed ends up. We have a problem, but as always in Semaphore we tackle it. We struggle on with our backs to the wall, doing the best that we can. The seaweed at one stage lodged at the end of the beach at the breakwater but it is now to the south of the North Haven breakwater. Nature presents us with that problem, but we will overcome it.

I also commend the members of the trust who carried out their duties well over the years. They were always approachable and responsible in my dealings with them and tried to do what they could. They have probably seen that the end of their time is nigh and they are winding up. I refer to the decision to sell off the project in 1983, which created a new set of problems for the development. The whole project has been a long time in reaching maturation. There is still a long way to go in the North Haven development. There is a change or concentration of responsibility with the Minister, rather than with the trust, having the say. It has been a long time coming and many different proposals have been put forward over the years. At one stage they were going to create an island development, which did not happen. We are still waiting for the hotel tavern development, the shops on the foreshore and so on. Even at this stage I still hear rumours about proposed alterations to the development, such as the relocation of facilities and so on. It seems ridiculous to move marine facilities from one end of the harbor to the other—it cannot happen. These rumours circulate continually.

The Hon. D.C. Wotton: As long as you are commodore it will be all right.

Mr PETERSON: Commodore of West Lakes harbor would be all right. I have a T-shirt with 'North Haven' across the front. On that point, I recently noticed publicity about the West Lakes foreshore. I believe that people should have access to the foreshore. One of the features of North Haven was that people would have access to the foreshore. With the change of responsibility, change of ownership and change of development plans that has also gone with the

wind as it has at West Lakes and Goolwa where the poor old battler cannot walk along the edge of the development.

The Hon. D.C. Wotton interjecting:

Mr PETERSON: There are battlers down there. It is all right for you in the Hills with all the rich people. There are battlers and workers down here, son. In the Hills you enjoy the gum leaves and the atmosphere. We let them put the harbor there and then they would not let us get to the water. The Minister is probably still getting nasty letters about access to the water. We lost that. Development is still taking place and providing a test bed for new concepts. Over the water housing concepts have been put forward, but I have not seen any examples yet. The idea of leasing or buying the waterfront to keep a boat (and not too many wharves buy them) is another concept.

We have not had a real explanation about the Crown Solicitor's concerns, but I am pleased that he has advised them not to let go of the responsibility altogether as significant developments are occurring. We still have the development of the golf course on which we have not had any final detail. I hope that the Minister in responding can give information on the expansion of the golf course as there was much concern and interest in it. It is also a community facility being used by a great number of people.

The Hon. D.C. Wotton interjecting:

Mr PETERSON: I recall the opening of the golf course when the member for Heysen was Minister. He had four swings and missed every one. He asked the professional what was wrong with his game. The professional said, 'You are standing too close to the ball.' The honourable member asked, 'When?' The professional said, 'After you hit it.' That is the way that he opened the golf course.

I hope that the Minister will respond and give details on how the responsibility will be handled, as the trust will not exist. If we have any queries, do we come direct to the Minister to get the information? Will he give some information on the future development under the new regime? I support the Bill.

The Hon. D.J. HOPGOOD (Minister for Environment and Planning): I thank the two members who have contributed to the debate. In relation to these specific matters, so far as I am aware—in answer to the member for Heysen—there are certainly no money raising activities that would require a decision. So far as I am aware the money raising activities are at an end, but out of an abundance of caution I will obtain information on that. Certainly, none require any decision. As honourable members would know, the Government has been keen to wind up the activities of the North Haven Trust. Mr Hodgson, who has not been with my department for some time, continues as chairman under a special arrangement with his new employers—the City of Adelaide—on the understanding, of course, that we would be winding up the trust fairly quickly. That may be pertinent to one or two matters that we will raise in Committee.

As to the member for Semaphore, I do not have specific information on the possible expansion of the golf course, but will obtain it. At any time the honourable member can come to my office to obtain information. I would have thought that the golf club itself would be a fertile source of information for what its ambitions might be and any discussions it may have had with the Government. I commend the Bill to the House.

Bill read a second time.

The Hon. D.C. WOTTON: Mr Speaker, I draw your attention to the state of the House.

A quorum having been formed:

The Hon. D.C. WOTTON (Heysen): I move:

That Standing Orders be so far suspended as to enable me to move an instruction without notice.

Motion carried.

The Hon. D.C. WOTTON: I move:

That it be an instruction to the Committee of the whole House on the Bill that it have power to consider a new clause relating to sunset provisions.

Motion carried.

In Committee.

Clause 1 passed.

Clause 2—'Commencement.'

The Hon. D.C. WOTTON: I move:

Line 13—Leave out 'This' and insert 'Subject to this section, this'.

After line 13—Insert subclause as follows:

(2) Section 9 of this Act will come into operation on the day on which this Act is assented to by the Governor.

In looking at my amendment, I must say that it seems a very complicated way of introducing a sunset clause, but this is exactly what the Opposition wants to do. As I said earlier, we believe that it is important that the responsibilities associated with this Act be wound up as soon as possible. Our Leader has made it quite clear on a number of occasions that we are looking for a leaner Government. We recognise the necessity to remove unnecessary legislation from the statutes. We believe strongly that in this case a five-year period is sufficient to enable the responsibilities yet to be carried out to be dealt with. As was pointed out earlier, the Crown Solicitor recommended that the North Haven Trust should be retained as a statutory corporation at least until the development obligations of the respective parties had been complied with. We believe that five years is a sufficient time for that to happen. I commend the amendments to the Committee.

The Hon. D.J. HOPGOOD: Before I respond to the substance of the honourable member's amendments, can I simply say that lean or fat in Government has very little to do with the number of statutes that one has on the books. I sit here and have a look at those blue bound volumes directly opposite me and I notice that they are about 2½ metres in total length, and I remind myself that, if they were 3½ metres in total length, or one metre in total length, they would have very little to do with the leanness of government. Lean government is all about cost-effective government; it is about what it costs in dollars to be able to deliver various services to the community.

I recall that not very long ago we finally got around to repealing the Camels Protection Act. I suppose that was interesting in terms of neatness and orderliness. I slightly regretted the fact that so exotic a piece of legislation should have been taken off the books, but seeing that no Government, no public, resources were being put into the administration of that Act, anyway, it had nothing to do with the leanness or otherwise of government. This has been said and done before: I can recall the Liberal Government, under David Tonkin, repealing a few Acts, and trumpeting that as though it was the greatest thing for public administration that one could imagine, when of course it was totally irrelevant. Having said all that, I go on to say that I accept the honourable member's amendment relating to the sunset provision, and I am prepared to join him in urging it upon the Committee. First of all, the effect of the amendment, of course, is that the Act would expire on 31 December 1993, or if the Governor, by proclamation, should fix some earlier day for its expiry, it would be the day so fixed.

Our only concern in keeping the Act alive in the form that is now being urged on the House was that certain conditions would still be fulfilled by the purchasers in that area of North Haven that was sold by 1991. Given that

date, a five year sunset date is probably not too much of a risk. I suppose that it is not impossible that someone could be back here at the beginning of 1994 with a new piece of legislation to fix it up, but that is unlikely. In those circumstances and because I am extremely reasonable, as is this Government, we accept the amendment.

Amendments carried; clause as amended passed.

Clauses 3 to 8 passed.

New clause 9—'Insertion of new section 26.'

The Hon. D.C. WOTTON: I move:

Page 2, after line 7—Insert new clause as follows:

9. The following section is inserted after section 25 of the principal Act:

Expiry of Act

26. (1) This Act expires on—

(a) 31 December 1993;

or

(b) if the Governor, by proclamation, fixes some earlier day for its expiry—the day so fixed.

(2) The Governor may, by proclamation, transfer or distribute any property, rights, liabilities and obligations of the trust to or between one or more of—

(a) the Crown;

(b) a Minister or Ministers of the Crown;

(c) the council,

with effect on and from the expiry of this Act.

(3) The Governor may, by proclamation, fix the boundaries of the area of the council so that the prescribed area continues to form part of the area of the council notwithstanding the expiry of this Act.

(4) A proclamation under subsection (3)—

(a) has effect on and from the expiry of this Act;

(b) does not alter the boundaries of the area of the council as in existence before that expiry;

(c) has effect for all purposes as if it were a proclamation made under Part II of the Local Government Act 1934.

This amendment is consequential on my earlier amendment and I commend it to the Committee.

New clause inserted.

Title passed.

Bill read a third time and passed.

TERTIARY EDUCATION ACT AMENDMENT BILL

Adjourned debate on second reading.

(Continued from 30 November. Page 1773.)

The Hon. H. ALLISON (Mount Gambier): Members will realise this Bill is something of a formality because the South Australian Institute of Languages was in fact established when the Tertiary Education Act Amendment Act 1987 passed both Houses and was proclaimed on 4 February 1988. Really, there is very little contention before us today. I remind members that the 1987 Bill was supported by the Opposition, as indeed it was widely supported within tertiary education circles, within the ethnic communities of South Australia, and within the broader public community of South Australia.

However, one aspect of the 1987 amending Bill concerned us, that is, the provision for the establishment of the South Australian Institute of Languages more by regulation than by legislation. In fact, there was little fine print for members to study when the amending Bill was introduced in 1987. The salient point was that regulations could be made and approved by the Governor, as indeed they were, but we as a Party have always subscribed to the principle that, as far as possible, within legislation the details of that legislation should be spelt out fully when matters are brought before the House for debate so that they can be fully discussed before enactment. However, we supported the Bill in principle and we cooperated with the Government at that time

to enable the South Australian Institute of Languages to become operative as soon as possible in 1988.

In his turn, the Minister agreed to return to the House later with the Bill that is now before us mainly to enact the regulations which appear to have been largely reintroduced in this legislation, but with some tidying up by Parliamentary Counsel. I also note an additional provision in clause 7 of this Bill which revises section 9 of the principal Act by inserting, among other things, new section 9e(1)(d), which enables the South Australian Institute of Languages to mount non-award bearing courses. Such courses, which do not compete with other branches of tertiary education institutions in South Australia for the awarding of diplomas, certificates or degrees, are provided in areas related to language studies.

This, of course, has considerable revenue producing potential for the South Australian Institute of Languages. I recall the member for Coles (Hon. Jennifer Adamson as she was then) drawing to the attention of the then Minister the fact that English as a second language, especially for Asian students, might be an important drawcard in South Australia, bringing in a considerable number of tourist students who would contribute to the State coffers by subscribing to these English language courses.

That was not really a new idea, because for a considerable time South Australia had provided secondary courses funded in part by the Federal Government; for at least a decade, from the mid-1970s to the mid-1980s, many Malaysian students came to Australia to engage in secondary studies, especially at higher secondary level, and then returned to their homeland.

Obviously, there was the potential to widen the scope from secondary into tertiary education and I believe that the Minister commented at the time that he, too, had recognised the importance of that proposal as a possible revenue earner for the South Australian Institute of Languages. I suppose that, in responding to my second reading contribution, the Minister could comment on what progress has been made in that direction. If not, perhaps the matter can be raised in Committee.

To some extent, the provisions of this Bill, the 1987 amendment and the 1988 regulations are also somewhat optimistic. I think that the Hon. Rob Lucas, who handled this legislation for the Opposition in the other place, commented on that air of optimism that was present in the legislation and the regulations. In particular, I refer to clause 9e(1), which provides for the South Australian Institute of Languages to exercise something of a coordinating role in providing for the teaching of languages throughout the whole of the tertiary institution range in South Australia. Will the Minister comment on that, or is it too soon to comment on the institute's success in that regard? Now that the South Australian Institute of Languages has been in operation for 12 months under regulation, perhaps the Minister can comment on the progress made generally in the areas provided for under the heading 'Functions and Powers of the Institute', particularly where any especially pleasing progress has been made.

As I said at the outset of this brief contribution, the Opposition supported the legislation when it was before the House in 1987. It has had no change of heart since and we would appreciate any comment that the Minister can make as to the success or otherwise of the South Australian Institute of Languages during its brief existence. We support the legislation.

Mr S.J. BAKER (Mitcham): I wish to make brief comments on the Bill, and I support the comments made by

the member for Mount Gambier. Principally, I will address the question of restructuring of tertiary education institutions. This is an enormous subject and I do not have the time nor the inclination to discuss the full ramifications of what has happened in the past 12 months. It would be a great shame if we did not have reform in this State. I understand the difficulties faced by the Minister when he had to deal with tertiary restructuring. I have made quite clear that I believe in a three-institution structure with the Flinders University, the University of Adelaide and the proposed University of Technology being the major instrumentalities.

It was important to achieve reform. We still do not know the bottom line of the Commonwealth Government's intentions. My file on this topic is more than 12 inches thick, as I suppose is the Minister's file. The literature provided quite interesting reading. The skeleton looked very shaky, but the proposition firmed up. I believe that the situation was ripe for reform in this State and that some changes had to be made to the tertiary education system in South Australia.

I cannot condone the fact that, at the end of the day, we still have the vested interests that apply in particular institutions which have won the battle. They have won the battle at the cost of the South Australian taxpayer. They have won the battle at the cost of good, solid tertiary education in this State, with all the ideals that I have about tertiary education and what role it should fulfil in the total education process. I find it difficult to believe that the Minister could not come up with a solution that I believe is quite tenable. I believe that the colleges of advanced education are, in some instances, corrupt. I believe that some of their practices are quite nefarious. I believe that a strong microscope could have been applied to the CAEs with respect to the role they fulfil. Some parts of that role belong within the other tertiary institutions and other parts could belong to the TAFE sector, or even the private sector.

Instead, the Minister, under a great deal of pressure, said, 'I'm sorry: we can't reform the system.' However, neither I nor anyone else in South Australia knows whether the Federal Government will pursue its aims and say that all those institutions which fail to live up to its expectations will take some pecuniary loss. A formula was put out by the Federal Minister as to how funding would be affected if various institutions could not—

The DEPUTY SPEAKER: Order! I do not want to interrupt the honourable member's flow, but I cannot see the connection between his contribution and the Bill now being discussed. The Bill refers to language studies and has nothing to do with the subject being addressed by the honourable member. I ask the honourable member to come back to the Bill.

Mr S.J. BAKER: Thank you for your indulgence, Sir, and the indulgence of the House. This is the first occasion on which we have discussed broadening tertiary education beyond the Institute of Languages, so I wanted to put my comments on the record. There will be other occasions when I will pursue the matter with a great deal more vigour. With those few words, I support the legislation before the House.

The Hon. L.M.F. ARNOLD (Minister of Employment and Further Education): I thank the members for Mount Gambier and Mitcham for their support for this Bill, and I acknowledge the comments made by both members. The member for Mount Gambier is quite correct: this is the fulfilment of a commitment given at the time the first legislation was introduced. We acknowledged then that it was not ideal—that there was so much by way of regulation and so little in the statute itself—but we also understood

the urgency of establishing the Institute of Languages, and that required a statutory provision. We are now amending that.

I introduced the Bill late last year, laying it on the table quite purposefully because at that stage we did not know how the restructuring of tertiary education would end up. In other words, we wanted to avoid putting through a Bill that would need amending some time this year. In the eventuality, that has not been the case and the original Bill as tabled can now proceed.

Turning to the Institute of Languages itself, I take this opportunity to congratulate the board of the institute under its Chairperson, Romano Rubichi, and the staff of the institute, particularly the Director, Dr Paul Tuffin, for the work they have done in establishing this institution within South Australia's education community. I will be tabling in this House (either tomorrow or the day after) the first annual report of the Institute of Languages, and I believe that a number of the questions which have been asked by the member for Mount Gambier will be answered in that report. I will ensure that he receives a personal copy of that annual report.

The honourable member asked particularly for the membership of the present board of the Institute of Languages. The Chairperson, who is appointed by my nomination as Minister of Employment and Further Education, is Romano Rubichi, who is also Chairperson of the Tertiary Multicultural Education Coordinating Committee. One member each is appointed by the Minister of Employment and Further Education, the Minister of Education and the Minister of Ethnic Affairs. My nominee is Eleni Glaros, a teacher at Underdale High School; the Minister of Education's nominee is Mr Chris Majewski, who is the Superintendent of schools with the speciality of English as a second language; and the Minister of Ethnic Affairs' nominee is Mr Flavio Verlato, who is the secretary of the Minister of Ethnic Affairs.

The tertiary education institutions of South Australia also have one nominee each. The University of Adelaide's nominee is Dr Jerzy Smolicz; Flinders University's nominee is David Askew, Dean of the School of Humanities; Roseworthy Agricultural College is represented by Mr Barry Thistlethwayte, the Director, and the most senior institute representative; the South Australian College of Advanced Education is represented by Mr John Chalklen, Dean of the Faculty of Business Communication and Cultural Studies; the Institute of Technology is represented by Dr Ann Martin, who is the head of general education; and the Department of Technical and Further Education is represented by Mr John Wolfensberger from the Adelaide College of TAFE. They are the current members of this particular institute.

With respect to new section 9e(1)(d), the honourable member is quite correct: we anticipate that the institute will be able to go out and raise moneys to provide a resource base to achieve the other objectives for which it has been established. That activity will incorporate a number of possibilities. For example, it could incorporate the very thing that the honourable member referred to, that is, providing English courses in South Australia for overseas students. However, it should be noted that that is already being done by a number of other institutions, including the Institute of Technology and the Department of Technical and Further Education. Of course, this can also involve local people doing short-term courses in language studies for use overseas. In other words, there could be courses in commercial Japanese, scientific Russian or scientific German where skills are required simply for an intensive program of study. However, it could also be for other enrichment courses not

being met by other providers. They cannot be award courses because that would put them in direct competition with other institutions, and that is not the aim. In any event, it would be beyond the human resource capacity of these institutions to support such a program.

However, I have strongly encouraged these institutions to look to this avenue to raise money, and there may be other ways that that can be achieved. The extent to which that has happened to date has not been extensive and they have not yet run any courses for others. Considerable time has been spent examining the pedagogic offerings of different institutions with respect to languages, resulting in the production of a profile or atlas of courses. Extensive negotiations have been undertaken to encourage institutions to host courses that originate from interstate but are studied by correspondence. In other words, there are various ways of increasing the language offerings of our institutions. One is to have a fully staffed South Australian school or department within an institution that teaches a program of language. Frankly, it is beyond the resource capacity of institutions in South Australia to maintain the breadth of languages that we need for our community.

I suggested a long time ago—and the institute agrees—that South Australian students should have access to language studies originating interstate. In other words, the students can study the language here in South Australia but the lecturers are interstate, the course writing is done interstate and perhaps some aspects of accreditation are achieved interstate. With appropriate cross-crediting arrangements students could then incorporate interstate studies in their degree or award course in South Australia.

I am pleased to advise that, after considerable work, the Institute of Languages has now been able to reach satisfactory arrangements with respect to two languages—Russian and Arabic. A third language, Ukrainian, is still under discussion. In congratulating the Institute of Languages for arranging the two, possibly three, special hybrid courses, it should be noted that the first hosting offer was made to the University of Adelaide. Unfortunately, the University of Adelaide did not see its way clear to act in a hosting capacity for those languages here in South Australia.

For a moment it looked like we might lose it. I addressed a conference last year, and Dame Roma Mitchell, Chancellor of Adelaide University, addressed the same conference and she urged upon the relevant committee within the Arts Faculty of that university that it give favourable consideration to this proposal. I supported her request and reiterated that strong endorsement of the proposal. I am sad to say that it was not taken up. We nearly lost it, except that Flinders University took up the challenge, and it is now playing a host role to those two languages and, who knows, possibly the third one as well, when further work has been done.

I offer my congratulations to Flinders University and I hope that Adelaide University will see its way clear to re-examine the extent to which it may play host on other occasions when languages could be offered here in South Australia. The Institute of Languages also plays an advisory capacity to the Office of Tertiary Education, to myself and institutions about what is the profile of languages that will be needed in the years to come and where the shortfalls might be. I know that it is a matter of some concern to the institute that perhaps our higher education institutions are not being reactive enough to the very considerable demand that will exist for languages in the years to come from such things, for example, as the Languages Other Than English program (LOTE), particularly the primary school element

of that which will see, by Government policy, every primary school child in 1995 learning a language other than English.

I too have concerns about this. I am not convinced, for example, that the South Australian college yet realises how much effort will need to go into this area to give us that output of the required number of teachers skilled in language teaching and in particular languages to meet the constraints of that LOTE program. I do not accept the view that is expressed by some that, if this is a State Government priority, it should pay for it. The purpose of our higher education institutions is to meet the social and economic priorities of this community in South Australia. Those priorities are as defined by the community, by the institutions themselves, but also as commented on and defined by the State Government. We by right have the capacity to give our views about what we see as the State Government's priorities with respect to higher education.

I am simply saying that that is one of our priorities, and it should be met as equally as anything else from within the resources made available to higher education by the Commonwealth Government. Finally, I noted the comments of the member for Mitcham, and I also noted your admonition, Mr Speaker, to members not to stray too far from the Bill. However, it is pertinent to one extent that this Bill was held up because we do not know exactly where we are going with restructuring. I want to make a couple of comments in that context.

First, I share with the member for Mitcham the disappointment that we were not able to achieve more fundamental restructuring in higher education in South Australia at this time. Also, I maintain a sense of optimism that the institutions themselves will carry on discussions to meet the important objectives that the community has set for higher education, to increase access, to increase the equity of that access, to increase the responsiveness of it to the needs of the community in all senses, social, economic and whatever.

I am also confident that even if that does not lead to a reduction in the numbers of institutions in the immediate future, apart from Roseworthy, which has already started discussions looking at which institution it will merge with, at least there will be better cooperation between the institutions, which is relevant in areas such as language studies. When the final decision was made by State Cabinet not to be further involved in a pro-active sense, the decision was made upon the information given to the Premier and me by the Federal Minister. I specifically asked the question in a situation of various possible scenarios—a scenario of substantial restructuring, a scenario of the *status quo*, or a scenario of moderate restructuring, such as Roseworthy coming in to one institution or another.

In the short, medium and long terms with respect to recurrent, capital and research funding would our institutions in South Australia be better off, worse off or the same when comparing between each of those three scenarios? The answer that was given quite unequivocally was that there would be no penalising of South Australian institutions if there was no restructuring in South Australia.

The point was made that only one institution did not meet the criteria of the unified national system—namely, Roseworthy—but the others did. That is correct on the 2 000 threshold but it is not correct on the 8 000 threshold, which was commented on by John Dawkins the next day. But the question was unequivocal and the answer was unequivocal. It was said that it would be possible that a restructured higher education sector in South Australia would do better in terms of the funding they would receive from the private sector. A general statement was then made to

the effect that they might do better in the future with reiteration of the point that there would be no penalising.

On the basis of that very unequivocal response, Cabinet made its decision—and I accept the reasoning behind that decision. We are therefore very concerned that within days of that decision being made John Dawkins has made some opposite statements. I can give the public a statement right here and now, which I have already given in another forum, that we will be watching very closely to see that the words expressed to the Premier and myself are honoured.

Mr S.J. Baker interjecting:

The Hon. L.M.F. ARNOLD: We will be pursuing it in other forums because words given to the Premier and the Minister together are pretty definite words that have to be adhered to. In that same conversation when I asked a question about the Distance Education Centre (DEC)—of which there are to be provided six in Australia and there is some concern that we might not get one in South Australia—the Federal Minister said, 'Don't worry, South Australia will be all right'. Again, we will watch very closely that situation.

I understand the point made by the member for Mitcham, which has already been made by people in higher education institutions, that they do not wish to be worse off. That having been said, I go back to the starting point of all this. While with respect to particular funding allocations we can preserve a situation of no penalty, it is still better for the synergy of higher education in South Australia and what it can offer to the community that there be substantial restructuring. I strongly urge the institutions in this State to proceed down a path of cooperative discussion which will lead to restructuring. We, as a State Government, will receive any agreed positions at which they arrive and consider accordingly the statutory amendments required. We will not take a proactive stance in this matter any more, but I urge the institutions to proceed with what I think in the long term is in the best interests of education and, consequently, the community of South Australia. I thank members for their support of this Bill.

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

ADJOURNMENT

The Hon. L.M.F. ARNOLD (Minister of State Development and Technology): I move:

That the House do now adjourn.

Mr OSWALD (Morphett): During the latter part of December, much was said in the public arena about the need for Proclamation Day to be acknowledged in this State as a public holiday. As the member who represents the historic district of Glenelg, I will put on record my support for this move to declare 28 December a permanent public holiday. I also put on the record a few of the reasons why I think that should happen. All of us who have any knowledge of history can think back to the early days, and it will not hurt to run through a few of the historical facts of the early days of settlement. As early as 15 August 1834 a proclamation was enacted which reads:

... it shall and may be lawful for His Majesty, with the advice of his Privy Council, to erect within that part of Australia which lies between the meridians of the 132nd and 141st degrees of east longitude, and between the Southern Ocean and the 26th degree of south latitude, together with all and any the islands adjacent thereto, and the bays and gulfs thereof, with the advice of his Privy Council, to establish one or more Provinces, and to fix the respective boundaries of such Provinces; . . .

On that occasion, the State of South Australia was born. Referring to the *South Australian Gazette and Colonial Register*, the Editor, who was present at the proclamation of the province, wrote the following account of the landing of Governor Hindmarsh:

On the morning of December 24th [1836] HMS Buffalo entered the magnificent harbor of Port Lincoln, and found the Cygnet at anchor in Spalding Cove. Captain Lipson, R.N., came on board with a letter from Colonel Light, Surveyor-General, to His Excellency the Governor, announcing the most desirable location of our Metropolis to be on the eastern side of the Gulf of St. Vincent, at the same time encouraging us with a most glowing description of that portion of the country. . . . In consequence of the intelligence conveyed in Colonel Light's letter respecting the proposed location in St. Vincent's Gulf, and the knowledge that the officers of the Government who had preceded His Excellency were anxiously awaiting his arrival on the plains near Mount Lofty, it was determined to proceed thither without delay, and, in company with the Cygnet, the Buffalo came to anchor in St. Vincent's Gulf, Mount Lofty bearing due east, on the morning of the 28th. At 2 o'clock of the same day His Excellency, accompanied by the ladies of his family; Mr Fisher, the Resident Commissioner; Mr Stevenson His Excellency's Private Secretary; the Rev. Mr Howard, Colonial Chaplain; [and the] Colonial Treasurer;

[went ashore and were received on the ground by some 546 dignitaries.]

On that day the State came into being. It is interesting to read the history of the State and to realise the type of day that it was on which those settlers came ashore at Holdfast Bay. On that occasion the two boats came across the gulf, around the bottom end of the peninsula in the dark without the aid of lighthouses, and came at anchor in the early hours of the morning. The *Cygnet* went ahead of the *Buffalo* and it is reported in the log of the *Buffalo* that, as the *Cygnet* moved inshore to anchor off the Patawalonga, the Captain of the *Buffalo* could see the silhouette of the sailors standing in the rigging of the *Cygnet*, against the background of the ranges and the bushfires raging at the time. We could imagine that it was a day of excessive heat, probably over the century, and the settlers came ashore to establish the colony while the bushfires were raging in the Mount Lofty Ranges.

The first Proclamation Day ceremony took place under the Old Gum Tree, with which most members in this House are familiar, and at that ceremony the State's proclamation was read. Since that time, on 28 December in each year, a ceremony has been conducted under the Old Gum Tree at Glenelg, of which we are all very proud. That ceremony is held to express our homage and affection for our pioneers and ancestors. Behind Glenelg were the plains measuring 20 miles by eight miles, named by Hindmarsh, that were developed as the first wheat plains.

It is interesting, in talking about the history, to realise that the first 20 acres of wheat were planted on those plains by Messrs Allen and John McLean who paid a pound an acre to have the crop cut. It was a shilling a bushell to thrash it out into wheat and flour. Members may ask why I am spending so many minutes leading up to the history of what happened on that day. I do it for a specific purpose: to draw a comparison between those days when the sailors came ashore and were greeted by the first 500 settlers, and today when the State is moving into the twenty first century, a State leading the world in technology, a State which has come so far from those days when the first settlers came ashore.

This State has developed its railways and internal road network and come from that farm of 20 acres to mass broad acreage under massive cultivation. It has come from a situation of having no lighthouses, with sailing ships groping their way up and down the coast, to a State opened up by the ketches, with a developed port, silos, and internal roads and railways as the outer hinterland was developed. People

went out looking for mines and found them. They developed them until we now have the largest mine in the world at Roxby Downs. The State is proud of its development and the great rate at which it has developed. The State has not had a lot of natural resources when compared to other States, but we are proud to have been a part of it.

As one whose grandfather was one of the early city engineers of Adelaide who played a great role in its development, I have much affection for this State. It is a wonderful place. Over time, as people come to the State and other activities are opened up around the public holiday concept, the importance of the State has not been recognised as it should. As we compare what happens interstate and overseas, all of us in the parliamentary sphere who have a chance to influence public opinion should stand firm together and say that we will, as a matter of policy and conscience, ensure that 28 December each year is recognised in this State as the day on which this State was founded and the day on which we will have a public holiday to recognise it.

It would be unthinkable in some countries, such as the United States, for a State founded with the pioneering and heritage background surrounding 28 December at Glenelg, not to acknowledge it as a public holiday. It is taught in the schools. Although we have a large multicultural population, we are proud of our heritage background and teach it to those who come to this country. I would like to think that everyone in this House would support me in appealing to the Government that in future 28 December will be and will remain a public holiday. Through the educational process of our schools we can tell the story of how the *Cygnet*, with the *Buffalo* behind it, came into Holdfast Bay at 2 a.m., silhouetted against the bushfires in the Mount Lofty Ranges and on 2 o'clock that day Governor Hindmarsh came ashore to proclaim this country.

This State and country has developed from absolutely nothing. Natives in the sand dunes watched what they thought was a quaint ceremony. Five hundred settlers stood there, with women in bonnets and clothing buttoned up to the throat and soldiers in uniform. That was our beginning. I ask all members, in thinking about the situation later this year, to stand firm and support me when we will be calling for Proclamation Day on 28 December to be declared a permanent holiday in recognition of what it is: the commencement of this wonderful State.

Mr RANN (Briggs): I want to talk about several matters. One concerns the changes in the Liberal Party. I know that—

Mr S.J. Baker: We knew that that would be on the agenda.

Mr RANN: I know that members opposite will be delighted about this. I am not surprised to hear some responses from the member for Mitcham, because in many ways he is the saddest outgoing shadow Minister.

Mr S.J. Baker: You are the saddest one over there.

Mr RANN: I come here not to bury the member for Mitcham, but to praise him. He works harder than any of his colleagues. He handles all their Bills, legislation and amendments. He goes home every night swotting into the wee dark hours on this tortuous work of amending Bills, amendments that he knows have no hope. His loyalty has been rewarded by his being sacked.

There are other matters that I want to mention. I will not refer to the speech by the Leader of the Opposition at the Governor-General's farewell recently. It was one of the most distasteful and disgusting speeches that I have heard at any public event in the 12 years that I have lived in South Australia. Not only did he reflect on the sobriety of

a former Governor-General, but he set out in the most prudent way to denounce the incoming Governor-General. His speech embarrassed his own Party members, the judiciary and business people who were there. It just shows that, no matter how talented one's speech writer, one needs judgment to lead, and he has neither judgment nor leadership.

A few weeks ago, more in sorrow than in anger, I issued a press release to the country media about the role of the Opposition. I pointed out that the daily parliamentary Question Time was supposed to be the centre stage of Opposition concern. Yet the Leader of the Opposition, who represents the rural seat of Custance, but who in fact lives in the Hills and takes pride in the fact that he lives in the Hills, did not ask one question on rural matters during the whole of 1988.

Mr Duigan interjecting:

Mr RANN: I do not know whether he is on the roll in his electorate. It will be worth having a look. There was not one question on rural matters from the Leader of the Opposition during the whole of last year. The member for Eyre, who was then—I emphasise 'then'—the shadow Minister of Agriculture, asked only three questions of the Minister of Agriculture during the whole of 1988, and only two of those questions were on agricultural matters. I put out that press release and was amazed at the reception that it got in the rural media. It seems that I was ploughing a fertile field.

Members interjecting:

Mr RANN: It is no wonder that people in country areas are interested. They do not hear anything from the member for Victoria. He asked only one question on Bool Lagoon. I suppose one can say that was kind of rural. He was too busy trying to stab the member for Eyre in the back to get on the front bench, but he still has not got there. He has still got only half way there. There is only one member on the other side who tries to articulate on rural matters in a decent, strong way and with integrity—

Members interjecting:

The DEPUTY SPEAKER: Order! I ask the honourable member to resume his seat. On a matter as fairly insignificant as the adjournment debate it would be—

Members interjecting:

The DEPUTY SPEAKER: Order! I would not like to take the opportunity on the first day that Parliament resumes of having to name a member. We are not going to have a shouting match across the Chamber. Members may not like what is being said, but the honourable member is entitled to say it. I ask that he be heard in silence.

Mr RANN: I shall wrap up on this matter because I do not like exposing the difficulties of the Opposition, particularly when there is a great deal of unrest and meetings in corridors. I might add that I predicted in the Eyre Peninsula newspapers that Graham Gunn, two days before he was dropped, would be dismissed and replaced by the member for Victoria. The member for Eyre said that the member for Briggs knew nothing about matters going on in the Liberal Party, that he was a speculator and that it was all nonsense. That was two days before he was dumped.

An honourable member: Sacked, in other words.

Mr RANN: That's right; the member for Eyre was not quite in touch with his Leader, either. We have seen Legh Davis dumped. He was the darling of the 'Tiser and the 'wets' and Steele Hall. He is out there plotting. The member for Mitcham is extremely upset, I am told. In his own branch out in Mitcham they are supporting him; they are saying that it was an act of treachery by the leadership. And what else is there? Heini Becker, the member for Hanson, has been dumped.

The DEPUTY SPEAKER: Order! I must point out to the honourable member that Standing Order 152 states:

No Member shall refer to any other Member by name, except for the purpose of distinguishing him from other Members returned for the same Electoral District.

I would ask the honourable member to refer to people correctly in the House.

Mr RANN: My apologies, Mr Deputy Speaker. Anyway, there is dissention in the ranks. I was very amused to note that, in fact, the Liberals released a poll on 6 February. I have been referring to it as 'shonky polls incorporated'. From this poll the Liberals say that they lead in key policy areas. This poll was taken over eight seats, with 400 respondents—that is 50 people per electorate. However, 40 per cent of them did not know or did not want to say. So, when their figures are actually boiled down, only 15 people per electorate responded to this shonky poll by the Liberals. We will see more of these boded-up polls in the next few weeks, I am sure.

The Hon. L.M.F. Arnold interjecting:

Mr RANN: That is right; it reflects their support. I am pleased to see that the Deputy Leader is part of the leadership—there are the three at the top and the seven dwarfs. I also want to point out that it is exactly 10 years ago today that Don Dunstan was telling his senior ministers that he was resigning as Premier, and yesterday Senator Maguire, other former members of his staff and I had lunch with Don Dunstan and we reflected on those times. I had the privilege of working for Don between 1977 and 1979. It was a period of considerable controversy, involving issues such as industrial democracy, women's rights and uranium, the dismissal of a police commissioner, and the tragic death of his wife, Adele Koh.

It was an experience that taught me many things, but more than anything Don's message to the people of South Australia was that people in public life must always challenge their own entrenched assumptions in making policy decisions in search of new ideas and new solutions. Don Dunstan challenged South Australians to raise their sights above the hurly-burly of daily events. In the Australian and international context he showed us by example that Governments must never flee their responsibility to those who have been left out or left behind. He taught us that we must advance not by climbing over each other but by bringing everyone along. He taught us that we must never turn away from injustice and pretend that we do not see injustice and pain when it is before us because of political expediency.

Throughout his career Don has shown that he has been prepared to put his neck on the line when he believed that an issue was important enough. But in moving forward in often controversial areas Don Dunstan knew that he could not leave his electorate too far behind and so he took on the tougher and much more difficult task of explaining the need for change. We on this side of the House know that reform is always harder to sell than conservatism, and Don Dunstan knew it was no use just being an architect of reform without being a salesman as well, because without being a successful salesman one cannot implement reform policies. He wanted to implement reforms, earn public acceptance and then go on to win re-election so that more could be achieved. He showed that winning and reformist zeal are not mutually exclusive.

In that, Don Dunstan personified South Australia in the 1960s and the 1970s, just as John Bannon personifies this State in the 1980s and 1990s, and, hopefully, beyond. Don has had his share of detractors, and today we can hear the carps and whinges of those lesser mortals opposite. It is not surprising that those people opposite do not like him, because for a generation Don Dunstan was the most potent threat

to the cold citadels of privilege and prejudice in South Australia. His critics have always been vocal as well as vitriolic, but his supporters and friends far outweigh them.

Don Dunstan led South Australia out of dull conservatism to become a pacesetter in the nation and in many ways around the world. He put this State on the map and I pay tribute to him on the 10th anniversary of his resignation. Don Dunstan's most enduring legacy is his confident, insistent and invigorating summons for us to move forward.

The DEPUTY SPEAKER: Order! The honourable member's time has expired. The honourable member for Chaffey.

The Hon. P.B. ARNOLD (Chaffey): I wish to draw to the attention of the House, and particularly to the attention of the Minister of Water Resources, the concerns of people in the Riverland about the quality of water in Lake Bonney at Barmera. No one would deny that Lake Bonney is an important sport and recreational facility in South Australia and that it is indeed an important tourist attraction in this State. However, over recent years the quality of the water in the lake has deteriorated dramatically and a great deal of concern is being expressed, particularly in the Riverland, and there has been debate about what can be done to improve water quality.

In about 1974 or 1975 on I think at least two occasions I was able to obtain the agreement of the then Minister of Works (Hon. J.D. Corcoran) to lower the river level at Lock 3 and so draw water from Lake Bonney and replace it with fresh water. That required the lowering of Lock 3 for about six or seven days and in that period of time approximately 35 to 40 per cent of the water within Lake Bonney was removed. That had the effect of dropping the lake by about one or 1½ metres, which enabled service clubs and the District Council of Barmera to clean that part of the foreshore of Lake Bonney that is normally inundated with water and to collect all the broken glass and material that cannot normally be seen because of the colour and turbidity of river water. As a result, the number of accidents involving broken glass could be reduced; that is one of the side or fringe benefits of carrying out this procedure.

There is no other feasible way of improving the quality of water in Lake Bonney. Lake Bonney is situated at the end of Chambers Creek, which is about eight nautical miles in length, so there is a common inlet and outlet; therefore, the only way in which the water can be replaced is by the water being taken back out through Chambers Creek and dispersed into the Murray River at a time when water consumption from the river is low. The end of the irrigation season is the ideal time to undertake such a project. Irrigators and other users of the Murray River must be notified and given fair warning that the Government intends to undertake such a project in the interests of a facility of this State. People who depend on water from the Murray River can make alternative arrangements for a few days.

I understand that about 4½ years ago the former Public Buildings Department (now SACON) undertook a study which resulted in quite important findings about the quality of water, the level of algae in the water and also the level of salinity. That report has never been released and, no matter how hard different people have tried to obtain that report, it has never been made public. Although a study was undertaken, the public has not been made aware of the level of pollution in that lake. I do not suggest that Lake Bonney is currently a health risk. However, because of the algae and other material in the lake, considerable odours

emanate from the water and there is no way of overcoming the problems unless the water is replaced.

If the level of the lake is dropped by at least one metre or 1.5 metres, approximately 35 per cent of the water can be removed. If this is done on an annual basis, when river conditions are such as to allow this to occur effectively, the quality of the water in Lake Bonney can be improved dramatically. That will be in the interests of all South Australians as well as tourists from interstate and overseas. As I said, there is no doubt that it is a recognised facility and one which must be protected. The District Council of Barmera is very concerned about it, and a number of proposals have been put forward at various times as to how the quality of water in Lake Bonney could be improved by use of a pipeline or canal above Lock 4. However, the sheer cost of such a project would be quite prohibitive.

This procedure can be undertaken at very little cost and will dramatically improve the quality of the water. The district council and the Lake Bonney committee, which is involved in reforestation and improvement around the lake, have planted thousands of young trees along the shores of Lake Bonney as part of a rehabilitation and reforestation project. However, the high salinity level of the water in the lake makes the success of that undertaking extremely difficult.

If this program of lowering Lock 3 at appropriate times was proceeded with on a regular basis, there is no doubt that the salinity level in the lake would fall dramatically, enabling the reforestation attempts not only to proceed smoothly but to be very successful. The council and the committee are having quite a bit of success even at this stage, but the level of salinity is making success difficult to achieve. Numerous people use Lake Bonney, including visitors at the caravan parks, visiting school groups and other groups from all over South Australia.

In fact, Greenwood Park has to use water from the lake in its ablution blocks. Given the high level of algae in the water, once the water goes through the hot water system strong odours emanate and there is an adverse effect on visitors. It is a very safe area and one which is supported by literally thousands of people from all over this State.

When the level of Lock 3 was first lowered and a significant proportion of the water from the lake was removed, additional works were carried out in Chambers Creek to enable the maximum flow from the lake. However, because of the length of Chambers Creek (approximately eight nautical miles), even with the excavations that were undertaken, it took approximately five to six days to drain 35 per cent to 40 per cent of the water from the lake. As I said earlier, at that comparatively small flow rate the water disperses into the main stream of the Murray River and is absorbed quickly by the major flow. Therefore, there is no major detrimental effect on down river users, those who use the lake for swimming, sailing and other sport and recreational purposes.

Therefore, this practice can have little or no effect on anyone downstream. If it is carried out at the right time of year, the overall effect on other users of the Murray River system will be negligible. However, there will be a dramatic effect on upgrading and protecting an important sport, recreation and tourist facility in South Australia.

Motion carried.

At 4.51 p.m. the House adjourned until Wednesday 15 February at 2 p.m.

HOUSE OF ASSEMBLY

Tuesday 14 February 1989

QUESTIONS ON NOTICE

REPLIES TO QUESTIONS

29. **The Hon. D.C. WOTTON (Heysen)**, on notice, asked the Minister of Emergency Services: Will answers be provided to Questions on Notice Nos 505 of Wednesday, 2 December 1987 and 628 to 632 of Wednesday, 23 March 1988 of the previous session and, if so, when?

The Hon. D.J. HOPGOOD: Questions on notice numbers 505 and 628 to 632 have now been answered.

SANTOS

47. **Mr BECKER (Hanson)**, on notice, asked the Minister of Mines and Energy: Do companies associated with Elders IXL, Elders Resources or Elders Finance have an interest of more than 15 per cent shareholding in Santos Limited and, if so, for how long and what action is the Government taking to enforce legislation limiting to 15 per cent an interest or shareholding in Santos by associated companies or individuals?

The Hon. J.H.C. KLUNDER: Inquiries have been made pursuant to the Santos (Regulation of Shareholding) Act to the Elders group of companies. The view of the Elders group is that on its interpretation of that Act none of the Elders companies is in breach of the Act nor is the group or part of it in breach.

However, the Act does lend itself to different interpretations. On another interpretation of the Act the total Elders shareholding in Santos Limited may have reached 15.2 per cent of the issued capital. I have had a meeting with the management of Elders Resource NZFP Limited. At this meeting it was agreed that that company would cause other subsidiary companies in its group not to subscribe for a current rights issue in Santos Limited to the extent and with the result that it would then be unarguable, because of the group's smaller proportionate interest, that there was a breach of the Santos (Regulation of Shareholding) Act. My department will of course continue to monitor the situation.

PROBATION AND PAROLE PROGRAMS

74. **Mr BECKER (Hanson)**, on notice, asked the Minister of Correctional Services:

1. Why is there an increase of 13.5 staff proposed in this financial year for probation and parole programs?

2. How will such programs reduce the recidivism rate?

The Hon. F.T. BLEVINS: The replies are as follows:

1. The Department of Correctional Services, Community Corrections Division, financial budget on the current year is for 4.8 staff expansion with a full year staffing expansion of 5.8. (The difference between the budget on the current year and a full year staffing is a calculation of the time delays that occur during the budgeting and recruiting processes prior to effecting the increases in staffing.)

This proposed 5.8 full year staffing increase has been endorsed by a Review of resource requirements undertaken by the Department of Personnel and Industrial Relations in April 1988 at the request of the Treasury Department, and is allocated to the Community Corrections Division as follows:

3.0 Community Service Officers
1.8 Probation and Parole Officers
1.0 Based Grade Clerical Officer.

Proposed for the 1987-88 year was a staffing level of 88.2 which resulted in an actual level of 82.8 (reduction due to workers compensation, vacancy recruiting delays and delayed program commencements). Proposed for the 1988-89 year is a staffing level of 96.3. The difference between the 1987-88 actual level (82.8) and the 1988-89 proposal (96.3) gives a figure of 13.5. However, the comparison of proposed figures in the 1987-88 year (88.2) and the 1988-89 year (96.3) gives a difference of 8.1, which is made up of:

4.8 staff (budget on the current year), plus

3.3 staff (fine default allocation, the additional full year staff from the 1987-88 budget).

2. The Community Corrections Division has non-custodial programs available for offenders to assist them in changing their lifestyles if they choose to accept that opportunity.

QUESTIONS ON NOTICE 474 AND 540

90. **Mr BECKER (Hanson)**, on notice, asked the Minister of Transport: Does the Minister intend to provide answers to Questions on Notice 474 and 540 of the past session and if so, will the Minister expedite replies and, if not, why not?

The Hon. G.F. KENEALLY: The reply is as follows:

Question on Notice No. 474:

I have contacted my colleague the Minister of Local Government and been advised she will respond direct regarding Question on Notice No. 474.

Question on Notice No. 540:

Department of Transport—

1. The Department of Transport has 39 motor vehicles attached to it. The classification level of officers who have received approval to take such vehicles home each day/night are:

EO3
EO2
EO1
AO5
EN5
EN4
CO6

2. The Department of Transport for the nine months to 31 March 1987 has paid \$10 230.12 in Fringe Benefits Tax. In addition, Fringe Benefits Tax amounting to \$11 616.69 has been paid for the period 1 April 1987 to 31 December 1987.

Department of Services and Supply—

1. The Department of Services and Supply has 624 motor vehicles attached to it. The classification level of officers who have received approval to take such vehicles home each day/night are:

EO5
EO2
EO1
SO5

2. The amount of Fringe Benefits Tax relating to this motor vehicle usage, paid by this department for the six months up to and including December 1987 is \$11 420.69.

Highways Department—

1. The Highways Department has a total of 665 light motor vehicles attached to it. The classification level of officers who have received approval to take such vehicles home each day/night are:

EO6
EO3
EO1
AO1
CO5

- CS2 to CS4
- EN1 to EN5
- SUP1 to SUP6
- TO1 to TO4, TO6
- TII

2. The total amount of fringe benefits tax relating to motor vehicle usage as at 31 December 1987 was \$30 651. State Transport Authority—

1. The authority has a light vehicle fleet made up as follows:

Sedans and Station Wagons	80
Vans	39
Utilities	41
	160

Twenty vehicles are taken home each night by managers, supervisors and foremen who may be required for out of hours duties or emergencies as follows:

- EO5 ½
- EO3
- EO2
- EO1
- AO4
- AO1
- Engineer 5
- Technical Officer 3
- Foreman 15
- Foreman 14
- Foreman 12
- Foreman 7
- Leading Hand Plumber

2. An amount of \$6 730 was paid in Fringe Benefits Tax for the financial year 1986-87 in connection with the use of motor vehicles.

SEPTIC TANK REGULATIONS

127. **Mr BECKER (Hanson)**, on notice, asked the Minister of Health:

1. What response has the Minister given to the Housing Industry Association's letter of 13 September 1988 concerning septic tank regulations?

2. Is it intended to charge \$100 per quarter inspection fee for septic tanks?

3. Has the Minister been advised that new regulations will add \$3 535 to the cost of the average septic tank and \$6 400 to the cost of a biochemical tank and, if so, what action is the Minister proposing to take to minimise such increases?

The Hon. F.T. BLEVINS: The replies are as follows:

1. A copy of my response will be provided to the member for Hanson.

2. There is a once-only fee of \$25 payable to the Central Board of Health for examination of the plans for a proposed septic tank and inspection of the tank after installation (Health Regulation 81 (15)).

The member for Hanson may be referring to the fee charged by private contractors to maintain an extended aerobic treatment system. One contractor presently charges, on average, \$60 per quarter in the metropolitan area for the maintenance of such systems.

3. Health Regulation 81 requires the prior approval of the Central Board of Health to be obtained before a septic tank is installed. From 1 June 1988, the Central Board has adopted revised criteria in assessing applications to install septic tanks.

The revised requirements were adopted by the Board following a review of the previous criteria by an Inter-Departmental working party. These criteria had existed since the 1940s and the review was undertaken as a result of the

wide and increasing incidence of failed septic tank systems and the Mount Lofty Ranges Review.

The previous Minister and the Resources and Physical Development Sub-Committee of Cabinet were advised that the average increased cost for a standard block with a standard system and slight gradients would be of the order of \$2 000 to \$2 500. Average costs over six country areas indicate an increased cost of \$2 000 for a subsurface disposal system. For a biochemical tank (aerobic treatment system), the cost within the greater metropolitan planning area is \$6 000-\$6 500, which is the cost of such a system and not any additional cost as a result of the changes in requirements.

Under the Health Act and regulations, the Central Board of Health is the authority responsible for the approval of septic tank systems. The board is not subject to ministerial direction. The board has been made aware of the concerns of industry, local government and members of the public about a range of issues relating to the revised requirements, including costs. Whilst understanding the concerns, the board considered the increased capacities were necessary to deal with widespread problems of failure of septic tank installation, and to provide standards comparable with those applying in other States.

A booklet detailing the new standards is available from the South Australian Health Commission. This will enable people to determine the type of system required for their particular area.

HOUSING ESTIMATES

141. **Mr M.J. EVANS (Elizabeth)**, on notice, asked the Minister of Housing and Construction: What are the details of the various constituent cost estimates which make up the proposed 1988-89 budget for the categories of Public Housing—Emergency Housing, and Policy Advice to the Minister (Program Estimates and Information, page 305) and Government Employee Housing—Support Activities (page 308)?

The Hon. T.H. HEMMINGS: The reply is as follows:

Public Housing:

(1) *Emergency Housing*—The 1988-89 budget of \$4.770 m for Emergency Housing comprises \$4.408 m in Commonwealth untied grants and \$0.362 m in State Government funding. These amounts represent an increase over 1987-88 funding in line with inflation.

(2) *Policy Advice to the Minister*—In 1988-89 this sub-program includes the following amounts:

	\$m
Salaries and wages	0.434
Administration expenses	0.154 (a)
International Year of Shelter for the Homeless	0.102
State Bank—HOME Administration Fee	0.707 (b)
Total	1.397

Notes:

(a) The 1988-89 allocation for administration expenses is \$75 000 higher than the 1987-88 allocation. This is due to the inclusion of workers compensation insurance and accommodation costs as administration expenses in 1988-89.

(b) Included under the debt servicing subprogram in 1987-88.

Government Employee Housing:

(1) *Support Activities*—1988-89 this subprogram includes the following amounts:

	\$m
Salaries wages and related payments	0.593
Administration expenses, minor equipment and sundries	0.950
Total	1.543

MOTOR REGISTRATION OFFICES

146. **Mr M.J. EVANS (Elizabeth)**, on notice, asked the Minister of Transport: What are the full-time equivalent approved staff establishment, the actual number of FTE staff now employed, the total number of annual transactions of all kinds and the total annual turnover in dollars for the past financial year for each of the regional motor vehicle registration offices and for the main Adelaide office?

The Hon. G.F. KENEALLY: The following table provides the information to answer Question on Notice No. 146.

Branch	Actual Clerical Staff Employed Oct 1988	Annual Cash Transactions 1987-88	Cash Transactions per staff member daily	Revenue Receipts 1987-88 \$	Revenue per staff member daily \$
Adelaide	69.3	641 821	37	87 484 388	5 050
Elizabeth	19.1	231 294	48	22 566 774	4 726
Marion	17.8	230 958	52	26 183 180	5 883
Mitcham	7.4	126 087	68	15 250 637	8 244
Modbury	11.8	166 052	56	17 901 797	6 068
Noarlunga	11.1	174 880	63	17 472 862	6 296
Port Adelaide	12.4	186 464	60	22 110 724	7 132
Prospect	14.6	199 279	54	22 651 895	6 206
Tranmere	6.8	159 606	94	19 161 903	11 271
V.E.B.	3	48 713	65	7 188 714	9 585
Berri	5	79 681	64	7 934 387	6 347
Kadina	3	54 011	72	5 431 040	7 241
Mount Gambier	7.1	124 658	71	13 461 835	7 584
Murray Bridge	5	83 811	67	8 422 618	6 738
Port Augusta	3	49 085	65	4 348 401	5 798
Port Lincoln	2	58 202	78	6 068 944	12 138
Port Pirie	4	67 998	68	6 787 876	6 788
Whyalla	4	60 929	49	5 252 371	5 252
	206.4	*2 743 529	62.8 ave	315 680 346	7 130 ave

* Statistics of non-cash transactions such as enquiries, telephone calls, advices of change of address, change of engine, notices of sale items of correspondence etc. are not readily available. Cash transactions only are shown.

The complement of staff is continually being reviewed and as such reflects the individual branch establishment at any time.

VISITS TO ITALY

148. **Mr LEWIS (Murray-Mallee)**, on notice, asked the Minister of Education representing the Attorney-General: Since January 1980 has the Attorney-General visited Plati or any other part of the Calabrian region of Italy and, if so—

- on how many occasions;
- what was the purpose of each visit;
- was a Mr Francesco Labbozzetta of Cabramatta, also known as Il Capo, involved in any way in the arrangement of any part of the itinerary of one or more of such visits and, if so, how?
- where was the Attorney-General accommodated and if he did not stay at a recognised hotel, who paid or met the cost of that accommodation; and
- who paid or met the cost of his transport?

The Hon. G.J. CRAFTER: The reply is as follows:

1. The only visit which the Attorney-General has made to Calabria was in November 1974. From April to November 1974, he was studying Italian at the University for Foreigners at Perugia in Umbria. In November, he made a tourist visit of ten days or so to the south of Italy, namely the regions of Campania, Calabria and Sicily. He travelled by train. In Calabria, he spent one night in Cosenza and then travelled by train to Catanzaro, and then on to Taor-

mina in Sicily. He met his own travel and accommodation expenses.

The Attorney-General has not visited Plati.

The answer to (c) is 'No'.

2. In light of the speculation surrounding the Attorney-General's visits to Italy, he has lodged with the Clerk of the Legislative Council details of his visits.

SGIC

149. **Mr M.J. EVANS (Elizabeth)**, on notice, asked the Treasurer: Are the life insurance premiums charged by SGIC substantially more than those charged by the New South Wales GIO for the same cover and, if so, why?

The Hon. J.C. BANNON: The policy conditions of SGIC and the N.S.W. GIO are not identical and therefore no precise comparison of the two can be made. Nevertheless, the rates charged are similar for similar coverage except where the sums insured are large.

The Commission believes the N.S.W. GIO has adopted a policy of charging low premiums for large sums insured as a deliberate marketing strategy. In this respect, it is important to note that rates charged by the GIO are not guaranteed and can be changed for existing policy holders at any time. By contrast, SGIC rates are guaranteed to age 80 and as a consequence cannot be increased.

ELIZABETH SPORTS GROUPS

152. **Mr M.J. EVANS (Elizabeth)**, on notice, asked the Minister of Recreation and Sport: Which sporting groups

based in the Elizabeth area (including the electorates of Elizabeth and Napier) have received any form of public funding in each of the past two years, what is the name of each club and how much did each receive?

The Hon. M.K. MAYES: No facilities funding was provided to individual sporting groups during the past two years, as Government funding for sports development is currently directed through State Associations. However, I refer to the reply to Mr Evans Question on Notice No. 36 (18 August 1988) in which Mr Evans sought similar information for various clubs at Elizabeth. Two Clubs, Nunga Netball Club and Kaurua United Football Club received funding under the 'Specific Populations Recreation and Sports Development Grants Scheme'. No other organisations in Elizabeth received funding under that scheme for that period.

The Minister of Recreation and Sport does not have access to data about public funding which may emanate from other sources e.g. Local Government, Federal Government and other State Departments, to clubs in the Elizabeth area.

CORPORATE AFFAIRS COMMISSION

153. **Mr M.J. EVANS (Elizabeth)**, on notice, asked the Minister of Education representing the Minister of Corporate Affairs: Which statutory and administrative functions of the Corporate Affairs Commission are computerised now and which functions will be computerised in the near future?

The Hon. G.J. CRAFTER: The Corporate Affairs Commission has maintained a computerised register of companies, business names, cooperatives, associations and other names at the Government Computing Centre since 1969. Each month a microfiche index of current registrations is produced for use of the Commission's staff and its clients. The system also provides indices of companies name changes and deregistered organisations. The companies and business names system issues notices requiring the lodgement of company annual returns and renewal of business name registrations. The system issues notices requiring lodgement of registered office and officers notices after incorporation. Notices seeking the lodgement of liquidators' and receivers' six monthly accounts are also issued.

During the last three years the Corporate Affairs Commission has implemented a range of micro-computer systems. The entry of information to the Companies and Business Names system has been converted from manually produced input forms to 'on-line' micro-computer based facilities.

New systems have been implemented to process interim names registrations, issue company penalty notices, record employee information, record transactions requiring response and support accounts surveillance activities by the Commission. A micro based system contains information from incorporated associations' triennial returns aimed at providing a financial profile of the associations industry. A new micro-computer system commenced in 1987 to improve the follow up and maintenance of details forming the register of associations.

Micro-computers are also used for input and reporting of revenue and expenditure information, monitoring of building societies and credit unions financial conditions and processing of data to support investigation of companies.

The Ministerial Council for Companies and Securities, of which I am presently Chairman, has devoted significant attentions to provision of computing developments at a national level. Of particular note is the March 1988 direc-

tion of the Council that all non-computerised Corporate Affairs Offices should proceed to implement a common system and join a national corporate information network, as a matter of priority.

I am pleased to say that Cabinet approved the implementation of a new registry computer system for the South Australian Corporate Affairs Commission in December 1988. The system will enable South Australia to meet the requirements of the Ministerial Council for a cooperative scheme network and also provide a range of improved services to private and public sector clients.

Clients will be able to obtain information regarding registered organisations by either a computer extract from the Commission or through subscribing to an on-line service. The system will aid actions to enforce document lodgement requirements of the Companies (South Australia) Code with the aim being to improve the currency of the public information held.

Primary registration functions including new names approval, registration of new organisations, compliance examination, deregistration and updating of the register will be directly assisted.

The on-line enquiry service will also assist staff to improve responsiveness to telephone enquiries. Some improvements in productivity will occur as a result of professional staff having more efficient access to information.

Completion of the loading of companies and business names information to the new system is scheduled for near the end of 1989.

JUSTICE INFORMATION SYSTEM

154. **Mr M.J. EVANS (Elizabeth)**, on notice, asked the Minister of Education representing the Attorney-General: Which statutory and administrative functions of the Department of Labour were originally intended to be included in the JIS as it was first approved, which functions will be included as it is now intended to be implemented, and what are the reasons for any changes?

The Hon G.J. CRAFTER: The June 1984 feasibility study of JIS which formed the basis for approval by Government to develop JIS included the following applications for the Department of Labour:

- Case Initiation
- Case Access
- Scheduling
- Maintenance of Case Record
- Operations Reporting
- Documentation Generation
- Prosecutions

This was refined during the preparation of the tender specifications and resulted, in some cases, in a combination of application areas or a splitting of them for the purpose of development and implementation. For example, the prosecutions application area was retitled industrial regulation. The tender specification listed the following application areas for the Department of Labour:

- Case Administration
- Case Access
- Operations Reporting
- Document (Text) Generation
- Document (Text) Storage and Retrieval/Analysis
- Accounting
- Industrial Regulation

The Department of Labour has implemented the following applications:

Award Text Maintenance and Enquiry
Award Publications
National Wage Rate Calculations

The department will early in 1989 implement the Dangerous Substances system which forms part of the Industrial Regulation area and which was included in the tender specification for JIS.

The Board of Management of the JIS is currently undertaking work which will further refine the definition of JIS following a reassessment of the project undertaken by the Government Management Board. Considerable work has been required following the Feasibility Study to develop and implement computer systems. During the detailed investigation and analysis stages, refinements and other changes are made, often to reflect changed environmental circumstances. The results of the work undertaken by the Board and the reassessment undertaken by the Government Management Board will be used to formulate the 1989-90 budget and budgets for future years. I will be pleased to provide more information during the budget process.

INDUSTRIAL LIAISON OFFICER

15. **Mr OLSEN (Leader of the Opposition)**, on notice, asked the Premier:

1. When was the position of Industrial Liaison Officer in the Department of the Premier and Cabinet, currently occupied by D. Melvin, created?

2. Before the position was filled, was it advertised and, if so, how, when and how many applicants were there?

3. Is it a permanent Public Service appointment and, if not, what is the classification?

4. What is the duty statement for the position?

5. What was Mr Melvin's previous employment immediately before taking this position?

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

1. Mr Melvin has been employed as a Ministerial Officer since 17 May 1983.

2. The Ministerial Appointment was not advertised.

3. Ministerial Appointments are not Public Service positions. Mr Melvin's classification is Ministerial Officer Grade 2.

4. Mr Melvin's duties are:

(a) Provide general policy advice primarily on industrial relations matters to the Premier and the Minister of Labour;

(b) Prepare drafts of Cabinet submissions as required;

(c) Liaise with members of Parliament, Public Service Departments, other ministerial officers and electorate staff and other persons as required;

(d) Receive community inquiries and delegations;

(e) Draft speeches, prepare speech notices and position papers for the Premier and Minister of Labour;

(f) Carry out letter and report writing and research work as directed;

(g) Accompany and/or represent the Premier or Minister of Labour when required;

(h) Other duties as required or as requested by the Premier or the Minister of Labour.

5. Immediately prior to accepting a Ministerial Appointment, Mr Melvin was employed as a Personal Assistant to Senator McLaren.

CABINET OFFICER

156. **Mr OLSEN (Leader of the Opposition)**, on notice, asked the Premier: Has a position of Principal Cabinet

Officer (Aboriginal Affairs) been created in the Department of the Premier and Cabinet and, if so—

(a) when;

(b) was the position advertised and if so, when, how and how many applicants were there;

(c) has the position been filled and if so, by whom;

(d) what is the duty statement; and

(e) what salary does the position carry?

The Hon. J.C. BANNON: The reply is as follows:

(a) A temporary position of Principal Cabinet Officer with responsibility primarily in Aboriginal Affairs matters was created on 25 May 1987.

(b) The position was not advertised.

(c) The occupant of the position is Ms S. Briton-Jones.

(d) The following is a summary of the duties of the position.

Provide advice to the Premier, Cabinet, Cabinet committees and relevant Ministers in relation to the better implementation of Government policies and the determination of priorities in Aboriginal Affairs, act as an adviser to Cabinet Committee on Aboriginal Affairs as required; take a leading role in the improvement of co-ordination and monitoring of effectiveness of Government policies and programs in Aboriginal Affairs.

(e) The salary of the position is \$53 493.

EDUCATION DEPARTMENT LAND

157. **Mr BECKER (Hanson)**, on notice, asked the Minister of Employment and Further Education: Did the Kingston College of TAFE pay rent for or purchase the land and buildings owned by the Education Department at Carlton Road, Camden Park when it took over the premises in 1977 and in either case, how much was the payment?

The Hon. L.M.F. ARNOLD: In 1977 both the Department of TAFE and Education Department were under one Minister and it was normal practice for land which was surplus to one Department's needs to be transferred to the other Department at no cost. There is no record of the Kingston College of TAFE paying rent or purchasing the land and buildings.

GOVERNMENT VEHICLES

158. **Mr BECKER (Hanson)**, on notice, asked the Minister of Transport:

1. What Government business was being conducted at approximately 5.15 p.m. on Friday 18 November at Adelphi Terrace, Glenelg North requiring the presence of the following Government motor vehicles:

UQN 449, UQJ 414, UQO 171, UQE 087, UQJ 412, UQH 840?

2. To which department and to whom is each vehicle issued and why?

The Hon. G.F. KENEALLY: On Friday 18 November none of these vehicles were at Adelphi Terrace, Glenelg at the time stated.

UQN-449 is on long-term hire to SACON. This vehicle was at Netley at this time.

UQO-171 was on hire to the Department of State Development and Technology, and was at Port Adelaide at the time.

UQJ-412 is a Car Pool vehicle, and was not out on hire at the time.

The vehicles UQJ-414, UQE-087 and UQH-840 are all either owned by the Education Department or on long-term hire to the Education Department.

It should be noted however, that on Thursday 17 November all of these vehicles were parked at Adelphi Terrace, Glenelg, while their occupants were attending a Conference held for District Building Officers and Regional Managers from SACON to talk to representatives from the Education Department.

159. Mr **BECKER (Hanson)**, on notice, asked the Minister of Transport:

1. To which Government department does vehicle No. UQN-466 belong?

2. What Government business was the driver of this vehicle conducting at approximately 1.35 p.m. at Marion Shopping Centre on Friday 18 November 1988?

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

1. The vehicle UQN-466 belongs to Southern Domiciliary Care.

2. A staff member was taking a patient out shopping.

PREMIER'S OVERSEAS VISIT

160. Mr **S.J. BAKER (Mitcham)**, on notice, asked the Premier: Who were the public servants who accompanied the Premier on the recent promotional trip to Europe, how many business people undertook the trip and what was the total cost of the trip to the Government?

The Hon. J.C. BANNON: I refer the member to the answer provided to Mr Olsen on 30 November 1988, in reply to a question asked during Estimates Committee (see *Hansard*—page 1763).

The total estimated net cost of the mission to the Government including airfares, accommodation, travel expenses and seminars is A\$223 167.

DPIR OFFICERS

161. Mr **S.J. BAKER (Mitcham)**, on notice, asked the Minister of Labour:

1. How many officers of the Department of Personnel and Industrial Relations have received permission from the Director to operate a private business or hold a second job and how many sick days were taken by such officers in 1987-88?

2. How many, if any, have been given permission to carry on such business during normal working hours and how many sick days were taken by such officers in 1987-88?

The Hon. R.G. GREGORY: The Commissioner for Public Employment or his delegate has granted permission for nine officers to engage in outside employment in 1987-88. A total of 57 sick days were taken by these nine officers. No approvals for permission to carry on such business during normal working hours were granted.

REMM CONTRACT

162. Mr **S.J. BAKER (Mitcham)**, on notice, asked the Minister of Labour: Following discussions held with Remm on the \$45 million metal fabrication contract granted to an interstate firm, can the Minister supply details of how much of the work, in percentage terms (by value) will be carried out in this State?

The Hon. R.G. GREGORY: Discussions did take place in my office Conference Room between various parties involved in the Remm development over the granting of the metal fabrication contract. As to the commercial decisions taken by Remm as to that contract I would suggest that the Member contact Remm directly.

CENTRAL LINEN SERVICE

164. Mr **S.J. BAKER (Mitcham)**, on notice, asked the Minister of Health: Do any employees of Central Linen Service have their taxi fares paid to and from work and if so, how many, of what status and for what reason?

The Hon. F.T. BLEVINS: Under normal circumstances, no employees of the Central Linen Service have taxi fares paid to or from work. Occasionally there may be times when an employee is required to attend work at times outside their normal shift. Shift hours extend from 5.00 a.m. to 11.30 p.m. and when public transport is not available or personal safety could be at risk, the cost of taxi fares is met by the organisation. These cases are infrequent and are considered on the individual merits of each case. All employees are treated equally.

165. Mr **S.J. BAKER (Mitcham)**, on notice, asked the Minister of Health: Has the Central Linen Service involved itself in the supply of linen interstate and, if so, with what organisations, on what basis and has any interstate laundry defaulted on such contracts and, if so, what was the amount of stock (inventory terms) held by Central Linen Service at the time to meet the contract?

The Hon. F.T. BLEVINS: The Central Linen Service is a successful linen service enterprise and is one of the State's largest buyers of textiles. As part of its normal trading operations the Central Linen Service sells linen, in particular health care products, to its immediate trading competitors and is working hard to establish consistent sales levels to interstate clients. The service also acts as a sales agent for the State Clothing Corporation. With these business arrangements normal commercial margins apply.

As with any trading organisation, orders are accepted, modified (up or down) prior to delivery, and in some cases even cancelled. No clients, intra or interstate have defaulted with the consequence of a financial loss to any part.

166. Mr **S.J. BAKER (Mitcham)**, on notice, asked the Minister of Health: How many relatives of senior and office staff at the Central Linen Service have been appointed to Central Linen Service since 1984 and has the Department of Personnel and Industrial Relations been requested to investigate this matter?

The Hon. F.T. BLEVINS: Since 1984, seven relatives of senior and office staff have been employed at the Central Linen Service of a total of 207 appointments.

The Department of Personnel and Industrial Relations recently reported to the Commissioner for Public Employment on the issue of nepotism. While this report stated that DPIR were reasonably satisfied that no deliberately unfair employment practices had been introduced and maintained in the service, action has been taken to ensure all future personnel practices at the Central Linen Service are appropriate.

W.P. CROWHURST PTY LTD

167. Mr **BECKER (Hanson)**, on notice, asked the Minister for Environment and Planning:

1. Is there any risk to the local residential environment from hazardous products stored at the premises of W.P. Crowhurst Pty Ltd, 37 Belford Avenue, Devon Park and, if so, in what ways and what action has the Department of Environment and Planning taken to ensure the risk to residents is contained?

2. Is there any air pollution caused by activities of W.P. Crowhurst Pty Ltd's operations?

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

1. The hazardous substances stored at the premises of W.P. Crowhurst Pty Ltd, Devon Park, are paint solvents. The quantity and method of storage is such that minimal danger would be posed to the public in the event of a fire on the premises.

2. The material processed on the premises does not create emissions that infringe the Clean Air Act.

170. **Mr BECKER (Hanson)**, on notice, asked the Minister of Labour:

1. Has the Department of Labour inspected the premises of W.P. Crowhurst Pty Ltd of 37 Belford Avenue, Devon Park and, if so, do the premises provide a safe working environment and conform with regulations concerning health, welfare and safety?

2. Are any hazardous products stored on the premises and, if so, are such substances dangerous to employees?

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

1. The Department of Labour carried out inspections late in 1987, prior to the introduction of the Occupational Health, Safety and Welfare Act (1986) on 30 November 1987. The findings were that the premises provided a safe working environment, and conformed with legislative requirements.

The company is registered with the Department of Labour pursuant to the Occupational Health, Safety and Welfare Act. It has a written safety policy, rehabilitation policy, a fire safety policy which includes emergency evacuation plans for its employees. Fire evacuation is practised on a regular basis and all employees are trained in the use of fire appliances and apparatus by Chubb Security. To assist in maintaining a safe work place the company has five elected safety representatives and a safety committee which reports to the Board of Directors.

The company has had only one reportable work injury this year which has resulted in an employee being away for three days or more. This would indicate an excellent safety record; there are some 90 employees at this address.

2. The company has a licence to store dangerous substances in accordance with the Dangerous Substances Act. The dangerous substances stored on the premises are class 3 flammable liquids which include solvents, paints and manufactured products. These are stored in underground tanks and in 200-litre drums, total storage amounts to 177 kilolitres. Obviously these substances can be dangerous to employees if ventilation is inadequate and fire protection is not given a high priority.

The South Australian Metropolitan Fire Service has carried out an audit of these premises and I understand that its recommendations have been carried out. The company is currently tendering for a complete fire suppression and detection system which when completed will be in excess of current legislative requirements.

In conclusion, the view of the Department of Labour is that the company is aware of the safety problems associated with paint manufacture and its management have always cooperated with the department in a positive manner to continually upgrade the premises to enhance the safety aspects of its operations.

ISLAND SEAWAY

171. **Mr BECKER (Hanson)**, on notice, asked the Minister of Transport:

1. Were tenders called for work to improve ventilation on the *Island Seaway*?

2. Which company was awarded the contract?

3. How much will the work to be carried out cost?

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

1. Tenders were not called for the ventilation modifications for the following reasons:

(a) the work was carried out by Howard Smith who project-managed the work and sub-contracted the various tasks to various contractors. This was logical given Howard Smith's experience in ship modifications and their role as operators. Having the work project-managed by the operator facilitated coordination between modification work and the sailing schedule.

(b) given that the work involved modifications to an existing system rather than design and construction of a new system, and given that the work schedule had to fit in with the sailing schedule, the work did not lend itself to a lump sum tender process.

2. The companies who carried out the various elements of the modifications for Howard Smith and the costs of that work are set out below:

	\$
(a) Honeywell Pty Ltd.	
Design of replacement system; provision of new fans and alterations.	
Honeywell was the original ventilation sub-contractor (the performance specification was the responsibility of the vessel designer rather than the sub-contractor).	168 000
(b) Barnes & Fleck	
Review of the design, conduct of trials.	15 600
(c) C.M. Lowe	
New electrical supply; cables and controls.	79 000
(d) Perry Engineering	
Design of structural steel modifications.	11 600
Fabrication and installation.	206 400
(e) Wormald	
Consequential modifications to auto fire protection.	6 000
Sundry sub-contractors.	5 500
DMH costs	1 700
Total	494 400

This cost came within the project costs of \$16.4 million.

REPATRIATION HOSPITAL

172. **Mr BECKER (Hanson)**, on notice, asked the Minister of Health:

1. What are the 'certain conditions' the Government has sought in accepting the takeover of the Repatriation General Hospital?

2. What agreement has been made with the Commonwealth Government for the integration of the Repatriation General Hospital with the South Australian Health Commission by 1990 and was the Minister aware of the agreement when he replied to the question asked by the Member for Mitchell on 5 October 1988?

The Hon. F.T. BLEVINS: The replies are as follows:

1. The conditions were outlined in the Minister of Health's reply to the question from the Member for Mitchell on 5 October 1988.

2. No agreement has been made with the Commonwealth Government for the integration of the Repatriation General Hospital with the South Australian Health Commission by 1990.

Although the tentative date for the transfer has been set as 1 July 1995, it will only occur if the Returned Soldiers League is satisfied with the arrangements proposed and hospital staff are satisfied that their interests have been adequately safeguarded.

2. Yes.

The salary subsidy is designed to assist organisations to develop competent, professional management, with the association accepting an increased commitment to paying for the Executive Officer. Thus the reduction in 1988-89.

In 1987-88 an extraordinary grant for special projects was provided to the association to assist it to furnish the Douglas Scrub Camp and to encourage disadvantaged children to become members.

In making recommendations about this year's grants the salary subsidy commitment by the department was taken into account (\$4 000) and an amount of \$6 000 in additional funds were provided, broadly earmarked for membership development and promotion.

GIRL GUIDES ASSOCIATION

173. Mr LEWIS (Murray-Mallee), on notice, asked the Minister of Recreation and Sport:

1. Has the grant to the Girl Guides Association been cut from \$22 500 a year to \$10 000?

2. Has an assessment been made of the contribution which this association does make, has made and can and will continue to make to the development of responsible citizens among girls in South Australia today and, if so, what were the factors taken into account in fixing the amount of the grant?

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

1. Yes. See below:

	Salary Subsidy \$	Project/Program Funds \$	Total \$
1987-88...	8 000	13 625	21 625
1988-89...	4 000	6 000	10 000

LAND TAX

174. Mr S.G. EVANS (Davenport), on notice, asked the Premier: When will the Premier provide the report he promised relating to the .5 per cent land tax on properties valued at over \$200 000 during debate on the Land Tax Act Amendment Bill (*Hansard*, page 798)?

The Hon. J.C. BANNON: The reply is as follows:

- (a) The levy which applies to properties over \$200 000 valuation within the metropolitan area is 0.5 cents per \$10 which represents 0.05 per cent not 0.5 per cent as stated. It is estimated to produce revenue of \$1 056 000 in 1988-89.
- (b) The original intention was to use the funds to assist in the provision of parks and open space areas and the development of facilities for such areas.
- (c) The proceeds of the levy are paid into general revenue and help to finance the provision of parks and open space areas and the development of facilities for such areas.