HOUSE OF ASSEMBLY

Tuesday 19 March 1991

The SPEAKER (Hon. N.T. Peterson) took the Chair at 2 p.m. and read prayers.

ASSENT TO BILLS

Her Excellency the Governor, by message, intimated her assent to the following Bills:
Education Act Amendment,
Valuation of Land Act Amendment.

PETITION: MOUNT LOFTY REDEVELOPMENT

A petition signed by 18 residents of South Australia requesting that the House urge the Government to limit the prohibitions on development in the Mount Lofty Ranges as ordered by the supplementary development plans was presented by the Hon. Ted Chapman.

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 106, 167, 297, 333, 336, 340, 441, 446, 450, 456, 461, 466, 471, 473, 478, 487, 488 to 501, 503, 504, 506, 508 to 511, 513, 515, 517, 545 and 550; and I direct that the following answers to questions without notice be distributed and printed in *Hansard*.

COMMERCIAL TENANCY LAWS

In reply to **Mr GROOM (Hartley)** 13 February.

The Hon. G.J. CRAFTER: On 13 February 1991 the member for Hartley asked me, representing the Minister of Consumer Affairs, to give appropriate instructions to ensure that the new commercial tenancies laws come into effect without undue delay. The honourable member's longstanding interest in protecting small commercial tenants is well known. He will therefore be aware that some amendments to the Landlord and Tenant Act designed to protect small business, made by Parliament at the end of last year, have already come into operation. Thus, landlords must bear the cost of land tax under new tenancy agreements entered into after 15 November 1990. Since 22 November 1990 landlords have not been able to force retail tenants to open their shops for extended trading hours.

There will be no undue delay in bringing into operation the other important reforms passed by Parliament late last year. Soon after their passage, interested landlords, tenants and agents were asked to comment on the regulations necessary to bring the remaining amendments into effect. The responses of individuals and bodies such as the Real Estate Institute, Building Owners and Managers Association, Retail Traders Association, Law Society and Land Brokers Society were received in late January and early February.

Consultation with interested parties on the content of regulations is continuing, but in view of the legitimate concerns expressed by commercial tenants and their representatives, the Government has decided that a number of significant amendments should be proclaimed regulations. Thus, the amendments which extend the Act's protection to agreements with an annual rental of up to $200 000 will begin to operate in mid March. Similarly, new sections 61a and 61b dealing with the registration of lease agreements and the cost of their preparation will begin operating at that time to protect tenants. After the new regulations have been settled, a suitable lead time (for the printing of new forms and education of landlords about their use) must be allowed, but the Government is determined to bring all of these important reforms into operation as soon as possible.

WORKCOVER

In reply to **Hon. H. ALLISON (Mount Gambier)** 14 February.

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

1. Administration Costs

In April 1989 the WorkCover Corporation merged with the WorkCover Agency, which was administered by SGIC. Prior to that the administration costs of the agency formed part of the claims agents fee. A true comparison of administration costs for 1989-90 and 1988-89 is:

	1988-89 $'000	1989-90 $'000
Claims Agent Fees	18 944	—
Administration costs	12 997	35 668
	$31 941	$35 668

The increase in 1989-90 of $3 727 000 was largely due to inflation and the re-assessment of the development costs of the existing claim and levy system with the expected implementation of the corporation's new computing system in 1990-91, resulting in an additional amortisation of $794 000 in 1989-90.

2. Accommodation Costs

Prior to the merger of the WorkCover agency in April 1989, the accommodation costs for the first nine months of 1988-89 form part of the claims agents fee. Costs incurred in 1989-90 for accommodation were from leases for properties necessary to accommodate WorkCover staff prior to amalgamation into the Henry Waymouth Building. With the rent free period for this building no rental for Henry Waymouth Building was paid by WorkCover in 1989-90. All other leases have now been sublet or terminated with the exception of a small area at 41 Currie Street which is under negotiation.

STATE BANK

In reply to **Mr INGERSON (Bragg)** 19 February.

The Hon. J.C. BANNON: I have been advised by the Auditor-General that, after receiving allegations regarding the removal of bank documents at 4.15 p.m. on 15 February 1991, the Deputy Auditor-General immediately contacted the Chief Executive Officer of the bank and raised this matter with him. Assurance was received from the Chief Executive Officer of the bank that he would investigate the allegations with officers of the bank's data processing centre. Subsequently, officers of the Auditor-General's Department have visited the data processing centre and reviewed security arrangements at the centre, having particular regard to arrangements for shredding at the centre.

I have been informed that in normal circumstances shredding undertaken at the data processing centre involves the destruction of surplus and spoilt computer print arising from production of hard copy computer information for

the bank and its customers. Such material includes customer account statements, transaction list and control reports. However, the bank's Chief Executive Officer, on being contacted on Friday 15 February at 4.20 p.m., confirmed that he had instructed all bank areas of operations not to undertake any shredding and he again contacted Findon to ensure that there was compliance with his direction. This was confirmed.

In reply to **Mr D.S. BAKER (Leader of the Opposition)** 7 March.

The Hon. J.C. BANNON: I have been informed by the State Bank that the State Bank Group has 20 off balance sheet entities in New Zealand: 9 for the bank and 11 for Beneficial Finance.

MINISTERIAL STATEMENT: FRUIT-FLY

The Hon. LYNN ARNOLD (Minister of Agriculture): I seek leave to make a statement.

Leave granted.

The Hon. LYNN ARNOLD: I wish to advise members of the progress of the Government's efforts to bring the fruit fly outbreak in the Riverland under control. Following the trapping of three Queensland fruit-flies in the Department of Agriculture's lure grid system an outbreak was declared on Friday 15 March. The department then immediately implemented an eradication program. Members may be aware that we have since trapped a fourth fruit-fly. Fortunately, it was within the outbreak area and will not result in any widening or extension of the area currently under treatment.

By the afternoon of 16 March all properties within a 400 metre radius of the outbreak had been fully baited using a chemical attractant which is 97 per cent water, 2 per cent protien and 1 per cent malathion. The chemical is used at a rate considerably less than that found in common treatments for head lice in humans. An intensive trapping grid within a 1.5 km radius of the outbreak was completely baited by 18 March and a second baiting of what is known as the 'red zone', 400 metres from the outbreak, had been baited a second time. The red zone is being baited twice a week and the outer zone of 1.5 km radius is being baited once a week. This will continue for 12 weeks. The intensive trapping grid within the 1.5 km eradication area is being examined daily for further evidence of fruit-fly.

The total area to be treated is approximately 708 hectares, which includes 200 hectares of cereal stubble which obviously will not be affected. All growers and their families have been very cooperative and the Department of Agriculture has been able to fit its baiting program in with the normal harvesting and irrigation schedules. There have been extensive negotiations taking place between the department and exporters, processors and interstate quarantine authorities to ensure South Australia's access to interstate markets is maintained as far as is practicable.

It is important to realise that the Riverland no longer enjoys area freedom status in terms of interstate trade. As a consequence, fresh fruits and vegetables known to be fruit-fly hosts must meet specific interstate conditions of entry. The impact on the Riverland of this outbreak is very serious. The horticulture industry in that region is worth $170 million. It will only be through the combined and consistent efforts of the whole community, in concert with the Government, that we will bring this outbreak under control and thus preserve for South Australia its valuable horticultural industries.

PAPERS TABLED

The following papers were laid on the table:

By the Minister of Education (Hon. G.J. Crafter)—
- Director-General of Education—Report, 1989-90.
- Local and District Criminal Courts Act 1926—District Criminal Court Rules—Criminal Proceedings.
- Trustee Act 1936—Regulation—Custom Credit Corporation.

By the Minister of Transport (Hon. Frank Blevins)—
- Metropolitan Taxi-Cab Act 1956—Issues of Licences, 27 February 1991.

By the Minister of Occupational Health and Safety (Hon. R.J. Gregory)—
- Occupational Health, Safety and Welfare Act 1985—Regulations (3)—
  - Asbestos Work Processes.
  - Construction Safety—Asbestos.
  - Industrial Safety—Asbestos.

By the Minister of Employment and Further Education (Hon. M.D. Rann)—
- Corporation of Port Lincoln—By-law No. 25—Dogs.

QUESTION TIME

STATE BANK

Mr D.S. BAKER (Leader of the Opposition): Can the Treasurer, as Minister responsible for the State Bank, indicate what further expert advice has been provided since 12 February concerning the size of the State Bank Group's non-performing loan portfolio, the present value of the group's loss and the likely timing of the draw-down of the balance in the Government's $970 million special deposit account? In his statement of 12 February the Treasurer said:

> The Government was committed to meeting any differences as they emerge between the book value of the principal amount of the bank group's loans and related assets and their realisable value... the present value of these differences is estimated at $990 million... an amount of $500 million has already been paid from the special account to the State Bank.

It is now five weeks since that estimate was made.

The Hon. J.C. BANNON: Further intensive work has been done in this area involving, of course, the bank's advisers, J.P. Morgan, and the State Bank itself. The board, under the new Chairman (Nobby Clark), met last Wednesday to look at progress. In terms of figures, although there are no further or new figures to be presented, and as far as the Government's allocation under the indemnity fund is concerned, Mr Robert Martin of the Crown Solicitor's Office has a brief to supervise and look at the details of requests for particular work-out provisions, which will come and draw on the fund as appropriate. He has been doing some quite intensive work in that area.

Management changes have taken place in the bank in recent days. The Chairman, Mr Clark, advises that one of the priorities is to set in place a top management team to look specifically at that work-out area. I think that the experience of all banks has been that it is very difficult if one tries to associate the lending group with those who are assessing or managing the various loan portfolios. Those who are doing the business of the bank should be allowed to get on with that, because it is important that the bank keeps trading and operating, while another team looks specifically at the problem or non-performing loan area and works that through. As I said, quite intensive work is going on. The new Chairman has settled in well and I hope to be getting periodic reports from him either directly or through our Government group.

MULTIFUNCTION POLIS

Mr HOLLOWAY (Mitchell): Will the Premier advise the House of the outcome of the meeting of the MFP International Advisory Board which was held in Adelaide yesterday?

The Hon. J.C. BANNON: This inaugural meeting of the International Advisory Board could be called a quite considerable success. It undoubtedly marks a further stage in trying to bring to reality this extremely exciting concept and opportunity. Of course, we are not there yet. I have to make clear again that we are awaiting the final report of the management group, which will be finalised around the end of the month and which is due to be presented some time through April to the State and Federal Governments. From what I hear of progress on that, apart from the interim report that was released in January, that is going very well in terms of both the technical assessment of the site and the marketing and business opportunities for the MFP.

A number of quite detailed feasibility studies have been conducted into some very exciting opportunities. As Mr Will Bailey, the co-Chairman of the International Advisory Board, said yesterday, this project must be private sector driven. Obviously, the Government will be providing support, infrastructure, and the sorts of things one would expect in these areas but, essentially, we have to see some commercial opportunities arising from it.

I think that people could not fail but be impressed by the quality of the International Advisory Board that has been assembled. Mr Saito, who is the co-Chairman, is the Director and honorary Chairman of the Nippon Steel Corporation and is regarded as the father of the modern Japanese industrial revival. He is an extremely eminent figure in international circles and has been doing business in Australia since 1951. In fact, he recalls staying at the old South Australia Hotel on a visit to Adelaide in the 1950s and negotiation there. His presence on the board, with a number of his colleagues, such as Mr Tamaki, who is the Managing Director of the Industrial Bank of Japan, obviously gives it an important status. In addition, we have Mr Philip Hughes, the former Chairman of Logica, representing the United Kingdom interest; Mr Koo, from Lucky-Goldstar International Corporation, the biggest international corporation in the Republic of Korea; Professor Bill Miller, the honorary Chairman of the Stanford Research Institute International, again a world known figure who has been an adviser, among other things, in the recent developments in Eastern Europe in terms of the economic revival of what might be done there; Mr Stan Shih, the Chairman and Chief Executive Officer of ACER Incorporated, which is Taiwan-based, so we have two of the four tigers represented directly on the International Advisory Board; Mr Bert-Olof Svanholm, who is the President of ASEA Brown Boveri, one of the biggest international companies from Sweden; and two Australian representatives in addition to Mr Bailey, Mr Ross Adler, who is also Chairman of the managing group, and Mr Roger Allen of Computer Power. So, they are the members of the board who assembled yesterday.

It would be very difficult for Adelaide, for South Australia, indeed for Australia, to attract such a high-powered group concentrating its attention on opportunities here in Australia. We have been able to do this through the MFP. A couple of members were not able to be present. For instance, Dr Cartillieri, the German delegate, was not able to attend on this occasion, but he expects to be coming to Adelaide separately at some stage to get an up-to-date briefing on the project. Also, we had a last minute apology from the Thailand representative: in consequence of political changes in that country he had gone from being a business representative on the International Advisory Board to being the Deputy Prime Minister, and he felt that his new duties precluded him from attending the meeting.

That is an indication of the quality of the people who are prepared to work with us on this enterprise. Yesterday, they made a quite specific commitment to a series of tasks that will significantly advance the project. They are looking at identifying the business opportunities that could flow from it and have agreed to test and trial market the MFP-Adelaide concept within their own business networks in their home countries. This will give us a very important conduit into those economies.

Another interesting development was an agreement by the European members of the board—two of whom, the German and French representatives, were not able to be present—to form a European MFP interest group to raise awareness of the MFP within the European community generally. That is a very powerful group consisting of five or six individuals who will be able to make a major contribution. There will be a report of the meeting and each member of the board has agreed to prepare written submissions that can be taken into account in the ongoing considerations.

The board has agreed to assemble again in Adelaide in October this year. The date of that meeting has not been finalised, but somewhere around that time, all going well, we should see that high-powered group meeting again in Adelaide with, of course, all the benefits that will flow from that. A comment by the Australian Co-Chairman (Mr Will Bailey) is well worth highlighting in terms of the upshot of this meeting. In response to a question about whether the current recession will affect the MFP, he made the point that the current economic difficulties facing Australia—and, indeed, South Australia—give the project even more importance, relevance and significance. His remarks about the problem of availability of capital in the world at the moment have been highlighted, but those comments must be put in the context in which he raised them—that in a time of recession, where there is a constraint on international capital, we need a focus, a project, that can have some other or different attributes to attract attention and investment.

The MFP has potential in all those areas, and I am sure that all members will look forward very keenly to the report of the group of the management board, to that report proving up the feasibility and the possibilities of this project, and to seeing a commitment made by the Federal Government so that we can get on with it.

STATE BANK

Mr S.J. BAKER (Deputy Leader of the Opposition): As Minister responsible for the State Bank, can the Treasurer advise the House how the bank is funding the interest forgone on its non-performing loans? Under the terms of the indemnity deed with the State Bank, the Government has agreed to contribute money in respect of bank losses in terms of principal and capitalised interest up to the date of the indemnity. This seems not to include the annual interest forgone, which could be as high as $200 million, on the remainder of the estimated $2.5 billion non-performing loan portfolio not written off as a loss.

The Hon. J.C. BANNON: The bank will have to handle that in the normal way. As I explained when we established the indemnity fund, that was the best estimate at the time of the amount that was required, and part of that was paid immediately into the bank. A further amount is held pend-

ing the work out of loans and the requirements of the bank. That figure is not inflexible. I hope very much that we might not see a full call made. On the other hand, we could indeed be required to provide some more over time but, in terms of handling that particular interest component to which the honourable member refers, that is something that the bank must try to work through itself.

PUMPING STATION POWER CUTS

Mr HAMILTON (Albert Park): Is the Minister for Environment and Planning aware of allegations that a power failure at West Lakes on Thursday 7 March 1991 caused the failure of the E&WS Department's pumping equipment, which resulted in the flooding of a number of dwellings in Sunrise Court at West Lakes? The Minister would be well aware that last year something similar occurred in a number of other residences on West Lakes Boulevard, and my constituents in Sunrise Court are equally concerned about this issue.

The Hon. S.M. LENEHAN: I am aware of the matter to which the honourable member refers. At 8.15 on 7 March an electrical power failure occurred, which caused a number of pumping stations in the sewerage system to shut down, one of which stations was situated on West Lakes Boulevard. A senior supervisor with the E&WS Department who was sent to assess the situation contacted the Electricity Trust to determine the likely duration of this power failure.

He then personally called on residents in Sunrise Court, West Lakes, to reassure them that the West Lakes Boulevard pumping station had a storage capacity of at least five hours, that there was no cause for immediate alarm and that in the period since the last flooding instance to which the honourable member refers and which I am sure members of the House will recall because the honourable member was kind enough to raise it with me in the House a reflex valve had been fitted to the Lakeside Village to prevent back flooding from the main on West Lakes Boulevard.

As it turned out, the electricity was restored at about 10.40 p.m. and pumping resumed. We take this matter so seriously that I ask the honourable member to inform his constituents that further modification of the system during the coming weeks will ensure that, in the case of prolonged power failures, sewerage from the West Lakes Boulevard pumping station will now overflow into an adjacent system. As well as that, an alarm system is being installed that will ensure that flows to the West Lakes Boulevard pumping station are diverted before a significant reservoir of sewerage accumulates at the pumping station.

As a result of these latest modifications, residents of Sunrise Court and other lower lying areas of West Lakes can be assured that, while the system might occasionally produce some gurgling noises from time to time during power failures, there will not be further overflows of the kind that had occasionally occurred in the past from the overflow of the main on West Lakes Boulevard. I can assure the honourable member that there was no flooding on the 7th, and ask him to pass on to his constituents the assurance that I believe that flooding will not occur in the future.

STATE BANK

The Hon. D.C. WOTTON (Heysen): My question is directed to the Treasurer as the Minister responsible for the State Bank. Does the Government's decision not to sell a large parcel of South Australian State Bank managed mortgages to Japanese interests also cover proposals from other interests? I have viewed documents which indicate that Legal and General, as well as the Industrial Bank of Japan, support a proposal to sell around $500 million worth of State Bank mortgages, possibly including HomeStart mortgages, to outside interests.

The Hon. J.C. BANNON: I do not know what the reference to HomeStart mortgages is because that, in fact, was dealt with, I think last week. The honourable member mentions the IBJ in relation to the purchasing of the HomeStart loan portfolio, which is not for sale. It was an unsolicited approach from some middle man, not by the bank directly. Indeed, the initial inquiry of the IBJ is that it did not know anything about it. I am not sure what is the situation: all I can say is that from the perspective of SAFA those loans are not for sale. As to other aspects of the honourable member's question, I will obtain a report for him.

1990 GRAND PRIX

Mr McKEE (Gilles): Will the Premier give the House any information concerning the likely financial result of the 1990 Grand Prix? An article in the *Advertiser* of 18 March 1991 stated that the result of the Indy Car Race on Queensland's Gold Coast was expected to be a loss of $7 million due to poor attendance.

The Hon. J.C. BANNON: First, I suppose in answer to the honourable member one ought to clarify what one means by 'profit and loss' in relation to these events. As I said at the time when we sought the Grand Prix in 1985, if the underwriting cost to Government was between $1.5 million and $2 million (this is in 1984-85 dollars), we would be doing very well indeed for the tremendous return we would get for that kind of outlay. In fact, over the years we have not had to put up anything like that amount of money; indeed, in 1988 a book profit was made by the event. So, we are well within our parameters—in fact, we are way ahead in terms of that notional outlay as far as the event is concerned.

On the other side of the coin, the studies that have been commissioned and undertaken on behalf of the Grand Prix Board by Price Waterhouse have indicated the enormous return to the community and, therefore, the indirect or clawback effect that comes to Government from staging the event. In 1988, their estimate was that $26.6 million worth of cash was put into the South Australian economy in consequence of the event. The 1990 survey showed a net direct economic impact in the order of $32 million in that year. So, it really is an event that generates an extraordinary return for the underwriting that is provided by Government.

In fact, as Price Waterhouse put it, 'The Grand Prix is an integral part of a complex jigsaw puzzle representing investment, trade and tourist promotion in South Australia. Without it, the puzzle would be incomplete. By itself, the Grand Prix represents only part of the picture.' Therefore, in terms of our overall or net return, there is no question that the event is way ahead of those financial projections.

I set that against the explanation that the honourable member gave on the Indy event in Queensland. I do not know the validity of the so-called $7 million loss that has been stated there. Certainly, we are aware of an enormous amount of capital expenditure that went into staging that event. Certainly, we are aware that the crowd expectations fell way below what was estimated, and that must have had an impact on revenue stream. However, I notice the Queensland Premier, Mr Goss, is still saying that despite that there are major economic benefits to Queensland. I am

not sure whether he intends to commission the sort of study we commissioned which actually pins down some of those benefits, but I am sure that if he does he will find there are benefits; there is no question of that. The Indy race obviously had a lot of problems, it was not sanctioned by the FIA, and the way in which it was set up and established was not good for overall motor sport in Australia.

We can, obviously, have major concerns about the threats of retaliation by the FIA. Having said all of that, I believe that, if the organisers can get their act together, the Indy may generate a broader interest in motor sport. It certainly does not represent a threat to our Grand Prix except in so far as it is held outside the international rules. I think, as a matter of urgency, the Queensland Government and the organisers need to address that point because it will be very bad for the country if other events are put in jeopardy just to stage this event, the return for which is obviously not as great or, indeed, may be doubtful.

As far as the Adelaide Grand Prix is concerned, while the audited accounts are not available as yet, preliminary results indicate that it will be coming in, in terms of the underwriting requirements, at around the $2 million mark which, I think, is very good set against the major capital expenditure that we had to undertake on upgrading the 1990 and 1991 events.

However, as I say, this is really a question of accounting and how one does the accounts, and at the time they are finalised and published we will have a series of ways of looking at it just to reinforce the great benefit that this event brings to us. I would hope that they will be available some time towards the end of April. While the House will not be sitting then, I hope that we can announce the figures, and I will certainly table them when the House resumes.

STATE BANK

Mr INGERSON (Bragg): My question is to the Treasurer. Following last Thursday's announcement by the State Bank that it was immediately 'downsizing' its operations in Hong Kong, New York and London, will the Treasurer say how much in loans the bank currently has advanced from each of those centres and what proportion of those loans are non-performing? If he cannot provide this information today, will he undertake to do so tomorrow?

The Hon. J.C. BANNON: That is a question I would need to refer to the Chairman, Mr Nobby Clark. The announcement that the honourable member draws attention to indicates, I think, the way in which the new Chairman, whom we are delighted to have in the saddle, has grasped the reins and is really getting on with the job. In the short time that he has been in charge of the board, Mr Nobby Clark has certainly galvanised operations there, built on the work that was already under way and given it a new sense of direction and urgency. I would expect—

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order!

The Hon. J.C. BANNON: I know it really irks those members opposite who were hoping against hope that the bank would irretrievably collapse, bringing down the structure of South Australia with it.

Members interjecting:

The Hon. J.C. BANNON: I know it really irks them—and one can hear it from their reaction—that, having tried to bad mouth the bank to an extent where nobody would be prepared to come on deck and try to manage it into the future, we were able to secure the services of one of the most eminent bankers in Australia from the private sector to come and take over.

An honourable member interjecting:

The Hon. J.C. BANNON: The Leader of the Opposition says that he suggested him. He raised his name in the fond hope that there was no way Mr Clark would ever be associated with the State Bank and that when we appointed somebody else he would be able to say, 'Ah, you see, you could not get the best, could you? You failed.' That is why he raised it. Let us not be kidded by the Leader of the Opposition when he says, 'I suggested him'. We know very well that Mr Clark's name was mentioned because Mr Clark is one of the most eminent bankers in Australia, and the Leader of the Opposition hoped that he could put his name in the public domain so that there could be some expression of failure. The Leader was most surprised and shocked when he discovered that Mr Clark had been approached by us and had, in fact, accepted. I am delighted at the way in which he has taken on the job. So let us have no more of that, I will refer the question to Mr Nobby Clark and his board.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order! The member for Light is out of order, and the Leader is out of order.

PARLIAMENTARY SITTINGS

The Hon. J.P. TRAINER (Walsh): Will the Deputy Premier confirm whether a schedule of parliamentary sitting dates distributed last week around Parliament House is accurate in that Parliament will not sit beyond 28 November 1991, and does this represent a reduction in the role of the Parliament?

The Hon. D.J. HOPGOOD: I do not rule out the possibility of Parliament sitting in December; and, indeed, if it is required for Parliament to sit in December, it will sit. However, I can confirm that the schedule that has been made available to members is accurate so far as the end of November of this calendar year is concerned. I noticed some eschatological statements emanating from the Leader of the Opposition not so very long ago and, in light of this prediction of the end of parliamentary democracy as we know it, I gathered some statistics in relation to how long the Parliament has sat in the past few sessions. Those statistics should be put onto the record, because they certainly do not show the sort of trend that the Leader of the Opposition suggests.

In the second session of the forty-sixth Parliament we sat for 57 days, 775 questions without notice were asked and 1 124 questions on notice were answered. The average number of questions per sitting day was 13. The third session of the forty-sixth Parliament ran for 55 days, 761 questions without notice were asked, 1 354 questions on notice were answered and the average number of questions per sitting day was 15. The fourth session of the forty-sixth Parliament ran for 48 days, 737 questions without notice were asked and 988 questions on notice were answered. The average number of questions per sitting day was 15. The current session, at its close shortly, will comprise 56 sitting days, and I invite members to compare that with the figures I have just indicated.

There is clearly some variation in the sitting days from year to year, but indeed for the most part we can say that there has been no overall reduction in the time that the House sits. In fact, in the first session of the forty-seventh Parliament the average number of questions asked without notice was 19 per sitting day. The schedule that I have

distributed for the 1991 budget session provides exactly the same number of sitting days as in 1990 up to the end of November. I again make the point that, if we have to sit in December, we will. The session usually concludes in the new year and I confidently anticipate that, once the whole session is taken into account, there will have been no diminution whatsoever in the number of parliamentary sitting days.

The other point I make is that the House continues to profit from the change in Standing Orders which has led to very much greater and better management of the business. I could point to a number of suggestions from the Opposition as to the way in which the scheduling of the business should proceed which have been accepted by the Government and incorporated in closure motions usually moved on Tuesday following Question Time. Let us have none of this nonsense that the Government is running away from anything. In fact, there will be the same opportunity for questioning and probing of Government policies in the next session as there has been this session, and as there was in previous sessions.

STATE BANK

The Hon. JENNIFER CASHMORE (Coles): To avoid potential conflicts of interest, will the Treasurer ensure that all major parties associated with the State Bank will have legal counsel before the royal commission from a variety of firms?

It has been put to the Opposition that the State Bank may attempt to restrict the information placed before the Royal Commissioner by using only one legal firm to represent such diverse interests as Mr Marcus Clark, the former board of the bank, the former Executive Committee of the bank, the current bank, Mr John Baker and Mr Erich Reichert, the former board and executive of Beneficial Finance Corporation, Beneficial Finance as it is currently constituted and other major subsidiaries and off balance sheet companies of the State Bank Group. It is a matter of public record that a major breakdown in relations occurred between Mr Marcus Clark and the former bank board as it did between Mr Baker and the former board of Beneficial, to quote just two examples where conflicts of interest may be serious.

The Hon. J.C. BANNON: The question of representation has two elements, one being the desire of the parties. Whether or not that representation is financed by the bank or by some other means is a matter that would need to be referred to the Attorney-General. Secondly, the Royal Commissioner is running the show and will determine whether he believes there is conflict of interest in representation or whether those appearing before him are not able properly to handle their job because of that. Of course, the Royal Commissioner is assisted by a very able Queen's Counsel, Mr John Mansfield. Obviously, counsel assisting also has a key role in taking statements and determining the progress of the commission and any of these questions that arise.

The honourable member must understand that a royal commission is not like a litigation in that sense, where each and every party may require separate representation: the royal commission is there to ascertain the facts by the means the Royal Commissioner deems most appropriate. As I understand it—and I think there was a media report about this today—it would appear that the board will be jointly represented. Its interests will be handled and a firm has been briefed to do that. I understand that the former Managing Director will probably have separate representation. I think that a request has already been made, or notice given, on that basis. I do not know what other subgroupings of representation are necessary or desirable.

One thing I will say is that we ought to be very concerned that this commission does not become some kind of feasting ground for lawyers and the legal fraternity. The fees that are commanded and the sorts of expenses involved can be absolutely enormous and out of hand. This will be a fairly costly exercise anyway and I do not think any of us would begrudge spending appropriately on something like this. It is an important exercise and has to be carried out. Therefore, I do not think we should be cavilling about the expenditure required, as I think I said in answer to a previous question on this matter. Having said that, equally we are not in the business of profligately creating some kind of huge job creation scheme or income feast for lawyers. Appropriate representation is surely the thing—

Dr Armitage interjecting:

The Hon. J.C. BANNON: As the member for Adelaide interjects, the idea is to seek out the truth, and the commissioner will be in charge of that exercise.

MANAGEMENT OF NATURAL RESOURCES

Mr FERGUSON (Henley Beach): Will the Minister of Water Resources advise the House how the work being undertaken by the numerous ministerial councils and standing committees in Australia that focus on the management of natural resources might be better coordinated?

The Hon. S.M. LENEHAN: I believe this is a very important issue, because it relates to the better management of our natural resources across the country. Indeed, I can answer the honourable member's question. I have proposed a review of the numerous ministerial councils and standing committees in Australia that focus on the management of natural resources. My concern is that there are at least nine councils and relevant standing committees which deal with natural resources. For example, they include bodies relating to the environment, fisheries, nature conservation, mines and energy, agriculture, soil conservation, forestry and water, and there is the Murray-Darling Ministerial Council.

I am a member of four of those councils, my colleague the Minister of Agriculture is a member of at least three and the Minister of Mines and Energy is a member of at least two of these councils. It is obvious that a number of the same issues keep coming up at different council levels. Therefore, we must address these important matters with consistency and, indeed, without duplication of effort. I have, therefore, proposed an independent review of the ministerial council structure in Australia, which would look particularly at achieving much greater integration and management of our natural resources. I am sure that every Opposition member will welcome such a reasonable and rational proposal.

ILLEGAL FRUIT IMPORTS

The Hon. P.B. ARNOLD (Chaffey): My question is directed to the Minister of Agriculture. Does the Government consider that current penalties are a sufficient deterrent to the illegal importation of fruit into South Australia?

The Riverland outbreak has focused attention on penalties for the illegal activities which can bring fruit fly into South Australia. At present, the maximum penalty is a fine of $5 000, but in recent cases much lower penalties have been awarded. For example, in January two merchants were convicted for importing goods for the wholesale market.

One forfeited 30 cartons of egg fruit worth $40 a carton and was fined $1 300; in the other case, a merchant was fined $1 100 for importing tomatoes.

Several weeks ago I advised a director of the Department of Agriculture that it had been reported to me that table grapes were being imported into South Australia from the Sunraysia area and being marketed in Adelaide as Riverland produce, and I would like the Minister to indicate whether this matter has been investigated. It has been put to me that penalties for such activities are totally inadequate to deter illegal actions which have caused serious and widespread damage to individual livelihoods and to the State economy generally. It is suggested that a prison term, as well as much heavier fines, ought to be provided and that these penalties should be prominently displayed on signs at all entrance points to South Australia.

The Hon. LYNN ARNOLD: I thank the honourable member for his question on this very important issue. I know that he and all members of this place are concerned about the seriousness of the situation. I have been having discussions with the department about penalties and other issues and as to whether or not they are adequate. But, as the honourable member attests by virtue of the explanation of his question, the penalties set by statute and the penalties imposed by courts are not necessarily always the same; in other words, maximum penalties are not always imposed by the courts.

Nevertheless, the question whether or not there should be heavier penalties is being reviewed so that, if we cannot have the concurrence of some members of the community that it is right to try to adhere to the bans in relation to fruit fly, we will make sure that the sanctions are very costly indeed and will drive them away for those reasons. That matter is being further investigated. I will certainly keep the House advised and, if it is out of session, I will advise the honourable member directly about that situation. We are playing with very big figures in terms of an industry worth $170 million.

The Hon. P.B. Arnold interjecting:

The Hon. LYNN ARNOLD: Yes, certainly the cost of the eradication. I want to take this opportunity to say that there is no doubt that we will spend all that is needed to be spent on eradication. I gave an undertaking last week that we will keep on spending money on the eradication program until we have stopped this outbreak, as we do with other fruit fly outbreaks in this State. There need be no concern on the part of Riverland growers that we shall not be pursuing this eradication to all the necessary stages. The extra costs associated with that are for fumigation, for example, which growers have to pick up for those who are within the red zone or the zones around. That could be up to $4 million. I have asked the department to prepare a report for me on whether or not some growers will need extra assistance. I shall be prepared to discuss that matter with the Federal Minister, whom I am meeting on Thursday. Indeed, I will raise that point along with others on that occasion.

At this stage, we do not have any definite information that that is the case because we are able to limit the actual number of trees that need to be stripped. Indeed, the majority of fruit in the Riverland will still be able to be sold in various markets subject to appropriate fumigation.

Finally, it comes down to exactly what the community can do in this situation. In the final analysis, we could have all the sanctions and all the blocks in the world, but it really requires that everyone understand that there is a common interest factor and that all members of the community act responsibly. Obviously, a few people have let the situation down in this instance. The fruit flies that have been found in the Riverland—as I have said previously, and as I heard someone else say—did not walk in, they did not fly in: they were carried in. The only thing that will address that matter is adequate sanctions plus community cooperation.

In relation to the matter raised with the Director-General of Agriculture, I will obtain further information. The Director-General did mention it to me; I have not received the final report, but I will advise the honourable member further on that matter.

HOUSING TRUST MAINTENANCE

Mr De LAINE (Price): Will the Minister of Housing and Construction advise the House of the procedure used by the Housing Trust when dealing with subcontractors who work on trust dwellings? How do they determine whether the work has been done—and, if it has been done, whether it has been done properly—before payment is made?

The Hon. M.K. MAYES: This question is important because there is a good deal of interest in the community as to how work is managed by the trust, particularly work carried out on both vacant and tenanted properties. On vacant properties, a very clear process of inspection is carried out by trust officers, who are required to make regular visits to the work site to assess the progress of the work and to assess also the standards of the work performed by the subcontractors.

These constant inspections fulfil the requirement for authorising payment of invoices to subcontractors and, of course, the standard and state of that work must be assessed again. Also, a final inspection is undertaken by the maintenance inspector at the completion of the work, prior to the provision of the door lock combination in the vacant premises, so that they can then be passed on to the incoming tenant.

In addition, at the completion of the work on a vacant property, a property report is prepared by the inspector so that, in effect, we have virtually a double system of checking the standard of the work and, of course, a record of the state of the property before it is handed over to the tenant. That then provides an inventory for the incoming tenant.

In relation to maintenance and repair work on unoccupied dwellings, a standard requirement must be met with regard to the audit of invoices. Any invoice for over $200 must be inspected by a maintenance inspector, so that any work that is completed to that value or above must be inspected. In relation to all those invoices where work is completed to the value of less than $200, there must be an inspection of a percentage of that work. Basically, a sample of those invoices is taken and the maintenance inspector conducts about 10 per cent of inspections on work to the value of less than $200. In relation to a Housing Trust home occupied by a tenant, on arrival the contractor must require a work verification form to be signed by the tenant so that the trust has a record of the work that has been performed and of the fact that the tenant has observed the work being performed and completed. That form must be signed in order to have the invoice endorsed for payment to the subcontractor. So, the process of assessment of payment is—

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order! The Minister will resume his seat.

Mr S.G. EVANS: On a point of order, Mr Speaker, I think the Minister is abusing the system.

An honourable member: What is the point of order?

Mr S.G. EVANS: The point of order is that the Minister could make a ministerial statement in relation to this matter, and that his explanation is going into far too much detail in response to the question asked.

The SPEAKER: Order! There is no point of order. However, some of the answers given today have been extremely long according to the standards of this House. May I also say that one or two of the questions have been very long. No time limit is put on questions and answers. The House had the opportunity to set a time limit under the Standing Orders, but it chose not to. It is a matter of judgment for the Chair as to how long a question or answer may take, and until a time is set in the Standing Orders that matter is left to the judgment of the Chair; or, if the House takes exception to the Chair's judgment, the matter is left to the House to decide. I ask the Minister to draw his answer to a close.

The Hon. M.K. MAYES: I thought I was being exceptionally short, for me.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: I ask the Minister to come back to the response.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order!

The Hon. M.K. MAYES: It is not a reflection on the Chair at all: the Chair did not in any way question it. It is a reflection on the point of order, as a matter of fact. Audit control over work being done on Housing Trust properties is very important, and some major issues have been raised. Members of the Opposition do not appear to be interested in having this information provided to them. In my opinion, it is quite a serious reflection for the Opposition to question the answer to this very important point.

I might add that the Housing Trust is also looking very carefully at efficiencies in this area and developing a program whereby the tenants actually have a role in the maintenance and repair work conducted on trust properties. We are establishing with tenant organisations a process that will involve them in actually bringing in subcontractors to do very standard work, whether it involves repairing a leaking tap or a light switch, in order to reduce the amount of bureaucracy and improve efficiency in the delivery of services.

We can pass the responsibilities on to the tenants, which in the long term is the way in which we as a Government should proceed, and I support that strongly. There is a very clear system of audit control payment structure within the Housing Trust, and we will ensure that that is maintained so that we provide a proper basis for payment and maintenance of our services.

ELECTION CAMPAIGN ADVERTISING

The Hon. B.C. EASTICK (Light): I direct my question to the Premier. Because it will also affect State election campaigns, has the South Australian Government made any representations to the Federal Government about the proposed ban on television and radio election advertising, and is the South Australian Government supporting this move?

The Hon. J.C. BANNON: No, we as a Government have not made any submission, nor do we intend to do so. In principle, I support the view that, if something is legal, there ought to be the capacity to advertise it and that, one hopes, would apply to political campaigns. On the other hand, the problems that have been brought to light recently with the escalating costs of election campaigns, the need for Parties to canvass for donations and support and the way in which that can, either directly or impliedly, compromise those Parties are all issues of great concern that need to be addressed.

The fact is that the political process will not be impeded in a major way by such a ban, because there will still be access through news and other means to the electronic media. Equally, it is not unprecedented in that a number of the European democracies, including the United Kingdom, have apparently gone down this path for the same reasons. Therefore, I do not think that it is in any way an open and shut case. It is something that is being considered at the national level. The Federal Parliament, of course, has the power to regulate the electronic media and, no doubt, will make its decisions.

FRUIT-FLY

Mr ATKINSON (Spence): Will the Minister of Agriculture advise the House of the effectiveness and cost of fruit-fly roadblocks in the Riverland, and does his department have any plans to relocate the roadblocks?

The Hon. LYNN ARNOLD: I thank the honourable member for his question on this very important topic. Naturally, this outbreak does require that we reconsider all arrangements that are in place. Indeed, we are looking at determining the most effective means to control the entry of fruit-fly into this State. In saying that, I make the point that I think the roadblocks that have been in place in South Australia have been enormously effective over the years. The fact that this is the very first outbreak we have had in a commercial production area since the introduction of the roadblocks in the Riverland in 1957 compares very well indeed with the situation just across the border.

It needs to be noted that in the Sunraysia district, for example, in the past four seasons there has been an outbreak of fruit-fly. I guess to one extent we can say that we have done an excellent job to have kept it so long before there has been an outbreak. Of course, there is no intention to rest on our laurels; there is no intention to say, 'Just because we managed to get away with it for so long there is no possibility that we may be able to improve the system.' However, I think the officers deserve credit for what they have done, and they do a very difficult job because they are not always given the concurrence of all drivers who go by. They face some very rude people who somehow do not see their own individual community responsibility in this situation. So, I pay tribute to the work of these officers when it is not a particularly easy job.

As to the specifics, we have had two roadblocks in the Riverland: one at Yamba and the other at Pinnaroo. The roadblock at Yamba acts as a check on travellers from areas where there is a permanent fruit-fly population. That area encompasses Sydney and the coastal areas of New South Wales and Queensland; and, because of that, it is a roadblock that operates throughout the year. The Pinnaroo roadblock intercepts travellers particularly from Victoria (which is usually free of fruit-fly other than when outbreaks occur), and it is open during the summer season from 1 October to 31 May for 16 hours a day.

The cost of operating the Yamba and Pinnaroo roadblocks during 1989-90 was $323 292, against the other four roadblocks in the State of $588 000. In 1990, the Yamba roadblock inspected 300 000 vehicles, 24 000 of which contained intercepted fruit amounting to a total of 52 tonnes. Thirteen vehicles that were inspected had fruit-fly. I guess

it is a point of some concern that such a large amount of fruit is still being confiscated at roadblocks. It really comes back to members of the community, who must recognise their own responsibilities in this regard.

The point needs to be made that we are not in a position to be able to stop every vehicle that comes through; that would be an untenable situation. Ultimately, we have to do the best efforts, and the best efforts have kept us fruit-fly free until this time but, naturally, we re-look at the situation to see whether there are yet more things that we can do within a reasonable spectrum to improve the situation. There would never be a situation where every single person who deliberately wanted to break the rules would be caught. Customs Board guards at the Iron Curtain were not able to stop everything getting into Eastern Bloc countries, so there is no situation where there would be a 100 per cent apprehension rate in respect of everybody who wanted to break the rules. The community still has to work with us on this if we are to succeed. However, certainly we will continue to look at the efficiency of our—

The Hon. P.B. Arnold interjecting:

The Hon. LYNN ARNOLD: And the penalties question raised by the member for Chaffey certainly is correct; we will look at that, too. It is a package of things. Finally, the community has to be with us on this matter.

ADELAIDE CASINO

Mr S.G. EVANS (Davenport): Does the Minister of Finance approve of the advertisement promoting the Adelaide Casino which last week appeared in the interstate press? Entitled 'Gambling is not a matter of life and death', with the subheading 'It's far more important than that', the advertisement which appeared last Monday offers free membership to the casino's international room. The advertisement depicts a conversation between two parties in which one says that his gambling was going to help put his 'kid back in private school'. In the context of picking up his winning chips, the conversation continues:

> 'Your wife won't kill you now' I mused. 'It's far more important than that' he replied. 'If I hadn't won tonight, I would have seriously doubted myself.'

The Hon. FRANK BLEVINS: No, I do not approve of it and I think it is in appalling taste and is a stupid advertisement. I can assure the member for Davenport that it has been withdrawn, and was withdrawn very quickly indeed.

SMALL BUSINESSES

Mrs HUTCHISON (Stuart): I direct my question to the Minister representing the Minister of Small Business. Is the Minister aware of statements made by the Australian Chamber of Commerce that 17 out of 20 small businesses fail because 'its operators are poor managers'? If so, what steps are currently being taken by Government to assist small business operators to learn management skills, and is it envisaged that there will be more emphasis on encouraging small business operators to obtain the necessary skills? An article in the *Advertiser* of Monday 18 March headed 'Bad Managers Running Small Businesses' stated:

> One of Australia's main lobby groups has made a key admission: bad management, not Government, is what brings down most small businesses.

This contrasts with Liberal Party statements, one in the form of an advertisement and the other an article in the *Advertiser* of 8 March 1991, where the Opposition spokesman on small business predicted 'doom and gloom' with increased unemployment figures and blamed Government for small business problems. In the same article business groups spokesmen, Mr Matthew O'Callaghan and Mr Peter Anderson, indicated disagreement with Opposition statements and concern at their effects on small business.

The SPEAKER: Order! Let me draw the attention of the House to the length of some questions today and the length of some responses. Tomorrow the Chair will be paying closer attention to the length of questions and answers.

The Hon. G.J. CRAFTER: I thank the honourable member for her question. I know of her interest in respect of small businesses, many of which operate in her electorate and, indeed, the importance of services such as those provided by the Small Business Advisory Bureau to businesses throughout our community. We are very fortunate indeed to have in this State the services provided by that bureau. In addition to that, there has been well-established legislation over a number of years to provide additional protections and support for small business. That support has formed part of the fabric of a number of economic decisions that this Government has taken in recent years. I will be pleased to obtain a report from my colleague in another place to ensure that full information is provided to all members.

VIDEO GAMING MACHINES

The Hon. TED CHAPMAN (Alexandra): Will the Minister of Finance explain the reasons for the Adelaide Casino's decision to give the bulk of the video gaming contract to an American firm, International Gaming Technology (IGT), while Australian video gaming companies which could have supplied a similar product at less cost were ignored? The Liberal Party has been advised—and, might I say, as I understand it, very reliably advised—by the Australian video gaming market leaders, Olympic Video Gaming, that offers it made to the Adelaide Casino to view its product were ignored despite repeated approaches to casino management. The casino's decision to give the bulk of the video gaming contract to a foreign company has also raised the ire of other Australian video gaming equipment supply companies in the field, particularly in the current economic climate.

The Hon. FRANK BLEVINS: I thank the member for Alexandra for his question. I have no knowledge of where poker machines, video gaming machines, roulette wheels or anything else are made or how they are purchased, but I will certainly inquire of the casino for the member for Alexandra. I would be surprised if he has not made some personal inquiries himself. I am sure he knows the telephone number of the casino. I think it would have been very easy for him to pick up the telephone and ask. I am surprised—

The Hon. Ted Chapman interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order!

The Hon. FRANK BLEVINS: I certainly am not. I can assure the member for Alexandra that he is probably the second to last person on the other side about whom I would make any reflection whatsoever.

Members interjecting:

The Hon. FRANK BLEVINS: That is to make you all feel good.

The SPEAKER: Order! The Minister will come back to the response.

The Hon. FRANK BLEVINS: I can only assume that that was a commercial decision made by the casino. I am rather surprised and intrigued that members opposite, who strongly promote free trade—

Members interjecting:

The Hon. FRANK BLEVINS: I thank the member for Bragg for his interjection. He says that they promote 'Buy Australian'. That is absolutely contrary to everything that I hear from the Liberal Party spokesperson in this area in the Federal sphere, Mr Ian McLachlan, who is a very strong exponent of free trade.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order! The Minister will resume his seat.

Mr S.J. BAKER: On a point of order, Mr Speaker, we are fascinated by the Minister, but he is debating the subject.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order! The member for Napier is out of order. I uphold the point of order and ask the Minister to come back to the response.

PERSONAL EXPLANATIONS: MEDIA REMARKS

Mr BECKER (Hanson): I seek leave to make a personal explanation.

Leave granted.

Mr BECKER: In an article on page one of last Saturday's *Advertiser*, the Chairman of the State Government Insurance Commission, Mr Vincent Kean, is quoted as saying:

> I am tired of parliamentarians making accusations with the protection of the Westminster system. How dare they make an accusation that SGIC had bought No. 1 Anzac Highway... I am sick of having a business destroyed and reputation in tatters just for doing business with SGIC on normal commercial terms.

The newspaper article goes on to say that the Liberal member for Hanson, Mr Becker, told Parliament last year the SGIC had bought No. 1 Anzac Highway. In the only question that I or other members of the Opposition have asked the Treasurer concerning the property at No. 1 Anzac Highway, which was on 12 December last year, I did not say that SGIC had bought the building. I asked whether SGIC had been given the Treasurer's approval before making a mortgage loan to the company No. 1 Anzac Highway in respect of a property at that address. I explained to the House that the property was mortgaged to SGIC at the end of October 1988. *Hansard* of 5 March 1991 includes the Treasurer's written reply to my question, which makes clear that there was a mortgage loan from SGIC to No. 1 Anzac Highway. Mr Kean's assertions and implied impropriety on my part are totally unfounded and he should publicly apologise.

The Hon. JENNIFER CASHMORE (Coles): I seek leave to make a personal explanation.

Leave granted.

The Hon. JENNIFER CASHMORE: In last Thursday's *Advertiser* an article on page 21 headed 'Why 22... are in favour' by Simon Evans, purported to report the decisions of all members of Parliament on their intended vote on a private member's Bill to decriminalise prostitution. In that article I was reported as having said:

> At this stage, no, there are a lot of conservative members in South Australia.

I make clear to the House that I was never contacted by the journalist who purportedly wrote the article. I did not say what I was reported to have said and, naturally enough, I regard most seriously the fact that the clear impression created by that article was that my attitude to the proposed legislation is based on political expediency rather than on my own personal attitude of conscience and principle and in practice to that legislation. I understand also that I am one of at least a dozen members on this side from both Houses whose views have either been reported or misreported without contact by that journalist with the members concerned.

The error has been further perpetrated in an article in this week's edition of the *City Messenger* dated Wednesday 20 March 1991 in the column 'Statewatch' by Alex Kennedy. Under the heading 'Sorting out who's pro pros', she states:

> The Liberals' Jennifer Cashmore's reported comment was frank. She will vote against because her Party has a lot of conservative members. That equals a 'head'-and-proud-of-it decision.

As the result of what I consider to be unethical and unprofessional conduct by two journalists, my attitude to the legislation has been grossly misrepresented, and I am pleased to have this opportunity of putting on the record that, although I am strongly opposed to the legislation, my views have been reached as a result of searching my own conscience and studying the matter in practice and not as a matter of political expediency.

PHARMACISTS BILL

Returned from the Legislative Council with amendments.

CHIROPRACTORS BILL

Returned from the Legislative Council with an amendment.

STATUTES AMENDMENT (WATER RESOURCES) BILL

Returned from the Legislative Council without amendment.

ROADS (OPENING AND CLOSING) BILL

Returned from the Legislative Council without amendment.

ROYAL COMMISSIONS (SUMMONSES AND PUBLICATION OF EVIDENCE) AMENDMENT BILL

Returned from the Legislative Council without amendment.

SITTINGS AND BUSINESS

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

That the time allotted for—

(a) completion of the following Bills:
- Marine Amendment,
- Cooper Basin (Ratification) (Royalty) Amendment,
- South Australian Metropolitan Fire Service (Miscellaneous Powers) Amendment,
- Local Government Act Amendment (No. 2) and

(b) the motion for the establishment of certain national parks—

be until 6 p.m. on Thursday 21 March.

Motion carried.

LOCAL GOVERNMENT ACT AMENDMENT BILL (No. 2)

Second reading.

The Hon. M.D. RANN (Minister of Employment and Further Education): 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 is part of an ongoing effort to revise and update the Local Government Act, in a way which will consolidate the framework of the legislation governing local government to more adequately reflect the sector's contemporary methods of operation.

More particularly, the Bill provides for the introduction to the Local Government Act of a number of principles and mechanisms, rather than prescriptive requirements, which aim at establishing standards of administrative and personnel practices comparable to those in operation in other spheres of government. These amendments are proposed within the context of innovative and exciting changes in the relationship between State and local government, which have seen the disbanding of the Department of Local Government and which will involve the devolution of significant powers and responsibilities to the local government sector.

Local government has for many years asserted its right to full status as a sphere of government, with a relationship to the State similar to that of the relationship of the State to the Commonwealth. To date, the revision program for the Local Government Act has addressed the appropriate balance of powers and responsibilities for the State and local government sectors, with increasing emphasis on the devolution of such powers and responsibilities to local government, in order that it may legitimately undertake activities for its local communities, free from unnecessary State Government constraint. Of necessity, this balance must be achieved in a way which acknowledges the State Government's interest in a framework for the local government system, through the State legislation which establishes and delegates powers to local government.

It is, however, appropriate that the legislation sets general principles, rather than detailed requirements for the operation of local government. Such an approach is entirely consistent with the newly formalised understanding between State and local government, in which the two sectors will negotiate over 18 months the particular ways in which common goals, including the goals outlined in this Bill, will be achieved. The principles outlined in the Bill are intended as guiding rather than driving ones. They set an agenda, while enhancing the flexibility of councils to determine the processes by which the outcomes will be achieved, and in so doing, provide councils with a very broad and diverse range of options for responding appropriately to their individual community needs and expectations.

The Bill proposes three major changes to the Local Government Act:

the introduction of principles of administration and of personnel practice;

the abolition of the need to obtain a certificate of registration to be eligible for prescribed positions;

the establishment of the Local Government Equal Employment Opportunity Advisory Committee.

Principles of administration and personnel practice

These principles provide local government with standards of equity and accountability comparable to those of the other spheres of government. They define responsibility for the administration of a council and create a framework for local government operation to which both the sector and the community can look. The principles encourage councils to adopt flexible management systems and to operate in effective and efficient structures.

There is national agreement that principles of personnel practice, including equal employment opportunity principles, be incorporated into State legislation covering the local government sector. Such principles are already present in the Victorian Local Government Act, with Western Australia planning to introduce personnel principles as part of a review of their Act.

The amendments introducing principles of personnel practice also reflect the Local Government Association's policy on human resource management and set a standard of fairness and propriety in the management of local government employees and officers.

These principles of personnel management reinforce fairness in council administration with reference to those aspects of an employee or applicant's characteristics which cannot be used as a basis for discrimination in employment. Age has been included as one such aspect, as it will be covered by the Equal Opportunity Act 1984 from this June.

In association with the introduction of principles as outlined, the Act will also be amended to require councils to prepare, adopt and publish an annual report, available to the public. Such a requirement is consistent with other spheres of government, whose decision-makers are similarly accountable but, in their case, to Parliament. However, in the light of the new State and local government understanding, the form and content of annual reports will be a matter for regulations developed in conjunction with the Local Government Association, in order to ensure that such reports are appropriate to the needs of local communities.

The Bill also proposes to define the functions and responsibilities of chief executive officers, to include implementation and monitoring of the principles as outlined in the Bill. General principles relating to the conduct of officers and employees are also included in the amendments.

Abolition of certificates for prescribed positions

Originally, the Bill proposed to abolish only the need for certificates of registration for the prescribed position of chief executive officer. The discussion paper in which the proposed amendments were first canvassed, and the extensive consultation program conducted throughout the State, elicited many responses which identified this proposal as being too cautious. While support for abolition of certificates of registration was certainly not universally supported, many submissions from councils and local government organisations urged the Government to take the initiative in the area of qualifications, and remove the present restrictions for all the positions which currently require registration. In the spirit of devolution, and to support the local government sector in its capacity to make its own decisions about the people it employs, while of course observing the principles of personnel practice outlined in the amendments, it is now proposed that the professional standard of council administration will be protected through membership of professional bodies where appropriate. The relevant professional bodies associated with positions other than that of chief executive officer have indicated their support for this move, and have provided assurances as to their capacity to monitor membership of their organisations.

In the case of chief executive officer positions, it is appropriate that councils have the authority to employ people who, in their judgment, have the appropriate skills and experience for the particular position in their particular council. In some cases, councils will be seeking to employ people with a certain mix of skills and experience which may not be available to them only from the pool of people with current certificates of registration. There is no intention implied in the amendments to dilute the quality of the chief executive officer ranks, but rather to expand the options available to the local government sector, which have until now been somewhat constrained by the existing system.

Local Government Equal Employment Opportunity Advisory Committee

The Bill proposes the establishment of the Local Government Equal Employment Opportunity Advisory Committee to be chaired by the Commissioner for Equal Opportunity.

It is recognised that some steps are currently being taken in the local government sector to effect principles of equal employment opportunity, and that councils are currently subject to State equal opportunity legislation.

Around 50.3 per cent of salaried employees of councils are women. However, there is a marked concentration of women in traditional occupations. Eighty per cent of clerical staff are women, and 75 per cent of librarians and community service officers are women. In senior management, however, 90 per cent of positions are held by men. This concentration of women in clerical and service-related positions is contrasted with the structure of the work force of the local government sector throughout Australia, in which around 56 per cent of clerical and service positions are held by women, and with the Australian work force as a whole, in which 69.7 per cent of clerical, service and sales positions are held by women.

Women are not the only group poorly represented in the work force of the local government sector. Not only does this situation disadvantage individuals in the work force, it seriously limits the flexibility of the sector in its role in meeting the needs of local communities by limiting its work force capacity.

The impact of equal employment opportunity in the local government sector in South Australia has been minimal by comparison to other States.

Both the Federal and State Governments have for a considerable time now undertaken policy initiatives and practical programs designed to redress imbalances in the work force and in access to services. It is appropriate that local governmant, as a sphere of government, adopt a smilar approach.

It is therefore intended that the development and implementation of equal employment opportunity programs will be required. The Local Government Equal Employment Opportunity Advisory Committee will consist of four members, aside from the Chair, two of whom will be nominated by the Local Government Association, one by the Municipal Officers Association, and one by the Australian Workers Union. The functions of the advisory committee will be to advise and assist councils in developing and implementing equal employment opportunity programs, to collate information about councils' implementation of these programs, and to promote the purposes and principles of equal employment opportunity within local government.

There were concerns expressed in the submissions and at the public meetings about legislated limits being placed on the sector's autonomy as employers, by the imposition of detailed and specific requirements within equal employment opportunity programs. Councils submitted that their flexibility to meet the needs of their local communities would be restricted by such requirements.

While such concerns do to some extent reflect misunderstanding of the intent of equal employment opportunity legislation, it is important that they too are allayed. By structuring the legislation to allow for negotiation of the content of the regulations under the enhanced State Government-local government relationship, the sector will have the opportunity to develop its own standards and requirements within the general principles of the legislation.

By locating the advisory committee under the aegis of the Commissioner for Equal Opportunity, the sector's concerns about 'doubling up' in the area of equal employment opportunity can also be allayed. The reporting mechanisms for councils' equal employment opportunity programs have been simplified, and utilise the existing structures within the Equal Opportunities Commission.

The Local Government Association, and those councils which supported the introduction of specific legislation regarding equal employment opportunity, stressed that local government will need education and support in the introduction and implementation of equal employment opportunity programs. In addressing this request, the State Government will employ a consultant in the coming months to work with local government in an educative and developmental capacity.

As part of the new understanding between State and local government, the State Government will be assisting local government to develop a more flexible work force with a greater capacity through the implementation of equal employment opportunity programs.

These major changes represent the principal features of the Bill. An extensive consultation process accompanied the development of the proposals, including the distribution of a discussion paper, a circular to councils, and a series of seminars in metropolitan and country locations.

A total of 57 submissions were received, in response to the discussion paper and the seminars. A total of 130 people attended the four seminars, mostly chief executive officers and Chairs of councils.

While it is true that there were specific objections to certain aspects of the proposals as first drafted, the general intent of the legislation attracted broad sector-wide support.

It has been suggested that at this time of negotiation and change to the structure of the relationship between State and local government, such a Bill should be put aside and any principles be introduced as a part of any legislative framework which may be established as a result of these negotiations. The Bill was significantly altered to take account of the new State-local government understanding, as well as being developed in the course of the consultation process, and it has now been further amended in another place as a result of discussions with, and between, the Local Government Association and the Municipal Officers Association.

Clause 1 is formal.

Clause 2 provides for the measure to be brought into operation by proclamation.

Clause 3 amends the interpretation section of the principal Act. The clause inserts new definitions of 'engineer', 'equal employment opportunity program', 'merit' and 'selection processes'. The new definition of 'engineer' of a council is required in view of the removal of the provisions contained in section 67 relating to the appointment of an engineer. 'Equal employment opportunity program' is defined as a program designed to ensure that all persons have equal opportunities with others in securing employment with a council and subsequent promotion and advancement and in other respects in relation to employment with the council.

'Merit' and 'selection processes' are defined in the same terms as under the Government Management and Employment Act 1985.

Clause 4 inserts into Division I of Part III of the principal Act (general nature of council's responsibilities) a new section 35a setting out general management functions and objectives for councils. Under the new provision, the functions of a council are to include—

(a) the determination by the council of policies (not inconsistent with the Act or any other applicable law) to be applied by the council in exercising its discretionary powers;

(b) the determination by the council of the type, range and scope of projects to be undertaken by the council;

and

(c) the development by the council of comprehensive management plans, budgets, financial controls and performance objectives and indicators for the operations of the council.

The new section also provides that the operations and affairs of the council should be managed—

(a) in a manner which emphasises the importance of service to the community;

(b) so as to enable decisions to be made, and action taken, efficiently and effectively through clear division of administrative responsibilities, delegation of authority where appropriate, and flexible and responsive deployment of resources;

and

(c) with the goal of continued improvement in efficiency and effectiveness.

Clause 5 inserts into Part III of the principal Act (which contains the general provisions relating to councils) a new Division VII relating to annual reports. Under the new provision, a council is to be required to prepare, on or before a day (to be fixed by regulation) in each year, a report containing information and documents relating to the operations of the council. The information and documents to be included in such a report are to be detailed in the regulations. A report must, under the new provision, be made available for inspection (without fee) by any member of the public at the principal office of the council during the hours for which the office is open to the public. In addition, a member of the public is to be entitled, on payment of a fee fixed by the council, to obtain a copy of the report or any part of the report.

Clause 6 makes a consequential amendment to the heading to Division I of Part VI of the principal Act.

Clause 7 amends section 66 of the principal Act which deals with the chief executive officer of a council. The section is amended so that it is clear that the chief executive officer's responsibilities include, in addition to the responsibility of executing the decisions of the council, responsibility to the council—

(a) for the efficient and effective management of the operations and affairs of the council;

and

(b) for giving effect to the general management objectives (contained in the proposed new section 35a) and the principles of personnel management prescribed by proposed new section 69b (for which see clause 8).

The clause also removes subsections (5), (5a) and (6) of section 66 which provide for the qualifications for appointment to the office of chief executive officer or for an acting appointment to that office.

Clause 8 provides for the repeal of section 67 and Division II of Part VI of the principal Act and the substitution of new sections and Divisions. The proposed new section 67 provides that the functions of the chief executive officer are to include the implementation of the management plans and budgets determined by the council, and the development and implementation of other management and financial plans and controls including programs for staff development and training.

Proposed new section 68 provides for delegation by the chief executive officer of a council.

Proposed new section 69 provides for the appointment of officers and employees other than the chief executive officer. The provision replaces section 67, the provision currently dealing with this matter, but does not repeat the present provisions of that section which deal with the appointment of an engineer or overseer of works and the qualifications for those offices and other prescribed offices. As stated above, Division II which deals with the Local Government Qualifications Committee and certificates of qualification for appointment to prescribed offices is repealed. No new provisions are proposed that would require particular qualifications for appointment to offices in local government administration.

Proposed new section 69a sets out the following principles of personnel management which are to be observed in relation to employment in the administration of a council:

(a) that all selection processes must be directed towards and based on a proper assessment of merit;

(b) that there must be no unlawful discrimination against officers or employees or persons seeking employment in the administration of a council on the ground of sex, sexuality, marital status, pregnancy, race, physical impairment, intellectual impairment, age or any other ground nor may any form of unjustifiable discrimination be exercised against officers or employees or persons seeking such employment;

(c) that officers and employees must be afforded equal opportunities to secure promotion and advancement in their employment and proper access to training and development;

(d) that officers and employees must be afforded reasonable avenues of redress against improper or unreasonable administrative acts or decisions;

and

(e) fair and equitable practices must be followed with regard to recruitment and all other aspects of personnel management.

Proposed new sections 69b to 69e deal with equal employment opportunity in relation to employment with councils.

Proposed new section 69b provides for the establishment of a Local Government Equal Employment Opportunity Advisory Committee. Under this provision, the committee is to consist of the Commissioner for Equal Opportunity (who is to chair the committee), two persons nominated by the Local Government Association of South Australia, one person nominated by the Municipal Officers Association of Australia (South Australian Branch) and one person nominated by the Australian Workers Union (South Australian Branch). This new provision is to expire on 30 June 1994.

Proposed new section 69c sets out the functions of the Local Government Equal Employment Opportunity Advisory Committee. These are—

(a) to assist councils at their request in developing and implementing equal employment opportunity programs and, for that purpose, provide councils

with advice, guidelines and statements of objectives;

(b) to collate information as to the measures taken by councils to implement their equal employment opportunity programs and any other related initiatives taken by councils;

(c) to promote the purposes and principles of equal employment opportunity within local government administration.

This proposed new section is also to expire on 30 June 1994.

Proposed new section 69d provides that the chief executive officer of a council is responsible to the council for developing and implementing an equal employment opportunity program relating to employment with the council and for developing and implementing other initiatives to ensure that officers and employees of the council have equal opportunities in relation to their employment.

The proposed new section also requires a council to comply with such requirements relating to equal employment opportunity as are prescribed by regulation in relation to all councils or a class of councils to which the council belongs.

Proposed new section 69e provides that a council must submit to the Local Government Equal Employment Opportunity Advisory Committee for its advice and comment a draft equal employment opportunity program for the council and present to the committee an annual report containing prescribed information relating to the council's equal employment opportunity program and any other measures taken by the council in relation to equal employment opportunity. The draft program is to be submitted to the committee before the expiration of one year from the commencement of this provision and the annual report is to be presented to the committee on or before the prescribed day in each succeeding calendar year. This proposed new section is also to expire on 30 June 1994.

Clause 9 provides for the insertion of a new section 81a setting out general principles relating to the conduct of officers and employees of councils. These principles are as follows:

(a) that officers and employees must be conscientious in the performance of official duties and scrupulous in the use of official information, equipment and facilities;

and

(b) that officers and employees must, in their dealings with the public, members of the council and their fellow officers and employees, exercise proper courtesy, consideration and sensitivity.

Clause 10 makes an amendment to section 162 of the principal Act relating to the required qualifications for council auditors. The amendment is consequential to the amendments removing the provisions relating to the Local Government Qualifications Committee and the qualifications for various offices in local government administration. Under the amendment, no person is to be eligible for appointment as a council's auditor other than—

(a) the Auditor-General;

(b) a person who holds a practising certificate issued by the Australian Society of Certified Practising Accountants or The Institute of Chartered Accountants in Australia;

or

(c) a person who was eligible for such appointment immediately prior to the commencement of this provision.

This replaces the current requirement that a person be the holder of an auditor's certificate of registration issued by the Qualifications Committee.

Mr MEIER secured the adjournment of the debate.

MARINE AMENDMENT BILL

Adjourned debate on second reading.
(Continued from 7 March. Page 3399.)

Mr MEIER (Goyder): The Opposition cannot agree to support this amendment Bill. Members would be aware that this Bill relates to the membership of the State Manning Committee. Presently that committee consists of up to five persons, two of whom are master mariners, one a marine engineer and two representatives of employers or agents of ships. The proposed amendment seeks to increase the membership by two.

The present committee comprises one master mariner, who is a member of the Merchant Service Guild; one qualified marine engineer, who is a member of the Public Service Association; two employers representatives, who are unlikely to be attached to any particular employee organisation, although they may well be members of an employer organisation; and one master mariner, who serves as Chairman. So, in essence, two people could be equated to employees, two could be equated to employers and one person would act as Chairman of the committee. I would have thought that that was fairly equitable and, in fact, an analysis of crewing levels in this State over many years would show that that has been the case, because there has not been too much trouble with the requirements, particularly as they apply principally to safety aspects.

I recognise that, in relation to most of the vessels in this State, determination of crewing levels would be straightforward; there would usually be a master and a deckhand. However, there are several vessels that require additional crew; the *Island Seaway*, the *Accolade*, the *Island Navigator* and the *Island Philanderer* would be the principal vessels that need crew in addition to the master and the deckhand.

What we see in this case is an attempt by the Seamen's Union of Australia, the soon to be amalgamated Merchant Service Guild of Australia and the Australian Institute of Marine and Power Engineers to have representation or additional representation.

Given that the Manning Committee deals principally with safety, there would certainly be a strong argument that additional union representatives would bring in other industrial matters and that safety might not be the only consideration. Thus it is understandable that employers are very concerned about these additions. I was interested to receive comment from the Australian National Maritime Association (ANMA). In its letter to me, amongst other things, it stated:

> Experience with manning committees in the maritime industry generally has shown that small, balanced groups deliberating on manning questions can effectively deal with what can frequently be industrially sensitive issues.
>
> The expertise of participants in manning committees should be a key criterion for establishment of manning committees. Expansion of such committees inevitably introduces the industrial relations criterion, which our experience in the maritime industry in its broadest context shows is unreliable and historically a provocative method of determining manning levels on vessels.

An analysis of those comments indicates two key issues, first, that manning committees should be kept small. Presently there are five members on that committee and this Bill proposes to increase that number to seven. Secondly, a

key criterion should be experience in its broadest sense. If we expand the committee to include groups that may be interested not only in the safety angle, we could well be bringing trouble to the industry.

I am amazed that this Bill comes before us at a time when, as we have heard from our own Minister and from the Federal Minister, waterfront reform is a key issue in this country. We heard only last week in the Prime Minister's industry statement suggestions in relation to making this country more efficient. However, one thing which was not mentioned, as was pointed out clearly by Opposition members, was waterfront reform. In an interview in May last year, journalist Paul Lyneham went through various waterfront reform proposals and asked the Federal Minister for Shipping and Aviation Support (Bob Collins):

> If you do not get your 30 per cent increase in productivity will you hand in your resignation?

What did the Minister say? He stated:

> Yes, I will resign. If there has not been a significant amount of improvement in the reform process I will resign after one year in the job. I will quit. Promise.

That is what Minister Bob Collins said. I think it is interesting to quote that interview. I have a copy of the transcript here and it states:

> At this point Collins' minder, who had been listening, seemed set to blow a fuse. A few jokes about his job security and mortgage payments did not seem to relax him. Clearly he was taking the Minister seriously. At first I wasn't.

That is Paul Lyneham. It continues:

> The resignation of Federal Ministers is usually achieved only by a force similar to a neutron bomb. There's something about the magic combination of pay, prestige, perks and power that makes a return to the backbench unthinkable. Surely Collins had momentarily forgotten the political rule of never making promises so specific you can be held to them. Surely this was just grandstanding.

The SPEAKER: Order! I hope the honourable member will link these comments to the Bill that we are debating, which is the Marine Amendment Bill.

Mr MEIER: Indeed, Mr Speaker. As you would have been listening, you would have heard me say that this relates to waterfront reform.

The SPEAKER: I take it that the honourable member was not reflecting on the Chair then.

Mr MEIER: No; by saying that you would have been listening, I meant no reflection on the Chair.

The SPEAKER: I think it might pay the honourable member to leave it alone and get back to the debate by linking his comments to the Bill before the House.

Mr MEIER: Certainly, Mr Speaker. As you are aware, I was relating this interview with the Federal Minister for Shipping about waterfront reform and the fact that he said he would resign if he was not successful in achieving it. The whole point of this Bill, as I indicated earlier, is that we are supposed to be going down the path of waterfront reform; yet it would appear that, with a larger committee, we shall be heading into more industrial trouble if there is no need for the additional representatives. In that respect, I come back to Paul Lyneham, who asked the Minister:

> What do you mean by significant amount of improvement?

The Minister chose his words carefully, and said:

> If after 12 months the award restructuring process is not complete and we haven't wrapped up at least one major enterprise agreement, then I'll quit. I'm dead serious.

The article says:

> He was, too. His minder seemed to be in shock.

The Minister went on to say that as evidence he cites the agreement on smaller crew sizes on Australian ships and other items. I recognise that the amendments before us do not necessarily say that we shall have larger crew sizes: I am not saying that. But let us think about it. Why would we want a member from the Seamen's Union of Australia and a member from the soon to be amalgamated Merchant Service Guild of Australia and the Australian Institute of Marine and Power Engineers on that crewing committee if there were not some underlying belief that perhaps crew levels could increase? Are these members so concerned that they want to get on and reduce the crew levels? If so, that will be magnificent.

However, from my conversations with owners and agents, I was very disappointed to hear that over the past years there have been some indications from unions that, unless the agents or owners did as the unions wanted them to do, they would see that crewing levels increased. I will not go into any further detail, but that disturbed me greatly. It would appear that here is an example of the power of the unions. I am not talking about ordinary workers. I believe that they want to protect their jobs, that they are prepared to work hard and to do the right thing. However, the management of some of these unions is determined to take things beyond what is fair and reasonable.

I believe that the Minister here had the opportunity to help promote waterfront reform rather than to bring in this Bill. It seems to me that it must be as a result of union pressure. He could have said, 'No. The manning committee has worked effectively year after year.' In fact, we have seen a reduction in crewing levels. Talks are going on right now for further reductions in crewing levels on some vessels. Why should we suddenly change the composition of the committee? It would seem a retrograde step and something that we do not want at this time. For those reasons, the Opposition cannot support the increase in crew levels.

I turn now to the second part of the Bill, involving the removal of sexist language. We may not get to that if the Opposition has its way. It is proposed that the manning committee will become the crewing committee and the Chairman will become Presiding Member. The Opposition has no problems with those changes. As I said, hopefully the Bill will be defeated in the first place. However, we are concerned as to whether the Minister will seek to change names, such as the Seamen's Union. Will it become the Seapersons' Union? We could go on to a variety of other areas. If we are to remove sexist language here, at what stage do we stop it? We have no objection to the small areas brought up in this Bill. Unfortunately, it will be a retrograde step if there is an increase in crewing numbers, particularly from the two unions concerned.

The Hon. TED CHAPMAN (Alexandra): Without prior arrangement, I intervene in the debate to support my colleague the member for Goyder. I am prompted to do so because of my somewhat bitter experience in relation to the costs of the crews associated with those ships which have traversed between Port Adelaide and Kangaroo Island for many years. I was not as aware as possibly I should have been when this Bill was on the table of the import of this factor. Indeed, it was not until my colleague commenced to speak that I was reminded of its importance in that vessel crewing regard. Given that background, I am pleased to support the member for Goyder in his capacity as spokesperson for marine and associated matters on this side of the House.

Extra crewing levels can incur significant extra costs for the user. I am conscious that extra crewing levels at times are necessary for the purposes of the general safety of the crew and of those other passengers, persons or goods that might be carried upon seagoing vessels. Given that the safety factor is extremely important, I remind the House of

the importance also, especially in these economic times, of not allowing crewing levels to go wild and of not providing criteria or formulae for fixing crew levels on vessels at any higher level than is absolutely necessary.

I raise this matter also because nowadays, whilst shipping costs include a whole range of ingredients, crew costs—the costs of labour—are invariably the largest single factor: in most cases, if not all, more than fuel costs, ship's maintenance costs and interest on the capital involved. That can be demonstrated over and over again, not least in the example of the *Island Seaway*. As you, Mr Speaker, and other members of the House will recognise, along with the Hon. Martin Cameron, I pleaded with the Government of the day in the mid 1980s to have a service provided between mainland South Australia and Kangaroo Island for the transport of heavy goods. We wanted a low cost, freight-only vessel to replace the *M.V. Troubridge*, given the then low costs of construction and operation, with the lower crew levels that would have been required.

As you would well know, Mr Speaker, we were not successful in that campaign—the tourism industry beat us. It jumped into bed with the union movement, the very same union members who have been referred to by my colleague, and it created a monster of a ship to cater for loads and loads of passengers—which, incidentally, it does not carry any more—and, hence, up went the crew levels and the costs, so much so that, collectively now, very little freight is carried on the service and, indeed, the consumers at the other end of the line cannot afford to patronise it.

From the point of view of sheer economics, it is commonsense to keep to an absolute minimum the crew levels on vessels servicing South Australia. For that reason alone, my support for my colleague is justified in relation to the management and maintaining of the lowest feasible, safe and practicable crew levels on ships. The other reason, of course—as has been canvassed by my colleague—is that it is desirable to have a balance of representation in the crewing of vessels whether they be crewed by male or female members. As to the other part of the Bill that refers to sex discrimination, identification or behaviour, I am not particularly fussed.

Mr S.J. BAKER (Deputy Leader of the Opposition): I endorse the comments of my colleague the member for Goyder. This measure is like putting a compulsive eater in charge of a tuckshop. We have seen the situation involving wharves and shipping in this State and in this country reach a level of despair. That is the only word I can use to describe what has happened over the past 100 years. The situation has not improved a great deal, although I have noticed some improvements along the way. Three unions have contributed to this wonderful situation that we have before us: the Federated Ship Painters and Dockers Union; my old friends, the Waterside Workers Federation; and the—

The SPEAKER: Order! The honourable member will relate his comments to the Bill; as he is aware, those unions are not referred to in the legislation.

Mr S.J. BAKER: That is correct. The last union to which I refer is the Seamen's Union, which I presume is shortly to become the Seaperson's Union. The main issue in this Bill relates to who should have a say in relation to the levels of manning.

Mr Lewis: Levels of peopling.

Mr S.J. BAKER: The levels of peopling or of crewing. If we look at what is happening to crewing levels on ships in this country, at the way in which the Seamen's Union has collaborated to prevent free trade in this country, at the extent to which overseas vessels have been capable of shipping South Australian goods to overseas ports, and at the level and extent to which the Seamen's Union has restricted trade in this country, I suggest that any Government that puts the Seamen's Union forward as a responsible body to be involved in decisions on crewing has to have another think coming.

We have come a long way in the past 100 years, but I am not sure that we have advanced much as far as practices on the waterfront or on ships are concerned. There are mountains of material that indicate clearly that Australia has done itself no service whatsoever in the way that it has operated on the international trade front and particularly in relation to its capacity or incapacity to move goods. It is still a quoted fact that it is more expensive to move goods across the Tasman than it is to move them half way around the world. Part of the problem relates to the inefficiencies on the wharves and part to the restricted practices in relation to crewing levels that pertain to Australian shipping.

I am equally unrelenting in my comments about what has happened to Australian shipping with respect to the Australian Shipping Conference and the monopoly that that has created to the detriment of all Australians. I have been approached on a number of occasions by South Australian firms claiming that they could not get their goods out of Australia. Either they had to wait for a ship to come to Port Adelaide—and, if that occurred, there was no guarantee that they would get their goods onto that ship—or they had to rely on the port of Melbourne and move their goods by train to Melbourne and out through that port. Of course, everyone knows that the reputation of the port of Melbourne is well documented. For the reasons stated by the member for Goyder and for some other very profound reasons, it is inappropriate that the Liberal Party should endorse the involvement of the union in its own, if you like, crewing decisions. The Opposition opposes the proposition.

The Hon. R.J. GREGORY (Minister of Marine): I thank members for their comments and also for parading their ignorance here today.

Mr S.J. Baker interjecting:

The Hon. R.J. GREGORY: The member for Mitcham may laugh, but when he commented that it is cheaper to move goods across the world than across the Tasman, he ought to have compared apples with apples. We all know that in relation to small cargo it is more expensive on a long haul, but if large amounts of cargo are taken off a vessel and put onto other transport so that it gets away rapidly, costs diminish. I thought that the honourable member's training as an economist would have allowed him to have flexibility of mind, but what we have seen here today indicates that his mind is not that flexible.

There has been a lot of criticism today of the Seamen's Union, and I am astounded at the ignorance that has been portrayed. The member for Goyder talked about the 30 per cent improvement in productivity mentioned by the Minister for Shipping and Aviation Support (Mr Collins), but the Minister was talking about the situation on the waterfront in relation to the waterside workers. He was not talking about the Seamen's Union or the Merchant Service Guild, nor was he talking about the Institute of Marine and Power Engineers.

If we looked at what is happening in our trading vessels around the Australian coast and overseas, we would find that that part of waterfront or shipping reform has been carried out with the active participation of the officials of the Seamen's Union, the Merchant Service Guild and the Institute of Marine and Power Engineers. They have done

so, in many instances, against the express wishes of their members. They have actually negotiated with employers for the reduction of crews. I thought that members opposite would give credit where it was due, but they have not seen fit to do that. They have stood in this House and made implications about the intention and integrity of the Seamen's Union, and the other two unions that I mentioned, that are not true. Those implications are blatantly untrue and they were stated through ignorance on their part.

By means of this Bill we are ensuring that the social partners participate in what are fairly fundamental aspects of the crewing of vessels. In his explanation of why the Liberal Party is opposed to this Bill, the member for Goyder said that the Bill allows for two qualified master mariners and one qualified marine engineer. He placed the marine engineer in the Public Service Association and the qualified master mariner in the Merchant Service Guild. If he had followed normal practice, the qualified marine engineer would still be a member of the Institute of Marine and Power Engineers, but these people are not appointed because of their qualifications as union officials or as representatives of those particular trade unions, because they are not selected by those trade unions.

They are there because of their professional qualifications and are appointed by the Governor on the recommendation of the Minister. Is the member for Goyder suggesting that these people, who are appointed because of their professional qualifications, will then represent trade unions? If he is, I think that he should carefully consider his remarks. What the honourable member suggests is that these people will allow trade union matters to weigh over their professional integrity. The member for Goyder is attacking their professional integrity, and I find that a bit disturbing.

I have great confidence in the people who have been recommended by previous Ministers and appointed by me. They were appointed because of their particular and peculiar skills and not because of their membership of a trade union. The member for Goyder ought to apologise to those people and to the trade unions concerned but, then again, people in the Liberal Party seem to have people represent them whether or not they are members.

We are moving into a new era in industrial relations in Australia. We have seen industry reform initiated by the trade unions, who were aware that if there were no industry reform we would see industry as we know it in Australia disappear. We have seen the Federal Liberal Party embrace commodity development in this country as opposed to development of our secondary industries. It has been the Labor Party and the ACTU that have taken the initiative on waterfront reform in the only way in which it can possibly work: by talking things out with the employers and the unions, coming to an agreement and making it work.

The port of Rotterdam is one of the more efficient in Europe, with large amounts of cargo moving through it very quickly, yet, when its representatives were in the port of Adelaide recently and the Director of our Department of Marine and Harbors explained the pace of reform, how we were conducting the reform in our department, what was happening on the waterfront, how it would be achieved nationally in three years and how we wanted to do it here within the same time frame, he was astounded at the progress we have made so far, because what we had done had taken them seven years to do.

We are competing with the Europeans, with countries that have a high standard of living, low inflation and a lot of economic growth, greater than we have at the moment. They achieve that by cooperation, by involving the social partners in the decision-making processes. That is how they do it. They do not do it by bashing workers about the head, standing in a place such as this and denigrating them and their representatives, imputing improper motives to other people who might be appointed to positions on the recommendation of the Minister. They do not do it that way.

If we could emulate the Swedes, the Germans and other Europeans and have their rate of growth and level of inflation, we would be going a long way towards solving the problems we have in Australia. They do it through cooperation at the big and at the small enterprise levels, and they work at it very hard. To stand up in this House and say that because two people appointed as representatives to this committee belong to unions they would set about loading up the crews on these vessels, imputes improper motives to those people.

One ought to be aware of the celebrated firemen's case but, then again, that might be stretching the imagination of our friends opposite, because they do not understand that when people are members of boards they are there to make the decisions for which those boards are responsible. I suggest that representatives of the Seamen's Union, the Merchant Service Guild and the Institute of Marine Engineers, those people who would be recommended by the Minister, would be eminently suitable people to add to this Manning Committee, to assist in ensuring that ships were safely crewed.

I draw the attention of members opposite to the requirements of the Act. People just cannot go off and do what they want to do. The Act requires them to take certain things into consideration, and there can always be an appeal against their decision. In South Australia it is time that we climbed up out of the nineteenth century into the twentieth and twenty-first centuries. This Act was proclaimed in 1936, 50 or 54 years ago, depending upon when it was first assented to. Is it not about time for us to change and to accept that industrial relations have moved apace from 1936, the tail end of the Depression, when all employers could think of doing was bashing workers down? Is it not time that we brought workers in and involved them in what we are doing, so that they can contribute to the welfare of our country?

Mr Speaker, I draw your attention to the fact that what has been happening in the reduction of crews around the ports with ships of Australia has been on the initiative and with the cooperation of the Seamen's Union, the Merchant Service Guild and the Institute of Marine Engineers. It is the Seamen's Union which has adopted the concept of integrated ratings and which has forced its members to go to college and learn. We see seamen of 40 years or more going off to Launceston to become integrated ratings. The Seamen's Union insisted on it, and it is leading in this change. Why can it not be part of that here?

Bill read a second time.

In Committee.

Clauses 1 and 2 passed.

Clause 3—'Constitution of committee.'

Mr MEIER: I take it from the Minister's speech that the State Manning Committee has been in operation since 1936, and I assume that that committee has comprised up to five members during that time. That being the case, and seeing that crewing levels have come down and appear to be operating satisfactorily, why does the Minister see the need to enlarge the State Manning Committee?

The Hon. R.J. GREGORY: I have no idea whether the Manning Committee has operated since 1936, although I imagine that it has. Whether or not is has does not mean that things should not change after 50 or 55 years in light of current circumstances. I thought that the member for Goyder would have understood, and I explained in some

detail the reasons why we want to do this. It is important that the people who work in an industry have some say in what happens within that industry. If we look at the respective Acts that cover working people in South Australia, we will find that the workers play a part in a number of committees and boards. Indeed, they are nominated on the recommendation of the United Trades and Labor Council in many instances. This is an occupational business that involves people going to sea in ships. Why should they not be involved in this fairly important matter of determining how many people ought or ought not to be on a vessel?

Mr MEIER: In responding to my second reading contribution, the Minister said that he has great confidence in the sitting members, and then he went on to imply that I had questioned their ability. I make quite clear that in no way was I questioning their ability; I believe, without having followed their record that they have done a good job in the past. I have no problem there at all. In fact, my argument continues to be: no matter how long the committee has been in operation, why change it when it would appear to me—and I am backed up by the Australian National Maritime Association—that small groups are best for deliberating manning questions? We are moving to increase the size of this group, and I question whether that will be to the advantage of this State. Specifically, does the Minister believe that some of the crewing levels on the four key vessels about which we are talking can be reduced further in the near future?

The Hon. R.J. GREGORY: I will not answer hypothetical questions. If the honourable member names a vessel, I will comment on it.

Mr MEIER: Does the Minister have any view as to whether the manning level of the *Island Seaway* could be reduced further?

The Hon. R.J. GREGORY: If the member for Goyder understood a thing or two, he would understand that negotiations are under way at the moment about a reduction of that vessel's crew level.

The Committee divided on the clause:

Ayes (21)—Messrs L.M.F. Arnold, Atkinson, Bannon, Blevins, Crafter, De Laine, Ferguson, Gregory (teller), Groom, Hemmings, Heron, Holloway and Hopgood, Mrs Hutchison, Mr Klunder, Ms Lenehan, Messrs McKee, Mayes, Peterson, Quirke and Rann.

Noes (21)—Messrs Allison, Armitage, P.B. Arnold, D.S. Baker, S.J. Baker, Becker, Blacker and Brindal, Ms Cashmore, Messrs Chapman, Eastick, S.G. Evans and Ingerson, Mrs Kotz, Messrs Lewis, Matthew, Meier (teller), Oswald, Such, Venning and Wotton.

Pairs—Ayes—Messrs Hamilton and Trainer. Noes—Messrs Goldsworthy and Gunn.

The CHAIRMAN: There being 21 Noes and 21 Ayes, I give my casting vote for the Ayes.

Clause thus passed.

Clause 4, schedule and title passed.

Bill read a third time and passed.

COOPER BASIN (RATIFICATION) (ROYALTY) AMENDMENT BILL

Adjourned debate on second reading.

(Continued from 7 March. Page 3399.)

Mr LEWIS (Murray-Mallee): In considering amendments to this legislation it must be remembered that, when the initial indenture arrangements were first signed in the period during which Don Dunstan was Premier, mistakes were made. In some part, what we have before us now is a consequence of that inept negotiation of those days. However, because the law has been written the way it has, the time for renegotiation of arrangements for the payment of royalties is due. Therefore, the Government is warranted in at least the exercise through which it has gone in discussing the arrangements of the future with the Cooper Basin partners. However, that is about as far as the Opposition can go in supporting what the Government has done and proposes to do with this measure.

The central thrust of the Government's position during negotiations with the Cooper Basin indenture area producers has been that South Australia should not receive less royalty than would apply under equivalent interstate regimes. Its argument has been that at present the South Australian Treasury, which affects the South Australian taxpayers' cop to pick up the rest, has not been receiving as much as the interstate producers, and that is a moot point. It is not a point about which the Opposition makes great fuss but we believe, nonetheless, that the Government has rather loosely interpreted the averaging method to come to that conclusion. It is possible to come to an entirely different conclusion.

The Government is, in principle, within its rights to increase royalties. However, in this limited consultation process with the producers, a number of factors have emerged that cause us concern. Let me, in the first instance, address the number of enterprises which were consulted. The Government's mistake in this instance is to expect that it can satisfy the needs, in a democracy of the last decade of the 20th century, by simply talking to those people. That is a mistake, because in South Australia, since we discovered gas in the Cooper Basin and nearby, a number of enterprises have been established that rely upon that high quality gas as their base energy source. They are the primary purchasers of the gas and, just like householders, they are the end users of it, however in large volumes. They are enterprises engaged in the supply of such basic commodities into our South Australian economy and, indeed, our national economy as glass, rubber goods such as tyres—not only in the manufacture but in the retreading—plastics extrusion, steel production, detergent base or other washing material base industries, and things of that order which require reliance on gas, including building materials, apart from steel, such as cement.

Those people have not been consulted; they had not known that an increase of the kind which the Government is proposing in this legislation was about to occur and, in fact, if the Government has its way, will be backdated to the beginning of this year. That is the basis of the Opposition's strongest objection to the legislation—the retrospectivity of the increases which will very adversely affect cost factors in unit production between the beginning of the year and the middle of the year without fair notice to the people involved.

At present, the plant capacity in most of those industries is underutilised to a substantial degree, not just by a few percentage points such as 10 or 15; it is operating at well below capacity in this recession heading into depression. And it will get worse, not better. It is the worst possible time, from an economic point of view, to be doing anything like this. However, the basis of our concern is that now those producers using the gas have already made the product and sold it without including, as part of their price, the increase in cost of that production in consequence of the retrospective way in which the legislation is to be applied. They will have no chance of recouping that money: it will be a straight out deduction from any—and I emphasise the

word 'any'—residual amount there might have been for the calculation and determination of profit or, more likely, it will add to a loss in their operations during the first six months of this year. They will not be able to do as the Government intends and hopes to do in this instance and that is simply retrospectively to bill the customer. No customer anywhere would pay and no court in this land would feel compelled to make the customer pay.

For the past 12 months the Government has been seeking to increase petroleum royalties. That is well known. They were initially to be increased by 100 per cent or thereabouts. In doing so, it used threats of bringing in legislation and threats of legal action to get compliance from the firms that make up the Cooper Basin Indenture Area Producers. Cooper Basin producers except Delhi Petroleum, so far as I am aware, have very reluctantly agreed to an increase of approximately 50 per cent. In fact, it will turn out to be not, as the Government said, $18 million but more likely $20 million if it were in a normal trading year and at normal throughput volume.

Delhi Petroleum has objected very strongly in principle to the Government's abrogation of the indenture and the heavy-handedness which has been used. Once it is established, some part of the $20 million will flow on to gas prices in the hands of householders who have to pay those prices. Gas prices will increase by 4c to 5c a gigajoule and, although the percentage increase in cost may not appear large, most of the large industrial consumers are now looking at alternative fuels. I point out that these alternative fuels are, in fact, most attractive in the form of high-grade black coal from New South Wales, particularly in view of the fact that the Government is intending to push the Pipelines Authority of South Australia (PASA) to get a 5 per cent real rate of return on its capital. That will mean another increase in the price per gigajoule.

This price increase will also flow on to ETSA and will increase the amount that ETSA must pay, so that ETSA will have to pass on that increase to its end users in the price for electricity per kilowatt hour. That will also impact on household budgets in the same way that price increases for gas will impact on household budgets, putting up costs in the family homes of all South Australians in ways which, at present, ought to be avoided.

As I have said, we are in recession heading for depression. It is unfortunate that the effect of increasing gas prices to ETSA will encourage it to use more Leigh Creek coal and less gas. That is unfortunate, because it flies in the face of the essential strategy mapped out by the Minister's green paper, which was introduced into the Parliament some two or three months ago. We ought to be doing things which encourage the use of lower polluting alternatives and lower polluting substances rather than encouraging the use of higher polluting substances. Yet this policy will encourage enterprises to use more dirty coal, such as ETSA, others which are in the glass-making business and the cement-making business, and possibly those other enterprises to which I referred earlier and which, through co-generation, will be able to use the coal for making the heat that is essential to their industrial process and to the generation of their own electricity on site.

It is a pity too that, earlier this year, the Government talked about maintaining or reducing—more particularly emphasising the word 'reducing'—electricity charges to householders whilst, at the same time, it knew very well that the consequence of this policy would be to increase those prices. The Government was negotiating at the same time with the Cooper Basin area producers for an increase in royalties that would jack up the prices of gas being used by ETSA. Gas is more efficient and less polluting. It is the efficiency aspect that I am talking about in this instance. The cost per kilowatt hour from power houses is lower if gas rather than coal is used, and the incentive to ETSA now is to use less gas and more coal in consequence to generate the demand load.

Of course, there will be an even greater temptation to export further jobs to the eastern States by relying on greater quantities of imported electricity through the interconnection. That is another aspect.

An honourable member interjecting:

Mr LEWIS: What do I think of that? I think that is undesirable. I do not believe that, as a Parliament, with commitments to the future generations of this State and this nation to use less coal with lower greenhouse gas emissions, we should be doing things which, in fact, contradict that.

Clearly, the bulk of electricity brought in through the interconnection will be generated by burning coal. In the main, that coal in the Yallourn/Moe area is of even poorer quality than the stuff we have been digging up at Leigh Creek. It has a much higher level of atmospheric carbon emission per unit electricity sent out than has gas. The Government leaned on Santos as the senior partner in that group to give a beat up in the press release at the time it was saying these things about reducing power costs in South Australia back in January, that it would spend $300 million on exploration for more gas in South Australia.

The Government would be well advised not to encourage the production of too much gas or give a commitment to buy that gas if it is at such a price as will not enable us to find end users for it, otherwise we will be in the same sorry state as is the stupid Labor Government in Western Australia presently, having to pay for gas that it is not using under the terms of its contract with those producers. I do not want to find us in that position. It was bad enough that we were incompetent in the way in which the Dunstan Government negotiated with Australian Gaslight back in the 1970s: it would be even worse if we made the same mistake as did the Labor Government in Western Australia.

However, Santos has told the Government that the increase in these royalties payable to the State Government—in effect, an increase in the cost of its operations—will result in a reduction in the amount which it feels compelled to commit to exploration here in South Australia. That is in spite of the fact that, along with the Government, it made those statements which the Government then beat up, saying that it would lead to a $300 million exploration expenditure program this year.

The Government is endeavouring to contract gas from south-west Queensland (that is, 30 petajoules per annum in 1994) and from the Amadeus Basin (20-30 petajoules in 1993-94) in addition to our South Australian supplies already at 65 petajoules per annum. I point out that we do not want another Western Australian situation where the Government has to pay for a swag of gas that we are not using and cannot use.

The clauses of this Bill that we find contentious are those that provide retrospectivity. We do not accept that it is legitimate to backdate the charge against business and prevent that business from being able to recoup the costs imposed on it through the royalty mechanism: that is, the Pipelines Authority charges more to the distributors and the distributors then pass it on and collect it from the end users—the households and businesses of South Australia. Those which are most important to South Australia and upon which the greatest impact has occurred, or will be

likely to occur, stated what the consequences will be in the present economic circumstances.

I do not want to see 1 200 tonnes of glass manufacturing taken out of the factories here in South Australia. That will cost us jobs, and that is exactly what will be the consequence of the introduction of this proposed measure at this time, backdated to 1 January. How else can those businesses possibly pick up the loss that they will incur other than by contemplating an increase in costs of the order of 6 per cent? It is a stupid policy in the extreme to put at risk those jobs and that enterprise established here in South Australia.

Mr Atkinson: Jobs in Kilkenny.

Mr LEWIS: I thank the honourable member for that prompting, albeit out of order, as it nonetheless adds to the dimension of the debate. Before deferring to other members for their contribution, I wish to point out the main difference between the existing and proposed formula. In the existing formula the Cooper Basin partners were allowed a deduction for depreciation and the cost of capital on a credit foncier calculation arrangement. Credit foncier simply means number of equal payments made over time to whomever the payments are being made by the party making the payments—that may be a body corporate or an individual. They are equal in size and comprised of differing amounts of capital and interest. It is the common way in which most home loans are established. In the first payment, the greatest component is of interest and there is a small amount of capital. As the payments progress across time, the amount of interest on the outstanding capital is less and therefore the amount of capital in that same amount is greater. Hence, at the end of the day, the last payment exactly pays out the residual capital with the small amount of interest thereon. That is what credit foncier means, for the benefit of those members who did not understand.

In the new formula the capital invested in this way (and the way it is written off) will be divided into two categories and the payments will not be of a credit foncier nature. The old capital—money already invested prior to the commencement of the legislation—amounts to about $1.1 billion. That has been written down at the Government's insistence to $800 million—it just wipes off $300 million. The Government has its reasons for doing that, I do not doubt, although frankly it leaves me a bit cold. I would not do a deal with another organisation that had the power of screwing me in that way.

The $800 million will be written off over the next 10 years in a straight line at the rate of $80 million per annum. There will be no allowance for interest—none whatsoever. One does not have $1.1 billion in capital invested. We do not believe that that is legitimate. The Minister told the Cooper Basin producers that there is $300 million that they will not be allowed to write off in the future. He said that they have only $800 million. No interest is payable on that $80 million per annum for the next 10 years.

In addition, the new or future capital to be invested after the commencement date of the legislation will have a 10 year straight line depreciation. Interest is to be paid on that and will be calculated at half the long-term bond rate each year. Furthermore, each year any new capital invested will be treated in the same manner; in other words, a tenth of it will be deducted from the gross revenue of well-head price income and the interest of half the long-term bond rate will be added to the whole of the amount so calculated and also deducted from that gross income at the well-head. The net income after that and other expenses are deducted will be the figure used as the sum upon which royalty is calculated. I note from the Minister's expression that that is his understanding. He did look rather wiser.

The Hon. J.H.C. Klunder: I was not even listening.

Mr LEWIS: If you were not listening, you should have been. The second reading explanation did not explain that, for the benefit of posterity or for the people in this place who might have read it. I regret that. It should be possible for any citizen to pick up *Hansard*, read the debate and understand the proposal contained in the legislation and any argument there may be about that proposal. I regret that in this instance I have to point out to the Minister that I think he was deficient in that respect. If one did not have some training in accountancy, one would not have been able to discover how the royalties are to be calculated. In addition, one would have to read a copy of not only the Bill but also the schedule and the accounts.

The Government has reduced some overheads that were previously included by agreement in the original indenture as operating costs and, therefore, deducted from the gross revenue at the wellhead prior to the determination of royalties payable. These excluded overheads have been worth about $1.5 million per annum to this point. The Government proposes that royalty payments will now be made monthly instead of six monthly, as has been the case up to this point and still remains the case in law. That change gives the Government a significant advantage.

Members who know anything about bankcard finance (for instance) know very well that at the end of the year the amount charged as the rate charged per annum, calculated monthly and compounded monthly is, in fact, higher than it would be if that were the rate charged per annum—the same figure—and calculated per annum. So, the Government gets its cash flow monthly and that gives it an additional advantage which is not shown up in the actual sum, but which most certainly is an advantage gained at the expense of the producers, who were previously able to retain that cash in their own enterprises, thus reducing the amount of interest they would have to pay on their borrowings or, alternatively, increasing the amount that could be earned by investment of those funds on the short-term money market. Therefore, the effect on producers who are currently paying approximately 4.6 per cent of their gross sales proceeds is that they will now pay 6.8 per cent, or thereabouts, which is an increase amounting to 50 per cent.

With all that in mind, the only thing that the Opposition will attempt to do with this legislation is make it fair and bearable. The Opposition notes the amendments to the schedule that the Minister has recently introduced and finds no difficulty with them. They merely clarify the position the Government wishes to adopt and the Government can therefore accept responsibility for that. However, before concluding my remarks, let me again state, re-emphasise and leave the Government in no doubt whatsoever: the Opposition is utterly committed to the proposition that these royalty charges and rearrangements of the indenture must not be retrospective. It would be far more sensible, reasonable and realistic if they were to commence at the beginning of the next financial year. The Opposition's amendment to the legislation will accordingly have that effect. I place on the record my thanks to the very many members of staff of those several companies who have helped me to understand how the legislation will impact on their enterprises and, collectively, on South Australia's economy.

Mr S.J. BAKER (Deputy Leader of the Opposition): I rise to support the comments made by my colleague the member for Murray-Mallee. We in the Opposition have grave reservations about the propositions in this legislation. I would like to make some brief remarks about Santos and

also to address briefly the impact of the Bill. Santos is a proud South Australian firm; in fact, it is one of the last firms that we can truly call our own. So, we have a great interest in its future, just as we have a great interest in the future of the Cooper Basin and in its capacity to keep South Australians in the luxury to which they are accustomed, with gas supplies available at a reasonable price. They are two good reasons why we are vitally interested in the Bill.

I am aware that the producers have been under pressure from this Government for a considerable time to increase the royalties paid to the Government. It has been no secret, the dogs have been barking it around town, and I suppose it is only because we have people of considerable honour operating in Santos, Delhi and in other areas, that they have not gone out against the Government for what I believe is a breach of the indenture. Agreements that are now historical were made at a time when, perhaps, favours were being done and when both the supplier and the demander had particular needs. Of course, in this case, the supplier was Santos and the demander was the Government.

If those deals are made at a time when favours are being given, normally they are set in cement; they are inviolate and not subject to alteration. However, we know that for a long time the Minister has been placing a great deal of pressure on producers to upgrade the ante, because the Government is revenue-scarce, a situation that has reached momentous proportions as a result of the $1 billion State Bank debacle. The loss of revenue in that area has to be made up from somewhere and this is one of the mechanisms by which the Government believes it will start to pick up the tab.

I know that the negotiations with the producers related to the formula surrounding the calculation of the royalty. However, under this proposition it is not only that element that is being considered and changed but also the rate of royalty. On both counts, I believe that the Government is breaking an agreement. I can only assume that this agreement is enforceable by law. Therefore, I also assume that the Government has done a deal, or has been able to provide some offset to the producers, which is acceptable to them, because I cannot believe that anyone in his or her right mind would possibly give $20 million to this Government. I presume that there has been some trade-off or deal to allow Santos and the producers access to exploration areas that perhaps in the past have been refused. I have gone into this matter at considerable length. In fact, I was on a select committee some years ago, and I have read the legislation.

The Hon. J.H.C. Klunder interjecting:

Mr S.J. BAKER: Yes, the Minister was also included. There is no doubt in my mind that if the matter were taken through the courts and to the High Court, if that were appropriate, the Government would lose the case. Obviously, some deal has been done. If it has, I hope it will be to the future benefit of all South Australians.

The last matter I wish to address is the passing on of costs to the consumers. We do not have an estimate in the Bill of the ultimate cost to such front-end users as Brighton Cement and the households of South Australia which use the gas because, indeed, if Santos is true to itself it will obviously have to make up the shortfall of $20 million it is now paying to the Government in increased taxation.

I expect that there will be an increase in charges, and that is regrettable in present conditions. I do not know how much it will be. Perhaps the Minister in response will explain to the Parliament what his estimate of the increased costs to consumers in South Australia will be. He may be able to tell us what the increases will be for items such as cement or soda ash conversion, and he may be able to tell the person who has to cook the evening meal what the extra charges will be as a result of this extra $20 million impost.

I am unhappy with the proposition. I believe that it breaks the rules. I have not asked producers about the circumstances—perhaps it is better not to do so—but I believe there has been a breach of faith with this legislation. It breaks the agreement that was made in 1975. That in itself will affect future prospects for oil exploration or other mining ventures in this State if the Government, through a variety of means—and they are not known at the moment—changes the arrangements which were put in place 15 years ago. I express my reservations about the legislation and join the member for Murray-Mallee in saying that this House must on principle refuse the backdating of the commencement date.

The Hon. JENNIFER CASHMORE (Coles): I reaffirm the reservations expressed by my colleagues about this Bill. As the Minister said in his second reading explanation, not only the formula but the rate for royalties is to be adjusted, and it is to be adjusted retrospectively. The member for Murray-Mallee has outlined the technical nature of the Bill. I want to address myself principally to the economic consequences of the Bill and to the broader consequences in terms of the relationship of anyone with this Government in terms of contracts.

I will not go over all the ground that was covered in what was a forerunner to this Bill, the Natural Gas (Interim Supply) Bill, which was debated on 29 October 1985 in this Chamber. I remind the House that that Bill altered a contract that the Labor Government had signed with producers. That in itself was a very grave and serious step which undoubtedly must have disturbed the confidence of anyone who wished to enter into a contract which they would expect to be binding and which the Government was subsequently going to alter.

The consequences of the present arrangement are primarily economic. I draw the attention of the House to the fact that there was no consultation by the Minister or his adviser with the users—only with the producers. The users, of course, are extremely important players in energy consumption, because their products are consumed by Government, by the private sector and by households, and the consumption of those products has an effect on the CPI. It seems to me that by introducing this Bill to increase the rate of royalties and thus to increase costs the Minister is breaching undertakings that he gave publicly that the costs of electricity in this State would not rise. On 4 January this year, in the *Weekend News*, there was a substantial headline, 'ETSA cuts on way'. The article states:

> A 30 per cent drop in ETSA's electricity production will flow on to lower tariffs for consumers, an ETSA spokesman said today.

He went on to explain:

> The fall in production is the result of ETSA's link into Victoria's and New South Wales' cheaper electricity supplies which means that almost a third of South Australia's supplies now come from the Eastern States. ETSA's public relations manager David Sweet said South Australia would now save millions of dollars a year because of the lower production figures.

But that is not the case. Those millions of dollars a year allegedly to be saved will now fall within the ambit of this Bill which will increase costs to producers and to users. Earlier today I spoke to an executive of Adelaide Brighton Cement, who said that for that company alone—which is one of the principal users, if not the principal user; the others being BHAS and BHP Whyalla—the cost of gas would be increased by $200 000 a year, that the scope for passing on that increase was limited and, therefore, the profitability of that company would be severely affected with

all that goes with an impact on profitability, namely, staffing levels and capital improvements.

The effect of electricity cost increases is not yet determined for Adelaide Brighton Cement, but for one company at least, ACI Glass Packaging Division, the effect will be severe. It is worth reading to the House a letter to the Premier from the Supply Manager, Mr S. Douglas. There is no date on the letter, but it is shortly before the Bill was introduced. Referring to the Cooper Basin (Ratification) (Royalty) Amendment Bill 1991, he says:

> I wish to protest on behalf of the Australian Glass Manufacturers plants located at Port Road, Croydon, South Australia, and Dowling Street, Waterloo, New South Wales, over the abovementioned amendment Bill, which I understand is to be debated tomorrow, 14.3.1991.

So this letter was presumably dated 13 March. The letter continues:

> I would have expected that the Government would have entered into discussions with all major consumers, other than the gas distributors, as it will be they who will be the most affected. Instead, very little, if any, consultation appears to have taken place.
>
> Naturally, PASA will look to pass the increase on to both Sagasco and AGL, whose contracts allow for this. I certainly expect that both Sagasco and AGL will pass the increase on to their customers, and once again it will be the industrial consumer who will be forced to bear the brunt of any increases. I do not accept that 'some improvements in efficiency' may cause a lesser increase . . . The distributors should be compelled to absorb increases of this nature, the reward for which may well be improvements in their efficiency/productivity a little earlier than planned.
>
> The Government claims as its justification for this Bill that it is disadvantaged in comparison with other interstate royalty regimes. I would ask if, having arrived at this conclusion, the Government had really compared 'apples with apples', and, if so, then the Government might like to explain how the original agreement with the producers was arrived at.

Of course, we all know the sorry history of how the Dunstan Government breached that agreement and sold out the State in terms of selling our gas at prices which did not provide a fair return on investment or a decent deal for our consumers. Mr Douglas goes on:

> The Government should also appreciate that its estimation of the impact of the increase on final consumers is misleading—the industrial and commercial consumers will certainly pass any increases on to their customers at the first opportunity. As we are all ultimately domestic consumers irrespective of whether we are gas or electricity customers, a price increase will impact many times over, on everybody—

not just the producers, but everybody—

> every time a purchase is made. Politically, it will undoubtedly be too embarrassing for the Government to ask the domestic consumers to accept higher charges, so their share of the burden will also be passed on to the industrial consumers.
>
> I also note that, if passed, this Bill is to be made retrospective to 1 Janury 1991. What provision has the Government made to compensate those industrial and commercial consumers who have already been paid for goods or services provided since the proposed date of application? Does the Government expect that these consumers can afford to pay charges that had not been legislated for the time of sale? It is quite apparent that the Government has given no thought whatsoever to the effect of retrospectivity which, in real terms, is an insidious form of taxation anyway.

Mr Douglas sought the Government's consideration on the points that he made. It is quite clear that the Government has not considered those points or that, if it has, it is not willing to take any of them on board. The final outcome of this kind of action by the Government is that South Australia is becoming less competitive with the other States. That position is clearly stated in the *Engineering Industries Review* of 5 December last year as follows:

> Over recent years, the Engineering Employers Association has been warning that the competitive advantage which South Australia has—

or has had, I should say—

> over the eastern States is getting slimmer, and is in danger of disappearing altogether . . . The inefficiency of South Australia's electrical power generation is also detracting from the overall competitiveness of South Australian industry.

The publication goes on to point out that the EEA made a submission to the Industrial Commission Inquiry into Energy Generation and Distribution in which it pointed to the 1988-89 OECD survey of Australia which found that Australia's energy utilities operated at only 50 per cent of the average OECD productivity level. Not only do we as a State have to perform better than the other States if we are to compete and to provide employment in South Australia because of our distance from interstate markets, but as a nation we have to become infinitely more competitive, something which the Federal Government has at last recognised partially in its industry statement—and I stress only partially. The production, distribution and pricing of energy is a critical part of that interstate and international competitiveness.

Professor Swan of the Australian Graduate School of Management presented a paper to the Engineering Employers Association in which he said that he and his colleagues looked at the comparative efficiency of State electricity authorities and found that South Australia would have to reduce costs by $96 million per annum just to achieve levels of productivity comparable with those of Queensland. This Bill does exactly the reverse: it proposes to increase costs to producers, users and consumers. Where is the economic rationality in that and how much will we suffer as a result?

The Opposition submits that the suffering will be considerable and that it will be not just for electricity users but for the whole economy of the State. For those reasons and because of the retrospectivity of the Bill and its effect upon the large end users who were not consulted and who could not possibly have budgeted for its effects, the Opposition cannot support some aspects of this legislation.

The Hon. J.H.C. KLUNDER (Minister of Mines and Energy): I thank members for their contribution to this debate. The basic thrust of this legislation is that South Australia should not be disadvantaged in terms of royalty compared with the other States. While I have listened attentively to a number of people on the other side indicating that effectively there will be an increase in costs, I point out to them that by the same token a very large number of people in South Australia over a very large number of years have had reduced costs compared with costs applied in other States. Those costs are not rising above those of other States but are now approaching the same level as the average of the other States regardless of how one calculates them or how much one quibbles about the calculations.

At the outset, I point out that, while a lot of negotiation has taken place over the past 18 months or so, the final position placed on the table today results from an offer by the producers and is not a final demand put in unilaterally by the Government. The shadow Minister and other members opposite have made the point that consumers were not involved or consulted during this process. If we were to consult consumers, we would have had to consult all of them, and that would have been a staggering exercise because there are not very many people in this State who are not in one way or another users of the energy provided, in the first instance, by the production of gas at the Moomba fields.

Opposition members made a great song and dance about the claim by the large companies that they were not consulted and, by implication at least, stated that the ordinary consumer of this power does not matter as much as the large companies. I would knock that idea on the head, because clearly every single consumer would have an equal

right to be consulted if there were to be consultation of that nature, and that would be pretty difficult to do.

I am trying to drag to the forefront of my mind a saying of, I think, Colonel Ironside straight after King Charles I had been beheaded and Cromwell had taken over in Great Britain. He said, 'The poorest he in England has as much say as the richest he.' I may be misquoting as I am thinking back to my political studies of about 25 years ago. However, if there is to be consultation, everyone should be consulted and not merely those who believe by virtue of size—

Mr Quirke: A roundhead response to a cavalier approach!

The Hon. J.H.C. KLUNDER: It is certainly a roundhead response to a cavalier approach. The shadow Minister also stated that this is the worst possible time. It is always the worst possible time to increase charges or royalties of any kind. For a very large number of years people have been working under a lower royalty regime in this State than in other States, and they have been reaping the benefits during that time. I certainly hope that ETSA, with its increased efficiency and under the various programs that it is undertaking at the moment, will be able to underwrite or absorb a considerable proportion of the increases that will be passed on to it via the royalty from the producers through PASA, and I would be very disappointed if it could not.

I do not control SAGASCO; consequently, I am not in a position to be hopeful that it will absorb some of the increases. However, SAGASCO has increased its efficiency quite markedly over the past few years and, partly as a result of its increased efficiency, it has achieved a good result this year. Therefore, I hope that it will be willing to absorb some of the increases.

I object to the member for Murray-Mallee's implication that the Government would use threats to get its way. Our position was less favourable than that of the other States. I do not believe that it was a tenable position; it was one that we needed to do something about. We have certain rights under the Petroleum Act and the indenture to seek alternatives to the current situation.

We did so, and did so by negotiation. If negotiation had not been successful, clearly we could have taken the legal or legislative routes. However, we did not do so; in fact, we went to negotiation. The negotiations were very amicable even though, clearly, the producers would have preferred not to have been involved in the first place. Indeed, the question might well be: what would members of the Opposition want us to do? If negotiations were unsuccessful, did they then want us to pull back and not to insist or to continue with some way of making sure that South Australia received the same deal as did the other States?

If that were the situation, I put it to the House that negotiations led by an Opposition with that belief would never be successful, because anyone dealing with a Government led by the current Opposition would realise that, if they merely said 'No' often enough, the Opposition would back down.

Mr Lewis: And if things were different, they would not be the same.

The Hon. J.H.C. KLUNDER: Well, things are not the same. We have a Government in office that believes in ensuring that negotiations come to a successful conclusion. The honourable member went much wider than the Bill in talking about gas supplies from other States, but I do not particularly wish to follow him there—that can be done during another debate. The issue of retrospectivity, clearly, is of considerable moment to this House. When I sent a letter in August of 1989 seeking to open negotiations with the producers, I did not start with, nor did I intend, any degree of retrospectivity.

It must be understood that, while we negotiated with people without some kind of deadline, we did not actually get very far, and it is hard not to blame the producers for that. Every single day on which they could stall the negotiations, on which they could avoid coming to some sort of agreement with the Government, was a day on which they were working on a much lower royalty regime than in other States, and that, no doubt, had a very pleasant effect on their bottom line.

It was not until such time as I told them ahead of the date that 1 January 1991 would be the date from which royalties would apply that we started, all of a sudden, to get serious negotiation under way. In fact, the producers accepted that in a later letter, and indicated that they had accepted that 1 January 1991 would be the date from which an increased royalty regime, however arrived at, would be applied.

The honourable member then waxed eloquent on the deduction from that $1.2 billion (or $1.1 billion as he stated) to $800 million, and the change from a credit *foncier* to a straight line depreciation and, indeed, a depreciation without interest. He gave us the benefit of his wisdom in telling us what a credit *foncier* system was, which may have been of interest to some members. He also claimed that the Government had forced the producers into this. In fact, I can point out that it was an offer from the producers, and it was clearly an offer from the producers because the alternative was one that they feared considerably more.

That alternative was that there might have been an increase in the percentage of royalties under the Petroleum Act, and it was quite clear that the producers were keen to avoid that and, on the basis of that, made some of those concessions to which the honourable member referred. However, it is a little pointless to argue the individual methods by which the increases in royalties were arrived at (for instance, as the honourable member referred to in some detail, the fact that payments for royalties were to be made monthly rather than six-monthly).

The situation is that we arrived at a particular royalty regime which was the average of the States, and all these devices were ways of arriving at that particular royalty payment of about 6.8 per cent in order, from my point of view and as far as I know from that of the producers, to avoid the difficulty of South Australia's raising the gas royalties under the Petroleum Act in such a way that the other States could use that as a leapfrog situation to start increasing their royalties as well.

Various other members spoke, and some of the points they made need to be dealt with. The Deputy Leader, for instance, apparently argued that the fact that we were trying to get a better deal for South Australia was somehow reprehensible. I do not agree with that nor accept it. It is essential that we get the maximum out of things such as gas, oil, condensate and so on that are owned by the South Australian people and, before we allow ownership to pass on to other people, this State has a right to exact for the owners of those commodities, the South Australian people, the best deal possible—certainly not a deal that is considerably less than the Australian average.

The argument of revenue scarcity was raised by the Deputy Leader—and that was an odd one, because he tried to tie it to the State Bank! I can tell members that I started these negotiations with the producers in August 1989, and that date itself ought to be sufficient to knock that particular argument on the head. The other argument that the honourable member used—and it is one that keeps cropping up time and again on the Opposition benches—is that somewhere or other there are deals no-one is being told about

which are carefully constructed under the table and which no-one finds out about until years later.

The honourable member made that point when saying that he could not understand why anyone would want to pay $20 million to the Government if they did not have to, and that there obviously had to be an under-the-table deal somewhere. I reject that. I think that it was unworthy of the honourable member, and point out to him that, again, we have the power under the Petroleum Act to increase the royalty on gas. That was not seen as desirable by the producers, and the *quid pro quo* that they received was a 10 year certainty of a fixed royalty regime.

So, here we had two parties sitting down at a table, negotiating something that was of use to both of them. Under the circumstances, I do not think that anyone in this House should have any worries about this Bill going through and, indeed, going through with a 'retrospective' date, because, very clearly, we would not have been able to arrive at a situation agreed between 10 out of the 11 producers and the Government unless such a date were set at one stage or another. As I stressed, that date was set ahead of time. We did not impose on the producers a retrospective date: we told them ahead of time that, unless the situation had been resolved by 1 January 1991, royalties would apply from that date.

Bill read a second time.

In Committee.

Clause 1 passed.

Clause 2—'Commencement.'

Mr LEWIS: I move:

Page 1, line 15—Leave out this clause and substitute:
2. This Act will come into operation on 1 July 1991.

The Hon. J.H.C. KLUNDER: The Government opposes this amendment for the reasons that have already been canvassed during the second reading debate.

The Committee divided on the amendment:

Ayes (21)—Messrs Allison, Armitage, P.B. Arnold, D.S. Baker, S.J. Baker, Becker, Blacker and Brindal, Ms Cashmore, Messrs Chapman, Eastick, S.G. Evans and Ingerson, Mrs Kotz, Messrs Lewis (teller), Matthew, Meier, Oswald, Such, Venning and Wotton.

Noes (21)—Messrs L.M.F. Arnold, Atkinson, Bannon, Crafter, De Laine, Ferguson, Gregory, Groom, Hamilton, Hemmings, Heron, Holloway and Hopgood, Mrs Hutchison, Mr Klunder (teller), Ms Lenehan, Messrs McKee, Mayes, Peterson, Quirke and Rann.

Pairs—Ayes—Messrs Goldsworthy and Gunn. Noes—Messrs Blevins and Trainer.

The CHAIRMAN: There are 21 Ayes and 21 Noes and, there being an equality of votes, I give my casting vote to the Noes.

Amendment thus negatived; clause passed.

Clause 3 passed.

Clause 4—'The indenture.'

Mr LEWIS: I move:

Page 1, lines 26 and 27—Leave out subclause (2) and substitute:
(2) The amendments to the indenture will have effect from 1 July 1991.

Amendment negatived; clause passed.

Schedule.

Paragraph 1 passed.

Paragraph 2—'Clause 12.'

The CHAIRMAN: Does the member for Murray-Mallee wish to proceed with his amendments?

Mr LEWIS: I acknowledge that there is no point in my persisting with amendments which the Government will oppose and the result of which will be the same. The Opposition is sensible enough to know when that will not happen. How on earth does the Minister propose to recover increased costs for goods which have been produced using gas that has been paid for to date at a lower price than the price which will be applicable to it now that the amendments to the legislation will have effect from 1 January—when the gas has been used, the goods have been produced and the sales have been made?

Does the Minister expect the producers to simply cop it and not pass it on, or does the Minister believe that in some magical way those end users will be able to recover the loss? Does he acknowledge and understand that he now puts at risk two points: first, he is encouraging people, indeed the Electricity Trust in particular, to use more of the polluting coal and less gas in consequence of its being more expensive; and, secondly, there is a grave risk in relation to the number of jobs in South Australia given that workers could be transferred interstate as production for the Australian market, using more expensive gas, will be transferred interstate where it is less expensive?

The Hon. J.H.C. KLUNDER: I repeat part of what I said in the second reading stage: we are now getting to a situation that should have applied some time ago—where the royalty in South Australia is the same as the royalty in other States. Indeed, everybody has up to this point, in South Australia, been getting a better run than have people in other States, and for them to be moving up to the same level playing field as other States does not seem to me to be a bad thing. Certainly, the Opposition is always telling us how important level playing fields are. As I said, I am hopeful that the Electricity Trust can absorb a certain amount of those increases that will be passed onto it and, while I cannot speak with anywhere near the same degree of certainty for the South Australian Gas Company, I am hopeful that it also will be able to absorb some of those costs.

The Hon. J.H.C. KLUNDER: I move:

Page 3, clause 12 (2) *(f)*—
Leave out 'or in abandoning'.
Leave out 'any such costs incurred as a result of the loss of control of such well' and substitute 'any costs incurred as a result of the loss of control of any well'.

This is merely a tidying up of the statement before us in such a way as to deal with the loss of control in any well rather than in the restrictive number of wells as indicated in the Bill.

Mr LEWIS: The Opposition accepts the amendment and the Minister's explanation as, indeed, it accepts all amendments to the schedule, and would be happy for the Committee to consider them, with your indulgence Mr Chairman, *en bloc* now.

Amendment carried.

The Hon. J.H.C. KLUNDER: I move:

Page 3, clause 12 (3)—After paragraph *(d)* insert new paragraph as follows:
(da) Sale of Plant
Notwithstanding the provisions of subclause (2), if an item of plant is sold by a Producer ('the first Producer') to another Producer, or to a company that becomes a successor or assign of the first Producer under this Indenture ('the second Producer'), the second Producer may only depreciate the plant to the extent to which the first Producer was, immediately before the time of sale, entitled to depreciate the plant under this Indenture.

Page 4, clause 12 (4) *(c)*—Leave out 'within 60 days of the commencement of this clause' and substitute 'within 30 days of the enactment of the Cooper Basin (Ratification) (Royalty) Amendment Act 1991'.

Page 5, clause 12 (4) *(j)*—Leave out 'the Minister's audit' and substitute 'the Minister's receipt'.

I thank the Opposition for its courtesy in expediting the matter.

Amendments carried.

The CHAIRMAN: The Chair points out to the Committee two typographical errors in the schedule: paragraph 2, subparagraph (2) *(c)* 'Calculation of royalty', should read 'clause 6 (10)' not 'clause 6 (1)'; and page 3 subparagraph (3) *(a)* should read 'For the purposes of subclause (2)'—the word 'subclause' should be in lower case.

Schedule as amended passed.

The CHAIRMAN: I point out also a typographical error in the heading of clause 3. Instead of 'contiguous arrears' it should read 'contiguous areas'.

Title passed.

The Hon. J.H.C. KLUNDER: I move:

That this Bill be now read a third time.

Mr LEWIS (Murray-Mallee): The Opposition opposes the measure for the reasons outlined in the second reading debate. We find that the Government's explanation does not satisfy us—that this now makes us comparable with other States in the measure of royalties that we can collect. Indeed, it depends on how that is calculated. The end users who have a choice of where they will relocate old business or otherwise locate new business clearly explain in detail that South Australia's higher prices for its gas now put it at a disadvantage as this measure establishes them.

Moreover, the New South Wales users of South Australian gas are able to obtain that gas more cheaply than South Australian users, because royalties established under this formula as defined for future purposes in this legislation will mean that they are paying about half the royalties paid by South Australian users, as half the royalties have to be absorbed by the producer. That is under the unfavourable terms of arrangement that were made long ago. The greater the disparity between the royalties paid in this State and elsewhere, the greater the advantage to any business to relocate outside South Australia. Indeed, let me put that in the unfortunate negative context: the greater the disadvantage to the prospect of retaining existing business and establishing new business in South Australia.

This Opposition is about positive promotion of this State and the retention of its existing industrial base without further erosion of it. It is for that reason and not for any other that we oppose the measure. We hoped that the Government will accept the proposition to have the legislation commence on 1 July. As the Bill now stands we find it unacceptable since the commencement date is retrospectively determined at 1 January.

The House divided on the third reading:

Ayes (21)—Messrs L.M.F. Arnold, Atkinson, Bannon, Crafter, De laine, M.J. Evans, Ferguson, Gregory, Groom, Hamilton, Hemmings, Heron, Holloway and Hopgood, Mrs Hutchison, Mr Klunder (teller), Ms Lenehan, Messrs McKee, Mayes, Quirke and Rann.

Noes (21)—Messrs Allison, Armitage, P.B. Arnold, D.S. Baker, S.J. Baker, Becker, Blacker and Brindal, Ms Cashmore, Messrs Chapman, Eastick, S.G.Evans and Ingerson, Mrs Kotz, Messrs Lewis (teller), Matthew, Meier, Oswald, Such, Venning and Wotton.

Pairs—Ayes—Messrs Blevins and Trainer. Noes—Messrs Goldworthy and Gunn.

The SPEAKER: There being 21 Ayes and 21 Noes, I give my casting vote for the Ayes.

Third reading thus carried.

Bill passed.

SOUTH AUSTRALIAN METROPOLITAN FIRE SERVICE (MISCELLANEOUS POWERS) AMENDMENT BILL

Adjourned debate on second reading.

(Continued from 7 March. Page 3398.)

Mr MEIER (Goyder): By and large the Opposition acknowledges the changes embodied in this Bill. Certainly in debate in this place we will be asking questions as to the implications of some of the clauses, rather than moving specific amendments. It is possible that in another place changes may be made. As members may be aware, the amendments relate to three main sections of the Act: first, the power to enter and inspect public buildings, to determine the adequacy of fire and emergency safeguards; secondly, powers in relation to places at which a danger of fire may exist; and, thirdly, payment of costs and expenses where a vessel or property is uninsured.

There is no doubt that these areas are very important and need due consideration. In that respect, it was disappointing to find my colleague in another place, the shadow Minister of Emergency Services, indicating that nobody knew of the amendments proposed to the Act governing operations of the Metropolitan Fire Service. He also suggested that Crown Law had not been asked to consider certain legal ramifications of the Bill. I will be interested to hear the Minister's comments on whether or not that thinking is correct.

A Bill such as this needs wide consultation. The Opposition has not been able to get a full briefing from all persons consulted so far—another reason why we are seeking to examine the matter through questioning rather than by moving any specific amendments at this stage. I noticed this week in the *City Messenger*, under the headline 'Plague killing the city's heritage buildings', an article indicating that heritage buildings in the city are literally being killed off by the plague of fire safety laws which are, in the words of a leading businessman, 'too tough'. Malcolm Reid's Furniture Managing Director, Mike Harbison, states that his Rundle Street store, which has been an institution for more than 100 years, had become a pigeon loft because of Government fire safety rules. Mr Harbison said that his shop was forced to close under the weight of a $2 million upgrade bill to ensure that the heritage listed store met fire safety regulations. He states:

> Because it's an old building you can't get the rent you need to justify that sort of expense.

How true that would be. He indicated that the council's cavalier stance meant the end for Malcolm Reid and possibly for owners of other heritage listed buildings. He states:

> We have been struggling for three years, but it is time to give up.

That sort of story is very worrying at a time when we should be seeking to do everything possible to promote economic activity in this city and throughout the State. I will certainly be asking the Minister further questions in Committee to find out to what extent heritage buildings are suddenly to become massive liabilities to this State and to their owners. I guess we could think of other buildings. In fact, we remember the Remm site and the huge debate that occurred prior to Remm's being given permission to go ahead with its building. Members would recall that the existing buildings along North Terrace originally were requested to be kept in their pristine order. However, as a result of discussion, it was finally determined that only the facade of each building had to be retained and therefore a

complete modern building could be erected behind the facade.

I compliment the builders on retaining the facades; it adds a lot. But it is interesting to reflect on what would have happened if the original buildings had been maintained and on what sort of money would have had to be spent to upgrade them. I know that another member on this side wants to go into more detail in relation to the heritage angle. There will be extensive questioning in Committee and I look forward to the Minister's responses in due course.

The Hon. D.C. WOTTON (Heysen): I will speak very briefly on this legislation. I realise that the matters I wish to raise and the questions I want to ask would probably best be dealt with by the Minister's colleague the Minister for Environment and Planning. As we are dealing with buildings that have to be brought up to a particular standard in relation to fire safety, I would like to put on the record my concern about some of the things that are now happening to heritage buildings required to be brought up to the standard set down by the Metropolitan Fire Service.

I would be the first to agree that we need to take precautions to ensure the safety of buildings, in particular those which cater for the public. I do not think anyone would argue with that. However, fairly recently there has been a number of examples where, because of pressure from the Heritage Committee and through the Department of Environment and Planning, owners have upgraded their buildings to a particular standard to meet the requirements of those bodies, only to find, having done that, they do not meet other requirements set down under legislation or regulations under the South Australian Metropolitan Fire Service Act.

I have brought a number of examples to the notice of the Minister for Environment and Planning. I have a couple in my own electorate. One is a hotel that is a magnificent heritage building. As a result of the commitment shown by the owner of that building, it has been upgraded. Assistance was provided by the Heritage Committee and through the Heritage Fund. It is now a magnificent building and, having done that, the owner has now been advised that some of the work that has been carried out does not conform to the fire safety requirements.

Is the Minister able to indicate to the House how closely the two departments are working together in relation to this matter? It is important that there be close liaison when it comes to public buildings and, in particular, heritage buildings. I realise that it is probably more a responsibility of his colleague the Minister for Environment and Planning, but I would hope that there would be discussion between the Minister of Emergency Services and the Minister for Environment and Planning on this matter.

The Hon. TED CHAPMAN (Alexandra): It is not often that we have the Metropolitan Fire Service Act, or for that matter the Country Fires Act, brought to this House for amendment. They have been pretty tidy as Acts go and have served their respective purposes very well. However, I have one area of concern in relation to the boundaries between the two organisations, both of which are cited in this Bill. I refer to the lack of flexibility that applies between the boundary of the metropolitan area and that of the Country Fire Service area.

The Minister frowns just a little and apparently wonders how I might be linking this up with the Bill. I point out that the wharf at Port Lincoln comes within the authority of the Metropolitan Fire Service, which is established in the township and in the area adjacent to the port, while the Country Fire Service has jurisdiction over the broadacre areas adjacent to the beach, all of which are located in the same bay as that particular port facility. So, there is the opportunity, in the case of a vessel drifting ashore in the Country Fire Service area or on the boundary, for there to be confusion about jurisdiction; who is responsible?

It is in that context that I identify for the Minister that in my very own electorate on the South Coast, at Victor Harbor, there is a classic case of the need to address the need to expand with the township expansion into the metropolitan boundaries of the Country Fire Service zone. There is not the flexibility within the current system to have the boundary easily adjusted. I am told that it has to come back and the Act has to be altered or that all sorts of regulatory action must be taken; it is simply too rigid and defines too clearly and permanently the areas of jurisdiction of the respective services.

It is important to draw this issue to the attention of the Minister and to cite the problems associated with releasing authority, as in the case involving the CFS and the Metropolitan Fire Service in the Victor Harbor area, as well as the difficulties that the organisations have in achieving any compromise without the encumbrance of legislation and amendment to the Act. More powers and authority ought to be vested in the Minister to direct that commonsense prevail rather than having to come back each time to alter the boundaries as was the case with that example.

The Bill also proposes not only to extend the powers of the Metropolitan Fire Service or relevant authority to apply its services to a fire on a vessel in port or offshore, as was the case with the former sheep carrier, but also to extend the powers of those authorities to recover their costs. What I want to know from the Minister is whether the amendments to the legislation currently before us will result in a South Australian Metropolitan Fire Service Act that is consistent with that which applies in other capital cities or ports around Australia. I think it is terribly important that the rules that apply in Geelong, the port of Melbourne, Port Adelaide, the port of Fremantle and other ports up the eastern coast of Australia are consistent. If they are not and ours is more cumbersome and expensive by way of services, or not so comprehensive in its service, we, as the sponsors of the port of Adelaide, are clearly disadvantaged.

I think that South Australia is in enough trouble as it is in trying to attract shipping, especially overseas shipping, into our port without adding to it some differences or encumbrances that might be used against us for the purpose of favouring other ports. It is in that respect generally that I think it important that, with respect to all services to the port site (including the Metropolitan Fire Service) and the charges that go with them, they are consistent with those of our sister ports around Australia.

I raise this subject because, over the past year or so for one reason or another, I believe mainly through our own fault within the boundaries of Australia, we have lost very valuable overseas trade. We have almost entirely lost the live sheep trade from South Australia. We can ill afford to lose that trade, and I say that on behalf of both the rural sector and the community at large. The carriers, the wharfside employees, the agencies and their employees and the farmers—the breeders of livestock generally—have all been seriously disadvantaged as a result of the downturn in the movement of live sheep through our State port of Adelaide.

Only a matter of a year or two ago we were sending something like 6 million or 7 million sheep a year out of Australia to the Middle East, and I know that all sorts of factors have governed the total number despatched on an annual basis. The concern I have is that in recent times

South Australia has almost missed out altogether, that we have had only a couple of ships—and one, of course, had the fire on it in recent times—

The SPEAKER: Order! The member for Alexandra will link his remarks to the Bill before us.

The Hon. TED CHAPMAN: I appreciate the importance of doing that, Mr Speaker; I note what you say in that regard. I think that the whole subject of my address is closely linked with this Bill. I recognise that the Bill deals specifically with the powers that may be available to the Metropolitan Fire Service for the purpose of addressing fires on vessels in and about our port. I appreciate that point. However, the fact is that in very recent times a ship in our port had a fire, and it happened to be a ship carrying live sheep; and the magnitude of that fire, the cost involved and the difficulties that the Metropolitan Fire Service had in recovering its money led the Minister to introduce this Bill.

The second reading explanation initially conveyed to us that background and those points of importance. So, it is with that licence that I proceed to link my remarks to the Bill, and in so doing I take the opportunity of commenting on the live sheep trade on which we are all dependent one way or another. It seriously disturbs me that we should run the risk, in amending legislation, of perhaps fixing up one thing but mucking up another. I know that we have another place—a House of review in this Parliament—that is there for the purpose of cross-checking or counter-checking our activities, but I do not trust it any more than I trust people outside the Parliament to do the legislative work.

We ought to make every endeavour in this place to dot the i's and cross the t's and to be very cautious in dealing with legislation of this kind, especially sensitive legislation that provides for essential services at a cost to someone. When costs can be, and have been in this instance, inflicted upon the shipping industry, which is our bread and butter and which is a vehicle for the purpose of transporting our produce from here to the other side of the world, I become sensitive. Therefore I feel committeed to rise in this place and involve myself in the debate.

I take the point that you make, Mr Speaker. Far be it from me to flout your authority or to ignore your comments and signs. I read them loud and clear. On that note, I hope that the Minister has my message and will do his best to provide the answers at the appropriate time. I appreciate the opportunity to involve myself in this debate. I support the comments of our shadow Minister generally in what he has had to say so far.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order! The member for Napier will resume his seat.

The Hon. J.H.C. KLUNDER (Minister of Emergency Services): I thank honourable members opposite for what I can best term as their generalised support for this measure. This is a necessary measure to ensure that we can cope with some of the problems that have been shown to exist over the past few years. I must indicate that I am somewhat concerned about the comments made by the member for Goyder. He said that he has been told that there are too many fire safety regulations. That kind of comment arises out of a situation where there have not been any major fires for some time. Clearly, once we have a fire and people's lives are put at risk, all of a sudden we cannot have too many regulations. I am concerned that that kind of attitude is again surfacing in our society.

I remind the House that we are dealing mainly with two areas: places of public entertainment and ships. They are both specialised areas. One thing that places of public entertainment frequently have in common is, first, large numbers of people being present for relatively short periods; and, secondly, that occasionally some of them have a bit of drink taken—I think that is the phrase. In those circumstances we must expect that there will be very severe difficulties in clearing those places in the event of a fire. When that happens, it is absolutely essential to have all the various escape routes clear and open and inspected beforehand so that people can be moved out of the way very quickly. I can imagine how much odium would have been heaped on the Metropolitan Fire Service and, indeed, on me if there had been a fire last week and people had been able to say to us, 'You have not put into effect the various measures which are necessary to ensure the safety of the people of this State when they go out and enjoy themselves.'

The member for Heysen said that there are often difficulties in departments working together to achieve a common goal. Indeed, it would be very difficult for officers of the Metropolitan Fire Service to accompany officers of the Department of Environment and Planning as they went on their rounds talking about entirely different matters. The classic example is the putting in of underground wires and pipes. No sooner do we put in underground electricity cables than ETSA comes and digs them up and then, as soon as the road is repaired, SAGASCO comes along and digs it up again to put in its pipes. All attempts to coordinate such things have fallen flat because it usually requires enormous extra time to get anywhere. Once we identify a situation, such as the one that is before the House now, where there are dangers to people, we do not have the luxury of saying, 'We will worry about coordinating that with other departments first and come back in 18 months to do something about it.' Once we identify problems, we have no excuse for not acting as soon as possible.

The member for Alexandra raised some pertinent points. I can sympathise with his views on these matters. Clearly we cannot debate some of them here. The general issue of boundaries between the MFS and the CFS has to be taken up at a different time. The honourable member commented on a ship attached to a jetty and therefore technically in an MFS area possibly cutting adrift whilst on fire and ending up somewhere else. In this Bill there is the capacity for the Metropolitan Fire Service to go into other areas to deal with things which are particularly the area of its expertise. I hope that the two fire services will always cooperate in the common interest of putting out the fire first and worrying about whose territory it was afterwards. In this Bill at least there is a clear indication that the MFS has the right to go outside its territory to fight the kind of fire, such as a ship fire, which is particularly its own area of expertise.

With regard to the economic disadvantage at which we might place ourselves by asking for a particular amount of money to fight a fire or whatever and there being different situations in other States, I point out that we are in fact seeking only to recover costs and, if we were to try to get into an auction with other States of seeking to recover less than the cost of putting out the fire, we would be heading for a very reprehensible situation. The last thing any of us would want is an auction between the States, putting safety and cost and so on at risk in order to attract business to our State rather than let it go to other States. So, my view is that this State is seeking to recover costs, and that in fact ought to be the Australian standard. If it is not, other States ought to change to our system and I think the honourable member can appreciate my reasons for saying that. In view of the hour, that is probably enough for a second reading speech. I move:

That the sitting of the House be extended beyond 6 p.m.

Motion carried.

Bill read a second time.

In Committee.

Mr MEIER: Before we start, I would point out at this stage that some clauses within this Bill, such as clause 8, have many new subsections.

The CHAIRMAN: The Chair will take the new sections separately.

Clauses 1 to 6 passed.

Clause 7—'Powers of commanding officer at scene of fire or other emergency.'

Mr MEIER: We see here in clause 7 *(b)* (4)—and we will see it mentioned in other clauses—that the costs of engaging the contractor are recoverable by the corporation as a debt from the owner of the dangerous structure, object or substance, and I would seek the Minister's view now as to his thoughts on whether that definition of 'owner' should also include 'or occupier'.

The Hon. J.H.C. KLUNDER: My understanding from the advice I have just received is that this is only a small change from the definition provided originally. So, I am not really all that clear about what the honourable member is getting at. Clearly, in the case of a ship, the captain, I presume, would be the occupier and one would hardly try to recover $5 million worth of costs, in the case of a ship fire, from the captain of a ship. There, one has to go to the owner. In the case of, say, a hotel, the owner is I think by definition always well known under the relevant Act, so I am not entirely sure what the honourable member is trying to get at.

Mr MEIER: I will not go on with discussion here; I will wait until new section 49 and we can discuss it further then.

Clause passed.

Clause 8—'Substitution of ss. 48, 49, 51, 51a and 52.'

New section 46—'Power to proceed beyond fire district.'

Mr MEIER: New section 46 allows for a fire brigade or salvage corps to go into another fire district and, whenever a fire brigade or salvage corps attends at the scene of a fire or other emergency pursuant to this section, the costs and expenses incurred by the brigade or salvage corps are recoverable by the corporation as a debt from the owner of the property at which the fire or other emergency occurred. This section contrasts with what the CFS is able to claim by way of expenses. The CFS would not normally be able to recover such debt. Is the MFS allowed to depart from roadways or is it limited to streets as they are defined? I understand that the MFS may claim expenses in relation to a house fire that it attends.

The Hon. J.H.C. KLUNDER: The capacity of the MFS to go outside a fire district is defined. When the MFS goes outside a district to attend a fire it is still able to claim costs. However, we are dealing with two specialist areas. How far the MFS may go off a road is limited far more by the capacity of its heavy specialist vehicles to leave the road than by any legislation. Clearly, the MFS needs to go where the fire is and if this means that it has to leave a road to do so, then it will do so.

Mr MEIER: New section 46 (4) provides that 'In any proceedings under this section, a certificate apparently signed by the Chief Officer . . .' Why is the word 'apparently' used?

The Hon. J.H.C. KLUNDER: I am not a lawyer, but I understand that this is fairly common. If a document is taken as being signed by an officer, we will not have the sorts of legal quibbles that may occur when one asks whether or not the document was signed by the appropriate person. I have seen this word appear in a number of Acts and I do not think there is anything particularly special or new about it. It is new to this Act, but I do not think that it is a new concept at law.

Mr MEIER: I refer to the situation which the member for Alexandra highlighted earlier in relation to the fire that occurred on the *Mukarish Al Sades* the year before last. What would happen if costs were to be recovered from the owners of the ship when both the Metropolitan Fire Service and the Country Fire Service were used to put out the fire? Does the MFS have some sort of arrangement to apportion its costs?

The Hon. J.H.C. KLUNDER: I will need to check this, but if, in putting out a fire, costs are shared between two different agencies, I assume that each of those agencies would be able to recover its costs. I am not entirely sure in the case of that ship fire whether, because the CFS was used as a back-up, some of its costs were recovered through the MFS. However, that is probably a slightly different situation from the one mentioned by the honourable member because in that case one fire service brought in another fire service to assist. If costs are associated with putting out a fire on board a ship, whatever those costs were and by whomever they were incurred, they ought to be recovered.

The CHAIRMAN: Order! The member for Goyder has spoken three times on the new section.

New section agreed to.

New section 47—'Notice of fire or other emergency in CFS region to be given to Chief Officer of Country Fire Service.'

Mr MEIER: Reference is made to the chief officer in new sections 47 and 48. Chief officers could find themselves in a situation where the chief officer from the CFS and the chief officer from the Police Department might be involved, for example. How will they determine who is the senior officer, particularly between the MFS and the CFS, especially if it is land in the outer metropolitan or near country area?

The Hon. J.H.C. KLUNDER: Yes, the honourable member has indicated a difficulty. In these circumstances I would be irritated if the chief officers involved did not use their commonsense. It is perfectly clear to me from the outside that there are some areas where the MFS has a degree of expertise in fighting particular kinds of fires that the CFS does not have. Indeed, I would hate to see the MFS, with its specialised equipment, trying to fight a forest fire. They both have areas of particular expertise. I hope that those areas of expertise would be recognised by both the senior officers and that they would come to a quick and amicable agreement about which of them was to be in charge. If they did not come to such agreement, they would have to answer to me about that very soon afterwards.

New section agreed to.

New section 48 agreed to.

New section 49—'Interpretation.'

Mr MEIER: I refer to the definition of 'occupier'. The Committee will recall that I introduced the concept of owner or occupier in an earlier provision. Whilst that definition is acknowledged, will the Minister consider the following definition for 'occupier':

1. 'Occupier' in respect of a public building, includes the owner and any person apparently in charge of having the control and management of the building;
2. 'Occupier' being any person or persons who are the owner of a certificate of title of land or the owner or occupier of the whole of or part of a public building, as defined in this Act; or
3. 'Occupant' being a person or persons who is tenant, employee, lessee, caretaker within a public building as defined in this Act for any purpose.

In relation to where the word 'owner' is used (we also find it in other provisions), the use of the words 'owner occupier' and the suggested interpretation or definition of 'occupier'

that I have just advanced could overcome any difficulties when the Chief Officer or the person to whom he delegates authority has to decide just who is responsible. It may be much easier if the definition is enlarged as I have suggested.

The Hon. J.H.C. KLUNDER: The honourable member is asking me in my capacity as a Minister to decide about a legal matter, and I do not have that expertise. Even if I had that expertise I would be most reluctant to exercise it on the spur of the moment on the basis of something that was read out to me. I cannot help the honourable member in this matter.

Mr MEIER: I also suggest that in new section 49 thought should be given to including the interpretation of 'order'. I seek the Minister's comments on 'order' being a schedule or document served by the Chief Officer, the Building Fire Safety Committee or a Building Act referee, to comply with section 51 of this Act. Members would be aware that 'order' is referred to from time to time.

The Hon. J.H.C. Klunder: You've lost me.

Mr MEIER: I am suggesting an additional interpretation of 'order'; in other words, to prescribe specifically what an order really is, rather than at present, where we see the word mentioned from time to time yet there is no definition anywhere in the Act. I should also like to draw attention to the interpretation of 'public building' which, again, could be seen as insufficiently prescriptive in what it covers. I believe that it could be more prescriptive by including such public venues as marquees, temporary stands, large tents, inflated structures and caravans, when one thinks that Government departments use caravans from time to time so that they would be classed, I presume, as public buildings.

The Hon. J.H.C. KLUNDER: The honourable member is possibly foreshadowing amendments that might be moved in another place. Words such as 'order' may well have a meaning at law. That is something that I do not know, and in the drafting of these things we are very much in the hands of Parliamentary Counsel to decide whether or not terms such as 'order' need to be specifically defined or whether it is recognised by the courts as being a particular thing for which the meaning is already clearly established.

With regard to defining public buildings in terms of tents and caravans, etc., we have the same situation. I do not know whether, as is, the definition of 'public building' is exhaustive or not. I suspect that, since we are dealing here with two specific areas, that of ships and that of places of public entertainment, 'public building' should be defined within those particular constraints. It may well be that, under those circumstances, 'caravan' does not qualify.

Mr MEIER: I acknowledge that, as the Minister is aware, some of these questions are being phrased with the possibility of amendments being moved in the other place, because the Opposition does not have all its material back from the various people whom it has contacted so far. I seek clarification on the interpretation of 'authorised officer'. As the Minister would be aware, quite a few rural places (such as Kadina) have MFS units, although most of the units in my area are CFS units. However, if an MFS officer were under the impression that a building under CFS control had poor fire safety provisions, would that officer need to seek permission from the CFS officer to undertake an inspection?

The Hon. J.H.C. KLUNDER: My understanding is that there are building fire safety committees in place on which, if I recall correctly, either an MFS or a CFS officer serves, depending whether that committee operates in a Metropolitan Fire Service or Country Fire Service region. Consequently, one would normally have an overview of the buildings within particular areas by the officer who is designated by either the Chief Officer of the MFS or the CFS, depending on which area it happened to be in.

In those circumstances, the scenario painted by the honourable member is not likely to occur, specifically as this deals with places of public entertainment, which would be clearly known to be situated in either a Metropolitan Fire Service or Country Fire Service area, or on a ship where, quite clearly, that would be seen as being a Metropolitan Fire Service situation.

New section agreed to.

New section 50—'Power to enter and inspect a public building.'

Mr MEIER: This is one of the key clauses under which the Chief Officer or an authorised officer may enter and inspect a public building to determine whether there are adequate safeguards against, or in the event of, fire or other emergency, and undertake certain courses of action. This is an appropriate place for me to comment on something that the Minister said in addressing my second reading speech, when he indicated that I had said there were too many fire safety regulations.

The Hon. J.H.C. Klunder interjecting:

Mr MEIER: All right. Well, I think the Minister was referring to my reference to this week's *City Messenger*, in which other people were reported as indicating that some heritage buildings were being killed off through too many fire safety regulations. Whether or not that is the case, I will not comment at this stage. Certainly, we have many regulations, and we need them. It is always a worry as to whether an institution has too much power or insufficient power. However, I would like to know what provisions are in place to prevent what could generally be referred to as Hitler-type tactics (I guess in 1991 we could refer to them as Hussein-type tactics) occurring. It could be very unpleasant for an owner or occupier of a building to be confronted by an over-enthusiastic MFS officer or Chief Officer. Whilst these people certainly need to have appropriate powers, what safeguards exist in that respect to ensure that an over-zealous person does not get carried away?

The Hon. J.H.C. KLUNDER: I appreciate the honourable member's question. Probably it could have been phrased a little more delicately in order to avoid offending the susceptibilities of current personnel. I take his point that he does not wish to infer that any of the current personnel would exhibit those tendencies if given the chance. Apart from that, he is quite right: there are always difficulties in balancing public safety against the possibility of a public official exceeding his or her duties.

Under this Bill an authorised officer may exercise certain powers. If they are exercised for any length of time—and it turns up in later provisions—by having a building closed, that can only be done until such time as a court decides what to do. So, the final decision as to what needs to be done will always be taken by a court, and that is an appropriate situation for safeguarding against the kinds of tactics to which the honourable member has alluded as being possible at some undisclosed time in the future.

Mr MEIER: Does the Minister have fears for the future of many of the heritage buildings that will be subject to further inspection? As was highlighted earlier, with companies such as Malcolm Reid having to leave their buildings, does he consider that that will also happen to a few others which I can think of along Rundle Mall? If the full powers contained in the Act and in this amending Bill were exercised, those premises would not be able to be used as they currently are unless many millions of dollars were spent. Will the Minister explain a little further the intention of new section 50 (2) *(b)*, which provides that the Chief

Officer 'may, if there is reason to believe urgent action is required, use such force as is reasonable in the circumstances to enter and inspect a public building'? Will the Minister spell out clearly what would be 'reasonable force'?

The Hon. J.H.C. KLUNDER: With regard to the safety of people being balanced against the possibility that money may have to be spent on heritage buildings, I do not think that any member of this Parliament could come down on any side except that of the safety of people. Such things as need to be done to ensure that people are safe in the case of fires or emergencies must surely be paramount. Having said that, it is reasonable to say that building fire safety committees often look for alternative solutions where it is possible to do so. On a number of occasions when these committees have looked at buildings and indicated certain things that need to be done, they have been told that, for various reasons, those things are difficult to do, and discussions have taken place to see whether ways, which do not compromise the safety of people, can be found in terms of placement of exits, etc. The overriding concern of this Parliament surely must be the safety of the people of South Australia.

New section agreed to.

New section 51—'Rectification where safeguards inadequate.'

Mr MEIER: Where safeguards are inadequate, it may be necessary to include another option, namely, that of the non-maintenance or unsafe condition of essential fire safety equipment. I suggest that as another option because of last year's incident with the water tank in the State Bank building. The MFS could have checked up on that prior to its unfortunate collapse.

The Hon. J.H.C. KLUNDER: My advice is that the business raised by the honourable member regarding non-maintenance is contained within section 59 of the Building Act.

New section agreed to.

New section 51a—'Closure orders.'

Mr MEIER: The expression 'occupier' is mentioned, I think, three times in this new section. New subsection (5) *(a)* provides that a written notice containing a closure order must 'describe the danger that, in the opinion of the Chief Officer or authorised officer, necessitates closure of the building'. What policing mechanisms exist to ensure that the building is closed? Will there be any changes in future?

The Hon. J.H.C. KLUNDER: My advice is that, because this is a new section, it is the very first time that a written notice of closure must be issued. The only way in which it can be enforced is by continued inspection.

Mr MEIER: New subsection (7) provides, amongst other things, where the Chief Officer can apply to a local court. Should consideration be given to the use of the building fire safety committee or building referees in accordance with the Building Act? Past experience has shown that there are significant delays in instigating court action and, therefore, the building fire safety committee or building referees could be a preferred option in the short term when time is of the essence.

The Hon. J.H.C. KLUNDER: I am not inclined to support the idea that the honourable member has just floated on the basis that a building fire safety committee would consist of a number of people who have different kinds of expertise from that of the Chief Officer of the Metropolitan Fire Service in an emergency. If he gives an order for a closure, it is not because he feels that there might be a problem some time in the future: it is because he believes there is an immediate problem and, if the place were to stay open, people's lives would be in danger. To then call together a fire safety committee to deliberate on whether the building should stay open is inappropriate, in my view, because a closure order can be for only a maximum of 48 hours, without going to a court, in any case.

New section agreed to.

Remaining new sections (51b and 52) agreed to.

Clause passed.

Clauses 9 and 10 passed.

Clause 11—'Returns by councils.'

Mr MEIER: It appears that there is no penalty for a defaulting council. Why is that so?

The Hon. J.H.C. KLUNDER: My understanding is that new section 68c, which provides that a person who fails to furnish a return or declaration as required under this Act is guilty of an offence, sets a penalty.

Clause passed.

Clause 12—'Contributions where insurer is outside the State.'

Mr MEIER: Is it difficult to obtain pay outs from persons who are insured offshore or interstate, recognising that the principal Act relates to the insurance situation?

The Hon. J.H.C. KLUNDER: I must admit that I cannot assist on that. That is a question of detail that I just do not have.

Clause passed.

Clause 13—'Substitution of ss. 66, 67 and 68.'

New sections 66 to 68d agreed to.

New section 68e—'Offences by corporate bodies.'

Mr MEIER: Does 'a body corporate' include a council?

The Hon. J.H.C. KLUNDER: Yes.

New section agreed to; clause passed.

Clause 14—'Payment of costs and expenses where vessel or property uninsured.'

Mr MEIER: What does the Minister mean by 'elsewhere' in line 36? It is not clear what it applies to. Would it apply to a houseboat at Mannum? How easy is it to verify that a vessel is insured? If it is insured outside Australia, which I assume most would be, does the Minister expect it to be easy to extract payment after the vessel has left a port?

The Hon. J.H.C. KLUNDER: This apparently is the same usage as under section 45. I am not entirely sure what that means. I presume a vessel can be in transit on land, if necessary, although I doubt whether it would be sailing under those circumstances. As to the second point, that is one of the problems that we had with the vessel that caught fire in Port Adelaide. In fact, the Admiralty Act had to be used in order to get the company that owned the ship to pay the damages. There are problems, and it is because there were problems that this Bill was introduced. The degree to which it is possible and how easy it is to work out whether or not something is insured is something on which the Metropolitan Fire Service so far has remarkably little expertise, and long may it stay that way.

Clause passed.

Clause 15—'Duty to give information as to insurance.'

Mr MEIER: Is it usual practice for the MFS to recover costs from insurance companies or from uninsured companies or people? If so, how are the costs worked out? Is there such a thing as an arbiter or an appeal mechanism?

The Hon. J.H.C. KLUNDER: It has not been normal to recover costs, but in places where very large costs are involved it is necessary to do so. I would expect the MFS to take whatever steps are necessary to obtain the costs of fighting a fire, regardless of whether or not the vessel is insured. I cannot help the honourable member more than that.

Clause passed.

Clause 16—'Power of Chief Officer, etc, to enter premises and search debris, etc.'

Mr MEIER: This clause relates to section 73 of the principal Act, referring to every case of suspected arson or until arson has been established. Do the police cooperate in this exercise? I assume that an arson reward scheme—in other words, if one can find out who lit the fire—relies on the evidence being guarded. I am informed that the police are reluctant to spend the many dollars that it costs to guard the scene of a fire. Will the Minister comment on that?

The Hon. J.H.C. KLUNDER: I am in some difficulty here. Clause 16 provides:

Section 73 of the principal Act is amended by striking out subsection (2).

Subsection (2) provides:

A person shall not hinder any person acting in pursuance of this section.

That is included elsewhere, so there has not been a change. I understand that the honourable member is now asking a question with regard to section 73 of the principal Act. Is that appropriate?

The CHAIRMAN: Only inasmuch as it relates to subsection (2).

Mr MEIER: No, it does not.

Clause passed.

Clause 17, schedule and title passed.

Bill read a third time and passed.

ADJOURNMENT

The Hon. J.H.C. KLUNDER (Minister of Emergency Services): I move:

That the House do now adjourn.

The Hon. D.C. WOTTON (Heysen): In this grievance debate I wish to raise issues relating to changes proposed for the Adelaide Hills southern area. The Adelaide Hills District Office area of the Department for Family and Community Services covers the following areas: Gumeracha, Mount Pleasant, Onkaparinga, the rural half of East Torrens, Stirling, Mount Barker, Strathalbyn, Goolwa/Port Elliot, Victor Harbor, Yankalilla and the two local government areas of Kangaroo Island.

The area that the office covers was expanded late in 1989 to cover the local government associations, the idea being at the time that Family and Community Services should have the same boundaries across the State as the Health Commission, which most people saw as being an integral part, with one Minister common to both departments. Integrating this department into the Health Commission, to share not only common boundaries but resources, could have opened up career possibilities and experiences for many social work staff who still work largely in isolation of each other. This could have been the next step. It would seem, regrettably, that it was done towards 'coalescence', as it was termed at the time, but that idea, was dismissed, ironically in the name of productivity improvements and efficiency. I am not aware of any costings comparing this new model to the original aim of combining the two departments.

The new model claims efficiencies by amalgamating service areas into larger areas and therefore doing away with management and administrative staff. Integration into the Health Commission should have had the same result, but with the added bonus of resource sharing, wider career experiences and, importantly, much better service access to the public. The latter is a particularly important issue for the public in rural areas, even in the best of times; in bad times such as now it is even more crucial. What is being proposed for the southern hills areas is as follows:

1. Stirling Local Government Association to be serviced by a major FACS centre at Aberfoyle Park.
2. East Torrens Local Government Association to be serviced by a major FACS centre in the north-eastern suburbs of Adelaide.
3. Kangaroo Island will continue to have a resident worker but control will revert to Adelaide.
4. Gumeracha, Mount Pleasant, Onkaparinga, Mount Barker and Strathalbyn Local Government Associations will be serviced by a major FACS centre based in Murray Bridge.
5. Port Elliot/Goolwa, Victor Harbor and Yankalilla will be serviced by a major FACS centre at Noarlunga.

I am informed that there will be three sizes of FACS offices in future: A, B and C sized offices, C being the smallest. If the Adelaide Hills office were not broken up as described it would have sufficient staff to be classed as a C class office, and could operate in this manner even if senior management were based in Murray Bridge.

It is important to note here that the A class office will be allowed to operate four access service points; the B class office will be allowed three access service points; and the C class office, two access service points. At the moment the Adelaide Hills office has a major access office or branch office at Victor Harbor, and it shares office space with community groups such as Neighbour Aid at Strathalbyn and the Hut in Stirling. A similar office to Victor Harbor in the Gumeracha-Williamstown-Lobethal area would have been the department's next aim. In addition, Kangaroo Island has a resident worker. Excepting Kangaroo Island, all that is in place at the moment, including the office at Mount Barker and Victor Harbor (which has just been upgraded to make it habitable for more than one worker, or whatever visiting service; over $20 000 has just been spent on the Victor Harbor office), will go. Access offices as defined in this new plan will be as follows:

1. Shared office space with another service.
2. Concessions for pensioners, etc., will be made available, including emergency financial assistance and financial counselling.
3. A visiting social work service by appointment.

Other social work services, including child protection, and so on, will be provided by social work staff working out from the major FACS centres. This has all the hallmarks of the current police methods of relying on patrols. This is what is being proposed for Mount Barker and it is a clear degradation of current service accessibility. The same information has been given to workers based at Victor Harbor. This information has come, therefore, from a number of sources.

The changes suggest a strong move to preserve a separate identity for the department at all costs. The sad thing is that they are so strongly urban focused; country people have not been catered for; they will simply have to adapt once again to what will be available. A simple example of what this focus means can be seen when we look at what happens to those areas that are to be carved off from the Adelaide Hills office. Yankalilla, Victor Harbor and Port Elliot/Goolwa will be serviced by a city-based office at Noarlunga. Kangaroo Island will be serviced by Adelaide. The rural half of East Torrens that Adelaide Hills voluntarily looks after at the moment will also be serviced by a city-based office. Only Stirling, which is largely urban, escapes this focus, although it can hardly be an advantage for that LGA to be serviced from Aberfoyle Park.

Even more frustrating is the fact that Port Elliott/Goolwa, Strathalbyn and Mount Barker are, in that order, the fastest growing local government areas in this State. The Adelaide Hills office, with its strong community development focus, is ideally placed to meet the challenges that this considerable increase in population will bring with it. We are on the brink of enormous change in the southern Hills area. To argue, therefore, that the people of this area will be better served from either Murray Bridge or Noarlunga is nonsense. In 10 years it will be acutely apparent to everyone that this office will have to be replaced. We will start again 10 years behind time having lost the initiative that we now have, and all in the name of productivity and efficiency. The question is: would this have been the case had this area been a marginal Government seat?

The Adelaide Hills office has operated for over 10 years and has a high profile servicing the fastest growing areas in this State. On the present boundaries we could remain a C class office, which would be a lot cheaper than relocating and re-establishing a B class office in an area that could be adequately serviced by Noarlunga and Marion councils. The economic and service equity arguments for the *status quo* of the department against the Hub are compelling.

I ask the Minister of Family and Community Services to give this matter his urgent attention. I understand that it is proposed that such changes be considered in the very near future. I assure the Minister that I have received a considerable amount of representation from within my own district, and I know that the other areas to which I have referred, and which are covered by my colleagues the member for Kavel and the member for Alexandra, are very concerned about the proposed changes. It is the intention of the three members involved—the member for Kavel, the member for Alexandra and me—to seek a meeting with the Minister to discuss these issues in the hope that he will look at retaining the current services that may be found in the offices that I have mentioned. This is an urgent matter and I hope that the Minister will take account of what I have had to say this evening.

Mr BRINDAL (Hayward): I rise to address this House tonight on a matter that has been canvassed before in this place, that is, the matter of alcohol-related offences committed in our streets. In commencing this debate, I would like to acknowledge remarks made earlier in this session by my colleague the member for Morphett and by the member for Price in a speech that he made on this subject some time ago in this House.

The consumption of alcohol on our streets has reached the stage where this Government should look at doing something about it. Members might recall that, some time ago, I asked a question in this House in respect of an assault by some drunken youths that the member for Fisher and I witnessed during a lunchtime near the museum. At that stage, in answer to my question, the Minister said that the Government was interested in this matter but that it was largely the province of the council. Consequently, I wrote to the Lord Mayor of Adelaide and received a most encouraging reply that officers of his council were looking at the creation of a dry zone in North Terrace. I believe that the city council was motivated by its success in proclaiming, first, Rundle Mall and, secondly, Hindley Street as dry zones. The traders in those areas believe that that move has been successful. Those areas are now free from the problem that they had before and a much better environment exists for the people who frequent them.

It is unfortunate that many of the people who at one time consumed alcohol in Rundle Mall and Hindley Street now appear to have shifted to North Terrace. Indeed, they have created a problem along North Terrace. In case members opposite doubt that it is a problem, I suggest that they either use their eyes or consult the staff in this place. Only two weeks ago when the House rose reasonably late I was outside the building when a number of staff who work in Parliament came out and were waiting for their partners. It was necessary for me to remain with them because they were in some fear for their safety. They have told me, and I am sure that they will tell any honourable member in this House, that they do not find it easy some days to get into the building. They tend to use the back door to enter the building. They do not like to use the side door near Old Parliament House because on occasion one or two of them have been accosted.

It is not right that any adult person in Adelaide should have any fear, either in the day or night, of walking down what is one of our principal boulevards. If staff and members cannot come and go freely to this House, where can they come and go freely? It is a problem created by people who sit outside this building, often on the parapets of Old Parliament House, and drink to excess. The Government claims that, if we create dry zones, drinkers will go elsewhere. However, I point the Government to London, Paris, New York and many other cities that certainly have a problem with people who drink too much, but somehow or other those cities manage to get the problem away from their main tourist precincts and their main family boulevards. That is what North Terrace is.

If there is a problem related to alcohol, those people need to be helped. I am sure that members opposite would agree that agencies should be encouraged to do something about helping these people to be rehabilitated. In the meantime, I do not believe that these people have any right to impinge on the public freedom that every one of our citizens should enjoy. Therefore, I was appalled that in about January the Government announced changes to the rules relating to dry zones. One is forced to ask why this is so?

The councils with whom I deal all believe that dry zones have been a great success. One evening I went with the police in the area of the Glenelg amusement park and Colley Reserve when they were policing a dry zone area in force at that time of the year. It appeared to be most successful. The police commented that families and family groups had returned to an area where previously they had been somewhat frightened to visit because of the hoon element of drunken people and their unacceptable behaviour.

So, it was an area where the council believed the scheme had worked. The member for Morphett (Mr Oswald) has spoken in this place on this matter. A dry area in North Terrace could have helped, but the Government has come along and put caveats on the idea of a dry area. It says that councils can have dry areas but they can be only for specific periods, as I understand it, which cannot be long and they can apply for only a specific reason. If a dry area is proclaimed, some sort of rehabilitation service must be provided.

I suggest to the House that that is a ridiculous proposition. Glenelg council has visitors from all over South Australia. People from the eastern, south-western and northern suburbs visit Glenelg. Drinkers come from all over the city. The people of Glenelg have to put up with drinkers. Glenelg is a beach amenity that belongs to everyone in South Australia. Glenelg, Somerton Park and Brighton ratepayers rightly have to put up with people from other suburbs visiting their area. To claim that the Glenelg council and its ratepayers should provide a rehabilitation program for someone from,

say, Burnside who gets drunk at Glenelg is ridiculous in the extreme.

Similarly, it is ridiculous to say that anyone who comes into the city of Adelaide and gets drunk is the responsibility of the Adelaide City Council. The Adelaide City Council has not only to find out who they are but also to run the rehabilitation program for them. I was most disappointed when the Government introduced that matter, guideline, or whatever the Minister called it, because it was counterproductive and went against some very good work being done by local councils.

The member for Fisher put out a press release about urination, copulation and regurgitation that takes place on the steps of this building almost nightly. Like him, I register my disgust. All members know that it happens and it happens because groups of people consume too much alcohol. That should not be allowed to happen. I wonder why this Government does not make public thoroughfares generally alcohol-free areas. I cannot see why there is a need to drink on the street unless it is for a special occasion or in a licensed boulevard premises, such as the cafes on the southern side of North Terrace. Parks, seaside areas or picnic areas are a different matter. Plenty of people go to those areas for picnics and take some alcohol, and that is acceptable. However, I do not see why it is acceptable for people to drink in their car while driving along, or to drink in our streets or on our footpaths. That interferes with the liberties of other people and is always to be deplored and discouraged.

I look to members on the Government benches to show some leadership in this matter. It is not a political issue on which we should stand up and blame the Government, saying, 'It is all your fault.' This is a social problem that must be addressed. The Government can address it because it is the Government. I call on the Government to address this matter seriously. It is affecting families, especially children. It is stopping people visiting our museums. I suggest that it is discouraging tourists in the North Terrace precinct. It is certainly not a matter of which we can be proud. This is a city of which we can and should be proud and it is a State of which we can be very proud. I hope that in addressing this problem we can create an image for this city and for this State of which we can be prouder still.

Mr McKEE (Gilles): I will address my remarks to the state of finances generally. Much has been said in the past couple of months both in this Chamber and generally in the community in relation to financial activities and about banking activities. Much has been written in the press in particular concerning the banking industry. I believe it is important that it be pointed out and that people should be made aware of how widespread is the unbridled motivation by greed. *The Bulletin* of 12 February 1991 refers to this problem. The number of people who have been charged recently indicates how widespread is the crooked activity of certain people in big business. For example, the following charges have been laid: Alan Chapman, Director, AusFin Investments, was charged in August 1989 with misappropriation, offering securities without prospectus, and dealing without a licence—he is now awaiting a trial date; John Cornelius, Company Secretary, Elders Resources NZFP, was charged in December 1990 with conspiracy to defraud, breaches of acquisition of shares code, false statement to inspector, and he was before the court in February this year; Peter Falk, Broker, McNall and Hordern, was charged in December 1990 with conspiracy to defraud and breaches of acquisition of shares code, and also went to trial in February. Further, there is the well-publicised case of George Herscu, Managing Director of the Hooker Corporation, who was charged in December 1989 with official corruption. In December 1990 he was convicted and sentenced to five years gaol. Donald Keemish, Director, AusFin Investments, was charged in August 1989 with misappropriation, offering securities without prospectus, and dealing in securities without a licence. He is now awaiting a trial date.

The list goes on and on with people such as Bruce Murphy, for example, another Director of Alpex Commodity Traders, charged with gaining financial advantage by deception, and with defrauding investors; he was sentenced in 1989 to eight years in gaol. I included those names to indicate how widespread the activity of greed has been in our community over the past several years. Only now in some cases have these people been brought to justice.

When I was a young lad I was brought up under a State Liberal Government and a Federal Liberal Government—which was probably not the best way to be raised—and during those years knighthoods were given to people in our community. I have no problem whatever with knighthoods being given to people in the areas of medicine, the sciences, arts and literature, but I always wondered, when I was a young fellow, why they were given for business. It was always explained to me that it was based on people's contribution to the economy and to employment; it set a standard for business, gave a direction to the community, and it appeared to give something for people to aspire to in their corporate careers.

Again, I quote from the *Bulletin* of 12 February 1991 and the much publicised case of former knight, Sir Edmund Rouse, Managing Director of ENT Ltd, who was charged in June 1989 with attempted political bribery. The outcome was that in April 1990 he was sentenced to three years gaol—and rightly so. In fact, I should have thought that the sentence was a little light. Again, that indicates the sort of people in our community who have simply gone against the law, obviously, but also gone against what we always assumed in the community to be a code of conduct within the business community, when business people appeared to be leaders of our community. What we are finding out is that not all of them but a great number of them have had their snouts in the trough.

Mr Hamilton: To put it mildly!

Mr McKEE: Yes. At the moment I am a member of a select committee dealing with problems of law and order in our community, the select committee dealing with the Wrongs Act. We have been receiving evidence from different organisations and different sections of the community in relation to that Act. The one thing that is coming through time and again is: what sort of direction are a number of our young people going in when they see community leaders and community business leaders simply ripping off the system. They are highlighting the fact that white collar crime in our community appears to be acceptable to some people.

Mr Hamilton: Then they get stuck into the unemployed.

Mr McKEE: Exactly; people who simply do not have jobs and must apply for the dole to survive. The point I am making is that a substantial section of the business community is not giving the leadership it used to give to our community, and it is not surprising, when young offenders are pulled up by the police, that a number of them are saying (and saying to the social workers and the people who look after them once they have been through the courts system), 'What is the use for us to keep going on with our school work when we see in the newspapers every day people ripping millions of dollars out of the system and we cannot even get a job?'

The white collar crime system is more than a crime: it is a massive business in this country today. It is being run by a group of carpetbaggers who think that they can slice up the economy of this country and take whatever they feel like taking out of it, giving nothing back. And they do it without conscience. That is the point I wish to highlight: the fact that the business community cannot be held up in the way it used to be years ago for being a pillar of our society. A number of members of that community have been found to be plain, simple, ordinary crooks.

It is about time that that was publicised more in our community so that people are made more aware of it. I believe that steps will be taken, coming, it is hoped, from the Federal Government's inquiry into the banking system. Further, the National Securities Commission must have Acts designed for it, to enable it to go out and stop the white collar crime which is occurring in our community, so that we can get back to some decent, honest direction in our country.

Motion carried.

At 7.6 p.m. the House adjourned until Wednesday 20 March at 2 p.m.

HOUSE OF ASSEMBLY

Tuesday 19 March 1991

QUESTIONS ON NOTICE

PSYCHOLOGICAL PRACTICES ACT FEE REVENUE

106. **Mr D.S. BAKER (Leader of the Opposition)**, asked the Minister of Health:

1. What is the estimate of the 1990-91 revenue from fees payable under regulation 4 of the Psychological Practices Act announced in the *Government Gazette* of 5 July (p. 220) and what were the actual amounts in 1989-90 and 1982-83?

2. What was the estimate of the 1990-91 revenue from the fee payable under regulation 6?

3. What was the revenue from the fee payable under regulation 5 in 1989-90 and 1982-83?

The Hon. D.J. HOPGOOD:

1. and 2.

Fee revenue	1982-83	1989-90	1990-91 (est)
Reg. 4	$1 575	$6 660	$5 250
Reg. 6			$60 000

3. Regulation 5 prescribes a fee ($2) for a certificate of registration. However, the Psychological Board does not charge separately for the actual certificate. The cost is included in the initial registration fee (regulation 4) and in the subsequent registration renewal fee (regulation 6).

HEPATITIS B VACCINATIONS

167. **Mr BECKER (Hanson)** asked the Minister of Health: What is the estimated cost of giving all first aid providers in Government schools free hepatitis B vaccinations; will they be given and, if not, why not?

The Hon. D.J. HOPGOOD: Approximately $70 000 for designated first aid officers. The Education Department has agreed to fund the vaccination of school assistants who provide first aid services to students and staff. *Education Gazette* notice 31 August 1990 refers.

EARTH LEAKAGE DETECTORS

297. **Mr BECKER (Hanson)** asked the Minister of Education:

1. Have funds been provided to all primary schools for the installation of earth leakage detectors this financial year and, if not, why not?

2. When will earth leakage detectors as required under the Occupational Health, Safety and Welfare Act be installed at schools in the electorate of Hanson?

3. Have detectors been installed in other departments and statutory authorities under the Minister's control and, if so, when and, if not, why not?

4. What is the Government's policy for the installation of earth leakage detectors in all Government buildings and what are the priorities?

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

1. *(a)* No.

(b) The Occupational Health, Safety and Welfare Act requires the installation of ELCB devices only on electrical circuits where single insulated, portable devices are used, or where extension cords are attached.

2. There is no current plan to provide ELCB installations. Schools have been advised that old type single insulated hand tools should be replaced if they are still in use. Extension cords have been specifically banned from use in schools for many years. ELCBs are, therefore, not required in most schools.

Schools which choose to retain old single insulated equipment, or use extension cords, have been advised to provide portable ELCB devices. Funding for these arrangements can be applied from the school's annual grant, and the decision will be made by the individual school.

3. See answers to 1 and 2.

4. The Minister of Housing and Construction advises that the policy relating to the installation of ELCBs in other Government buildings is the same as described in 1 and 2 above.

MINES AND ENERGY DEPARTMENT

333. **Mr MATTHEW (Bright)** asked the Minister of Mines and Energy: How many formal and how many informal committees exist within the Department of Mines and Energy and in relation to each:

(a) what is the name;
(b) what are the terms of reference;
(c) when was it formed;
(d) when is it expected to achieve its objective; and
(e) to whom does it report?

The Hon. J.H.C. KLUNDER: There are 32 formal and informal committees within the Department of Mines and Energy, as follows:

Gemstone Industry Advisory Council
Advisory Committee on the Banning of Persons from Precious Stones Fields
Energy Planning Executive
SA Energy Forum
State Energy Research Advisory Committee
SA Uranium Advisory Committee
Board of Examiners for Mine Managers
Computer Advisory Committee
Computer Steering Committee
Workforce Planning and Finance Committee
Tenement Review Committee
Mintabie Consultative Committee
Roxby Downs Interdepartmental Committee
Working Group on Uniform Codes of Practice for Uranium Mining, Milling, Waste Disposal and Transport
Brukunga Steering Committee
Olympic Dam Environmental Consultative Committee
Environmental Issues Coordination Committee
Working Party to Review Energy Pricing and Tariff Structures
Golden Grove Management Plan Working Party
Technical Document Management Working Party
Mining Regulations Review Committee
SA Exploration Towards 2000 Seminar Planning Committee
Lead Zinc Program Committee
Joint Operations Management Group—Seismic Exploration Meeting
Development Geology Reservoir Engineering
Geographical Information System Steering Committee
Drillhole Database Steering Committee
Coal Review Group
Joint Consultative Committee—Coordination of Administrative Procedures for Uranium Miners Production Operations Meeting
SACATAS—Project Management Committee.

Other details as requested (terms of reference, date formed, etc.) are too lengthy to have printed in *Hansard* and so have been sent direct to the honourable member by letter.

WOODS AND FORESTS DEPARTMENT

336. **Mr MATTHEW (Bright)** asked the Minister of Forests: How many formal and how many informal committees exist within the Woods and Forests Department and in relation to each:

(a) what is the name;
(b) what are the terms of reference;
(c) when was it formed;
(d) when is it expected to achieve its objective; and
(e) to whom does it report?

The Hon. J.H.C. KLUNDER: The Woods and Forests Department has a total of 38 committees, 32 formal and 6 informal (*):

Combined Shop Stewards Committee
Departmental Co-ordinating Committee, Award Restructuring (GGCWCC Award)
Central and Northern Region Working Party, Award Restructuring (GGCWCC Award)
South-East Regional Working Party, Award Restructuring (GGCWCC Award)
Woods and Forests Timber Workers (South Australian Government) Timber Industry Industrial Agreement Restructuring Co-ordinating Committee
Mount Gambier Mill Timber Workers Consultative Committee
Mount Burr Mill Timber Workers Consultative Committee
Nangwarry Mill Timber Workers Consultative Committee
Capital Works Review Committee
Central and Northern Region Contracts Consultative Committee
South-East Region Contracts Consultative Committee
Departmental Occupational Health and Safety Committee
Central and Northern Region Occupational Health and Safety Committee
South-East Regional Occupational Health and Safety Committee
Mount Gambier Mill Safety Committee
Mount Burr Mill Safety Committee
Nangwarry Mill Safety Committee
*Mount Gambier Mill Fire Wardens Committee
*Mount Burr Mill Fire Wardens Committee
Central and Northern Management Group
Northern District Management Group Committee
Engineering Committee
*Publicity and Editorial Committee
*'Timber News' Committee
Library Review Committee
Payroll Error Elimination Project Committee
Mount Burr Mill Kiln Drying Project Committee
'290 × 19' Project Committee
Steam Utilisation Project Committee
Adelaide Training and Development Working Party
Mount Burr Mill Training and Development Working Party
*Canteen Sub-Committee
Capital Works Committee
Data Processing Committee
Geographic Information System Steering Committee
Joint Working Party into Strategic and Investigation Options
*Lewis Avenue Closure Committee
Vocational Rehabilitation Working Party

Other details as requested (terms of reference, date formed, etc.) are too lengthy to have printed in *Hansard* and so have been sent direct to the honourable member by letter.

DEPARTMENTAL COMMITTEES

340. **Mr MATTHEW (Bright)** asked the Minister of Emergency Services: How many formal and how many informal committees exist within the Police Department and in relation to each—

(a) what is the name;
(b) what are the terms of reference;
(c) when was it formed;
(d) when is it expected to achieve its objective; and
(e) to whom does it report?

The Hon. J.H.C. KLUNDER: There are 29 formal and informal committees within the Police Department, as follows:

Central Exercise Writing Team
Firearms Consultative Committee
Radio Communications Advisory Group
Neighbourhood Watch Association (SA) Inc.
Security Industry Association of SA
Mintabie Consultative Committee
Committee Safety House Association of SA Inc.
Police, Correctional, Court Services Departments Liaison Committee
Water Search and Rescue Liaison Committee
State Westpac Rescue Helicopter Evaluation Committee
Adelaide International Airport Security Committee
SA Dangerous Substances Standing Committee
Olympic Dam Ore Transport Committee
Anti-Hijack Committee
Westpac State Rescue Helicopter Steering Committee
Grand Prix Security Committees
SA Ports Security Advisory Committee
Interdepartmental Committee on Drink Driving Legislation
SA Arson Liaison Group
Police, Correctional, Court Services Departments Liaison Committee
Ministerial Council on Drug Strategy
Victims of Crime Liaison Committee
Inter-Agency Intelligence Unit
Senior Managers Australia and New Zealand Forensic Science Laboratories Group
National Automated Fingerprint Identification System User Group
National Working Party, use of computers in the investigation of serious crime
National Witness Protection Programme Steering Committee
Professional Advisory Council of the Bereaved through Suicide Support Group
Committee of Chief Executive Officers—Criminal Justice Agencies

Other details as requested (terms of reference, date formed, etc.) are too lengthy to have printed in *Hansard* and so have been sent direct to the honourable member by letter.

GULF ST VINCENT PRAWN FISHERY

441. **Mr MEIER (Goyder)** asked the Minister of Fisheries: What have been the effects of the decline in the Gulf St Vincent prawn fishery in relation to loss of domestic and export sales and employment and what are the reasons for the decline?

The Hon. LYNN ARNOLD: The long term sustainable production of a rehabilitated Gulf St Vincent prawn fishery is expected to be of the order of 375-400 tonnes (Copes 1990 Report). On current prices this has the potential to generate a gross return of the order of $4.5-$4.8 million 'at the wharf'. There are no data on which to determine either the nett return to the industry from this production or the market value. In 1989-90 the reported production from the fishery was 169 tonnes with a gross at wharf value of $2.185 million.

There are no data on the actual percentage of this catch directed to the export market; however, unlike the Spencer Gulf prawn fishery it is thought the majority of the Gulf St Vincent prawn fishery catch is sold on the domestic Australian market. There are no data on employment changes in the fishery other than the reduction from 16 to 11 vessels in the combined Gulf St Vincent/Investigator Strait fishery in accordance with the provisions of the Fisheries (Gulf St Vincent Prawn Fishery Rationalisation) Act 1987. Those leaving the fishery were compensated.

446. **Mr MEIER (Goyder)** asked the Minister of Fisheries: Is the Minister aware that in late 1988 the Director of Fisheries was the author of a letter to the *Advertiser* which appeared over the signatures of Gulf St Vincent

prawn fishermen's representatives rather than the director's name, claiming that declining catches were due to a deliberate Department of Fisheries policy of forgoing catches to assure better catches in the future and if so, did the director also advise the Minister in relation to hoped for outcomes of increased prawn catches?

The Hon. LYNN ARNOLD: I am advised that in November 1988 the Director of Fisheries drafted a letter for the consideration of Messrs Edwards and Valcic, the then Secretary and President of the Gulf St Vincent Prawn Boat Owners Association (GSVPBOA). I am further advised this was done at a time of bitter acrimony between the GSVPBOA and a minority number of previous members of the Association and in response to a letter to the *Advertiser* by one of this minority on 30 October 1988. I understand the letter was written in consultation with Messrs Edwards and Valcic in an attempt to defuse this situation.

SCHOOL VANDALISM

450. **Mr MATTHEW (Bright)** asked the Minister of Education: What action is being or has been taken against year 12 students from Christies Beach High School who extensively vandalised their school on 31 October 1990?

The Hon. G.J. CRAFTER: No vandalism or wilful damage occurred at Christies Beach High School on 31 October 1990. Some year 12 students celebrated their last days at school by playing pranks. There was no major inconvenience and no defacing of the school or any property.

GOVERNMENT VEHICLES

456. **Mr BECKER (Hanson)** asked the Minister of Transport:

1. What Government business necessitates frequent regular visits by the driver of the vehicle registered UQX 881 to a house in Coolah Terrace, Marion?
2. Are the guidelines set out in Public Service Circular No. 30 being adhered to by the driver?

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

1. Vehicle UQX 881 is owned by the Education Department (Southern Area Education Office) and is officially based at the Hub Learning Centre at Aberfoyle Park. There is no secure parking for the vehicle at its base and there has been a high incidence of vandalism to vehicles parked in the vicinity overnight. The Coordinator of the Learning Centre takes the vehicle home overnight.
2. The use of this vehicle is in accordance with the requirements of Circular No. 30.

STOCKWELL FILTRATION PLANT

461. **The Hon. B.C. EASTICK (Light)** asked the Minister of Water Resources:

1. Were members of a delegation from the Barossa Valley area in 1989 advised that a pilot filtration plant would be sited in the valley for evaluation and, if so, what are the details?
2. Was the plant commissioned and, if not, why not and if the plant was commissioned elsewhere than in the valley, where was it and why there and not in the valley?
3. Where is the plant now and what have been the results of its use to date?
4. Is the Stockwell filtration plant still on schedule for completion at an early date and, if so, what are the details?

The Hon. S.M. LENEHAN: The replies are as follows:

1. I presume the honourable member is referring to a delegation that I met on 16 May 1989. Unfortunately there is no transcript of the meeting available so I cannot confirm what was specifically discussed. However, the Barossa Valley community has been kept informed of the situation with regard to the filtration plant for the area and the pilot plant with correspondence to the district councils in April 1989 and a news release in August 1989.
2. The dissolved-air flotation pilot plant was commissioned at Myponga reservoir and apart from some work at Lake Alexandrina treating water containing toxic algae has remained there since.
3. The pilot plant is still at Myponga reservoir but work there is now successfully completed. The plant will soon be relocated to a site in the Barossa Valley to test the process on the local water. Negotiations have taken place with a landowner near the Swan Reach-Stockwell pipeline just north of Nuriootpa and when finalised the pilot plant work will commence. Construction of the proposed plant to provide filtered water to the Barossa Valley will proceed once the Myponga filtration plant is completed in the 1993-94 financial year. It is anticipated that the proposed plant will include dissolved-air flotation and the concept design will be initiated following completion of the pilot plant work in the coming months.

GOVERNMENT VEHICLES

466. **Mr BECKER (Hanson)** asked the Minister of Transport: What Government business was the driver of the vehicle registered UQR 617 carrying out which necessitated parking the car between 12.30 and 2 p.m. behind shops at 205 Sturt Road, Seacombe Gardens on Thursday 13 December 1990 and were the guidelines set out in Public Service Circular No. 30 being adhered to?

The Hon. FRANK BLEVINS: On Thursday 13 December 1990 the vehicle registered UQR 617 was in the care and use of a Field Investigation Officer from the Berri Regional Office of the Department of Labour. The officer was in Adelaide on official business, including attendance at a regular Departmental Investigation Officers' conference. Within the period in question, that is, between 12.30 p.m. and 2 p.m., the officer took advantage of being in Adelaide and visited his optician during his lunch break. During this time, for safety and security reasons, he left the vehicle parked off the main road behind the shops at 205 Sturt Road, Seacombe Gardens. Whilst the officer was acting with the approval of his manager, I believe that this was probably outside the spirit of the guidelines of Commissioner's Circular No. 30. All relevant managers will be advised accordingly.

MOTOR BOAT REGISTRATION

471. **Mr BECKER (Hanson)** asked the Minister of Marine: Has the Minister or the Department of Marine and Harbors compiled two reports into the cost effectiveness, efficiency and safety benefits of licensing to operate and the registration of motor boats and, if so, what are the details and what does it cost to handle each registration of a motor boat?

The Hon. R.J. GREGORY: No reports have been compiled along the lines suggested in the question. In line with Cabinet's regulation review procedures, a draft green paper has been prepared prior to a review of the Boating and Marine Acts and the preparation of a new Navigation Act.

The green paper discusses the financial and social cost/benefits of registration and licensing as part of an overall assessment of current marine legislation, but at this stage the draft has not been circulated outside the department.

Referring to Mr Becker's question regarding costs of registration, the total cost of providing registration services during 1989-90 was approximately $243 000. Given that there are approximately 53 000 registered motor boats in the State, this equates to an annual cost of $4.58 per registered motor boat. It is expected that costs for the 1990-91 year will be about 10 per cent to 15 per cent lower due to improved efficiency and staffing reductions brought about by the recreational boating system. The primary safety benefit of licensing motor boat operators is that those operators must have a basic level of safety knowledge before being permitted on the State waters. Registration enables identification of motor boats and their owners providing a system through which the activities of a boat can be linked with its legally responsible owner.

POLICE LUNCHEONS

473. **Mr BECKER (Hanson)** asked the Minister of Emergency Services: Do some police personnel attend regular luncheons at Regency Park School of Catering and at Echunga; if so, are such luncheons attended as part of duties and, if so, why?

The Hon. J.H.C. KLUNDER: I understand that some persons employed within the South Australian Police Department have on occasions, in a private capacity and at their expense, attended luncheons at the Regency Park School of Catering. I have no knowledge of police personnel attending regular luncheons at Echunga. Meals are provided at Echunga Police Training Reserve for personnel attending official programs.

HIP REPLACEMENT OPERATIONS

478. **Dr ARMITAGE (Adelaide)** asked the Minister of Health: What was the average waiting time for a hip replacement operation at the Queen Elizabeth Hospital, Flinders Medical Centre, Modbury Hospital, and the Royal Adelaide Hospital, respectively, on the following dates: 1 January 1990, 30 June 1990 and 1 January 1991?

The Hon. D.J. HOPGOOD: The median waiting times for total hip replacement procedures, at the requested intervals, are outlined in the table below. Admissions from the booking list over the previous six month period have been used to calculate the median waiting time.

Median Waiting Times for Total Hip Replacement Procedures (in months)

	31 Dec 1989	30 June 1990	31 Dec 1990
TQEH	3.0	3.0	3.5
RAH	3.0	4.9	2.6
FMC	3.6	2.3	1.4
Modbury	6.8	5.1	3.3

TORRENS OUTLET BRIDGE

487. **Mr BECKER (Hanson)** asked the Minister of Transport:

1. Does the barrier and railing on the recently upgraded bridge on Seaview Road, West Beach over the River Torrens outlet prevent children from walking on the railing and if not, why not, and will the Highways Department take action to provide greater safety for children and discourage them from walking on the railing?
2. Does the design of the railing and barrier comply with proposed fencing regulations concerning private swimming pools and if not, why not?
3. Does the railing of this bridge comply with the standards of the National Association of Australian State Roads Authorities and if not, why not?
4. Why did it take so long to complete construction of the bridge railing and barrier?
5. What was the cost of replacement of the previous bridge railing and barrier?

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

1. The question of preventing children from walking on the railing of the bridge over the River Torrens on Seaview Road is considered to be primarily a matter of parental control.

In regard to the design of the railing at this location, it should be noted that the barrier serves the dual function of being both a pedestrian and traffic barrier. Due to the greatly increased strength requirements for vehicle barriers, the design used is considered to be the most appropriate to provide an acceptable level of safety for both pedestrians and vehicles. This particular barrier design has been in use in South Australia for the past 10-15 years in locations where a combination type is required.

2. The design of the barrier does not comply with the proposed fencing regulations concerning private swimming pools as they do not apply to this situation.
3. The barrier complies with the current NAASRA standard.
4. The aluminium railing sections of the barrier are manufactured in Sydney by Alcan Australia Ltd, the only company with the appropriate dies to extrude the rails.

Whilst the Department of Road Transport advised Alcan of the requirements prior to calling the contract, the contractor experienced a problem with late delivery. In addition, an incorrect number of components was delivered which further delayed the installation while the manufacturer fabricated the missing items.

5. Approximately $125 000.

PRIMARY TEACHERS

498. **Mr BRINDAL (Hayward)** asked the Minister of Education: How many primary trained teachers have been newly employed and have been offered permanent appointments since November 1990?

The Hon. G.J. CRAFTER: Since November 1990 the Education Department has recruited 159 permanent primary teachers. This figure includes specialist teachers who teach across Reception to Year 7 in such fields as LOTE, special education, music and library.

TEACHER APPOINTMENTS

499. **Mr BRINDAL (Hayward)** asked the Minister of Education:

1. How will the impact of secondary teachers appointed to primary schools for longer than one term be measured?
2. Will the job satisfaction and personal development of such teachers be monitored and, if so, how?
3. How will the students of such teachers be monitored to ascertain whether educational development and academic progress are satisfactory?
4. If no monitoring is to be undertaken, why not?

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

1. Principals of schools will monitor the performance of secondary teachers who have been appointed to short-term primary vacancies.
2. No; however, any feedback provided by principals and teachers will be noted.
3. Through normal internal school monitoring processes and through the activities of the Education Review Unit as part of the school review process.
4. Monitoring will be undertaken as outlined above.

CRIMINAL COMPLAINTS

500. **Mr BRINDAL (Hayward)** asked the Minister of Education:

1. How many teachers or other staff employed by the Education Department in the western and eastern areas reported crimes to the police or the Education Department against their persons or property in 1990 and what were the numbers, type and location of such complaints?
2. Did any Education Department staff allege that they were raped or assaulted in 1990 and, if so, how many were there in each category, where were they based and where did the alleged offences take place?
3. How many prosecutions have resulted from the complaints and how many convictions have been recorded?

The Hon. G.J. CRAFTER: The Education Department does not collect data relevant to the honourable member's question. The police have data on allegations, prosecution and convictions but they do not collect it by occupation or place of employment.

PRIORITY EDUCATION OFFICE

501. **Mr BRINDAL (Hayward)** asked the Minister of Education: Who is the current Coordinator of the Priority Education Office and how was that person appointed?

The Hon. G.J. CRAFTER: L. Symons is Acting Coordinator of Priority Education. The officer was reassigned from the position of Project Officer to the position of Coordinator in a short-term capacity.

EDUCATION DEPARTMENT INFORMATION

503. **Mr BRINDAL (Hayward)** asked the Minister of Education:

1. How will the integrity of new processes for disseminating Education Department information through a combination of public advertisement, the *Education Gazette* and Ed FACTS be monitored to guarantee to all members of the teaching profession equity of access?
2. What policy decisions have been made to determine which types of information will be circularised by each method?
3. Will the monitoring be reviewed and, if so, on what time scale and, if the process proves unsatisfactory, will it be amended?

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

1. The Education Department of South Australia has set up new methods of internal communications to take advantage of the network of facsimile machines installed in all schools last year. From the beginning of this school year, notices of events of interest to schools are distributed to schools in a new publication entitled 'EDfacts'. This is faxed to all Government schools and other Education Department worksites throughout the State every week during term time.

An electronic print-out allows the Education Department to identify any school which has not received the facsimile message. Within a short time of the message being sent, each school which has not received it is contacted and another attempt is made to send the message via the fax network. If the fax network fails a second time, the message is sent by mail to the school. All schools and other worksites have been notified of this new method of communicating within the department.

A School and Support Unit Vacancies circular is sent to all departmental worksites in the same manner as the 'EDfacts' circular, and using the same system of checks to ensure that each worksite receives the information within a one-week time span. It should be noted that public advertisements in the print media are only used as a summary of this School and Support Unit Vacancies, in order to ensure that any teachers on leave who might wish to apply for vacant positions have ready access to the same information as teachers in schools.

2. The *Education Gazette* will from now on be an official historical record of administrative decisions. It will contain details such as changes to the Administrative Instructions and Guidelines, Teachers Salary Board awards, and lists of appointments to Education Department positions. The 'EDfacts' circular will contain any notices of coming events or attractions of interest to schools. The School and Support Unit Vacancies circular will be used to advertise Education Act vacancies, and public advertisements will be used to alert teachers on leave to these vacancies.
3. Receipt of the circulars in schools will continue to be monitored on a weekly basis. Alternatives will be investigated in the future if the process proves unsatisfactory. Feedback from schools indicates that teachers are very happy with this system of communication via the fax network because it considerably reduces the timeline for informing schools of coming events, and there are advantages for students in our schools because it is now possible to advertise and fill vacant positions in schools in a much shorter time span.

PRIORITY EDUCATION OFFICE

504. **Mr BRINDAL (Hayward)** asked the Minister of Education:

1. Who is the Assistant Director/Superintendent of Schools (Social Justice) currently responsible for the oversight of the Priority Education Office and how was that person selected for the job?
2. What is the substantive level of the position and is the incumbent receiving that level of pay and, if not, what level is being paid?
3. What is the substantive status of the incumbent?

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

1. There is no position Superintendent of Schools (Social Justice). The Assistant Director of Curriculum, Social Justice, is M. Wallace. The position was filled by advertisement and the panel process.
2. ED4. Yes.
3. ED4.

SCHOOL CARD

506. **Mr BRINDAL (Hayward)** asked the Minister of Education:

1. How many students received the benefit of School Card in 1990 and how many have been approved for 1991?

2. What was the total cost of School Card in 1990?

3. Has any qualitative research been done as to the benefits of School Card from the point of view of school administrators, teachers and recipient students and, if so, what were the results and if no research of this nature has been undertaken, why not?

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

1. *(a)* 55 824.

(b) It is anticipated that 58 000 students will be approved for 1991.

2. $6.493 million.

3. A pilot study into the School Card was undertaken and used in the construction of 1991 guidelines.

EDUCATION DEPARTMENT CURRICULUM DIRECTORATE

508. **Mr BRINDAL (Hayward)** asked the Minister of Education:

1. What is the structure of the curriculum directorate of the Education Department for 1991?

2. What are the numbers and categories of FTE seconded teachers, clerical and administrative staff by location?

3. Where is each superintendent based, what are their designated areas of responsibility, and how many are there?

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

1. The proposed structure of the curriculum directorate for 1991 will depend on the outcomes of the Government Agency Review Group.

2. Curriculum unit staff as at October 1990 is shown on the following table.

Curriculum Unit	Superintendent's Area of Responsibility	Seconded Teachers		Admin. & Clerical	
		State Funded	Other Agency Funded	State Funded	Other Agency Funded
Ingle Farm	English language and literacy.	3	4	5	1
Plympton	The arts.	4	—	6	—
Newton	Languages other than English, English as a second language, Multiculturalism in education, New Arrivals Program.	9	21	6.8	7.4
Marden	Health and personal development.	4	4	4.4	4.6
Fulham Gardens	Human Society and the environment.	4	—	2.4	—
Mitchell Park	Maths, science and technology.	9	3.5	4.7	—
Gilles Street	(1) Early childhood—Year 7 (2) Education of girls	11	3	6	0.5
Morialta	Secondary education.	4	4	3	0.6
Flinders Park	Special education.	4	—	3	—
Priority Education	Disadvantaged schools program and country education program.	—	16	—	8.3
Darlington	Materials development and technology services.	8.8	2	20.5	2.6

3. There are 12 superintendents of curriculum. They are based at curriculum units as shown in the table with their areas of responsibility.

SECONDARY TEACHERS

509. **Mr BRINDAL (Hayward)** asked the Minister of Education:

1. How may secondary trained or practising teachers have been appointed or placed in primary schools for 1991?

2. How many secondary teachers on the permanent staff of the Education Department still have to be found positions for 1991?

3. How long will secondary teachers be expected to teach in primary schools?

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

1. The number is currently 24.

2. Sixty-six secondary teachers are currently placed as temporary placement teachers in secondary schools to undertake relief and other support activities. Fifty-three secondary teachers were placed at the Open Access College to assist in the preparation of curriculum support materials.

3. Secondary teachers appointed to primary schools or placed in temporary positions in secondary schools are being relocated progressively as secondary vacancies become available.

PERMANENT TEACHERS

510. **Mr BRINDAL (Hayward)** asked the Minister of Education: How many secondary trained teachers have been newly employed and have been offered permanent appointments since November 1990?

The Hon. G.J. CRAFTER: Since November 1990 the Education Department has recruited 115 permanent secondary teachers.

511. **Mr BRINDAL (Hayward)** asked the Minister of Education: How many lower primary/junior primary teachers have been newly employed and have been offered permanent appointments since November 1990?

The Hon. G.J. CRAFTER: Since November 1990 the Education Department has recruited 105 permanent lower/junior primary teachers.

OLYMPIC DAM

513. **Mr BRINDAL (Hayward)** asked the Minister of Mines and Energy: Was 'power gel' from the Olympic Dam site used to bomb the Roxby Downs Police Station and, if so, will the Minister liaise with Western Mining Corporation to ensure a review of security at the site particularly as it relates to the security of explosives?

The Hon. J.H.C. KLUNDER: The incident relating to the use of explosives which damaged the Roxby Downs Police Station on 5 February 1991 is still under investigation by the police, with the type of explosive which was used not being conclusively known as yet. A person has been charged over the matter but the case has been adjourned until 27 March 1991.

I am unable, therefore, to comment further on the matter at this time, other than to advise that the Senior Inspector of Mines at Roxby Downs is having discussions with Olympic Dam Operations regarding reviewing security arrangements with particular regard to the use of explosives.

SENIOR CITIZENS CARD

545. **Mr MATTHEW (Bright)** asked the Minister of Transport: In what States can the South Australian Senior Citizens Card be used for public transport concessions and, if not in all States, what action is being or has been taken to negotiate acceptance of the card in those States?

The Hon. FRANK BLEVINS: The Seniors Card (or equivalent) is now available in most States, but, due to the wide variety of card designs and eligibility criteria, no reciprocal arrangements exist between the States. Australian residents, visiting from interstate, can apply for a South Australian Seniors Card if they qualify under the conditions that apply to our local residents. On receipt of a duly authorised application form, a Seniors Card is issued. I understand that South Australia is the only State that does this.

GOVERNMENT VEHICLES

550. **Mr MATTHEW (Bright)** asked the Minister of Housing and Construction, representing the Minister of State Services: What Government business was the driver of the vehicle registered UQU 450 conducting when travelling along Tapleys Hill Road, Glenelg North, at 5.20 pm on 9 February?

The Hon. M.K. MAYES: The Motor Registration Division has advised that no Government vehicle with a registration number UQU 450 existed on the date of the alleged offence on 9 February 1991.