

HOUSE OF ASSEMBLY

Tuesday 9 February 1993

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:

Ambulance Services,
Construction Industry Long Service Leave (Miscellaneous) Amendment,
Dairy Industry,
Dangerous Substances (Equipment and Permits) Amendment,
Dried Fruits (Extension of Term of Office) Amendment,
The Flinders University of South Australia (Miscellaneous) Amendment,
Industrial Relations (Miscellaneous Provisions) Amendment,
Local Government (Financial Management) Amendment,
Motor Vehicles (Confidentiality) Amendment,
Parliamentary Committees (Publication of Reports) Amendment,
Stamp Duties (Penalties, Reassessments and Securities) Amendment,
State Bank of South Australia (Investigations) Amendment,
Statutes Amendment (Right of Reply),
Summary Procedure (Summary Protection Orders) Amendment,
Superannuation (Benefit Scheme),
Superannuation (Scheme Revision) Amendment,
Supported Residential Facilities,
Wine Grapes Industry (Indicative Prices) Amendment,
Workers Rehabilitation and Compensation (Miscellaneous) Amendment.

PETITIONS**RAPE CRISIS CENTRE**

A petition signed by eight residents of South Australia requesting that the House urge the Government to ensure the autonomy of the Rape Crisis Centre was presented by the Hon. Lynn Arnold.

Petition received.

DISABLED CHILDREN

A petition signed by 26 residents of South Australia requesting that the House urge the Government to provide equitable access to out-of-school-hours care services to disabled children was presented by the Hon. T.R. Groom.

Petition received.

YANKALILLA PRISON

A petition signed by 414 residents of South Australia requesting that the House urge the Government not to proceed with the proposed construction of a prison in the area of the District Council of Yankalilla was presented by the Hon. Dean Brown.

Petition received.

STURT ROAD

A petition signed by 30 residents of South Australia requesting that the House urge the Government to sequence traffic lights along Sturt Road to improve traffic flow was presented by Mr S.J. Baker.

Petition received.

OFFENSIVE MATERIAL

A petition signed by 49 residents of South Australia requesting that the House support measures to restrict the display of offensive material in retail premises was presented by Mr Becker.

Petition received.

ADELAIDE AIRPORT

A petition signed by 44 residents of South Australia requesting that the House urge the Government to support the retention of the aircraft curfew at Adelaide Airport was presented by Mr Becker.

Petition received.

STATE BANK

A petition signed by 255 residents of South Australia requesting that the House urge the Government to allow the electors to pass judgment on the losses of the State Bank by calling a general election was presented by Mr Becker.

Petition received.

LIQUOR LICENSING

A petition signed by 386 residents of South Australia requesting that the House urge the Government to rescind the increase in liquor licence fees was presented by the Hon. B.C. Eastick.

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 11, 33, 42, 44, 57, 58, 70, 88, 90, 91, 131, 138, 142, 152, 153, 191, 204 to 206, 208, 213,

214, 216, 217, 220, 221, 226, 237, 239 to 248, 250 to 252, 254, 255, 257 to 259, 261 to 278, 282 to 299, 302, 303 and 307; and I direct that the following answers to questions without notice and questions asked during the Estimates Committees be distributed and printed in *Hansard*.

SUMMONSES

In reply to **Mr HAMILTON (Albert Park)** 15 October.

The Hon. G.J. CRAFTER: My colleague the Attorney-General has advised that the serving of summons for criminal matters is covered under section 27 of the Summary Procedure Act. The Act permits the service of summons by several methods:

- (a) 'delivering the (summons) to him personally'; or
- (b) by 'leaving it for him at his last or most usual place of abode or of business with some other person, apparently an inmate thereof or employed thereat, and apparently not less than sixteen years of age'.

Section 27a of the Act also allows for a summons '... to be served on the defendant by posting the summons by ordinary pre-paid post addressed to the defendant named in the summons at his last known or usual place of abode or of business'.

The Court Services Department delivers approximately 21 000 summons each year by non-personal service (that is, 12 000 summons by post and 9 000 non-personal service to another person at the defendant's last known abode or business). It also delivers approximately 9 000 summons by direct personal service each year. On average, the department receives somewhere between 50 and 100 complaints each year regarding non-receipt of a summons. This represents less than one-half of 1 per cent of the 21 000 matters processed.

In cases where a fine, an order for costs, or a monetary penalty is imposed by a court as a result of the non-personal service of a summons, the department mails a notice to the defendant. These notices provide comprehensive details about the offence, the penalty, and more importantly, to the defendant's rights to a re-hearing (see attached Notice of Pecuniary Penalty). It informs the defendant, in part, that under section 76a of the Justices Act, a defendant can apply to have their conviction set aside if they can demonstrate that they did not receive the summons to appear at the original court proceedings.

Similarly, the serving of summonses for civil matters is regulated by Rule 46 of the Magistrates Court (Civil) Rules 1992.

This rules states that '... the Registrar may serve a document on a person: (a) by sending it by pre-paid post to the most recent address of the person supplied to the Registrar, or in the case of a body corporate to the registered officer of the body corporate; or to the solicitor acting for the person; and (b) by any other means provided by these rules'.

There are approximately 30 000 summons served each year by the civil division of the Magistrates Court. Of this number approximately 18 000 are served by the Registrar by post. The remainder are served either by the plaintiff, the plaintiff's solicitor, or to a much lesser extent, the Sheriff.

As in the case of criminal matters, judgments made against a defendant can be set aside upon the completion of a standard application at no cost. On the other hand, '... where service by post is, or appears, ineffectual the Registrar must set aside any judgment signed in default of the filing of a defence; serve on the plaintiff a notice in writing of the fact that service was or appears to be ineffectual; and, not again attempt service by post, unless the plaintiff has made further reasonable inquiries to ensure that the address for service is the postal address of the defendant'.

The current methods of serving summonses are highly effective and do provide appropriate safeguards.

HOUSING TRUST TENANTS

In reply to **Mr QUIRKE (Playford)** 6 November.

The Hon. G.J. CRAFTER: In raising this issue, Mr Quirke referred to the case of a particular constituent. Following

investigation I can advise the Mr Quirke's constituent contacted the trust's Salisbury Regional Housing Centre on 4 November 1992, and advised staff that she had been a victim of violence whilst residing in a trust property. At that time, Mr Quirke's constituent had actually left the trust property and was residing in temporary accommodation provided through the Salvation Army, although she did not advise trust staff of this until the following day when she was again interviewed.

During her initial contact with the trust, Mr Quirke's constituent stated that she wished to remain in the property and requested that the locks be changed. However, as she was not the tenant and had only resided in the property since June this year, the trust officer could not give an undertaking to comply with her requests until the circumstances had been substantiated in accordance with the trust's Domestic Violence Policy and attempts made to get her spouse to vacate the premises.

During the interview on 5 November 1992, Mr Quirke's constituent provided the trust with additional information in support of her request for assistance, including the fact that she had fled the marital home prior to the previous day's contact, and that her spouse had not been residing in the property for several weeks. The trust has had no contact from her spouse since the violence occurred and has been able to confirm that he is no longer living at the property. In light of these facts, the trust had no hesitation in arranging to transfer the tenancy into her name and to change the locks for her safety and security. This was completed on 9 November 1992.

In the circumstances, I am satisfied that trust staff have acted in accordance with the Domestic Violence Policy and once the full facts were known, acted promptly to ensure Mr Quirke's constituent's security of housing.

The trust's policies have always been directed at providing timely and sensitive responses to victims of domestic violence, particularly where women and children are involved. Recognising violence in the home as a growing concern in the community the trust recently reviewed its policies in this area to ensure its programs are effective and, wherever possible, minimise the dislocation experienced by those affected by domestic violence. This review culminated in the public release, on 29 September 1992, of an information package containing details of the trust's policies and programs of assistance to victims of domestic violence, a handbook for staff in public housing authorities and information for workers who might refer people to the trust as a result of domestic violence. This package has been well received in the community and I am satisfied that the trust's Domestic Violence Policy is appropriate. The policy will be kept under review.

STERILINE MANUFACTURING

In reply to **Hon. T.H. HEMMING (Napier)** 26 August.

The Hon. G.J. CRAFTER: Following the honourable member's question, the Attorney-General wrote to the Australian Securities Commission and has been advised as follows:

Steriline Manufacturing Pty Ltd was placed in liquidation on 10 June 1992 with Mr John Sheahan of Sheahan Sims, being the appointed liquidator.

The liquidator is currently completing his investigation into the activities of the company. Should it become apparent during his investigation that a past or present officer of the company may have committed an offence in relation to the activities of the company, he is required to report such matters to the ASC pursuant to section 533 (1) of the Corporations Law.

Currently the ASC has not received a report of this nature in relation to Mr Sims or any other officer of Steriline Manufacturing Pty Ltd (In Liquidation). Should a report be lodged it will be assessed and action taken where deemed appropriate. It should be noted that other parties who may have information in relation to this company, may also place that information before the ASC, to be assessed accordingly.

Two other companies with which Mr Sims is or has been associated have been placed into receivership. These companies are:

- (i) Steriline Properties Pty Ltd (Receiver and Manager appointed on 4 March 1992); and
- (ii) Trimtech Pty Ltd (Receiver and Manager appointed on 13 March 1992).

ASC has not received any notification from the receiver and manager of the above companies of any occurrence of offences or misconduct by its officers.

Presently ASC is not planning any action in relation to Mr Sims or in relation to any of the companies with which he is or has been associated.

PLANNING AND URBAN DEVELOPMENT OFFICE

In reply to **Mr OSWALD (Morphett)** 10 November.

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

1. As of 10 November 1992, 623 full-time equivalent positions were transferred to the Office of Planning and Urban Development.

2. Action necessary to transfer from the Office of Planning and Urban Development to the Department of Environment and Land Management approximately 490 full-time equivalent positions is proceeding. In the interim the program responsibilities that were the responsibility of the Department of Environment and Planning are being actively continued by the same staff with similar reporting relationships as existed under the previous department.

ARNOTT'S BISCUITS LIMITED

In reply to **Hon. J.P. TRAINER (Walsh)** 10 November.

The Hon. LYNN ARNOLD: Arnott's has one of its factories based in South Australia at Marleston and employs approximately 400 employees. The Marleston factory has been designated as the 'short run' plant for the Arnott's operations, with the production aimed primarily at the domestic market.

The Federal Treasurer has not disapproved the takeover bid using the Foreign Investment Review Board powers, but has made the takeover contingent upon certain conditions such as where the majority of the board reside and where the head office of Arnott's is maintained.

The issues are now largely commercial matters for the shareholders to determine. The State Government is monitoring developments and anticipates a continuing close association with the company whether or not the takeover bid is successful.

PUBLIC SECTOR SALARIES

In reply to **Hon. JENNIFER CASHMORE (Coles)** 10 November.

The Hon. LYNN ARNOLD: The provisions applying in respect of the appointment of Chief Executive Officers are specified in section 37 of the Government Management and Employment Act. Appointments are for a term and the normal public service appointment procedures are followed. No formal contract document is required. Details of the salaries paid to Chief Executive Officers are contained in Table 45 of the 1991-92 Annual Report of the Commissioner for Public Employment which was tabled in Parliament on 18 November 1992.

The provisions of section 37 (1) (e) of the Government Management and Employment Act prescribe that Chief Executive Officer appointments are 'subject to such conditions (not inconsistent with any other provisions of this Act) as may be determined by the Governor'. Therefore Chief Executive Officers receive the same leave entitlements and conditions of employment as other senior officers appointed under the Government Management and Employment Act.

FLOOD DAMAGE

In reply to **Mr MEIER (Goyder)** 13 October.

The Hon. LYNN ARNOLD: There are no statistics available on property damage mainly because in general it is entirely up to the individual to bear damage claims. Listed below are areas which were flooded and details of crop losses.

Major areas which were flooded include:

- Wingate Road, south of river—mainly hobby blocks, horses, grazing, vineyards (4 hectares) and almonds (8 hectares).

- Wingate Road, north of river through to the Two Wells/Gawler Road, the 'Golden Mile' district. Estimated 200 acres (80 hectares) of field vegetable production (potatoes, onions, carrots) under water. Affected properties include—Redente, De Lucca, Mundullo, Princiotta and Polito.
- McGee and Hayman Roads, south of river. Some vegetable production, mostly green manure cereal/bean crops.
- Zarella's packing shed flooding through wash water wastage drain pipes to river—being controlled by Country Fire Service crews pumping drain constantly—minor damage at this stage.
- Further west, water is flooding through the same pathways as previously, namely, Baker Road, Johns Road, Gawler River and through to Dawkins Road.
- Culverts under the Port Wakefield main highway are channelling the flow through Gawler River tomatoes (ley ground).
- Much of the land from Baker Road (west and north) comprises previously affected area and grazing areas. Buckland Park is again flooded.

UNIVERSITY STAFF

In reply to **Hon. JENNIFER CASHMORE (Coles)** 15 September.

The Hon. M.D. RANN: The universities and the Department of Employment and TAFE allocate considerable resources to the professional development of the teaching staff each year.

A total of \$1.492 million has been allocated in 1992 across the three universities on staff development programs. Each university uses a different accounting procedure to allocate resources which makes direct comparisons difficult. However within the definition of professional development the University of Adelaide allocated \$654 000, the University of South Australia \$484 000, and Flinders University of South Australia \$345 000.

The University of Adelaide and the University of South Australia have specialist units which provide programs designed to strengthen the quality of teaching and learning. Flinders University of South Australia does not have a designated centre, but employs Staff Development and Training Officers to enhance the quality of teaching and learning.

The Department of Employment and TAFE allocated \$1.350 million in 1992 to Colleges and Program Groups to enhance the quality of teaching and learning.

There is also expenditure for attendance at conferences, teacher exchange, and study leave which further enhances the quality of teaching and learning at the universities and TAFE colleges in South Australia.

BLANCHE FLEUR VETCH

In reply to **Mr VENNING (Custance)** 9 February.

The Hon. T.R. GROOM: I believe that the recent adverse publicity concerning Blanche Fleur vetch has the potential to jeopardise both established and new vetch food markets at a time when the area sown to this crop has been increasing and when South Australian farmers are seeking new crops, especially for export markets. More importantly I believe this type of publicity could severely harm South Australia's reputation as an exporter of other human food crops.

Some time ago, the Department of Primary Industries through its leadership in the South Australian Grain Legumes Consultative Committee recommended that all sections of the industry, from producers to end users, be warned of the potential problems with this vetch.

At about the same time the Grains Council of Australia commissioned the Australian Academy of Grain Technology to carry out tests in an effort to prove or disprove the basic claims made by Dr Tate and his colleague at the Waite Agricultural Research Institute. I am now informed that additional tests are currently being carried out at the Australian Academy of Grain Technology on behalf of the Grains Council of Australia which hopefully will shed more light on the questions of the effect of cooking and soaking on the toxins and the nature of breakdown products during these activities.

Until the results of those tests are available I believe that we must rely on exporters to ensure that Blanche Fleur vetch is clearly labelled as such, in compliance with the requirements of the Australian Quarantine and Inspection Service.

As soon as the results of the tests currently being conducted by the Academy of Grain Technology are available, Department of Primary Industries will organise a meeting to discuss the future of vetch in South Australia.

Invitations to the meeting will be issued to representatives of all facets of the local vetch industry with a view to providing clear guidelines on future research and development for this crop and to farmers considering sowing the crop in 1993.

Estimated crop losses from recent flooding of parts of the Northern Adelaide Plains are as follows:

22 hectares potatoes
4 hectares onions
34 hectares brassica crops
4 hectares carrots
1 hectare lettuce
2 hectares bunch crops

at an estimated crop value loss of \$1.2 million.

An estimated 90 glasshouses containing tomatoes, cucumbers, capsicums and eggfruit at a crop value estimated at \$120 000 were also flooded.

A further 200 hectares of cereal crops and pastures and 30 hectares of almonds, and vines were flooded, but losses are not substantial and are impossible to estimate.

The figures regarding damage to crops are an update of those given by the Minister of Primary Industries in the House of Assembly on 22 October 1992.

WARRANTS

In reply to **Mr HAMILTON (Albert Park)** 22 October.

The Hon. G.J. CRAFTER: The Attorney-General has advised that a person who has outstanding warrants and can demonstrate personal or family hardship, may apply to the Registrar of a court to make arrangements to satisfy them. He or she does not have to deal with the police in these matters.

Persons may telephone court offices to seek information without risk, that is, confidentiality is assured and details will not be relayed to police.

A Registrar of a court has powers which include suspending the operation of warrants, allowing further time to pay, allowing payment by instalments, arranging for penalties to be 'worked off' through the Community Services Scheme, and remitting the penalties. Advice of these options is given on the court's penalty and reminder notices.

In relation to the disclosure of warrant information, the Minister of Emergency Services has advised that the policy concerning this strictly precludes the release of information to telephone callers except in certain circumstances to ensure the privacy of records held by the Police Department.

Information is not given over the telephone for reasons of lack of identification. This information is strictly confidential and should only be released to the party to whom it relates.

EXPORTS

In reply to **Hon. DEAN BROWN (Leader of the Opposition)** 15 September.

The Hon. LYNN ARNOLD: A breakdown of South Australian exports between unprocessed agriculture, unprocessed minerals and manufactured products including processed agricultural and mineral products, for the past three years has been provided in the accompanying table. These figures are for overseas exports and therefore exclude exports interstate.

The table shows that manufactured exports, as a percentage of total exports, have increased slightly over the three year period, from 52 per cent to 57 per cent, while unprocessed or raw agricultural products have declined from 35 per cent to 17 per cent of total exports. This decline is largely due to a big drop in wool and wheat prices.

The table also indicates that a significant proportion of manufactured exports are processed agricultural and mineral products.

SOUTH AUSTRALIAN EXPORTS BY INDUSTRY

Sector	1989-90 (\$'000)	(%) of Total SA Exports	1990-91 (\$'000)	(%) of Total SA Exports	1991-92 (\$'000)	(%) of Total SA Exports
Total Unprocessed.....	1 164 485	41	927 558	31	887 535	25
Unprocessed Agricultural.....	1 007 150	35	779 742	26	607 884	17
Unprocessed Mineral.....	143 317	5	130 658	4	248 681	7
Total Manufactured.....	1 485 518	52	1 749 783	58	2 006 764	57
Processed Agricultural.....	597 130	21	660 749	22	789 733	23
Processed Mineral.....	435 966	15	573 549	19	631 167	18
Confidential Items; Waste and Scrap NES*; Second-hand Goods NES; Special Goods.....	190 178	7	325 107	11	597 048	7
Total Exports**.....	2 841 290	100	3 005 367	100	100	100

*NES—not elsewhere specified

**Percentages may not sum to 100 due to rounding.

Source: ABS Microfiche MX13B

SALE OF PROPERTIES

In reply to **Mr BRINDAL (Hayward)** 18 September.

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

1. Receipt from Sales of Surplus Properties 1991-92

Location	\$
Black Forest PS (part).....	64 340
Seaton North PS (part).....	1 500
Keithcot Farm PS (part).....	203 996
Point Pass.....	1 000
Kybunga RS.....	2 760
Hackham Pioneer Village.....	173 759
Ethelton PS (part).....	225 000
Purnong PS.....	3 565
Port Pirie Education Centre.....	85 600
Bolivar East (part).....	120 949
Gulnare RS.....	20 044
Mount Hill RS.....	7 552

Location	\$
Delamere RS.....	74 060
Morphett Vale Town School (part).....	143 163
Pooraka (Montague Road).....	662 000
Kidman Park HS (buildings).....	3 587 000
Sturt PS (part).....	89 200
Warradale PS (part).....	225 000
Other receipts credited.....	54 814
	<hr/>
	\$5 705 302

2. List of Properties for Sale 1992-93 (as at 1.10.92)

Location
Hindmarsh PS (1)
Hindmarsh PS (2)
Klemzig JPS (land)
Elizabeth Vale JPS
Playford HS (1)

Playford HS (2)
 Wandana JPS (land)
 Goodwood HS (1)
 Goodwood HS (2)
 Ingle Farm Central PS
 Kidman Park HS (1)
 Kidman Park HS (2)
 Strathmont HS (1)
 Strathmont HS (2)
 Strathmont HS (3)
 St Morris PS
 Charleston PS
 Klemzig JPS (sch)
 Wandana JPS (sch)
 Dover Gardens HS
 Glengowrie HS
 Ingle Farm PS
 Campbelltown HS
 Findon HS (part)
 Ingle Heights
 Adelaide Girls HS
 Kilburn Work Centre
 Hamilton SS (part)
 Campbelltown HS
 West Lakes HS
 Thebarton PS
 Taperoo HS (part)
 Kongorong PS (house)
 Osmond Terrace

PAPERS TABLED

The following papers were laid on the table:

By the Treasurer (Hon. Frank Blevins)—
 Friendly Societies Act—Amendments to General
 Laws—Lifeplan Community Services

By the Minister of Housing, Urban Development and Local
 Government Relations (Hon. G.J. Crafter)—
 Corporate Affairs Commission—Report 1992
 Rules of Court—
 District Court—District Court Act 1991—
 Criminal Division Enforcement of Orders
 Non Application of Rules
 Magistrates Court—Magistrates Court Act 1991—
 Civil Jurisdiction—Costs and Forms
 Criminal Jurisdiction—Various
 Supreme Court—Supreme Court Act 1935—
 Commonwealth and Foreign Judgements
 Criminal Division—Enforcement of Orders
 Suitors Fund Investment
 Planning Act—Crown Development Reports on—
 Erection of Storage Shed, Goolwa Barrage
 Re-roofing Willunga Police Station
 Relocation of Transportable Classrooms—
 Mt Compass Area School
 Goolwa Primary School
 Regulations under the following Acts—
 City of Adelaide Development Control Act
 1976—Heritage Item Removal
 Housing Co-operatives Act 1991—Electoral Procedures
 Planning Act 1982—Development Controls—Local
 Government
 Corporation of Mt Gambier—By-law—No. 5—Council Land
 District Council of Lincepede—By-law No. 9—Council
 Land
 By the Minister of Environment and Land Management (Hon.
 M.K. Mayes)—
 Regulations under the following Acts—
 Liquor Licensing Act 1985—

Port Augusta
 Port Augusta (Amendment)
 Various
 South Australian Country Arts Trust Act
 1992—General
 By the Minister of Education, Employment and Training (Hon.
 S.M. Lenehan)—
 University of South Australia—Report 1991
 Children's Services Act 1985—Regulations—Appeal
 Procedures
 By the Minister of Labour Relations and Occupational Health
 and Safety (Hon. R.J. Gregory)—
 South Australian Occupational Health and Safety
 Commission—Report 1991-92
 WorkCover Corporation—Report 1992
 Regulations under the following Acts—
 Construction Industry Long Service Leave Act
 1987—Levy Rate
 Industrial Conciliation and Arbitration (Commonwealth
 Provisions) Amendment Act 1991—Transitional Provisions
 Workers Rehabilitation and Compensation Act
 1986—Medically Assessed Compensation
 By the Minister of Business and Regional Development (Hon.
 M.D. Rann)—
 Government Adviser on Deregulation—Report 1991-92
 Response to the Third Report of the Economic and Finance
 Committee—Inquiry into the Public Accountability of the Australian
 Formula One Grand Prix Board
 Regulations under the following Acts—
 Freedom of Information Act 1991—
 SABSA Exemption
 SABSA Exemption (Amendment)
 Harbors Act 1936—Fees and Penalties
 Road Traffic Act 1961—Bicycle Safety Helmets

By the Minister of Health, Family and Community Services
 (Hon. M.J. Evans)—
 Regulations under the following Acts—
 Controlled Substances Act 1984—Simple Cannabis
 Offences—Expiation Notice
 Optometrists Act 1920—Registration Fees
 South Australian Health Commission Act
 1976—Prostheses Charges

By the Minister of Primary Industries (Hon. T.R. Groom)—
 Advisory Board of Agriculture—Report 1991-92
 Dried Fruits Board of South Australia—Report For Year
 Ended 29 February 1992
 Regulations under the following Acts—
 Agricultural Chemicals Act 1955—Registration Fee
 Revocation
 Cattle Compensation Act 1939—Compensation Level
 Fees Regulation Act 1927—Stock Medicines Fees
 Revocation
 Fisheries Act 1982—Marine Scalefish Fishery—Licence
 Transfer.

PUBLIC SECTOR DEBT

The Hon. FRANK BLEVINS (Treasurer): I seek
 leave to make a ministerial statement.
 Leave granted.

The Hon. FRANK BLEVINS: A number of statements in recent days have caused confusion as to the State's net debt position.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order!

The Hon. FRANK BLEVINS: Mr Speaker, this is important.

The SPEAKER: The Chair considers that to be so, and I call on the Treasurer.

The Hon. FRANK BLEVINS: Thank you, Sir. In particular, it is necessary to correct the Leader of the Opposition's assertion that the official disclosure of the State's net debt position and obligations arising from support of the State Bank has been inadequate or misleading. At budget time the State Treasury Department published its provisional estimate for South Australia's public sector net debt as at June 1992. These estimates are based on Australian Bureau of Statistics definitions with some minor differences in coverage. These estimates were shown on page 71 of Financial Statement No. 1.

As it happens, Treasury has recently revised upwards its provisional June 1992 figure of \$7.3 billion to \$7.4 billion following the availability of audited and corrected data not available at the time of the budget. The Treasury estimates are also subject to an ongoing process of reconciliation with the Australian Bureau of Statistics. As will be appreciated, Treasury information is published a great deal earlier than the ABS statistics and thus the classification of various financial transactions has to be based on a provisional interpretation of ABS definitions.

The Treasury figure of \$7.4 billion reflects the payment of money to the State Bank pursuant to indemnity support arrangements for the bank. It will be recalled that three payments to the bank have occurred to date:

- . \$500 million in February 1991
- . \$1 700 million in August 1991
- . \$99.6 million in June 1992

That brings the total cash support to the bank to \$2.3 billion. In addition, the Government has recognised a further obligation to meet the 1991-92 loss of the Group Asset Management Division of \$450 million. In no sense has the Government sought to hide or disguise that obligation as alleged by the Leader. I would argue that it is hardly a secret.

That obligation was included in the accounts payable line of the State's 'balance sheet' which is table 3.6 on page 75 of Financial Statement No. 1 rather than the net debt figure which records accumulated net borrowings. Accounts payable at June 1992 were larger than normal because of the \$450 million. The inclusion of the \$450 million is clearly explained in a footnote to table 3.6. As was explained at budget time, it was anticipated that there would be a return of capital from the bank which would fund or offset at least part of the \$450 million. In addition, it was stated at budget time that an amount of \$400 million had been reserved in a special deposit account for possible further indemnity payments.

To obtain a picture of the State's total liabilities, it is certainly legitimate to add accounts payable, accrued interest, unrepresented cheques, unfunded superannuation, etc., to the capital value of the State's borrowings less financial assets which is captured in the ABS concept of

net debt. This is what table 3.6 seeks to do. It is also informative to set a total liabilities figure against a figure for total assets which is also what table 3.6 does. In fact, the State has an estimated excess of assets at current value over liabilities of around \$12.6 billion.

I wish to refer also to a debt figure of \$8.25 billion used by the Prime Minister in a recent statement. The \$8.25 billion derives from a report by Access Economics published in December 1992. Inquiries have revealed that the figure of \$8.25 billion was an Access Economics estimate based on a face value figure of the State's debt. The face value is the amount payable at final maturity of the debt. Accounting standards require that debt be recorded at the value of the proceeds of a borrowing, plus any amortisation of the difference between the face value and proceeds amount. Because a significant amount of the State's debt has been issued at a discount, there is a substantial difference between face value and book value, as is also the case, incidentally, in other States. The more meaningful concept which is preferred by the Australian Bureau of Statistics and which is used in the State Treasury figures is book value, which accords with accounting standards.

It is also possible to produce a similar figure to the \$8.25 billion Access Economics figure by adding \$850 million to the published State Treasury estimate of \$7.3 billion. This figure anticipates further payments to the bank of \$850 million, comprising the \$450 million indemnity amount for the 1991-92 GAMD loss and the \$400 million reserved in the special deposit account. The \$2.3 billion actually paid to the bank, plus the \$850 million for anticipated further payments, gives the \$3.15 billion that has gained currency as the expected size of the State Bank bail-out.

However, for an item to qualify as indebtedness or accounts payable at a given point in time, there has to be a clear definition and knowledge of amounts owing. A liability has to be in existence before it can be recorded. It is not proper accounting procedure to recognise the potential for future net cash outgoings of uncertain amounts and record those estimates as a debt or liability incurred today. Data on net debt and other liabilities as at 30 June 1993 will be published in the budget in the normal fashion. Of course, it will be higher than as at June 1992 for the simple reason that the State has a net borrowing requirement which was budgeted for in 1992-93. But there are many factors which will affect the number, including net cash payments as between the bank, GAMD and the Government, including a possible return of capital. As was the case for June 1992, estimates will be prepared according to established principles at the time of the budget on the basis of the data which will then be available. These estimates will be published in accordance with the Government's established policy of full and open disclosure of financial data.

EDUCATION RESPONSIBILITY

The Hon. S.M. LENEHAN (Minister of Education, Employment and Training): I seek leave to make a ministerial statement.

Leave granted.

The Hon. S.M. LENEHAN: Education in South Australia has enjoyed a reputation as a leader of change, both nationally and internationally, for a very long time. The essence of this reputation is that we have always endeavoured to respond to the school community so that education of the highest quality is provided for all the people in this State. This has developed steadily over the years, gaining impetus from the freedom and authority memorandum in 1975 and the Karmel and Reeves inquiries into education in South Australia in 1971 and 1981.

In my role as Minister, I intend to continue to develop and maintain this excellent reputation and to strive to deliver to all young people quality education which will enable them to actively participate in all aspects of our society. Our schools should reflect the very nature of their communities and they need to support their students in socially just ways. It is therefore appropriate that schools have the opportunity to determine their own priorities to meet local needs, while ensuring the best educational outcomes for all students.

Schools at present have considerable authority over a wide range of administrative functions, and we need to examine ways in which schools and their communities can, where practicable, develop these responsibilities. The sharing of responsibility for decision making can increase opportunities for creativity and flexibility - opportunities for a partnership between the 'professionals' and the local community and a genuine partnership between parents and school staff.

We are now entering an era which I believe will be characterised by a time of stabilisation and consolidation. This does not mean that there will be no further changes or that the system will be frozen in time. We shall continue to pursue priorities which ensure that the high quality of education, for which we have become internationally known, will be maintained and enhanced.

It is within this context that school communities and the Government will explore shared responsibility for education in this State. We will move forward in a way which ensures that all parties are supported, that they participate in discussion and that they are able to make choices. Clearly, these directions will also need to be practicable and within workable time lines. During 1992 the Education Department invited comment from school communities on a number of issues related to shared responsibility and received a total of 1 120 submissions in response. These submissions are currently being summarised, and an analysis of responses will be released by me for further consultation. Through consultation we need to reach a common understanding of what is possible to share.

Further developments will be explored in ways which will allow schools and their councils to test the feasibility of proposals at a pace that will match the schools' capacity and their confidence to manage transition. Specific proposals for possible implementation, for trialling or for further consideration will be circulated to allow schools and their communities the opportunity to respond.

In conclusion, shared responsibility is about maximising the potential of parents and school staff for the benefit of students and students' learning. It is not about imposition and expediency in dealing with school

communities, as has been experienced in Victoria. We will not—

Members interjecting:

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

The Hon. S.M. LENEHAN: We will not tear up our industrial agreements or require schools to undertake excessive administrative tasks which would divert them from their professional focus.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order! The Chair will not try to shout over interjections in this House. If it has to take action, it will be against individuals.

MENTAL HEALTH

The Hon. M.J. EVANS (Minister of Health, Family and Community Services): I seek leave to make a ministerial statement.

Leave granted.

The Hon. M.J. EVANS: Members will recall the tragic death of Dr Chandraratnam, one of Hillcrest's longest serving doctors, in early December last year. It came at a time when South Australia's mental health services were undergoing change. Change inevitably brings with it uncertainty. Dr Chandra's untimely death was followed by a series of events which, despite the best efforts of the board and the Chief Executive Officer, required decisive action in order to restore stability and ensure that patient care was maintained. That action was taken.

Members will recall my announcement on 10 December that the board of the South Australian Mental Health Service had been dissolved, the Chief Executive had agreed to stand aside and that I had asked Her Excellency the Governor to appoint Mr George Beltchev as Administrator of the service. Mr Beltchev was also appointed to chair a review team with the following terms of reference: to define for me the role and function of SAMHS consistent with the devolution process and the National Mental Health Policy; to identify the current problems affecting the operation of SAMHS; to recommend to me a course of action enabling the resolution of the identified problems; and to recommend the priorities that the new SAIVHS board should address. Two other members of the team are Emeritus Professor Bill Cramond and Associate Professor Fran Sutton. That team has been reporting directly to me.

I believe it is important that members are informed of progress to date. In relation to the management of the Mental Health Service, top priority has been given to restoring a sense of stability, and Mr Beltchev has visited SAMHS sites and talked to staff, consumers, carers and union representatives. Particular attention has been given to a number of areas. Interim organisational structures have been put in place at Hillcrest and Glenside in both administrative and clinical areas to provide leadership and ensure that staff are aware of their operational and management responsibilities. A complete assessment of the physical security requirements of Hillcrest has been made, and recommendations about procedures for safe practice are now being developed.

An improved system for reporting critical incidents has been instigated, and there are plans to provide aggression management training for all staff at the Mental Health Service. A formal complaint mechanism within the Mental Health Service will also be established. In relation to the review team, an extensive process of consultation has been put in place. Interested parties have been approached to make representations; staff groups, consumers and unions have been approached; and public notices have been placed in the *Advertiser* inviting submissions. The review team has set aside every Wednesday and Friday to receive presentations and submissions. Recommendations will be made to me in due course.

I should emphasize that, while the devolution of Hillcrest Hospital and the further development of community services has been delayed until the report of the review team has been considered, the framework for the reforms remains firmly in place.

The whole reason for our reform process is to put psychiatric hospital services closer to where people live and, most critically, to improve and expand community services for the mentally ill. Those reforms are completely in line with the National Mental Health Policy, and we should not now move backwards. Indeed, we will not move backwards. I am pleased to announce that, as part of the recently signed Medicare agreement, Commonwealth funding has been allocated for the implementation of the National Mental Health Policy. This money will be used to develop community based services in priority areas in both the city and the country. Clearly, there is still some way to go, but stability has been restored to the Mental Health Service. The review team is continuing its work and I will report again to the House when its final recommendations are available.

QUESTION TIME

STATE BANK

The Hon. DEAN BROWN (Leader of the Opposition): My question is directed to the Premier. Was the purchase of the State Bank by the Commonwealth Bank discussed at last month's meeting between South Australian and Commonwealth officials; will the Premier give an assurance that no such sale will be permitted; and why did the Treasurer subsequently deny that the Government was considering the sale of the State Bank? I have been very reliably informed that during the discussions early last month the sale of our State Bank to the Commonwealth Bank was explored and remains under active consideration. In his economic statement this afternoon, the Prime Minister has said that a Federal Labor Government would retain majority public ownership of the Commonwealth Bank and that the State Banks should be sold.

In 1990, Mr Keating secretly negotiated with Mrs Kirner the sale of the State Bank of Victoria to the Commonwealth Bank—a move which I am told has already cost Victoria 4 000 jobs, with more to go—and the ongoing closure of 250 State branches. There is concern among State Bank employees and in business

circles that the proposal by the Commonwealth and State Labor Governments for the Commonwealth Bank to purchase the State Bank would severely damage banking services here in South Australia. The Treasurer's denial as recently as 21 January that the State Bank may be sold is plainly false.

The Hon. LYNN ARNOLD: I believe the Leader of the Opposition would do well to read just the public statements of both the Prime Minister and me and he would have a fulsome answer to the issues he has raised today. While the public statements made by the Prime Minister, the Deputy Premier and me are consistent throughout, what are not consistent are the statements by the Leader of the Opposition on the question of the bank. He wanders all over the place. In fact, listening to his questioning today, I wonder exactly where he does stand on the future of the State Bank, because it is certainly in contradiction to many of the other comments he has made on the State Bank on other occasions. Indeed, one need not go on to talk about how he variously values the bank—

Mr MEIER: On a point of order, Mr Speaker, Standing Order 98 provides that no debate is allowed. The Premier is debating the question.

The SPEAKER: This point about using replies to debate matters has been raised before. The Premier is into the first minute of his answer, so I suggest that we do not take up the point about his debating the question until he is a little further down the line. However, for the member for Goyder's benefit, I will watch that point and I ask the Premier to be as specific as possible in answer to the Leader's question.

The Hon. LYNN ARNOLD: I will certainly be specific, given the Leader's vague position. The Prime Minister has said on a number of occasions that he believes that State Governments should not have State banks, that they should sell them. He has said that publicly, and he said it again today. However, that is not a new expression of opinion. When I met with the Prime Minister last year he said precisely the same thing to me, and I know that he said the same thing to my predecessor, the member for Ross Smith.

The view which I have expressed all the way, which remains the view I continue to express today, is that the future of the bank, whatever that is, must be in the best financial and social interests of South Australians. After we have done a proper analysis of all the financial and social questions involved, a decision can be made. I will not be steamrollered into a decision on the matter of the future of the State Bank. Today I will not be forced to say 'Yes' or 'No' as to the sale of the State Bank because I cannot guarantee that a decision to sell or not to sell will be in the best interests financially and socially of South Australians. I said that to the Prime Minister last year; I said that to him last week; and I have said it in public arenas on many occasions. He fully understands my view on those matters.

In the process of deciding whether or not the State Bank should be sold, we really must come to an important starting point. I repeat the point I have made on other occasions: I do not have an ideological fixation about that question, either for or against.

An honourable member interjecting:

The Hon. LYNN ARNOLD: I do not know what their position is. They may have an ideological position, but it changes from day to day. I do not have an ideological fixation on this matter. I will come to a decision with my Government, with my colleagues in Cabinet and Caucus, after we have looked at all the important questions. If we are to make a profound decision, we need to have information. We need to have facts. We are in the process of getting facts, as has been announced. A process of evaluation is being undergone at the moment to look at the bank, to assess its marketable value, so that we can more properly make a decision about whether or not it should be sold.

Given what happened to the State Bank of Victoria, when there was some compensation from the Commonwealth Government when the bank was sold, it is important for us to know exactly whether or not the Commonwealth Government would make available to us that amount of assistance if the bank were sold. Questions have been asked of Commonwealth officers as to what would happen. If the State Government came to a decision to sell the bank, what would the Commonwealth do? There were some discussions on that matter in January, and, last week, the Prime Minister confirmed publicly what the Commonwealth Government would do if we decided that the bank should be put up for sale in whole or in part. That answer was that, for a period, the Commonwealth would offer to the State Government compensation for tax revenue that it would receive from a privately owned bank.

I was disappointed that, last week, we did not have that firmed up in actual figures, in terms of the time that that would take place for, but I understand it was not possible to have it tied up with figures as to the amounts because we do not have a proper feel for what the income stream of the bank will be over the next five or 10 years upon which such a figure would be based.

When that information becomes available, it will be factored into our decision-making process. If after all our deliberations on the financial questions and social considerations we determine it is in the best interests of South Australians—that is the key question as to what will happen to the bank—that the bank be sold, clearly we will know what the Commonwealth will offer. If the bank is not to be sold, that one aspect of the offer made by the Prime Minister last week would not come into play. The other issues which we discussed last week, and which were also discussed with officers of the Commonwealth Government in January, are still alive and will come into play.

STATE FINANCES

The Hon. D.J. HOPGOOD (Baudin): My question is directed to the Treasurer. What is the scope and purpose of the study apparently being undertaken on behalf of the South Australian Government by the financial advisers Baring Brothers Burroughs as reported in the *Financial Review* of 22 January this year?

The Hon. FRANK BLEVINS: I thank the member for Baudin for his question because there has been some speculation over the past two weeks or so about the purpose of the Baring Brothers' investigation. I have

been quite surprised at the degree of speculation, because I announced in the House towards the end of last year that the time was fast approaching when some more in-depth assessment ought to be made, quite properly, of the value of the bank. I stated also in the House that the only information we had to date was Nobby Clark's view that the bank was worth about \$1 billion. That was it.

I do not think Nobby Clark would claim that that was a particularly scientific or considered view, but nevertheless it was the only view we had. I would not expect it to be a million miles out, given Nobby Clark's stature in the banking industry, particularly as he held the reins of the State Bank for 18 months or so. So, I would think it is of that order—it is unlikely to be hugely more or hugely less. I made that announcement here in the Parliament. All of a sudden members opposite are running around saying that the bank is for sale. I can repeat now what the member for Ross Smith said some time ago, what the Premier has constantly said, and what I have constantly said: the bank is not for sale.

The Hon. Jennifer Cashmore: That's not what Keating says.

The Hon. FRANK BLEVINS: It is not Keating's bank. Apparently the Prime Minister has the same view as the Leader of the Opposition. I do not know; I have never spoken to the Prime Minister about it. I can tell members that the bank is not for sale. The reason that the bank is not for sale, as the Premier has just stated, is that we do not know whether it would be in the financial interests—let alone any other considerations—of the State to sell it. The only person I have heard say, 'Sell it at all costs' is the Leader, who has an ideological position. He says, 'Sell it.' It does not matter to him whether it damages the State. In fact, he goes further and says, 'Sell it to the Japanese; sell it to whom you like, only sell it.' That is his position. Incidentally, it is not the Deputy Leader's position and it is not our position. No responsible person would advocate selling the bank if that was going to make an already difficult financial position in South Australia even more difficult. No responsible person would say that.

Members interjecting:

The Hon. FRANK BLEVINS: The interjection is that the Prime Minister said that. It may well be that the Prime Minister knows something that I do not know, and it may well be that the Prime Minister knows how much compensation he would give the State Government if we did sell the bank, so it would be something that was financially prudent to do. When the Prime Minister shares his confidence with me (and I expect him to do that), I may come around to his way of thinking.

At the moment I have no information before me that says it would be to the financial benefit of this State—let alone the social benefit—to sell the bank. The Baring Brothers' investigation will give us some guidance—it will not be definitive—as to whether it will be in the financial interests of this State. That is why I carried through what I announced in this Parliament towards the end of last year. There is nothing devious behind it, and there has been no back sliding on any statement. It was a statement made at the end of last year, and it is being carried through. Consistent with not in any way giving advantage to a possible buyer if the bank is sold, I will make available as much information as is prudent to do

so from that Baring Brothers report. I believe the whole of South Australia—

The SPEAKER:—Order! I ask the Treasurer to bring his response to a close.

The Hon. FRANK BLEVINS: —will want to be involved in this debate. Leaving aside the financial and social reasons, even the politics of this matter must be considered by every member in this House. I know the Opposition has made a decision: it must be sold.

Mr S.J. BAKER: I rise on a point of order, Mr Speaker.

The Hon. FRANK BLEVINS: It does not matter whether it is to the Japanese or anybody else.

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

Mr S.J. BAKER: Mr Speaker, I draw your attention to the length of the Treasurer's reply and the amount of repetition it contains.

The SPEAKER: The Deputy Leader would know that I have drawn the attention of the Treasurer to the length of his reply. However, the two leading questions are very important because they involve the State Bank. The Chair considers that they need to be fully responded to. The Deputy Leader is correct: some repetition occurred at the end of the Treasurer's response, and that is why I asked the Treasurer to bring his answer to a close. However, in the opinion of the Chair, they are significant questions, and they need to be fully answered.

The Hon. T.H. HEMMINGS: On a point of order, Mr Speaker—and this is in no way reflecting on you—I have always been given to understand that, when a point of order is taken, the relevant Standing Order should be cited to draw your attention to—

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order! The member for Napier will resume his seat. I do not uphold the point of order, as the member for Napier, on many occasions, has raised points of order without referring to a Standing Order. I hope the Treasurer is very close to completing his response.

The Hon. FRANK BLEVINS: In conclusion, I will say I assume that this matter will be debated even further in this Chamber—perhaps even today. So, I will conclude, and I look forward to more questions from the Opposition to give me an opportunity to expand on my views on the topic.

STATE BANK

The Hon. DEAN BROWN (Leader of the Opposition): My question is directed to the Premier. Will the Government give a guarantee that any sale of the State Bank will be through open tender, with suitable conditions attached, as outlined by other members of the Liberal Party and me over many months—

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order!

Mr Hamilton: Sit down, you fool.

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

The Hon. DEAN BROWN: —and I first outlined those conditions on ABC radio in June last year—to protect the interests of South Australians?

The Hon. LYNN ARNOLD: The Leader of the Opposition cannot be Premier so he is trying to be Premier by default. He will try to have me say, 'Yes, I will accept the conditions that you announce for any sale of the State Bank if such a decision is made', so that at least he can feel what it is like to be the Premier of the State. I can disabuse the Leader of any dream he might have in that regard, because I do not intend to be his simple cipher and that the range of ideas, which in their totality are very confused indeed, will be how I determine my position and the actions that I undertake. What I come back to is that any decision about the bank, whether or not it is put up for sale, will be taken in the best interests of South Australians, both financially and socially, and I stand by that statement.

MULTIFUNCTION POLIS

Mr De LAINE (Price): Can the Premier say what will be the likely future of MFP Australia in the unlikely event that Australia is unfortunate enough to have a Hewson Coalition Government after 13 March?

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order! The Premier.

The Hon. LYNN ARNOLD: Mr Speaker—

The Hon. Dean Brown interjecting:

The SPEAKER: The Leader is out of order.

The Hon. LYNN ARNOLD: The Leader interjects that it would make more progress. I was interested to see on 23 July last year an *Advertiser* report that one of the Federal shadow Ministers, in fact a key person in Federal Cabinet if there were to be a Hewson Government—Ian McLachlan—commented that the MFP was dead in the swamp and should be scrapped. That is the view we have from the Federal Opposition, yet we hear from the Leader that it would make more progress. That is somewhat like what David Tonkin used to say, 'We are going backwards more slowly.' Somehow, that is the kind of the philosophy that the Leader must have on these matters.

The reality is that the Opposition has never given a clear indication of where it stands on the multifunction polis, and certainly not at the Federal level. That should be a matter of concern to some members opposite, because I know that there are some members of the State Opposition who actually do believe in and do support the concept. I even have a feeling that the Leader is one of them, but I know that there others behind him who are not of the same ilk and who would do their best to see the Opposition move as far away as possible from the multifunction polis.

Clearly, 1993 is a very critical year for the multifunction polis. We have put in place all the necessary groundwork that was needed—the legislation, the establishment of the corporation, the appointment of the board and the soon to come appointment of the Chief Executive Officer—and we have seen a number of things take place in recent times, including the signal processing institute and a number of the national and international centres that will be focusing on the MFP site.

It is true that this year is the year when we need to see the public imagination being fired by this grand vision of the MFP. Certainly, it has been fired at the outset but,

because of all the necessary stages that have had to be gone through to this point, it is true that there has perhaps been some loss of interest in some sections of the community.

The Hon. Jennifer Cashmore interjecting:

The Hon. LYNN ARNOLD: The member for Coles interjects, 'Not to mention the loss of confidence.' She is one of the members who has never liked the concept in the first place, and any chance at all to talk it down—

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: The member for Coles is out of order.

The Hon. LYNN ARNOLD:—and to dig criticism into the MFP to ensure from her point of view that it stumbles would be welcomed by her, so her comment now is not worth anything. It is a comment without any credibility because of the position from which she comes on this issue. A number of things will be happening this year. Indeed, on my way back from overseas I spent a day in Japan and was briefed there as to present Japanese attitudes on the MFP. I can say that there is a renewed interest taking place there. Indeed, there is a working committee representing about 60 companies—

Mr S.J. Baker interjecting:

The Hon. LYNN ARNOLD: The Deputy Leader laughs; he laughs more in embarrassment, because he was hoping that this would be the year that the MFP is not a success, but that working committee of some 60 companies—

Mr S.J. Baker interjecting:

The SPEAKER: The Deputy Leader is out of order.

The Hon. LYNN ARNOLD:—plans to meet on a monthly basis to receive information on the progress of the MFP and the ways in which Japanese companies can look at opportunities that may be there for them to take part in. Likewise, we will be looking at increasing interest in other parts of the world.

The international advisory board will have its next meeting in Adelaide in March this year, and that will be an important opportunity for the feel of international reaction to the MFP to be further tested and also for the international reaction to be further promoted. There are things that will happen this year, but it does require a commitment not only by the State Government and not only by one or two members opposite (it would be nice to have them all) but also by the Federal Government, and what we know both by statement and by dollar—in other words, by budgetary reallocation—is that the Federal Labor Government is committed to this project. What we do not know is whether or not the Federal Liberal Opposition is committed to this project. All we have at the moment is the sort of comment from Ian McLachlan that the MFP should be scrapped.

If the Leader of the Opposition can do his best and if other members opposite can do their bit to try to extract something better than that from the Federal Opposition, all of us as South Australians will be much better off.

STATE DEBT

Mr S.J. BAKER (Deputy Leader of the Opposition): My question is directed to the Treasurer. What was the estimated State debt as at 31 December

1992? Why did the Government avoid paying the \$450 million owed under the State Bank indemnity and the over \$400 million of other interest owing as at 30 June 1992? What is the estimated real cost to the State budget this financial year of funding the State Bank losses?

Following the introduction of the 1992 budget, the Opposition predicted that State debt would blow out to at least \$8 600 million by the end of this financial year. Last week's revelation by the Prime Minister that our net public debt 'is around \$8.25 billion', which took account of these unpaid liabilities, suggests that our estimate of the real level of State debt might have been optimistic and that it is heading towards \$9 billion this financial year.

The Prime Minister also said that the State Bank is costing the South Australian budget about \$280 million every year. This exceeds, by \$105 million, the estimate given by the Government in the State budget papers.

The Hon. J.P. TRAINER: On a point of order, Mr Speaker, I believe that the questioner is guilty of the same prolixity and repetition on which he himself took a point of order.

The SPEAKER: I would ask the Deputy Leader not to repeat the points of the question and to keep it as brief as possible. I understand that his questions are important to this Parliament and this State, but I ask him to keep them as brief as he can.

Mr S.J. BAKER: I have been told that the figures used by the Prime Minister were given to the Commonwealth Government by South Australian Treasury officials last month and that they indicate a blow-out in the State budget deficit this financial year to more than \$400 million.

The Hon. FRANK BLEVINS: I found the question as boring as my ministerial statement, which responded to the question. First, I congratulate the Deputy Leader in attaining his position. I am sure it was as much a surprise to him as it was to us that he should on that—

The Hon. Jennifer Cashmore interjecting:

The Hon. FRANK BLEVINS: Well, the member for Coles—

The SPEAKER: Order! I point out to the Treasurer that there is a requirement for relevance in a response to a question.

The Hon. FRANK BLEVINS: That is absolutely correct, Sir, but I always think that the Parliament is no worse off for the niceties being gone through, and I was merely doing that. The member for Coles distracted me, and I apologise. The answer to the Deputy Leader's question was given in my ministerial statement. All I can say is that the numbers in the budget papers are numbers that have been signed off by the Auditor-General. If the Deputy Leader wishes to argue with the Auditor-General, he is free to do so.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order!

The Hon. FRANK BLEVINS: In fact, in my ministerial statement I gave some updated figures for the Deputy Leader—from \$7.3 billion to \$7.4 billion. It is all there in the ministerial statement. At 30 June next year in the budget papers he will get the updated figure. It will all be explained and signed off by the Auditor-General. If some outside organisation wishes to put together its own figures, it is free to do so. What we

do is to put them together in guidelines issued by the Australian Bureau of Statistics and signed off by the Auditor-General. I do not believe one can be fairer than that. If he wished to argue with those organisations, particularly the ABS, I would have thought that the Deputy Leader, who fancies himself in a minor way—

An honourable member interjecting:

The Hon. FRANK BLEVINS: —I know—as a statistician, would agree that the ABS is a reputable body and that its guidelines ought to be adhered to, and that is what we do.

EDUCATION POLICY

Mr HOLLOWAY (Mitchell): Will the Minister of Education, Employment and Training provide the House with a comparison between the policies announced in her statement on shared responsibilities for the delivery of education in South Australia and the changes being implemented by the Liberal Government in Victoria?

The Hon. S.M. LENEHAN: I welcome the question from the member for Mitchell and I thank him for his ongoing interest in this matter. There is a very great difference (and I think it is important that it be pointed out not only to the Parliament but also to the people of South Australia) between what the South Australian Government is proposing in terms of shared responsibility (which is underpinned by a concept of increasing opportunities for choice and accepting responsibility) and the devolution process that has been adopted by the Liberal Government in Victoria. At the heart of the Kennett Government's educational reforms is a very radical plan eventually to inflict upon schools total responsibility for staffing and a significant responsibility for curriculum. Quite responsibly and reasonably, teachers across the country, including this State, are very much concerned to ensure that professional standards, qualifications and working conditions are maintained. Just as equally, teachers in this State are concerned that we ensure that the principle of equity for students is also maintained.

It is interesting that devolution proposals are starting to appear in South Australia as the Leader of the Opposition drip feeds his education policies into the community. I would point out that nobody really knows what the educational policies of the Opposition are, but recently the Opposition Leader did tell the ABC that there was a clear direction, and I have tried to ascertain what this direction is. First, on the ABC in October last year the Opposition Leader told the community that it is his intention to reduce the recurrent budget in Government by 15 to 25 per cent. In education, that translates to a reduction of 5 000 teaching jobs or (there are options) a reduction of \$181 per week in the salaries of band 11 teachers.

Then in January the Leader of the Opposition informed the community that he would give more power to schools and that he would scrap the 10 year placement policy. Then again, on 25 January, he told the ABC that the main direction would be to make better use of resources. All of this—

Mr BRINDAL: On a point of order, Mr Speaker: as you will understand, it is difficult to follow the Minister's answers.

The SPEAKER: What is the point of order?

Mr BRINDAL: I believe the question related to the Minister's statement to the House today and the policies of the Kennett Government in Victoria. I therefore do not believe that the Minister is answering the question or being relevant.

The SPEAKER: I do not uphold the point of order but I would ask the Minister to be pertinent.

The Hon. S.M. LENEHAN: I am using these examples because they add up to a Brown version of the devolution concept that has been perpetrated on the communities in New Zealand and now in Victoria. Finally, to cap off this whole interesting drip feeding of policies, last week the Leader announced that he would reintroduce caning into our public schools. I am sure many of his colleagues (and I look around and see some very reasonable and sensible people) would oppose this. It is very clear, and it is clearly emerging to the community of this State, that there are very significant differences in educational philosophy and policies emerging between the Liberal Party in this State and the Government. I look forward to some future debates on some of these very important issues.

UNION RALLY

Mr INGERSON (Bragg): My question is directed to the Minister of Labour Relations and Occupational Health and Safety. Will any employees of the Government be given paid leave of absence tomorrow to attend a Trades and Labor Council forum and rally, which will campaign against the industrial relations policies of the Liberal Party?

The Hon. R.J. GREGORY: No

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order! The honourable member for Albert Park.

ALGAL BLOOM

Mr HAMILTON (Albert Park): Will the Minister of Public Infrastructure inform the House of the incidence this summer of blue green algae in South Australia and in the Murray-Darling River system?

The Hon. J.H.C. KLUNDER: I thank the member for Albert Park for his question, which is important with respect to the quality and cost of preparing water for his electorate as it is for mine and for a number of people in this State. I am pleased to report to the House that there are no significant problems arising from toxic blue green algae so far this summer, and obviously that rider needs to be attached. Algae numbers have remained low in the Murray River during the past few months, largely as a result of the high flows. As members know, a high flow rate disturbs the algae and stops them from multiplying.

The New South Wales Department of Water Resources warned late in January of the presence of anabaena in the Darling River just upstream from Wentworth, but the numbers there are low. There is also the chance of a

bloom in the Darling anabranch near Wycott but, again, the algae numbers are low and neither incidence currently poses a problem for South Australia. Outbreaks of algae have been reported in various reservoirs around Adelaide but, due to the vigilance of and the regular monitoring by the E&WS, they have been detected at a very early stage and have been quickly controlled by copper sulphate dosing. However, because of the potential for blue green algal blooms and the threat they pose to health, the E&WS has developed detailed contingency plans to ensure a safe water supply to all areas in the event of toxic blooms or other water quality problems.

In addition, work is continuing at the Australian Centre for Water Quality Research into the taxonomy and ecology of blue green algae, various means of controlling them, the detection and measurement of toxins and toxicity and methods of water treatment. Members will be interested in the fact that a British expert on blue green algae, Professor Geoffrey Codd of the University of Dundee, is currently in Adelaide on a month long study visit. Professor Codd is a member of Britain's blue green algal task force and his visit here provides an excellent opportunity for our local researchers to share ideas and information with acknowledged international experts. A highlight of Professor Codd's visit will be his participation in a national symposium on toxic blue green algae to be held in Adelaide on 17 February.

TEACHERS

Mr BRINDAL (Hayward): How does the Minister of Education, Employment and Training reconcile the answer just given by the Minister of Labour Relations that Government employees are not to be given paid leave of absence to attend political rallies with the fact that many teachers will attend tomorrow's SAIT and UTLC forum and rally on a paid basis, with relief teachers being appointed? Will the Minister order that any teacher attending this political function must forfeit pay to do so in view of the unjustified disruption this will cause to students' education and the cost to taxpayers?

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order!

Mr BRINDAL: I have in my possession internal documents being circulated within the Institute of Teachers which demonstrate that tomorrow's event is part of a continuing political campaign against the Liberal Party. For example, the document states that the event is 'to oppose the Hewson/Kennett/Brown Jobsback policies' and falsely alleges that, under these policies, awards and other employment conditions will be abolished by legislative decree in South Australia.

Mr QUIRKE: I rise on a point of order. I believe that you, Sir, made a ruling earlier about debating questions.

The SPEAKER: Order! I uphold the point of order. The member for Hayward was commencing to debate. I ask him to keep to the explanation of his question.

Mr BRINDAL: The document also shows that, for teachers attending tomorrow, temporary relieving teachers will be provided to replace them. I have

received approaches from parents who are outraged that the education of their children will be disrupted tomorrow for what they have alleged to me to be blatantly political purposes, with additional cost to the taxpayers of the temporary relieving teachers.

The SPEAKER: The honourable Minister of Labour Relations.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: The Leader is out of order. The member for Hanson is out of order. We are at the start of a new session and I point out to members that we should not mar it on the first day. The honourable Minister.

The Hon. R.J. GREGORY: I was asked a question earlier by the ex-Deputy Leader and I just wonder whether he will ever lodge a job reinstatement claim. He might have a basis of argument under section 31. In response to the question of the member for Hayward, I want to make it clear that it is quite possible that Government employees will be at a meeting tomorrow. However, the question was simply: were they attending and being paid to attend? The answer is 'No'. A question was asked of me—

Members interjecting:

The Hon. R.J. GREGORY: Mr Speaker, the monkey is speaking again instead of the organ-grinder, which is the member for Hayward. The question was about paid leave. It was made quite clear that there would be no paid leave for anyone to attend this rally that is being held. I do not know what arrangements have been reached for anyone to attend the meeting, but they are not being paid. That is the very simple response to that question. I would be very interested if the member for Hayward could produce the evidence—

The Hon. Dean Brown interjecting:

The Hon. R.J. GREGORY: —or the interjecting Leader—could produce the evidence where people were paid by the Government to attend.

The Hon. Dean Brown interjecting:

The SPEAKER: The Leader is out of order. I have had to speak to the Leader three times on this first day and that is not a good start.

INDUSTRIAL RELATIONS

Mr FERGUSON (Henley Beach): Will the Minister of Labour Relations and Occupational Health and Safety explain how the Government's industrial relations policy differs from that of the Opposition?

The Hon. R.J. GREGORY: The Leader has indicated on a radio interview that, if he were fortunate enough to become the Premier, the industrial relations policy of his Government would offer workers a clear choice of either staying on award systems or moving across to enterprise agreements. The amazing thing is that that is exactly what applies currently in South Australia and federally where people are moving across.

Mr Ingerson interjecting:

The Hon. R.J. GREGORY: If the member for Bragg interjects and says that that is not the case, the honourable member is saying they want a situation where people can be thoroughly exploited because they have no award coverage. That is what the Leader was indicating

when he was asked on that radio program to give details about his industrial relations policy. He declined that opportunity, and one could make one or two assumptions as to why he did that. First, perhaps the Opposition does not have an industrial policy. Perhaps it is like so many other things that the Opposition does in this State—it makes it up as it goes along and as it is interviewed.

Or perhaps members opposite do have a policy but do not want to tell anyone about it. Perhaps they are like Richard Court who, when questioned about this, said, 'I will not do anything until after the Federal election because I do not want to upset Dr Hewson.' It is a very disgraceful attitude to say, 'We have a policy but we won't do anything because it might upset somebody else.' It is a little like the Liberal Party in Victoria which, on being elected, suddenly undertook a whole course of action that it did not indicate it would take when it was in Opposition.

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

The SPEAKER: I assume that the Deputy Leader is going to take a point of order on debating?

Mr S.J. BAKER: Yes.

The SPEAKER: I uphold the point of order and ask the Minister to be precise in his answer.

The Hon. R.J. GREGORY: One can only assume that there is a hidden agenda in this area. The hidden agenda is a very vicious one that will attack the rights of workers in this State. It will take away from the 135 000 female workers the protections of an award. One has to remember that, when these female workers have their rights taken away from them—

Dr Armitage interjecting:

The Hon. R.J. GREGORY: —for instance, doctors in their surgeries, like the one who is interjecting constantly, will be able to pay them what they wish. They will simply ask those one or two people who work in their surgeries or offices, 'Do you want to work under the award or don't you? Because if you want to work under the award, I don't have a job for you here any more.' That is precisely what it is about. That is why the Opposition is so keen on this policy of taking people's rights away from them. One knows that when that happens people do lose their rights and are thoroughly exploited in a way that makes other people ashamed. That is why there has been a rejection of that policy in Victoria and Western Australia, and it will be rejected across Australia as a whole.

PAYROLL TAX

Mr D.S. BAKER (Victoria): My question is directed to the Premier, and it is a simple one. What plan does the State or Federal Labor Governments have to abolish payroll tax?

The Hon. LYNN ARNOLD: A simple question from a simple member!

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order!

The Hon. LYNN ARNOLD: If the would be and once was Leader were to look at the comments made by the South Australian Government, he would understand that the South Australian Government has always supported the abolition of payroll tax. I point to the member for Ross Smith's comments about this matter

when he was Premier. But, of course, clearly we have not been in a position to dispense with payroll tax—none of the States has—

The Hon. D.C. Wotton interjecting:

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

The Hon. LYNN ARNOLD: The question then relates to what the policies will be at the national level with respect to payroll tax and what will be determined by the Federal Labor Party in its policy. I was interested today to note the economic statement by the Prime Minister—a very good statement—with respect to a number of issues. One of the things that he addressed was the rate of company tax. He said that company tax will be reduced, I think, to 33 per cent. How many companies pay company tax? Hopefully all companies pay that tax, because we would hope that they all make a profit. But I accept the fact that as we track out of the recession many companies are not in that position. Nevertheless, the aim of being in business is to make a profit; therefore, the aim of being in business by making a profit means that company tax is a relevant question to every single company. Let us look at the situation of payroll tax. How many companies pay payroll tax in South Australia? Of all the companies in South Australia, due to the exemption levels we have in this State, the amount of salaries or wages that you can pay before you incur payroll tax—

Mr Ingerson interjecting:

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

The Hon. LYNN ARNOLD: Because of that figure, which we have increased over the years, and because of other things that we have done to reduce payroll tax in this State, only 8 per cent of companies in this State—

The Hon. Frank Blevins: But not for 92 per cent of companies.

The Hon. LYNN ARNOLD: Ninety-two per cent of companies do not pay payroll tax. Yet that 92 per cent want to be in a position of making a profit and, if they did make a profit, they would have to pay company tax. I thank the member for Victoria for this question—the simple question from the simple member—because it gives me the opportunity to congratulate the Prime Minister on his announcement of a major reduction in company tax, which will benefit all companies in Australia—and, of course, our interest is all companies in South Australia. With respect to the issue of payroll tax, we will see what happens with that in the time ahead.

SUPERDROME

Mr McKEE (Gilles): Will the Minister of Recreation and Sport say when the general community will be given an opportunity to visit the new Superdrome at Gepps Cross?

The Hon. G.J. CRAFTER: Many of South Australia's greatest achievements in sport will soon be on show at the Superdrome at Sports Park. The inaugural South Australian Sports, Health and Leisure Expo will also be a showcase for the latest developments in health and leisure industries—two important industries in this State. The event will be staged from 5 to 7 March at the

new cycling Superdrome at State Sports Park and will feature more than 120 exhibitors, and this magnificent new structure is expected to attract about 50 000 people.

South Australians spend more than \$800 million annually on sporting and recreational activities making it one of the fastest growing industries in this State, and this is producing broad economic benefits for the community. There are more than 10 000 sporting clubs in South Australia with over 250 000 registered members, while a further 100 000 people are estimated to be members of recreation and fitness clubs. The offshoot of this is a growing commitment to a healthy, active lifestyle, and I am delighted that this spirit is being captured in the inaugural Superdrome Sports, Health and Leisure Expo. The expo will feature some of South Australia's high achievers, including Olympic cycling medallists, leading AFL and SANFL footballers, stars of cricket, squash, rugby and racing, and a host of other sporting and recreational bodies.

The State aerobics championships will be staged during the expo, along with the inaugural City to Superdrome cycling race and a family fun run around the Gepps Cross Complex. Of course, of significance, the expo will give the people of South Australia their first opportunity to view at close quarters this magnificent complex. Other open days will be held on the two Sundays following the expo, that is, Sunday 14 and Sunday 21 March.

RAILWAYS, ALICE SPRINGS TO DARWIN

Mr GUNN (Eyre): Does the Premier agree that, if the Prime Minister is sincere in his belated recognition of the need to integrate the Australian economy with Asia, the construction of the Alice Springs to Darwin railway line must proceed as soon as possible? Has the Premier urged Mr Keating to provide Federal funds for this vital national project? If he has, what has been the Prime Minister's response?

The Hon. LYNN ARNOLD: Again, I would draw attention to the many public statements by the South Australian Government on the Alice Springs to Darwin railway line. We believe it would be of significant benefit to this country and we believe that there is a national interest question involved in this matter that does require a national Government response. We have suggested previously, for example, that the issue of taxation breaks or other forms of capital incentive should be provided to enable the figures to stack up.

The problem we have with the railway line is that all the analyses that have been done show that the figures do not quite make it on a strictly commercial basis. I make the point that this State Government has offered much help to the Northern Territory Government in terms of trying to do a lot of work on the feasibility of the Alice Springs to Darwin railway line, and that was publicly acknowledged by the Chief Minister of the Northern Territory who repeated last week that he appreciated our technical help on that matter.

The point stands that we think it is a project of major national significance. We hope that both major Parties will accede to that. I want to make one other point: it is our general view that there is a need for further infrastructure development in this country—and not just

that one project but a number of projects. In fact, last week I told Chief Minister Peron that we have a number of other projects that we in South Australia think are of critical importance in this State, including development of the transport hub linkages, the extension of the runway at Adelaide Airport and so on.

I believe that those projects also should be taken seriously by the Federal Government. Both Federal Parties should be listening closely to those sorts of issues from South Australia. It would be incumbent on all members here to indicate that together we want to support these kinds of infrastructure projects in South Australia. The stand that we have taken on the railway line in the past remains the position we have today. It is a position that I have expressed to the Northern Territory Government, and it appreciates that position.

POINT LOWLY LIGHTHOUSE

Mrs HUTCHISON (Stuart): My question is directed to the Minister representing the Minister of Transport Development in another place. Has the Minister accepted any tender for the Point Lowly lighthouse? In the tendering process was there any requirement for a guarantee to be given for the continued operation of the lighthouse? I have had a number of inquiries from constituents in my electorate, in both the Port Augusta and Port Pirie areas, as well as from people in Whyalla, and all those people have been concerned about the safety of all types of vessels in Spencer Gulf if that lighthouse should be closed.

The Hon. M.D. RANN: The honourable member as well as some of her constituents have made their views clear to both me as Minister of Tourism and to my colleague the Minister of Transport Development. I shall certainly obtain a report for her as soon as possible.

LOTTERIES COMMISSION

Mr OSWALD (Morphett): My question is directed to the Deputy Premier. As the term of the former Deputy Premier, Mr Jack Wright, as Chairman of the Lotteries Commission expires today, can the Minister inform the House whether Mr Wright's appointment is to be extended for a further term?

The Hon. FRANK BLEVINS: No, Mr Speaker.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order!

HERITAGE LISTING

Mr HAMILTON (Albert Park): My question is directed to the Minister of Environment and Land Management. In his statement on the environment presented in Adelaide on 21 December 1992 the Prime Minister announced that two related sites would be nominated for world heritage listing in 1993. I understand that they are the Riversleigh fossil site in Queensland and South Australia's Naracoorte cave complex. Can the Minister inform the House what has been the South Australian reaction to this statement?

The Hon. M.K. MAYES: I thank the member for Albert Park for raising this question, because it is an important one from the community's point of view,

particularly in the South-East, where there has been overwhelming support for the recognition, in particular, of these caves. Significantly, it will draw a focus to that region and it will have enormous benefits not only in the sense of preservation of the caves and the valuable fossils in those caves but for the complex and community as a whole. In fact, there will be an enormous benefit as a focus for tourism and community activity and certainly recognition of the significance of the caves in South Australia.

The Commonwealth has recommended that the caves be listed on the World Heritage List. At this time State Cabinet has not considered the matter, but it will be considering it. As to the community's view and the support generated both within the agencies and the community at large, those interest groups who are very focussed on it, I believe there is overwhelming and generous support for recognition. The heritage listing will open up the opportunity for obtaining Commonwealth funds to help with the management of the area, and that in itself will be a significant factor.

From the point of view of world heritage listing, it is probably the least contentious of the listings recommended because I have not heard a mutter or murmur against recognition. In fact, it will offer South Australia and Victoria a focus opportunity for us as communities. I look forward to bringing the matter before Cabinet so that it can offer its support to the listing, and I hope that we will then see it as one of the most significant world heritage listings for Australia.

PRISONS SECURITY

Mr MATTHEW (Bright): Will the Minister of Correctional Services confirm that serious faults have been identified in the electronic security surveillance systems at Mobilong, Port Augusta and Northfield prison complexes, what action is being taken to rectify them and, in the meantime, to provide back-up security? Last Friday night tests were conducted to determine the reliability of the new microphonics system installed at Mobilong prison. In one test two officers climbed on the external perimeter fence after putting up a ladder. They shook the fence violently but the alarm was not activated. Kicking the fence and hitting it with a brick produced a similar lack of response.

I have been told that one reason for the failure could be the need to turn down the sensitivity levels of the fence because, at certain levels, the system can be activated when winds exceed 25 km/h. While the installation of this system was ordered as a prerequisite to removing perimeter patrols at Mobilong, these tests suggest it is not suitable for this purpose. I have been further advised that a similar system installed at Northfield has been so unreliable that it is frequently turned off. At the new Port Augusta complex a system installed in the sterile zone between two outer fences has not operated since the prison was opened. I am reliably informed that prisoners are aware of these problems and that officers are worried about the potential consequences.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order!

The Hon. R.J. GREGORY: I recall that in the latter part of last year the member for Bright called going to prison a soft option and, on that basis, wondered why people would want to escape. I am not aware of the situation that has been raised by the member for Bright. However, I will get a report and advise the Parliament as soon as I possibly can of the facts surrounding the matters that have been raised by the honourable member.

BRIDGE ROAD

Mr QUIRKE (Playford): Will the Minister representing the Minister of Transport Development take up the matter of a suitable pedestrian crossing on Bridge Road at or near the intersection of Bridge and Research Roads, Ingle Farm? The intersection is dangerous to both vehicle and pedestrian movement. Students coming from the Pooraka estate to the North Ingle Primary School are particularly at risk.

The Hon. M.D. RANN: I am aware of this area because it is very close to my electorate. I am also aware of the honourable member's personal crusade as to road safety matters, particularly as they relate to schoolchildren in his district, so I will certainly take up this matter with my colleague in another place.

HEALTH INSURANCE

Dr ARMITAGE (Adelaide): Does the Minister of Health agree with the retiring Federal Labor member for Grey, Mr Lloyd O'Neil, that it is fair and reasonable to provide a tax rebate for people who take out private health insurance? If so, when will the Minister and the South Australian Health Commission become pro-active on this issue, as was recommended in the Hunter report of last July?

In one of his last speeches late last year to the House of Representatives Mr O'Neil said, 'Let us be perfectly honest: there are long delays in the public hospitals for such things as hip replacements...and other surgery, although these operations can be done immediately in private hospitals if one has private medical cover.' Mr O'Neil also said that it was wrong to believe that only the wealthy took out private health insurance, and he concluded by urging the Federal Government to allow tax rebates for people taking out private health coverage.

As well as reflecting the Coalition's policy, Mr O'Neil's statements are in accord with the Hunter report on hospital waiting lists which the South Australian Government received in July last year and which recommended that the Health Commission must take a pro-active role in seeking policy changes to encourage people to take out private medical insurance.

The Hon. M.J. EVANS: The State Government and, of course, the Commonwealth Labor Government very much supports the role that the private sector plays in the health service industry. There is no doubt that the health sector receives a valuable contribution from the private health industry and I personally, and on behalf of the Government, support that role. However, I do not, the Government does not and I am certain the Federal Government does not support any provision which will ensure that vast sums of money are taken from the public health system and given not necessarily to private

hospitals to provide private health services but straight to medical incomes to support the substantially inflated private incomes of medical practitioners, because that is the very risk which one has under the scheme of insurance supported by members opposite.

I am proud of the decision that was taken by this Government a few days ago to sign the new Medicare agreement. I would remind the House of the steps that were taken by the New South Wales and Victorian Governments late last night, at five minutes to six, five minutes before the death knell when the caretaker Government provisions were to take over, to sign the same Medicare agreement to secure the benefits for the people of their States which this Government had already, weeks before—

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order!

The Hon. M.J. EVANS: —secured for the people of this State. It is quite clear—

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order!

The Hon. M.J. EVANS: —that they want the benefits of the Medicare health policy even against the unlikely event of the election of a Hewson Government. It is quite clear that that is its strategy—to secure the benefits of Labor Party health policy—

Dr Armitage interjecting:

The SPEAKER: The member for Adelaide is out of order.

The Hon. M.J. EVANS: —no matter what the outcome of the Federal election. While one clearly recognises the importance of that health sector, one does not do so at the expense of the public sector or public patients. Clearly, one can endorse those policies of the Medicare agreement which are now in place virtually across Australia and which are endorsed by the Governments of both political colours in the States which have to take the real responsibility for implementing that policy and providing quality health care for their citizens.

GRIEVANCE DEBATE

The SPEAKER: Order! The proposal before the Chair is that the House note grievances.

Mr HAMILTON (Albert Park): I am glad to see that the Minister of Emergency Services is in the House, because I want to raise with him a matter that has gained considerable publicity in the media, that is, steel spiked pieces of equipment for the police. On 19 August last year I raised in this place the utilisation of such pieces of equipment. I pointed out that I believed that such pieces of equipment could be used in high speed car chases, and I referred to incidents where juveniles were involved in high speed car chases and to the stolen bus that was driven down Highway 1 from Adelaide towards Murray Bridge.

It was my opinion then, and it is still my opinion, that tests on such equipment by the Police Department are long overdue. I subsequently asked a question of the

Minister, indicating that this equipment had been tested and utilised in Canada yet was not utilised here in South Australia. I asked the question because the constituent to whom I conveyed this information asked, 'How much longer will it be before the Government and the Police Department utilise this piece of equipment, albeit on a trial basis?' I believe it is long overdue that this equipment should be made available for the police to use in South Australia.

Also, I provided this information to the daily paper but, for some reason or another, it chose not to run the story. I believe that South Australians in particular are fed up with the number of high speed car chases. I have not got on the band wagon over this matter. Anyone who looked at what I have said in this place and in my community would see that I referred to the incidents that occurred in Western Australia and the hell of an outcry that erupted in that State when a radio station embarked on a campaign as a result of the road deaths that occurred as a consequence of high speed car chases and the deaths of a number of people in that State. In my opinion there was an over-reaction, and that opinion was supported by a number of the police in that State when they brought in draconian legislation, albeit to satisfy the community at large.

Having said that, I believe that the steel spiked pieces of equipment, a photograph of which was shown in the *Advertiser* I think last week by a local manufacturer, should be utilised on a trial basis in South Australia. It seems to me as a lay person that, where four or five police cars are involved—and I offer no criticism of the Police Commissioner—this equipment could be utilised on a trial basis in some areas to stop motor vehicles. My understanding is that the equipment would puncture the tyres of these vehicles and pull them up. If there is concern about whether local residents' property might be damaged, I believe that a trial in certain areas should be implemented. It is the sort of equipment that could readily be made available in police vehicles in South Australia.

For too long we have seen high speed car chases. I know there are other issues involved in this area, particularly the treatment of juveniles and the reasons why juveniles get involved, but that is another matter. Nevertheless, I still believe that our Police Force should be well equipped to be able to use this equipment, albeit on a trial basis for a number of months. I would enjoin the Police Commissioner. I know we do not have the power to direct the Police Commissioner; we as a Parliament can request him, or the Minister can request him, to do this on a trial basis. I would enjoin the Minister to request the Police Commissioner to initiate this on a trial basis so that we can at least find out the effectiveness of this equipment.

Mr GUNN (Eyre): I am pleased to have this opportunity to participate briefly in the debate this afternoon, and I share the concern of the member for Albert Park about the misuse of motor cars, particularly when people endanger the lives of innocent citizens who are lawfully going about their business. I do think it is a great pity that it has taken us so long to recognise that the law needs to be changed to deal with these villains, and I firmly hold the view that, if people steal motor

cars and set out in a reckless manner to endanger the community, not only should the law be strengthened so that they are treated as adults but also the courts should have the option of applying a limited form of corporal punishment—they should be given the birch. The same should apply to those who break into elderly people's homes and endanger them. Those people have no regard for the citizens' rights, and most of those elderly people are helpless and have no means of defending themselves. Society should not tolerate this antisocial behaviour, which unfortunately has been occurring too frequently.

That is not the matter I wanted to raise this afternoon: I refer to the deliberately misleading material that has been circulated around the electorate of Grey. I am one of those who believe that the facts should be put before the public, and I have in my possession a couple of interesting little dodgers that have been circulated by a Mr Pilz. It is interesting to note that there is only one, very limited reference to the ALP, and that is on the bottom, alongside the authorisation by one Rhonda Niel. We know that Rhonda Niel was the person who got involved to ensure that the Mayor of Port Pirie did not get the endorsement for the seat of Grey. In the unlikely event of a local win, she has been promised a position in the office of Mr Pilz.

Let us look at what this document states. There is no ALP letterhead or the flag, as usual; he does not want to display it too prominently, because people in Grey have had a real taste of the tonic. There is massive unemployment, no decent infrastructure development, high unemployment and high interest rates, but let us look at some of the things that are said in this little document and let us look at the facts. The document states, 'We can confidently look forward to a growing economy and more jobs.' Thousands of jobs have been lost. People have no hope of getting employment in what Mr Pilz is asking people to vote for—more of the same. The highest rates of interest that we have had in this country for generations have caused havoc in the small business sector. People are not employing but, to make that even worse, comrade Keating brought in the capital gains tax.

The member for Stuart knows what one of the leading agricultural machinery agents had to say the other night about capital gains and the effect it is having. This country had the finest agricultural manufacturing sector in the world. In South Australia we had the best tillage manufacturers in the world—Shearers. It has virtually been decimated. If one went down to Shearers and fired a shotgun, one would not hit anyone. Members should go on the train to Melbourne and see Massey-Ferguson at Sunshine. Does the honourable member know that in 1972 the Massey-Ferguson agent in Streaky Bay sold in excess of 30 headers, which were made in this country? One cannot buy a Massey-Ferguson header now; there is no agent in those towns. There is massive unemployment and there has been no apology for the hardship and the harm that has been inflicted on this community; there is no recognition that there has to be development to create jobs— There were two great industries: the mining industry and the agricultural sector. With the tourist industry, they would employ people if given a fair go.

This scurrilous little document tries to gloss over the massive problems that the people in that vast electorate are facing. If these people are given an opportunity, they

will provide massive benefits to this country and to this nation. They are the people who have helped to build this country; they are the people who are used to getting dirt and grease on themselves, whether they have been employed in the railways, in the mining sector, in the agricultural sector or in the fishing and tourist industries. They have gone out and done something. For the past 10 years, together the State and Federal Governments have got in their way, interfered with the education facilities and have done nothing to help those people to look after themselves. I therefore call on this House—

The ACTING SPEAKER: Order! the honourable member's time has expired. The member for Stuart.

Mrs HUTCHISON (Stuart): In the five minutes I have available to me today I would like to touch on two subjects, and the first one briefly. I would like to commend both the State and Federal Governments for the money that was put into providing the mobile mammography unit that is now travelling the country areas of South Australia. Having looked at the unit, at the way it has been set up and at the work that has gone into it, I would have to commend them doubly for what has happened. I know on the basis of the number of women in Port Augusta and the region who are using that mammography unit that it is being very well used and that the unit has few appointments available. So, it has been a wonderful initiative. It has been recognised, and the member for Flinders would agree with me that it has been something that we have long looked forward to in the country. It is now with us, and I would have to say that I look forward to the second unit, which I believe will be built at a later stage.

The second subject I would like to touch on is the Alice Springs-Darwin railway line. I would like to pay credit again to the member for Ross Smith for the work that he has done with regard to the Alice Springs-Darwin railway line. His work has not been short term: it has been done over at least to 10 years, and he has been a strong advocate for the building of this railway line because of its enormous benefits for this State and because he has always had the benefits of this State at heart.

The Hon. J.C. Bannon: We nearly had a deal with Hawke.

Mrs HUTCHISON: As the honourable member says, we nearly had a deal with Hawke, but at the last minute the Northern Territory Chief Minister (and I have to use the term, although I dislike it) chickened out at the last minute and did not take up the option to build it.

Mr Meier interjecting:

Mrs HUTCHISON: The honourable member interjects, but he does not have the facts.

Mr Meier interjecting:

The ACTING SPEAKER: Order! The member for Goyder will come to order.

Mrs HUTCHISON: I would refer the honourable member to the people who know, and they are Mr Everingham and the member for Ross Smith. They were present at that time. There has been a lot of misinformation from members opposite about the building of that railway line. I am aware that, when Malcolm Fraser was the Prime Minister of Australia, he said he would build it but, at the time he left

Government, very little had been done in reality towards building that line. It has always been an infrastructure project which this State has supported, and I would like to put that on the record.

Approximately two years ago, the member for Ross Smith as the Premier of South Australia raised this issue again as a major infrastructure project at the Premiers Conference. At the same time, I raised it with the backbench committee that was looking at important infrastructure projects around Australia which would create employment and which would get Australia going again. I went to the trouble of putting in a submission to that backbench committee, which was chaired by Mr Lloyd O'Neil, who was previously mentioned in this House. While it did get a good hearing, it was unfortunate that it was not approved as one of those projects, although it was still left on the agenda for future discussion, and I believe it is still on the agenda now. When the Federal Minister, Bob Collins, was here recently I presented a letter asking him to attend a meeting in Whyalla to discuss this project.

During the time I was lobbying for the project at the Federal level, I received support from the three major councils of the area: one (the Whyalla council) was from the Deputy Premier's area and the other two were the Port Pirie council and the Port Augusta council. I received major letters of support from those councils as well as from BHP, BHAS, engineering firms and anybody who could have some input into the building of that line. We must get the project going for the sake of this State and for the sake of the nation.

I am vitally involved in this matter, as the member for Stuart, and I have pledged, and will continue to pledge, my total support for it. I compliment both the member for Ross Smith on his ongoing support and the Premier, who has indicated that he, too, will support it. I know that the Deputy Premier will attend the meeting in Whyalla to offer his support to a project that will be of immense benefit to his electors and to those in the electorate of Stuart. This project has been a long time coming but I do not believe that we need give it up. However, I must say that there have been a lot of problems on the opposite side in not getting it going.

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

Mr BRINDAL (Hayward): I rise on the matter about which I questioned the Minister of Education, Employment and Training in this place today and which must be of grave concern to all South Australians. On 29 January 1993 under the title 'Bulletin No. 1 1993—Federal Election Campaign', the South Australian Institute of Teachers advertised a SAIT Federal election workshop. That campaign workshop was to be held on Wednesday 10 February from 9.15 a.m. to 12 o'clock at the SAIT building on Greenhill Road at Parkside. It was planned to develop campaigning skills and strategy skills and to establish networks and electorate campaign committees, and other practical activities were planned. The delegates were to be given a luncheon, which was to be provided by SAIT, and were to be taken to a UTLC rally, which was to be held between 1 and 4 p.m. on Wednesday, 10 February, at Morphettville Racecourse. The UTLC delegates forum is entitled, 'United we

bargain, divided we beg'. Part of the advertisement stated:

Please apply to attend by fax to Jill Cavanagh at SAIT. If you require a TRT, please indicate this.

The blurb goes on to mention that it was clearly to oppose the Hewson/Kennett/Brown Jobsback policy. It contained some absolutely scurrilous allegations. It talked about the abolition of the award and arbitration system and the cutting of leave loading, shift penalties and other rights, all which, by any degree of the imagination, are nothing but plain, straight-out lies. They are a total misrepresentation of any policy put forward by the Leader of the Opposition in this place or by—

The SPEAKER: Order! I wish to seek some clarification. Is the honourable member referring to something put out by a member of this House or to a statement by a member of this place?

Mr BRINDAL: No. I am referring to the lies put out by the South Australian Institute of Teachers on the grounds that they are supposedly political information. Since I asked the question, I contacted a friend of mine who informed me that the workshop has been cancelled. Schools have been informed that the reason for its cancellation is that there are problems getting the temporary reliever positions out of the Government. If, because of Opposition questioning, the Government has at this late stage reneged on some deal that it might have made with the Institute of Teachers, that is the Government's business, but it proves to this House how important vigilance is in these matters.

It is clear that there was an expectation by the Institute of Teachers that the Government would provide temporary relieving teacher positions to enable other teachers to attend a political rally. If that had been the case, this Government and the taxpayers of South Australia would have paid twice: once for the time of the teachers to attend the rally, because presumably they would be on leave with pay and not on leave without pay and, secondly, we would pay the temporary relieving teachers who took their place. There would have been a double charge to the people of South Australia had that occurred. If the workshop has been cancelled, as I believe it has, I congratulate those people who informed the Opposition and thus ensured that a waste of taxpayers' money did not occur.

I should also like to draw attention to one other point about the question that I asked. Under part 3, division 1, of the Education Act, appointments to the teaching service and all conditions relating to teachers are clearly the responsibility of the Minister of Education. While I realise, Sir, that it is outside your control as to which Minister answers a question, I record my abhorrence that the Minister of Education, Employment and Training could once again resile so quickly from her responsibility to this House in this area and hide behind the Minister of Labour Relations and Occupational Health and Safety.

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

Mr QUIRKE (Playford): There were a couple of little chestnuts in the last address to this Chamber that need to be explored further. We were told that vigilance is absolutely essential and that the role of the Opposition has brought about a series of alleged cancellations of

events that were to take place tomorrow. My understanding is that the rally will take place tomorrow and, if the honourable member is so interested, we should approach our respective Whips so that the two of us can be there as well, because everyone in South Australia should be well and truly aware of what is happening in this country. As to vigilance, it should be pointed out to the member for Hayward that the community in South Australia will be vigilant. They will remember what Jeff Kennett promised, what he did not promise and what he delivered the day after the election.

There is no doubt that that lot over there went on about the 17.5 per cent loading until October last year, and then they all went silent on it. It has always been their agenda to take it from the working men and women of this country, because that is what they are in here for. They are here to protect capital; they are here to protect business; they are not in here to protect the ordinary working conditions of men and women in this country.

The rally tomorrow is important and I hope that, in five weeks, the effect of that rally and many others around the country will be to highlight to the electorate the industrial relations policy of what used to be the Liberal Party. The small 'l' has certainly disappeared from that agenda. This is not the Liberal Party of the Malcolm Frasers, the Bob Menzies or the others who went before. This Liberal Party is about destroying the basic conditions for which unions and the labour movement have fought in this country for many years. In this place today we have heard a series of statements which deny the worker the right to hold a rally, to point out what is going on, to point out what is the likely result should a Liberal Government—liberal in name only—be elected in Canberra on 13 March.

The policy statements from the Liberal Party in South Australia have covered everything except its main game. In the past couple of months we have had a whole series of machinations. The most interesting one, I suppose, is to see the new, retreaded Deputy Leader in the Chamber. I give my sympathy to the former Deputy Leader, because many people on this side had no trouble relating to him, and it is sad that slightly more than half on the other side had problems relating to him, so I wish him well for the future. I hope that he looks to higher office again, but he had better watch his back where that is concerned.

The Hon. J.P. Trainer interjecting:

Mr QUIRKE: He could lodge a section 31, as the member for Walsh suggested. Since his steady hand on the helm has gone, what have we seen in the way of policies? We have had policies on hangings, canings and all sorts of things, but we have not had policies on where this State is heading. We do not get that. First we had, 'You have to sell the State Bank.' Then another one gets up—I will not say who it is—and says, 'No, we will not sell it to this lot.' Then the Leader gets up and says, 'Yes, we will, under certain conditions.' Then today we hear, 'You can't do it that way, it has to be done by tender or various other methods or not at all.' The reality is that the Opposition has to get its act together, and that is very clear. There is no doubt that pursuing the sorts of policies it has pursued in the past few weeks, with the emotional issues being raised, in many respects is causing not only a great deal of distress in many areas of

the community but also a number of eyebrows to be raised about the role of the Opposition in this State. I hope the Opposition gets its act together because—

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

Mr S.G. EVANS (Davenport): It is not my intention to speak about any area of conflict with Victoria, this State or the Commonwealth, but I would just ask the member for Playford, if he has the time, to sit and listen for one minute. He referred to what Kennett said before and after the election. I ask him to consider what his Party said about no child being in poverty by 1990, and then go out and look at the families that have been destroyed and the children in poverty and the businesses and others that have suffered in recent times. The Prime Minister, formerly the Treasurer, said there was no recession, and then said it was the recession we had to have, and he then said the recession was over. Now we have unemployment at 12 per cent. I need say no more about the double standards and double talk of the A.L.P. both Federal and State.

I wish to refer in particular to the general community concern in Blackwood and neighbouring districts about crime and vandalism by young people in the main. Children as young as 10 years old are mixing with people up to and over the age of 18 in parks and areas where they are able to congregate, sometimes until 1 or 2 a.m., with alcohol being quite evident and prevalent, yet we as a society seem to do nothing about it.

It took me 17 years in this place to fight to have the law changed so that any person under 18 years of age drinking in a public place was committing an offence, and those who supplied them with alcohol were committing an offence also. It took 17 years to do that, and I know I will not be here to fight the next battle unless I work through a different area after the next election.

I would ask members of the House to think about it. At times 40 to 70 young people meet together, destroy both public and private property, and assault people. I have spoken to the local police about one business house which has had 19 crime reports in 12 months. It has now reached the point where insurance companies will not insure that business. In the case of these young people, as young as 10 years but mainly 13 years and upwards, who are drinking alcohol under age, why cannot we find out where they obtain their liquor and make sure that the persons who are providing it—and I understand it is not from licensed premises but from people over 18 years who are purchasing it on their behalf—are apprehended?

I am convinced that we need to change the law again to give police the power to breath test young people, the same as they do in the case of drivers of motor vehicles, if they believe that these people are breaking the law, and seek to find out where they obtained their supplies. Unless we are prepared to do that, we will have much trouble right throughout the metropolitan area. It is not just occurring in my area but people in other parts of the community are experiencing similar problems, and the areas of Aberfoyle Park, Hallett Cove and Marino have been referred to me by others. What these people do to community facilities is just unacceptable. It has reached the stage that some people will not catch the train from

the Blackwood railway station, and we should be concerned about that. They will not travel on the train. Some elderly people are selling their homes because they have no peace and quiet, their properties are damaged and they cannot go for a walk in the evening because they are frightened.

In the end, the only way we may be able to stop it is by issuing people over 14 years of age with a tax file number and leave the penalty on their tax file so they know that when they are older they will not obtain a visa out of the country until they pay back the debt they owe society. At 14 years they know they are breaking the law when they are causing this damage. They claim to be adults and they leave home, and the Family and Community Services organisation encourages them in many instances to leave their parents. If they are that mature, we should put the debt on their tax file until they reach the stage where they are earning an income and let them pay it back.

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

Mr BRINDAL (Hayward): Mr Speaker, I draw your attention to the state of the House.

A quorum having been formed:

SITTINGS AND BUSINESS

The Hon. FRANK BLEVINS (Deputy Premier): I move:

That the time allotted for completion of the following Bills:

Economic Development,

Mining (Precious Stones Field Ballots) Amendment, and

Dog Control (Dangerous Breeds) Amendment

be until 6 p.m. on Thursday 11 February.

Motion carried.

SELECT COMMITTEE ON JUVENILE JUSTICE

The Hon. T.R. GROOM (Minister of Primary Industries): I move:

That the time for bringing up the committee's report be extended until Tuesday 9 March 1993.

Motion carried.

ECONOMIC DEVELOPMENT BILL

Adjourned debate on second reading.

(Continued from 26 November. Page 1731.)

Mr OLSEN (Navel): Frankly, it is difficult to know what to say about yet another try to get the economic development legislation right. I suppose I would like to know what kind of economic crisis it would take for the Arnold Government to recognise when it needs to act instead of talking and fiddling around the edges of the problem. How many tries and how much procrastination must we see before we get action? Is this finally it for the Economic Development Bill? Are we sure there are no other matters that might hold up this legislation prior to its passage? Are we really convinced this time, after eight months of inaction and shuffling of papers, that

South Australia is finally to get the crucial legislation that the Arthur D. Little report indicated we needed immediately for the future of our State's economy?

I guess we can expect no more action to redress the State's economic crisis from Premier Arnold than we could from the snap-frozen member for Ross Smith, former Premier Bannon, even though the words are definitely more appropriate and the promises look more promising. The concern for the State always sounds more genuine, but in the end we have the same: just months and months of window dressing and puffery, and real action delayed time and time again.

Each week he delays is a week lost for South Australia's focused economic recovery. It is nothing short of scandalous that the Economic Development Bill was not passed through Parliament last year. It is a disgrace that we have had no Economic Development Board until today, despite months and months of promises of 'next week, soon, almost there, won't be long'.

The member for Stuart might well recall during the Estimates Committees last year that the Premier said he would be announcing the board within a matter of days. Despite that, we have had month after month of delays without any determination by the Government, and finally we have it. We have had a dictionary of excuses from the Arnold office to explain away the delays, and still we have not moved far past go. The Public Service always claims you can tell when a Government has reached its death throes: its Cabinet meetings take longer and longer and fewer and fewer decisions emerge from them; decisions are made and then changed at the following Cabinet meeting; Cabinet keeps calling for more information, more research, anything to delay the inevitable; and it is too scared of the polls and of the media to take any major decisions until it can no longer delay. This is exactly the picture which has emerged in relation to this Bill.

In December last year, the Premier, in his speech on the Bill, had the audacity to say that the Government had moved swiftly to implement a program of reforms outlined by Little—window dressing while the most necessary component of Little's blueprint for recovery was flopping around and going nowhere. That speech was five months after the Little report had indicated that such moves were needed without delay. This recommendation is supported by the union movement, the employer organisations and by all the major political Parties. In other words, it has all-round community support, yet it took the Government 8½ months to get the legislation before the Parliament. Little identified it as the key recommendation in his report, the most important recommendation which had to be implemented forthwith so that the Economic Development Board could get on with the job of framing the economic blueprint for South Australia. We have had month after month of delay and procrastination in the establishment of this legislation and the board. The State needed an emergency treatment: it did not need to have this legislation left lying around.

Upon his return from overseas just recently, the Premier said that the legislation before the House was to be amended. I have not seen any amendments, but they are coming. We have had an eight or nine month wait to

get the legislation that was so urgent, and on the first day that we are to debate the legislation we will have a series of amendments to it which have not been given to the Opposition and which have not been given to the public to examine and digest. If these amendments are of a substantial nature—and we do not know because no-one has consulted the Opposition regarding them, despite the fact that we have publicly indicated that we will support the thrust of the Bill and the establishment of an Economic Development Board—it would be appropriate for the matter to be deferred for us to have a look at it and consult upon the amendments the Government is proposing.

Mr S.G. Evans: It is important.

Mr OLSEN: Indeed, it is important, because it might change the actual thrust or objective of the Bill. We cannot make a judgment, because all we can work on is the Premier's statement at the airport that he is now back and that his fact-finding mission was of such value that he now sees the merit in changing the legislation that was introduced just prior to the House adjourning for Christmas.

It is important to trace some of the history and the importance to South Australia of the Arthur D. Little report. The report was a damning indictment of Labor and its policies of the last decade or so—in fact, Little refers to two decades—in South Australia. It was a report that had—as the then Premier Bannon said—a warts and all assessment of the economy, an independent assessment of the economy. What Mr Bannon did not say about the report when he made his initial announcement was—and I would like to quote extracts of the Arthur D. Little report that provide the context, importance and urgency of this board, of the authority and of the development of an economic blueprint for South Australia—that we wasted valuable time last year. The report states:

South Australia's performance in manufactured exports is more typical of a less developed country, a performance in manufactured exports that is lower than that of India and Malaysia.

But the recession is not the major cause of current problems. Further, the reports states:

Fundamental structural problems which persist regardless of the stage of the economic cycle are the root cause of South Australia's poor performance. South Australia arguably faces a greater challenge than any other State in Australia. South Australia has a very low level of competitiveness in the global economy.

The report also states:

Greece is the only one of the 22 OECD countries whose performance in internationalising its economy is judged to have been worse than Australia's. If South Australia is to attract and develop new industries, availability of capital under appropriately structured arrangements will be vital. If the withdrawal of bank regional officers from Adelaide or the difficulties of the State Bank or other Government owned institutions do in fact restrict the availability of such finance, then restructuring is likely to be significantly impeded.

The report identified clearly that there was a significant economic malaise in South Australia. It also indicated quite clearly that part of the reason for that economic malaise was the high cost of operating businesses in South Australia. The high level of taxes and charges in

this State *vis-a-vis* other States of Australia seriously placed business in South Australia at a disadvantage. For example, we saw last year an announcement in the budget that tax increases of \$77 million in a full year would occur. Here was a Government that had been demonstrated through the Arthur D. Little report as having implemented the wrong economic policies and strategy direction, where it was stifling, crippling and starving business—and in particular small business—of funds because it was taking it out of funds of business not only with high levels of FID tax but with the highest workers compensation premiums, the second highest electricity tariffs and the highest water rates of any State in Australia.

This is the track record of a Government that has eroded the competitive base of small business. No longer would those small business operators retain liquidity and capital, because it was all being used for survival—coupled, I might add, with the Keating policies over five years of high interest rates over and above 18 per cent on average for small business operators. What it did was bring those businesses to their very knees. What we have seen is a strategy and a policy development of this Government over 20 years, interrupted by the Tonkin Government (when there was the abolition of taxes, where we were able to hold back the level of tax impact in South Australia). What we have seen is a report by Arthur D. Little, not by the Liberal Party, that the economic strategy of this Government has been wrong for South Australia. Clearly, that impact on our economy is the reason we have had the high level of bankruptcies and the high level of unemployment. To demonstrate the hypocrisy of the Government, which has said, 'We will pick on the Arthur D. Little Report; we will introduce a package to give back \$40 million in tax relief, incentives and various other packages'—

The Hon. Lynn Arnold interjecting:

Mr OLSEN: No, I am talking about, for example, the \$11 million that went to the Department of Mines and Energy for the mapping program, and so the list goes on. The sum of \$40 million was to be returned. But, of course, they just put up the tax revenue by \$77 million. They demonstrate that with one hand they are trying to assist business and the economy but, with the other hand, they are simply taking it away. That has been the track record of this Administration for some time. We can look at Access Economics and go beyond the Arthur D. Little report.

The Hon. Lynn Arnold interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order!

Mr OLSEN: Access Economics is a group of consultants who have developed a reputation across Australia and some note is taken of them. In fact, the media, which is critical of various consultancy firms, tends to quote Access Economics as an authority in matters economic on numerous occasions, and I would think that that tends to indicate its attributes in this area. Access Economics indicated clearly that South Australia—and it is a wrongful tag for this State—was part of the rust belt of Australia. That is a tag that we should argue against. Perhaps it is a tag we might deserve given some of the policies that have been in place and reflecting where we are at the moment, but we must note that tags like that can do irreparable harm to a

State when it comes to boardrooms making decisions as to where they will allocate their future investment dollars. Clearly, we need to put in place a set of policies to turn around this economic malaise.

According to Access Economics, private investment has collapsed in Australia and it appears that there will be no early recovery in business investment. Business is not investing and it is not hiring. It will not build up stocks rapidly. It is having to cut costs rather than raise prices. In other words, it is in survival mode and not profit mode. Firms are repairing balance sheets and improved cash flow is being used to reduce debt rather than to increase investment. In South Australia we have compounded that problem because we have reduced the retained earnings and the liquidity and capital injected into many of these business enterprises. Until and unless we have policies that change that thrust we will not in any meaningful way tackle the high level of unemployment.

I turn to the Chamber of Commerce and Industry's budget submission to the Government last year, because it, too, followed the same theme and thrust and said we had to restore business and investor confidence in South Australia. It said that that had to be the number one consideration. I would have thought that following the release of the Arthur D. Little report, with the key recommendation for the establishment of the board and the authority, that the Government would have moved hastily to implement that, given the bipartisan support and given the fact that it would pass the Parliament with a minimum of difficulty.

However, as I have said, we have had to wait some months for that to be put in place. The Chamber of Commerce and Industry says that not only do we have to restore business and investor confidence but we have to generate the right perception of South Australia. In the boardrooms, where major investment decisions are made, we need to indicate clearly that South Australia is a good place to invest. We need to do that by cutting State based taxes and charges on business, including Work Cover, financial institutions duty and payroll tax, and so the list goes on. There are other costs such as electricity and water rates to which I have referred.

It talks about being able to rationalise the cost of Government. South Australia has a cost of operating Government facilities and services that is 25 percent higher than applies in other States. We simply cannot afford that. There are policies that ought to be put in place. I well remember that in 1985 I talked about privatisation and the need for the Government to return to its core activities, the provision of essential services—

Mr Atkinson interjecting:

Mr OLSEN: It was a concrete commitment. The only trouble with the policy was that it was a bit before its time. I well remember Prime Minister Hawke and Treasurer Keating taking me to task on the policy. I well remember the State Bank commercials, which I would like to roll back to a few of you on the other side of the House at the moment, because they contain a subtle message. The simple fact is that, like business across this country has had to retreat to core activities, so Government must retreat to core activities such as the provision of essential services to people.

The Government should not provide that which the private sector already provides and it should not duplicate what the private sector already duplicates. In this way the cost of the operation of Government can be reduced to the point where we can start removing imposts and the impact on business so that once again it can become profitable. If business can become profitable, it can start investing in new plant and equipment. If it invests in new plant and equipment, it will become more cost efficient. If it becomes more cost efficient, it will be able to access the important international markets from which it has been priced out for a variety of reasons. If it does that it will start creating job opportunities for South Australia and we will have an economy that is starting to kick along.

Not only do we have the Chamber of Commerce and Industry, Access Economics and Arthur D. Little but we also have no less an authority than the Prime Minister, Paul Keating, talking about the state of the South Australian economy. I mention this only to indicate the broad number of organisations and individuals who have a very consistent view about the policy directions of Labor for 20 years in South Australia and what it has done to small business and job opportunities in this State.

What did the Prime Minister say about South Australia's economic woes? He said that it has been 'a problem bedevilling South Australia for the past two decades'. The Prime Minister correctly identifies the past two decades, the period of the Dunstan and Bannon Governments.

Mr Atkinson interjecting:

Mr OLSEN: And the Tonkin Government. If you had been paying attention rather than reading when I was speaking a moment ago, I indicated how the Tonkin Government—

The SPEAKER: Order! The member will direct his remarks through the Chair and will not refer to members as 'you'.

Mr OLSEN: Thank you, Mr Speaker; I heed your warning, caution and request. Clearly, South Australian Labor has had policies in place for the past 20 years that have failed South Australia. The Prime Minister talked about not only the level of debt in South Australia but how that debt was escalating at a rate of \$6 million a day during the financial year. We simply cannot afford to have a position where the cost of the debt is increasing at \$6 million a day. We have to put in place a set of strategies to contain the debt, restructure the debt and reduce the debt. The first and most important task for the new Economic Development Board must be to compile a clear list of priorities of Government action to be put in respect of changing economic direction and the economic climate.

The Prime Minister talked about employment and said that since 1978 Australian employment had risen by 28 percent but—according to the Prime Minister—in South Australia the increase was 15 percent, just over half the national rate of employment growth. If we look at the relative impact of the State Bank losses, the Prime Minister said:

While in dollar amounts the losses of the State Bank in Victoria and the State Bank in South Australia were about the same, Victoria's revenue base is three times larger than South

Australia and hence Victoria has far greater ability and capacity to be able to cope with the losses.

That is clearly further confirmation that the State Bank's losses represent the worst financial disaster in the history of Government in Australia and, in effect, if we look worldwide, the losses come within the category of the 10 worst financial collapses worldwide. That is not a record of which this Administration should be proud. It is not a record of which the Labor Government ought to be proud. In fact, it is a damning indictment of its policy direction.

I refer now to key factors that have influenced South Australia's economic and financial performance, and I have already mentioned a number. They include State taxes and charges and the highest rate of bank charges in Australia, and I hope the Premier's economic statement in March or April, whenever it comes down, will address that and that he will start to reduce some of these taxes and charges on business. We also have the highest rate of State petrol tax, the highest workers compensation premiums, the highest water costs, and the second highest electricity tariffs. Our cost of living is almost six times the average of all the other capitals. Our unemployment rate is growing and, at 12 per cent, it is the highest of the mainland States.

I have taken some time to go over the recent economic history in South Australia, and I did that quite deliberately because it demonstrates that the policy direction of the Labor Government in this State for two decades has been wrong. It has been wrong according to the Chamber of Commerce and Industry, wrong according to Access Economics, wrong according to Prime Minister Paul Keating, and wrong according to Arthur D. Little. What Arthur D. Little said was, 'You have got it wrong; you have to change direction. These are the measures you need to put in place.' It is unfortunate that the Government has been very tardy, to say the least, in putting those changes in place. What we need to be doing for the future, and what I think the Economic Development Board and the authority need to be doing as a matter of priority, is providing leadership and clear direction for South Australia and creating a focus for the private and public sectors so they are required to meet performance goals, objectives and standards.

We need to reduce the State's debt. That is a major priority—we have to achieve budgeted annual reductions. We must have smaller government and we must have asset sales in this State to reduce that debt. We need to re-focus industry. We must look at those industries that can give us value-added and at those that will meet some of the growing and expanding markets in the Asian Pacific region, where we should be looking at tapping into the enormous funds that are available through the Asia Development Bank and the World Development Bank to meet some of the requirements in the Asian region.

Let me give one example of that. Indonesia, which has some 13 000 islands, has no mapping system—that is, no title system. In Indonesia, Mr Speaker, you get a certificate to enable you to build on a piece of land, but you do not own that land. Because of the very significant investments going into Indonesia through Korea and Japan, a lot of pressure has been placed on the Asia

Development Bank and the World Development Bank to create a proper land titles system. Who is better placed to put into effect in Indonesia a good land titles system than South Australia, given its background and experience? They are the avenues we ought to be exploring—selling our expertise into those markets, funded by the Asia Development Bank and the World Development Bank.

It is that focus of the next 10, 20 and 30 years that we ought to recognise, and we ought not to miss the boat. If we have much more procrastination, such as we have had, we will find that Germany, the United States or Canada will provide that service and not us, and it is on our doorstep. It is only a stone's-throw from Darwin.

The Hon. P.B. Arnold: And they would have got the system from us.

Mr OLSEN: And they would have got the system from us, as the member for Chaffey rightly points out. What we ought to be doing is not procrastinating, as we have seen in recent times. Proper investment incentives have to be put in place. We need to define the incentives. We have to get approval processes for development so there is some predictability, some certainty. No-one will invest dollars in a major development or project in this current economic climate in Australia, or for that matter world-wide, without some predictability and certainty that the investment dollars and the feasibility studies, which cost an enormous amount of money, will bear some fruit further down the track.

Our track record over the past five years is pretty dismal. Any boardroom around Australia would look at South Australia and say, 'Based on your track record of investment and feasibility studies, and how you have given a lack of support to those, we will simply not take the effort to go to South Australia. We will look at other States which more readily accept and encourage investment in major developments.' We need to privatise some of the non-core activities, and I have spoken about this on a number of occasions in this House. Business has gone back to core activities. Government has to get back to core activities. Economic imperative dictates that it will be so. The warning signs were there in 1984 and 1985. They have become absolutely imperative to put in place now.

We need to develop some of our external trade links. We have missed out, Mr Speaker, in accessing in particular the Asian Pacific region. If you look at Indonesia and the way in which it is growing as a nation, not only in relation to its population but in economic terms, and at the way in which its wealth is expanding, you will see that it will be demanding a range of services which we have, to which we are accustomed and in which we have some ability and expertise. We ought to be, as the Northern Territory Government has done very successfully, targeting Indonesia. If there is any State or Territory in Australia that has successfully accessed the Indonesian market it is the Northern Territory. It has done it better than any State in Australia and it has done it through hard work and effort. No less than (I think) five Ministers in the Northern Territory Government speak the language, and they regularly visit the region to look at opening up opportunities.

In those four or five points that I have listed I have put together the areas that I think the Economic Development Board ought to be giving urgent priority to, and I trust and hope that it will. I see its role as changing the economic climate in South Australia. We all recognise and appreciate that it will not be changed overnight, but that change needs to begin—and a determined change at that.

In summary, the forgotten equation in many instances in an economy is the small business sector, and in South Australia some 56 000 small business operators employ 48.7 per cent of the private sector work force. If we were to give small business operators the capacity to retain their earnings and have greater profitability, many would employ additional people. But we have destroyed the incentive for them to employ because of things such as WorkCover and the increase in operating costs. Many small business enterprises which have had to rely on the owner's capital—mortgaging the family home and other such activities—to simply get started are in survival mode not profit mode, as I referred to earlier. So the task for the board is in some respects daunting, but the task for the board and the authority is absolutely crucial and essential for the future of South Australia and the future of our children and grandchildren. It will mean and require a fundamental change, a generational change of direction, for the economy of this State, and anything short of that will sell short the prospects for future generations of South Australians.

The Opposition supports the establishment of the Economic Development Board and the authority—in other words, it supports the legislation. However, we reserve our judgment on the amendments until we have seen them. I repeat that if they are substantial in any form we will ask that the matter not be debated today or tomorrow because this piece of legislation is far too important. It is one of the most important items of legislation to be listed on the Notice Paper for several decades. We have to get it right. There is bipartisan support because we see the urgent need for a change of direction.

The Government has said that it is willing to embrace some of that change and, where it embraces the right change, it will get 100 per cent support. Where it wants to go down the path of implementing that change, it will be backed up during the implementation phase. Having said that, however, I must say that I am concerned that we have had some eight or nine months of inaction, despite support for this legislation across the board. In Committee I will be posing a number of questions to the Government on the legislation, on its attitude and on its direction and about how soon we will be likely to see some positive results from the Economic Development Board and the authority. I commend the legislation to the House.

Mr INGERSON (Bragg): I support the Bill and the comments of the member for Kavel. I agree with the honourable member that, in the short time I have been in this House, there has never been a more important Bill, and it is disappointing to me that the Premier of this State, who introduced the Bill, has not seen fit to remain in the House through the whole of the debate. Apart from the budget, we will see no other more important

piece of legislation in the next 12 months of this Parliament.

The A.D. Little report, which was released some six to eight months ago, set a base figure of where South Australia was at that time, and we on this side recognise that it is probably the most important research paper that has been prepared for a long time. It is an excellent research paper, because it has clearly put down in all but one area the actual positions in the South Australian economy. I think it is a tragedy that industrial relations was omitted from this study. Nowhere in this magnificent document about the status of the State is there one mention of industrial relations. In my view, that just shows that, in looking at the economic condition of the State, this Government has not seen that our industrial relations system is archaic and needs changing. We have a view of change that is obviously significantly different from that of the Government, but there is no mention of industrial relations in that report, and I believe that is a major tragedy.

Since the tabling of this report, there has been a general winding down of the Department of Industry, Trade and Technology to the stage where, I have been informed, many members of the staff are leaving and that there is a general attitude that the department is going absolutely nowhere. So, there is an urgent need for the Parliament to pass this legislation so that it can be implemented, with its new board, which was announced today, and with the new authority. In essence, the new authority will take up the majority role of the Department of Industry, Trade and Technology. So, there is an urgent need to get on with the job in South Australia. As the member for Kavel said, there is total support for this Bill, with the proviso that the changes put forward by the Premier today are fair and reasonable.

I want to take this opportunity to go backwards and then to come forward and comment on what I think should happen. The issue of payroll tax was brought up by the Premier today as one that is not really as important as we have stated. In my view, payroll tax is one of the most important single issues that can turn around employment in our State. I recognise that many small businesses are not affected by the payroll tax regime, but a lot of large businesses, which are just as important to our State, are affected by payroll tax, and an increase in employment in those areas as part of our economy will be very important to the growth of South Australia.

The Premier also mentioned today that the Keating package, which will reduce company tax, is a big issue in South Australia. I would like to remind the Premier that by far the majority of small businesses are not incorporated; in other words, there is not a company structure but a partnership, such as between a husband and wife, between friends, or among four or five persons, with a single owner. By far the majority of businesses are not incorporated. So, whilst there is a criticism that the Fightback package will deal with large business through payroll tax, equally one could say that today's package of reducing company tax will affect principally large businesses and some of the small to medium businesses, but by far not the majority.

Private investment is the most important single issue that Governments must encourage through their economic policy. As we would know, the majority of our economic policy is Federal Government driven, but all the taxes and charges and costs on business are principally State driven and State controlled. When we look at housing interest rates, we see that in this State they are principally controlled by the State Bank. When we look at taxes and charges such as FID, petrol tax and Workcover tax, we see that in essence all those taxes are created and controlled at State Government level. So, if the State Government has a positive economic policy, it can have a significant effect on the way our State can grow in the future. So, it is absolutely critical that this Economic Development Board be set up as quickly as possible so it can recommend to the Government important changes in the taxes and charges area.

It is important to note that South Australia has the highest bank charges in Australia—FID and debits tax. We have all heard anecdotes about businesses ferrying money to Queensland because that State has a zero tax base. I was at a manufacturing company last week and I brought up that issue. It also happened to have a factory in Queensland and I was advised that at the moment it is not transferring its money interstate, but the person I spoke to further went on to say that the cost of doing that business here in South Australia was \$75 000. That company employs about 200 people and it costs it \$75 000 more to run its business here in South Australia, because of the FID charges, compared with Queensland. While it will not shift because of that sort of small sum, if the company gets any bigger and grows, it will become a real issue to that company. We have the highest petrol tax, the highest workers compensation premiums, the highest water costs and the second highest electricity tariffs.

I have a particular interest in workers compensation costs and our industrial relations system. It is absolutely critical that we make sure that in the next five years we transform our industrial relations system so that we have the choice for individuals to enter into individual enterprise agreements or to remain within the industrial award system. The Minister said today that we already have that. We do have enterprise agreements in South Australia, but one of the arms that is tied behind our back is that we must have the unions involved in those agreements. That is okay for those shops that are unionised, and I have no objection to that, but the reality is that only 30 per cent of all employees in the small business sector are unionised, so what we have is an archaic system that needs some upgrading so that we can have a much more flexible system. The industrial relations system has not been discussed in the A.D. Little report and, in the overall projection of the report, that is a tragedy.

Because of our very low private investment, unemployment is the single most important issue for our State. There is no question that youth unemployment and the future of our State and, indeed, our country are the most important issues for the State and Federal Governments. Our unemployment rate is the highest in the mainland and we are currently losing approximately 150 jobs per day. The work force growth in this State is approximately 2 per cent and, last year, we had a 2 per

cent growth in productivity. From those figures, it can be seen that we need a growth per annum of 4 per cent just to stand still. The A.D. Little report recommends that we ought to set our future growth rate at 4 per cent. From the figures of the past 12 months, which are projected for the next 10 years, we will have a 12 per cent unemployment rate by the year 2000, according to the A.D. Little report. That is a tragedy that we should not accept because, in essence, we are committing our young people to the dole heap and, more importantly—and this issue concerns me most of all—we will be sending our kids interstate and overseas. That means that the long-term potential growth for this community will go down the gurgler. We need our children to stay here in South Australia and have the opportunity to make our State grow over the next 10 years.

I note that the Minister of Tourism is in the Chamber, and the A.D. Little report spent considerable time discussing the tourism potential of this State. As the Minister knows, there is no doubt that tourism is the biggest single people opportunity for us and, for that matter, for all of Australia. Tourism will be a very important issue for us in the next 10 years. I am looking forward to an earlier introduction of the Tourism Commission than occurred with the Economic Development Board, because it is my view that the only way that tourism will improve from its dull, boring and poor development of the past 10 years is to translate it from a bureaucratic, backward, slow-moving marketing group to a positive, industry-driven group, which is what a tourism commission could achieve. It is my view and it is the Party's view that tourism is the single biggest people opportunity for the future economic development of the State.

I note with interest from the A.D. Little report that in the budget the State Government has allocated \$5 million to tourism development. I am fascinated to know when it will be spent, where it will be spent and what will happen in tourism, because I note that none of the major projects that were highlighted in the A.D. Little report has gone anywhere. Again, in this major job opportunity area for people, there has been no action by this Government in the past six to eight months.

Employment growth, which is the other side of the employment/unemployment equation, was very slow for the three months up to October—they were the last figures that I was able to obtain. Since 1978, employment growth in South Australia has been half that of the rest of the Commonwealth. The A.D. Little report, which suggests that the past 20 years of management of the South Australian economy by the Labor Government (other than the three years of Liberal Government) have been a disaster, is highlighted by the fact that our employment growth is only half that of the nation.

In its briefing of November 1992, the South Australian Centre of Economic Studies stated that, whilst we had slow growth until October, it believed that the labour market indicators and poor retail sales would make it very difficult to see a continuation of employment growth. Unemployment is at 12.1 per cent, the highest in the country, and employment growth is likely to stall. There is a need for major change in economic direction,

driven principally by changes to industrial relations and in Government cost structures. That is why the Economic Development Board will be essential for our State's future.

The inflation rate in this State is also the highest in Australia. Under the Labor Government, we seem to be blessed with the highest everything: unemployment, inflation, State Bank debt, State Government insurance problem and workers compensation. We also have the lowest employment growth. It is no wonder that business in this State is finding it very difficult to survive. Unless business survives and prospers, and unless profit becomes the most important function of business and of the community, our children, who are the most important people in our community, will not have a future in this State. I am concerned that we give our children a future in South Australia. They have not had a future for the past 10 to 15 years of Labor. Adelaide has become almost a retirement village.

We need to turn that around so that South Australia reopens itself for business. That is what we need to do. We need this Economic Development Board to have a philosophy to reopen South Australia's doors for business. We need a Government that accepts that the economic development of this State is its number one priority. All the other social things that we as individuals and Governments believe are important are of no value if we do not have a business community and a business ethic that creates profit and employment for this and other generations.

Another issue of concern is our slow population growth, which I touched on earlier. On Sunday, my son's girlfriend left for overseas on a Tourism SA sponsored deal. It so happened that we went along. There were 100 young people, all under 20, at that show on Sunday. One of the things about that group that really concerned me was that about 50 of them cannot get jobs in this State, yet they are highly qualified. They are leaving for Melbourne, Sydney and overseas, and we as a community, the Opposition and the Government have a responsibility to make sure that we turn that around and give the kids of our State an opportunity through this development board and through proper and sensible Government industrial relations, taxes and charges, so that we are able to say, 'South Australia is open for business.'

Mr S.J. BAKER (Deputy Leader of the Opposition): I endorse the remarks of my colleagues John Olsen and Graham Ingerson, the members for Navel and Bragg respectively, for their fine contributions to this debate, because they have got it right and we have got it right. We know what the problems are, and the major problem is the Government of this State. I think of this Bill a little along the lines of a pregnancy—conceived in a moment of passion with a nine months gestation period, but we are not sure whether it will actually bear a pup.

It is a reflection on the Government—and this has already been alluded to by the previous two speakers—that here we are with the centrepiece of the State's revival, and it has stuttered and floundered under the administration of the Premier of this State, without any cohesiveness and with his having no sort of idea of

exactly what he is trying to achieve. That is simply not good enough. If the Premier really believes that the Economic Development Authority and the Economic Development Board will make a substantial contribution to the revitalisation of this State, I would have expected a lot more effort to have been put into the legislation, into the composition of the board and into getting the processes under way. However, we have not seen that.

This Bill has been hanging around and nobody has been too sure what it would comprise. Even the Premier came back from overseas and said, 'I have had further thoughts on the matter and I may be moving some amendments.' Those amendments are still a mystery to this House, and I have not seen any filed, so whether the Premier was indulging in rhetoric to justify his overseas trip, which cost the taxpayers \$30 000 or \$40 000, or whether he did actually pick up one or two ideas whilst he was overseas, we are yet to find out.

Mr Hamilton interjecting:

The DEPUTY SPEAKER: Order!

Mr S.J. BAKER: But we still have the Committee stage to find out exactly what the Premier intends in relation to this Bill. We have had no indication—

Mr Hamilton: You are a scumbag! You are a slime bag!

Mr S.J. BAKER: Mr Deputy Speaker, I would ask the member for Albert Park to withdraw.

The DEPUTY SPEAKER: I am afraid I have no idea what the honourable member said. I was engaged in a conversation with the Clerk because we have a message from another place. What is the honourable member complaining about?

Mr S.J. BAKER: If you had not been interrupted, you would have known that the member for Albert Park was indulging in his normal language of 'sleaze bag' and one or two other choice nouns. Can the honourable member please be asked to withdraw?

Mr Hamilton: Withdraw what?

Mr S.J. BAKER: Your comments.

The DEPUTY SPEAKER: The member for Mitcham has requested the member for Albert Park to withdraw his remarks, and I ask him to do that.

Mr HAMILTON: No, Sir.

Mr S.J. BAKER: It is the normal process in Parliament, upon request—

Mr Olsen: A courtesy.

Mr S.J. BAKER: It is a courtesy of the Parliament where a member goes over the top—and we have all been prone, on occasions, to become a little bit excited. All I can say is that the member has the manners of a pig, and he will probably get his just deserts at the next election.

The DEPUTY SPEAKER: Order! I would ask the honourable member to sit down. The honourable member asked that a remark that he considered to be unparliamentary be withdrawn. It does not add to the debate for him to make another unparliamentary remark. I would ask the House to come back to the debate and that there be no interjections. The honourable Deputy Leader.

Mr S.J. BAKER: Thank you, Sir. I was referring to the background of this Bill and why it has taken so long for the Government and the Premier of this State to get their act together. It is important that, if this State is to

get off its knees, some action be taken on a number of fronts that have been outlined already by members on this side. It is important not only that action be taken but that action be taken immediately. I guess the most compelling point made in recent weeks was that of the Prime Minister, who said that the State's narrow economic base has been a problem bedevilling South Australia for the past two decades. That really indicates that the Prime Minister has no faith in this State, and the people of this State have no faith in the Premier and the Government of this State. The Prime Minister makes that point clearly.

Mr BRINDAL: Mr Deputy Speaker, on a point of order, I refer you to Standing Order 137 which states:

If any member having used unparliamentary language refuses either to explain its use to the satisfaction of the Speaker or to withdraw it and, if necessary, in the opinion of the Speaker, apologise for its use, the Speaker names the member and reports the member's offence to the House.

In speaking to my Deputy Leader, you, Mr Deputy Speaker, said that the member had used unparliamentary language. You ruled that way in your own statement to this House. He has not explained its use. He has not withdrawn it. Therefore, I ask you to invoke Standing Order 137 and report this matter to the Speaker.

The DEPUTY SPEAKER: Order! I thought that I had explained the situation before the Chair to the House, but I will carefully explain it again. When the interjection was made, I was drawing to the attention of the Clerk the fact that we had somebody waiting with a message from another place, and I did not hear the alleged remarks. I cannot give a ruling on what I have not heard. The request was made of the member for Albert Park to withdraw those words, and he refused. Because I did not hear the original remarks, I was unable to take the matter any further. That situation remains. Unfortunately, I am not able to take the matter any further because I did not hear the words. I requested the Deputy Leader to advise me what the words were. He was unable to do so.

Mr S.J. BAKER: On a point of order, I did say that one of the words was 'sleaze bag'. I actually used those words when I raised—

The DEPUTY SPEAKER: I ask the honourable Deputy Leader to sit down. The Deputy Leader is now being more specific than he was at the time I made the request. In any event, it is my intention to overrule the objection, because I was unable to hear the words that were expressed at the time. The honourable Deputy Leader.

Mr S.J. BAKER: I will return to the debate. I was making the point that the Prime Minister of this country is obviously frustrated with the economic performance of this State and this Government. He is well aware that this Government has been in power for almost all of the past 20 years except for one period of office of the Tonkin Government between 1979 and 1982, so it could hardly be said that the Liberal Party has had any long term impact on this State, at least in the past 20 years, when one is assessing the performance of this Government and this State.

The Prime Minister did get it right in terms of the debt facing this State. He did get it right in terms of the economic woes that this State faces. He made the point very strongly that, since 1978, Australian employment

had risen by 28 percent but that the rise of 15 percent in South Australia was only just over half the national rate.

Over the same period, employment rose by 53 per cent in Queensland and by 44 per cent in Western Australia. That is a damning indictment of the performance of this and previous Governments led by Labor leaders, because they have done untold damage to this State which will take tremendous time and energy to repair. It can be repaired only by a change of Government, but in the interim we expect some leadership from the Premier of this State. His performance today was atrocious. He could not stand up and answer his questions: he had to go out on the steps of Parliament to rectify his original bungle. They have a front bench and a back bench that are waiting for the day when they will no longer be on that side of the House. That is simply not good enough.

We must fight and fight hard. We should not sit idly by and let the State go down the gurgler, as this Government is doing. We need some impetus; we need some drive. We believed that the Premier at least recognised that need and was ensuring that this Economic Development Authority and the Economic Development Board represented some means of repairing the damage and getting on with the job. But, as I said at the beginning, this reminds me of a pregnancy which has been nine months in gestation, and we still do not know what it will bear—it may well be a pup. Like my colleagues, I am interested only in one thing, that is, the future of this State and of this country. Without jobs and opportunities we will continue to die, and we will continue to fall down that ladder of economic performance, the OECD rating of countries. In that regard, we have performed abysmally in this State and in this country, and we hope that will be repaired by the next Federal and State elections, from which we expect to see a change in the leadership of this country and of this State.

I do digress because it is a very sorry reflection on the Government of this State that it cannot provide for its citizens. Various information has been provided previously by my colleagues the members for Kavel and Bragg on this subject and the need to create opportunities, to help small business, to get out of the way of small business and to open up the State for business, which is a phrase for which I have a great deal of feeling. It is important that, if we are going to set up an authority, that authority will make the changes necessary.

I will not repeat much of the material that already has been presented, but I did receive a copy of a log of claims today which was served by the ASU on an employer of this State. This employer has no unionised employees, and he does not know how he suddenly has been brought into this bun fight. However, he has a log of claims, although he is unsure from where they were generated. He pays above award wages, and his conditions are better than those of the award. He is unaware of the reason why he has been targeted, he has no union employees, yet somehow he has received these demands. This document, which just reflects the state of malaise that we are experiencing, as one of its demands, states:

Ordinary hours of duty shall not exceed 28 per week, to be worked in four days, and each daily shift shall be of equal

duration. Employees should not be rostered again until they have had at least 12 hours off. A shift worker who is transferred from one shift to another shall get a 200 per cent loading on their ordinary pay. All employees shall be allowed a rest period of 30 minutes during the morning and afternoon of each working day which shall be counted as time worked.

Then it talks about how much time you have on and off the job. Of course, this log of claims is moderate in industrial terms compared to those we have seen by building unions over a period—claims which, of course, ask for six months leave with full pay and various other conditions. Working 20 hours per week is one of the other claims that building unions placed on the employers. That is indicative of the problems facing this State. We have a gutless Government which depends on the union movement for its funds and other resources and which is not willing to take a stand for the sake of this State. So, the EDA and the EDB have their hands tied.

One of the most fundamental changes that must take place is in the workplace, and that cannot happen with this State Government or the Government in Canberra. Yet, the Government says, 'We will let the EDA and the EDB look at these matters, but we will leave the industrial relations climate alone, because it is all too hard, and that is our union base.' That is simply not good enough. I could go through that log of claims, but it simply does not make good reading. As we are aware, it is just a process whereby the unions create a dispute which can then be heard by the Industrial Commission. Any outside observer of our system must wonder exactly what we are trying to achieve when they see such stupidity in writing by the union movement.

In relation to the development of this State, every member in this House should have a clear idea of the changes that must take place; they are fundamental and they are far reaching. Nibbling away at the edges or not having a committee or board will not make a scrap of difference: it is the willingness to make hard decisions, to look at the State budget and sort out the debt problem that will bring about change. The Prime Minister, Mr Keating, was right again: he concluded that this State had an horrific debt problem and that the only assistance he would provide is if the State Government sold the State Bank. So, that was the carrot and the stick. We have heard the Premier today disabusing himself of any inclination to sell the State Bank, and at the same time holding active discussions on how the Government can quit the bank without upsetting their union mates. That is absolutely pathetic, and it reflects on the capacity of this State.

I remind members that we are suffering from some huge disadvantages in this State. Some of our taxation rates are the highest in the country. I remind members of the BAD, FID and State petrol taxes, of the high workers compensation premiums, water costs and electricity tariffs. In a number of other areas, because of the imposts themselves, the charges are greater than those of other States. We must be better than them. We must create a level of lower cost which will make it possible for our smaller business not only to survive but to generate employment opportunities.

We have heard the Premier waffling on about getting rid of payroll tax: the only people who will get rid of

payroll tax are members of the Federal Liberal Government, and that is the hope of the country and of this State. He has made the suggestion that company tax will be reduced from 39 to 33 per cent. Quite unequivocally, most companies in South Australia are not making a profit, so the decline from 39 to 33 per cent will make little or no difference to those companies or to all the small businesses in South Australia which need some breaks in the system in order to survive.

So, whilst we wish the Premier well with his endeavours and whilst we wish that the EDA will provide a bit of light in a tunnel of darkness, we know that the record of the Government will continue, because it does not have the guts and the determination to take up the major issues facing this State and this country. Whilst the Opposition supports the Bill, it has tremendous reservations about the capacity of the Government to actually use the EDA and the EDB for the purposes for which they were designed.

The Hon. JENNIFER CASHMORE (Coles): The Opposition supports the Bill and it certainly supports its objects, as follows:

(a) to promote internationally focused, competitive, market driven and sustainable economic development in the State;

(b) to promote a productive partnership or collaboration between public and private enterprise ...

(c) to encourage and facilitate investment, and industrial and commercial development in the State;

(d) to contribute to public understanding of the issues affecting the economic development of the State;

(e) to establish the Economic Development Board...

Addressing each of those aims specifically, we on this side of the House believe that none of those aims is achievable under the present regime. One has only to look at the record to see a litany of abysmal failure by successive Labor Governments in attempting to achieve those goals. I maintain that it is past the time when this Government can say, 'Let's do this, let's do that, let's look at the future.'

I say to South Australians that we are now forced to look at the past, to look at the record and to say that this cannot be allowed to continue. No longer can we entrust the achievement of fine sounding goals to a Labor Government that has demonstrated its total inability to meet any one of those goals. Let us look at the promotion of internationally focused, competitive, market driven and sustainable economic development in this State.

My colleagues who have preceded me in this debate have outlined the demonstrable failure of South Australian Labor Governments to make this State competitive. We have had an outline of the reasons why we are not competitive. We have the highest BAD and FID taxes, the highest workers' compensation charges, the second highest electricity charges, high water charges and a whole range of taxes, regulations and administrative policies which make it difficult indeed for people to invest with confidence in South Australia.

We then go on to the next goal, namely, to promote a productive partnership or collaboration between public and private enterprise in this State. How can anyone believe this Government when it makes that claim as a goal? We need look only at the comparatively recent

past, at the absolute debacle of Scrimber, a public and private collaborative enterprise, which led us into a \$60 million debt under the ministry of the now Minister of Public Infrastructure, the Hon. John Klunder.

We had that \$60 million catastrophe. We had a catastrophe with Marineland, which was supposed to be a productive collaborative effort between the South Australian Government and Chinese investors. That ended up in acrimony on both sides. It ended up in legal action. It was a total debacle, yet the Government, in the form of the Premier, can bring this Bill into the House and expect us to believe that this Government aims to promote a productive partnership between public and private enterprise.

We say that the record is so appalling that no investor could be expected to have any confidence in this Government. Clause 3(c) provides for the encouragement and facilitation of investment, and industrial and commercial development in the State. I say, and so do my colleagues, that there will be no serious major private investment in this State as long as this Government remains in office. That is an important message for South Australians at the next State election, as well as for Australians at the pending Federal election.

The reason is that, if South Australians go to the polls and vote to return this Government, they will be giving a powerful message to the rest of the country and the rest of the world that we will continue to tolerate a Government that has brought us to our knees economically and that has brought us to unprecedented level of debt. No-one will invest in a State or nation that is debt-ridden. No-one will do that and that has been demonstrated—

Mr Atkinson interjecting:

The Hon. JENNIFER CASHMORE: The member for Spence refers to Somalia and trivialises the problems, I suggest, both of that nation and of this State. We have been brought low, and there can be no investor confidence as long as South Australians are prepared to tolerate a Government which not only has ignored debt levels as they have continued to mount but which also has piled debt upon debt by its failure to manage key South Australian financial enterprises.

The next objective is to contribute to public understanding of the issues affecting the economic development of the State. I will be interested to see how that goal is achieved by this legislation. Public understanding of issues affecting the economic development of the State requires, in the first instance, an honest appraisal of why we are in such a parlous condition. The Prime Minister, a member of the Government's own Party, and its Federal Leader was at least honest in his statement released on Wednesday 3 February in Adelaide. The Prime Minister said that South Australia faces an uncertain future regardless of what happens elsewhere in Australia.

The first and primary reason for that is our relatively narrow economic base, which has made it relatively difficult to respond to the forces of structural change. He said:

This has been a problem bedevilling South Australia for the past two decades.

Who has been in office for all but three years of the past two decades? It is members opposite and the Labor Party which has presided over—

Members interjecting:

The Hon. JENNIFER CASHMORE: Actually, it has presided over a do-nothing two decades. The opportunities for structural change have been completely bypassed by this Government. It has been indifferent to opportunities and has neglected the chance for microeconomic reform. It has failed—

The Hon. T.R. Groom interjecting:

The Hon. JENNIFER CASHMORE: If one wants to see microeconomic reform, one can see what happened under the Greiner Government and the benefits that flowed from that. The removal of impediments to efficiency and profitability is essential if the goal of microeconomic reform is to be achieved and, as long as we have high levels of State taxes and charges, high levels of regulation and compulsory unionism, which means that the industrial system is tied up by unions and union demands, we will not achieve the reforms that are necessary to inspire investor confidence in this State.

So, the first requirement for public understanding of the issues is an honest assessment of those issues. As I said, and as I believe previous speakers have identified, at least the Prime Minister is prepared to say that we are in a parlous position. He said that the State Bank's debt will prevent any recovery. Interestingly, he also said that, when he learnt of the extent of the debt, he felt an immediate contempt for those who managed the bank.

The ultimate managers of the bank were the Government, the Cabinet and the Premier and Treasurer. It is interesting to see one Labor Leader expressing contempt for another. Perhaps that is all part of the honest debate. The Prime Minister said that interest payments will take up 15 per cent of State revenue in 1992-93, even though interest rates are much lower than that. As I recollect the budget debate—and my colleague the shadow Treasurer will correct me if I am wrong—we are now at a point where 50 per cent, if not 60 per cent, of all State taxes and charges—

The SPEAKER: Order! The member for Victoria will resume his seat and will not stand with his back to the Chair. The member for Napier will stop his chatter. The member for Coles.

The Hon. JENNIFER CASHMORE: Between 50 per cent and 60 per cent of State taxes and charges go on interest repayments. I am not talking about the total of State revenue; it is 15 per cent of total State revenue which of course includes revenue from all sources, including the Commonwealth. The fact that more than half of the money we raise directly by way of State taxes and charges goes not to productive purposes but to interest repayments is an indication of the total failure of the Bannon and Arnold Governments to manage the State's economy, let alone to bring us to a point where we are internationally focused, competitive, market driven and capable of sustaining economic development in this State in accordance with the goals of this Bill.

The provision in relation to the establishment of the board and the board's membership as set out in the Bill is largely technical and does not differ to any significant extent from other boards. However, we note that under clause 13 members of the board are required to fulfil

duties of honesty, care and diligence. It is pleasing to see those qualities mentioned in a statute for the first time for some considerable time; it indicates that the qualities of honesty, care and diligence have been sadly lacking in recent times. That is one of the reasons for the predicament in which South Australia finds itself.

I noted at Question Time—and this is not relevant directly to the Bill but is relevant to the principles of this clause—that the former Deputy Premier, Mr Jack Wright—has not been reappointed to his two positions with the Totalizator Agency Board and the Lotteries Commission. Public confidence in both those boards has been severely dented by the way in which they have conducted their financial affairs. All this has profound implications for the economic development of the State. Investors look at South Australia and say, 'Things are a bit murky with a lot of its statutory authorities. There have been doubts cast as to the integrity of boards. There have been extraordinarily poor investments made not only by the bank but by SGIC. How can we place our confidence in a State when the electorate is prepared to permit a Government to allow those things to happen?'

Members must understand that there are links in investors' minds between all these matters, and unless there is a very thorough clean-up of all the statutory authorities in this State—a clean up which a Liberal Government will certainly instigate and carry through with considerable vigour—we cannot expect things to be right unless they are right at the top. As far as investors are concerned, the 'top' is not only the Government and the Cabinet and the attitude of the Parliament overall but a whole lot of economic instrumentalities which profoundly affect the economic life of the State.

I conclude by referring once again to the Prime Minister and his statements—not the statement he made in Adelaide last week assessing the economic circumstances of South Australia and concluding that they were appalling and that the State could not possibly pull itself out of this hole on its own but to something that was said in a non-election campaign context by the Prime Minister, Paul Keating, and was reported in the *Australian* of Tuesday 12 May last year. In that report, after the special Premiers Conference when the real colours of a Prime Minister are shown—not the election campaign colours but the real colours—we learnt that the States told Mr Keating and Treasurer Mr Dawkins that in the decade since the Hawke Government came to power Commonwealth funding to the States had fallen from 36 per cent of Federal revenues to 29 per cent—a very significant proportionate reduction. The States said, 'This reduction represented \$7 billion and easily surpassed the combined deficit of the States of \$4.8 billion.' Since then South Australia's deficit has soared and any chance we have of getting back into a competitive position through being solvent and not pouring income and revenue down an interest rate drain, which we are doing at the moment, has considerably diminished.

I say to the Premier and to those who expect this Bill to save or help save South Australia that under the present Administration it is not possible for us to have confidence that the objects of this legislation can be achieved and that under the present Federal Labor Administration it is not possible for us to have confidence that South Australia's difficult position will be

adequately recognised and that we will be given at least a decent hand to get us on the road to recovery.

The rest of the Bill deals with the powers and functions of the board, which are considerable, with its obligation to report to Parliament and so on. The powers and functions of the board include the requirement to prepare a series of plans for the growth and development of the economy; to formulate policies and strategies for the implementation of the plan; to identify infrastructure necessary to maintain and expand the State's economy; to foster the development of regional economies and so forth. One only has to look back 30 years and realise that virtually all those functions under the Playford Administration were fulfilled by either the Premier or the Cabinet. There was no need then to set up boards and to hive off these responsibilities; they were seen as the responsibility of the Leader of the Government, and they were fulfilled magnificently by the then Leader of the Government.

If one were translating it to the 1940s and the 1950s, one might describe clause 16 of the Bill as Playford's blueprint. We have a lot to learn by looking back as well as by looking forward. I maintain, and so do my colleagues, that the objects of this legislation cannot be achieved under a Government that has lost all credibility, energy and capacity (whatever it ever had). We will not see economic development on a sustainable basis in South Australia until we see a change of Government.

Mr FERGUSON (Henley Beach): I have been extremely disappointed by the tone of the debate that we have had so far. Every member who has spoken to this Bill so far has said that they support it, yet all we have heard from the Opposition is carping criticism—absolutely whingeing, carping criticism. I think the member for Coles has shown a great deal of front in entering this debate because we well remember, when the now Minister of Education, Employment and Training was trying to establish a development in the Flinders Ranges—something that South Australia really wants and something that would have created jobs for this State—she said, 'I will lie in front of the bulldozers'.

So, how could anybody who has taken every opportunity to resist development in South Australia have the effrontery to get up and start talking about the way the Government should be tackling economic development in this State? The situation, as you would well know, Sir, is that the world recession had caught up with South Australia, and we have had a pretty tough time. Nobody can deny that we have had a tough time over the past couple of years. As a result of this, the State Government employed the Arthur D. Little organisation to give a report to the Parliament and the Government as to what should happen as far as development in South Australia is concerned. As a result of that report, we now have this Bill before us. This Bill gives the opportunity to provide a springboard for economic development in South Australia, and I would have thought that members of the Opposition would have grasped the opportunity to do something about it, instead of getting up with this whingeing, carping nonsense that we have heard so far.

An honourable member: It's traditional!

Mr FERGUSON: It certainly is traditional. If I had been a member of the Opposition, I would have taken a different approach. I have been lucky because, in the 11 years I have been in here, I have never been in Opposition: I have always been in Government. I have had to sit here year after year and hear the knocking from the other side of the House and the whingeing and carping that goes on. But, had I been a member of the Opposition, I would have taken the opportunity to stand in this place and tell the public of South Australia, my supporters and the press what I would do about economic development, but what have we heard? Nothing more than whingeing and carping. The two points that all members of the Opposition have made so far have been the criticism of the Government's handling of industrial matters and in relation to taxation in this State. When members opposite talk about handling industrial matters, they really mean that they want us to adopt the Kennett approach and attack and exploit the workers—that is really what they are saying.

Mr Ingerson interjecting:

Mr FERGUSON: If that is not what is on their mind (and the shadow Minister over there said it is nonsense), what is their policy?

Mr Ingerson: We told you.

Mr FERGUSON: You have not told us. What I would like in black and white from members of the Liberal Party is their policy on industrial matters. What they are asking us to do is to grasp a Kennett style administration—

The SPEAKER: Order! The member for Henley Beach will resume his seat. The need for relevance raises its head once again. There is no reference at all to industrial relations in the matters that have been referred to by the Opposition; there is nothing at all about industrial relations in this Bill, and I would ask the member for Henley Beach to be relevant to the Bill before the House. The member for Henley Beach.

Mr FERGUSON: Of course, I would like to come back to the Bill. I was merely rebutting the debate that has already been put to the House by previous speakers and taking up point by point the debate that has been made previously by the four Liberal speakers on this Bill. All of them mentioned industrial relations, and all of them suggested that the Government is being too soft as far as industrial relations are concerned.

I would like to take up the only other point that the Opposition has made so far with respect to this proposition. It has complained bitterly, without putting up any examples, about the taxation set-up in South Australia. Every speaker so far has mentioned the taxation proposition and the fact that the taxation set-up in South Australia is allegedly holding up development. I refer to the KPMG Peat Marwick South Australian Business Climate Study, and I quote from the report as follows:

Nevertheless, in terms of State Government impost at least, South Australia is a low tax State. The perception and the reality do not gel, however. Payroll tax is seen as particularly pernicious, yet only Queensland charges lower rates than South Australia. The payroll tax burden is also somewhat lower in South Australia because of the State's lower average wage ... This is something that is never mentioned by the Opposition. We have a low average wage in South

Australia; we have a wage advantage. The document continues:

If State taxes and charges are a major business concern, this is more a reflection of the business climate than what caused it. Entrepreneurial endeavour will not be impeded by minor differences in payroll thresholds or in FID rates. This is not to suggest that costs are not important, but any perceived differential between South Australia and the other States is more imagined than real and would matter less if the market share was increased or new markets tapped. The New South Wales tax review found that—

Mr D.S. Baker: Why have we got the highest unemployment?

Mr FERGUSON: The member for Victoria just interjected and asked why we have the highest unemployment. South Australia does not have the highest unemployment; it is Tasmania that has the highest unemployment, and Tasmania is led by a Liberal Government. The KPMG Peat Marwick report, which has become my bible somewhat, tells us that payroll tax in South Australia is among the lowest in Australia, and this afternoon I heard speakers here complaining about payroll tax. We have the lowest payroll tax in Australia—lower than in any Liberal Administration. These are not my words: this is the KPMG Peat Marwick South Australian Business Climate Study, as follows:

When viewed on a segmented basis, South Australian electricity prices compare more favourably, particularly among larger users . . . the effective price of natural gas in the Adelaide industrial market to represent the least expensive in Australia across virtually all consumption levels. We have the lowest price as far as natural gas is concerned, so the criticisms that have been rolled up by the Opposition so far in this debate are nonsense.

I would say one thing about economic development in South Australia, and I would like to raise a criticism. That criticism is that investors find it extremely difficult to get through all the planning, environmental, bureaucratic, governmental and local government processes that we have in South Australia before they can get developments up and running, and I can see that that is a problem. What we need, in so far as any of those projects is concerned, is to establish a strong personality, a person who can take charge, a person who can be given the authority to guide the projects, whatever those projects might be. It might be the Mount Lofty project that is currently being spoken of in the newspapers.

The Government should appoint someone to guide these projects and to cut the red tape where there are hold-ups, where there are problems in the environmental area, where there are problems with planning, where there are problems with local government—wherever there are problems. Parliament should empower someone in the development area to take over and cut through the problems that arise.

Members may well remember Jubilee Point, which was very close to my electorate. Every group under the sun jumped up and down complaining about it. Even the Liberal local member, the member for Morphett, complained loudly about Jubilee Point and added his voice to the crescendo that stopped the project. As a Parliament, we ought to agree to the appointment of someone who can guide these projects along the way. Mr

Speaker, you may remember the problems encountered in the Flinders Ranges when the member for Coles suggested that she would lie in front of the bulldozer in order to prevent that project from going ahead. Fanatical groups in our society try to stop these developments, and we should be able to empower someone to guide various developments.

One has only to travel Europe, as I am sure you have done, Sir, to see what Napoleon Bonaparte was able to achieve. Some of the great boulevards in Europe would not have been built if it had not been for that very strong personality. Even the autobahns in Germany were achieved by the efforts of some very strong personalities. I believe that this Parliament ought to think seriously about appointing someone who can cut the red tape and get these projects up and running, not necessarily bypassing the environmental process, but by being able to push the projects through.

Mr Olsen: Why don't you start in your Caucus room?

Mr FERGUSON: The honourable gentleman could not even gather the numbers to get to the top. I have been disappointed with the contributions by Liberal members on this Bill. They have all been negative; they have shown the white feather; they have run up the white flag and surrendered. Instead of making carping criticism they ought to get behind the Government and, together, in a bipartisan way, we should be able to do something about economic development in South Australia. I do not agree with the member for Coles who said that no-one will invest in this State.

The superannuation funds to which employers have kindly contributed in the past 12 months with their extra 4 per cent are now accumulating enough money to do something positive with it. If there are any viable development funds, I am sure that they will be used when the opportunity arises in South Australia. I have also been disappointed about the criticisms from members opposite about our attitude towards the industrial climate. I do not think that anyone on this side would agree that working men and women should be forced out of awards, that holiday and leave loading be abolished, that working hours and penalty rates be up for grabs, that no longer—

Mr BRINDAL: I rise on a point of order. I ask you, Sir, to rule on relevance. I believe that the matters now being canvassed are not relevant to the debate.

The SPEAKER: Order! I do not uphold the point of order because I want to see whether the member for Henley Beach is developing an argument. If there is no reference to the Bill before the Chair, I will rule him out of order.

Mr FERGUSON: I thank you for your protection, Sir. The criticism from the Opposition has been that this side of politics will not exploit workers in South Australia. I would not like to see the conditions that now apply in Victoria to apply here. No longer is industrial action a right in Victoria. In most cases, it is outlawed. Workers can now be fined for withdrawing their labour. The fundamental right of working men and women has gone and this has been achieved by vicious legislation from Mr Kennett. The Liberal Opposition in this State has not been prepared to put down its policy on industrial matters.

Mr S.G. Evans: They are not talking about industrial matters.

Mr FERGUSON: They are certainly talking about it. They have been talking about it for years. I hope that time will come when they have the courage to put down on paper exactly what is their situation so far as industrial matters are concerned. If they are prepared to follow the Kennett line in Victoria, they will not reach their goal of Government in South Australia, and this is something they realise.

The SPEAKER: Order! I ask the member for Henley Beach to come back to the Bill.

Mr FERGUSON: I will certainly come back to the point. I agree that the Economic Development Board will play a vital role in manufacturing industry in our economy. We are in a rapidly changing world and a lot of South Australia's original industry has disappeared or changed. The sort of industrial and other development that we look forward to will be very different from the industrial world of the past 20 years. That will be the catalyst to enable us to move forward into the future and see proper development in South Australia.

Mr BRINDAL: Mr Speaker, I draw your attention to the state of the House.

A quorum having been formed:

[Sitting suspended from 6 to 7.30 p.m.]

MOTOR VEHICLES (WRECKED OR WRITTEN-OFF VEHICLES) AMENDMENT BILL

Received from the Legislative Council and read a first time.

ECONOMIC DEVELOPMENT BILL

Second reading debate resumed.

Mr BRINDAL (Hayward): I have just returned from an electorate function in Unley, in the course of which—

Members interjecting:

Mr BRINDAL: Very successful, and I thank my colleagues who joined me in that function.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order! The member for Hayward has the call.

Mr BRINDAL: I can truly say that the electors of Unley are as perplexed as I am about this Bill. Many of them put to me that they could not understand how a Government which has been in power for two decades and which has consistently got it so wrong can now come into this House and pretend to have found the magic panacea, the cure, for this State's ills.

The question that Unley is asking—indeed, the question that all South Australia should be asking—is, 'When a Party has had two decades on the Treasury benches in this place, how can it dare to come in here after a report like the A.D. Little report and continue in government?' How can members sit on the Treasury benches and say, 'We have had two decades to get it right; we have got it all wrong: trust us now'? For two

decades, the people of South Australia have trusted this Government, and this Government has been found wanting. I do not see how it can present this Bill to the House.

I listened with interest to the contributions made by my colleagues on this side of the Chamber and, if you noted, Sir, some of the most prestigious members on the Opposition benches have thus far contributed to this debate. It is with some little trepidation that I have to gently chide them for some of their remarks. I listened to what they said in terms of this Bill, and they seemed to deny that this Government had made any progress at all in its two decades. I have to point out that this Government does have some accomplishments to its credit, accomplishments that might be related directly to this Bill, and they include industries which, under their superintendence and direction, have expanded remarkably. I will just point out a couple of them.

The Public Service, as my friend the member for Hanson will attest, has enjoyed a growth never before seen in the history of this State. There has been a huge ballooning of the Public Service. Then we have the rehabilitation industry. I think the Government developed WorkCover as a clever strategy for creating a new industry—the rehabilitation industry—which now employs many people who are very well paid, whose existence is perhaps questionable but who do very nicely, thank you very much, and thanks to this Government.

Finally, we get to the *piece de resistance* of this Government, that is, the brand new growth industry for the 1980s in South Australia. As we all know, that was consultancies. Everybody in Adelaide, under this Government, did have or could get a consultancy. I am sure that you, Mr Speaker, if you retired from this Chamber, would be invited to do consultancy after consultancy. Members opposite recognise wisdom when they see it. They would look at you, Mr Speaker, and they would say, 'What we need is someone of the wisdom and perspicacity—

Mr Olsen: And his advice would be a lot better than some that has been given to them. It would be good, practical advice.

Mr BRINDAL: Mr Speaker, the member for Kavel very wrongly interjects that your advice would be worth more than most of their consultants—

The SPEAKER: Order! I suggest that the member for Hayward take the advice of the Chair and relate his remarks to the Bill.

Mr BRINDAL: I come back to the point that three areas have expanded, one being consultancies. One consultant in Adelaide who would have missed out, even under this Government, is Jason, for Jason, as we know, was a purveyor and interpreter of dreams. In the 10 years of this Arnold/Bannon Government, there have been no dreams. I would remind you, Mr Speaker, of the line from *Jason and His Technicolour Dreamcoat*, 'Any dream will do.' Perhaps until tonight, perhaps until this legislation came before the Parliament, that was almost an irrefutable fact. We have been promised, at election after election, in speech after speech, dreams for the future of South Australia, but there have been no dreams, either good or bad. There has been a darkness, a morass and a collapse of industry in this State. This Bill purportedly attempts—very belatedly—to fix this

malaise, this growing darkness that surrounds South Australia. But the question that must be asked is, 'Will the Bill do what it purports to do?' The rhetoric and its aim is very fine. The Bill provides:

To promote internationally focused, competitive, market driven and sustainable economic development in this State.

That is a wonderful line and a fine aim—one which, I know, the Government took straight from a speech by the Hon. Dean Brown, Leader of the Opposition. He has been saying this for months and months. At last members opposite are listening, and at last they are writing his speeches into legislation and doing something. We as an Opposition cannot condemn them for that. The second aim of the Bill is:

To promote a productive partnership of corroboration between public and private enterprise in this State.

Again, that is a laudable aim, but what has been the evidence? What has the Government produced in the past 10 years? Why should we as a Parliament believe that the passage of this Bill will change one single thing for the business community and for the workers and doers of South Australia? The Government might have legislation, but it has not been able to do it without the legislation; why should it be able to do it with a piece of paper, which then must be enforced by the will of the Government of the day and by the will of the public servants who supposedly serve this Government? The third aim is:

To encourage and facilitate investment and industrial and commercial development in this State.

How can one encourage and facilitate investment unless one creates the right climate, and again I refer not only to the Leader of the Opposition but to other eminent frontbenchers who, for half a decade and more, have been talking about this very aim—the need to encourage and facilitate investment, and to do it as Sir Thomas Playford did it by creating a low cost State. It is all right to produce this type of legislation but, until such time as members opposite look at the infrastructure of South Australia—the electricity charges and the red tape that strangles small businesses to the point at which many of them just close their doors and give up—this aim is nothing more than hollow rhetoric on a piece of white paper, and not even recycled paper at that.

It also states, 'To contribute to public understanding of the issues affecting the economic development of this State'. How can this Government contribute to public understanding when it so demonstrably does not understand it itself? For two decades it has got it wrong. How can it, in this legislation, suddenly say, 'We are the leaders; we are the dreamers; we are the ones who know the answer,' when its record speaks for itself. It does not know the questions, let alone the answers.

Finally it states, 'To establish the Economic Development Board as the State's primary agency for determining, coordinating and implementing economic development strategies for this State'. There we have it: there in the final object is the real curse of this Bill—that is that we have never got it right before but now we are going totally to take control, totally dominate this area, totally tell everybody how it should be done and presumably not only muck it up by degrees, as it has done in the past decade or more, but totally muck it up. It does not want half measures in South Australia. If the

member for Coles was not here I would tell you what it wants, but, in view of you, Sir, and the member for Coles, I will just say that it wants this State to go from bad to worse.

The Chamber of Commerce and Industry, in writing to the then Premier of South Australia (Hon. John Bannon) on 14 August 1992, had this to say:

My dear Premier, the state of the South Australian economy continues to be of major concern to the chamber and its members.

It then goes on to talk about the things that need doing in South Australia. Instead of bringing in this sort of Bill the then Premier and the current Premier would have been better off reading what the chamber says is wrong and, instead of putting another statute on the books, amending existing legislation in areas that would promote the very aims which this Bill seeks to promote. The first area was restoring business and investor confidence, and in this respect it says:

This is the number one consideration. It is an absolute priority that all policy pronouncements by your Government add to the confidence of those doing business in South Australia. This State is not insulated from the national economic problems; neither is an environment dominated by extremely high unemployment and business failures conducive to building business confidence. But your Government can do something. It can provide leadership and make it emphatically clear that creating the best possible business environment in South Australia is a number one priority.

Then it talks about generating the right perception in South Australia and cutting State-based taxes and charges on business. Of WorkCover it says:

WorkCover is a disgrace. It is clearly within the power of your Government to reduce this crippling impost on South Australian business. There perhaps is no single other issue detracting more from the perception of South Australia as a good place to do business than the Government's apparent unwillingness to fix the WorkCover issue.

I acknowledge that very recently you, Sir, have done something positive to try to make that criticism which at that time was valid less valid than it is today.

The Hon. T.H. Hemmings interjecting:

Mr BRINDAL: Your contribution must be acknowledged, Sir; I will purposely ignore the member for Napier. I believe that if you, Sir, had not got this Government off a hook, on which it was hanging quite firmly, it would be in much more trouble than it is today.

Mr FERGUSON: On a point of order, Sir, I must draw your attention to the relevance of this line of debate. The honourable member is very keen—

The SPEAKER: The member has made his point. I uphold the point of order. The member for Hayward will relate his remarks to the Bill as it is before the House.

Mr BRINDAL: I thank you for your direction in this matter. The chamber goes on, and I will relate what it says to the context of the Bill, because the two are clearly interrelated. The chamber is pointing a direction for South Australia, the Bill is pointing a direction for South Australia, and the chamber is vitally interested in the area covered by the Bill. I therefore think it is relevant to comment on the direction in which the chamber thinks South Australia should be going. It talks about cutting business regulations. This is an area that is

strangling South Australia: the regulations and filling out forms that has to be done by every small business, not day after day, but week after week and month after month.

It also talks about seeking private sector growth, increasing user pays and promoting competition. It says the following of the Economic Development Board (and there can be nothing more pertinent to the Bill than the Economic Development Board):

This is a matter which we will address in a subsequent submission to your Government on the specific findings of the A.D. Little study. It nevertheless is appropriate that a brief reference is included in this document... Premier, we must go for growth in the private sector. To achieve that we must compete successfully for private sector investment dollars. The Government's role in that is to seek to provide an attractive investment environment with South Australia being, and recognised as being, the preferred place for doing business in Australia.

We have heard some chirping and chiding opposite about GST and about what the Premier of Victoria is currently doing in that State. Members relate it to this Bill and say that this is what we must do; we cannot go down that road. Again, I draw members' attention to that final paragraph in the chamber's letter. The only road which this Bill, and indeed any legislation in this place, must take South Australia down is that which once again makes South Australia competitive in Australian terms and restores us to pre-eminence in certain areas in South Australia so that our economy may once again thrive. I make no apology for saying that, and I hope that every member in this Chamber supports that statement. I do not care whether it is the Hewson, Kennett or Arnold road, provided that it is the correct road, and it is a very blind man who refuses to see any other road but his own. That is one of the reasons why Governments in this State, because of their political ideologies and their refusal to see an alternative point of view, have got us into so much trouble.

I conclude by talking about the difference between a pro-active and a reactive Government. In this I blame not so much the Government itself with this proposition that is before the House but the nature of the Public Service not only in South Australia but indeed throughout Australia, for most public servants in this country are reactive. If there is a problem, they react to it and fix it up. That is the great difference between Australia, which is on the decline, and economies such as Korea that are on the incline, because it has a pro-active approach to Government.

There can be no better illustration of this than the fact that, some years ago, Korea looked around and decided that the microchip was the industry of the future. There was no microchip industry in Korea but, having decided that the microchip was the industry of the future, the Koreans got the expertise, the research and everything that was needed, and Korea is currently one of the greatest producers of microchips in the world. That is a significant difference because, while we look at what is going wrong and try to patch it up, they have a vision of what is needed and try to do it.

It is a difference that we would understand, because we cannot keep patching up old industries that are losing their relevance in a modern world. If they are losing

their relevance they will go; they will pass, as many other things have passed. What we need is vision and forward thinking; we need to know what the future holds and we need to aim at the future. That is the great dream of the MFP.

That, Sir, is one area in which you and I would commend the Government for vision and forward thinking. Yet, like this Bill, when it gets down to asking what the vision is, what the future holds, what it is that we are aiming for, we get back to that Public Service mentality: it might be this and it might be that or it could be something else. Basically, they do not know what it is, so they will try to tart up something that is a bit tired anyway and troop it out and present it in the emperor's new clothes. They will tart it up, make it look good, and say that it is a new vision. It is not a new vision; it is a tired vision.

This Bill is like the curate's egg: it is good in parts. So far as it goes, it is good. If it were being implemented by a Brown Liberal Government and by people of vision, I would commend it to the House, but I cannot find it in me to commend this Bill to the House when I know that it will be put in the hands of people who for two decades have proved themselves incompetent to run South Australia. They have failed this State consistently and they continue to fail this State. This Bill shows no promise for the future because, as they cannot run this State, they cannot do the things that would make this a good Bill.

The Hon. T.H. HEMMINGS (Napier): I enthusiastically support this Bill. On my reckoning so far we have had six speakers. Apart from the hard hitting, truthful, to the point speech by my colleague, the member for Henley Beach, what have we had? We have had the chief spokesperson for the Liberal Party, the member for Kavel. Let us look at his record. He failed as a Leader, failed as the prime mover of a palace coup, came back from the Senate, attempted to rise like the phoenix and fell on his face. Yet he has the temerity to tell this Government where it has gone wrong in the past.

The member for Bragg desperately wanted the position of Deputy Leader. He could not organise the numbers for something like three or four years. Then, when he did get the job—by sheer mistake—he held it for a mere month. He could not even overcome the hangovers at the 3 a.m. rebirth. The Deputy Leader, the member for Mitcham, can only be described as the ultimate failure and the Liberal Party's talking machine. The member for Coles, who undeniably is the most astute person on the other side—

The SPEAKER: Order! The member for Coles has a point of order. The member for Napier will resume his seat.

The Hon. JENNIFER CASHMORE: Mr Speaker, I do not believe that my capacity or that of my colleagues has any relevance to the Bill. I feel that the honourable member's remarks should be ruled out of order.

The SPEAKER: I uphold the point of order. The honourable member had been speaking for only 60 seconds or so and I was waiting to see whether the member for Napier was developing some relevance to the

Bill. I have not yet seen it, so I ask the member for Napier to bring some relevance to the Bill.

The Hon. T.H. HEMMINGS: I take your observation very seriously, Sir. In effect, I was attempting to look at the five key speakers who have laid the groundwork for the Liberal Party's opposition to the Bill, and I am trying to provide the House with a short scenario of their own downfalls in this parliamentary life that we all share. If I upset the member for Coles by saying that she was the most astute person on the other side, I withdraw that. However, it reinforces what I was going to say after that, namely, that the member for Coles qualifies as being the most cynical and bitter person in this House in the way that she allowed her emotions to run riot when she wanted to lay herself in front of the bulldozer to protect her Wilpena Pound.

Then the member for Hayward gave us his contribution on this Bill. He is the only person I have ever known in this Parliament who has never been known by the constituency that he represents, by his surname or by his Christian name. He is commonly known on both sides of the Parliament as 'Ankles', because he sucks up to whoever is holding the top job on the other side.

Well, they are the members who have spoken. Let us have a look at the so-called key final part of the member for Hayward's contribution to this House—the difference between a proactive and a reactive Government. He gave us examples of third world countries. Of course, they can be proactive; of course they can encourage capitalist economies to come in because they are paying slave wages to the workers in those areas; and of course they can undercut the more developed countries. They import the skills and the technology, and then they use their workers at low, ridiculous wages to compete on the market. That is termed 'proactive' by the member for Hayward.

Let us look at some of the reactive attitudes of the Opposition. Let us look at the time that you, Sir, and I have been in this Parliament. Let us look at some of those innovative and imaginative projects that have been put to the people of this State by this Government for support and encouragement—and they have got it willingly from this side. Then we have had the whingeing, carping reaction from members opposite. The person who was in control on the side of the Chamber whilst most of this was going on was the member for Kavel—the glorious Senator, the one who was known as Tombstone, because he knocked everything that was ever put up in this Parliament. Let me remind the member for Kavel that we had the ASER project. He paid lip service to it, but he fought it all the way. The Casino—

The Hon. D. C. Wotton interjecting:

The Hon. T.H. HEMMINGS: Maybe the member for Heysen finds that my accent is a little bit funny, but at least I do tell the truth and every hair on my head is mine. The Liberal Party opposed the Casino all the way down the line. The submarine contract was opposed. Members opposite attempted to come in afterwards and say that they did not mind it. They opposed the Grand Prix. There were all the marinas that were to be erected along the coast. It was not the Liberal Party as a whole: it sent out little groups to organise against the marinas. The Mount Lofty development—

The Hon. D.C. Wotton: Where is it?

The Hon. T.H. HEMMINGS: The member for Heysen led the charge against the Mount Lofty development. Even the Mount Lofty management plan was attacked. He is a traitor to the constituency he represents. The member for Heysen attacked the Mount Lofty management plan, right in the heart of the Mount Lofty Ranges, every inch of the way. Luckily, a few people on his side of politics were members of the Environment, Resources and Development Committee and at least had a better understanding of the heritage of this State.

The Hon. D.C. WOTTON: On a point of order, Mr Speaker, I ask the member for Napier to withdraw the statement that he has just made that I was a traitor to my constituents, which I believe to be very serious. I ask that the honourable member be asked to withdraw and apologise.

The SPEAKER: I can ask the honourable member to withdraw.

The Hon. T.H. HEMMINGS: I will gladly withdraw, but the *Hansard* record remains there for all to see and can never be changed. I will withdraw the word 'traitor'.

The SPEAKER: The member for Napier has withdrawn?

The Hon. T.H. HEMMINGS: Unreservedly, Sir. I was going on to a point that was made by my colleague the member for Henley Beach in, as I said, his hard hitting contribution. Jubilee Point would have rejuvenated that part of the coastline, but it was attacked time and again even by the local member who, I am glad to say, would have been known by some of his constituents as someone who turned his back on his own area.

Then, finally, Wilpena. It turned out to be the undoing, ultimately, of the member for Victoria when eventually, along with the member for Eyre, he forced the Liberal Party room to support Wilpena, which resulted in his being deposed as leader at some later date and in the member for Coles packing up her knitting and ultimately saying that she would resign from this Parliament. So, there is your reactive Opposition, Sir. What happens when this Bill comes before it? We have had members opposite whinge and carp about no development, about restraints on developers put on not only by this Government but by the regulations, the bureaucracies and everything else that is there, and it has been freely admitted by my colleague that there are too many restraints in certain areas. So, what did this Government do?

As a result of the A.D.Little report we had this Bill. But, prior to that, we had the Planning Review. Every developer, local government and most organisations who have anything to do with development in this State, with the exception of the Liberal Party, applauded the Planning Review. We all know that any other Bills that come in as a result of that Planning Review and the A.D.Little report, of which this is the key part, the Opposition will fight every inch of the way. Of course, they say 'We support this Bill', but members should listen to the speeches. Listen when we go into Committee.

Let me give members an example. The key spokesperson, the member for Kavel, who is supposed to have said that he supports the Bill, was the subject of a

very good article in the City Messenger, which actually sums up not only the member for Kavel's attitude to the Economic Development Bill but the attitude of his colleagues in relation to the world in general. In the column entitled 'Politics' under the byline of Alex Kennedy, with the headline—'Hanging, caning: Liberals suffering heatstroke'—

Mr BRINDAL: On a point of order, I do not see the relevance of hanging, caning and heatstroke, nor of the article, to the Bill before the House.

The SPEAKER: The member for Napier has indicated to the Chair that part of that article indicates an attitude to economic development. I believe that he is building that argument. If he does not refer to economic development in his reference, I will censure him.

The Hon. T.H. HEMMINGS: I know you will, Sir, because I have known you so long. It just shows you how toey the member for Hayward and some members opposite are. They think that because the headline is 'Hanging and caning' I am going to give a lecture about the attitude of the Liberal Party to hanging, caning, decapitating and castrating. I am not going to talk about that at all. What I am going to talk about is the final paragraph, which sums up the member for Kavel's attitude to the Economic Development Bill, and the attitude of the rest of his colleagues, ankles included, to the world in general. In the final part it says:

Apart from announcing caning, Dean Brown's mini broad policy announcement last Wednesday was from a dose of worn 'heard it all before' cliches. It's time for substance or it's time to shut up. There is, for example, little point in John Olsen putting out a constant stream of press releases berating the Government over the delay in announcing the promised Economic Development Board—

and that is where I get to the Bill, Sir, you will notice—

when his own Party are avoiding promised policy releases like the plague. Maybe capital punishment and caning have been too time consuming to get down to real work.

That sums it up, Sir. The member for Kavel knew, as a result of the Premier's introducing the Economic Development Bill, that the board was in the process of being appointed and that the Chief Executive Officer was in the process of being selected. The member for Kavel fled from the ivory towers of Canberra to come back to our warm environment here, although he failed to get the leadership when he came back, but that is past history; maybe I could give the member for Kavel some lessons on how to project himself better so that ultimately he may get the leadership of the Liberal Party.

But even the member for Kavel and his foolish friends should know that, if this Government and this Parliament are going to place so much importance on what this Bill, this board and this authority will achieve for the people of this State, you just do not go around and pick willy-nilly six or seven of your mates and give them a job. That may be the way the Liberal Party operates but it is not the way this Government operates, and so the Economic Development Board, when it is announced—

Mr Olsen: It has been, six or seven hours ago.

The Hon. T.H. HEMMINGS: I knew it had been announced but I was not quite sure whether you lot knew. Members will notice from the representation on that board and the Chief Executive Officer that it is literally the cream of the private sector and the cream of

the public sector, and those people, with all the skills that they possess, will be able to give some guidance to this Government and to the people of South Australia. But no, because the Government, quite correctly, goes down this path of head-hunting the best people possible we have the member for Kavel going through his press clippings, looking at those old TV ads. Do you remember, Sir, when he appeared in the cemetery with all those tombstones, talking about woe betide this State? He went back to those and he kept on putting out his press releases criticising this Government.

Mr Ferguson interjecting:

The Hon. T.H. HEMMINGS: My colleague reminds me—no ifs, no buts: this is what you are going to get. Well, he got it; he really got it. He got it in the neck and lfed to Canberra, but really that is beside the point. That is what this board is all about. It is about giving industry new direction.

I will just finish with one short statement which might surprise some of my colleagues on the other side. I do not believe in the Liberal Party *laissez-faire* type of economy where government gets out the way and lets industry get in there and make its quid, make its profit regardless of how the people work for it, as long as the sole motive is the profit motive. But I am beginning to get a little concerned that those so-called promoters of *laissez-faire* capitalism are leaning less and less on their industrial mates—those out there in the private sector. They are saying the Government should provide jobs; and they are not only saying it here in South Australia, they are saying it nationally.

Because the private sector no longer wishes, for reasons known only to itself, to invest in South Australia, or invest in Australia, then it is up to the Government to provide those jobs by way of tax reimbursement or whatever kind of lurks that the private sector can extract out of Government. This Economic Development Bill does not promote that philosophy; it promotes the private sector, local government, State Government and everyone, including the trade unions, getting together, working in harmony to achieve a better life-style for those people whom we represent and the children of those people whom we represent. But you mark my words: apart from all the lip service that we have heard so far this afternoon, about how they support this Economic Development Bill, over this weekend you just look and see whether you can find one pro-active or positive comment that comes from the other side.

I very much doubt whether you will find one. In fact, I am saying, 'Go to the cricket; don't bother to read the *Hansard*, because you will not find one. All you will find is a diatribe attacking the trade union movement and the taxation system.' That brings me to the report entitled 'The South Australian Business Climate Study' published by KPMG Peat Marwick. I have yet to hear anyone on the other side quote from that report because it shoots down in flames all their philosophy and all their press releases about this Government's record.

I will read the first conclusion. My colleague read it many times, and it needs to be read out many times to sink in to those people opposite. The report states:

Nevertheless, in terms of State Government imposts at least, South Australia is a low tax State. The perception and the reality do not gel however. Payroll tax is seen as particularly

pernicious, yet only Queensland charges lower rates than South Australia. The payroll tax burden is also somewhat lower in South Australia because of the State's lower average wage rates. If State taxes and charges are a major business concern, this is more a reflection of the business climate than what caused it. Entrepreneurial endeavour will not be impeded by minor difference in payroll thresholds or in—

The SPEAKER: Order! The honourable member's time has expired. The member for Napier will resume his seat. He will not get up in direct opposition to the Chair.

Mr BECKER (Hanson): I suppose we can be thankful that we live in a democracy, because I often wonder what this country did to deserve an import such as the member for Napier. I think he is performing this evening in the wrong Chamber; he should be next door at the Festival Theatre. His contribution will be considered as irrelevant. This legislation is necessary because of the bungling of the economy and of the future plans and preparations for this State. About 50 years ago, we had men of the calibre of Sir Richard Butler, who planned and prepared methodically the industrialisation of South Australia. We had men with the wisdom of Sir Thomas Playford who followed to ensure that that plan was carried out. South Australia was developed and put on a plane that was equal to anywhere in Australia let alone the South Pacific region and the rest of the world.

Following the Second World War, displaced migrants from Europe came to this country. These tradesmen and women brought to our country not only culture but trade skills through our Engineering and Water Supply Department, the railways and other Government functions and private industry. They were the top tool makers, fitters and turners in the world and they brought with them some brilliant skills, but we have lost those skills. We have lost the ability of those men to follow through and for other apprentices to follow on because of the poor Governments that followed that era, because the Governments of the day, such as the Dunstan Government, concentrated on social justice and not on providing and mixing the other most important component, the engineering skills of this State.

So, we have lost the plot and we have to try to get back the plot. Arthur D. Little wised up the Government and the people of South Australia to what was needed. Following that report, we now have this measure which simply sums up the aims and the objects of the legislation, which are—and I will repeat them—to promote internationally focused, competitive, market-driven and sustainable economic development in the State; to promote a productive partnership or collaboration between public and private enterprise in the State; to encourage and facilitate investment, and industrial and commercial development, in the State; to contribute to public understanding of the issues affecting the economic development of the State; and to establish the Economic Development Board as the State's primary agency for determining, coordinating and implementing economic development strategies for the State.

That reads well and looks good, but when we go back over the past few years and have a look at the track record of Labor Governments and see what they did and tried to do, when you get a partnership between private

enterprise and Government and Government interference in the planning of the development of the State, we see some of the costly mistakes that have been made. Mention has been made by the member for Napier of Jubilee Point. Jubilee Point was a sop for the construction industry, because as they were building and developing the Remm site in Rundle Mall the construction workers were told, 'Take it easy, fellas, because when this job is finished you will go down to Jubilee Point and you will have many years work down there.'

It never happened, because it was poorly planned and poorly organised and it would have raped the most important beach and waterway of the State, let alone what it would have done to the local residential environment. So, it was a failure from day one, but the developer lost \$2 million. Whilst one could feel sorry for the developer, when we look at the subsequent contracts he has been awarded by the Government we see that he did not take long to pick up the \$2 million. That same developer is the one who runs the Grand Prix. The Grand Prix is not staged by the Grand Prix Board; it is staged by a private company. We have not been told that before. The contract is worth between \$350 000 and \$500 000 a year.

There are 28 full-time staff running the Australian Formula One Grand Prix, a four day event for Adelaide. Yes, it brings a lot of people to South Australia—one company alone is responsible for bringing in 500 people—and it is worth about \$40 million to \$45 million to the economy of South Australia, but when the first motor cycle grand prix was held on Philip Island a few years ago two part-time staff coordinated and ran that event. Why do we need 28 staff? It is because of Government involvement, because of the philosophy of this Government and its attitude of wanting to control everything and to milk the sacred cow and to take all the credit for the work of others, the volunteers, the CAMS officials, the officials who come from all over Australia at their own expense to act as track marshals, and the other officers and personnel involved in motor racing.

The success of that event lies with the people who are dedicated to the sport, yet they are not recognised or given any credit whatsoever. Of course, the State must create the environment or the situation for the developers to come in, for new enterprises to be established and for new ideas to get off the ground. Let us look again at Marineland in my electorate. Members opposite do not want to look at that. The Premier is here, and he knows all about it. The Bill establishes the Economic Development Board. The Premier and I know very well of his involvement with the Marineland redevelopment. It cost the State \$11 million eventually, and we got nothing. The site has been levelled and there is a fence around it. We are waiting for the West Beach Trust to spend a further \$500 000 or \$600 000 to relocate the cottages for holiday accommodation, and no doubt it will spend a bit more money and build others. What a tragedy. It would have been a top tourist attraction that would have brought at least 100 000 people into the area and supplement the accommodation at one of the finest caravan parks in Australia, with an excellent 18 hole public golf course and other sporting and recreation facilities for the people.

That is what it was all about. That was Playford's vision. The surplus land from the development of the Adelaide Airport was to be the West Beach Trust land. The Marineland park was to be a playground and recreation area for the people of the State. We had so many ideas and projects. At one stage, the Chinese developer was planning to build 600 home units on the land between Marineland and the Glenelg sewage treatment works.

But nothing got off the ground because it was poor planning, because the bureaucracy stepped in, public servants were involved, and Blind Freddy would have known that it was not possible to put more than a two storey building in that area because of the proximity to the main runway of Adelaide Airport. Yet the developers were encouraged to spend hundreds of thousands of dollars, to commit millions of dollars in fund raising for such a development. Yes, we will establish an Economic Development Board and let us appoint a group of business people to get that board off the ground and to encourage private enterprise to come in. It will not raise any money, it will be fully accountable and it will be a board consisting of between eight and thirteen members. I understand that 12 people have been appointed. Clause 3 of the legislation provides:

The board membership must include persons who have, in the Minister's opinion, appropriate expertise in economic development, international business, management and industrial relations and at least one of those persons must be a woman and at least one a man.

That is helpful; we have one of each. The point is that we see the appointment of two women on the board, yet the Hon. Anne Levy from another House has openly stated that she would prefer to see 50 per cent representation of women on all boards. So, what happened with this board? We have Robin Marrett who has now been made the Chairman. He is the General Manager and Chief Executive of the Electricity Trust of South Australia. We have Don Williams, who is involved with the Submarine Corporation; Brian Croser, wine maker and Chief Executive of Petaluma Limited; John Goodman, Chief Executive of Baulderstone Hornbrook; Brian Martin, Joint Secretary of the Adelaide Branch of the Federation of Industrial Manufacturing and Engineering Employees, that is the union representative; Peter Crowfoot, Corporate Affairs Manager, Kimberly-Clark; Ian Duncan, Western Mining Corporation; Ms Lee Watt, Chief Executive of the South Australian Division of Sedgwick Limited; Peter Rehn, General Manager and Chief Executive Officer of Computer Sciences of Australia; Ms Kaye Schofield, Chief Executive Officer of the South Australian Department of Employment and Technical and Further Education; Dr Peter Crawford, Chief Executive of the Department of the Premier and Cabinet, well known for his development expertise, I can assure members; and then the *piece de resistance*, the Hon. Chris Hurford, the political appointment.

The Government cannot seem to get away from making political appointments of their old mates on the board: Chris Hurford, dear old Chris, retired Labor politician, worn out ambassador for Australia to New York. Come on! If you want to do something beneficial for the State, for the country, get some live wires on to

these organisations, get people in there that are achievers, get people in there with a bit of get up and go and get away from the humdrum business we have here.

The Hon. Lynn Arnold interjecting:

Mr BECKER: Premier, I am glad you are here for this part of the debate because I refer to the developer who wanted to run a ferry from Glenelg to Kangaroo Island. A \$3 million project—simple, easy; develop a landing point at the Patawalonga entrance and run this ferry backwards and forwards from Glenelg. But, no, he was not allowed to do that because the bureaucracy interfered. Instead of a \$3 million project we now have an \$80 million project, which has been going on for a couple of years. We want to build houses out to sea, take up the best part of the coast. We want to build home units along the Patawalonga. We want to acquire people's properties, we want to transfer this, we want to do that, we have grandiose schemes, the Glenelg council has committed itself to \$200 000. What about the people who live in the area? What about their residential environment? We do not want such schemes and I hope it never proceeds. Let the poor bloke spend his \$3 million and run his ferry service to Kangaroo Island. We do not want these great big grandiose ideas.

We want functional projects and plans. This would do something for tourism. You are not going to build a boat marina down there in the worst coastal area. Build it further down at West Beach near the sewage treatment works where it will not interfere with anybody, and for goodness sake include in it plans to clean up the Patawalonga. It will cost \$7 million I am told, but who knows how much it is going to cost. It is a guess. But the bureaucratic bungling of that project will see it down the drain. How are we ever going to encourage developers to come in? What did we do as a Government and as a Parliament when the Adelaide Steamship Group—and the State Bank I believe was involved in it—saw SAFCOL sold off to Thailand.

Fancy letting SAFCOL, one of the most respected brand names, be sold off to overseas interests. That is where we have failed. Another company that went down the drain a few days ago was Arnotts. Arnotts Motram Menz—nobody remembers those other names. The well known, well established Menz family in South Australia, biscuit manufacturers, was taken over by Arnott and Motram and so it became Arnott Motram Menz and they dropped that and finally it became Arnotts. Now it is part of the Campbell soup company group from America.

Arnotts is a wonderful company that employs many people in the electorates of Peake and Walsh and certainly in Hanson. It is a company that has South Australian roots and is involved in South Australia, but I bet London to a brick that it will not be long before we lose that. That is what annoys me. Nobody goes to these companies or organisations to say, 'What can we do to help you? What can we do to encourage people to buy shares in your company so we can keep it in Australia?' This country has a foreign debt of \$200 billion. Absolute lunacy! When I went into the Ampol service station the other day to buy Ampol petrol, because I am proud to support and buy Australian-made goods in preference to any imported goods, I picked up this pamphlet entitled

'AusBuy Guide No. 2'. The following should be one of the main objects of this legislation:

If every Australian averaged \$50 per week buying Australian-made products and buying from Australian owned companies—instead of spending the same amount buying imported products from foreign owned companies, then Australia would: save \$20 billion a year on foreign debt; create 500 000 new jobs; no longer have a recession.

It is fairly simple. That is the trouble, it is too easy and too simple for the economists, and it is too easy for the bureaucrats. They all get suspicious. We will have to have a committee meeting, a conference or a seminar to consider it, and by that time Australia will no longer exist. The pamphlet continues:

In the world, at least 100 foreign Governments, with their business leaders, are planning to increase their imports into Australia and to compete against Australia's exports. The international marketplace is tougher than our domestic one. If Australians do not support Australian companies, no-one else is going to!

Australians will be the 'serfs' of the twenty-first century, working for overlords but owning nothing!

That message is very clear because tragically we have seen what has happened to the State Bank with \$3 150 million prospective losses. We are talking about selling off the bank, the bank that the Government never owned, because the Savings Bank of South Australia was the property of the depositors of that bank, a bank that was taken over and managed by a Labor Government, and which witnessed horrendous losses, unprecedented in the history of financial institutions in Australia's history. Now we have to start talking about selling it off to try to get out of the mess. The Government has no right to sell it off. It does not belong to the Government. Talk about Ned Kelly. By God, he was an amateur when it comes down to it.

In the past three weeks I have not been sitting around twiddling my thumbs in my electoral office whilst the Premier has been away overseas, and I would like to know what the other 46 members of Parliament have been doing in that time. People have come to me complaining that one company wanted to buy all the offal that was available at SAMCOR, but SAMCOR was not interested because its selling prices were too high. Instead of dumping the stuff, the company was prepared to pay competitive prices to export it to Europe—not interested! The same company had an order from Germany for 13 tonnes of powdered milk per month. The company representative went to a South Australian company but had to wait two and a half months for a reply because the company had to do this and that. It had to see the union because it meant having to put on another 50 people to fulfil the order. He got sick and tired of waiting two and a half months and rang a representative of the New Zealand Government, and within 48 hours had secured an order of 13 tonnes per month of powdered milk to be shipped from New Zealand to Germany for the next five years. We lost that and those 50 jobs.

Another person came to see me recently wanting to set up a recycling plant. He required no financial assistance at all from the Government because he can finance the whole operation himself. He wanted X hectares of land, and I approached the Adelaide Airport, but they did not

have sufficient. I went to Australian National and we have secured land at Peterborough. Hopefully, in a few weeks, 12 people will be taken on to start up this operation, and within 12 months they will be handling about \$3 million worth of recycled tyres and plastics with employment for 200 people at Peterborough.

What wonderful news! It shows what can be done if people use their initiative and hop in and help. A former chocolate maker sold his equipment and his chocolate factory; he then took up the offer of the Federal Keating Government to re-invest in this country. Tragically, because of high interest rates, he lost his money. This gentleman had invented a chocolate making machine for households, which he is hoping to sell for about \$65. That invention has now gone to a South Australian company, which we hope will be able to manufacture it. It is a very simple machine. Cocoa and other ingredients are put in at one end, a little tap is turned on and out comes the chocolate.

That is another couple of jobs created but, no matter how many jobs we create, we are losing jobs at the rate of about 150 a week. Let us all get together and do something to stop it. If this development authority will do it, it has my total support, and I hope it does. We should be encouraging ideas, inventions and developments to create employment for those who rightly deserve it and to give some future to the young people of South Australia. Let us stop the talking and let us become active and do something for the future generations of this State instead of listening to the blessed waffling nonsense that we heard from the member for Napier.

Dr ARMITAGE (Adelaide): I commend the present member for Hanson, the future member for Peake, for his statements. It is, indeed, the future of young South Australians which is at greatest risk at the moment given the unfortunate economic circumstance in which South Australia now finds itself, and I am sure that is the reason why members on this side of the House wish to see South Australia's economy taking a very much needed upward spiral. That such a Bill must be contemplated is nothing more or nothing less than an indictment of 25 years of Labor Party rule in the past 28 years, because economic decisions relating to taxes and charges and disincentives to business have caused South Australia's economy to be in such a poor state at the moment. We all know of the disastrous unemployment levels around Australia, and there is the potential for one million unemployed Australians.

Mr Becker: That is disgraceful!

Dr ARMITAGE: What a disgrace for this Government and for a Federal Government going to an election in the next 32 days that one million people will be unemployed. I graduated from university in the dying days of the Whitlam experiment, which cost Australia so greatly. I recall speaking to people in New Zealand and being absolutely appalled at that stage that Australia had 8 per cent unemployment. Oh to have 8 per cent unemployment now, rather than the 12 per cent in South Australia and the greater than 40 per cent youth unemployment. It is no wonder that economic confidence in South Australia is at rock bottom because of Government decisions.

The only reason why businesses do not do well, given that they have made the correct decision to start in the first place, is that they are prevented from doing so by disincentives. If a business is well managed and well run, it has every chance of making a profit, unless there are specific disincentives. Being the member for the District of Adelaide, which takes in much of the central business district, I am interested to note so many recent complaints about land tax. There were much vaunted promises from the Government last year or the year before that land tax would not be increased. I have had a rash of people writing to me complaining of huge increases in their land tax bills. The Government says one thing and on the other hand means something completely different. It is imposing these disincentives on businesses which are already on their knees.

The on-costs, so-called, of employment in South Australia are part of the reason why our economy is so bad. I was speaking with a large employer in South Australia who not long ago had 600 employees but who over the past couple of years has gone down to 400 employees. He was telling me that he will never go back to 600 employees, because he has found that, with two-thirds of the work force, he faces only two-thirds of the WorkCover component, the superannuation guarantee, holiday leave loading and union problems. In fact, he has found he quite enjoys it. He said that his income was down but that he would never go back to employing 600 people because of the disincentives of this Government. It is not a failing of anyone else other than the people sitting on the Treasury benches who have directly caused South Australia's appalling financial plight.

Mr S.G. Evans: They hate individual success.

Dr ARMITAGE: As the Opposition Whip says, members opposite hate individual success. It is my view, and I know it is the view of members on this side of the House, that if an individual is successful he or she stimulates the members of his or her family to try harder and to be successful as well, and the minute families are doing well the whole of society is doing well. The way to get society performing well is to encourage individual success, and that is the difference between the philosophical base on this side of the House which would see encouragement of individuals to get out and have a go, to make businesses work and to employ people, and that of members opposite. That is our philosophical base, with the equalisation at the lowest common denominator level on the other side.

The reason why we need to have a Bill for an Act to promote the economic development of this State is the Government's mismanagement—mismanagement which was aptly identified by no less a figure than the present Prime Minister (and I emphasise the present Prime Minister). He indicated that one of the major causes of the problems affecting South Australia was our narrow economic base, and he said, 'It has been a problem bedevilling South Australia for the past two decades.'

As I said before, as the Labor Party has been in office for all but three of the past 20 years and 25 of the past 28 years, the Prime Minister's criticism hits home dramatically. The Prime Minister went on to say that Australian employment since 1978 had risen by 28 per cent, but in South Australia the rise was only just over

half that at 15 per cent. In Queensland there had been a 53 per cent rise in employment and Western Australia had had a 44 per cent increase. Something is going wrong in South Australia, and what is wrong is sitting on the other side of this House, because the Government fails to grasp the nettle that encouraging success and business is what this State needs. The State Government over the past 20 years has brought in a regime of taxes and charges and as a result South Australia has the highest rate of bank charges, State petrol tax, workers compensation premiums and water costs and the second highest electricity tariffs. Our CPI between the December quarters of 1991 and 1992 rose by 1.7 per cent—almost six times the average rate for all the capitals.

Is it any wonder that business people say to me, 'I was in Queensland recently looking for where I could move my business and there were more South Australians there than there were Queenslanders'? Is it any wonder that our business base is flying to Queensland as quickly as it can when this Government continually puts disincentives in front of people who want to do well?

As I said previously, the prospect of an Economic Development Act is an indictment of the Government that has brought about a long-term unemployment situation where 19 500 South Australians have been out of work for between one and two years and 18 500 have been out of work for more than two years. Of course, every member in the House knows that when people have been out of work for protracted periods of time it becomes endemic. In my role as a school health doctor I have spoken to youths of today and I have asked them as a point of interest what they intend to do when they leave school. It is a golden period for them; they are in the equivalent of intermediate, leaving and leaving honours, or years 10, 11 and 12 as they are now. It is a golden period, with their lives in front of them in the lucky country of Australia, and their response in many of the high schools is, 'Well, I'm going to work for the Government.' 'Work for the Government' is not working for the Government: it is a euphemism for going onto the dole. That is the horizon for large numbers of South Australia's youth. What an indictment of the social circumstances, compounded by the fact that we need to have this Bill.

I contend that it is not the role of an economic development board to fix the State's woes; that is why a Government is elected, and it is why the Government ought to be taking appropriate action. Clearly, it does not do so, because it sits paralysed with fear every time it looks at an opinion poll. Of course, this has led to a net debt in South Australia of about \$8.25 billion, as identified by the present, but soon to be former, Prime Minister, Mr Keating. Mr Keating claims that he is the person who pulls the levers; at one stage clearly he has been the world's greatest Treasurer, and I am sure that every unemployed person in Australia would have a wry chuckle at the thought of that.

The Hon. H. Allison: He is the Treasurer we had to have.

Dr ARMITAGE: He is the Treasurer we had to have, as the member for Mount Gambier says, and, unfortunately, he gave us the news that we had to have, namely, that South Australia is now in debt to the tune of \$8.25 billion, and that debt rises by \$6 million a day.

Looking at the Bill itself, I see the objects thereof, and I draw members' attention to clause 3(a), which states that an object of the legislation is to promote internationally focused development in this State. As short a time ago as lunchtime yesterday I was speaking with a leader in South Australian industry who told me a tale of woe about his attempts to get State Government assistance to help him with export. There was absolutely none, because the people within the Public Service, led by this Government and by the Ministers, had absolutely no inkling of what was required. It is a joke that the Economic Development Board or this Act will be to promote internationally focused development. It will not occur until we change our mind set at present.

Clause 3(b) states that the legislation will promote a productive partnership or collaboration between public and private enterprise. I can suggest one perfect collaboration between public and private enterprise in this State which the Government may choose to take up, and that would be a collaboration between the public and private health systems.

We all know, as Mr Lloyd O'Neil, the retiring member of the Federal Parliament, said, that it is a tragedy that people cannot get into private health insurance. Where are the tax incentives? Let this Government help the private sector to have more private health insurance to sustain a private sector in health care, which will employ more people and help the hundreds of thousands of people around Australia, and in South Australia in particular, who are at present in pain and suffering.

Clause 3(c) refers to encouraging and facilitating investment. What a joke, coming from a Government that has encouraged investment by making financial institutions duty so horrific that people from this State are doing their banking in another State. Rather than pay the taxes and charges of this paralysed and morally bankrupt Government, they go to another State to do their banking. What does the Deputy Premier and Treasurer say about this? He says, 'Quick, get out the guns; let's shoot the messenger.' The Deputy Premier did not say, 'What can we do about this to address the issues? If people are going interstate to do their banking, if businesses are failing here and moving interstate, let us make conditions conducive for them to stay; let us make the system such that they want to keep their banking in South Australia.' No, Sir. The Deputy Premier and Treasurer said, 'I think we should contemplate legislation to make it illegal to do it.' What a crass answer. The solution is to address the problems, listen to the message, and not shoot the messenger.

Clause 3(d) provides:

The objects of this Act are...to contribute to public understanding of the issues affecting the economic development of the State.

Again, what a joke! The public understands only too well the issues affecting the economic development of this State. The public knows only too well that for 25 out of the past 28 years we have had a Government that has been intent on its own survival rather than the betterment of the State. The public understands only too well that with 12 per cent unemployment, and 42 per cent youth unemployment, it is time to do something about the cause. The public listens to the message. The public

understands only too well that the issue affecting the economic development of this State is sitting opposite on the Government benches. The public understands only too well that the way to make this State develop properly in its economic scenario is to change the Government and to bring in a Government that is keen on incentives for business and for employment.

The opinion polls just before Christmas were 53 per cent for the Liberal and National Parties and 37 per cent for the Government. There has been a minor improvement for the Government for a short period, but everybody in South Australia knows only too well that Superman has gone stale and it will not be long before the polls once again reflect what we were saying before.

Clause 3(e) indicates that as part of the legislation the Economic Development Board will be established 'as the State's primary agency for determining...economic development strategies for the State'. That is the Government's job. It is not the job of an Economic Development Board, a strategy board or any board to be the State's primary agency for determining economic development strategies for the State. That is why we have Governments. It is the Government's job to be the powerhouse of the State, it is the Government's job to encourage enterprise and it is the Government's job to be the primary determinant of economic development strategies for the State. But of course the reason that this Government wishes to defer its own responsibility to be the primary agency for the development of economic policies of the State is that it does not have any ideas.

Clause 16 (a) provides for the preparation of a plan for growth and sustainable development of the State economy. What has the Government been doing for the past decade and for at least 25 of the past 28 years? The board is going to prepare a plan for growth and sustainable development of the State economy. That is why people sitting on the front bench on the right hand of the Speaker get paid more money than the people on this side of the House. That is their job. That is what Governments are all about. They are just flick passing the responsibility. South Australia's confidence is way down. It is no wonder, because this Government has made a series of manoeuvres which one could almost suggest were designed primarily to stifle business. One wonders, given the philosophical base of equalising at the lowest common denominator, whether that is not why we have to go to all this trouble of substituting an Economic Development Board to do the job that is the responsibility of any proper self-respecting Government.

Mr OSWALD (Morphett): After reading the Bill and its objectives, I believe that clause 3(e) is a most extraordinary clause. It sets up the Economic Development Board as a type of *de facto* Cabinet, a group of experts put together to bring the State out of its malaise. It is an admission of failure on the part of the Government because it has wasted the past 10 years as it has tried to address itself to the management of the State. Ten years of utter waste; ten years of enormous expense in running Government; and 10 years at the end of which we have a financial debacle never seen before in this State, and a financial debacle that will cost us for many years to come unless the Commonwealth comes to our assistance. The State needs the Economic Development

Board because the State Government has demonstrated that it no longer has the initiative, the ideas, the credibility, the integrity or the management skills to generate what is needed to put South Australia back on the road to recovery.

The 13 members of Cabinet have clearly run out of ideas. The Arthur D. Little report that all honourable members were given a copy of recently established this without any shadow of doubt whatsoever. It is not really surprising to see in the objectives of the Bill that we now have this new *de facto* Cabinet of experts set up to establish a new Economic Development Board as the primary agency for implementing economic development strategies for the State. In other words, it will be working on the economic strategies of the State. It is also charged with preparing a plan, or a series of plans, for the growth and sustainable development of the State economy. Once again, that is the role of Cabinet. I believe we would never see such abrogation of duty in any other State Parliament or the Commonwealth Parliament.

I do not believe we would see such a situation anywhere else, where a State Government has failed after 10 years and refused to go to the people at the polls because it knows what its fate will be and instead comes forward with an Economic Development Board to take over the running of Government. A total admission of failure. I have every confidence that this State can be turned around, but it will not be done by this Arnold Government. The Government could forget just for a while its trade union bias and have more faith in small and medium businesses in this State and give them the wherewithal to bring about a recovery. Then indeed we would see a recovery commence. The recovery would come in many ways, but first we must regenerate business confidence in this State. We must be able to send signals across the border to other States that this State is the preferred State for business investment in Australia. If we cannot do that we will continue to fail. We must have the lowest State taxes and charges.

It must be cheaper here for business than it is in other States. We must clean up our act as regards our policies with respect to the environment and our social equity issues which people get hung up on and in the end nothing happens; our business regulations that people get hung up on and nothing ends up happening; and the discriminatory regulations which apply in this State and which people in business and the Government sector get hung up on and in the end nothing happens. Most importantly we must have a State Government that business people believe will do nothing to disadvantage their business activity in South Australia.

We have a business community that in some respects is almost paranoid about this Government, because people never know what next they will be hit with that will affect their profitability. Whilst we have businesses that believe that and talk to their counterparts and business colleagues across the border, we will not have businesses coming to this State and setting up their branch and head offices here in South Australia. Up until now the Government has been a disaster in presenting a favourable image of South Australia overseas and interstate. For too long it has talked about overhauling our taxes and charges while at the same time increasing

them. It talks about changes to the bureaucracy and changes to red tape at Federal, State and local government level, and the fast tracking of opportunities, but then it does nothing about them. It has been a Government of talk, but of very little action.

The rescue of small business in this State is vital to its recovery. The rescue of small business must become the prime objective of this new Economic Development Board, the new *de facto* Cabinet of this State. Business needs greater access to capital, greater tax incentives and greater confidence in the Government. Business has been slaughtered by the Keating Government and also by the Bannon and now Arnold State Government. Anyone at all who reads the press and who keeps his or her eyes open in this State can see that the recession-hit small businesses have become a casualty of an economic slump forced upon us by Labor policy.

There is no good getting away from it, whether or not it is an election month. The fact is that the recession-hit businesses are in this situation because they have been forced into it by a deliberate act of a Federal Government and of a Federal Treasurer who now struts the Australian stage wanting to be elected as the Prime Minister for the first time in his own right, bearing in mind that the last time he got there because he managed to kneecap the previous Prime Minister, who was removed as a casualty.

Small business needs tax breaks, which is a subject that is not dear to the heart of members opposite. Think about tax breaks and they nearly go into a conniption. But if you do not give business tax breaks, then small business will not survive. Indeed, it is healthy to think in terms of giving small business a tax break, and then the Government will be able to provide those breaks and, indeed, to look back with some pleasure and see a recovery in the business sector. The scrapping of taxes is vital.

While on the subject of taxes, let us look at some of the taxes that affect the ability of business to succeed and to employ. In case the Government has not realised it, tax is the main disincentive for business to employ. With tax levels as they are, it is very difficult to package South Australia as a competitive State and a place to which we want investors to move. We are finding it very hard to entice current investors here in South Australia to reinvest. If you cannot get businesses in your own State to reinvest, then it becomes even harder to bring businesses across the border and ask them to invest here for the first time.

But to achieve those objectives, we have to start being very practical in our attitudes of management of Government. The first matter is the abolition of the FID and BAD taxes or a dramatic reduction with a view to their abolition in future. If we can do that, business would be in a better position to employ. Also, we need a reduction in the penalty on business of land tax, and the same applies to creating the ability for business to re-employ. If you abolish payroll tax, the same applies. Bring workers compensation costs under control and the same applies: more jobs at the end of the day.

The Economic Development Board must also address itself to the costs of running government. I see in its terms of reference, as *de facto* Cabinet, it will be given the opportunity of putting up ideas and plans to the

Government and I trust for the first time in 10 years the Government will listen. It obviously listened to the Arthur D. Little report. Here is an opportunity to listen to another group of men and women who will be making up this board so that when those ideas are put forward on the cost of running government I hope that the Government has the sense, for the benefit of the State, to listen to what the board says.

The cost of running government is a major issue. If business is expected to cut its cloth—and we all expect business to cut its cloth in the recession—then Government should be doing it even sooner because it must be remembered that government does not generate any revenue for this State. It is business out there, small and medium size businesses, that generate the revenue. Government only spends the revenue which is earned and attracted to this State by business, and governments, as I say, spend it, while the small and medium size businesses earn it. Therefore, business is justified in demanding that we see a drop in the recurrent government expenditure and contracting out of government services so that the size of government is reduced and indeed shifted over to the private sector, the wealth-generating sector. I hope that the new Economic Development Board can convince this Government that a cut in recurrent spending will enable more financial injections of capital into other parts of government that will help create long-term jobs.

We know this State is in a state of bankruptcy. We know it because the Prime Minister told us last week we are in a state of bankruptcy. He told us at a time when it was opportune for him to tip a bucket over the South Australian Government to save his own political skin. He told us because he realises that he could lose three to five Federal seats, but because of his fear over these three to five Federal seats we are about to see a massive injection of capital back into this State. I welcome that massive injection of capital back into the State because without it we were heading to a most extraordinary constitutional crisis where we, through our own resources, would not have the ability to pay our public servants by the end of this year and not have the ability to get ourselves out of debt in the long term—because we probably do not have the assets to sell off to generate the size of the debt.

The Prime Minister tipped a bucket over his own Party in this State to save his neck. He also made the extraordinary announcement of the additional \$1 billion that we are in debt, something our own Premier will not admit to. That admission was brought about because of the five marginal seats in this State: in the seat of Makin Labor has a margin of 3 per cent; the Liberal Party will win the seat of Adelaide with a swing of only 1.7 per cent; the margin in Hindmarsh is 1.2 per cent; in Grey it is 2.2 per cent; and in Kingston it is 4.9 per cent. It is no wonder that we have seen a sudden resurgence of interest by the Federal Government in South Australia, but it is a great shame that that resurgence of interest in trying to do something for business and to create wealth and the State back on its feet had to remain obscured until we had a Federal election on our hands. Only then because of the Prime Minister trying to save his own political back have we seen this possibility—and it is only a possibility—of money coming into the State because it was only promised on the basis: you elect a

Keating Government and we will consider a cash flow back into the State.

That is a very good statesmanlike way of running a country but one we have become used to from this Government. I wonder how much support we would have received if the fate of the Keating Government was not going to be decided on the last 1 or 2 per cent vote in South Australia. Under Federal and State Labor, South Australia has continued, whether we like it or not, to bear the rustbelt tag. Every economic indicator that has come out for the past 12 months and continues to come out points to it. Victoria and Tasmania also share the unfortunate problem of South Australia in having to bear that tag as well.

Every other State has enjoyed some sort of growth in the availability of jobs, but the Arnold Government has failed to achieve that. On that basis alone I must support the creation of the Economic Development Board so that at least over the next 12 months, until the Brown Liberal Government takes control of the Treasury benches, we will have a group of men and women who have some knowledge and expertise in running business and who will be there advising as a *de facto* Government to at least get some ideas into Cabinet.

Mrs Hutchison interjecting:

Mr OSWALD: The member from Port Augusta will have her chance shortly and I will be interested to hear what she has to say about the need for economic development in this State because, if ever there were cities and regions in need of support (and I will refer to them shortly) from the Government, it is those major cities in the north that are not doing well at all under the Labor socialist Government.

The future development of this State is all about investor confidence. My opening comments related to investor confidence and I will come back to close my remarks in respect of investor confidence—confidence in our Government, confidence in knowing that our investments are safe if people decide to invest in this. State and confidence in knowing that people will receive a reasonable return on their money. For a business person, it is not unreasonable when investing in this State to have those expectations but, until now, the Government has had a philosophical hang-up, perhaps through its trade union background, that if anyone comes in and invests, they should not expect a reasonable return on their money or, if they do, the Government steps in and asks for its share straight away.

It is for that reason that we have continued to decline as an economic strength in Australia. Indeed, the whole country has continued to decline as an economic strength in the south-east region of the Pacific. We have to get around this problem, whether we are trade unionists or whether we come from a business background. If we do not create investor confidence, people will not invest. If they do not invest, our standard of living drops and our ability to employ young people coming on and give them hope in this world declines at a rapid rate.

Other than the Grand Prix and the submarines nothing has happened of any great note in this State for the past 10 years. Remember Marineland? We all remember the Marineland debacle and projects such as Westcliff, Mount Lofty, Wilpena, Jubilee Point, the East End Market—I can keep on going—and various marinas

around the coast, including the Glenelg project, a project dear to my heart that is yet to get the finance to go ahead. That is by no means a certainty. We had the Remm development losses, and the Cape Borda project which was of some note just before Christmas is yet to get off the ground. One cannot ignore the cessation of activities in regional centres. I referred to them briefly a moment ago with my reference to the member for Stuart.

One bright light on the horizon is the new Kimberly-Clark mill at Millicent, and I applaud them for it. However, that was the only bright light last year in the district of the member of Victoria. That new pulp paper plant will be of great benefit to the people of the South-East.

Under Labor at least four of South Australia's regional centres are sitting ducks and could suffer the same fate as Broken Hill if we are not careful. They are not at that point yet, but we have to bear in mind that each of those cities relies on one major industry and, if that industry takes a dip because of the economic situation now applying, then those regions will suffer. In 10 years this Government has done nothing that I have observed to bring about any sort of regional growth in those areas. Those cities have a fairly large population. They are not extremely large cities but large enough to be greatly concerned that we have not seen decentralisation into those cities. We have seen no regional growth in those cities over the past 10 years.

This month at Port Pirie we have been warned that 500 positions could be cut from PASMINGO. The impact at Broken Hill sadly will flow into Port Pirie and there is the possibility of an employment decline in that region. Whyalla and Port Pirie are both involved in smelting. Millicent has its paper pulp and such industries can be affected by poor economic performance in the State, in the Commonwealth and outside in our markets.

I conclude by referring to the Bill, which sets up the Economic Development Board. It sets up the board as the State's primary agency for determining, coordinating and implementing economic development strategies for the State. As I said in my speech, it sets up a board to be a *de facto* Cabinet; to take the place of a Cabinet that has failed this State; to take the place of a Cabinet that has run out of ideas and initiatives and to provide that Cabinet with those ideas and initiatives. The Government, through this legislation, will set up a board to prepare a plan for the resurrection of the economy of the State, when in actual fact we have 13 Ministers with an army of public servants waiting on instructions from the Cabinet; an army of public servants who are totally demoralised at the moment because they are in a state of flux, running departments when they are still not sure of what the organisation of the department is and yet they are meant to perform. They will perform as well as the Cabinet directs them. This Cabinet has failed to direct them. The State is in its present economic state because this Government has failed and it should call an election.

Mr D.S. BAKER (Victoria): I want to carry on from some of the remarks made by the member for Morphett. It is fit and proper that we all support the Economic Development Board as it is vital for South Australia's future. In fact, with the calibre of the people on it, especially the Chief Executive Officer, there is a

tremendous chance that something could happen in South Australia. Of course, the sad part is that it took Arthur D. Little, in the past 18 months, to say what was going wrong in South Australia. A similar report, which was carried out in South Australia in 1983, pointed to the very problems that we have at the moment, that is, a bloated bureaucracy, lack of management, lack of incentive for business and a declining business base in South Australia. All of those things were pointed out 10 years ago and nothing happened; no-one made any decisions.

Mr Olsen: They sacked the council.

Mr D.S. BAKER: As the member for Kavel says, when they came to Government in 1983 they sacked the council. Since that time it has not been seen as necessary to have an Economic Development Board because the Government, in its wisdom and with the magnificent Cabinet and the intellect of the Cabinet, it could do it all! These people opposite, who were elected to Government in South Australia with only 47 per cent of the vote, could do it all. You only have to look back over those 10 years to see what could have happened. Imagine the potential for South Australia if we had had an Economic Development Board and if we had had people of the calibre that are on the board at present working for South Australia. Of course, one has only to look at the Bill to realise that nothing would have happened because, as clause 7 provides:

The board is subject to control and direction by the Minister. Therein lies the problem. South Australia has been bereft of management in the past 10 years because no-one will make a decision. I will not go over what other speakers have said on this side and the other side because I do not think that is in the best interests of South Australia. We are here debating this Bill, hoping that with some management and with some accountability that this board will get some direction and that the Government will listen to some of the recommendations. It did not listen to the recommendations of the Development Board 10 years ago when it pointed out the problems in South Australia; the problems were put under the carpet.

I am interested to note the culture of these Ministers opposite who have been part of this Government for the past 10 years because it is always to blame someone else. The former Minister of Forests, when Scrimber lost \$60 million, said, 'Well, don't blame me; middle management was the problem'. How can you have Ministers, with a lack of ability like that, blaming someone else? Look what happened with the State Bank. The State Bank finally collapsed because of lack of management, because of lack of accountability and what happened when it collapsed? 'Don't blame me, blame someone else'.

We had that culture tonight, Mr Deputy Speaker. After an interjection across the floor you, who receive a considerable salary as Deputy Speaker in this House, said, 'I'm sorry, my attention was distracted'. That is the culture of the 1980s. People are paid to do a job; they have got to do it and make the decisions.

The DEPUTY SPEAKER: Order! I hope the member for Victoria is not reflecting on the Chair. The honourable member had adequate opportunity to take a point of order at the time. That moment has now passed in accordance with Standing Orders. If he wishes to take

other action against the Deputy Speaker, he can do so by way of substantive motion. The honourable member for Victoria.

Mr D.S. BAKER: Thank you very much, Mr Deputy Speaker. That culture of no accountability and no responsibility goes right back. On many occasions the member for Napier, who was a Minister for a long time during the 1980s, stood up in this House and said what a wonderful job he was doing. He said tonight, 'We have had a bit of trouble with the bureaucracy. You could not get any developments up because the planning laws were not quite right and everything was blocked. We did have too many rules and regulations.' Whose fault is that? Who is accountable? It is the Government Ministers who managed the State. No-one else can be blamed but those people charged with the responsibility and who are handsomely paid to carry out that responsibility.

The problem in South Australia, on the most generous assumption that anyone could put, was that their attention was distracted, because they lost sight of where South Australia should be going, and they have lost sight of what should be happening in South Australia. So, it does not matter how good the board is if you do not change the mental attitude in the bureaucracy, if you do not manage it and instruct the bureaucracy that you want the planning laws fixed up. If you want a fast track development, instruct them to get it through because it is the Government and the Ministers of the day who make those decisions, not the bureaucracy and not the Economic Development Board.

That is where it concerns me, with this very good idea of the Economic Development Board. It would work very well with a competent Government and competent Ministers, but I am afraid that history will show that, unfortunately, not only has South Australia had an incompetent Government but it had some very incompetent Ministers and some other officers who were not quite up to the task. That is the problem we are facing in trying to turn South Australia around. The people on that board have tremendous experience in business and intellect, but they will very soon lose their incentive if nothing happens. In fact, I know quite well some of those people, and they will not bash their head against a brick wall if the planning laws cannot be fixed, if a Scrimber operation cannot be got up and going, if a Marineland cannot be got up and going and if the Mount Lofty development cannot be got up and going, and Ministers hide their head in the sand while the State loses \$3.5 billion as the State Bank goes into receivership and the true financial position of South Australia is hidden at each budget by cooking the books.

Those people will not work under those conditions. I do not know what their remuneration is. I hope they are adequately paid because, if there is not some incentive for them, they will do what the bureaucracy and what many members of the Government are doing—sitting around biding their time until the next election to help with their superannuation, because sure as hell they are not making any decisions that may help to turn South Australia around. They are not in any way, shape or form taking that responsibility for their positions and accepting the fact that, if you accept any higher office at all, you must perform. If you do not, not only should the people of South Australia kick you out but the Premier,

if he had any guts, would alter some of those positions and try someone else. He should look at some of the people sitting on the back bench and give them a go. They might keep their eyes on the ball, and that might keep up the attention. That is the problem we face.

Looking at the primary industry area, we see where \$1 million was spent on the McKinsey report. McKinsey has given all the answers, and all the best consultants were employed, but the Government now is not acting. The only thing it did—and this was not recommended in the report—was to set up the South Australian Research and Development Institute which will be an unmitigated disaster because no-one is there to manage it.

How can you have a bureaucracy within a bureaucracy? How can you have people working side by side under different masters? Anyone who has had any experience at all with business can say that direction can come only from the top. A business can work only if people are properly focused and managed, but it will not work with the problems that South Australia has, as shown by the McKinsey and Arthur D. Little reports, problems, of course, that are not being attended to. It was very interesting that the member for Henley Beach went on to talk about payroll tax and he questioned, as did the Premier today, the fact that only 8 per cent of people pay payroll tax in South Australia, but it still raises \$450 million. 'What about the exemptions we have granted to everyone?' he asks, but if we look at the Government enterprises and the amount of payroll tax they pay, consider the cost impost that that puts on business in South Australia.

ETSA alone pays \$12 million in payroll tax. Given the \$104 million that the Government sucks out of ETSA, what sort of a debilitating effect did that have on the former Chief Executive Officer of ETSA? How much lower could our business imposts or electricity tariffs be if we ran it better, if we did not have the impost of payroll tax or fuel tax? Just taking fuel tax, STA alone pays \$1 million in State fuel fees. That is the impost on those people who travel on buses in South Australia. The E&WS uses 3 million litres of fuel a year, and so we can think of that impost on the E&WS and the charges on the people in South Australia.

The Opposition is applauding the setting up of the Economic Development Board. It is proper that a board should be set up. But it will not be the panacea. You cannot make a silk purse out of a sow's ear. If the people involved in running it do not have the intellect, do not have the mental capacity to run their ministries or their bureaucracy which has run wild and unchecked throughout the whole 10 years of this Government, how can the Economic Development Board fix it? It can identify the projects, and I suppose it will identify them all over again. We might even have a re-run of Scrimber or the Mount Lofty development. We might even see Marineland come back because the unions may have backed off. Fancy having a major development in South Australia not built because the unions say, 'We don't want it.' What happens if the Economic Development Board says to the Minister of the day, 'Sorry we don't want that development?' Will the Minister overrule that? He may, but they would not overrule these other developments. For four years Forests Minister Klunder was told by the Opposition the financial position of that

investment. For seven years we pointed out problems in SGIC and in the State Bank, and every time no accountability, no responsibility was accepted.

The Hon. H. Allison: And no visits by the Ministers, I can assure you of that.

Mr D.S. BAKER: That's exactly right. As the member for Mount Gambier knows, he was one who was hitting very hard as well. Unless you are going to provide some incentive in the South Australian economy, and that means taking some tough decisions, unless you are going to provide a business climate in which people want to come back to South Australia and invest, members of the Economic Development Board will sit there like the Ministers and members on the Government benches today and serve out their time to get their superannuation, and that is not good enough for South Australia. Knowing the calibre of the people on the Economic Development Board, my tip is that if the board does not start getting some support and some decision making on the part of the Government, especially in the planning area, those people will soon drift off to other States or to overseas countries where there is some incentive provided for their expertise to be used in the development of South Australia.

The Hon. B.C. Eastick interjecting:

Mr D.S. BAKER. That is right: as the honourable member said, some chance of profitability. Profit seems to have been a dirty word in the 1980s, and the whole culture of Government intervention I think comes home to roost in South Australia. We have seen what has happened in the other two States, which were called the rust bucket States of Victoria and Western Australia and we have seen what a lack of accountability did in those States. So, the Opposition and I support the setting up of the Economic Development Board. Unfortunately, it is a diversion for the public of South Australia to hide the ineptitude and lack of ability and accountability of the Ministers of this Government.

Mr MATTHEW (Bright): I support this Bill, as one which has been introduced to promote economic development in our State. In doing so, I cannot help but state at the outset that it is long overdue. In itself, this Bill is almost monumental: indeed, it is monumental to the procrastination and inefficiency of this Labor Government. We have witnessed protracted delays in the establishment of the Economic Development Board. This legislation is long overdue. It has come much too long after the August 1992 Arthur D. Little report. In mentioning that report, I believe that during the course of this debate it is important to refer to some passages of that report. In doing so I turn, first, to the opening remarks in the Executive Summary of the Arthur D. Little report, for those words are indisputable. I notice very little mention, in fact no mention, of the seriousness of these words in the Premier's second reading explanation. The Executive Summary is headed, 'South Australia's economy is poorly structured and vulnerable'. It states:

South Australia for many years has enjoyed a high standard of living, an enviable lifestyle and a relaxed pace of life. Today all of those are under threat. Unemployment is running at levels which society cannot sustain without encouraging severe social difficulties. The unemployment situation could get worse. It is

time to ask whether this is simply the product of the current recession or whether there is a more fundamental cause for South Australia's difficulties.

The answer to this question is not difficult to find. The problem is not the current recession: it is much deeper and more fundamental. The receding economic tide of the recession is simply revealing the structural weaknesses just underneath the surface of the economy.

That is a fairly damning indictment of the state of our economy at present. This document was handed down by the Government in August 1992 and it has taken until February 1993 for this Government to finally start debating in this Parliament legislation to establish a board—legislation which is long overdue and legislation for which the Opposition has continually called and demanded the opportunity to debate. Indeed, Mr Speaker, there was the opportunity to extend the parliamentary sittings last year to enable this legislation to be debated at that time but, no, the holiday mood prevailed and the Government indicated its lack of ability to be able to deliver to this State the lifeline that it needs so badly.

The opening paragraphs I have read give but a small insight into the real problems. Indeed, as one moves further through the report it is interesting to note the areas in our economy which are targeted. The report in part states:

A competitive balance and outward looking economy needs to be created. The need for action to retrieve South Australia's current economic position is urgent.

I repeat: 'is urgent'. The urgency with which this Government has regarded that statement has been shown through the five month delay since the tabling of this report. The report further states:

The guide to action is a statement of a vision of what South Australia could be by the year 2000 if its skills and capabilities are properly harnessed, the business climate is improved and the State reorganises to meet the challenge. The vision of South Australia by the year 2000 is of an outward looking, competitive growth economy with a high standard of living.

The Arthur D. Little report goes on to detail some important economic building blocks which must be set in place in order to revitalise South Australia, and members should be aware that they include things like: drawing on the strengths and competencies of South Australia, those being its resource endowments and the skills of its people; drawing on the competitive and attractive elements of our existing industrial base; drawing on the research and development establishments that we have in our State, many of which were established during the time of the Tonkin Liberal Government; drawing on agriculture, minerals and energy, particularly where value can be added to those resources; and drawing on our existing physical infrastructure.

But it is absolutely pointless to draw on and utilise that base unless that base can first be stabilised, and one of the most difficult things South Australia faces at present is the fact that businesses continue to leave this State in droves. The reason they continue to leave this State in droves has been well detailed time and time again by the Liberal Opposition, because the fact remains that South Australia is uncompetitive and, until we as a State become competitive with the eastern States—with all other States in Australia, which are gradually moving to

Liberal State Governments which are experienced in the handling of business and which understand the need for a competitive economy and a competitive infrastructure—we will simply not progress. That is because South Australia has the worst investment climate in Australia.

That is not something that I stand up in this House to preach about with any sense of pride, simply being negative as an Opposition member hitting out at the Government: it is something that I stand to speak about in this House with a sense of shame that this has happened to our State under the present Government. What we presently offer businesses in this State are the highest WorkCover premiums in Australia, the highest petrol tax, the highest FID and debit tax on financial transactions and the second highest electricity tariffs. It does not matter what boards we put in place or what infrastructure we attempt to build on; if we do not redress the existing imbalances, it will be very difficult for our State to regain its economic fortune. These things are highlighted through the Arthur D. Little report, which has provided the foundation for this Bill.

On page 90 of the executive summary under the heading 'Strengthening the business climate', the Arthur D. Little report states, in part:

In the course of the study, we have met with representatives of the State's industry in a variety of forums—face-to-face interviews, the reference group, informal meetings, seminars and workshops. Throughout, there has been almost universal agreement that the underlying business climate in the State is not conducive to profitability and growth. The main specific concerns expressed are mostly to do with the shortcomings of Government, either State or Federal: there is no long term planning in the State; the Government approvals process is very slow; the Government-regulated charges are high, particularly for energy and WorkCover; there is a weak business culture, both in government and within the education system; there is a shortage of finance for investment.

Indeed, that has been reflected by just two people who have been to my electorate office so far this week (and the week is still only fairly young) to express their concerns about what is happening in their area of business in South Australia. The first of those people who spoke to me is someone who works for a company called ABB Electrical Transformers. That company which manufactures the large transformers used by the Electricity Trust of SA and which also exports those transformers domestically to other States, is closing up shop. All the equipment in that factory is presently being put in packing cases and the trucks have been ordered to freight all that equipment—that entire business—to Queensland, and in the main the reason for that occurrence is that the costs of running a business in this State are not competitive.

The tragedy of that business moving is not simply that this State loses yet another valuable industry but that that industry had employed 100 South Australians. Indeed, some of those people are retaining their jobs because they are prepared to sell their homes and move to Queensland. More experienced and skilled South Australians are leaving this State. That is a tragic indictment of the lack of business incentive that is provided today.

The other constituent who approached me this week worked for a well-known Adelaide fleet management company. That gentleman had been a director of the fleet management division. He had been laid off before Christmas not because there was anything wrong with his capabilities—in fact, quite the contrary—but because the business climate in South Australia has contracted to such an extent that companies are no longer entering into large fleet deals; those companies do not need the cars that they required for reasons of downsizing the number of employees and for reasons of executives involving themselves in salary and package sacrifices, which in turn lead to yet more casualties. In this case, it is a fleet management business in South Australia and one more company winding down part of its operations.

That was one day's business in my electorate office—two people coming in and indicating that they are leaving South Australia. The gentleman involved in fleet management is also packing his bags, selling his house and moving his wife and five children to Queensland. The fleet management business there is prospering, because in that State there is a more competitive environment and economy.

With all these things in place, is it any wonder that Opposition members are absolutely staggered that it has taken since August 1992 for the Government to start to implement some of the measures in the Arthur D. Little report—finally to bring this legislation before the House, to put in place the Economic Development Board and to start trying to turn our State around? Those five months are five months lost. During those five months, more businesses have gone and further damage has been done. Those businesses might not return.

It is time for South Australia to reopen for business, and I hope that members on all sides of politics will agree with that. More and more companies are moving out of the State. Those which are deciding to stay are moving their banking operations out of South Australia, once again particularly to Queensland, because in that State the FID and BAD taxes are notable by their absence. This Government needs to address those issues before any other thing it does starts to have any effect.

The new horizons for growth need to go beyond that. I hope that members of the Government took note of the statement by Liberal Leader Dean Brown on 5 February that soon after the Federal election the Liberal Leader will be releasing a major statement summarising a Liberal Government's development objectives for South Australia during the rest of this decade and beyond. This statement will set new horizons for the restructuring and growth of our economy and to enhance our lifestyle and environment. It is important that we have those specific policies in place to achieve those things, and the Liberal Party will take much pleasure in paving the way for South Australia to regain economic prosperity as we release those policies and move closer to the election.

Over the past two years we have released a number of key discussion papers on important issues to our State such as education, Commonwealth-State relations, community safety, health, family and community services, the environment and passenger transport. These papers have been released quite deliberately to stimulate community debate and to encourage constructive comment. Comments received by the Liberal Party have

been used to formulate our final policy programs, the program of reform that we believe will start setting the scene for South Australia's development.

While we stand tonight and debate the introduction of this Bill to the Parliament, while indeed we have read the writings of the Arthur D. Little group, and seen the things that are necessary, as well as the Government's continued procrastination and delays, we realise, when we read the Premier's second reading explanation, that it is almost as though he fails to acknowledge the extent and seriousness of the problem. I went through that second reading explanation, and absolutely nowhere did I read the serious words that I drew out of that report. Indeed, they would not have been hard for the Premier to find because they were contained in the opening paragraphs of the Executive summary. Rather than address those issues head on, the Premier simply says, in part:

We must all recognise that the challenges we face are also for the community as a whole. In a rapidly changing world it is important for us to move positively and to recognise our strengths so that the business climate in South Australia is conducive and supportive of increased investment.

As I said in my opening remarks tonight, certainly we must recognise our strengths. However, we must also recognise our weaknesses, and it is the weaknesses in our economy at present that this Government has been particularly reluctant to acknowledge and address. Until this Government is prepared to stand up and say, 'We as a State have a problem: these are our weaknesses; these will be addressed and this is the program we will put in place to address them,' the situation will not be rectified.

I did not think that I would ever stand in this Parliament and draw attention to a statement made by the Prime Minister, Mr Keating. I did not think I would ever have cause to stand in this Parliament and actually commend the Prime Minister for the honesty and integrity of a statement, for rarely can I be in a position to do that. The Prime Minister rarely issues such a statement, but indeed, much to the embarrassment of this Government, the Prime Minister flitted into Adelaide last week and, in so doing, said, 'South Australia's net debt is now around \$8.25 billion.'

That is about \$1 000 million more than the latest official figure given by the Arnold Government. The Prime Minister then went on further to say, 'The State Bank is costing the State budget about \$280 million every year.' The present Labor Government has said that interest payments on the State Bank debt will be about \$175 million this financial year. Indeed, the Prime Minister's figures are so much in conflict with those released by the Labor Government that we expected in this Parliament a full statement of explanation by the Premier of the differences and what was being done to address the situation.

Mr Holloway interjecting:

Mr MATTHEW: Despite the interjection from the member for Mitchell, we did not get that statement. That statement was, I believe, a very important precursor to the debate of this Bill, because this Bill reflects the Arthur D. Little report, which is based on the state of our economy. In a nutshell, from Mr Keating's statements, the debt of this State is rising by almost \$6 million a day. This Bill in itself will not turn around a

million a day. This Bill in itself will not turn around a rising debt of \$6 million a day. I do support this Bill, but the Liberal Party expects to see many more changes in the economic direction of this State if, indeed, we are to drag ourselves out of the tidal wave of destruction, the havoc, that has been wreaked on this State by this Government.

The Hon. H. ALLISON (Mount Gambier): The very fact that we have this Bill before us is obviously an admission of failure by a Government which has been in power for some 24 out of the past 27 years and which now has to create an Economic Development Board to carry out a task that surely the Government itself should have been capable of and ready and willing to have done.

Mr Quirke interjecting:

The Hon. H. ALLISON: Well, I ask you! 1966. The mathematics compared with the magnitude of the problem, I suggest to the honourable member, are really of minuscule proportion, and if he can worry himself about only five minutes in the course of the history of the earth I suggest that that is a reflection on the way that the whole Government has been navel gazing for the entire time that it has been in office. It bears out exactly what I am trying to say to members of the House: members opposite are so busy worrying about the minutia of life that they cannot see that South Australia is perishing. I thank the honourable member for his interjection.

Another thing that worries me is this: when the Premier was overseas—and Parliament has not sat for two months since this Bill was introduced—he heralded amendments to the Bill. Here we are, two thirds of the way through the second reading debate, and none of us on this or on that side of the House knows whether we are actually debating the Bill in its final form. If there are amendments, where are they? We have not seen them.

Mr S. G. Evans interjecting:

The Hon. H. ALLISON: They could, as the Whip (the member for Davenport) says, be very major amendments. I suggest that the Government could not run a chook raffle or a country dunny in the mood that it is in at the moment.

Members interjecting:

The Hon. H. ALLISON: All right: you could run a chook raffle or a country dunny, but there is very little else that you can do. And I thank you for that. Once again, by their interjections, members opposite are pointing out the measure of their capabilities, and I thank them for it. The A.D.Little report stated the obvious: it pointed out that South Australia was in deep trouble under this dead hand of socialism. It has taken nearly eight months for the Bill even to be brought forward after the recommendations of the A.D.Little report. The Premier himself has been in charge of the economic development of this State for years: it has been his ministerial responsibility. The Bill is belated. It reflects years of failure and inactivity, and the Government is asking the board to do what the Government has failed to do for 22 or 23 years.

It is a herculean task that the board is confronted with. It will require protean efforts on its behalf. From 1982 to 1992 we have had a decade of Labor, a decade of decay.

We have had businesses leaving South Australia, closing down or bankrupted in record proportions; headquarters have transferred interstate; and the most recent fiscal decision to double the State's bank charges has triggered off another spate of threats from major businesses to remove their banking interstate, possibly to Queensland, to avoid the crippling costs of operating in this State. As other members have said repeatedly, South Australia used to boast the lowest operating costs in Australia, but no longer—not according to business and commerce which is departing.

Now we are going to appoint a board of non-parliamentarily elected members to bear the responsibility for State development which, as I said, the State Government should have been bearing for the past two decades. We have had a decade of ineptitude and abject failures, and now we have a board that may well bear in future the responsibility for these failures. It may well have the blame passed to it if it does not bring home the bacon. It could be blamed for past Government inactivity, for the Government's lack of imagination and for its fiscal and innovative bankruptcy. Under the legislation before us, the Economic Development Board is being asked to shore up the State Government, which has presided over disaster after disaster. Failed Ministers and Premiers have seen State debt go from \$2.3 billion in 1982, just 10 years ago, to over \$8.5 billion at least in 1992, plus the unfunded debt of superannuation and the like, which is probably another \$5 billion plus.

Our Government buildings and assets are increasingly dilapidated, as a succession of Public Accounts Committee reports into housing, highways, TAFE, Education Department, health, marine, the E&WS Department and ETSA have pointed out to the Government. The State education system is being criticised, rightly or wrongly, for lack of discipline and lowering of standards. Our forests have not paid a dividend to the Treasury since 1983 and, in fact, the forests, and probably almost all the State's remaining assets, are in hock: the forests to the tune of \$407 million, give or take a million dollars, to AGL in Sydney. Our Government has seen vast sums of money lost, not only to the State Bank (\$3.5 billion) but to SGIC, BFC, Greymouth mill, New Zealand, Scrimber, where the Minister never even visited the South-East during the four years that it was in obvious decline and during the seven years that we were questioning how successful it could be.

It reached the point diminishing returns after only two or three years. The Marineland project, failed textile mills, the closure of Onkaparinga and Bunge in Mount Gambier have occurred under Labor's tariff policies. South Australia's greater industries appear to have survived with difficulty in the face of Government ineptitude. Even Prime Minister Keating on his recent visit could do little but offer sympathy. He said:

South Australia has problems which the rest of Australia does not face, and these have to be addressed.

He is simply echoing the Arthur D. Little report. He continues:

I do not say this lightly...The State faces an uncertain future regardless of what happens elsewhere in Australia.

There is a foreboding of doom indeed. Further:

South Australia's additional problems stem from two principal causes: first its relatively narrow economic base has made it difficult to respond to the forces of industrial change.

I interject on the Prime Minister there to remind members of the House that South Australia's broad industrial base which Labor inherited from the Playford Government in 1966 is now a narrow base according to all the experts. Headquarters have been lost: whitegoods manufacturers, Simpson Pope, Lightburn and the Phillips electrical industry. The lost, closed down country rail services, shipbuilding at Whyalla, the lost finances—about \$8.5 billion—and so on and so on: as so many of my colleagues have pointed out, these have gone under 20-odd years of Labor rule in South Australia. Indeed, we can point to some successes such as the O-Bahn system, which has been lauded by Labor, and the Roxby project, which was a mirage in the desert according to Labor which now they are singing the praises of very loudly. These were Liberal Party projects, Liberal Party successes.

I need not remind my colleagues also that the previous decade of Labor—the Dunstan decade—created problems for that Liberal Government. We wrote off \$100-\$200 million worth of debts which included \$23 million SAMCOR. Golden Breed failed, and there were Riverland ventures and the frozen foods projects. There was Monarto, whose debt we largely discharged to the Whitlam Government. They lent the money; they did not give it as many people thought. There were so many of these projects which had to be paid off before the Tonkin Government could even start to redevelop the State, as indeed it did so well in such a brief term of office, just three years. Labor Governments have been notoriously ineffective in developing South Australia. For the past decade they have lived on many Liberal initiatives.

Keating tells us again on 4 February, when he made his quick trip to South Australia, that since 1978 Australian employment generally has risen 28 per cent but South Australia has only had its employment rise by 15 per cent, and unfortunately for South Australia, he said, many of Australia's expanding industries have been located elsewhere. Queensland's employment has risen 53 per cent and Western Australia, 44 per cent, during that same period. Again, I am quoting Mr Keating.

The second cause he mentioned of South Australia's additional misfortune is more recent and relates to the State Bank. Well, there is a statement of the obvious. When John Bannon told me, he said, back in January 1991 of the losses of the State Bank 'it seemed such an utter waste of public resources. I felt an immediate contempt for those who managed it'. I do not know whether he understood what he was saying when he expressed those words but had he read the Jacobs Royal Commission report into the State Bank he would have seen that the State Government and the former Premier were clearly indicted as a part of that State Bank debacle.

The Prime Minister is certainly saying that he had contempt for those who managed it. Well, I suggest that the joint management by Government and the bank administration was part and parcel of his condemnation. The State Bank inquiry report was an indictment of the former Premier and of the present Government members who allowed that fiasco to develop. They cannot

exonerate themselves from the implied blame carried in the Jacobs report.

The Prime Minister refers to the latest commitment of \$850 million in the State budget. There is a divergence of mathematics between the figures quoted by the Prime Minister and those quoted by the Premier and his Cabinet. He said that the latest commitment of \$850 million to the State Bank, making total assistance to the State Bank of \$3.15 billion at enormous cost to State finances, has restricted the State Government's ability to respond to the recession. Again, these are findings of the royal commission, findings of the A.D. Little report, findings that are common knowledge to all South Australians who are suffering the massive financial problem of having to meet the interest payments.

Keating says that the net public debt of \$8.25 billion in South Australia, nearly 30 per cent of gross State product, is contrasted with the 15 per cent which the interest repayments represented in 1990, only two years ago. Interest payments will take up 15 per cent of State revenue in 1992-93 even though the interest rates themselves are low. Obviously the drain is immense. A successful South Australian economic development board is desperately needed. Victoria with its problems has been used as a comparison but, as Mr Keating said again, Victoria has the scope to work its way out of its financial problems and to put its financial house in order, because it has a revenue base three times that of South Australia. I seek leave to continue my remarks later.

Leave granted; debate adjourned.

ADJOURNMENT

The Hon. M.D. RANN (Minister of Business and Regional Development): I move:

That the House do now adjourn.

Mr HAMILTON (Albert Park): For some years now I, like other members of this House, have campaigned about the problems associated with domestic noise. The problems of domestic noise and disruption of the community again came to the fore last month when I received correspondence from constituents in the Semaphore Park area of the South Australian Housing Trust. Quite properly, those residents expressed to me in writing their antagonism and frustration at having to put up with the 'disruptive' attitudes of some local tenants. I have always believed that one of the best approaches in those situations is to meet with the tenants, and yesterday it was my privilege to talk to my constituents, together with a representative from the Housing Trust, Mrs Debbie Dellow, and Mr Peter Hale from the Port Adelaide Branch of the South Australian Housing Trust, in an endeavour to resolve the problems they were experiencing.

The meeting went for some hours in the car park in Lower Street. During the conversation my constituents expressed, again quite properly, their frustration at having to put up with various activities which disrupted them and caused them considerable concern. It is a difficult situation for tenants, as it is for the police who endeavour to resolve these problems, particularly when some of the people involved are retired or in the eventide

of their life and do not want to lodge official complaints with the police for fear of recrimination.

That is particularly where a criminal element is involved, as I understand may have occurred in this case. Their frustrations came out and in my dealings with these people I suggested that there were a number of alternatives available, including constantly reporting these matters to the police in respect of every incident that occurred, taking up the matters with the Housing Tenants Association, keeping me informed on all occasions and, if they so desired, to lay charges that could be heard in the local court if they were prepared to give evidence at a hearing.

I believe that meeting was fruitful. Given that these are people who rarely do complain, clearly they have had a gutful of these activities. This is not uncommon, be it in Housing Trust or any other community areas, be it private or Government housing. I raise this matter because for some years, as my colleagues would be aware, I have campaigned within Government circles and in Parliament for the police to be given additional power so that on their own initiative in disruptive circumstances such as those that I have outlined they can tell a tenant or landholder to either turn down the noise or cease disrupting the community.

If they should refuse, the police should be able to take action against such people on their own initiative. As I understand it, when police are called in respect of such matters in some cases by bluff they can ask a person to curb their noise or activities but, unless a person is prepared to lodge an official complaint, in many cases the hands of the police are tied. This leads to frustration, not only amongst members of the Police Force who are called out to attend these disruptions but also to local residents.

I have gained the support of local police both in Port Adelaide and Henley Beach and I have corresponded with my ministerial colleagues to address these problems. Only recently I received correspondence from the Minister of Environment and Land Management, who said:

I refer to your letter of 9 November 1992 regarding the proposed Environment Protection Authority (EPA) legislation. The matter of police powers relating to domestic noise has been addressed in the EPA Bill. The police have expressed their concerns regarding the problem of obtaining evidence of a formal complaint. A formal complaint is not a requirement of the relevant section of the Bill.

The letter goes on to point out:

This matter is contained in the evidentiary provisions of the Bill in section 115(4).

The letter goes on to point out in part:

(a) that noise, odour or smoke was emitted from a place occupied by another person; and

(b) that the level, nature or extent of that odour or smoke within the place occupied by the other person was such as to constitute the unreasonable interference with the person's enjoyment of the place, constitutes proof in the absence of evidence to the contrary that the defendant caused an environmental nuisance by the emission of noise, odour or smoke.

I thank the Minister for that information because not only will that provide relief to my constituents but also to thousands of other people out in the community as well.

Too often we hear of people complaining to members of Parliament about the problems of noise, disruptive parties and constant antagonism between neighbours. Under the EPA Bill this provision will give the police those additional powers which, as I understand from correspondence I have received from them, they fully support. I only hope that the Bill comes before the Parliament very quickly. As yet I have not had an indication from the Minister as to when that Bill will be coming before the Parliament. It will be particularly important for elderly people and those people living by themselves to have this form of protection that has been wanting for so long.

People who have come to me over many years—and this goes back prior to about 1990 when I first raised the matter—have expressed the desire for something to be done to assist them, particularly those people who expressed fear of recriminations. It was not a gutless approach by them but a real concern, particularly of women living by themselves and elderly people who fear that if they lodge an official complaint with the police that some time in the future there will be recriminations against them.

So, I believe the campaign that I have waged in this area is certainly paying off. When the Bill has finally been passed not only will thousands of constituents in South Australia be happy with it but it will provide the much needed powers that the police, quite properly so in my opinion, should have to curtail this unruly element within our community.

The Hon. P.B. ARNOLD (Chaffey): The Australian wine and wine grape growing industry is at the crossroads. In fact, we have reached the turning point where the industry can either go ahead in leaps and bounds or it can self-destruct as a player on the world stage. We have never had a better opportunity for the Australian wine industry to really go ahead and make a place for itself on the export market and to create a strong and viable industry for this country.

It is not so long ago that the Government introduced a Bill to create the Wine Grapes Industry (Indicative Prices) Act, which was supported by both wine makers and wine grape growers. At that time it was believed, and I had the belief, that such legislation to provide indicative prices across the three States of South Australia, Victoria and New South Wales would certainly be in the best interests of creating a truly national wine industry in this country, an industry that would compete effectively on the world export market. However, it is incredible that now, having that legislation in place, legislation which was supported by the wine makers as well as by many of the wine grape growers, we have a situation where the wine making industry is refusing to participate or accept the indicative prices which have been determined.

In fact, it is hard to believe that the Australian wine making industry is so inept as to destroy the viability of the private wine grape grower in this country by taking that action, which is self-destructing as far as the wine industry is concerned, because there is no wine. There is no way that the wine industry in Australia can possibly hope to meet its target of an annual export market of \$1 billion by the turn of the century. If the wine industry

is intent on maintaining wine grape growers in a peasant existence, the wine grape growers of this country will never be able to provide the quality and varieties demanded by the world market to achieve the \$1 billion export figure that the wine making industry talks about.

We now have the big three wine makers operating in Australia. For them to work in a manner which denies a fair and reasonable income to the average private grape grower is a self-destructive exercise as far as the wine industry in this country is concerned. The prices being offered by the wine industry to this year's vintage, which is about to start this week and will be in full swing within the next two weeks, are disastrous as far as the wine grape growers are concerned. There is no way that they can survive on the prices being offered, particularly in a year like this with the extent of rain and hail damage and the disease that has been thrust upon them right from the beginning of this season. The sheer cost to the individual wine grape grower of trying to control the disease in vineyards is such that there is absolutely nothing left for the wine grape grower and his family on which to live.

The grape grower has tried to the best of his or her ability to provide a crop for the wine industry of this country. Unfortunately, this harvest will be down by at least 100 000 tonnes, if not 150 000 tonnes, and by the end of the season it could be considerably worse than that. The stocks held by the Australian wine industry are extremely low. The wine industry needs every possible wine grape it can lay its hands on, yet the prices being offered are way below the indicative prices which have been set under the legislation introduced into this Parliament by the Government not so long ago. As I said, that legislation was introduced into this Parliament with the blessing of the wine makers at that time. Now they are refusing to act in the spirit in which it was introduced, and that is a great tragedy for the wine industry in Australia.

The comparatively small fledgling wine industry in New Zealand is winning awards in many countries. It has taken the top wine awards at the London Wine Show in open competition with France and Germany, beating them hands down. At the same time, that small wine industry in New Zealand, largely based on the Marlborough area in the north of the South Island, pays its wine grape growers in the vicinity of \$800 to \$1 000 per tonne for many of the varieties. That is 300 per cent more than the Australian wine industry offers growers in

this country. It just does not add up. If New Zealand can do it and still take the top wine awards in the world against highly prominent countries such as France and Germany, we have to look at the Australian industry and ask just where it is going wrong.

As was stated at a public meeting in Berri on Sunday night, if the Australian wine industry was in the hands of the Japanese, you can rest assured that they would make sure that its source of raw material was well protected. It would see that its growers had sufficient resources to plant and maintain their vineyards with the varieties needed and demanded by the world market, but that does not occur in this country. That is why I am staggered at the attitude and reaction of the big three wine makers in this country towards the wine grape growers.

Unless that changes, I believe there is not a bright future. Yet this country, of any country in the world, has possibly the greatest potential to expand and become a force in the wine industry. We have the climate, the land, the water, the ability to produce wine grapes, and the machine pruning and harvesting techniques. That gives us an edge on the rest of the world. We have proved on the European, United Kingdom and North American markets that we can produce some of the best wines in the world and at a very competitive price. But unless the industry is prepared to pay its growers a figure that will enable the grower to survive, to maintain the vineyard and to produce the varieties that the industry needs, of course the industry has little future.

The only force in existence at the moment which is standing up for the wine grape growers in South Australia is the Consolidated Cooperative in the Riverland, which is single-handedly trying to take on the big three wine makers and force a reasonable price. That is a tall order. However, if the wine making industry played the game in the manner that it said it would at the time the legislation to provide for indicative prices was introduced into this Parliament, the industry would have a great future. There must be a basis on which wine grapes can have a floor price of some sort and from that point indexation to flow on from it.

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

Motion carried.

At 10.17 p.m. the House adjourned until Wednesday 10 February at 2 p.m.

HOUSE OF ASSEMBLY

Tuesday 9 February

QUESTIONS ON NOTICE

LAND TAX

11. Mr BECKER:

1. Is it the normal practice of Mr Carlo Mancini of the State Taxation Office of the Treasury Department to threaten and intimidate alleged land tax defaulters with the words 'Smart (expletive), I'll have you gaoled' when one property in question being charged land tax should in fact be exempt as it is used solely for primary production as an almond orchard?

2. What training are State Tax officers given in dealing with the public in a courteous and responsible manner and, if none, why not and will such training programs be considered forthwith?

3. What disciplinary action will be taken against Mr Mancini and, if none, why not?

The Hon. LYNN ARNOLD:

1. No. The Commissioner of State Taxation has advised that he has conducted a thorough review of the matter and he is satisfied that Mr Mancini at no time made a threat of the type described and it is strongly denied that any such threat occurred. Mr Mancini has approximately 17 years experience in dealing with the public in respect of outstanding debts. Such actions would be entirely our of character.

Secondly, presuming that the question relates to the application of an exemption in terms of section 10(1) (j) of the Land Tax Act 1936, sufficient evidence has not been provided to the Commissioner of Land Tax to support such an exemption.

2. State Taxation Office Compliance Branch staff are provided with extensive training including:

- A formal induction course. Amongst other things this course deals with the conduct of officers when dealing with the public.
- Attendance at a 'Basic Evidentiary and Techniques of Investigation' course conducted by the South Australian Police Department.
- A legal education course conducted by the Legal Services Commission of South Australia.
- Practical field training in the company of an experienced officer.

3. I believe this question relates to the conduct of Mr Mancini at a recent Unsatisfied Judgment Summons Hearing in the Adelaide Local Court concerning the recovery of outstanding land tax from a taxpayer who has failed to meet his obligation for the 1989-90 and 1990-91 years. In the review that has been conducted no evidence has come to light to demonstrate any improper conduct on Mr Mancini's behalf. In fact the evidence presented to me paints a very different picture. I am advised that after the hearing Mr Mancini suffered repeated verbal abuse and threats from the taxpayer and showed true professionalism in rising above the attacks levelled at him. Accordingly, no disciplinary action has been taken or is contemplated.

PUBLIC SECTOR ASSETS

33. Mr S.J. BAKER: In relation to each department and authority for which the Minister is responsible, what was the value of assets as at 30 June 1992 in the following categories:

- vacant land;
- buildings;
- vehicles;
- other property;
- financial; and
- total,

which of those individual assets had a value of \$5 million or more and what was the value?

The Hon. S.M. LENEHAN:

Education Department

- \$391.4 million (defined as unimproved value)
- \$2 479.8 million

(c) \$38.37 million, including the Education Department's school bus fleet

(d) \$71.6 million

(e) This information can only be derived from schools financial statement which are received in the Education Department annually and which reflect the situation at the end of the school financial year, namely, 31 October. Funds, including cash balances and investments, held by schools at 31 October, 1991, were \$54 million.

(f) The total value of the above assets is \$3 035.17 million. The individual assets which have a value of \$5 million or more are:

	\$M
Aberfoyle Park High School	5.5
Adelaide High School	7.5
Banksia Park High School	5.13
Brighton High School	7.0
Campbelltown High School	5.04
Christies Beach High School	10.5
Glenunga High School	7.79
Hallett Cove R-10	11.0
Hamilton Secondary School	8.45
Marden Senior College and Open Access College	6.8
Marion High School	5.2
Marryatville High School	8.88
Modbury High School	5.5
Morialta High School	9.26
Mount Barker High School	7.0
Murray Bridge High School	6.35
Norwood High School	11.4
Para Hills High School	6.95
Seacombe High School	5.3
Thorndon High School*	9.0
Urrbrae High School	9.0
Wirreanda High School	5.3

*Now Charles Campbell Secondary School, operating from the 2 campuses. To be consolidated at the Thorndon site 1993.

Senior Secondary Assessment Board of SA (SSABSA)	\$
(a) Vacant Land	Nil
(b) Buildings	Nil
(c) Vehicles	40 000
(d) Other Property	550 000
(e) Financial—Cash and Investments	480 000
Total	<u>\$1 070 000</u>

No single asset is assessed as valued over \$5 million.

Children's Services Office (CSO).....	\$
(a) Vacant Land	374 000
(b) Buildings (inc. land value).....	26 313 500
(c) Vehicles	545 506
(d) Other Property	480 769
(e) Financial	Nil
Total	<u>\$27 713 775</u>

There is not a single asset which has an assessed value of \$5 million or more.

Department of Employment and Technical and Further Education (DETAPE).

Details as previously advised (copy attach).

BLYTH STREET CAR PARK

42. Mr. S. J. BAKER:

1. When was the Blyth Street carpark purchased by SGIC and at what price?

2. How many parking bays does it have?

3. What was the average occupancy in the past financial year and what were its revenue, operating costs and profit?

The Hon. FRANK BLEVINS:

1. The property known as Blyth Street carpark located at 13/19 Bank Street, Adelaide, was purchased on 28 February 1990 for \$15 500 000.

2. The property consists of 311 parking bays plus a retail area which form portion of Station Arcade. The tenable areas are:

Level 1	542.5 square metres
Level 2	583.5 square metres
Level 3	734.4 square metres

TOTAL	1 860.4 square metres
-------	-----------------------

3. The information requested would place SGIC at a commercial disadvantage and has therefore not been disclosed.

BRIGHTON HIGH SCHOOL

44. **Mr. BRINDAL:** When will Stage III of the Brighton High School be commenced and completed, does it include complete Technical Studies and Home Economics facilities and what is its anticipated cost?

The Hon. S. M. LENEHAN: Early in 1992, a Forward Planning Group was established to investigate, develop and critically analyse options for the curriculum restructuring of both Brighton and Mawson High Schools.

No decision has been made concerning further upgrading of Brighton High pending an assessment of recommendations and a report by the Forward Planning Group.

This report is being considered by officers of the Education Department and is to be made available to the local school communities. When an assessment as to the viability of the recommendations has been made, an announcement will be made. Specific project details and costs cannot be determined until such time.

EDUCATION DEPARTMENT

57. **Mr. BRINDAL:**

1. Have all the provisions of the Occupational Health, Safety and Welfare Act been fully implemented in Education Department schools and if not, by what date is full implementation anticipated?

2. What are the estimated costs of implementation?

The Hon. S. M. LENEHAN: The Education Department is developing a program relating to the requirements of the Occupational Health, Safety and Welfare Act and is in the process of meeting its obligations as currently defined.

Having regard to the complexities of the implementation of the Act in all schools and worksites, it is not possible to make a definitive statement about meeting the obligations within a specified time line.

The exact cost of implementation of the Act and its Regulations cannot be determined given the complexity and diversity of schools. The Department is working towards developing appropriate plans of action having regard to the requirements of the Act, employees and the reasonableness and practicability of the proposed solutions within available resources.

58. **Mr. BRINDAL:** What are the related policies of the Education Department and in particular, what protection and support does it offer to its staff who are sexually, physically or verbally abused by students or their parents?

The Hon. S. M. LENEHAN: Under Sections 104 and 105 of the Education Act it is an offence for any person to behave in an offensive manner to a teacher who is acting in the course of his or her duties. If guilty the person is liable to a penalty not exceeding five hundred dollars. Any prosecution for such offence must not be commenced without the consent of the Minister.

Regulation 124 regarding suspension, exclusion and expulsion has recently been revised to allow principals to exclude any student for a period of up to ten weeks. Students over the age of compulsion may be expelled for a period of one to five years if their behaviour is extreme. Such action may be taken, for example, where a student has threatened or perpetrated violence or has acted in a manner that threatens the good order of the school or the safety and well being of a student or staff

members. These measures have been introduced to give added protection to both students and staff members.

The usual protection of persons against acts of this nature is afforded by the criminal law. As these would be offences against the person, the teacher would personally lodge a complaint, apply for a restraint order to take other appropriate action with the police and attend at court to give evidence if necessary.

Notwithstanding this, staff members who have been sexually, physically or verbally abused have access to personnel counsellors who are located in the metropolitan Teacher and Student Services Centres and the Central Office.

MEDIA LIAISON

70. **Mr BECKER:**

1. How many media liaison officers are employed in each department and statutory authority under the control of each Minister?

2. Which departments or authorities employ these officers?

3. On what terms, conditions, salaries and allowances are they employed?

4. Why are such appointments necessary?

5. What is the reason for the delay in answering this question since it was first asked on 8 August 1989 and again on 20 February 1990 and 13 March 1991?

The Hon. LYNN ARNOLD: Because this question was asked before the Cabinet reshuffle it has been answered in the previous Ministerial format.

MINISTER OF HEALTH

There are no officers with the title 'Media Liaison Officer' employed by the South Australian Health Commission or Department for Family and Community Services.

ATTORNEY-GENERAL

1. & 2. There are no media liaison officers employed in the departments and Statutory Authorities under the control of the Attorney-General.

3. The Senior Education Officer, Publicity and Promotions, is employed under the terms of the Government Management and Employment Act, 1985 at classification level ASO-5 and salary range of \$37 515-\$42 025.

4. The Commissioner for Equal Opportunity has a statutory obligation to foster and encourage unprejudiced attitudes in the community and to disseminate information pursuant to section 11 of the Equal Opportunity Act. The Senior Education Officer, Publicity and Promotions Officer, assists the Commissioner in carrying out this statutory function.

MINISTER OF INDUSTRY, TRADE AND TECHNOLOGY

1. & 2. The Department of Industry, Trade and Technology has one position where the role, in part, is to liaise with the media. The title of the position is Public Affairs Manager.

3. The employment terms of the position are a three year contract at ASO6 level.

4. The position exists to ensure the provision of a range of information, public relations, publicity and promotional services on specific projects to audiences locally, interstate and overseas necessary to assist in the achievement of the Department's overall priorities to contribute to new employment and economic growth.

TECHNOLOGY DEVELOPMENT CORPORATION

- 1. None.
- 2. N/A.
- 3. N/A.
- 4. N/A.

DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE

1. & 2. The Department of Agriculture employs two officers responsible for liaising with the Media. Their positions are not designated Media liaison officer.

3. Senior journalists GME Act ASO5, Publicity Promotion Officer ASO4 3 year contract. No allowances are paid and salaries are paid in accordance with the classification levels stated.

4. The positions exist to promote the services and functions of the Department.

The Senior journalist is responsible for the development and maintenance of an effective information, publicity and public relations function for the Department of Agriculture resulting in an increased employee and public awareness of the Department's functions and services.

The Publicity and promotion officer is accountable to the senior journalists to work as a team to provide the publicity, public relations, and communications functions of the Department including media liaison, news release and feature writing, promotions, campaigns and launches which result in an increased awareness of the Department's operations and achievements statewide.

DEPARTMENT OF FISHERIES

1. & 2. The Department of Fisheries employs one Publicity and Promotions Officer.

3. The Publicity and Promotions Officer is employed under the GME Act at ASO5 level; standard Public Service conditions of employment.

4. The position provides professional assistance in the preparation and dissemination of fisheries information—advising commercial and recreational fishers of legislative and regulatory changes to the management of fisheries. Edit departmental magazine.

OFFICE OF MULTICULTURAL AND ETHNIC AFFAIRS

1. Nil.
2. Not applicable.
3. Not applicable.
4. Not applicable.

MINISTER OF EDUCATION

EDUCATION DEPARTMENT

1. Nil.
2. Not applicable.
3. Not applicable.
4. Not applicable.

CHILDREN'S SERVICES OFFICE

1. Nil.
2. Not applicable.
3. Not applicable.
4. Not applicable.

SENIOR SECONDARY ASSESSMENT BOARD OF SOUTH AUSTRALIA

1. Nil.
2. Not applicable.
3. Not applicable.
4. Not applicable.

NON-GOVERNMENT SCHOOLS REGISTRATION BOARD

1. Nil.

2. Not applicable.
3. Not applicable.
4. Not applicable.

TEACHERS REGISTRATION BOARD

1. Nil.
2. Not applicable.
3. Not applicable.
4. Not applicable.

TEACHERS CLASSIFICATION BOARD

1. Nil.
2. Not applicable.
3. Not applicable.
4. Not applicable.

TEACHERS APPEAL BOARD

1. Nil.
2. Not applicable.
3. Not applicable.
4. Not applicable.

MINISTER OF TRANSPORT
OFFICE OF TRANSPORT POLICY AND PLANNING

1. & 2. No media liaison officers are employed by the Office of Transport Policy and Planning.

3. & 4. Not applicable given answer to 1 and 2.

STATE TRANSPORT AUTHORITY

1. & 2. There are no media liaison officers as such employed by the State Transport Authority. The Customer Services Manager is responsible for media work among a wide range of other duties.

3. He is employed on a three year contract and among other things manages all customers information, internal publications, marketing and advertising. His remuneration is \$76 120 per annum which is subject to national wage adjustments.

4. To provide accurate information to customers and to enhance internal communications.

DEPARTMENT OF ROAD TRANSPORT

1. & 2. Two media liaison officers are employed in the Department of Road Transport.

3. The officers are full-time GME Act employees, viz.:
A/Manager, Corporate Communications (ASO-6 \$46 125 per annum)
Public Relations Officer (ASO-4, \$35 548 per annum)

4. To handle departmental liaison with the media, public relations, publicity campaigns and promotional activities.

DEPARTMENT OF CORRECTIONAL SERVICES

1. & 2. The Department of Correctional Services employs one officer who is responsible for liaising with media, that is the Co-ordinator, Public Relations.

3. This position is gazetted as a permanent salaried position at the level of ASO-5. The annual salary range is \$37 515 to \$42 025. The Co-ordinator, Public Relations is responsible for developing and co-ordinating public relations strategies which promote public understanding and awareness of the work of the department. One aspect of this work is media liaison.

4. With much of the department's work taking place behind the walls of the State's prisons and within the bounds of confidentiality, the Department of Correctional Services is susceptible to allegations, misinformation and exaggeration being presented via the media. It is essential that the department works with the media and counters negative media coverage in its

efforts to gain public support for Government initiatives in corrections and prison reform.

MINISTER OF TOURISM—
TOURISM SOUTH AUSTRALIA

1. & 2. There are no officers employed in Tourism SA, with the title "Media Liaison Officer".

3. However, it should be noted that Tourism SA employs a Manager, Public Relations with a staff of two who undertake media liaison as part of their duties. They form Tourism SA's Public Relations Unit which is responsible for helping to create a positive public and industry awareness of the importance of tourism to South Australia. This obviously involves liaison with the media.

4. The staff and their annual salaries are: Manager, Public Relations, \$42 490; Public Relations Co-ordinator, \$32 827; and Publicity Co-ordinator, \$31 058. All are employed under the GME Act.

SMALL BUSINESS CORPORATION

1. There are no officers employed in the Small Business Corporation of South Australia with the title "Media Liaison Officer", however the General Manager of the Corporation is involved in media liaison.

MINISTER OF HOUSING AND CONSTRUCTION

1. SACON does not employ any media liaison officers. Activities relating to media liaison and publicity and promotions are undertaken by a range of officers including the Chief Executive.

2. Not applicable.
3. Not applicable.
4. Not applicable.

EMERGENCY SERVICES

1. ETSA has five public relations staff all of whom have dealings with the media from time to time as part of their duties. It is estimated that media liaison absorbs the equivalent of 0.5 of a person.

2. ETSA employs these officers.
3. Normal ETSA award conditions and salaries apply.
4. The media relations aspect of public relations in ETSA is to ensure the flow of factual information to the media to facilitate the formulation of accurate community perceptions of ETSA.

MINES AND ENERGY

1. None.
2. Not applicable.
3. Not applicable.
4. Not applicable.

MINISTER OF RECREATION AND SPORT

The Department of Recreation and Sport does not specifically employ media liaison officers. However, there are staff within the marketing unit employed who have media liaison duties as part of their overall responsibility. These staff are employed under the GME Act.

STATUTORY AUTHORITIES

South Australian Totalizator Agency Board

The General Manager has advised that the SA TAB does not employ any Media Liaison Officers.

Bookmakers Licensing Board

The Assistant Secretary has advised that the Board does not employ any Media Liaison Officers.

SA Greyhound Racing Board

The General Manager has advised that the SA Greyhound Racing Board does not employ a Media Liaison Officer, as all media contact is handled by Management.

SA Harness Racing Board

The General Manager has advised the Board has no Media Liaison Officers. An Officer of the Board has responsibility for relations with the media and this would constitute approximately 10 per cent of his total activities.

Racecourses Development Board

The Chairperson of the RDB has advised that the RDB does not employ any Media Liaison Officers.

SOUTH AUSTRALIAN HOUSING TRUST

1. The Housing Trust employs two Public Relations Officers, designated at Levels 4 and 5 respectively (corresponding to PP2 and PP3 in line with the Publicity and Promotion Award as determined by the Department of Labour).

Between them, these officers are responsible for the publicity and media contact of an organisation with statewide responsibility for some 63 000 rental properties.

Their duties cover a broad range of tasks including:

- preparation of a variety of internal and external publications;
- liaison with staff and clients;
- co-ordination of publicity, marketing and information programs and functions;
- maintenance of the Trust's corporate image;
- co-ordination of a range of specialist consultants responsible for graphic design, media liaison and media monitoring.

Because of the range of tasks to be undertaken, the media liaison function is supplemented by the use of external specialists in public relations who are paid a monthly retainer. The consultants provide advice on opportunities for contact with the media and the appropriateness of that contact, and press releases, articles and preparation of copy as required.

The media functions of the Trust are considered vital in ensuring:

- effective and timely communication with clients and the broader community on pertinent issues;
- co-ordination of a range of specialist consultants responsible for graphic design, media liaison and media monitoring.

Because of the range of tasks to be undertaken, the media liaison function is supplemented by the use of external specialists in public relations who are paid a monthly retainer. The consultants provide advice on opportunities for contact with the media and the appropriateness of that contact, and press releases, articles and preparation of copy as required.

The media functions of the Trust are considered vital in ensuring:

- effective and timely communication with clients and the broader community on pertinent issues;
- responsiveness to public comment and reactions to the Trust; and
- the fulfilment of its responsibilities as a government agency providing an essential housing service to the lower income group.

SOUTH AUSTRALIAN URBAN LAND TRUST

No media liaison officers have been employed by the Urban Land Trust.

HOMESTART FINANCING

No media liaison officers have been employed by Homestart Finance.

MINISTER OF LABOUR

There are no 'Media Liaison Officers' employed in the Departments and authorities within the Minister of Labour's portfolios.

Current salary is \$44 699 per annum (\$1 713.70 per fortnight).

Current overtime allowance is \$6 705 per annum (\$257.10 per fortnight).

MINISTER FOR THE ARTS AND CULTURAL HERITAGE

Under the portfolios of the Minister for the Arts and Cultural Heritage, Minister for Local Government Relations and Minister of State Services, there are no Departments or statutory authorities that employ Media Liaison Officers.

WOODS AND FORESTS DEPARTMENT

1. & 2. The Woods and Forests Department does not employ Media Liaison Officers.

3. The appointment to this position is made under the Government Management and Employment Act, 1985 on a permanent basis. Employment is as a Publicity and Promotions Officer, ASO-5, on a salary between \$37 515 to \$42 025 per annum.

MINISTER FOR ENVIRONMENT AND PLANNING

There are no employees with the title 'Media Liaison Officers' employed by the Department of Environment and Planning, Engineering and Water Supply or Lands.

SOUTH AUSTRALIAN TIMBER CORPORATION

1. No media liaison officers are employed by the SATCO Group.

2. Not applicable.

3. Not applicable.

4. Not applicable.

MINISTER OF EMERGENCY SERVICES
POLICE DEPARTMENT

1. There are currently three Media Liaison Officers with a fourth officer to take up his duties on 17 September 1992, employed by the South Australian Police Department.

2. South Australian Police Department.

3. All are employed under the terms, conditions, salaries and allowances provided by the Police Officers' Award.

4. The appointments are necessary to provide an accurate and timely flow of information on police affairs to all sections of the media. This is especially important during times of major public events and emergencies. In such cases, it is vital that officers responsible for operation control of the events are not distracted by journalists and camera operators. It is the duty of the Media Liaison Officers to take care of these needs. It is also particularly important to systematically cater for the continuous demands from the media for authoritative and accurate information as to police activities of all kinds, particularly in the field of criminal incidents and investigations.

MINISTER OF EMPLOYMENT AND FURTHER
EDUCATION
DEPARTMENT OF EMPLOYMENT AND FURTHER
EDUCATION

1. One officer uses .25 of her time on media liaison.

2. Department of Employment and Technical and Further Education.

3. The officer is permanently appointed full time under the standard conditions of the GME Act at ASO-4 (Consultancy and Information) level on a salary of \$35 548.

4. Media liaison is necessary for accurate and effective dissemination of information on a wide variety of matters concerning this Department to the public.

No media liaison officers are employed by the Policy Support and Higher Education Secretariat or State Aboriginal Affairs.

SOUTH AUSTRALIAN METROPOLITAN
FIRE SERVICE

1. The South Australian Metropolitan Fire Service employs one Public Relations Officer with media liaison as part of the duties.

2. The Public Relations Officer is a uniformed Firefighter reporting directly to the Superintendent Services Department.

The Public Relations Officer is required to be available on 24 hour call for attendance at fires and emergency incidents to liaise with the media and keep a photographic record.

3. Conditions are provided for in the Firefighters and Ancillary Employees Award for day working staff. By agreement, the overtime and standby provisions of the Award do not apply.

Salary: \$43 167

Allowances: Use of Fire Service pool vehicle

4. The appointment is considered necessary for the development and maintenance of effective communications with all sections of the media, for the development and maintenance of sound public relations policies and practices and for the production of official Fire Service publications. Additionally the Officer may be required to represent the Fire Service in a public relations role.

TREASURY DEPARTMENT

1. Neither the Treasury Department nor any of the statutory authorities under the jurisdiction of the Treasurer employ media liaison officers or staff who are responsible solely for liaison with the media.

Media enquiries relating to the State Bank and the group's subsidiary companies are directed to the Public Affairs Section of the Bank's External Relations and Communications Department. From time to time members of the Bank's executive also deal with the media.

SGIC's dealings with the media are coordinated by the Manager, Corporate Affairs. From time to time other members of SGIC's executive also deal with the media.

The General Manager of the Lotteries Commission normally handles enquiries from the media about Commission matters.

2.-4. Not applicable.

PREMIER

DEPARTMENT OF THE PREMIER AND CABINET

1. No media liaison officers employed in this Department.

GRAND PRIX OFFICE

1. One media liaison officer employed.

2. Employed by the Australian Formula One Grand Prix Office.

3. Contract reviewed annually. Leave conditions apply similar to those within the State Public Service. Salary package is \$54 000.

DEPARTMENT OF MINES AND ENERGY

1. One full-time equivalent is employed in the Office of the Minister as a media liaison officer.

2. See above.

3. Terms and conditions of employment negotiated for these positions, accordingly these positions are deemed to be contract employees not GME Act.

4. To liaise with the media, to inform them *re* publicity for the Event.

MULTI FUNCTION POLIS

1. Media liaison is one of the functions carried out by the MFP Australia Public Affairs area. The project's in-house Public Affairs group currently comprises a Public Affairs Manager, Information Officer and Administrative Assistant. An additional Public Affairs Officer will be appointed by mid-September 1992.

The range of duties carried out by the MFP Public Affairs Unit includes media liaison, speech writing, special event organisation, advertising, promotion, writing and production of newsletters and publications, public inquiries, preparation of school project material, project briefings, audiovisual materials, exhibitions and displays, video production, seminars, sponsorships, community consultations etc.

Members of the MFP Public Affairs Unit are employed on three year contracts. The total salary bill for the Unit is now \$138 000. The Public Affairs Manager is provided with a fully maintained motor vehicle.

The Public Affairs Unit within the MFP is necessary to assist in presenting the concept to potential national and international investors as well as supporting the corporate goals of the organisation and providing support for the MFP marketing investment attraction program.

FUNERAL DIRECTORS

88. **Mr BECKER:**

1. When will legislation be introduced regulating funeral directors and what is the reason for the delay?

2. How many complaints has the Government received concerning pre-paid funerals?

3. Is the Government aware that one funeral director lost about \$55 000 in the past 12 months on pre-paid funerals due to increased costs associated with cemeteries, falling interest rates and management fund costs and if so, what protection can the Government offer consumers and if none, why not?

4. What investigations have been undertaken into pre-paid funeral plans and what acceptable costs can be legitimately deducted?

The Hon. S.M. LENEHAN:

1. There are no immediate plans to introduce legislation to specifically regulate funeral directors.

The Minister of Consumer Affairs has established an Advisory Forum consisting of members of the industry, the Public Actuary and the Commissioner for Consumer Affairs to consider and advise on various issues including pre-paid funerals.

2. & 3. The Commissioner for Consumer Affairs received 53 complaints in 1992, 2 in 1991, 2 in 1990 and 2 in 1989.

Forty-nine of the 53 complaints for 1992 refer to one company, and I understand that most of these matters have been resolved.

4. The Prices Surveillance Authority "Investigation into Funeral Prices" did not find any need to regulate funeral directors by licensing or registration given the regulation imposed on funeral directors from other sources such as local government, health departments and industry associations.

FORGERY

90. **Mr BECKER:**

1. Why did the Registrar-General register a document relating to a transaction involving the property situated at 279 Wright Street, Adelaide, knowing it to be forged under section 69 of the Real Property Act and Regulation 91E?

2. What action is being taken to compensate the aggrieved parties injured financially by this action and if none, why not?

3. When will this matter be finalised and what is the reason for the approximately 3 year delay so far?

The Hon. G.J. CRAFTER:

1. The document in dispute related to a transaction involving the property situated at 279 Wright Street, Adelaide and was not

registered. The Registrar-General had been served with an injunction from the Supreme Court of South Australia restraining him from registering the document. The document was subsequently withdrawn and a newly executed document was lodged. That document was registered on 13 October 1992.

2. & 3. The delay in dealing with the matter was caused by an action before the Court. The matter has now been resolved between the parties out of Court and all registrations on the Certificate of Title are now in order.

CRIME

91. **Mr BECKER:**

1. How many persons are employed by the Government as investigators, particularly with respect to corruption, fraud, larceny and white collar crime etc., in which departments and statutory authorities are they employed and at what salary range and package?

2. How many prosecutions have been instigated by these investigators in the past 12 months, for what crimes and what were the results of each prosecution?

3. What is the estimated cost to each department or agency of these investigations including salary package and expenses?

The Hon. LYNN ARNOLD:

Because this question was asked before the Cabinet reshuffle it has been answered in the previous Ministerial format.

MINISTER OF HEALTH

MINISTER OF FAMILY AND COMMUNITY SERVICES

The Department for Family and Community Services does not employ persons as investigators.

SOUTH AUSTRALIAN HEALTH COMMISSION

1. In the South Australian Health Commission and in the health sector no one is specifically employed as an investigator. However, the South Australian Health Commission has two internal auditors and there are internal auditors at the Royal Adelaide Hospital/Institute of Medical and Veterinary Science, the Women's and Children's Hospital and an internal auditor's position is about to be established at the Queen Elizabeth Hospital. The people in these positions do become involved in investigations with respect to corruption, fraud, larceny and white collar crime etc.

The audit positions are in the ASO-5 to ASO-7 salary range (\$37 515-\$52 326).

2. No prosecutions have been instigated by Internal Audit although they are involved in cases as and when they arise.

3. No separate accounting for the cost of investigation work by Internal Audit is done.

ATTORNEY-GENERAL

1. The Attorney-General's Department employs five Government investigators. Of these five, three have duties which include preliminary investigations into allegations of corruption, fraud, larceny and any other crime or serious misconduct by Government employees.

The salaries of these officers range from \$43 460 to \$46 125 per annum.

2. Ten matters have been referred on to the Police Department for further investigation and likely prosecution for the following offences: larceny, misappropriation, embezzlement, breach of the Secret Commissions Act.

Five of these ten matters have resulted in convictions. The outcomes of the remaining five have yet to be determined.

3. For 1991 the costs for the Government Investigation Unit was \$266 600. It is estimated that approximately one quarter of these resources were directed to investigations of this nature. (i.e. \$66 000).

OMBUDSMAN'S OFFICE

1. The Ombudsman's office employs five officers as investigators. However, none of these investigate corruption, fraud, larceny or white collar crime.
2. Not applicable.
3. Not applicable.

STATE BUSINESS AND CORPORATE AFFAIRS OFFICE

1. Two persons are employed at the State Business and Corporate Affairs Office as investigators. Their principle activities are directed towards ensuring compliance with the Co-operatives Act, the Associations Incorporation Act, the Business Names Act and other legislation administered by the Corporate Affairs Commission. It is estimated that about 10 per cent of their time is involved with investigations regarding fraud and white collar crime. Where such matters involve a breach of the Criminal Law Consolidation Act the investigators work in conjunction with officers of the S.A. Police Department. In these cases any prosecutions which ensue are laid by Police.
The SBCA investigators are employed on GME Act conditions at the ASO-7 (salary range \$48 206-\$52 326) and at the ASO-6 (salary range \$43 460-\$46 125) levels.
2. Aside from matters involving police officers, prosecution action ensues where appropriate and where compliance is not otherwise achieved. In cases where briefs of evidence are prepared prosecution is not pursued where compliance precedes the laying of charges. In the last 12 months one prosecution was instituted in respect of a breach of Business Names Act. The fine and costs imposed totalled \$193. Because the default continues, the matter of whether further prosecution proceedings should be taken is being considered.
3. The estimated costs are \$190 000 which comprises their salaries plus the overhead costs associated with employing and accommodating the officers. As indicated above, it is estimated that 10 per cent of these officers time is involved with investigations regarding fraud and white collar crime.

EQUAL OPPORTUNITIES COMMISSION

1. The Equal Opportunity Commission employs nine conciliation officers. Their responsibilities include the conciliation of complaints of unlawful discrimination. This necessitates some investigation in relation to those complaints, however, not with respect to corruption, fraud, larceny and white collar crime etc.
2. Not applicable.
3. Not applicable.

OTHER AGENCIES

The remaining agencies within the Attorney-General's portfolio (i.e. Court Services Department, Legal Services Commission and the State Electoral Department) do not employ investigators.

MINISTER OF INDUSTRY, TRADE AND TECHNOLOGY DEPARTMENT OF INDUSTRY, TRADE AND TECHNOLOGY

1. Nil
2. Nil
3. Nil

DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE

1. Nil
2. Nil
3. Nil

DEPARTMENT OF FISHERIES

1. Nil
2. Nil

3. Nil.

OFFICE OF MULTICULTURAL AND ETHNIC AFFAIRS

1. Nil.
2. Nil.
3. Nil.

MINISTER OF EDUCATION
MINISTER OF CHILDREN'S SERVICES
EDUCATION DEPARTMENT

1. There are no specifically designated officers employed by the Education Department as investigators.
2. Not applicable.
3. Not applicable.

CHILDREN'S SERVICES OFFICE

1. The Children's Services Office does not employ investigators.
2. Not applicable.
3. Not applicable.

SSABSA

1. SSABSA does not employ investigators.
2. Not applicable.
3. Not applicable.

TEACHERS REGISTRATION BOARD

1. The Teachers Registration Board does not employ investigators.
2. Not applicable.
3. Not applicable.

MINISTER OF TRANSPORT
MINISTER OF CORRECTIONAL SERVICES
MINISTER OF FINANCE
DEPARTMENT OF ROAD TRANSPORT

1. The Internal Audit Section comprises five employees and the annual salaries total \$204 388, including on-costs.

Salary Costs-1991/92 Financial Year				
Manager, Internal Audit	ASO-6	\$43 460-\$46 125	Nil	\$46 12
Senior Operations Auditor	ASO-5	\$37 515-\$42 025	Nil	\$37 515
Operations Auditor	ASO-4	\$33 313-\$34 850	Nil	\$33 313
Internal Auditor	ASO-3	\$29 008-\$31 058	Nil	\$30 473
Internal Auditor	ASO-2	\$24 908-\$26 958	Nil	\$24 908
				\$172 334
Add:				
Salaries On-Costs	18.60%			\$32 054
TOTAL INTERNAL AUDIT SALARIES plus ON-COSTS				\$204 388

The role of this Section is to perform routine audit reviews including compliance audits, management reviews and ADP audit Reviews and, on an ad-hoc basis, assist management in the investigation of circumstances arising from suspected fraud, larceny and corruption.

2. In the past 12 months, three prosecutions have been carried out which have involved some investigation by the Internal Audit Section. All three prosecutions involved the Falsification of Accounts contrary to Section 178a of the Criminal Law Consolidation Act and the results were:

- (1) Dismissed as a result of a technicality regarding the Evidence Act.
 - (2) Convicted on three counts of Falsification of Accounts.
 - (3) The charge was proven but no conviction recorded.
3. The estimated cost of these investigations was \$3 000, including overheads.

DEPARTMENT OF CORRECTIONAL SERVICES

1. The Department of Correctional Services employs two Investigations officers to conduct investigations not only into the matter referred to but primarily into any matters or incidents of concern to the Chief Executive Officer and Government relating to prisoners, clients, staff and members of the Public and includes escapes, sexual harassment, deaths in custody, alleged assaults, allegations of misconduct, accidents, property and injury claims, disturbances and contraband in Prisons.

The Senior Investigations Officer is currently paid at the ASO-6 range and the Investigations Officer at the ASO-5 range.

2. In the past 12 months four police prosecutions have been instigated against staff and resulted from departmental investigations.

- One officer was charged with larceny of departmental property and fined.
- One officer was charged with assault but the police charges were subsequently withdrawn due to a lack of evidence.
- One officer has been charged with larceny of departmental property but that matter has not yet been finalised by the courts.
- One officer was charged with firearms offences and a breach of a restraint order and fined.

In addition 12 staff appeared before Departmental Inquiries in relation to disciplinary matters.

3. The cost to the Department for these investigations was \$102 500 in 1991-92.

STATE TRANSPORT AUTHORITY

1. The State Transport Authority (STA) does not employ any person in a dedicated role of investigator.

Investigations into matters of corruption, fraud and white collar crime are usually undertaken by the STA's Internal Audit Department, whilst matters involving petty larceny are investigated by the STA's Transit Squad.

2. Seven matters were investigated in the past 12 months. No prosecutions were achieved.

3. As there is no dedicated investigation section, costs are not separately reported.

OFFICE OF TRANSPORT POLICY AND PLANNING

1. No persons are employed by the Office of Transport Policy and Planning as investigators.

2. and 3. Not applicable given the answer to 1.

MINISTER OF TOURISM
MINISTER OF CONSUMER AFFAIRS
MINISTER OF SMALL BUSINESS

1. Nil
2. Nil
3. Nil

MINISTER OF HOUSING, URBAN
DEVELOPMENT AND LOCAL
GOVERNMENT RELATIONS
MINISTER OF RECREATION AND SPORT
SOUTH AUSTRALIAN HOUSING TRUST

1. Eight officers are currently employed by the Housing Trust to investigate instances where it is considered Trust clients are obtaining benefits by fraudulent means, including rebated rent, rent relief, Emergency Housing payments and fraudulently obtained cheques. Their salaries range from \$30 655 per annum to \$37 970 per annum with no package benefits.

In addition the Housing Trust employs 5 Internal Auditors who, while not primarily being engaged in fraud detection, attempt to ensure internal controls are in place in order to prevent fraud. If fraud is detected by audit or brought to audit's attention an investigation will be conducted by the police with audit's assistance, if requested. The salary range of Internal

Auditors within the Trust is \$34 440 to \$58 905. There are no package benefits for Internal Audit staff.

2. Of some 1 250 cases of detected fraudulently obtained benefits/cheques, only one case has been forwarded to the S.A. Police for prosecution. The case is still proceeding.

The overpaid benefit relating to the 1 250 cases amounting to \$591 734 has or is currently being repaid to the Trust by the offenders, together with an ongoing increased rent being paid of approximately \$29 666 weekly. The annual benefit to the Trust therefore potentially exceeds \$2 134 366.

Internal Audit has instigated no prosecutions in the last 12 months.

3. The estimated cost of the benefit review process is \$529 000 per annum.

Fraud investigations instigated by Internal Audit were nil, as a consequence the costs were nil also.

DEPARTMENT OF RECREATION AND SPORT

1. Nil.
2. Not applicable.
3. Not applicable.

MINISTER OF LABOUR
MINISTER OF OCCUPATIONAL HEALTH
AND SAFETY MINISTER OF MARINE

WORKCOVER

1. The Fraud Prevention Department of the WorkCover Corporation has six operational investigators employed for the purposes of investigating breaches of the Workers Rehabilitation and Compensation Act. There are two classifications and salary levels within those positions. The salary range for the position of Investigator is between \$33 276 and \$35 885 per annum and the Senior Investigator position is between \$37 516 and \$41 866 per annum.

2. In the past 12 months there have been 20 prosecutions instigated by this Department. All of these relate to offences of fraud, dishonesty and making of false statements under the provisions of the Workers Rehabilitation and Compensation Act legislation as well as charges under the Criminal Law Consolidation Act on one or two isolated matters. Fourteen of the previously mentioned prosecutions have not yet been finalised through the Courts. Of the six that have been finalised, one was convicted without penalty, one was ordered to perform 80 hours Community Service, three have received suspended imprisonment sentences ranging from 2 to 5 months with respective good behaviour bonds, one received a 6 weeks term of imprisonment and fines and costs ordered ranging from \$312 to \$2 595. Furthermore, with the advent of restitution provisions being included in our legislation, orders for restitution have varied from \$396 to \$34 611.50. The total amount of fines and restitution ordered regarding these matters is approximately \$41034.54. In addition to prosecutions however, this department has also been involved in undertaking investigations regarding medical servicing issues. This has resulted in the Corporation lodging a complaint with the Medical Board of South Australia alleging unprofessional conduct concerning one Medical Practitioner. As the result of inquiries made concerning this Doctor this department has achieved total savings of \$341307. Other medical issues have been identified and investigations are currently being undertaken.

3. The estimated cost of these investigations is \$85 010.41. This figure is based on calculated expenditure per investigation and consideration must be given to the fact, that although the total salary package of the six staff employed is greater than that figure, time, effort and resources are utilised on other matters in addition to these listed prosecutions. The overall results achieved by the Department together with investigation costs incurred, are based on manpower resources of 4.5 Investigators and Senior Investigators, due to secondment, over the past 12 months.

DEPARTMENT OF LABOUR

1. The Department of Labour has employed a fraud prevention officer in the Government Workers Rehabilitation and Compensation Office (GWRCO) since early May 1992. This person is responsible for coordinating investigative activities being undertaken by private and government investigators for the GWRCO. This person currently receives a salary of \$37 515 per annum. In addition, during 1991/92 the GWRCO paid private investigators \$37 000 to undertake investigative activities on its behalf.

2. During 1991/92 there was one prosecution. This person was found guilty of fraudulent declaration of earning whilst on workers compensation.

3. The estimated cost to the Department of Labour of the work of the fraud prevention officer during 1991/92 was \$6 250 (salary only, as other costs are absorbed into the normal operating costs of the GWRCO). In addition, during 1991/92 a further \$37 000 was spent on private investigators by the GWRCO.

DEPARTMENT OF MARINE AND HARBORS

1. Nil.

2. One successful prosecution was achieved in relation to misuse of resources by an employee. The individual was fined with no criminal conviction recorded. A formal inquiry was also then conducted under the GME Act and disciplinary action was administered.

3. Cost of investigation to the Department is estimated at \$3 000 excluding work costs of the Government Investigator, Crown Solicitor's Office and Police Department which are not charged to the Department.

SOUTH AUSTRALIAN OCCUPATIONAL HEALTH
AND SAFETY COMMISSION

1. Nil.

MINISTER FOR THE ARTS AND CULTURAL HERITAGE
MINISTER FOR LOCAL GOVERNMENT RELATIONS
MINISTER OF STATE SERVICES

1. I advise that there are no persons employed in agencies under my control as investigators of corruption, fraud, larceny and white collar crime. The agencies use the resources of the Police Department and Attorney-General's Department (Government Investigation Officers) as necessary.

MINISTER FOR ENVIRONMENT AND PLANNING
MINISTER OF WATER RESOURCES
MINISTER OF LANDS

DEPARTMENT OF ENVIRONMENT AND PLANNING

The information in relation to the cost of specified investigations is not kept itemised or separate to the other enforcement and administrative work of the officers and branches concerned.

1. Nineteen investigators are employed by the Department of Environment and Planning none of which are employed in the matters mentioned in the question.

The salary range is: NP6\$39 000

TGO3	\$38 950
TGO2	\$34 850
NP4	\$34 500
NP3	\$30 300
TGO1	\$30 132
ASO2	\$26 958

2. Prosecutions instigated:

Ozone protection	3	2 guilty, 1 x \$2 000 fine
Air quality	2	No outcome yet
Noise	4	No outcome yet
Natural resources	92	Average fine \$214

3. Estimated cost details not kept separate from general enforcement work.

ENGINEERING AND WATER SUPPLY DEPARTMENT
DEPARTMENT OF LANDS

All investigations for the Engineering and Water Supply Department and the Department of Lands are undertaken by Crown Law.

MINISTER OF EMERGENCY SERVICES
MINISTER OF MINES AND ENERGY
MINISTER OF FORESTS

1. Nil.
2. Nil.
3. Nil.

MINISTER OF EMPLOYMENT AND FURTHER
EDUCATIONMINISTER OF YOUTH AFFAIRS
MINISTER OF ABORIGINAL AFFAIRS
DEPARTMENT OF EMPLOYMENT, TECHNICAL AND
FURTHER EDUCATION
MINISTER ASSISTING THE MINISTER OF ETHNIC
AFFAIRS

1. No persons are employed by the Department of Employment and Technical and Further Education as investigators.

However, any manager, as well as staff of key areas e.g. Internal Audit, Human Resources, may be involved in preliminary inquiries before specialist investigators i.e. Government Investigations Officers from the Crown Solicitors Office, Police Department, are called in.

2. Four matters have been referred to specialist investigators during the past 12 months.

3. As neither the Crown Solicitor's Office nor the Police Department charge for services provided to Government Departments, the investigations undertaken do not result in any direct cost to the Department of Employment and TAFE. However, unquantifiable costs arise indirectly from the need for Departmental officers to prepare reports dealing with possible offences.

OFFICE OF TERTIARY EDUCATION

1. No investigators were employed by the Office of Tertiary Education. Note that the office was merged with the Department of Employment and TAFE from 1 July 1992.

2. None. Not applicable.
3. Nil. Not applicable.

STATE ABORIGINAL AFFAIRS

1. None.
2. None. Not applicable.
3. Nil. Not applicable.

PREMIER—TREASURER
DEPARTMENT OF THE PREMIER AND CABINET

No persons employed in this Department as investigators.

GRAND PRIX BOARD

1. Nil.
2. Not applicable.
3. Not applicable.

TREASURY DEPARTMENT—SGIC

1. Four persons are employed as fraud investigators, one is employed as an analyst and two as clerks to perform office duties. The salary range is \$22 000 to \$56 000. Motor vehicles are provided as part of the package for Investigators, but a salary offset is deducted for private use.

2. SGIC Investigators have no statutory powers and as such must refer matters to the appropriate authority for prosecution.

The Fraud Investigation Unit's activities are split between SGIC's Compulsory Third Party (CTP) and General Insurance operations.

Statistics relating to the investigations are as follows:

No. of matters Investigated	Referrals to Police	Referrals to the Legal Complaints Committee
CTP 202	10 (6 False Pretences) (4 Perjury)	2 —
General 68	25 (False Pretences)	—

3. The cost of running the operations of the Fraud Unit within SGIC amounted to \$142 700 for the year ended 30 June 1992 or 0.25% of Gross CTP Premium Income.

STATE TAXATION OFFICE

1. The STO employs Investigators who conduct specific compliance programs to ensure that each taxpayer group receives audit attention. Their primary responsibilities are to:

- detect and collect avoided or evaded duty;
- assess the extent of avoidance/evasion activities and assess potential revenue loss;
- increase compliance through field audit.

The Branch has 19 FTEs currently engaged in these activities in positions with salaries ranging from \$24 908 to \$53 351.

2. Prosecutions are made for breaches of tax legislation. The main focus of such activities is to identify the extent of tax liability and to apply penalties in accordance with the relevant Acts. Duties and penalties due to the Crown are recovered.

3. The 1991-92 expenditure for the STO Investigators was \$1 023 586.

HOSPITALS, CLOSURES

131. **The Hon. D.C. WOTTON:** How many State funded hospitals closed in South Australia in the past two years and how many are planned to close in the ensuing year?

The Hon. M.J. EVANS: In the last two years, the Government has ceased to provide funds to Onkaparinga District Hospital Inc. and the Blyth District Hospital Inc. The Oodnadatta Hospital and Health Service has amalgamated with the Port Augusta Hospital. Funding for Oodnadatta is now provided to the Port Augusta Hospital.

The Government does not have plans to cease funding any other State funded hospitals in the ensuing year.

SUPERANNUATION

138. **The Hon. D.C. WOTTON** asked the Minister of Public Infrastructure:

1. Why has the Commonwealth superannuation levy been included in Executive, Professional, Technical, Administrative and Clerical Support, Intra Agency Support Services (page 292, Program Estimates and Information, 1992-93)?

2. What are the details of the other amounts in this program?

The Hon. J.H.C. KLUNDER:

1. Unlike the Public Sector Employee Superannuation Scheme (the 3 per cent productivity scheme) which benefits all government employees, the superannuation guarantee levy applies only to those employees not presently members of employer-sponsored superannuation schemes.

Although the agency was in a position at budget time to determine, in aggregate terms for the organisation, the number of employees not participating in employer sponsored superannuation schemes and associated costs, it was not possible in the time available to reflect, with any degree of accuracy, the

funding at the program level. In discussions with Treasury it was deemed appropriate to include the amount of the levy under Intra-Agency Support Services in the program estimates and the Estimates of Payments and Receipts documents.

It is the understanding with Treasury that during the financial year actual expenditure associated with the levy will be reported against specific programs in order that the full costs of administering programs are appropriately identified.

2. The proposed and actual amounts shown under Intra-Agency Support Services for 1991-92 relates to the Commonwealth grant for the Australian Centre for Water Treatment and Water Quality Research, refer page 145 of the Estimates of Payments and Receipts 1992-93.

RECOVERABLE WORKS

142. **The Hon. D.C. WOTTON:**

1. Why was there no estimate of receipts from Recoverable works in 1991-92 when the actual receipts were \$6.7 million?

2. What are the details of the Recoverable works actual expenditure, 1991-92 totalling \$8.2 million and if this figure included work in progress, was the value included as a receipt in the estimates for 1992-93?

3. Were any losses incurred in relation to 1991-92 Recoverable works and if so, what are the details of the contracts and the losses and what effects have they had on rates?

The Hon. J.H.C. KLUNDER:

1. The Estimate of Payments and Receipts is a budget document, the format of which is prepared largely by the Treasury and approved by the Treasurer.

An effort has been made to improve the quality of information provided and an effort was made to agree, where possible, the Estimate of Payments and Receipts to the agencies published financial statements. For Engineering and Water Supply Department this meant the inclusion in the Estimates this year, the line 'Recoverable Works'.

The changes to format were approved by the Treasurer for the 1992-93 Estimates, which by convention does not allow for changes to prior years estimates which have been ratified by Parliament.

2. Actual expenditure for 1991-92 of \$8.2 million related to 2 983 individual sundry debtors. The major categories of debtors include, other government departments, statutory authorities, e.g. SAHT, Local Government councils and private contractors involved primarily in the housing industry.

For the 1991-92 financial year expenditure incurred of \$8.2 million represents both completed and works in progress. Payments not received at the end of the financial year for works undertaken by the Department are recognised in the balance sheet as part of current assets receivable in accordance with Australian Accounting Standards. In accordance with Auditor-General requirements and to ensure consistent treatment between financial years an amount of \$2.3 million is shown as sundry debtors in note 16 of the financial statement for 1991-92 (page

66 of the Auditor-General's Report). This amount is expected to be collected and consequently has been included as a receipt in the estimates for 1992-93.

3. Recoverable works are either undertaken on a firm quote basis or at actual cost i.e. no profit or loss is expected. A periodic analysis of firm quote work is carried out by the Department's internal Estimating Services to ensure the accuracy of quotes.

Recoverable works are accounted for separately and have no impact on the determination of rates.

HOUSING TRUST PROPERTIES

152. **Mr BECKER:** In the past three financial years how many housing properties and vacant blocks of land have had to be decontaminated by the South Australian Housing Trust and at what locations and cost?

The Hon. G.J. CRAFTER: The attached table details the housing properties and vacant blocks of land where site remediation works have been undertaken by the South Australian Housing Trust in the past three financial years.

This summary does not include asbestos removal work, generally of minor nature involving asbestos-cement sheeting,

which is carried out by SACON in accordance with Department of Labour requirements.

SITE INVESTIGATION AND REMEDIATION COSTS ON TRUST SITES			Maylands	Clifton Street	\$12 506
			26.19.01.00		
			26.19.01.01		
			26.19.01.02		
			Marden		
			25.12.01.03	Lower Portrush Road	\$3 579
1 July 1989 to 30 June 1990			Nailsworth		
			42.72.00.01	Harvey Street	\$1 021
			42.72.01.00		
			Magill	*** Glen Stuart Road	\$274 498
Project	Address	Site Investigations and Remediation Cost	20.94.02.00		
			20.94.02.02		
			20.94.02.05		
Albert Park	Hawke Street	\$349 352	St Marys	Ayliffes Road	\$7 244
93.14.01.00			42.57.00.02		
Pennington	Arthur Street	\$16 346	Adelaide	Sturt Street	\$35 068
23.45.01.00			26.31.00.01		
23.45.02.00			26.31.00.02		
Bowden	Florence Street etc.,	\$31 985	Brompton	Chief Street	\$117 072
87.08.03.00			23.79.01.00		
	Total	\$397 683	23.79.00.01		
			Adelaide	Carrington Street	\$3 137
			99.84.02.01		
1 July 1990 to 30 June 1991			Bowden	Eighth Street	\$10 000
			25.28.00.99		
Project	Address	Site Investigation and Remediation Cost	Port Pirie	34 John Street	\$320
				48 Wright Street	\$680
				Total	\$2 024 148
Bowden	7, 8, 9th Streets	\$16 187	1 July 1992 to 30 June 1993		
87.08.00.06			Site Investigation and Remediation Cost		
Royal Park	Palm Avenue	\$36 331	Project	Address	
25.68.00.01					
Mile End	Railway Terrace	\$44 979	Peterhead	*Mead Street	\$10 332
42.28.01.00			26.16.01.02		
42.28.00.02			Colonel Light Gardens	*Eton Street	\$26 605
Bowden	Hawker Street	\$7 534	26.01.00.01		
42.76.00.01			Plympton Park	Hill Street	\$3 705
Port Pirie	25 John Street	\$2 511	43.45.01.01		
	Total	\$107 542	Plympton Park	*Ferry Street	\$736
			44.02.00.01		
1 July 1991 to 30 June 1992			Brompton	Trembath Street	\$49 372
			87.08.03.00		
Project	Address	Site Investigation and Remediation Cost	Brompton	*	\$75 114
			87.03.00.10		
Brompton	** Ex Readymix Site (Burley Griffin Estate)	\$1 188 100	West Hindmarsh	*South Road	\$29 128
22.39.01.00			20.40.01.00		
Largs Bay	Peterhead Street	\$8 295	Port Pirie	36 Wright Street	\$532
42.88.00.01				Total	\$195 524
Glenelg North	Bagshaw Street	\$28 858	Total Costs Incurred		
25.03.01.00			\$2 724 897		
Unley	Mary Street	\$27 746			
26.09.00.01					
26.09.00.01					
Albert Park	Murray Street	\$6 681	* = Work not completed		
43.12.01.01			** = Remediation costs on this site comprise:		
Brompton	First Street	\$127 134	(1) \$782 600 site preparation works related to controlled filling of pugholes after removal of concrete and other loose material.		
87.08.00.05			(2) \$405 500 works associated with soil contamination.		
Bowden	*Trembath Street	\$6 224	*** = This expenditure includes significant costs associated with asbestos removal and the demolition of existing buildings.		
26.22.01.00					
26.22.01.01					
Rosewater	Torrens Road	\$26 004			
92.25.00.01					
Exeter	Causeway Road	\$31 908			
25.78.00.01					
Kensington	Thornton Street	\$17 704			
25.09.00.02					
Bowden	Trembath Street	\$12 230			
41.74.00.01					
41.74.00.02					
Ascot Park	Beaconsfield Terrace	\$78 139			
25.82.00.01					

URBAN LAND TRUST

153. Mr BECKER:

1. What is the reason for the reduction of interest received by the South Australian Urban Land Trust from \$6 947 000 in 1990-91 to \$1 746 000 in 1991-92?

2. How many Urban Land Trust deposits, of what amount and at what interest rates, were held with the South Australian Government Financing Authority for each of those years?

The Hon. G.J. CRAFTER:

1. The South Australian Urban Land Trust's average daily cash balance during 1990-91 was \$53.7 million, compared to \$20.3 million during the 1991-92 financial year. Additionally, there has been a substantial reduction in interest rates over the two year period. The reduction in cash balances is mainly attributable to the outlay of \$27.6 million in June 1991 for the purchase of land at Northfield and Walkley Heights.

2. Under centralised cash management arrangements with the South Australian Government Financing Authority (SAFA), all surplus cash balances held by the South Australian Urban Land Trust are deposited on an 'at call' basis with SAFA's Public Sector Cash Management Account. Interest rates are variable, being calculated on the average of either the 30 day or 90 day bank bill rates, with interest payments being made on a monthly or quarterly basis respectively. The calculation method is at the Trust's option, reviewable at half-yearly intervals. At the end of the last two financial years, 'at call' deposits held with SAFA were:

	\$million	
At 30 June 1991	23.384	Interest rate for June 1991 was 10.53%
(one deposit)		(average 30 day bank bill rate)
At 30 June 1992	18.021	Interest rate for June 1992 was 6.62%
(one deposit)		(average 30 day bank bill rate)

AGENT-GENERAL

191. **Mr S.J. BAKER:** Will the office of the South Australian Agent-General in London be located in Australia House, and, if not, why not?

The Hon. LYNN ARNOLD: The lease agreement under which the Agent-General's office has been operating at South Australia House has hitherto been most advantageous in terms of rent payable.

On 31 December 1994, the lease agreement is due for review and a considerable increase in the cost of rental is anticipated. In addition, reductions in staff numbers in recent years have reduced space requirements. Discussions have taken place between the Agent-General and the Australian High Commission with a view to possibly vacating South Australia House at the expiration of the current lease and relocating at Australia House. The High Commission has suitable vacant office areas that are due for refurbishment.

ELECTRICITY TRUST

204. **Mr BECKER:**

1. How much security bond money was held in trust by ETSA and for how many private and business consumers, respectively, in each of the years ended 30 June 1991 and 1992?

2. How many security bonds were returned to private or business consumers, respectively, during each of the years ended 30 June 1991 and 1992?

The Hon. M.D. RANN:

1.

Security Deposit Held			
1991-92	No.	1990-91	No.
\$2 664 123	19641	\$2 789 992	19645

ETSA's records do not differentiate between business deposits and residential deposits.

2. During the year 1991-92 11 244 Security Deposits were returned to customers, either because the customer had established a two year good record of payment or was deducted from the final account when the customer vacated the premises.

The total number of Security Deposits returned during the year 1990-91 is not available but the number refunded would be of a similar order.

PATAWALONGA

205. **The Hon. D.C. WOTTON:** What specific plans does the Government have to commence a dredging program in the Patawalonga Basin to eliminate future flooding in the Glenelg North area adjacent to the Patawalonga and when is it anticipated that it will commence?

The Hon. M.K. MAYES: Dredging the Patawalonga does not have any impact on the risk of future flooding of the Glenelg North area. Because of the low lying nature of Patawalonga, the state of the tide governs whether or not water can be released from the basin during major inflows of stormwater and thus whether the risk of flooding exists or not.

Rare extreme high tides would themselves cause flooding if the gates at the mouth of the basin were not closed. Conversely, if the gates are closed, it is possible for stormwater to fill Patawalonga, backup through the local drains and also overtop the banks of the basin, thereby flooding adjacent residences. This situation in fact occurred on 30 August 1992.

If the quantity of stormwater entering the basin over the period during which the gates are shut can be contained below a certain level, then flooding will not occur. The "airspace" volume between the initial water level and the level at which flooding commences, determines how much runoff can be contained. Since the silt is submerged below the initial water level, dredging cannot increase the stormwater storage capacity of Patawalonga, and hence the flood risk will not be reduced.

WATER METERS

206. **The Hon. D.C. WOTTON:**

1. Has the E&WS Department contributed to the preparation of Australian Standard 3565-1988 "Meters for cold potable water"?

2. Since the introduction of AS 3565-1988, have domestic water meter installations fully complied with all the requirements of that standard and if not, which standards are complied with?

3. If the AS 3565-1988, section 3.1 requirement for a maximum permissible error of + or -2% flow rate error for water meters is not complied with in relation to domestic water meters, why not?

4. How many domestic water meters were tested by the E&WS Department at the request of consumers, at their homes, over each of the past five years and how many were found to be unreliable?

5. Can the Minister confirm that, in every case where testing was carried out—

- (a) accurate records of the results of the tests were kept;
- (b) accurate records of the method of testing were kept;
- (c) instruments used in these tests were scientifically accurate and calibrated by the Standards Laboratories to National Measurement Regulations requirements;
- (d) certificates of verification pursuant to National Measurement Regulations existed for every instrument used in these tests; and
- (e) consumers were provided with a copy of the documentation referred to in (a), (b) and (d)?

6. Were the methods of on-site testing used by E&WS on disputed domestic meters over the past five years incapable of—

- (a) inflicting any harm or damage to the mechanisms of the meters that might adversely influence their calibration in subsequent testing; and
- (b) suppressing the calibration error that might otherwise have been recorded at normal water delivery flow rates through the meter?

The Hon. J.H.C. KLUNDER:

1. The Department's Chairman, Meter Management was a member of the Standards Committee WS/24, from its conception in 1982. He was appointed Chairman of the committee in 1987.

2. Domestic meters installed in South Australia conform with the requirements of AS 3565-1988.

3. In accordance with section 3.1 of AS 3565-1988, both new and refurbished meters are required to register over the nominated flow rate range with a maximum permissible error of + or -2%. However, the Consolidation of Regulations under the

Waterworks Act, 1932-1981 requires meters in service to register with an error not in excess of + 5%.

This applies to all meters in use, including meters that have been in service for more than ten years.

The accuracy requirements stipulated in the Regulations for meters in service have been adopted as Departmental policy for many years. The accuracy requirements for new meters stipulated in AS 3565-1988 have only been in existence since 1988.

With more emphasis now being placed on the need for accurate water meters, aged meters are now being site tested and replaced only if the calculated error is outside of +2 to -4 %.

4.—

Year	No. Tested	No. Unreliable
1987	240 Est	N/A
1988	250 Est	N/A
1989	213	60
1990	236	69
1991	227	84
1992 to date	120	31

Records of meter laboratory and bench test results have been kept since January 1989.

5. (a) Records of the results of all meter laboratory and bench tests have been kept since January 1989.

(b) Since January 1989 all meters have been tested for accuracy followed by stripping and detailed examination of all components for fault detection as a standard procedure.

(c) The three master proving tanks are checked and certified by the Standards Laboratories to National Measurement Regulations requirements every two years.

(d) Certificates of verification pursuant to National Measurement Regulations are held for all three master proving tanks.

(e) Consumers have the option of personally witnessing the meter laboratory and bench tests, otherwise they are advised of the results in writing.

6. (a) Meters are site tested either by connecting a portable test unit directly to the property meter or by connecting to the tap nearest to the property meter. Neither of these test methods would be detrimental to the meter performance.

Domestic water meters are robust instruments and performance would not be influenced by site testing techniques within reason, including the disconnection of the meter from the property pipework.

(b) Domestic meters, in accordance with AS 3565-1988, are designed to accommodate flows to at least twice normal design flow for periods up to one hour without any damage or performance reduction. Subjecting meters to full flow in most installations would not be detrimental to meter accuracy.

LAKE LITTRA

208. The Hon. D. J. HOPGOOD:

1. Was the flooding of Lake Littra artificially prolonged in summer 1989 to promote fish recruitment and, if so, how was this achieved and was there additional recruitment and, if so, which species were represented and in what quantities?

2. What plans are in hand for further such manipulation of River Murray water levels?

The Hon. M. K. MAYES:

1. Flooding of Lake Littra was prolonged in the summer of 1989 by placing an earth embankment across the drainage outlet. The study was undertaken to examine the effects of extending of floodplain inundation upon:

- juvenile fish growth and survival;
- prey abundance;
- associated physical/chemical properties of the water body.

The results indicate that prolonged flood duration does not result in direct enhancement of native fish recruitment although those fish trapped in the Lake did show an increased growth rate. Furthermore converting temporary backwaters to permanent backwaters favours exotic fishes eg: carp, redfin over native fish, eg: callop, bony bream.

No estimates of the quantity of fish are available.

2. There are no plans to extend this research study, although the results will be included in a report to the Murray-Darling

Basin Commission outlining flow management strategies for enhancing native fish species in the River Murray.

SEPARATION PACKAGES

213. Hon. D. C. WOTTON:

1. How were the E&WS voluntary separation packages funded during 1991-92 and how will they be funded during 1992-93?

2. Have existing provisions for long service and annual leave been adequate to cover the packages accepted to date?

The Hon. J. H. C. KLUNDER:

1. Voluntary separation packages for both 1991-92 and 1992-93 have and will be funded on a commercial basis via a SAFA financing facility.

2. The leave provisions disclosed in note 20 of the financial Statements (refer page 67 of the Auditor-General's Report) are sufficient to cover the calculated leave liability for all E&WS employees.

ENGINEERING AND WATER SUPPLY DEPARTMENT

214. The Hon. D. C. WOTTON:

1. Will any of the net gain of \$2.39m on the sale of E&WS assets in 1991-92 be treated as recovered depreciation?

2. How has the Department calculated its depreciation rates during 1990-91, 1991-92 and how will it calculate its rates in 1992-93?

3. What were or are the depreciation rates for each of these years and if any rates have been changed, why?

4. In determining depreciation rates is the level of maintenance taken into account?

5. What assumptions have been made about the economic life of mains and what are the reasons for these assumptions?

6. What residual values are taken into account when depreciation is calculated and are these values revised whenever assets are revalued?

The Hon. J. H. C. KLUNDER:

1. The net gain of \$2.39m on the sale of assets in 1991-92 was made as follows:

Land	\$1.69m
Vehicles and Machinery	\$0.70m
	<hr/>
	\$2.39m
	<hr/>

The net gain from the sale of vehicles and machinery does represent a recovery of depreciation, however the net gain from the sale of land, which is a non-wasting asset (i.e. not depreciated) represents proceeds in excess of original costs.

2. In the 1986-87 financial year the Department raised depreciation in the accounting records for the first time. In formulating a policy for depreciation it was recognised that the most appropriate basis for the calculation of depreciation would be to use a straight line method over the economic life of the Department's assets having regard to the current replacement cost of the assets.

Because of resources and time needed to develop appropriate data bases and systems to correctly determine economic lives and true replacement costs, the Department adopted as an interim measure, the conventional historic cost depreciation policy.

The economic lives established as an interim measure are detailed on Appendix A. These economic lives, have been used as the basis for straight line depreciation since 1986-87 and are currently being used to raise depreciation for 1992-93.

In 1989-90 the Department adopted a policy to progressively revalue its assets from historic cost to current replacement costs. As a result additional depreciation is raised above the charge derived from the historical cost method.

3. The economic lives as detailed on Appendix A have been used as the basis for calculating straight line depreciation since 1986-87 and are currently being used to raise depreciation for the 1992-93 financial year.

4. In determining economic lives for depreciation purposes normal operating conditions and preventative maintenance are taken into account.

5. When the Department commenced depreciation in 1986-87 the economic life of mains was set as 80 years. This period was based on information and statistics held by the Department and other similar authorities.

Since that date significant improvements have been made to the quality and quantity of data held regarding mains eg. age, location, material type, number of bursts, renewals etc., which have indicated to date that an 80 year economic life may be too conservative.

A review of economic lives of all Departmental assets is an ongoing process and where sufficient information is available to confidently predict the economic life of an asset depreciation rates will be amended accordingly.

6. Apart from vehicles and machinery no residual values are taken into account when depreciation is calculated. Given the nature and location of the majority of the Department's assets this approach is considered appropriate.

GROUP	TYPE	LIFE (YEARS)
Evaporation Basins	Earthworks	50
	Surrounds	N.W.
Hydro/Met Stations	—	25
<i>Plant and Equipment</i>		
Minor Plant	—	5
Major Plant	Refer Major Plant Depreciation Schedule	
Computing Software	—	5
Intangible Assets		
Leaseholds	—	To be determined
Copyrights etc	—	To be determined

APPENDIX A

DEPRECIATION RATES

GROUP	TYPE	LIFE (YEARS)
<i>Infrastructure Assets</i>		
Reservoirs	Earthworks	99
	Structural	50
	Pipework	80
	Surrounds	N.W.
Tanks and Storages	Earthworks	99
	Structural	50
	Pipework	80
	Surrounds	N.W.
Major Pipelines	Various	80
	Water Mains	N.W.
	Sewer Mains	
Services	—	30
Connection	—	80
Bores and Wells	Structural	50
	Mechanical	25
	Electrical	15
	Surrounds	N.W.
Pumping Stations	Structural	50
	Pipework	50
	Mechanical	25
	Electrical	15
	Surrounds	N.W.
Treatment Plants	Structural	50
Water Filt. Plants	Mechanical	25
Fluoride Plants	Electrical	15
Chlorin. Plants	Surrounds	N.W.
Chloram. Plants		
Iron Rem. Plants		
Embankments	Earthworks	30
Channels	Structural	30
Sluice Structures	Earthworks	50
Drainage Structures	Structural	50
Buildings	Structural	50
Depots	Surrounds	N.W.
Houses		
Land	—	N.W.
Bridges	Timber/Concrete	50

COMMUNITY SERVICE ORGANISATIONS

216. **The Hon. D.C. WOTTON:** What formula is used to distribute funding to non-Government community service and disability organisations?

The Hon. M.J. EVANS: In the funding programs administered by the Department for Family and Community Services there are no specific formulae for the allocation of funds. Experience has shown that statistical formulae are not able to take into account subtle local variations which are important in the provision of community services.

The Family and Community Development Fund allocates resources on the basis of need and draws upon:

- data compiled in the Social Health Atlas;
- Dr Forster's study on locational disadvantage;
- other statistics where they are available on the demand for services;
- and the knowledge and experience of Advisory Committee members and project staff,

in order to formulate the recommendations on funding priorities to the Minister.

The Supported Accommodation Assistance Program provides funds according to an annual State Plan which is developed through the work of sector advisory committees and the Ministerial Advisory Committee. On each of these groups government and non-government agencies are equally represented. Advisory Committees and project staff also draw upon relevant statistics and their practical knowledge of service needs to prepare the State Plan.

In the Home and Community Care Program, there is no specific formula for the distribution of funds to non-government community service and disability organisations. Funds are allocated to a range of government, local government and non-government organisations to provide priority services in specific areas where a needs based planning approach has identified unmet needs.

WATER SUPPLY

217. **The Hon. D.C. WOTTON:** What matters have been covered in the Australian Water Resources Council's Inter-Agency Comparisons and will the Minister make the comparisons available to the House?

The Hon. J.H.C. KLUNDER: The Water Industry Performance Review covers the period from 1987-88 to 1990-91 and provides the capacity to analyse the key financial issues and to measure the management performance achieved by the water industry.

The information provided involves a cross sectional and time series review of water agency costs, charges, standards of service and Real Rate of Return (RRR). Because of differences in geography, demography, charging mechanisms, standards of service, levels of debt and other operational variations it is very difficult to draw accurate comparisons between agencies. The Review does not claim to do this. Instead it looks at overall trends.

The major insights arising from the Review are:

Australian water industry total costs per head of population have not increased in real terms over the last four years.

Labour shedding has not had any significant impact on costs due to the short term impact of redundancy payments. An increase in metropolitan operating costs has been offset by reduced capital costs. This reflects the decrease in infrastructure replacement and the ongoing depreciation of assets.

Charges per customer have risen by 3 per cent in real terms. This reflects a move to greater cost recovery and technical quality improvements such as improved water treatment.

Non metropolitan water and sewerage services do not recover their costs. Operating costs have reduced for these services.

Irrigation services are still heavily subsidised by States. Total costs for irrigation have decreased. Substantial price increases are required to recover costs.

The metropolitan sector is financially viable at existing charges and levels of service. However the relationships between prices, standards of service, tax and dividend policies for the water industry still needs consideration.

Looking at the 1990-91 comparisons with the national average, South Australia compared well in metropolitan water and sewerage:

	National Av.	South Aust.
Operating cost per person	\$127	\$105
Total cost per person	\$328	\$324
Operating revenue per person	\$301	\$259
Economic real rate of return	3.17%	2.04%

In country water and sewerage:

	National Av.	South Aust.
Operating cost per person	\$123	\$169
Total cost per person	\$357	\$821
Operating revenue per person	\$256	\$243
Economic real rate of return	1.24%	-1.79%

The reason for higher costs per person in South Australian country areas is explained by the very small communities served, and in many cases, the long distances between these communities and their sources of water.

LEGAL AID

220. Mr BECKER:

1. Why has unlimited legal aid been provided to a Mr Leon Carpenter of Port Augusta through his solicitors, Ross & McCarthy, enabling him to take protracted legal action against Mr R. Siepman of Modern Weighbridge & Scales Service Pty Ltd and Mr Bill Chinnick in relation to loan documents and bills of sale for amounts totalling in excess of \$300 000 over a 12 month period, allegedly signed under duress?

2. Is it normal practice of the Legal Services commission to assist loan defaulters in this matter and if so why and to what extent?

3. Does the Commission pay costs and damages in the event of their client's case not being successful and, if so, what percentage?

The Hon. G.J. CRAFTY:

1. The Commission is often questioned about grants of aid to other parties to litigation, often in an attempt to have legal assistance to the aided party terminated. In some instances, information is provided to the Commission in support of a request by an unaided party that aid to the other party be terminated. The Commission fully investigates all such complaints. However, because of the confidentiality provisions of the Legal Services Commission Act, the results of the Commission's investigations including information as to whether legal aid has in fact been granted, or not, or whether legal aid having been granted is maintained, terminated or varied, are not conveyed to the author of such a complaint.

Accordingly, the Legal Services Commission is not able to disclose information concerning the affairs of any person, having regard to the provisions of section 31 of the Legal Services Commission Act, 1977. In the instant case the Commission considers that the prohibition on disclosure in that section operates.

2. See the answer to 1. above.

3. If, and when, the Commission makes a grant of aid to assist a person to pursue or conduct litigation, and costs are ordered to be paid by that person, then the payment of any such costs is the responsibility of the person assisted. Furthermore, the Commission is of the clear view that it is not statutorily empowered under its Act to indemnify an assisted person for any costs ordered to be paid by that assisted person.

GLENGOWRIE HIGH SCHOOL

221. Mr BRINDAL:

1. Has the South Australian Housing Trust purchased any part of the Glengowrie High School site and if so, what portion and at what cost and if not, why not?

2. Did the Trust bid or receive any indication that it could bid for the site of the Oaklands Primary School and if so, what was the outcome of those negotiations and if there were none, why not?

3. as the Trust expressed any interest in the following sites:

- (a) Dover High School;
- (b) Dover Primary School;
- (c) Darlington Primary School; and
- (d) Mawson High School?

The Hon. G.J. CRAFTY:

1 No

2. No.

3. (a) No.

(b) No.

RECREATION AND SPORTS GRANTS

226. Mr BECKER: What grants are to be given to recreation and sporting associations and organisations this financial year, how do they compare with the previous year and what is the reason for any reduction or increase?

The Hon. G.J. CRAFTY:

(a) Department of Recreation and Sport—Sports Division: There is an overall budget of \$1.4 million to be allocated to sport through the SASI Sports Plan program in 1992-93, which is consistent with that allocated in 1991-92.

The funds allocated to sport through this program are approved throughout the year at a time most appropriate for the sport, therefore not all funding has been approved. It is envisaged that overall funding levels will remain reasonably consistent throughout this financial year.

i.e. Approvals so far:

	1992-93	1991-92
	\$	\$
Orienteering	5 500	5 500
Weightlifting	50 000	51 000
Athletics	110 000	90 000*

(*1991-92 was an abnormal year as a number of major events were held in Adelaide therefore reduced expenditure required.)

There has been an impact relating to the establishment of the Coaches' Award structure and backdated to October 1991. To maintain the quality of programs and ensure there were funds available for these commitments there were two full-time programs dropped—Men's and Women's Lawn Bowls. In addition, the employment of four coaches has been terminated, i.e. Men's Lawn Bowls, Women's Lawn Bowls, Swimming Assistant and Tennis Assistant.

There will also be funds allocated through the Sports Development Section during this year. These funds will be allocated to sports not already receiving Sports Plan funds. It is planned to commence the funding through this program as soon as possible.

(b) Department of Recreation and Sport Recreation SA:

Recreation SA conducts an annual, rolling grants program that is directed towards management assistance, specific activities, recreation leadership training and recreation event support. The program also contains social justice components, catering to groups that provide recreational activities for people with disabilities, Aboriginals, older adults and women.

The total budget allocation for 1992-93 is \$510 500.

The actual grant allocation for 1991-92 was \$418 000.

The funds allocated to Recreation Associations are approved throughout the year and the following is a list of approvals to date with last year's comparison.

Association	1991-92	1992-93
	\$	\$
Bicycle SA	8 000	2 000
Calisthenics Association	2 250	2 945
Australian Council for Health, Physical Education and Recreation	2 624	500
Canoe SA	20 000	22 650
Kindergym SA	4 000	12 000
Bush & Mountain Walking Leadership Training Board	20 000	23 000
TAFE (Regency Park)	54 000	54 000
Australian Association for Women's Sport and Recreation	30 000	30 589
Recreation for Older Adults	40 000	43 000
Surf Life Saving SA	93 200	93 200
Australian Society for Sports Administrators	—	2 000
SA Keep Fit Association	—	8 000
Taijiquan Association	—	500
Association of Blind Sporting Clubs	—	2 000
Cambodian Australian—Youth Group	—	500
SA Deaf Recreation Association	—	2 500
SA Children's Week Committee	—	1 000
Kite Flyers Association of SA	—	1 400

The grants program now includes an event component and was not operational for part of the 1991-92 year and this explains the apparent increase in this year's budget allocation.

**SOUTH AUSTRALIAN
GOVERNMENT FINANCING AUTHORITY**

237. Mr BECKER:

1. What were the names of and assets and liabilities of all 'affiliated entities' of the South Australian Government Financing Authority in the year ended 30 June 1992?

2. Who are the directors of each affiliated entity and what are their annual remuneration and expenses?

3. Who audits each 'affiliated entity'?

The Hon. FRANK BLEVINS: In responding to this Question on Notice it is relevant to refer to the information provided in the Annual Report of the South Australian Government Financing Authority (SAFA) in relation to 'affiliated entities'. The SAFA Annual Report has a chapter entitled 'Affiliated Corporate and Trust Structures' which explains the general purpose of the major SAFA affiliates and includes a description of their activities. The chapter dealing with Equity Investments contains an explanation of the purposes of the group of entities associated with Enterprise Investments and a summary of their financial position as at 30 June 1992 together with a brief history of results since the Enterprise Investments Trust was established in 1989. The financial position of the major affiliates are also incorporated in SAFA's financial statement, making them subject to verification by the Auditor-General and the auditor appointed by the SAFA Board, Deloitte Ross Tohmatsu. Appendix B to the SAFA Annual Report contains a complete list of the directors who held office with the affiliates at 30 June 1992.

It has been a consistent policy for SAFA to provide relevant information regarding its 'affiliated entities' in the Annual Report to Parliament. Much of the information asked for in this question is provided in the report for the 1991-92 financial year.

The answers to the specific questions raised are:

1. The names of and assets and liabilities of all affiliated entities of the South Australian Government Financing Authority in the year ended 30 June 1992.

<i>South Australian Finance Trust Limited (SAFTL)</i>	
Assets	\$7 236 million
Liabilities.....	\$7 235 million

SAFTL's main function is that of Trustee of the South Australian Finance Trust and included in its liabilities is \$6 448 million incurred as Trustee and assets of \$6 448 million representing its right of indemnity against assets in the Trust.

<i>South Australian Finance Trust (SAFT)</i>	
Assets.....	\$6 511 million
Liabilities	\$6 448 million
<i>South Australian Finance Limited</i>	
<i>South Australian Investments</i>	
<i>South Australian Sterling Investments Limited</i>	
Consolidated Assets	Stg. £138 million
Consolidated Liabilities	Stg. £138 million
<i>South Australian Finance (Hong Kong) Limited</i>	
Assets.....	US\$384 million
Liabilities	US\$383 million
<i>South Australian Finance Trust (Hong Kong)</i>	
Assets.....	US\$356 million
Liabilities	US\$342 million
<i>Jerningham Limited</i>	
Assets.....	US\$179 million
Liabilities.....	US\$179 million
<i>Riabine Limited</i>	
Has not undertaken any transactions.	
<i>SABT Pty Limited</i>	
Assets.....	\$56.6 million
Liabilities.....	\$56.6 million
<i>South Australian Finance (USA) Limited</i>	
Has not undertaken any transactions.	
<i>Enterprise Investments Limited</i>	
Assets.....	\$34.5 million
Liabilities	\$1.2 million
<i>Enterprise Investments Trust</i>	
Assets.....	\$1.2 million
Liabilities.....	\$1.2 million
<i>Enterprise Securities Limited</i>	
Assets.....	\$2.5 million
Liabilities.....	\$2.4 million
<i>Defic No. 1 Pty Limited</i>	
Assets.....	\$56.9 million
Liabilities.....	\$62.3 million
<i>Defic No. 2 Pty Limited</i>	
Assets.....	\$58.3 million
Liabilities.....	\$62.7 million
<i>Defic No. 3 Pty Limited</i>	
Assets.....	\$40.2 million
Liabilities.....	\$43.5 million
<i>Defic No. 4 Pty Limited</i>	
Assets.....	\$146.7 million
Liabilities.....	\$157.2 million
<i>SGIC Finance Pty Limited</i>	
Assets.....	\$266.4 million
Liabilities.....	\$266.4 million
<i>Collins Street Properties Pty Limited</i>	
Assets.....	\$283.8 million
Liabilities.....	\$574.2 million

2. The directors of each affiliated entity and their annual remuneration and expenses are:

South Australian Finance Trust Limited

Mr R.S. Ruse
Dr G.C. Bethune
Mr D.G. David

No remuneration or expenses were received by the directors in 1991-92.

South Australian Finance Limited, South Australian Investments and South Australian Sterling Investments Limited

Dr G.C. Bethune
Mr G. Walls
Mr M.C. Shipp

None of the directors received remuneration or expenses in 1991-92. The Agent-General's Office was reimbursed £4 500 for Mr Walls' services, the State Bank received £4 500 for Mr Shipp's services and SAFA received £4 500 for Dr Bethune's services.

South Australian Finance (Hong Kong) Limited and Jerningham Limited

Dr G.C. Bethune
Mr I. Johnston
Mr J. Brewer

Dr Bethune did not receive fees. Mr Johnston received HK\$28 125 as a director. Mr J. Brewer is employed by Barkleys Bank which provides a range of accounting and

secretarial services to the companies for which it was paid US\$82 500. The Director's fee component is not significant.

Riabine Limited

Mr I. Johnston

Mr J. Brewer

Directors fees are included in charges for South Australian Finance (Hong Kong) Limited and Jerningham.

SABT Pty Limited

Mr R.S. Ruse

Mr J.F. Keough

Mr K.P. O'Donnell

Mr P.J. Favretto

No directors received remuneration or expenses in 1991-92.

South Australian Finance (USA) Limited

Mr R.S. Ruse

Mr C.R. Somme

Mr D.W. Wells

No directors received remuneration or expenses in 1991-92.

Enterprise Investments Limited

Remuneration

	Board	Investment Sub-Committee	Audit Sub- Committee	Superannuation ⁽¹⁾ Guarantee Payment (3%)	Total
	\$	\$	\$	\$	\$
J.H. Heard	28 000	3 000		930	31 390
M.J. Astley	21 000		2 000	690	23 690
A.R. Prowse ⁽²⁾	14 000		2 000	480	16 480
J.W. Frogley	14 000		2 000	480	16 480
R.G. Schwarz (paid to SAFA)	14 000	3 000		510	17 510
M.J. Terlet	14 000	3 000		510	17 510
S. Richardson	14 000			420	14 420
R.C. Bassett	14 000			420	14 420
					152 440

⁽¹⁾ Superannuation Guarantee Payment payable from 1992-93 financial year. Base directors fees have remained unchanged from 1991-92.

⁽²⁾ Mr Prowse tendered his resignation on 19 November 1992

Enterprise Securities Ltd

(30 June 1992)

Remuneration

J. H. Heard

nil

R. C. Bassett

nil

D. J. Ciracovitch

nil

R. G. Schwarz

nil

In 1991-92 management fees amounting to \$1 026 424 were paid to BCR Venture Management Pty Ltd for the operation and management of the Enterprise Investments Trust.

In 1991-92 management fees amounting to \$20 391 were paid to BCR Financial Services Pty Ltd for accounting services.

BCR Venture Management and BCR Financial Services are companies associated with Dr R. C. Bassett.

Defic No. 1 Pty Limited, Defic No. 2 Pty Limited, Defic No. 3 Pty Limited, Defic No. 4 Pty Limited

Mr R. S. Ruse

Mr J. R. Parkinson

No director received remuneration or expenses in 1991-92.

SGIC Finance Pty Limited, Collins Street Properties Pty Limited

Mr J. Lamble

Mr. M. M. Jones

Mr A. R. G. Prowse⁽¹⁾

Mr K. P. Lynch

Mr S. J. Chapman

Mr J. T. Hill

Mr R. England

No remuneration (additional to that received as SGIC Commissioners) is received by the directors of either body.

⁽¹⁾ Mr Prowse tendered his resignation on 19 November 1992.

3. The auditor of each "affiliated entity" is:

- (i) Auditor-General for South Australia:
 - South Australian Finance Trust Ltd
 - South Australian Finance Trust
 - Enterprise Investments Limited
 - Enterprise Investments Trust
 - Enterprise Securities Limited
- (ii) Price Waterhouse* (United Kingdom) audits:
 - South Australian Finance Limited
 - South Australian Investments
 - South Australian Sterling Investments Limited
- (iii) Coopers and Lybrand* (Hong Kong) audits:
 - South Australian Finance (Hong Kong) Limited
 - South Australian Finance Trust (Hong Kong)
 - Jerningham Limited
- (iv) Price Waterhouse* (Australia) audits:
 - SABT Pty Limited

(v) Deloitte Ross Tohmatsu audits:

Defic No. 1 Pty Limited

Defic No. 2 Pty Limited

Defic No. 3 Pty Limited

Defic No. 4 Pty Limited

(vi) KPMG Peat Marwick audits:

SGIC Finance Pty Limited

Collins Street Properties Pty Limited

* In relation to those companies which are incorporated in an overseas or interstate jurisdiction it has been necessary for SAFA to facilitate arrangements which allow the Auditor-General to have access to the auditors with respect to the scope and coverage of the audit because his authority does not extend to those jurisdictions. The Auditor-General has indicated that these arrangements are acceptable.

CASINO

239. Mr BECKER:

1. How many persons were detected attempting to defraud the Adelaide Casino by using 'dud' coins in video gaming machines in the past financial year, how do these incidents compare with the previous 12 months and what action has been taken against these persons?

2. How many incidents have been recorded whereby patrons used Dazzeland tokens or coins attached to fishing lines in video gaming machines since their inception and what action has been taken against the persons involved?

The Hon. FRANK BLEVINS:

1. No. persons have been detected attempting to defraud the Adelaide Casino by using 'dud coins' in video gaming machines. However, 'dud coins', ranging from plastic tokens, to washers, to foreign coins, have been discovered in gaming machines. Approximately 100 'dud coins' have been found in machines since machines were introduced in March 1991.

All machines are fitted with a coin selector, or comparator, which is designed to accept coins of the proper denomination and return undesired or invalid coins. The comparator checks for correct thickness, diameter and metallic content.

When a 'dud coin' is accepted by a gaming machine, the comparator is tested and adjusted to ensure that in future such

coins are rejected. However, while comparators have a high degree of accuracy, they are not absolutely foolproof.

2. Approximately 20 Dazzeland tokens were located in video gaming machines in the two days following the opening of Dazzeland. All gaming machine coin comparators were adjusted and any attempt since to use the tokens has resulted in those tokens being rejected by the gaming machines.

Approximately 15 coins attached to lines have been discovered in video gaming machines. The internal mechanism of the coin comparator allows a coin to drop through under gravity. If the coin is then drawn back up through the comparator, the mechanism closes, making it impossible for the coin to be pulled out. At the same time the machine emits a high pitched alarm and the screen flashes 'Yo Yo'.

No persons have been detected using coins attached to lines.

Additional Information

Records are not maintained of the use of 'dud coins' or coins attached to lines. Each incident however is investigated and appropriate action taken, e.g. adjustment to comparator. 'Dud coins' are not considered a problem given the low number of 'dud coins' as compared to the total number of coins that pass through the machines.

240. **Mr BECKER:** Was an application for employment at the Casino from a distant relative of Robert Trimbole refused and if so, on what grounds and by whom?

The Hon. FRANK BLEVINS:

Temporary approval for employment at the Adelaide Casino was given to a distant relative of Robert Trimbole on 23 June 1986. On 16 April 1987 the then Liquor Licensing Commissioner issued a notice of proposed revocation to this person because certain matters had come to his attention which were so serious that he decided to withdraw the temporary employment approval forthwith.

The Liquor Licensing Commissioner advised the employee of the reasons and arranged for an interview for 30 April 1987, whilst in the presence of legal counsel, to determine whether he should be reinstated.

At the interview which was recorded and transcribed, the Commissioner provided the employee with certain documents and reports relating to various family relationships. The documents included a report from the commissioner of Police. The commissioner instructed in writing that he had no objection to the report being provided to the employee provided that no copies were retained by him or his counsel.

In brief it was found that this person is a member of a broad family group which in the opinion of the representative of the Commissioner of Police can only be described as a major organised crime group. The family links included a Trimbole connection.

The Liquor Licensing Commissioner determined that in all the circumstances, this person should not be given approval to be employed at the Adelaide Casino.

TONSLEY INTERCHANGE

241. **Mr BRINDAL:** In relation to the Tonsley Bus/Rail Interchange, will the express trains to Adelaide stop only at the two terminals or will there be intermediate stopping points and if so, which points will they do?

The Hon. M.D. RANN: Yes, express trains to Adelaide will only stop at the two terminals.

242. **Mr BRINDAL:** Who is responsible for preparation of the Supplementary Development Plan in connection with the Tonsley Interchange, when did work start on preparation of the plan, when will it be finished and what public consultation process will be involved?

The Hon. M.D. RANN: The preparation of a Supplementary Development Plan (SDP) in connection with the Tonsley Interchange has been carried out by the Office of Planning and Urban Development in conjunction with the State Transport Authority, its principal design consultant, SACON and its planning subconsultant, Hassell and Partners.

Work on the SDP first commenced in October 1991 with the lodging of a Statement of Intent with the Advisory Committee on Planning. Subsequent to that extensive consultation with interested parties, including local resident groups, took place

during the latter part of 1991, culminating in the preparation of a Statement of Investigations and Draft SDP for public exhibition.

The placing of the Draft SDP on public exhibition is scheduled to take place once Federal funding for the proposal has been approved. The normal statutory requirements associated with an SDP provide for a two month period for public examination and comment including a public meeting to be convened by the Department of Housing and Urban Development. Following this, any necessary change to the SDP will be carried out before finally submitting it for ratification.

BRIGHTON AND MAWSON HIGH SCHOOLS

243. **Mr MATTHEW:** Will the final decision regarding the future of both Brighton and Mawson High Schools be made by the end of the 1992 school year and, if not, why not?

The Hon. S.M. LENEHAN: Early in 1992, a Forward Planning Group was established to investigate, develop and critically analyse options for the curriculum restructuring of the two high schools and to prepare a report for the Associate Director-General (Schools) with recommendations for further change.

Extensive consultation

The Forward Planning Group has consulted extensively with the school communities since March 1992. An information newsletter, 'Future Directions: Brighton/Mawson High Schools' was distributed widely and encouraged people to contribute to the consultation.

Presentation of report

After extensive consultation, the Forward Planning Group has developed a set of recommendations with a report which has been forwarded to the Associate Director-General of Education (Schools).

This report is being considered by officers of the Education Department and is to be made available to the school communities. When an assessment as to the viability of the recommendations has been made, an announcement will be made.

FIREARMS

244. **Mr MATTHEW:** How many Smith & Wesson and Sig-Sauer firearms, respectively, were purchased during each of the years 1989-90 to 1991-92, from whom were they purchased and at what cost?

The Hon. M.K. MAYES:

1989-90

20 Smith & Wesson—Model 19 Revolvers—Cost \$7 141

10 Smith & Wesson—Model 66 Revolvers—Cost \$4 073

Supplier:

Grycol International Pty Ltd

344 Botany Road, Alexandria, N.S.W. 2015

1990-91

31 Sig-Sauer—Model 226 Pistols—Cost \$24 118

Supplier:

Luigi Franchi Pty Ltd

U4, Lot 30 Stephens Road,

Dandenong, Vic. 3175

1991-92

105 Smith & Wesson—Model 19 Revolvers—Cost

\$41 791

125 Smith & Wesson—Model 60 Revolvers—Cost

\$55 219

25 Smith & Wesson—Model 640 Revolvers—Cost

\$11 625

Supplier:

Grycol International Pty Ltd

344 Botany Road, Alexandria, N.S.W. 2015

METROPOLITAN FIRE SERVICE

245. **Mr MATTHEW:**

1. How many recruits commenced with the Metropolitan Fire Service during each of the years 1989-90 to 1991-92?

2. What training has been provided to MFS officers during this time and how many officers receive such training?

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

1. The following number of recruits were recruited and trained within the South Australian Metropolitan Fire Service (SAMFS):

- (a) From 1 January 1989 to 1 January 1990—(21). They commenced employment 10 July 1989.
- (b) From 1 January 1990 to 1 January 1991—(22). They commenced employment 16 July 1990.
- (c) Recruitment from 1 January 1992 to 16 November 1992 was nil.

2. Over the past three years and indeed many years prior to 1989, training within the Fire Service has been continuous. The scope varies from basic hands on trade-like skills through to executive development.

The training, which is ongoing, is either conducted by the SAMFS or outside organisations such as the Australian Assembly of Fire Authorities, Australian Counter Disaster College, Australian Management College and courses include Management Development Program, National Intermediate Command Course, various State Disaster Courses, Vehicle Accident Rescue Courses, Critical Incident Stress, Train the Trainer, etc. Attached is a list of courses attended during a given year, which is a typical example.

SUMMARY OF EXTERNAL COURSES, SEMINARS AND WORKSHOPS COMPLETED BY METROPOLITAN FIRE SERVICE PERSONNEL BETWEEN 1 JULY 1991 AND 30 JUNE 1992

Employee	Course	Date	Conducted By
Supt Bentley, M	Advanced Counter Disaster	29.9.91	ACDC
S/O Richard, L	Counter Disaster Planning	24.11.91	ACDC
S/O Carpenter, T	Counter Disaster Planning	24.11.91	ACDC
S/O Grivell, J	Counter Disaster Planning	24.11.91	ACDC
S/O Bryant, L	Counter Disaster Planning	24.5.92	ACDC
S/O Dwyer, L	Counter Disaster Planning	24.5.92	ACDC
SFF Hall, P	Critical Incident Stress Seminar	11.11.91	
Supt Bentley, M	Critical Incident Stress Seminar	28.1.92	
Supt Barnes, B	Disaster Response Management	7.7.91	ACDC
D/O Murphy, K	Disaster Response Management	1.9.91	ACDC
S/O Heinze, M	Disaster Response Management	8.10.91	St John Ambulance
Supt Clayton, D	Disaster Response Management	8.10.91	St John Ambulance
S/O Keen, B	Disaster Response Management	22.10.91	St John Ambulance
S/O Wiley, M	Disaster Response Management	22.10.91	St John Ambulance
S/O Kemp, D	Disaster Response Management	5.11.91	St John Ambulance
S/O Moar, V	Disaster Response Management	5.11.91	St John Ambulance
S/O Collins, J.D	Disaster Response Management	26.11.91	St John Ambulance
Supt Gray, J	Disaster Response Management	10.2.92	ACDC
D/O Wood, L	Disaster Response Management	10.2.92	ACDC
S/O Wells, B	Disaster Response Management	26.4.92	ACDC
D/O Lawrence, R	Disaster Response Management	31.5.92	ACDC
Education Officer: Van der Sommen, P	Effective Time Management	25.6.92	Australian Institute of Management
Physical Education Officer: Pedrick, R	Effective Time Management	25.6.92	Australian Institute of Management
D/O Horsell, D	Evacuation Management	15.9.91	ACDC
ACO Hagan, R	Government Agencies Legal Aspects of S/Deliv.	6.9.91	University of Adelaide
Supt Clayton, D	Hazard Analysis for Disaster Management	28.7.91	ACDC
D/O O'Connell, G	Intermediate Command Course	2.11.91	AAFA
D/O Sedunary, R	Intermediate Command Course	2.11.91	AAFA
D/O Drohan, E	Intermediate Command Course	2.11.91	AAFA
ACO Petersen, L	Intro. to Disaster Response (Senior Executive)	16.2.92	ACDC
Librarian: Kittell, L	Librarian Workshop—Emergency Services	8.9.91	ACDC
Supt Gray, J	Management Development Program	13.1.92	Australian Management College
Supt Bentley, M	Management Development Program	14.3.92	Australian Management College
D/O Tomicz, N	National Incident Control System	29.9.91	AARFA
D/O Clayton, R	National Incident Control System	29.9.91	AARFA
S/O Virgo, M	National Incident Control System	29.9.91	AARFA
Supt Clayton, T	Operational Disaster Management	12.8.91	ACDC
Supt Clayton, D	Operational Disaster Management	15.3.92	ACDC
HSO Dougherty, G	Train the Trainer	19.6.92	Australian Institute of Management

FISHING, SCALE

246. **The Hon. J.P. TRAINER:** What measures are proposed to reduce the size of professional catch of scale fish to ensure the continued viability of the fishery and will the Minister consider—

- (a) banning the use of commercial nets in all major bays and inlets;
- (b) prohibiting large mesh nets in the gulfs and in Investigator Strait; and
- (c) the restriction to 200 hooks per licence at any one time, and, if not, why not?

The Hon. T.R. GROOM: The white (policy) paper released in August 1992 was formulated after extensive consultation with the various sectors of the Marine Scalefish Fishery and the release of two discussion papers. This process occurred over a period in excess of two years. The necessity for adjustment of fishing effort in the commercial sector has been recognised. Therefore it is proposed to introduce a licence amalgamation scheme for the commercial sector of the fishery as the main measure to reduce catch levels. This scheme should be reviewed two years after its implementation for evidence of real and substantial fishing effort reductions. It is considered that status of the resource is such that the introduction of this scheme must be effective within this period, or replaced with other, more direct measures for reducing commercial fishing effort and catches. Therefore if insufficient effort has been removed to meet the biological and effort reduction objectives, then further operating restrictions would be introduced. These restrictions include either those outlined by the honourable member or the introduction of allocated catch quotas.

FISHING, WHITING

247. **The Hon. J.P. TRAINER:** What is the body length of sexually mature male whiting and does this size precisely denote the minimum allowable fish size which should be permitted to be taken and if the size criterion is not based on breeding maturity, what other scientific basis is used to determine—

(a) the minimum body length which is allowed to be taken; and

(b) the numbers allowed to be taken in any one catch?

The Hon. T.R. GROOM: The average size of male King George whiting at first sexual maturity is 27 cm, but it is not linked to the determination of the minimum legal length, which is 28 cm.

(a) The minimum body length has been determined in order to optimise yield (numbers of fish) in the fishery but

(b) by limiting the numbers of fish taken through controlling fishing effort at or below present levels, sufficient numbers of fish are able to escape into deeper waters where the bulk of spawning takes place. The overall objective is to improve present levels of egg production.

FISHING, SCALE

248. **The Hon. J.P. TRAINER:** What proportion of scale fish stock depletion over recent years can be attributed to professional and amateur fishers, respectively?

The Hon. T.R. GROOM: Estimates for the proportion of catch landed by the recreational and commercial scalefish fishery sectors are available for King George whiting only. Based on the relative proportion of fish tags returned by these sectors, on a State-wide basis, 62 per cent of the King George whiting catch is landed by the commercial sector and 38 per cent by the recreational sector.

STATE FLEET

250. **Mr BECKER:**

1. How many motor vehicles have been sold by State Fleet by tender and/or to dealers and in relation to each sale what was the make, model, type, month and year of purchase and odometer reading at time of disposal and what was the sale price?

2. What was the real cost of selling each vehicle?

The Hon. M.D. RANN:

1. 745 vehicles have been traded in during the period 1 July 1991-20 October 1992. This figure does not include State Fleet vehicles which have been sold to a dealer through the State Supply auction at Seaton.

A print-out, containing the details of each sale, as requested by the honourable member, is quite lengthy. Its incorporation into *Hansard* is cost-prohibitive. Therefore, I will make it directly available to the honourable member.

2. It has been estimated that the cost of operating the trade-in system for 1991-92 is \$63 000, covering a total of 558 vehicles

traded in during that financial year. This equates to a cost of \$113 per vehicle.

GOVERNMENT VEHICLES

251. **Mr BECKER:** How many vehicles, by make and model, were purchased in each of the years 1989-90 to 1991-92 that were not on State Supply contracts, on what dates were purchase orders raised for each vehicle and on what dates was approval given by the State Supply Board?

The Hon. M.D. RANN: The following information is supplied in regard to non-contract passenger vehicles; dates shown are either the date purchase approved by the State Supply Board or its delegate.

2.10.89	20 each Holden Commodore Sedans (Police)
	20 each Ford Falcon Sedans (Police)
19.3.90	5 each Holden Commodore Sedans converted into Limousine Taxis
27.8.90	5 each Holden Nova SLX Hatches
	5 each Holden Nova SLX Sedans
10.9.90	Up to 20 each Holden Statesman Sedans
17.12.90	1 each Rolls-Royce Limousine (Governor)
7.1.91	Up to 30 each Ford Laser Station/Sedans
4.2.91	Up to 75 each Nissan Pintara Executive Sedans
2.9.92	Up to 20 each Holden Statesman Sedans
14.2.92	46 each Holden Nova SLX Sedans
16.3.92	1 each Rolls-Royce Limousine (Governor)
11.6.92	30 each Toyota Camry Spirit Sedans/Wagons
20.7.92	35 each Holden Nova SLX Sedans
	10 each Holden Apollo SLX Sedans
3.8.92	3 each Holden Barina 5 door Hatches
	3 each Daihatsu Charade G100TS Hatches
27.8.92	25 each Holden Apollo SLX Sedans/Station Sedans

The dates that purchase orders were raised by Government agencies after State Supply Board or its delegate approval is unknown.

STATE FLEET

252. **Mr BECKER:** Has State Fleet disposed of any vehicles other than through the tender to dealers process or through the disposal facility at Brebner Drive, West Lakes?

The Hon. M.D. RANN: In order to maximise values, experimentation has been undertaken on three occasions since 1 July 1991, and a total of 13 vehicles have been sold through a Melbourne vehicle auction house and two Adelaide-based private sector damaged vehicle auction organisations. State Supply Board approval was obtained.

254. **Mr BECKER:**

1. Does the State Fleet workshop have approved equipment and trained and qualified operators for EFI equipment?

2. Is the workshop authorised by any manufacturer to perform any warranty work and, if so, by which manufacturers?

3. Does the State Fleet garage have licensed equipment and operators for vehicle air-conditioning work including refrigerant gas recovery?

4. Does the garage have a vehicle wash bay and, if so, does it comply with all relevant legislation?

The Hon. M.D. RANN:

1. State Fleet workshops at both Gilles Street and Netley have approved equipment, together with trained and qualified operators, for the diagnosis and repair of EFI equipment.

2. No. However, depending on the fault, the warranty work may be discussed with the vehicle manufacturer and on occasions, with the manufacturer's agreement, may be undertaken within State Fleet's workshops.

3. Licensed equipment is located at the Gilles Street workshop and a total of eight accredited technicians are attached to State Fleet.

4. Vehicle wash bays are located at each of Gilles Street and Netley workshops. The Netley wash bay was recently inspected by E&WS. It is understood both vehicle wash bays comply with all relevant legislation.

255. **Mr BECKER:** What are the short-term vehicle hire rates, by vehicle make and type, offered by State Fleet, how are the rates calculated and by whom?

The Hon. M.D. RANN: Short-term hire rates appear on the table following. The differing rates reflect the varying costs, including rental in operating each of the pools. Short-term hire vehicles are only available from a car pool.

The rates are calculated, after taking into account costs, including interest on capital invested in the vehicle, depreciation, provision for replacement, fuel, service and maintenance, tyres, accident cost, registration and third party insurance, together with overhead expenses. The resultant rates are then checked against long-term hire charges to ensure compatibility. High vehicle usage is gained from the pooling approach.

Rates are calculated by the Business Manager, following development of all data by the State Fleet finance people and are checked within State Fleet.

STATE FLEET

Vehicle Hire Rates—Effective 1 July 1992

SHORT-TERM HIRE

Category	Rate Code	State Centre and Frome Street \$/hour	Noarlunga, Other and Mt Gambier \$/hour	Elizabeth and Murray Bridge \$/hour
0	01	4.35	3.55	3.15
1	11	4.85	4.05	3.65
2	21	5.35	4.55	4.15
3	31	5.90	5.10	4.70
4	41	6.45	5.65	5.25
5	51	6.25	5.45	5.05
6	61	6.45	5.65	5.25
7	71	7.50	6.70	6.30
8	81	8.10	7.30	6.90

Category	Description
0	Very small cars (1300cc and less) Mira, Charade, Barina
1	Small 4 cylinder cars Corolla, Laser, Nova
2	Large 4 cylinder cars Camry, Magna
3	6 cylinder cars Falcon, Commodore
4	Prestige cars Calais, Magna Elite, Verada, Fairmont
5	Commercial vehicles Econovans, Express, Tarago
6	Small 4WD vehicles Subaru, Corolla
7	Medium 4WD vehicles Hilux, Navara, Rodeo, 4-Runner, Jackaroo
8	Large 4WD vehicles Patrol, Landcruiser

FISHING, WHITING

257. **The Hon. J.P. TRAINER:** Would increasing the minimum legal size of whiting from 28 cm to 30 cm have a beneficial effect on the stock of fish and, if so, how would this benefit compare with that expected from reducing the total recreational catch by 4 per cent by implementing a one-third reduction in whiting bag limits?

The Hon. T.R. GROOM: The assessment of the King George whiting stocks estimates that the present level of egg production is extremely low and the objective of the present measures is to significantly improve the level of egg production without prohibiting the public's access to the fishery. If the present levels of fishing effort could be contained then an

increase in the minimum legal length would result in an increased weight but fewer number of King George whiting being landed. Ultimately the returns to the commercial sector of the fishery might be greater; however there would be no marked increase in the production of eggs within the King George whiting stocks. There would be little or no noticeable increase in the size of the whiting populations.

The introduction of a one-third reduction in the whiting bag limit by recreational fishers, while retaining the minimum legal size of 28 cm, is expected to result in a 4 per cent reduction in the total recreational catch of this species but most importantly, assuming that a proportional decrease is achieved within the commercial sector, is expected to result in a significant improvement in the level of egg production and the number of King George whiting. In the longer term this may mean an increase in catch rates by all sectors.

TAXIS

258. **Mr S.J. BAKER:** What instructions have been issued to Government departments and statutory authorities governing the use of taxis?

The Hon. FRANK BLEVINS: General instructions have not been issued to Government departments and authorities governing the use of taxis. Control is left to the discretion of each Chief Executive Officer.

HOSPITALS, CLOSURE

259. **The Hon. D.C. WOTTON:**

1. How many State funded hospitals have been closed in the past two years?

2. How many State funded hospitals does the Government plan to close in the ensuing year?

The Hon. M.J. EVANS: In the past two years, the Government has ceased to provide funds to Onkaparinga District Hospital Inc. and the Blyth District Hospital Inc. The Oodnadatta Hospital and Health Service has amalgamated with the Port Augusta Hospital. Funding for Oodnadatta is now provided to the Port Augusta Hospital. The Government does not have plans to cease funding any other State funded hospitals in the ensuing year.

ECONOMIC DEVELOPMENT BOARD

261. **Mr OLSEN:** What will be the future of the Manufacturing Advisory Council and the South Australian Export Council after the Economic Development Board is established?

The Hon. M.D. RANN: The functions of the Manufacturing Advisory Council and the South Australian Export Advisory Council will remain important functions within the economic development portfolio after the Economic Development Board is established. The board may wish to reconsider the roles of these organisations and their relationship to the board.

CABINET AND GOVERNMENT MANAGEMENT OFFICE

262. **Mr OLSEN:** How many positions in the Information Utility of the Office of Cabinet and Government Management have been transferred to the Office of Business and Regional Development, who is head of the new office and what remuneration package is that person to receive?

The Hon. M.D. RANN: At present the work on the Information Utility (IU) project is being performed by a number of people from the Government Management Board's Information Technology Unit in the Department of the Premier and Cabinet. Several of these people are working on the IU on a full-time basis but a number are working part time whilst continuing their policy roles as part of the Government Management Board. Currently, the Chief Executive Officer (CEO) of the Office of Business and Regional Development is assessing, in conjunction with the IU Project Director, the best way of separating the roles of people involved in the IU from those associated with the Government Management Board's

normal responsibilities. A more complete picture of the actual number of positions to be transferred will be available within the next four weeks.

Mr Bill Cossey has been appointed CEO of the Office of Business and Regional Development and has been appointed at the same salary he was receiving as CEO of State Services Department. That salary is \$94 087 per annum. In addition, Mr Cossey receives an executive standard vehicle subject to the normal provisions applying to such vehicles and for which an annual contribution of \$723 is paid.

BUSINESS AND REGIONAL DEVELOPMENT OFFICE

263. **Mr OLSEN:** How many officers are attached to the Office of Business and Regional Development and what activities will the office undertake during the remainder of this financial year to encourage business and regional development in South Australia?

The Hon. M.D. RANN: At present the staffing of the Office of Business and Regional Development includes the Chief Executive Officer (CEO), the CEO's secretary, the Government Adviser on Deregulation and three staff of the Deregulation Adviser's Office. In addition, as indicated in the answer to Question on Notice 262, Information Utility (IU) project staff will become part of the office.

The Office of Business and Regional Development has been given a role to coordinate activities across a portfolio of business and regional development. Included in that portfolio are the following organisations:

- Tourism SA
- Department of Industry, Trade and Technology
- State Services Department
- SA Centre for Manufacturing
- Small Business Corporation
- Industrial Supplies Office
- Government Adviser on Deregulation
- Information Utility
- Technology Development Corporation
- Manufacturing Advisory Council
- TCF Skills and Resource Centre.

Each of these organisations has a role to play in assisting the growth of business in South Australia. A number of initiatives are already in train through these organisations and the establishment of the new portfolio will not only see a strengthening of these activities but a greater coordination between them. A major focus will be a range of initiatives pursuant to the A.D. Little report and which will use the \$40 million which the Government has set aside as its response to that report. Already the Government has announced its assistance to the wine industry and more initiatives are being developed and will be announced in due course.

CORRECTIONAL SERVICES DEPARTMENT

264. **Mr GUNN:** Is it intended to dispose of all employee housing currently owned by the Correctional Services Department and, if so, when and, if not, what other arrangements does it intend to make with its current tenants?

The Hon. R.J. GREGORY: The Department of Correctional Services does not own any houses; in fact, the houses are the property of the Office of Government Employee Housing. A review of subsidised housing was an initiative taken by the Department of Correctional Services to establish a fair and equitable arrangement for staff posted to country locations. The review recommends the cessation of subsidised housing in all but remote locations.

The Department of Correctional Services executive have agreed to the recommendation in principle. Implementation of the proposal is reserved until a strategy has been approved and consultation has occurred. Part of the implementation strategy is the formulation of options to assist departmental employees make the transition from past practice. This document is currently being considered by the Department of Labour and is subject to consultation with the Public Service Association through the DCS/PSA Central Consultative Committee. The process of consultation/ implementation is not yet completed.

EXPIATION FEES

265. **Mr GUNN:**

1. Is it the aim of the Government or the Police Department to either encourage or instruct police officers to issue as many on the spot fines as possible?

2. Does the department issue verbal or written instructions to traffic police or the officers in charge of local police stations requiring them to issue certain numbers of on the spot fines and, if so, will the Minister table them in Parliament and, if such instructions are not issued, who determines the policy in relation to on the spot fines?

3. Does the department consider the most important role of police officers is to issue on the spot fines?

4. Which officers were 'ministerial' and which officers had tenure and were appointed under the GME Act?

5. What salary and other remuneration was payable for each position?

6. Which positions in the Minister's above office were unfilled as of 13 November 1992, and what were the salaries and other remuneration payable for such positions?

The Hon. M.K. MAYES:

1. It is not the aim of the Police Department to issue as many infringement notices as possible. The power to apprehend or report persons for breaching the law is an individual power given to each police officer. An officer, upon detecting a breach of the law, has a discretion as to the manner of handling such a breach. The member can warn, caution, report or arrest an offender, depending on the circumstances at the time.

2. The Police Department does not issue instructions to traffic police to achieve numbers of traffic infringement notices. It is reasonable to expect supervisors and managers to expect a reasonable level of enforcement activity of all types from their members, but this falls far short of a quota system. As answered in question 1 above, the manner in which the member handles a traffic breach is a decision he/she alone takes. There is no policy direction.

3. No, the policing of traffic laws is only one part of the duties of a police officer. As much time is taken up in pro-active policing. The Police Department is charged with the responsibility of, amongst other things, the prevention and detection of crime. The policy of traffic laws and the issue of infringement notices is only a part of this overall activity.

WATER HYACINTH

266. **The Hon. D.J. HOPGOOD:** To which rivers of the Murray-Darling is the Water hyacinth (*Eichhornia crassipes*) currently confined, what is its rate of spread and what control measures are currently in force and to what effect.?

The Hon. M.K. MAYES: Water hyacinth (*Eichhornia crassipes*) is largely confined to tropical and sub-tropical regions. Historically it has been recorded in southern New South Wales, Victoria and eastern South Australia but it is now considered eradicated from these regions. Water hyacinth has not been common within the Murray-Darling Basin in recent times but isolated incidences do occur. A major outbreak on the Gingham watercourse on the Gwyder River near Moree occurred in the 1970s. From 1976 the New South Wales authorities and the Moree Plains Shire, with the help of Commonwealth and State (including South Australia) funding, brought the infestation under control, from an original 7 000 hectares to currently less than 20 hectares. Work is now confined to hand-pulling the odd plant.

A minor outbreak occurred on Marthagi Creek near Warren, New South Wales. This was quickly controlled and surveillance of the area is continually undertaken to hand-pull any new plants. In Queensland, isolated outbreaks have occurred near Yelarbin and Billa Billa in the McIntyre catchment area and near Chincilla on the Condamine. Very active control measures were taken with regular follow-up inspections.

Current control methods are highly effective. Biological control is used for large outbreaks, with several control agents (that is, a specific type of weevil and moth) being available depending on the conditions prevailing at the site of the infestation. Small outbreaks are controlled through hand-pulling. Seed of water hyacinth can persist for a considerable time and

therefore continued surveillance of outbreak areas needs to be undertaken for a number of years.

GRAND PRIX

267. **Mr BECKER:** What action will the Grand Prix Board take to provide improved all weather walking pathways instead of dusty or, following watering by staff, muddy paths?

The Hon. LYNN ARNOLD: The parklands come under the control of the Adelaide City Council and all works relating to them need the approval of council. The matter of all weather walking pathways will be raised with the council.

268. Mr BECKER:

1. How many male and female toilets were available at the Australian Formula One Grand Prix from 5 to 8 November 1992 inclusive, and how do these numbers compare with 1991?

2. What action can be taken to—

- (a) provide more toilets;
- (b) provide cleaner toilets;
- (c) remove unsavoury odours; and
- (d) locate toilets away from the race track?

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

1. A grand total of 66 transportable toilet blocks, 108 single self-contained toilets, four handicapped toilet blocks, six Adelaide City Council (ACC) permanent toilet blocks and all of the South Australian Jockey Club (SAJC), Victoria Park toilet facilities were provided for the use of patrons and support staff of the 1992 Australian Grand Prix.

These toilet facilities were distributed and allocated as follows:

- Gold patrons
 - 29 transportable toilet blocks
 - 6 single self-contained toilets
 - 1 ACC toilet block
- General public
 - 34 transportable toilet blocks
 - 5 single self-contained toilets
 - 5 ACC toilet blocks
 - all SAJC toilet facilities
- Corporate patrons
 - 1 transportable toilet block
 - 54 single self-contained toilets
- Handicapped patrons
 - 4 transportable toilet blocks (located adjacent disabled viewing areas)
- Track marshals
 - 20 single self-contained toilets
- Support staff (dedicated toilet facilities)
 - 2 transportable toilet blocks
 - 23 single self-contained toilets.

The number of (transportable and permanent) toilet blocks provided in 1992 is the same as that provided in 1991. The number of single self-contained toilet blocks provided in 1992 has increased by 10 from 98 in 1991 to 108 in 1992.

2. If a need was identified to provide more toilets for future events, this could be done subject to the following considerations:

- (a) the sourcing of suitable transportable toilet blocks (probably from interstate):
 - the availability of sewer connection points on the Grand Prix site or the installation of new sewer lines around the site to provide more sewer connection points;
 - budgetary considerations associated with any new infrastructure work (for example, point above) or associated with the additional hire charges for extra toilets.
- (b) The cleaners clean each block thoroughly at the start of each day and the finish of each day.

During the course of each day the problems experienced at the busy blocks were that very little cleaning could be achieved. Each toilet block was visited every 2-2½ hours and most times the cleaners were only able to restock with paper products and even this had to be achieved with difficulty.
- (c) In an effort to eliminate odour the cleaners used the following products:
 - Bionil Disinfectant Hospital Grade

- Spice Disinfection Deodorizing Cleanser
- Bowel Clean Acidic Disinfectant for toilet bowls and urinals.

Possible improvements for future events:

- More toilets to be connected to sewer mains. This potentially reduces odour, blockages and overflow.
- All pump out toilets be supplied with, and daily serviced by suppliers, a formaldehyde tablet 'megablu'. This is recommended to eliminate some odour problems. This tablet is placed in the tank at the time of installing and renewed when pumped out daily.
- Stationing a toilet attendant at each group of toilet blocks. His/her responsibility would be to clean, maintain and monitor those blocks on a continuous basis all day;
- Having more specialist toilet cleaning crews whose responsibility is to circulate between groups of toilets on a regular basis. With more crews the cycle time would be reduced and the toilets would receive minor maintenance cleaning often rather than major cleaning twice a day.

(d) The location of toilets is governed by several factors:

- the location of sewer connection points or easy accessibility by toilet tank evacuation vehicles;
- the toilets must be located adjacent to point of crowd accumulation. The on-site facilities which need toilets located nearby include catering outlets, bars and the popular trackside viewing positions.

Due to the nature of the event, it is desirable to locate toilets near the race track in order to improve their visibility and reduce the walking distance for patrons. Some single self-contained toilets are located in between the concrete barrier wall and the spectator fencing and are dedicated for track marshals' use. By necessity, these toilets must remain very close to the race track. The closest public toilet block is approximately 17 metres from the closest concrete barrier wall. The position of this block is fixed by the Prince Alfred College fence and cannot be shifted further away from the race track. In general, the toilets are not closer than 25-30 metres from the race track.

GOVERNMENT VEHICLES

269. Mr BECKER:

1. Why was the Government vehicle registered VQJ-742 with magnetic signs bearing the letters 'CAMS' on both front doors parked in the car park behind the Start/Finish location at the Australian Formula One Grand Prix on Sunday 8 November 1992 next to cars parked and reserved for M. Hemmerling and I. Cocks?

2. Is it normal practice for Government plated motor vehicles to carry letters of a registered privately controlled association and, if so, why?

3. To which Government department or authority was the motor vehicle attached and was the motor vehicle used in accordance with Government Management Board circular 90/30 and, if not, why not and what action does the Government propose to take?

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

1. The Grand Prix Office has determined that the most efficient approach to the acquisition of its fleet is to acquire such vehicles on short-term rental basis and also that the State Fleet, Department of Services and Supply, is the most competitive supplier. All vehicles are supplied to the office on a commercial, short-term rental basis. Vehicle VQJ-742 was allocated to CAMS as a steward's vehicle.

2. The vehicle in question was used within the Grand Prix track as a steward's vehicle. It is the policy of the FISA and CAMS to place temporary signage on each working vehicle used within the Grand Prix track area to comply with safety, security and access requirements. While this is not normal Government practice, the Grand Prix Office is bound to comply with these requirements.

3. The vehicle was allocated to the Australian Formula One Grand Prix Board and used in accordance the Commissioner's Circular No. 30.

GRAND PRIX

270. **Mr BECKER:**

1. Which company or companies were successful tenderers to erect and dismantle grandstands, concrete barriers, marquees and pit buildings for the Australian Formula One Grand Prix and from which States does each operate?

2. How long does it take to erect and dismantle this equipment?

3. What was the cost of these contracts and how do they compare with the previous year?

The Hon. LYNN ARNOLD: The following companies were contracted to install and dismantle grand stand seats:

- Australian Seating Systems, a Victorian based company, supplied and built 8 587 seats at a cost of \$510 000. This contract involves a six week installation period, and a four week dismantling period. The cost per seat in 1992 is less than in 1991.
- Fast Formwork Industries, a South Australian company, built 12 835 seats at a cost of \$577 000. This contract involves a six week installation period and a four week dismantling period. The cost per seat in 1992 is the same as in 1991.
- Anderson Construction, a South Australian based company, built 3 978 seats at a cost of \$101 000. This contract involves a five week installation period and a three week dismantling period. The cost per seat in 1992 is slightly greater than in 1991.
- Australian Seating Systems built 2 877 bleachers (timber seats) at a cost of \$60 000. This contract involves a three week installation period and a two week dismantling period. The cost per seat in 1992 is slightly greater than in 1991.
- The concrete barriers, together with debris fence, general admission seating stands and associated equipment was contracted to Mayne Nickless Transport Management at a cost of \$286 000. Mayne Nickless Transport Management is a South Australian company. The contract involves a five week installation period and a 2.5 week dismantling period. The cost of this contract is very marginally less than in 1991.

The following companies were contracted to supply, erect, and dismantle marquees and tent-like structures:

- Renniks Hire, a South Australian company, at a cost of \$61 000.
- Event Rentals, a South Australian company, at a cost of \$21 000.
- Geoff Tucker's Hire and Catering, a Victorian company with a South Australian subsidiary, at a cost of \$176 000.

These three contracts involve a three to four week erection period and a one to 1.5 week dismantling period.

The pit building structure is contracted to Anderson Construction at a cost of \$620 000. Anderson Construction is a South Australian company. The contract involves a 12 week erection period and a six week dismantling period. The cost of the contract is less than in 1991.

271. **Mr BECKER:** Is non-union labour permitted on the Australian Formula One Grand Prix track and, if not, why not?

The Hon. LYNN ARNOLD: No. The board entered into an industrial site agreement with the UTLC in 1985, which was renegotiated in 1992, which requires that all contractors use union labour. Through this agreement the board gains benefits that ensure the circuit is completed on time and to the highest standards.

HOUSING TRUST DEVELOPMENTS

272. **Mr BECKER:** Does the South Australian Housing Trust propose to build 15 dwellings on a property situated on the north-west corner of Raymond and Padman Avenues, North Plympton and, if so—

- (a) is the development contrary to local government zoning;
- (b) is it part of the Government's Urban Consolidation Program;
- (c) what is the cost of the development;
- (d) what is the expected annual rental per unit;
- (e) were local residents consulted about the proposal and the change of usage of R1 zoning and, if not, why not;
- (f) what type of category of trust tenants will be considered for the accommodation; and
- (g) when was West Torrens council support for the project sought and what was their response?

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

- (a) The current zoning is Residential 1 (R1) 'a zone primarily accommodating detached dwellings at low densities on individual allotments'. A number of the dwellings (seven of the 15 dwellings) are actually individually either permitted or consent land uses within this zone. The collective form of housing however, is interpreted as being prohibited development in the City of West Torrens Development Plan. The principal objective to achieve residential development within a residential zone is satisfied.
- (b) The SAHT has been responding to its clients' demands for centrally located housing for small households for a number of years. This site offers an ideal opportunity to provide housing to satisfy that need, and would be consistent with the principles pertaining to Urban Consolidation contained within the metropolitan section of the Development Plan.
- (c) \$1.48 million.
- (d) The annual rent collected from these dwellings is entirely dependent upon the income of each individual tenant.
- (e) The proposal has been the subject of public notification by the relevant planning authority, the South Australian Planning Commission. Public notification includes advertising the proposal in a locally distributed newspaper and postal notification to abutting property owners. The Housing Trust has also made contact with specific property owners adjoining the site in order to achieve an acceptable development.
- (f) The proposed housing ranges from two bedroom, two storey townhouses, to detached three bedroom dwellings, and it is therefore likely that a wide range of households will be accommodated on this site.
- (g) The trust has consulted with the West Torrens council prior to purchasing the site and has continued to work closely with the council.

LPG

273. **Mr BECKER:**

1. Why are Government motor vehicles not converted to LP gas?

2. What is the estimated cost of conversion to gas of the various types and makes of Government motor vehicles?

The Hon. J.H.C. KLUNDER:

1. At present it is not economic in most cases to convert Government vehicles to LPG. The Government has been monitoring the economics of converting vehicles in its passenger fleet for eight years and conducted a major trial on LPG converted passenger vehicles over three years in the mid 1980s.

Government vehicles are purchased free of sales tax and the present retention policy of two years or 40 000 kilometres has been adopted to optimise resale value and minimise overall vehicle costs. This compares with the current payback period of 45 000 to 50 000 kilometres for converting vehicles typical of those in the Government fleet. For this reason, the economics of converting Government vehicles to LPG are less favourable than for private sector fleets.

The estimated additional cost to the Government of operating 6 cylinder and larger 4 cylinder vehicles on LPG over the two years on 40 000 kilometres retention period varies between \$300

and \$450, depending on the ratio of city and country use. The cost increases for smaller vehicles.

2. For the majority of Government vehicles the conversion costs will vary between \$1 800 for small sedans to \$2 200 for large station wagons.

GRAND PRIX

274. Mr BECKER:

1. How many persons were removed from the enclosures of the Australian Formula One Grand Prix on each of the four days of the event because of drunkenness and misbehaviour and how do these statistics compare with the previous Grand Prix?

2. What can be done to contain or prevent unacceptable behaviour at future events?

3. How many police were on duty at the Grand Prix track this year?

The Hon. LYNN ARNOLD:

1. The following table provides details of the number of persons removed from the circuit because of minor behavioural offences and entering the circuit unlawfully.

	Thursday	Friday	Saturday	Sunday	Total
1992	1	10	4	7	22
1991	0	1	13	5	19

A number of other persons were reported or cautioned for minor offences but not removed from the circuit.

Most arrests, reports, removals and cautions, inside the circuit, were within the provisions of the Grand Prix Act, having the safety of patrons in mind.

2. This office shares a highly cooperative relationship with the South Australian Police Department, and with MSS Guard Services, Wormald Security (our security consortium), each member of our 600 person ground staff group and with our catering organisations.

The intelligence shared between these organisations provides effective crowd control planning and, via on track communications systems, effective crowd control practice. Additionally, the 600 CAMS marshals assisted police and security groups in crowd control on Sunday afternoon, 8 November.

Relationships with the corporate supporters of the event ensure, so far as is possible that the 'good behaviour' policies of the Australian Formula One Grand Prix Board are respected.

When compared with other events attracting similar crowds, for example, New Year's Eve and night life entertainment outside the circuit, there are significantly less policing problems inside the declared area.

The Australian Formula One Grand Prix Office will maintain its approach to contain or prevent unacceptable behaviour by continuing to follow (and where possible) to improve its existing event planning and event management policies and procedures.

3. The numbers of Police on duty at the Grand Prix track vary from day to day, and from shift to shift building up to the race itself and the post race concert. An average of 185 police officers were on duty inside the circuit on each of the four days of the event.

GOVERNMENT VEHICLES

275. Mr BECKER:

1. What Government business was the driver of the vehicle, registered VQG-821 attending to on Saturday 14 November 1992 whilst the car was parked at the South Henley shops at approximately 8.50 a.m.?

2. To which Government department or agency is this vehicle attached?

3. Were the terms of Government Management Board Circular 90/30 being observed by the driver of this vehicle and if not, why not and what action does the Government propose to take over the use of this vehicle?

The Hon. M.D. RANN:

1. The driver of the vehicle in question is attached to the Western Domiciliary Care and Rehabilitation Services Adult Personal Care and Access Program Team and was performing shopping services as requested by a client. This service forms part of an approved service plan as agreed with the client and involves out of hours service delivery for a number of clients.

2. The vehicle is registered in the name of Western Domiciliary Care and Rehabilitation Service which is a community service department of The Queen Elizabeth Hospital.

3. Yes.

GRAND PRIX

276. Mr BECKER:

1. Who designed and printed the pamphlet 'Who won the Grand Prix'?

2. How many copies were printed?

3. To whom were they distributed and at what cost?

4. What was the purpose of the promotion and what did it achieve?

The Hon. LYNN ARNOLD:

1. The pamphlet 'Who won the Grand Prix?' was designed by Clemenger (Adelaide) in conjunction with the Grand Prix Office. It was printed by Finsbury Press, 3 Jeanes Street, Beverley, South Australia.

2. 15 000 copies were printed.

3. 5 000 copies were inserted in SA in *Business*, November issue.

9 000 copies were inserted in *Business to Business*, November issue.

107 copies were mailed to one hundred and seven selected South Australian-based Grand Prix corporate clients.

59 copies were mailed to South Australia media.

Remaining copies are available for visitors to the Grand Prix Office.

The total cost of the exercise was \$6 775.82.

4. The board considered that the promotion was necessary to illustrate that the event is still very successful and important for the State's economic and corporate sectors, and to highlight the benefits the event brings to South Australia.

From the general feedback it has increased awareness in the corporate sector of the benefit that the Grand Prix brings to South Australia. As recipients were not asked to specifically respond it is not possible to accurately measure the achievement.

HOUSING TRUST CONTRACTS

277. Mr BECKER:

1. When purchasing former industrial land, do South Australian Housing Trust contracts seek a warranty from the vendor that the land is not contaminated and, if not, why not?

2. How many properties have been acquired in each of the past three years where the land has been found to be contaminated and what has been the cost to decontaminate it in each case?

The Hon. G.J. CRAFTY:

1. All house and land purchase contracts now entered into by the South Australian Housing Trust are subject to a specific condition regarding land contamination which requires:

A satisfactory site history and health assessment indicating that the land is free of contamination and is suitable for residential development, and any other appraisals and approvals required by the Department of Environment and Planning to enable the purchase of a property by a statutory authority.

In the case of former known industrial land, additional care is taken in site appraisal for the likelihood of soil contamination.

2. The total number of sites acquired in the past three financial years and to date in the current financial year is 97. Of these, 20 sites were identified as contaminated and the cost of decontaminating these sites was \$213 355.

In the financial year 1989-90 five sites were identified and the remediation cost was \$81 276; 1990-91, ten sites at \$97 011; 1991-92, two sites at \$35 068 and July 1992 to 30 November 1992, three sites were identified, but required no health management measures upon advice received from the South Australian Health Commission.

MINISTERIAL PREROGATIVE

278. **Mr LEWIS:** What are the names and titles of all of the people who work full-time or part-time in the offices or

departments of all members of the Ministry and who are appointed or seconded (specify which) to their roles on ministerial prerogative?

The Hon. LYNN ARNOLD:

List of Personnel and Titles Appointed or Seconded to Ministers as at 14 December 1992

Minister	First Name	Last Name	Position Title	Comments			
Lynn Maurice Ferguson Arnold	Amy Ethne Fiona Gail	Goodrich Lange Campbell Greenhalgh	Research Officer Appointment Secretary Ministerial Officer Grade 2 Secretary	Seconded from Department of Primary Industry			
	Gene Jeff Jim Julienne June Karen Lee Kevin Michael Paul Ray Verna	Reardon Turner Kouts Vaughan Appleby Chenoweth Foley Wright Willoughby Garrand Varga	Adviser, Human Services Press Secretary, Grade 1 Press Secretary, Grade 1 Secretary Enquiries Officer Ministerial Officer Ministerial Officer, Grade 1 Ministerial Officer, Grade 2 Press Secretary, Grade 1 Ministerial Officer, Grade 2 Secretary to Executive Assistant				
	Frank Trevor Blevins	Alvan	Roman		Ministerial, Officer Grade 2	Seconded from Department of Arts and Cultural Heritage	
		David	Cox		Senior Adviser, Economics and Finance		
		Karen	Mathewson		Press Secretary, Grade 1		
	Christopher John Sumner	Jill	Bottrall		Press Secretary, Grade 1		
	Gregory John Crafter	Cathie Margaret	King Ralston		Ministerial Officer, Grade 2 Press Secretary, Grade 1		
	Barbara Jean Wiese	Ian Margo Pat	Newbery Carmichael Hudson		Ministerial Officer, Grade 2 Ministerial Officer, Grade 3 Press Secretary, Grade 1	Seconded from SACON	
		Milton Kym Mayes	Derek Karen Simon		Robertson Ashford Bryant		Ministerial Officer, Grade 2 Press Secretary, Grade 1 Ministerial Officer, Grade 2
			Susan Mary Lenehan		Geoff Helen		Loveday Till
	Marie	Sellstrom			Ministerial Officer, Grade 2		
Ron	Slee	Ministerial Officer, Grade 2					
Rosa Toni	Colanero Jupe	Ministerial Officer, Grade 2 Press Secretary, Grade 1					
John Heinz Cornelis Klunder	David Peter	Abfalder Charles	Ministerial Officer, Grade 2 Press Secretary, Grade 1				
	Robert John Gregory	Gary	Williamson	Ministerial Officer, Grade 2	Seconded from Department of Labour Seconded from Department Marine and Harbors		
Simon		Clayer	Press Secretary, Grade 1				
Judith Ann Winstanley Levy	Lois Rik Scott	Boswell Morris	Ministerial Officer, Grade 2 Press Secretary, Grade 1				
	Michael David Rann	Andrea	Martin	Ministerial Officer, Grade 2	Seconded from Department of Employment, Technical and Further Education		
Helen Ann		Thew	Press Secretary, Grade 1				

Minister	First Name	Last Name	Position Title	Comments
Martyn John Evans	Jozef	Bennink	Ministerial Officer, Grade 2	Seconded from Department of Labour
	Stephen Victoria	Boyd Purman	Ministerial Officer, Grade 2 Press Secretary, Grade 1	
Terence Robert Groom	Gracie Michelle	Portolesi Nardeli	Ministerial Officer, Grade 2 Press Secretary, Grade 1	Seconded from Department of Primary Industry

CENTRAL MARKET**282. Mr BECKER:**

1. What complaints has the Minister received from the Central Market Stallholders Association concerning the activities of the City of Adelaide's Central Market Authority over the past two months?

2. Have any complaints been investigated and what action has the Minister taken and if none, why not?

The Hon. G.J. CRAFTER:

The Minister of Housing, Urban Development and Local Government Relations has received no complaints concerning the activities of the City of Adelaide's Central Market Authority over the past two months.

LOCAL GOVERNMENT COUNCILLORS**283. Mr BECKER:**

1. How many councillors are there in each Local Government Council and how many completed and filed by due date their annual return of register of interest?

2. What audit is undertaken to ensure such requirements are met?

3. What action has been taken against any councillors not lodging their register of interest on time and how many councillors are involved?

The Hon. G. J. CRAFTER:

1. According to the S.A. Local Government Directory 1991-92 there are 1 206 elected members of Local Government. A breakdown for each Council can be obtained from the Directory which is readily available from the Council Purchasing Authority Pty Ltd, Local Government House. To my knowledge, all but two completed and filed their annual return by 29 September 1992 which is one month after the due date and the date on which a member automatically loses office if the required return has not been submitted.

2. No audit, as such, is undertaken. The scheme established by the provisions of the Local Government Act does not rely on independent audit but on the severe penalty which automatically follows failure to comply. Members are required to lodge annual returns on or within 60 days from 30 June, that is, on or before 29 August. Where a member fails to submit a return within the 60 days, the Act requires the Chief Executive Officer to notify the member of that fact as soon as practicable by letter sent by registered mail. A further period of grace of one month is allowed after the initial due date. If a member fails to submit an annual return on or before 29 September, then his or her office on the council becomes vacant. The Chief Executive Officer is required to notify the members of the council of the occurrence of the vacancy at the next meeting and also give notice of it in the *Gazette*.

3. Two councillors automatically lost office in 1992 as a result of failure to submit annual returns. The Act provides that such persons have a right to apply to the nearest court of summary jurisdiction for an order reinstating them to office if the court is satisfied that the failure to submit a return arose from circumstances beyond the member's control. Both members made such an application and were reinstated on 12 November 1992.

JUNK FOOD**284. Mr BECKER:**

1. What surveys and studies have been undertaken by the South Australian Health Commission into the impact on children of television promotion of junk food and, if none, why not?

2. Will the Commission consider continual monitoring of the influence television has on children through the promotion of junk food and, if not, why not?

The Hon. M.J. EVANS:

1. A study of television food advertising directed at children was conducted in South Australia in April 1989 by Ms Heather Morton from the Department of Nutrition and Social Health at the South Australian college of Advanced Education at Underdale.

This study, which has since been published in the *Journal of Community Health Studies*, Volume 14, No. 2, 1990, revealed that between 4 p.m. and 5 p.m. on most weekdays during the survey period most of the advertisements were for foods of poor nutritional quality, that is, high in fat, refined sugars, salt and energy and low in fibre. Ms Morton presented this paper on 12 May 1992, at the South Australian Health Commission's State Policy Forum as part of the consultation process of the National Food and Nutrition policy. There was a strong consensus of opinion amongst forum participants that:

(1) legislative controls need to be put in place for television advertising during children's viewing times; and

(2) the development of advertising guidelines in consultation with industry, media, advertising marketing groups, the health sector and the community is required.

2. It should be noted that at its 90th Session, the National Health and Medical Research Council (NHMRC) directed that a working party be established to investigate television advertising of foods to children.

The Working Party's report entitled 'Television Advertising of Foods Directed to Children' was adopted and its recommendations endorsed by the NHMRC at its 92nd Session in October 1981.

A major recommendation of the report was the development of guidelines for television advertising of foods directed to children, but no action as yet has been taken in this regard at the national level.

However, the recent adoption of a National Food and Nutrition policy by the Commonwealth Department of Health, Housing and Community Services has resulted in a move to develop a national nutrition education curriculum for Australian school children.

There has also been an agreement amongst the State Health Departments to conduct national nutrition education campaigns that have a significant media component. This education program and series of campaigns will attempt to counter-balance the poor nutrition messages that children are receiving from television advertising.

Consequently, the South Australian Health Commission will not be taking further action at this stage to monitor the influence of television advertising on children. It will attempt instead to support locally the Commonwealth initiatives at the State level.

ENTERTAINMENT CENTRE

285. **Mr BECKER:** Was there a disturbance at the Entertainment Centre during or after a concert featuring 'Red Hot Chili Peppers' rock group and, if so—

- (a) how many staff were injured and taken to hospital and what was the extent of the injuries;
- (b) was there an inquiry into the incident and, if not, why not; and
- (c) did this incident and the late removal of the band and equipment cause difficulties for the producers of the 'Jesus Christ Superstar' concert and was the delay in rehearsals the reason 'Jesus Christ Superstar' opening performance started 20 minutes late?

The Hon. G.J. CRAFTER: There was no disturbance involving staff or patrons during or after the 'Red Hot Chili Peppers' concert on 15 October 1992.

- (a) Adelaide Entertainment Centre staff did not receive serious injuries resulting in hospitalisation.
- (b) Centre management has a comprehensive incident reporting procedure that is reviewed after each event.
- (c) The 'Red Hot Chili Peppers' bump out was completed before the bump in of the 'Jesus Christ Superstar'. Rehearsal and sound check did delay by 20 minutes the planned opening of the auditorium to patrons. The performance commenced 15 minutes later than the scheduled 8 p.m. The delay was due to the time taken by visiting company management running the rehearsal.

PARNANGA CAMPSITE

286. **Mr BECKER:**

1. Why did the Government sell the school holiday campsite known as 'Paringa' at O'Sullivan Beach last year?
2. What was the property valued at by the Valuer-General and what was the price obtained when sold?
3. What alternative affordable campsites are available for schools in the south-eastern suburbs?

The Hon. S.M. LENEHAN: The campsite referred to was known as 'Parnanga' and was the property of the Department of Recreation and Sport. The Minister of Recreation and Sport has submitted the following information in reply.

1. The campsite was known as 'Parnanga' and it was sold as a result of a review carried out by the Department of Recreation and Sport into its departmental campsites in South Australia. The department could not justify owning and operating the campsite in competition with the many other campsites in South Australia unless it was used as part of a departmental program. It was decided that Parnanga did not have the requirements for any of the department's programs and it was subsequently offered to other Government departments. This offer was not taken up by another department and the property was therefore sold by tender on the open market.

2. The property was valued by the Valuer-General at \$260 000. The price obtained for the property was \$270 000.

3. There are nearly 90 campsites in South Australia which are available for hire by groups or individuals offering bunk style accommodation similar to Parnanga. These campsites are all listed and described in a publication put out by the Camping Association of South Australia titled 'Directory of Camps'. Their cost of hire ranges from \$6 to \$15 per night for an uncatereed site.

287. **Mr BECKER:**

1. What organisations, including Government departments are allowed to use Government contracts for purchasing motor vehicles, spare parts and fuel?

2. What monitoring of the use of these contracts is performed and by whom?

The Hon. M.D. RANN:

1. Use of all Government Supplies Contracts, including those for motor vehicles, spare parts and fuel, is mandatory for:

- All State Government departments, agencies and statutory authorities included in the State Supply Act 1985. Other State and Commonwealth agencies also have access on an optional basis.

Limited access for specific purchases, such as motor vehicles, is granted on a case by case basis to public benevolent organisations that normally meet the following criteria:

- are in receipt of significant Government funding (State or Commonwealth);
- are non-profit organisations; and
- are sales tax exempt.

2. All purchases of contract motor vehicles, with the exception of purchases made by State Fleet and State Transport Authority are made through State Supply. A computer database of these purchases is maintained by this agency. In regard to spare parts and fuel, State Supply does not monitor the use by Government agencies, but overall usage is obtained by State Supply to use as a basis for the renewal of these contracts. Individual agencies may monitor contract usage, for example, State Fleet monitors fuel usage.

GOVERNMENT VEHICLES

288. **Mr BECKER:**

1. What is the expiry date for registration of Government vehicles?

2. What is the expiry date for third party insurance for Government vehicles?

The Hon. M.D. RANN:

1. 30 November 1993.
2. 30 November 1993.

MOTOR VEHICLE TECHNICAL ADVISORY COMMITTEE

289. **Mr BECKER:**

1. What is the relationship between the State Supply Board and the Motor Vehicle Technical Advisory Committee, when was this relationship last reviewed and by whom and what was the result?

2. What records are kept of the operations of the Motor Vehicle Technical Advisory Committee and who keeps them?

The Hon. M.D. RANN:

1. The Motor Vehicle Technical Advisory Committee was reviewed in 1988 by an officer of the State Supply Board resulting in the renaming of the committee to the Motor Vehicle Contract Management Committee and terms of reference for operation of the committee being established. The role of the committee is to define procurement strategies and make recommendations to the State Supply Board on matters associated with the establishment, renewal and/or maintenance of the motor vehicle contracts.

2. In 1983 State Supply appointed a Secretary to the Motor Vehicle Contract Management Committee who is responsible for the recording and documentation of the activities of the committee.

GOVERNMENT VEHICLES

290. **Mr BECKER:** Has any contractor breached any condition of contract for the supply of motor vehicles in the past three financial years and, if so, what conditions were breached and what action was taken against the contractor(s)?

The Hon. M.D. RANN: The motor vehicle contracts are monitored by State Supply and no breaches of the contracts have been detected over the last three years.

291. **Mr BECKER:** Is there a database of vehicle cost and resale values, operating costs and fuel usage figures and, if so, which agency manages this database and is it available to other agencies and, if not, why not?

The Hon. M.D. RANN: State Fleet currently controls approximately 2 400 vehicles and this constitutes approximately 35 per cent of the Government's light motor vehicle fleet. State Fleet has a record of vehicle cost and resale values, together with fuel usage. Vehicles are maintained in accordance with manufacturer's specification. State Fleet operates on a commercial basis and because they are effectively in competition with other departments' own fleets, the information is not made available to other agencies.

292. **Mr BECKER:** Has there been a study carried out to determine the benefits of purchasing different models of motor vehicles and if so, what was the result, who conducted it and when and is the information from the study made available to all Government agencies and, if not, why not?

The Hon. M.D. RANN: There has not been a study carried out to determine the benefits of purchasing different models of motor vehicles.

It has been the practice of the State Supply Board to mainly let contracts for the supply of Australian-made passenger motor vehicles.

The selection of models accepted in the vehicle ranges offered by suppliers is based on technical criteria and the calculation of whole of life costs which includes the expected resale value at the end of two years or 40 000 kilometres.

293. **Mr BECKER:**

1. What systems are in place to ensure that employees are reimbursed their drivers' licence fees only for their period of employment?

2. What are the conditions for reimbursement of drivers' licence fees and do they apply to all agencies?

The Hon. M.D. RANN: The question raised by the honourable member is covered by Commissioner for Public Employment Determination No. 25. I will provide the honourable member with a copy of this determination.

294. **Mr BECKER:**

1. What is the Government's policy relating to motor vehicle servicing?

2. What instructions exist to cover vehicle servicing and which agency is responsible for issuing and revising these instructions?

The Hon. M.D. RANN:

1. State Fleet's policy is to adhere to the manufacturer's specification.

2. State Fleet has produced a pamphlet associated with servicing and repair and this outlines the need to follow the manufacturer's specification.

295. **Mr BECKER:** Is any monitoring of the market for second-hand motor vehicles performed and, if so, by which agency and are the results of such monitoring made available to agencies?

The Hon. M.D. RANN: State Fleet currently controls approximately 2 400 vehicles and this constitutes approximately 35 per cent of the Government's light motor vehicle fleet. State Fleet monitors the prices received for remarketed vehicles through the trade-in process, Government auction and the 'Red Book', published as a guide for the second-hand motor vehicle industry. In addition, discussions are regularly held with dealers and the Motor Trade Association.

296. **Mr BECKER:**

1. How many motor vehicle parking spaces are set aside for Government vehicles within the area bounded by and including Greenhill Road, West Terrace, North Terrace, Dequetteville Terrace and Fullarton Road?

2. How many of these spaces are privately owned?

3. What is the annual cost of these spaces and where are they located?

The Hon. M.D. RANN:

1. State Fleet operates car pools and parking within the designated area at the State Centre Car Park, Gawler Place and Frome Street Car Park (located between Pirie and Grenfell Streets). There are 355 car parks in total. Provision has been made in the agreement with the State Centre Car Park owners, SGIC, whereby a charge is made for those Government vehicles parked in excess of the base number of permanent car parks. It is known that there are other car parking facilities in the CBD, used by departments as part of their leasing entitlement through office tenancy, for example, GRE Building, Grenfell Street; Citicentre Building, Hindmarsh Square; Natwest Building, Pirie Street; Capita Centre, Pulteney Street; etc. In addition, the Government owned Motor Registration Division building in Wakefield Street has approximately 32 parking spaces in the basement for use by vehicle dealers and for Government parking.

2. With the exception of the Motor Registration Division building parks, Government departments do not own parking spaces.

3. The annual cost of State Centre Car Park and Frome Street Car Park permanent spaces is \$591 780.

297. **Mr BECKER:** What regulations or guidelines exist which cover the use of log books for recording journeys in Government motor vehicles?

The Hon. M.D. RANN: Guidelines exist in relation to the need for log books to be maintained for a minimum period of three months to enable calculation of car fringe benefits tax. Departments would also need to retain records of usage similar to a log book for reasons associated with accounting charges, together with the need to be aware of the driver's name in the event of a parking or speeding infringement notice.

298. **Mr BECKER:** What is the change-over policy for all Government motor vehicles?

The Hon. M.D. RANN:

The change-over policies for Government motor vehicles are as follows:

- Sedan and sedan derivative vehicles, two years of service or 40 000 kilometres, whichever comes first.
- Light commercial vehicles including four-wheel drive light duty passenger vehicles. At the discretion of the Chief Executive Officer of the Government agency concerned but should only in exceptional circumstances exceed six years or 120 000 kilometres.
- Police patrol vehicles, two years of service or as soon as practicable after 50 000 kilometres.

299. **Mr BECKER:** What are the guidelines or regulations which govern the purchase and/or fitting of optional equipment to Government motor vehicles?

The Hon. M.D. RANN:

State Supply Board Policy Statement 4.2 sets out the guidelines for purchase of optional equipment for Government motor vehicles and mobile machinery. Details of the policy are as follows:

Optional Equipment (except Air-conditioning) for Government Motor Vehicles and Mobile Machinery

Chief Executive Officers or their delegates may authorise the purchase of any item of optional equipment listed in the State Supply Board contract list and any other specific options which are essential for safety and the performance of the task required. Public authorities requiring a specific option not on the contract list should contact the Senior Contracts Officer, Government Supplies, State Supply, requesting the option be added to the list.

Ministerial approval is required for options which are not essential for the safety and the performance of the task required.

Installation of Air-conditioning for Government Motor Vehicles and Mobile Machinery

On 6 February 1989 Cabinet approved the inclusion of air-conditioning, where practicable to do so, in all vehicles and mobile machinery ordered for delivery after 30 June 1989.

On 2 April 1990, Cabinet approved the fitting of air-conditioning, where practicable to all existing work vehicles and mobile machinery within three years from 1 July 1990.

SPEED LIMIT

302. **Mr BECKER:**

1. Why have road speed signs on National Highway One not been changed to show the reduction of the State speed limit from 110 km/h to 100 km/h?

2. What is the estimated cost of replacing all speed signs throughout the State?

3. When will these signs be corrected, how many jobs will be created and what will be their duration?

The Hon. BARBARA WIESE:

1. Although the general State speed limit dropped to 100 km/h, the major sealed road network, including National Highway One, has been speed zoned at 110 km/h. This had the overwhelming support of rural councils.

2. Approximately \$100 000.

3. (a) 110 km/h signs have been installed, as necessary, on virtually all roads for which the Department of Road Transport is responsible. In the case of local roads, where it is agreed that the speed limit should be 110 km/h, it is anticipated that councils will have completed signposting by June 1993.

(b) No jobs were specifically created. Alterations to signing are being carried out by existing departmental and council resources.

SEAVIEW ROAD

303. Mr BECKER:

1. Why have the police failed to remove louts from Seaview Road, West Beach, who during evenings on weekends and in particular on summer evenings cause unnecessary loud noise by squealing motor vehicle tyres and smashing drink bottles on the road and beach walls?

2. When will action be taken to restore law and order and a peaceful residential environment in the area?

The Hon. M.K. MAYES:

1. The declaration of dry zones along the beachfront and adjoining car parks within the Grange, Henley and West Beach areas, has been a pro-active measure towards eliminating some of the causative factors; however, additional police presence has also been required and has been provided. As in past years a special police operation, 'Operation Clean Up' will once again be conducted between 10 December 1992 and 31 March 1993. This operation will provide extra police on duty between 2.30 a.m. on each Thursday, Friday and Saturday to specifically address these behavioural problem areas. The primary target areas for saturation policing include that to which the complaint is directed and firm positive action will be taken against those who choose to break the law or disrupt peace. The usual police coverage for other response and duties in the Henley Beach Subdivision will also be maintained.

2. The Operation Order and provision of extra police along the beachfront has taken effect from 10 December 1992, however, normal police patrols are available at all times for response to ensure the peace of the community at large is preserved. Every attempt is also made by police in the area to involve the local community in specific programs aimed at combating such problems.

GRAND PRIX

307. Mr BECKER:

1. What surveillance was undertaken of city hotels, taverns and restaurants during the Australian Formula One Grand Prix checking on prices charged for drinks and how many breaches of Licensing Regulations were detected and reported?

2. Why were hotels permitted to serve wine in plastic glasses and charge \$3.50 for the contents?

3. Will the Government take legislative action to prevent hotels, taverns and licensed premises from selling wine in plastic glasses and, if not, why not?

The Hon. G.J. CRAFTER: There is considerable confusion in the community in relation to price control on liquor. Liquor prices are not fixed under the Liquor Licensing Act and the

Licensing Authority has no enforcement role. Under the Prices Act which is administered by the Commissioner for Prices (Office of Fair Trading) only ale, beer, lager and stout in front bars and bottle shops are subject to price justification. The provision is in many ways an anachronism because there is no longer any requirement in the Liquor Licensing Act for hotels to have a front bar. Therefore, unless the hotel has a front bar still shown on the approved plan of the premises, the licensee is not bound by the recommended retail price. In practice, most licensees comply with the spirit of the legislation and have at least one licensed area where ale, beer, lager and stout are sold in accordance with the recommended retail prices.

There is no price justification on wine or spirits. However, the industry still produces a recommended price structure for wine and spirits which in respect of bar trade is generally adhered to even though it has no legislative backing.

There was therefore no special price control surveillance undertaken during the Australian Formula One Grand Prix. The Commissioner for Prices investigates complaints received which indicate a trader may have exceeded the justified price. No complaints were received in relation to prices charged in front bars or bottle shops during the Grand Prix period.

2. Prior to the Grand Prix, the Liquor Licensing Commissioner met with the Adelaide City Council and the Commissioner of Police to develop a strategy to minimise alcohol related problems in the city during the Grand Prix. As part of the agreed strategy, the Liquor Licensing Commissioner imposed various conditions on licensed premises in an endeavour to keep liquor and glass off the streets, and forwarded letters to licensees in designated areas restricting the sale and supply of liquor during the Grand Prix. The areas were developed in conjunction with the Commissioner of Police. In brief, the areas radiate from the Grand Prix track to the dry areas in Hindley Street and Rundle Mall. The intention was to:

- prevent consumption in the streets by removing licensed areas on footpaths;
- prevent glass from being carried onto the street by imposing a condition that liquor could not be sold for consumption off the licensed premises;
- restrict carry off where it was allowed to the sale of liquor in plastic cups only.

As part of this strategy the Liquor Licensing Commissioner also suggested to licensees in the designated areas that they consider selling liquor for consumption on the premises in plastic cups only, or provide adequate security measures to ensure that glass containers were not removed from the premises.

The Commissioner of Police supported the actions of the Liquor Licensing Commissioner and both believe that these conditions, which have now been applied for the past four years, have been instrumental in reducing the street behaviour problems of the earlier Grands Prix.

3. The Commissioner of Police and the Liquor Licensing Commissioner both advocate the measures used currently and support similar measures for future years. The small inconvenience to those people who wish to purchase drinks in glasses is more than offset by the significant law and order issues.