

HOUSE OF ASSEMBLY

Tuesday 12 November 1996

The **SPEAKER (Hon. G.M. Gunn)** took the Chair at 2 p.m. and read prayers.

PAPERS TABLED

The following papers were laid on the table:

By the Deputy Premier (Hon. S.J. Baker)—

South Australian Office of Financial Supervision—Report, 1995-96

State Electoral Office—Report, 1995-96

By the Treasurer (Hon. S.J. Baker)—

ETSA Contributory and Non-Contributory Superannuation Schemes—Report, 1995-96

Minister for Industrial Affairs (Hon. G.A. Ingerson)—

Australian Major Events—Report, 1995-96
Industrial Relations Commission and Senior Judge,
Industrial Relations Court—Report of the President,
1995-96

By the Minister for Health (Hon. M.H. Armitage)—

Commissioners of Charitable Funds—Report and
Statement of Accounts, 1994-95

By the Minister for Family and Community Services (Hon. D.C. Wotton)—

Department for Family and Community Services—Report, 1995-96.

GAMBLERS REHABILITATION FUND

The Hon. D.C. WOTTON (Minister for Family and Community Services): I seek leave to make a ministerial statement.

Leave granted.

The Hon. D.C. WOTTON: Yesterday in the *Advertiser*—*Mr Clarke interjecting:*

The SPEAKER: Order! I do not want to have to deal with the Deputy Leader of the Opposition, either.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order!

Mr Clarke: I'll be there.

The SPEAKER: Order!

An honourable member: I don't think you will be there for long.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order! The Minister has been given leave; I suggest that members listen to what he has to say.

An honourable member interjecting:

The SPEAKER: The honourable member might not be here if he keeps interjecting.

The Hon. D.C. WOTTON: Yesterday in the *Advertiser*, under the heading 'Gamblers miss out on \$2.5 million aid', it was claimed that gambling addicts and their families had been denied more than \$2.5 million in services promised to them through the fund. The article claimed that of \$3.5 million paid by publicans, clubs and the Adelaide Casino into the fund over the past two years, only \$1 million had gone in support. It also indicated that \$1.6 million remains in Treasury coffers and \$826 000 in the Department of Family and Community Services' bank account, while \$67 000 has been spent by the Department.

This report was followed on 5DN yesterday with a radio interview with the member for Elizabeth, who said that the

State Treasury had kept \$1.6 million of the fund; that less than one-third of the money had gone to people with a gambling problem. The honourable member also accused me, as Minister for Family and Community Services, of hoodwinking the public and being dishonest. I find these comments insulting and scurrilous, not just to me but, in particular, to the members of the independent committee that oversees the fund and to the hotels and clubs that generously donate the money to help deal with problem gamblers in this State.

It is impertinent to suggest that the Government is holding back funds or refusing funding. That is not the case. Never once have I refused funding requests recommended to me by the independent committee. That committee, the Gamblers Rehabilitation Fund Committee, consists of an independent Chair, who is Dale West of Centacare, and representatives of the SA Hotels Association, Licensed Clubs Association, Treasury and Finance and the Department of Family and Community Services. I explained clearly in the House on 5 November, in answer to a question on the Auditor-General's Report from the member for Elizabeth, the current standing of the fund. I will explain the situation once again.

South Australian Hotels and licensed clubs contributed \$1 million to the fund in the first year and the State Government, through the Casino, provided \$500 000, which was used as a special payment to families affected by gambling. In the second year, hotels and clubs contributed \$1.5 million. This money was, at the request of the hotels and clubs, placed in the Consolidated Account to be allocated as recommended by the independent Gamblers Rehabilitation Fund committee, on a quarterly basis, to organisations servicing gambling addicts. Because of timing differences between reconciliation on 31 May and the Auditor-General's Report of 30 June, the amount credited to the fund was shown as \$1.917 million, not the \$2.5 million actually contributed by the industry in the first two years.

Of this amount, all but \$826 000 was allocated in the first two years. Community organisations and the independent Gamblers Rehabilitation Fund committee did not request any further funding, and the committee decided to leave unallocated funds in the Consolidated Account for disposition at a later date. In the meantime, the hotel and club industry has contributed a further \$1.5 million for use in the current year, ending 30 June next year. Currently, payments and commitments will mean that all but \$41 000 of this money will be expended by the end of this financial year. The unallocated funds are not controlled by the Department of Family and Community Services and do not sit in some FACS bank account.

Any suggestion of impropriety or wastage by members of the Gamblers Rehabilitation Fund committee is totally offensive, and I know members of the fund and hotels and clubs that have provided the money take exception to those claims. Community organisations know that the fund does not allow money to be used by the Government for any other purpose. They also know that the fund committee will consider proposals for increased funding based on service demand and that such demand has not been demonstrated to date. The members of the fund committee have also taken great care to ensure that money is distributed in line with the purpose of the fund. They will not make recommendations to me as Minister for distribution just because there is money available.

I have found the comments about the handling of the fund and my role as bordering on the actionable. It was at best

intentionally misleading and totally ignorant of the facts. The facts are:

- More money is spent in this State on problem poker machine gambling per head of population than any other State.
- Out of the total \$1.5 million allocated in the year ended 30 June 1996 only \$51 000, or less than 4 per cent, was paid to FACS for salaries, wages and travelling expenses.
- Other charges for travel relate to the cost of facilitating statewide planning meetings for the group of community welfare organisations known as the Breakeven Network, so that a coordinated, integrated and appropriately focused distribution of services for problem poker machine gamblers can be achieved. Without this payment these welfare groups would have to pay for travel out of their own limited resources.
- A \$220 000 community education program has been developed and will be launched on 25 November. This program discusses controlled gambling and provides information about where to get help with problem poker machine gambling.

While I accept that this is a complex issue, I hope I have clarified the situation and that in future the member for Elizabeth will think before she attacks the reputations of people who are genuinely trying to assist people with real problems and concerns. If ever the hotels and clubs decide to withdraw their most generous contribution to this fund, South Australians will have no-one else to blame for losing this support than the member for Elizabeth and the malicious misinformation and false accusations she has frivolously spread.

RURAL ADJUSTMENT SCHEME

The Hon. R.G. KERIN (Minister for Primary Industries): I seek leave to make a ministerial statement.

Leave granted.

The Hon. R.G. KERIN: The Federal Government has commissioned a review into the Rural Adjustment Scheme and the State Government has submitted a formal response. A three person committee headed by Jim McColl is now conducting hearings around Australia. This morning I had the opportunity to appear before the committee and discuss the South Australian Government submission. We believe that there is a continuing role for RAS but with some shift in emphasis. We believe that Governments have a role to play in facilitating ongoing adjustment in the rural sector to achieve a more market driven attitude. Achievement of this aim revolves around availability of quality information and advice, planning and adequacy of skills. It is in these fields that we consider RAS has a role to play. We support a continuation of RAS funding that enhances this move towards self-reliance and increases the viability and profitability across the farming community. One method of achieving this is through the upgrading of farm business management skills aimed at self-reliance.

We believe, therefore, that much greater emphasis must be placed on using RAS funding to support training and skills development within the farming community, and this was the major thrust of our submission. In my presentation this morning I also indicated that South Australia supports the concept of the Rural Partnership Program and structural adjustment on a regional basis. The Eyre Peninsula Regional Adjustment Strategy being implemented under that program is seen to offer a real opportunity from a whole of

Government and community perspective to address adjustment issues in that region of the State. While it is early days yet, given the community drive and involvement in this program, we are confident of its success.

RAS is currently seen by many as having a welfare focus, and this perception needs to be addressed. RAS must be seen to focus on adjustment only and not welfare. Hence, we have suggested that exceptional circumstances assistance should be removed from RAS and be treated as part of the welfare system. In summary, we see the future emphasis for RAS to be a catalyst to achieving a more market focussed, efficient and self-reliant farming sector.

PUBLIC WORKS COMMITTEE

Mr OSWALD (Morphett): I bring up the forty-first report of the committee on the Port Road Thebarton widening from Phillips Street to Goal Road and move:

That the report be received.

Motion carried.

The Hon. S.J. BAKER (Deputy Premier): I move:

That the report be printed.

Motion carried.

QUESTION TIME

JOBS LOSS

The Hon. M.D. RANN (Leader of the Opposition): My question is directed to the present Premier.

The SPEAKER: Order!

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order! I will continue when the House comes to order and conducts itself in an appropriate manner. The Leader knows that, when he asks a question, he should not comment.

Mr FOLEY: I rise on a point of order, Mr Speaker.

The SPEAKER: Order! If the honourable member wants to take a point of order on his Leader, that is up to him.

Mr FOLEY: No, Sir, I am asking the member for Norwood to apologise for the obscene gesture he just made to the Opposition. He stuck his finger up at the Opposition, which is totally unparliamentary.

The SPEAKER: Order! The Chair did not witness the action. However, if the honourable member made an unparliamentary gesture, I suggest to him that he apologise for his action.

Mr CUMMINS: Mr Speaker, I was about to scratch my nose, when the honourable member interjected.

The SPEAKER: Order! The House has not started off too well today. The Leader of the Opposition has the call to ask his question.

The Hon. M.D. RANN: Since I raised the issue in Parliament last week of nearly 400 jobs being lost from BHP in Whyalla and from Griffin Press, has the Premier spoken with John Prescott, the Managing Director of BHP, and Griffin Press head Mike How with respect to saving hundreds of South Australian jobs, or has he been too busy trying to save his own job?

The SPEAKER: Order!

The Hon. DEAN BROWN: I have asked my staff to arrange an appointment with Mr John Prescott, and I presume they are doing so.

DEPOSIT 5000

Mr CONDOUS (Colton): Can the Premier advise the House of details of the recent scheme that the South Australian Government has launched to encourage South Australians to purchase new homes and boost the housing and retail sectors of the local economy?

Mr Brindal interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order! The member for Unley.

Mr CONDOUS: Last Sunday, the Premier and the Minister for Housing and Urban Development announced an assistance scheme for new home buyers called Deposit 5000, and publicity for the scheme appears in a full page advertisement in today's *Advertiser*.

The Hon. DEAN BROWN: The Government has announced this new housing package to help South Australians move into new housing. It is the best such package released for many years in this State. It will mean that people or families wanting to go into new homes can obtain a grant of up to \$5 000. It will also mean that many families or people who in the past have been unable to raise the money for a deposit are now able to get the money for a deposit and get into a new home. It will also work effectively in stimulating the building industry, particularly at the bottom end of the housing market; it will create jobs. However, most importantly, it is designed to help South Australians move into new homes. It is designed to help increase home ownership throughout the whole of South Australia.

Very importantly, about 1 300 people are expected to be assisted in going into their new home, and that will be an enormous boost to those families or people. Already, since Sunday afternoon, when details were released, the State Government had received 1 200 telephone calls up to midday today. About 400 telephone calls were received this morning; 700 telephone were received yesterday; and even on Sunday, when a hot-line was available, 100 telephone calls were received. It shows that an enormous number of people are interested in owning a new home. They are people who probably have the means to pay the ongoing interest payments and repayments but who do not have the money to put down a deposit. This scheme will help them. The Government has made this \$4 million commitment.

I highlight the point that we are able to make this commitment because of the work the Government has done in fixing up and getting under control the State debt and the deficit within our budget. Here is part of the benefit that we as a Government are able to pass out to the community. I highlight to the House the sharp contrast between the Labor Party, which spent the taxpayers' money and wasted it on tourist resorts in Queensland through the State Bank, and this Government, which will spend the money wisely to the benefit of South Australians and their families in getting homes within the State.

UNITED WATER

The Hon. M.D. RANN (Leader of the Opposition): My question is directed to the Minister for Infrastructure responsible for privatisation. Given the Minister's statement to this House on 24 October 1995 that the Government's contract would require United Water to have a minimum of six resident directors, why has this undertaking not yet been met? On 22 November 1995 the Minister told the House:

Six of the 10 directors will be resident in Australia—have no fear about that because it will be in the contract.

A check with the Corporate Affairs Commission yesterday revealed that United Water has nine directors. Three of the directors were born in France and have given their address as being in Paris. Three were born in England and have given their address as living in London and only three have Australian addresses.

The Hon. Dean Brown interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order! The Minister for Infrastructure.

Mr Quirke interjecting:

The Hon. J.W. OLSEN: No, it is simply not up yet. As was clearly indicated to the House—and as the Premier rightly interjected—the 12 month period for the settling in of this contract has not yet expired.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order!

The Hon. J.W. OLSEN: I suggest that the Leader of the Opposition show a little bit of patience.

Mr Clarke interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order! I warn the Deputy Leader.

The Hon. J.W. OLSEN: We know who will go: it will be the Opposition Leader at the next election when he gets the result that he rightly deserves. What they do not like to acknowledge (it is like the member for Hart, and I referred to this earlier)—grudgingly—what they cannot bring themselves to acknowledge is that this contract is providing a service to South Australians far in excess of that provided before. It is saving \$33 000 a day, every day—\$1 million per month. In addition, it is locked in contracts overseas where the contract for the first 12 months—and we are not there yet either—required some \$9 million worth of export orders being issued. As at four or five weeks ago, \$31 million worth of export orders had already been issued. In every respect this contract is surpassing the commitments given to this House, and the simple fact is that members opposite do not like it.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order! The member for Unley.

DEPOSIT 5000

Mr SCALZI (Hartley): Will the Minister for Housing, Urban Development and Local Government Relations advise what reaction has been forthcoming from the housing industry to the Government's Deposit 5000 housing assistance scheme?

The Hon. E.S. ASHENDEN: I am delighted to answer that question and add to the information already provided by the Premier. When the Government made its decision to introduce this scheme, it saw that it had two main results that it wished to achieve, the first being to provide an opportunity for more people in South Australia to own their own homes, as the Premier has pointed out. Given that about 1 200 people having telephoned already on the hot line, the proof of the pudding is in the eating: the people of South Australia have shown that they want it.

At the same time, the building industry has indicated that it is absolutely delighted with the scheme introduced by the Government. We had initial briefings with the building and finance sectors on Friday morning and at that time they certainly indicated that they would be very supportive of such a program. Now that they have had the opportunity to analyse it, they have made very clear to the Government that the scheme will be excellent in reviving the building industry in South Australia. We should note the comments of the President of the Real Estate Institute, Mr Michael Brock, that

'the Deposit 5000 scheme will provide a timely stimulus to South Australia's property sector'.

The Chief Executive of the Housing Industry Association has also publicly stated what an opportune time it is for the Government to have introduced this scheme. Certainly, there is no doubt that over the last 12 months or so the housing industry in South Australia has been lagging. Further, there is no doubt that a scheme of this nature is required. I am certain that the scheme will bring business back into the housing industry and will provide a number of people with homes. Of course, not only the housing industry will benefit but also the white goods industry, the soft goods industry and so on.

Mr Brindal: They don't like it.

The Hon. E.S. ASHENDEN: I agree with the member for Unley: members opposite do not like it one little bit, because they know that this is a scheme which shows South Australians, both those in the market to buy a home and those in business, that they have a Government that is determined to ensure that the economy is one in which we can all take part.

UNITED WATER

Mr FOLEY (Hart): My question is directed to the Minister for Infrastructure.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order! If the member for Hart does not wish to ask his question, I will call the member for Playford.

Mr FOLEY: Thank you, Sir. Given the Minister's guarantee to this Parliament on 24 October 1995 that within 12 months of that statement to Parliament there would be 60 per cent Australian ownership of United Water, when will the company offer its shares for sale? On 24 October 1995 the Minister for Infrastructure told this House that 'within 12 months there will be 60 per cent Australian equity in this company'. The Minister also said, 'No ifs and no buts and no maybes about that; that will be the position, have no fear.'

The SPEAKER: The Minister for Infrastructure.

An honourable member interjecting:

The Hon. J.W. OLSEN: I will be pleased to. There was a 12-month time line from the signing of the contract, and we have not reached that point. From evidence given before a select committee, the honourable member knows the process that will be followed through. Once again, the Opposition does not want to understand and acknowledge the facts of the sequence of events or to indicate and accept that this contract is delivering substantial benefits for South Australia—be that as it may.

Mr Atkinson interjecting:

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

HAWK 100 FIGHTER AIRCRAFT

Mr EVANS (Davenport): Will the Premier advise the House of the benefits to South Australia of the Commonwealth Government announcement that South Australian-based British Aerospace has been awarded the contract to supply the Australian defence forces with up to 40 Hawk 100 fighter aircraft?

The Hon. DEAN BROWN: It is good news for South Australia that British Aerospace at Technology Park has been able to secure an order for 40 Hawk 100 fighter trainers. British Aerospace is a major defence contractor and employer in South Australia. It employs 1 000 people at Technology Park. This will help to secure those jobs at Technology Park

and create an additional 50 jobs. Of course, the work itself will be done throughout the whole of Australia, particularly in New South Wales and South Australia. But the important fact is that the part done in South Australia is the smart end of the aircraft: it is the end of the aircraft involving the software packages and so on that ensure the plane is suitable for combat. Importantly, that is what this Government is about—attracting hi-technology defence work to South Australia. I commend the Minister for Industry, Manufacturing, Small Business and Regional Development, because he has been part of the team that has gone out to push South Australia in terms of this contract.

Members interjecting:

The Hon. DEAN BROWN: A number of us were involved. I have been with the Minister for Industry, Manufacturing, Small Business and Regional Development when we have been out there pushing for this contract. It shows—

Mr Atkinson interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order! I warn the member for Spence for the second time; he appears to be a slow learner.

The Hon. DEAN BROWN:—that this Government can provide the right environment and support to companies for major defence contractors in South Australia to win major international defence contracts. Forty per cent of Australia's defence work is done in Adelaide. We are the defence capital of Australia and most of that work is done at Technology Park. It will build up an ever-increasing focus around Technology Park and the MFP.

STATE ECONOMY

Mr QUIRKE (Playford): In the light of reports of public dissatisfaction with the Government's management of the economy, does the Treasurer intend to make any adjustment to the direction of economic policy? The editorial in last Friday's *Australian* stated:

The leadership group that includes the Treasurer (Mr Baker) and the Education Minister (Mr Lucas) are accused of failing to address the impact of cuts to education and health budgets, both areas of public concern.

The Hon. S.J. BAKER: I think that all members of the House would be pleased with the progress that the Government has made with the State debt.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order! The Leader of the Opposition and the Deputy Leader will not interject again or the Chair will be required to take action.

The Hon. S.J. BAKER: The program of adjustment was laid down before the election. We have followed that program of adjustment, and the major part of that process of adjustment has been completed. Members should reflect upon the budget papers when they see the achievements of this Government. Every Minister has played his or her part in that process.

Mr Clarke interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order! I warn the Deputy Leader for the second time.

The Hon. S.J. BAKER: They have achieved budget containment at the same time as they have delivered a better product in many areas. Every Minister of this Government should be applauded for the efforts they have made on behalf of South Australia. Let us get it right. In terms of budgetary adjustment, we adjust budgets every day of the week, as the member for Playford knows. Every day of the week there are contras that occur simply because programs do not occur or

fall off and other programs come into place. That process will continue unabated until the next election, and there will be some benefit to the community because of the progress that has already been made.

MINING AND EXPLORATION

Mr CAUDELL (Mitchell): Will the Minister for Mines and Energy advise the House of work being undertaken by Mines and Energy SA to use developments in information technology to provide data to the mining industry?

The Hon. S.J. BAKER: As former Ministers would acknowledge, one of the great strengths of the Department of Mines and Energy is its databases. I am not claiming credit for this because it has built up over a long time. It is a great credit to former Ministers over a period of 30 or 40 years that South Australia has built up one of the best databases in this country. In fact, an observer said that it is probably the best in the world except, perhaps, for the system in Toronto. That is not to my credit but a credit to the organisation and to the people who have come before me. I have inherited something that is very special.

In terms of the dictum that information is strength, because we have such a grand information system, we are able to provide miners in South Australia with information that cannot be obtained in almost any other jurisdiction. I will briefly relate some of the areas in which we have exceptional quality of data. The geological and geophysical databases held by MESA contain huge amounts of information. Since the start of the South Australian Exploration Initiative (SAEI) in 1992, there has been a move to create geoscientific digital databases for ease of manipulation, transfer and storage.

The Petroleum Division developed the Petroleum Exploration and Production Systems (PEPS)-SA, which contain attributes of approximately 1 300 petroleum wells and approximately 550 seismic surveys. In addition, the production history of 500 wells is recorded on a monthly basis. Wireline log data for 1 000-plus wells is also contained within PEPS-SA. The Minerals Resources and Groundwater Divisions have developed the SA-GEODATA base, which incorporates minerals as well as ground water attributes, and members would be well aware of the importance of water to this State and the progress that has been made in identifying and monitoring water supplies.

Records of over 150 000 drill holes, 130 000 rock samples and associated geochemistry and over 30 000 water samples and hydrochemistry have been captured. Maps of surface geology, aeromagnetic and gravity data are also available. In addition, details of exploration licences, surface topography and cultural layers, such as roads and rail, are available in digital form.

Manipulation of the multitude of data sets is by the Geographical Information System (GIS) software. ArcInfo, ArcView or MapInfo are the GIS packages used within MESA to display multiple data sets in map form and to manipulate data. Previously, digital data were stored on magnetic tapes and in the memory of the computer disks. Having found that this information deteriorates very quickly, we are converting it to CD-ROM, which can be stored and which has a lot longer life. It can then be bought by anybody who wants the information.

In December 1994 the Premier, Dean Brown, launched three digital geological data packages of South Australian mineral provinces on CD-ROM at St Barbara's Day celebrations. This was considered to be a world best technology, and

one of the initial packages contained data from the western Gawler Craton. The amount of exploration now in the western Gawler Craton and in the Gawler Craton itself, not only for gold and copper but also for a whole range of other minerals, is reaching significant proportions, and all South Australians would be delighted by that progress.

The beauty of this technology is that a CD-ROM can be purchased for \$9 and therefore the information is readily transferable, manipulated and available. I congratulate the department and the many former Ministers who have had a part to play in that process. We have one of the best systems in the world, and it will be one of the most significant benefits to this State in the years to come.

EDS (AUSTRALIA) PTY LTD

Mr FOLEY (Hart): I direct my question to the Premier. What advice did the Government receive from the MFP about the impact of the decision to locate the EDS Data Management Centre on North Terrace instead of at the MFP's Technology Park? The Business Development Manager of Technology Park, Mr Mick O'Neill, was quoted in the *Australian* newspaper on 25 October as saying that attracting EDS to Technology Park had 'given a significant impetus to the MFP strategy to create a sustainable employment base for its innovative, smart city'.

The Hon. DEAN BROWN: It would appear that the member for Hart does not even bother to listen to the answers I give in the House. I have previously informed the House that EDS had already taken the corporate decision not to put all its staff at Technology Park, even if it put some there. It had decided that the majority of staff would be in the city, no matter what—

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order!

The Hon. DEAN BROWN:—because it had established its Asia Pacific Education Centre (APEC) in the city and wanted to make sure it had a major marketing centre very close to that in the city. This question makes the assumption that all the EDS staff were going out to Technology Park, but that was never going to happen. The honourable member just does not seem to understand that fact.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order!

The Hon. DEAN BROWN: In the last sitting week the honourable member raised issues about EDS's building in the city. At the end of the week he was clearly embarrassed, because he had all the wrong facts.

Mr Clarke interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order! The Deputy Leader of the Opposition knows the consequences.

Mr Foley interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order! I can say that the member for Hart also knows the consequences.

Mr Foley interjecting:

The SPEAKER: I call the member for Hart to order.

Mr Foley: I just agreed.

The SPEAKER: Order! It does not matter: the honourable member is not in a position to agree or disagree. The honourable member for Flinders.

AQUACULTURE

Mrs PENFOLD (Flinders): Will the Minister for Primary Industries advise the House of the progress being

made on management plans for the aquaculture industry on Eyre Peninsula? The Government has been reviewing the aquaculture plans for the lower Eyre Peninsula and in particular has been considering the effects of the tuna deaths on the industry.

The Hon. R.G. KERIN: I thank the honourable member for her question, acknowledging the interest she has shown in aquaculture on Eyre Peninsula, particularly its impact on the long-term sustainability of aquaculture there and on jobs and regional development in her electorate. Oysters, tuna and abalone are key industries that have been addressed in the draft lower Eyre Peninsula aquaculture management plan, which we have released today for public consultation. We are confident that South Australia's aquaculture industry will continue to develop and do so in such a way as to complement the coastal environment.

The industry now contributes more than \$90 million to the State's economy and is an example of ecologically sustainable growth. We predict that the size of the industry will treble in the next 10 years. So far, 140 aquaculture ventures have been approved on the West Coast, which translates to much needed jobs and valuable regional development, and those jobs are certainly vital to many of the towns on Eyre Peninsula. In 1995 the equivalent of nearly 300 full-time jobs were involved. In the coming season, 500 people will be either directly or indirectly employed in the tuna farming industry alone. Also, each 10-hectare oyster site employs a minimum of three people, and there is a flow-on effect to other industries of another two per lease.

The recently opened Lincoln Marine Science Centre is seen as a catalyst for further development of tuna, oyster and abalone farming in the region. The plan provides for a two-hectare research site adjacent to the centre for their studies. Research into other forms of aquaculture, which include mussels, rock lobster and various fin fish, is under way in the area, and further interest in abalone and the position involving investors in other forms of aquaculture is strong at the moment. The draft plan also considers proposed changes to tuna farming. Under the proposal, three zones are set aside for tuna farming in exposed waters, while the tuna farming in Boston Bay is to be reduced, with a total limit of 1 000 tonnes of tuna allowed in pens within the bay at any one time.

Under the draft plan, the number of tuna farm sites within the bay will remain at current levels, with reduced total stocking and cage numbers. The long-term intention is that these will be used primarily for harvesting, fish transfer and research projects which need the more sheltered waters. The State Government is committed to ensuring sustainable long-term tuna farming and other aquaculture industries for the lower Eyre Peninsula and also to ensuring that this regional development creates many jobs for people in the area. I encourage people interested in this matter to study the draft management plan and make comments if they so desire.

WINE AND TOURISM COUNCIL

Ms WHITE (Taylor): What was the Minister for Tourism's involvement in the appointment process of his former adviser, Ms Anne Ruston, to the position of General Manager of the Wine and Tourism Council?

The Hon. G.A. INGERSON: None.

INDUSTRIAL RELATIONS

Mr WADE (Elder): I direct my question to the Minister for Industrial Affairs. Will South Australia be following the Victorian Government's decision to hand its State industrial relations powers over to the Commonwealth?

The Hon. G.A. INGERSON: No. I thank the honourable member for his question and interest in industrial relations. Clearly, South Australia has no intention of transferring its State industrial relations system, as has been done in Victoria. I would also like the Parliament to note that when you do not have a system it is pretty easy to give it away. When the Victorian Premier, Mr Kennett, introduced a whole lot of new legislation in Victoria, there was the biggest single exodus ever from the Victorian system into the Federal system. Although the Deputy Leader is laughing, it is interesting that the same Deputy Leader also made the statement that the introduction of South Australian industrial relations legislation would see the same exodus. Today, exactly the same proportion of employees are in the South Australian State system as are in the Federal system, and they are enjoying the fact that enterprise bargaining is set up in South Australia.

One main reason why we do not wish to shift is that the Federal legislation is modelled on the South Australian legislation and, apart from some minor areas with which we will be working with the Federal Government on a harmonisation program, fundamentally the two Acts are very similar. Over the next couple of months we will talk with employers and employees to determine what areas should be translated into South Australian legislation, so that we can achieve a harmonised system because, as I said, the Federal system is fundamentally based on South Australia's legislation.

The other reason why, logically, we would not transfer it is that South Australia has one of the lowest levels of dispute in Australia. For example, South Australia has 60 per cent of the number of disputes relative to Victoria. Clearly, South Australia's industrial relations system is producing a very harmonious work place. Also, this Government has fought very hard to maintain a State system because, clearly, it has some tremendous advantages. Who would want to hand over a system that guarantees the base rates of wages of Victoria or New South Wales, when clearly the living standards and the cost of living in South Australia is significantly less—probably the order of 10 per cent?

In terms of transporting our goods interstate and overseas, surely we would not want to hand that over to the Commonwealth and end up with that sort of system. As I said, when the Federal Act is finalised, we intend to talk with employers and employees to harmonise those areas of the South Australian system that need it.

WINE AND TOURISM COUNCIL

Ms WHITE (Taylor): Will the Minister for Tourism confirm that Ms Ruston was not the preferred candidate for the position of General Manager of the Wine and Tourism Council at the time the Minister contacted members of the interview panel, and did he attempt to influence them to favour Ms Ruston?

The Hon. G.A. INGERSON: As I have had nothing to do with it, I can report to Parliament only that the people who made the decision were the Chairman and Deputy Chairman of the Tourism Commission and the Chief Executive who has just left. As they were the three senior people in the Tourism

Commission, I would be very surprised if they had made an incorrect decision.

INFORMATION TECHNOLOGY INDUSTRY

Mr SCALZI (Hartley): Will the Premier advise the House of steps which the South Australian Government is taking to boost the availability of skilled staff with appropriate qualifications to work in the information technology industry in this State? As reported in today's *Advertiser*, the Adelaide-based Managing Director of Motorola, Mr Inamdar, has indicated that Adelaide is an ideal location for information industries but that Australia suffers from a lack of suitably qualified and trained employees.

The Hon. DEAN BROWN: I appreciate the question, and I hope that the member for Hart listens to the response because we hear so much from him and, might I add, his bleeding heart for jobs at Technology Park. I point out to the honourable member that this Government attracted Motorola to South Australia. Motorola gave a commitment to create 400 jobs at Technology Park by the year 2000. Recently, as a result of discussions with the Government, it has decided to increase the number of jobs from 400 to 1 000 by the year 2000—1 000 jobs within the next four years, provided it can recruit enough people to meet its demands. The State Government is working with Motorola to ensure that it can do that. Motorola is thrilled with three particular aspects of its location in Adelaide. It regards Adelaide as the best location for its software development centres anywhere in the world.

An honourable member interjecting:

The Hon. DEAN BROWN: Yes, the Minister for Industry, Manufacturing, Small Business and Regional Development was involved in attracting Motorola to South Australia. The three factors are: first, it likes the existing infrastructure at Technology Park and in Adelaide, and is now particularly thrilled that the MFP urban development is going ahead; secondly, it likes South Australia's quality of life; and, thirdly, Motorola is very impressed with the level of support it gets from the State Government.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order!

The Hon. DEAN BROWN: When the member for Hart is finished—is he finished yet, because he just cannot stand the good news? Here we are, announcing another 600 jobs at Technology Park, and what is he trying to do? He ridicules and knocks once again. The State Government is now working with Motorola in two particular ways: first, to identify exactly Motorola's demand; and, secondly, to help recruit people, both within Australia and overseas. About half Motorola's staff comes from interstate, which means that, potentially, about 450 people and their families will move to South Australia to work at Motorola over the next four years.

That will be good for the urban development of the MFP, and it will also create new demand for housing in South Australia. Also, the State Government is working with Motorola to identify from where suitable, highly educated staff can be recruited overseas. A task force has been set up to help Motorola achieve this recruitment. We are working with Motorola in several countries to identify and attract those people to South Australia under the Skills Migration Program. In particular, we have targeted Olivetti, a company that is downsizing its work force in Italy very substantially. It has the highly skilled work force that is needed, and we believe that we can recruit a number of its people to South

Australia. Here is further proof that the information technology strategy of the Government is working. A company that has created already a number of jobs is now about to expand to 1 000 jobs over the next four years. It shows that the 2 500 jobs we have established in IT in the past two years is just the beginning for South Australia.

WINE AND TOURISM COUNCIL

Ms WHITE (Taylor): Given that the position of the General Manager of the Wine and Tourism Council was advertised internally to staff of the South Australian Tourism Commission at a salary of up to \$46 000 *per annum*, why was the Minister for Tourism's former adviser, Ms Anne Ruston, appointed to the position with a salary package exceeding \$80 000 *per annum*?

The Hon. G.A. INGERSON: The member for Taylor ought to look at the commercial advertisement that appeared in the *Advertiser* because, if she happens to read that and becomes informed, she will see that the advertisement states that the salary package is to be negotiated with the winning candidate. As I said earlier, that decision was made by the Chairman and Deputy Chairman of the Tourism Commission and the Chief Executive who just retired. When I first became a Minister I was told—and I am quite sure that every other Minister who has been in this Parliament has been told the same thing—that Ministers have no right, nor should they have any right, in the selection, payment or enrolment of individual staff.

REPATRIATION GENERAL HOSPITAL

Mr BUCKBY (Light): My question is directed to—
Mr Brokenshire interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order! I warn the member for Mawson.

Mr BUCKBY: —the Minister for Health. Will the Minister inform the House of any initiatives to improve health services to war veterans?

The Hon. M.H. ARMITAGE: I thank the member for Light very much for his question, which is timely for two reasons: first, it comes at a time when the South Australian Health Commission has commenced the process of planning for a massive \$22 million redevelopment at the Repatriation General Hospital at Daw Park. This vitally important development in health care in the area of South Australian veterans, aged people and people in the southern suburbs coincides with the second timely reason for the member for Light's question, and that is the much more poignant event yesterday of Remembrance Day, when the entire nation remembered the supreme sacrifice made by a number of Australians in time of war.

The Health Commission is seeking private sector interest and participation in the \$22 million proposed redevelopment of the Repatriation Hospital on its current site. A wide range of services will be enhanced and facilities built to capitalise on the already fantastic performance of staff at the Repatriation Hospital. To reach this stage much consultation has taken place with key groups, specifically including representatives of the war veterans, as it was felt that their input was essential for such a major development and health enhancement to take place. The planned works include the construction of a new multi-purpose rehabilitation facility which includes a 25 metre hydrotherapy pool. This is so long overdue that I hope members opposite will give due credit to

the Government for putting in a large rehabilitation facility that people have been crying out for for a decade.

The planned works will also include purpose built and redeveloped facilities to replace existing ward areas. A new patient hotel will provide step down care and accommodation. There will be a day surgery centre from redeveloped present ward areas, and a number of existing in-patient wards will also be redeveloped. The Government will contribute \$13 million following negotiations with the Federal Government. One of the first things this Government did on coming to office was to tackle a project which had been stagnating for months and, within a very short time, it had secured an excellent deal for South Australians; and part of that deal was some Commonwealth funding. The Government will contribute \$13 million, and an additional \$9 million is being sought from a private sector operator to build a collocated hospital.

The Repatriation Hospital is expected to benefit families living in Adelaide's southern suburbs by improving in a significant manner their access to public and private hospital services in the area. The proposal is a major contributor to the metropolitan Adelaide strategic health facilities plan, which, with the help of the private sector, will provide modern, up-to-date and efficient health facilities. This project is the fourth hospital development project undertaken by this Government following on from Modbury Hospital, Flinders Medical Centre and the Queen Elizabeth Hospital. To date, these projects have yielded substantial private funding for public infrastructure and significant recurrent cost savings from the outsourcing of public patient facilities and services to collocated private operators.

Looking at the Repatriation Hospital, there are a number of main elements, but I stress that the services at which we are looking in particular will not include the Repatriation Hospital's clinical services. However, the psycho-geriatric rehabilitation or medical services are likely to be relocated from other public health institutions. It is the Government's vision for the Repatriation Hospital that it will be the best hospital in Australia for older people, and it will provide one of the best rehabilitation facilities in Australia. I would like members of the House to acknowledge this important project on South Australia's health landscape and to recognise the impressive quality of health care that will be provided for citizens in Adelaide's southern suburbs, particularly our important war veterans.

WINE AND TOURISM COUNCIL

Ms WHITE (Taylor): Will the Minister for Tourism confirm that Ms Ruston's application for the position of General Manager of the Wine and Tourism Council was received over three weeks after the close of nominations and, further, that Ms Ruston was made aware of the names of short-listed applicants before selection had been made?

The Hon. G.A. INGERSON: As I said when I answered the first question, I do not know whether that is the case but, since the member seems to be so interested in a public servant, I will find out that detail. For the honourable member's information, the advertisement appeared in the *Advertiser* of Saturday 3 August 1996 and it says that the people need to apply for the position—

Ms White interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order! The honourable member has asked her question.

The Hon. G.A. INGERSON: I would have thought that any person from either the public sector or the private sector who saw an advertisement in the *Advertiser* would have the right to apply. Since the honourable member is so concerned about timing and seems to be on a witch-hunt in relation to a public servant, I am very happy to provide that detail. As I said earlier, it is not normally my practice to do this but, because the member has made this a public issue and wants this information about a person in the public sector, I will bring that detail back to Parliament. I point out that it was publicly advertised, and I would have thought that any person whether or not they are a member of my staff could apply.

YOUTH AFFAIRS POLICY

Mr ANDREW (Chaffey): Will the Minister for Youth Affairs report on a recent meeting of all State and Federal Ministers for Youth Affairs?

The SPEAKER: In calling the Minister, I point out that it is a very vague question, but it does not give the Minister the licence to go into an unnecessarily lengthy answer.

The Hon. R.B. SUCH: The answer will be less vague. I thank the member for Chaffey for the question because it is an important issue. Last Friday we had the first stand-alone council meeting of youth Ministers in Canberra. It was very important because, traditionally, matters relating to young people have been tacked onto the end of other ministerial council meetings. I have been arguing for a long time that we need to spend time focused purely on issues relating to young people. I congratulate Senator Vanstone for calling and chairing the meeting. It was a most productive meeting. Some of the topics covered included youth employment and self-employment, that is, encouraging young people into self employment. Other Ministers noted that South Australia was a leader in this regard because South Australia has the Selfstarter scheme which they are keen to copy.

Other topics included: the development of a national youth strategy; the question of youth allowances—consolidating Abstudy, Austudy and other allowances into one allowance was a very important issue to be discussed; youth homelessness, which is an issue of relevance to my other ministerial colleagues in the House; the matter of young people in care and protection and what happens to them in life, which is of particular interest and concern to Senator Vanstone and the rest of us; young people and the law—often their ignorance about the law—and we discussed alternatives to some of the ways of dealing with young offenders; the concept of a national youth week, which we are seeking to implement as soon as possible; reconciliation between young Aboriginal and non-Aboriginal Australians—a very important topic; youth suicide, which, sadly is a topic we still have to come back to—and I know my colleague the Minister for Health is doing a lot in that area, and the Commonwealth Government is about to commit substantial resources to that issue; and, importantly, the question of young people and the sense of community, that is, involving them in community activities and developing within young people a sense of community.

I point out to members of the House that the Governor-General asked to meet all the youth Ministers because of his deep interest and concern for the young people of Australia. I must say that I was very impressed with the commitment of the Governor-General (Sir William Deane) to our young people and his intimate knowledge not only of issues affecting young people in other States but certainly his

interest and knowledge about young people in South Australia. It was an important first step. We do not pretend that in one day we can solve all these issues, but it was very productive to meet with all the Ministers to talk about these issues and to work out ways of dealing with them in a more effective manner.

WINE AND TOURISM COUNCIL

Ms WHITE (Taylor): In relation to Ms Anne Ruston's recent appointment or any other matter relating to the employment of particular staff, has the Minister for Tourism given direction to the Chief Executive of the South Australian Tourism Commission? Section 15(2) of the Public Sector Management Act provides:

No ministerial direction may be given to a chief executive relating to the appointment, assignment, transfer, remuneration, discipline or termination of a particular person.

The Hon. G.A. INGERSON: First, I point out that the Chief Executive to whom we are referring is no longer employed by the Government; he has had his contract terminated. As I said earlier, it is not my responsibility, nor has it ever been my responsibility, to interfere. I do not interfere in any area in terms of employment. Also, I note that the honourable member jumped up and said how fantastic this \$80 000 salary package was. I just happened to find a briefing note on it, and it is always important to correct these little games that are played. When she worked for me, Anne Ruston was a tourism, recreation and sports adviser and got \$55 000 or \$56 000 plus oncosts. I point out that she is now on \$60 000, plus oncosts, and not \$80 000 as the honourable member was running out. Every person who is an adviser in the Tourism Commission has a car. What is the big deal? It just happens to be that staff at that level in the Tourism Commission get a car. I am surprised that such a big deal is being made of this.

As I said earlier, I am absolutely fascinated that the honourable member opposite should be so concerned with a Minister's staff member applying for a publicly advertised job. It will make me look at what happened in the past. I happen to know of a couple of examples, and I am sure they will make some pretty interesting stories—Abfalter is one and there are quite a few others. They will make some pretty interesting stories. It is quite staggering that an honourable member should take on a public servant and run down the wrong lane.

If the honourable member opposite wants to be briefed on this whole matter without making a public scandal out of nothing, I would be happy to run through it. Instead of playing around with documents that have been fed to her from previous staff, it would make better sense if she walked across the House and inquired. I have answered the question as I know it. I am not involved, and that has never been my position. When the honourable member asks questions, she ought to get her facts right, because the new package is \$60 000, not \$80 000.

ANIMAL WELFARE

Mrs ROSENBERG (Kaurna): What action does the Minister for the Environment and Natural Resources intend to take against two organisations claiming to represent the interests of animal welfare—

An honourable member interjecting:

Mrs ROSENBERG:—and we have a few of those in here—that are proposing to mount an international campaign to urge tourists to boycott South Australia and local produce? The Victorian based Australian Wildlife Protection Council and the International Fund for Animal Welfare have produced a draft brochure, which they say they will circulate internationally, condemning South Australia's record in wildlife management.

The Hon. D.C. WOTTON: First, I am appalled that groups such as this should resort to such malicious distortions and untruths to try to harm this State's international tourist reputation. It stinks, to be quite frank. This brochure, to which the member for Kaurna has referred, is full of untruths. For example, it says that South Australia pays a bounty of \$1.50 a head to landowners for kangaroos destroyed on their property. That statement is untrue. It claims that wildlife officers are paid solely from fees levied on the kangaroo industry. Again, that is scurrilous and untrue. It claims that there is an unwritten but deliberate policy by wildlife authorities to eliminate completely resident native animal populations. That allegation is so insane that it takes away any credibility at all that these organisations have.

I was interested to hear a representative of this group interviewed on the Murray Nicoll show recently, and what concerned me even further was that the author on whose information the brochure was based actually stated that his own information had been manipulated, twisted and distorted by the groups involved. After looking at this brochure, I believe that this group is not about saving wildlife but about trying to cook up an issue whereby it might be able to seek more membership and revenue by creating public sympathy for its own purpose. After all, at the back of the brochure is a donation form conveniently seeking tax deductible donations.

It is important that this campaign be exposed for what it is—nothing more than an appalling effort by organisations with questionable motives seeking to boost their own bank accounts. I am aware that the Crown Solicitor is looking at the brochure with a view to instigating legal action. In addition to this, I will write to the appropriate authority seeking that they revoke the tax deductible status of the organisations involved, because their *bona fides* are most questionable.

It is also worth noting the comments by Dr Walmsley in response to the propaganda put out by the organisations. Dr Walmsley, who is an independent and not a Government worker in the field, says that South Australian wildlife laws are far less exploitative than Victorian laws. Additionally, about 10 species of rare and endangered mammal are more in number in the wild in South Australia than 20 years ago. There are none in Victoria. As well, landholders are not allowed to destroy scrubland in South Australia but they are in Victoria. It seems strange that a Victorian based organisation should attack South Australia in such a way. The Australian Wildlife Protection Council and the International Fund for Animal Welfare should think carefully before embarking on any international campaign because, based on its misguided information, they are treading on dangerous ground.

HOSPITAL SECURITY

Ms STEVENS (Elizabeth): Given that the Minister for Health reviewed hospital security last April and that a child was abducted from Port Augusta Hospital yesterday, what

degree of confidence can the public have in the Minister's new security arrangements for hospitals?

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order! The member for Culance.

Ms STEVENS: Following the abduction of a child from the Lyell McEwin Hospital in April this year, the Minister initiated a review into security at all public hospitals. On 27 June, the Minister told the Estimates Committee:

I received the outcome of the review a month or so ago and, frankly, I did not believe that it was substantial enough to give the degree of confidence that I felt people required, and I actually have some more work being done on it.

What was it?

The Hon. M.H. ARMITAGE: The matter to which the member for Elizabeth referred is a police matter. It is *sub judice*, so I will not comment on it. However, I wish to give some background to these matters. As well as the matter that the member for Elizabeth raised, there was an abduction at the new Children's Hospital at Westmead in New South Wales. The Government has undertaken a review of hospital security, and a number of initiatives have been implemented since then. In particular, with the support of the Health Commission, key hospitals have improved security for newborn and paediatric wards. These new initiatives amount to a further \$320 000 in total being allocated to security arrangements in metropolitan hospitals.

As I pointed out at the time, hospitals obviously wish to maintain a friendly and caring environment that is conducive to the healing process for both the patient and those accompanying the patient. Therefore, security needs to be managed without creating a fortress mentality. If the member for Elizabeth wishes hospitals to be like Stalag 17, I would appreciate her letting me know.

Ms Stevens interjecting:

The Hon. M.H. ARMITAGE: The member for Elizabeth says, 'Don't be ridiculous.' In other words, the member for Elizabeth is clearly agreeing with the Government's policy, which is to have hospitals managed without creating a fortress mentality. That is the only conclusion that one can draw: I notice that the member for Elizabeth is now nodding, and that is good. She is agreeing with the Government's policy, which is not to create a fortress mentality or have Stalag 17 in our hospitals. Of course, that means that the member for Elizabeth agrees with the direction the Government is taking.

I will also give a status report as of mid-1996. Public hospitals currently spend in excess of \$3 million per annum on security. Another \$320 000 has been added to that. At the Royal Adelaide Hospital at any given time, four security officers are on duty and 25 security cameras operate 24 hours a day at strategic locations. Door alarm and sensitive area alarm networks are installed and a security control room is manned 24 hours a day. At the Women's and Children's Hospital all staff during orientation and through regular yearly updates receive Hospital Watch training. Security staff are part of the immediate action team; they carry a pager and a mobile radio for emergency communication. All hospital staff are issued with identification badges and it is mandatory that they wear them while on duty. Security staff frequently check staff ID, especially after hours.

In the regional hospitals, for example at the Port Pirie Regional Health Service, duress alarms are installed and security patrols by contracted security to check the grounds and the locked doors three times nightly. Electronic surveillance cameras are installed in accident and emergency at the

main entrance and at the car park, and all staff are required to wear an identity badge. I go on to talk about Hospital Watch. Currently 20 hospitals are in the scheme and the 1996-97 health service agreement has provision for all hospitals to be involved in the Hospital Watch program. Hospital Watch involves a Hospital Watch co-ordinator at each hospital as the security point.

Interstate comparisons are interesting: security in South Australian public hospitals compares more than favourably with interstate counterparts. The North Western Adelaide Health Service, the Flinders Medical Centre and the Women's and Children's Hospital were asked recently to compare their security arrangements with the standard for newborn and paediatric security set out in the draft Australian standard on security for health care facilities. A high level of compliance was identified but a number of improvements have been implemented as a result of that comparison.

Finally, I refer to advanced technological ways of improving security. Detention Monitoring Services Pty Ltd is the supplier of electronic monitoring equipment to be trialled by the Department for Family and Community Services for the surveillance of young adults on home detention. On my instruction, the Health Commission has been chasing this, but Detention Monitoring Services Pty Ltd does not believe that its mechanism is suitable for newborn infants because it is primarily used for adults, the ankle band is too large and the system has no application anywhere in the world in any hospital. However, it has identified another product which may be suitable for newborn infant security and the Health Commission is in the process of investigating whether these devices will provide the security required. Arrangements are being made to demonstrate in South Australia.

In that long and protracted expose, I have indicated that security is well and truly under control in South Australian public hospitals, and the member for Elizabeth has acknowledged that by nodding that the Labor Party—the Opposition—does not want Stalag 17 or a fortress mentality in hospitals. While we will continue to provide these sort of measures, we will also clearly try to strike the best possible balance between fortress mentality and making hospitals available for visitors and friends to visit people who are in the process of recovering from illness or who have just given birth to a baby. Obviously, that is a very important part of a hospital process.

GRIEVANCE DEBATE

The SPEAKER: The question before the Chair is that the House note grievances.

Ms STEVENS (Elizabeth): You always know when you have hit the mark with the Minister for Family and Community Services because, following your getting to the nub of an issue, generally there is a ministerial statement filled with high dudgeon and righteous indignation. That was the case again today when the Minister gave his reply to a question about the spending of money from the Gamblers Rehabilitation Fund. I will spend a few moments putting to the House some of the facts.

Members interjecting:

Ms STEVENS: I would like you to listen and be clear. The Opposition sought information on the expenditure of this fund. We had four goes at getting this information. We have the information and I will refer it to all members. Members can refer to the figures in *Hansard* of 5 November 1996 (page 378) and the answer that the Minister himself gave me on this matter. Members will see that what we said in our press release and what was reported was quite correct. If we look through the list and add up the figures, we note grants of \$1.006 million, with Treasury still holding \$1.6 million. The closing balance—the final figure in the list of figures that members will find in *Hansard*—as at 30 June 1996 was in fact \$826 721.51. This closing balance is in this account.

The Hon. D.C. Wotton interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order!

Ms STEVENS: I would like members to understand that—

The Hon. D.C. Wotton interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order!

Ms STEVENS:—the name of this account in which the Minister says that the money is not held is 'Family and Community Services Gamblers Rehabilitation Fund'. It is there in black and white. I ask all members to read it and make their own judgments. I am not critical of the members of the committee charged with the job of distributing these funds. I certainly do not accuse them of any impropriety or wastage, as was suggested by the Minister in his report to the House. I am sure that they are doing their job to the best of their abilities and according to the guidelines set down. The point I am making is that this fund has been in operation for two years: into this fund \$3.5 million has been donated by the Casino and the hotel owners in good faith.

The Hon. D.C. Wotton interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order!

Ms STEVENS: Listen to the Minister: you can see when he gets agitated. The money is to be used to help people with gambling problems. In two years less than one-third of that money has found its way to those people. I live in an electorate where a lot of people are hurting because of the introduction of poker machines and I am sure that many members have found the same thing. This fund was to help such people and I am asking that it be used for that purpose.

Our strongest criticism is of a Minister who should have known and does know that this money is not getting out into the field—a Minister who should be asking why this is happening. If the guidelines are too restrictive, he should be looking at them and determining whether they are appropriate. Instead, he sits on his hands and Treasury keeps the bulk of the money. That is not good enough.

Finally, I was very interested to hear the Minister say that, if the Hotels Association and the Casino withdraw their funds, it will be my fault. What a ridiculous comment! This man is the Minister in control of this department, and it is his responsibility to use this money for purposes for which it was designed. No-one else can take the blame for that. Rather than being totally ignorant of the facts, I make the final point that the facts that we used were those that this Minister provided in answer to a question. He cannot have it both ways.

Ms GREIG (Reynell): Today I bring to the attention of the House the recent success of the Catchment Care—

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order! The member for Reynell does not interject on other members. I intend to see that she is given a fair go. Members who are interjected upon are usually those

who interject far too often themselves. As the member for Reynell is not one of those she will be heard in silence.

Ms GREIG: Thank you, Mr Speaker: I will start again. Today I bring to the attention of the House the recent success of the Catchment Care Fair. The fair was masterminded by students and teachers of Morphett Vale West Primary School in conjunction with the Friends of Living Christie Creek. Being an environment education/Landcare focus school, Morphett Vale West has been able to support not only its own students but also neighbouring schools in caring for the land and water. The Catchment Care Fair was attended by 1 800 children and 350 adults over 24-25 October.

Young people are concerned about the environment and are keen to become actively involved in its protection and improvement. Educating and encouraging individuals to appreciate and to take positive actions to conserve and preserve our environment is what Catchment Care is all about. Morphett Vale West Primary School, along with the wider community living alongside Christie Creek, realise that they have a commitment to work in partnership for the improvement of the local catchment area.

I acknowledge the work of all students—from the CPC children through to years 6 and 7. All students had a key role in making the fair a success. I took the time to visit all classrooms, and the students were eager to share their knowledge and experiences. Each class produced a theme of its own in relation to the catchment. Like other visitors, I viewed some spectacular work relating to droughts, floods, wetlands and water care. I was not overly keen on Mr Hopkins' invitation to make friends with some visiting snakes; however, I did not mind meeting the yabbies, tadpoles, frogs and turtles—all catchment creatures that we can enjoy and learn from.

Catchment Care is an issue of which we should be more aware, but like many issues it takes us as a community some time to realise how important our creeks and rivers are. We tend to think that, because they are there and are part of the natural environment, we can take it for granted that the creeks and rivers will always be there; somehow, we forget about how we built our communities around our waterways. We forget about the added pressures of pollutants, stormwaters and industrial waste. It takes us a long time to realise the degradation and ongoing erosion problems we are causing, but we are very quick and sometimes overtly ignorant when we look at the problems we have caused and conclude that a concrete drain will solve the problem—not so.

In fact, it is about time we revisited our pipe dreams and based our solutions on practical realities. It is important to note that the more development that occurs in a catchment the more everyone needs to be aware of caring for the environment. Changing the landscape from natural vegetation to paddocks or roads and houses increases the amount of stormwater run-off from about 5 per cent to over 50 per cent and as much as 98 per cent in a fully built-up area. The difficulties the creek network experiences become obvious with the environmental damage that occurs resulting from such an enormous amount of extra water flowing at a much greater rate, especially when that water contains litter, leaves, twigs, gravel, animal faeces, oil, grease and all sorts of chemicals.

I should also mention that only this year Morphett Vale West Primary School was selected from 24 nominations to be an environmental education/Landcare focus school. The school received \$4 000 to develop curriculum materials, resources and professional development for staff. The

projects undertaken by the school were generated in close partnership with interested parents and community groups. Morphett Vale West Primary School aims to develop a reputation as an effective environment focus school supporting a program which not only presents knowledge about the environment but also places a special emphasis on caring for Christie Creek by providing students with opportunities to develop skills across all areas of curriculum via Landcare, Waterwatch, revegetation, Frogwatch, bushland protection, gardening and tree planting.

The program embarked upon by Morphett Vale West is the start of an exciting and challenging journey. As competency and expertise are developed, the knowledge gained is being shared with neighbouring schools, and links are being made to other participating schools across South Australia.

In conclusion, it would be remiss of me not to acknowledge the work of Mr Peter Smytherman, Deputy Principal of Morphett Vale West Primary School, through whose personal commitment and dedication to environmental issues the Catchment Care Fair came to fruition. I also acknowledge the efforts of the Principal (Mr David O'Loughlin), his staff, the students and the strong parent community.

Ms WHITE (Taylor): Before referring to the topic I will discuss today, which relates to a newsletter I received in the mail from a financial institution, I pay tribute to the staff of the Salisbury branch of the CPS Credit Union for their outstanding service, which I find to be far superior to that of the other banks with which I deal. The friendly service I receive from the CPS branch in question is much appreciated and makes my life much easier. The fact that one does not have to fill out forms at the CPS Credit Union is really a Godsend. I say that, because I do value this service. However, I was somewhat miffed when I received in the mail the CPS's regular update newsletter subtitled 'The latest CPS news about your money'.

I refer to an article in that newsletter on page 2 of the November edition entitled 'New access fees'. I bank with CPS Credit Union because its fees and the services it provides for its customers are better than those of any other institution I know of. However, I was annoyed to read this article, from which I will quote, because it illustrates that the CPS Credit Union reprimands people for accessing their money. The article states:

Earlier this year a major member survey revealed your attitudes to members who overuse some credit union access services. It is widely seen as unfair for the majority to bear the expense of a small minority of members who abuse these services.

This interested me, because subsidising people who abuse services is not something I would condone. Further, the article states:

In fact, 70 per cent of all members surveyed endorsed a complete user pays system of fees and charges. As a result, CPS will be introducing new access fees from 1 January 1997 to allow us to charge members who do a large number of withdrawals each month.

There is nothing different about these fees from those other banks charge. The article goes on to list these fees, and I was interested to note the fee structure comprising three categories. From now on you will be allowed five free over-the-counter withdrawals—thereafter, \$1.50 each; 15 free ATM withdrawals—thereafter \$1 each; and five free declined ATM or EFTPOS transactions per month—thereafter \$1 each. In the market place this may well be regarded as a competitive fee structure. However, I objected strongly to the next sentence, which states:

Importantly, these fees won't affect the majority of our members who already act responsibly towards their access usage.

I object to this because I do not regard it as irresponsible, in terms of accessing one's funds, to make withdrawals five or more times a month. Indeed, every time I use a teller at the other banks with which I deal I am charged in excess of \$4 for accessing funds. I object strongly when I am talked to in this way—as is the case with this newsletter—about my responsibility in this regard and abusing services, because, after all, this is my money. While I probably will not fall into the category of people who have to pay these charges, a lot of people who do what should be regarded as reasonable in accessing their own funds are being told that they are irresponsible and are abusing services. That is quite inappropriate and this newsletter should be withdrawn.

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

Mrs ROSENBERG (Kaurana): I congratulate the Christies Beach-Port Noarlunga RSL on their usual respectful service which was held yesterday. While we were having a cup of tea afterwards, a message was sent to all the diggers to the effect that, during the service, some Noarlunga council and Department for Transport workers, who were working in the township of Port Noarlunga, heard the music, the speeches and/or the service and stood to attention for the whole service. My thanks to those workers, who showed respect for those who lost their lives for Australia, needs to be recorded. That is really important and shows the deep feeling of respect that they have for those people who served.

Last week I had the dubious pleasure of attending what appeared to be a Labor Party election rally in my electorate. I am sorry that I had to describe it as an election rally because it was supposed to be a public information evening. It was arranged by the Old Noarlunga Residents Association to allow residents to hear from SA Water officials, to ask questions and to adopt resolutions about the proposed Old Noarlunga sewerage scheme, which was announced about 18 months ago. I could be forgiven for calling it a Labor Party rally because of the flavour of the meeting and the stirring speeches that were given by the Labor infrastructure spokesman (Kevin Foley) and the Labor candidate. In fact, the Labor candidate's standing increased considerably in my eyes because I was surprised that he found the hall. That was well done and I congratulate him on that.

In 1987, the Labor Minister for Water Resources (Don Hopgood) introduced a Bill to amend the Water and Sewerage Act so that all residents in South Australia paid a standard capital contribution cost for water and sewer connections. He said in his speech:

The most significant policy deficiency relates to the issue of equity between ratepayers, orderly development and cost recovery.

At that time, purchasers of newly created blocks bore the full cost of recovery of the provision of services, while those connected in older subdivisions were subsidised and paid for by all taxpayers in South Australia.

The member for Hart advocates that we return to that inequity and he disagrees that the Labor Government of 1987 was right. He said that it got it wrong. He believes that it is okay for some South Australians to pay for their direct connection and for other South Australians not to pay, the tab being picked up by all taxpayers. He advocates a return to a system of higher charges, taxes and debt levels so that a few South Australians can be connected to the sewer at the

expense of all South Australians. He also advocates that, if people have owned a block in a serviced area for the past 10 years and they decide to build and connect today, unlike their neighbours who connected free, they will have to pay.

The member for Hart does not really know what he wants except that he thinks that the previous Labor Government and Don Hopgood were wrong; therefore, he must think that everyone at Old Noarlunga should connect for nothing. Yet at the Labor Party rally which was held the other night he did not commit the Labor Party to that. He did not promise to connect them free of charge. He promised to meet them halfway, that is, if they pay half, he will pay half when he is the Minister for Infrastructure. In other words, he promised them exactly what they are currently getting. He promised them no change. The Government already meets them halfway. It subsidises the scheme by over \$1 million, in the total cost of the scheme. Either the member for Hart is very bad at mathematics or he was trying to lie to the meeting for political reasons, and I know which option I believe. With regard to the commitment that Labor got it wrong before—

Mr ATKINSON: I rise on a point of order. The member for Kaurna has just accused the member for Hart of lying to a meeting. That is inappropriate language, and I ask her to withdraw it.

The SPEAKER: Order! Did the honourable member use the word 'lie'? I understood she used another term.

Mrs ROSENBERG: No, Sir, I used the word 'lie', and I apologise. The member for Hart was obviously trying to mislead the meeting. I have read all 209 pages of the Labor Party's policy for the next election, and there is not one mention of the fact that he intends to repeal the legislation which he claims Labor got wrong in 1987.

Mr CLARKE (Deputy Leader of the Opposition): I should like to refer to some of the extraordinary events of the last few days surrounding the leadership of the Liberal Party.

The Hon. W.A. Matthew interjecting:

Mr CLARKE: Well may the Minister for Emergency Services laugh, because it was from the Minister for Emergency Services that the Minister for Infrastructure learnt those famous lines: only trust those who tell you that they are not going to vote for you. I refer to the split within the Liberal Party, which has its antecedents in 1972 and, in particular, the formation of the Liberal Movement. The present member for Coles was very active in the formation of that divisive body, which has plagued the Liberal Party from the day of its formation.

When thinking about all the events that have happened in the world since 1972, we can name the collapse of the Soviet Union and the Berlin Wall, the reunification of Germany, the end of the Vietnam War, and the end of apartheid after 350 years of white-dominated rule in South Africa, but still the Liberal Party cannot get over its schisms of 1972 when the then Leader of the Opposition (Steele Hall) resigned and created his own political Party—the Liberal Movement. That schism has plagued the Liberal Party to this present day.

It is also important to note the answer of the Treasurer and Deputy Premier (for the time being) today to a question from the member for Playford. The member for Playford asked a very direct question with respect to change in the economic policy of the State Government. As we on this side of the House understand it, it is with economic policy that members of the back bench of the Liberal Party are so dissatisfied, because they see it as the ruination of their political careers—the oncers in the Liberal Party.

Mr Bass interjecting:

Mr CLARKE: The member for Florey may well interject and well he may be worried because of the mood in the electorate. The present Treasurer said that there would be no change in economic policy. There was a love-in this morning in the Liberal Party room, and even the Premier acknowledged the work of his Minister for Infrastructure for the first time in nearly three years.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order!

Mr CLARKE: We all know that the Liberal Party's love-in is very shallow. We had only to look at the faces of the backbenchers today, because they realise their mortality, they realise the swing is on and they realise they are goners. Three years ago the Premier misled them into believing that they could actually win re-election at the next election, rather than tell them to take a valium, enjoy themselves for four years, and accept their fate because they would not be back here after 1997.

The present Deputy Premier has made it quite clear that there will not be a change in the economic policies of this Government. The interesting point is that we were told that the Premier and his troika of the Attorney-General, the Education Minister and the Treasurer would listen and consult with the Liberal Party back bench and would do things about the economy of South Australia to placate the back bench. What the present Deputy Premier had to say is that it was all a sham, because the economic policies that his Government has pursued over the past three years would be maintained, irrespective of the views of the backbenchers in his own Party. He quickly shared the blame—as rightly he should—with all other members of the Cabinet by saying that all members of the Cabinet share that same responsibility.

I think it would have been an act of betrayal to dump the current Deputy Premier, as the Premier tried to do over the past three days. He tried to use the Deputy Premier as a sacrificial lamb in carrying out the policies of his Party. To have dumped the Deputy Premier would have been the ultimate act of betrayal to a person who has had to do all the hard work—all the unpopular, dirty tasks that fall to a deputy leader, particularly the Deputy Premier and Treasurer, because that is the job he has to do. The hyenas on the Liberal Party back bench—the Premier's own faction heads, such as the member for Coles—were trying to undermine the Deputy Premier by sacrificing him to the Minister for Infrastructure.

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

Mr ROSSI (Lee): Today I want to draw attention to the closure of Findon Primary School. On 23 October this year the Minister for Education and Children's Services, the Hon. Robert Lucas, attended a public meeting at the Woodville Town Hall to explain the reasons for the closure of Findon Primary School. The Minister spoke to the meeting and took questions from the floor. After the Minister left the meeting, some members of the Opposition made deliberate misleading statements. I should like to place on the record the facts concerning the closure of Findon Primary School by highlighting the hypocrisy of the Labor Party regarding the issue of school closures.

Mr Atkinson interjecting:

Mr ROSSI: If you'll just shut up and listen, I will come to it. The Brown Government is using exactly the same policy with regard to school closures and amalgamations as was used by the preceding Labor Government. The shadow

Minister for Education and Children's Services, the Hon. Carolyn Pickles, supported this policy of closures and amalgamations by the Labor Government through her role as Chair of the Education Committee advising the previous Minister. She now attempts to criticise the Government for implementing the same policy she supported.

As regards the member for Spence's interjection, the Hon. Carolyn Pickles said to the public meeting that from 1986 to 1993 there were only three school closures under the then Labor Government. Two of those closures were in the seat of Lee: West Lakes High School and Seaton North Primary School. Her mathematics is totally wrong and her statement totally false. The Hon. Carolyn Pickles knows that the Labor Government closed 70 schools—not three—in its last years of Government between 1986 and 1993. This is an average of 10 schools per year. The current Government is closing or amalgamating an average of about 10 schools per year—exactly the same number as the Labor Government. How can Opposition members criticise Government policy with regard to school closures when the Labor Government used exactly the same policy and closed or amalgamated the same number of schools per year during its period of Government?

For members opposite to criticise the Government is to criticise themselves; it is total hypocrisy. I was going to give every member of the Labor Party a destroyer name; I think they are total destroyers of the truth, honesty and integrity of our society. Contrary to what Labor spokespersons would have the public believe, the Minister's decision to close Findon Primary School at the end of 1996 followed a recommendation from a local review committee comprising parents, principals and a SAIT representative. Before making its decision, the review committee engaged in wide community consultation with parents, teachers and principals for more than 12 months. The committee considered but rejected the option of keeping Findon Primary School open. Its report highlighted a long-term significant decline in enrolments from 490 to only 174 students this year, with little prospect of enrolment growth in the future. An enrolment of 150 has been estimated for 1997.

The Labor Government did nothing during its term of office to look at other facilities at the school. The working and learning environment of the school is so bad that a default notice under the Occupational Health, Safety and Welfare Act has been placed on some facilities. This has meant that staff and students have had to move out of these areas. Redevelopment of these facilities would be a very expensive option and unwarranted in light of the falling enrolment. The Government has promised that all the moneys available from the sale of the site will be spent on the redevelopment of western suburbs schools. In particular, the redevelopment of Woodville Primary School and Flinders Park Primary School will proceed.

Another myth being perpetrated by Labor spokespersons is that the Government is targeting Labor held electorates for school closures. It is true that Findon Primary School is in a Labor held seat, but it is blatantly untrue to suggest, as it was at the public meeting, that the Government is targeting schools in Labor electorates. In fact, of the eight schools most recently closed or amalgamated by the Brown Government or those to be closed or amalgamated by the end of the year, the vast majority have been in Liberal electorates. In fact, six of the eight are in Liberal held seats and only two are in Labor held seats.

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

STATE RECORDS BILL

Adjourned debate on second reading.
(Continued from 17 October. Page 263.)

Mr QUIRKE (Playford): When I first got this piece of legislation I wondered 'Why me?' It seems to me that the legislation we have before us is one of those things that really are not of enormous moment. It is not about to shatter windows around town; it will not precipitate a leadership crisis in the Liberal Party; and I do not think it would have got much of a guernsey at last Tuesday's or this morning's meeting, or whatever meeting in which it was discussed. But I now confess that I was wrong. In fact, in terms of archives and records, some people out there argue—and I think they are probably right—that this might be one of the more important pieces of legislation to go through the House this year. People will want to come back and look at contemporary attitudes in 1996—and, for that matter in the 1990s or the 1980s—and their principal source will be primary documentation, the recording of which is dealt with by this Bill. A number of history buffs out there will probably want to try to interpret these years by looking very closely at the records.

I well remember being advised of French records that have been kept for more than 350 years. In fact, the original scheme, which I believe was introduced in France in 1624, has continued since that time. As a consequence of that, in France there are written records of the activities of government and government agents and general reports on the population for more than 350 years. I am also advised that one of the reasons that France is the source of much historiography is the existence of an enormous amount of raw material which can be accessed by scholars, not only within France but also from all over the world. The interesting thing is that the French never set out to get their records correct: they set out with other purposes in mind. In that light, the Bill before us today may well be of considerable importance to people in future years.

I guess that we need to approach the issue extremely seriously when we consider how we will keep these records, what records will be kept, who will keep them, who will have access and exactly what they will have access to. Over the past 10 years or so, we have debated a number of other issues associated with this, such as freedom of information and various other pieces of legislation. As a member of the Opposition, I can tell the House that I love it when things roll off the side of a truck, particularly Cabinet submissions and those sorts of things. I well remember my first Question Time in this Parliament when the then Opposition came in with at least six leaked documents. I was absolutely horrified by that experience, having worked in Canberra for 4½ years, where one leaked document would be the source of endless inquiries and finger pointing for at least two to three months until the next document came out, all of which were reasonably harmless and, in many instances, fraudulent.

A leaked document produced by the then Opposition and the Opposition today is, I guess, the equivalent of another bomb going off in Beirut, and it is treated as such by most of the media and, for that matter, everyone else in the South Australian community. Notwithstanding that, it is significant that we are today debating legislation on this issue. I inform the Minister that we support his legislation, but that support is conditional on certain aspects of the debate this afternoon, and we may well take a slightly different attitude in the

Legislative Council. I will place on the record today a number of issues that I believe need to be addressed in this Bill.

First, my Caucus was absolutely horrified that the Levy amendment, as we know it, was not included in the Bill. Seven persons are to be appointed to the council to determine what records will be kept and how they are to be kept. We are told, to our absolute dismay, that the Bill makes no provision in respect of the council's gender balance. That is just not good enough. Our Caucus was horrified by that and wanted me to make crystal clear this afternoon that we give the Minister due notice that he had better remedy that oversight before it gets to the next place, or we will do it for him.

As we understand it, there will be seven categories for membership of the council. We understand that all seven categories are related to specific organisations. There is an argument—and I think that the Friends of the Archives and other groups have raised the question—that possibly the council should be a little larger and should include some general members of the public who are not tied to the specific organisations (the seven building blocks) of the council. I do not know whether this was the Minister's intention or the intention of the Government, but the Bill provides that a member of the council can be removed by the Minister on application of the organisation that nominates that member to the council.

We all know that there are many boards in South Australia—in fact, when he was in Opposition, the Minister tried to get the previous Government to say how many boards existed in South Australia. I well remember one Friday going to see the Premier to tell him that it would be very embarrassing if we did not know the answer. I can now tell the House, some four years later, that a person was appointed to physically count the number of boards. Although that person could not give us an answer, he discovered that a committee had been appointed some five years earlier to determine the number of boards in South Australia. I suggested to the then Premier that we ought to shut up about it because we were just making publicity for the then member for Bright, but that is another historic note on this debate.

It is amazing that we see in this Bill the ability of a member organisation of the council to nobble one of its people if he or she does not do what they require. It simply goes to the Minister and says, 'Look, pursuant to this Act, Charlie is not representing us.' He might be doing the work the Government wants him to do, but that is a separate issue. We simply raise this issue. I must say that there was a division of opinion on this issue in my own Caucus. Some people thought that this was a horrific example of lack of accountability, and that a person really ought to have the right to show what a genius he or she is once they are appointed to a board, subject, of course, to not being nominated the next time. Others of my ilk thought that this would be a vast improvement and that we could remove some of these geniuses who go running off on a tangent. I suggest that my view was in the minority, but the matter was never brought to a vote. I know that I would have the support of the Deputy Leader on such an issue because, of course, we have experienced many problems with boards doing things about which their constituent members are not at all happy.

I guess that is the history of Parliament, too, and I guess that is why we have a mace in front of us and a black waddy in the other place, because elected politicians also go off and do things, but that is another issue for the Minister to look at. The other aspect about which we are curious is that I am told, on good account, that annual reports are due by 30

September. I think the Minister must be assuming that the council will be somewhat hard to get together because he has given it until 30 October to report. We would like to know why the council will receive a month's extension for the preparation of its report. The other matter which the Minister might address in his reply to the second reading debate, and which will save a lot of time this afternoon, is the question of the preservation and access to FOI and local government records from 30 years to 20 years. We would like to know a bit about that.

The Friends of the Archives has written me a letter, and I will read out some parts of it. It is pretty concerned about this Bill, and one reason for its concern is a lack of consultation by both the Government and the Minister. I will read various excerpts from the letter, which makes the case pretty well. The letter states:

I write on behalf of the committee of the Friends of South Australia's Archives with respect to the State Records Bill currently before the House of Assembly. Please find attached a brief report prepared by the State Records Bill Subcommittee of the Friends which may be of interest to you as Opposition spokesperson on the Bill. A copy of the subcommittee report is being forwarded to the relevant Minister, Wayne Matthew, and to the Australian Democrats for their consideration also. The Friends draw your attention to the following matters of concern in particular: the proposed State Records Council needs a higher standing and authority than that defined in the Bill.

Without digressing too far, I believe that that is an issue the Minister ought to address this afternoon. The letter continues:

Given the trend towards appointing non-specialist executives across a range of Government agencies, i.e., people are appointed as managers rather than as practitioners from the relevant professions, it is imperative that the proposed State Records Council has professional archival records management and historical expertise in the event of the Manager of State Records not being a professional archivist.

I understand that the Friends of the Archives, and certainly those people who have spoken to me about the matter, are quite satisfied with the person who has been employed as the keeper of State records and believe that that person will do a good job. The letter continues:

The operating role of the proposed State Records Council needs to be defined more clearly; for example, will the proposed council simply have an advisory function, or will it operate as a board? What remuneration is envisaged for members of the proposed council? What provision has been made for operating the proposed council—who is responsible for organising, administering and overseeing the proposed council? What is the procedure in the event of a tied vote—will the *status quo* be maintained pending a review of the matter in dispute? What is the precedent for the exclusion of the records of Parliament from the operations of the Bill? Indeed, why should the parliamentary records be excluded at all? There may be a need for a parliamentary archive to be formally constituted: in the meantime the parliamentary records appear to be in limbo because they are not covered by legislation. Are you or the Minister aware that there has been no public consultation on the Bill in its current form?

Therefore the friends have arranged for a discussion meeting to be held next Wednesday [tomorrow]. . . at 6 p.m. in the Ira Raymond Room at the Barr Smith Library. As well, there appears to have been little or no recent consultation within the Public Service administration. In the meantime. . .

The letter goes on to ask us to seek to have the matter adjourned. We will not do that: we will let the Bill pass in this House and deal with matters in the other place, depending on the Minister's response to these issues this afternoon. It would be reasonable to say that the Opposition, in particular some members of the Opposition, have had quite an interest in these issues and understand fully the importance of proper archives and records being kept in South Australia.

I remember when I made an application to join Adelaide Teachers' College in 1969 and I was rejected on various grounds, one of them being that the Director of Secondary Education did not think I was a fit and proper person for the position, which was fine by me because the next day I started work in the Hospitals Department. One of my duties was to go to the records section of the Hospitals Department (as it was then), which was a building in Rundle Street opposite Hambley-Clarkes' gun shop and one or two other shops at that time. In the basement of another building was an army surplus store that sold all sorts of gear that the army wanted to get rid of at that time. Times were different in 1969: they sold the stuff that the army is more famous for than the drinking bottles you can buy in those stores today. I was horrified to find out that in that section—complete with the dust—they could tell you how many sick days you had had since 1868. I do not know what was so important about 1868, but I remember the fellow telling me that they had perfect records on everything in the Hospitals Department going back 101 years at that time.

Generally, most members would see that as a waste of time, but certainly records on a number of issues should be kept for 100 years (or even more) and will be of interest in the future. Maybe I am wrong: maybe I am a Philistine and sick day records are something that we ought to keep for hundreds of years into the future. I lasted in the job six days. Some three years later, when I had a university degree and a successful career as a concrete layer, I approached Adelaide Teachers' College on the fourth floor to get a scholarship for one year to undertake a Diploma in Education. They took the file out and repeated to me what I had said to Hedley Beare, the Director of Secondary Education, some three years earlier and told me I was not a fit and proper person because of what I had told him. However, I did hurry down the stairs to the third floor, where they employed me immediately as a teacher. I did that because I knew that the Education Department records would take at least half an hour to go from the fourth floor back to the records section. At that time under a former Minister for Education—not the present Minister but the late Hugh Hudson—I became a teacher in one of Her Majesty's schools.

I did see that file again. It was brought out some years later when I was given a 4A assessment for a senior master-ship but it was rejected on the grounds of gross insubordination because I told the deputy principal not only what I thought of him but where he could go and what he could do when he got there. As the principal said to me—and it is written all over my file—he understood that this fellow was 10 pence to the shilling (he put it in different wording than that but I will not use it for parliamentary purposes) but he was not going to have one of his junior teachers going around telling the world that. The story ends by the principal education officer at that time pulling out my file and saying that I had not changed in nine years.

It is one of my wishes to go through some of those files one day. I would like to find out exactly what was in there, but I did get some nice bits read out to me at that time. Obviously, the Education Department had some reasonably good files but it was slow at pulling them out of the filing cabinet. I will not take any longer this afternoon except to say that I know a number of other members would like to put a few other notes on my file, and I wish them very well. We can now go to the Minister to answer some of the specifics and we may be able to avoid the Committee stage.

The Hon. W.A. MATTHEW (Minister for State Government Services): I thank the member for Playford for his usual frank appraisal of the Bill before him and for the indication of the Opposition's intent to support the passage of the Bill subject to a number of questions being answered. I also acknowledge the member for Playford's opening comments. He indicated initially on receiving the Bill he wondered 'Why me?' I must admit my reaction was similar. On becoming Minister for the newly created department, State Government Services—an amalgamation of the old SACON or the then Department of Building Management that followed it and the old Department of State Services—I noted that this piece of legislation had been around in various shapes and forms for some time. I also acknowledge the member for Playford's comments that after closer examination he found, as did I, that this Bill could be regarded as one of particular import that was introduced into Parliament because of its provisions regarding the keeping of records that will be accessed in the future.

The passage of time has seen this looked upon for some time. There is a fair bit in the archives in State Records about the Bill and the debate. It goes back to 1975, when the Report of the Committee of Inquiry into the Public Service of South Australia (the Corbett report) noted the problems of poor record management in Government and recommended a number of strategies. Here we are 21 years later still looking at the recommendations of the Corbett report. In 1982 a Bill was drafted but rejected because it did not adequately cover the records management functions that the Government was seeking.

In 1990 State Records was formed as a business unit of the then State Services Department. It was the then Government's intention that this further change would strengthen records management in agencies through a policy of commercialisation. By 1990 most Australian States had separated their archives functions from library control and emphasised records management in separate archival legislation. A series of other things occurred but, finally in June 1995, the Cabinet of this Government approved that a draft Bill be released for public consultation and comment. Since June 1995 public consultation and comment has been sought and duly received, and in October 1995 State Records became a unit of the Department of State Government Services, which trades as Services SA following the amalgamation between the former Department of State Services and the former Department of Building Management and, prior to that, SACON.

After 21 years of procrastination and analysis, after a period of public consultation on the draft Bill that occurred from June 1995, we have reached a stage where absolutely every element of possible consultation has occurred. For that reason, I am surprised that the member for Playford has received a letter from a group claiming inadequate consultation. There has been more consultation on this legislation than on anything I have seen come before the Parliament for quite some time. I have not seen the letter to which the honourable member referred. I am not aware whether it has even arrived in my ministerial office, but he would have noted my making a call to one of my staff—

Mr Quirke interjecting:

The Hon. W.A. MATTHEW: The honourable member indicated that he received it Wednesday. I have not yet seen that. It is entirely possible that it has arrived in my office. As members of Parliament would appreciate, Ministers receive much correspondence each week and, if I have received it in my office, I will certainly respond to the concerns of that

organisation. If I have not, I will look forward to their referring a copy of their correspondence to me.

The honourable member raised a number of matters which I am happy to address in turn. If I do not cover all the matters that the honourable member has raised, it may well be that we have to go into Committee for a short period. Like the member for Playford, I am hopeful that we can avoid that. The honourable member talked about the gender balance on the seven person council and indicated that there are members of his Party who would be concerned if there was an opportunity for an imbalance. Of course, it is the policy of this Government that all boards and committees achieve a gender balance. Indeed, in my role as Minister I have demonstrated that I am working rapidly toward achieving that. The honourable member is right: I do not recall seeing anything specific in the legislation to require that. If members of this Chamber—and, indeed, of another place—are insistent that specific reference be made in the Bill to ensure that the Government's policy is put into effect, I am comfortable with that. I am happy to see that occur, either within this place or in the other place. I am in the hands of this House to determine where that should occur.

The honourable member mentioned that at least one group was concerned that the seven person council should be larger and include more general members of the public. I have heard some of those concerns, but a wise group of seven people ought to be sufficient to ensure that the purpose of this Bill is adhered to. I do not see any great need to go beyond seven. I am certainly open to sensible discussion as to where we may be able to accommodate others, but I am one Minister who is not a great believer in large cumbersome committees. The last thing we want to see created through this or any other legislation is a larger body than need be to ensure the efficient workings of the legislation and the processes expected by this Parliament. However, if a compelling case is put to me for areas that are not covered by the seven person council, I am certainly open to suggestion as, indeed, would be my colleague in another place.

The honourable member indicated that there is some concern that these provisions would allow a member of the council to be removed by the Minister on application from the group who has been responsible for nominating their representative in the first place. For those who are perhaps concerned about this aspect, I point out that the group needs to make an application to the Minister and the Minister needs to be satisfied that that application is a responsible one if there is a member who needs to be removed.

I might add that the original intent of this clause was simply to allow for organisations who may change office holders at annual general meetings the opportunity to replace their nomination at that time. It was not included for any insidious reason. The balance is appropriate. I acknowledge that the honourable member supports the cause, but he is putting to the House the concerns of his Party room, as would be expected of him. In the main, it enables groups to have their representatives changed as office bearers change at annual general meetings. With the provisions both for the group to apply to the Minister and for the Minister to agree to that application, there is sufficient coverage in the legislation to ensure that people are not removed from a role for any insidious reason.

The honourable member referred to the annual report dated 30 October. That certainly was not in any direct response to a direction from me for the date to be any different from 30 September. Frankly, I am not aware

whether every other piece of Government legislation refers to 30 September rather than 30 October. My recollection is that all those pieces of legislation for which I am responsible in my various portfolios refer to 30 September. Again, if there has been a drafting error with respect to the Bill, I am quite happy to ensure that that is amended to be in keeping with all other legislation.

There was mention of the 30 years to 20 years for local government. Indeed, the restriction on Cabinet material is 20 years. The reason for the 20 year reference was simply to be in keeping with that and for no other reason. That is a perfectly reasonable time frame, and it is perfectly reasonable that local government have similar restrictions on its material, as does the Cabinet of the Government of the day.

The honourable member indicated a number of concerns expressed in a letter from Friends of the Archives. As I said, I have not yet seen those concerns, but I am happy to respond now regarding the ones I have noted. The council has been given an appropriate standing within the Bill. I am not sure to whatever extra standing they are referring; perhaps they may like to communicate that to me. It has been appropriately provided for in the legislation. With regard to the reference to non-specialist executives and the need to have professional archival record managers, I believe that the membership of that seven person council is provided for appropriately through the nomination provisions and we will get appropriately qualified people on the council as a result of those provisions.

The exclusion of parliamentary records is something that was the subject of quite a number of discussions behind the scenes. An earlier draft of the Bill included parliamentary records within this process. As all members would be aware, the Houses of Parliament are also subject to Standing Orders, and the Standing Orders of both Houses of the South Australian Parliament have coverage through Standing Orders with respect to the keeping and availability of their records. So far as they are able and so far as the Standing Orders allow, the provisions of the Bill will be followed by both Houses. I have had discussions with the Speaker and with staff members of this Parliament about the way in which records are kept.

It is important that the House is aware that the services of a professional archivist were provided by my department to the House to enable many of our records to be carefully read through and appropriate professional archival procedures put in place. I was pleased with the result of that work. From memory, we had a staff member working in an office in the Parliament for about six months to ensure that the parliamentary records were in good shape. That officer is particularly satisfied with the amount of time she had to apply herself to that task, and I am told she is satisfied that she carried through that task to its finality. The honourable member also indicated that this group had said that there was no public consultation on the Bill and, as a consequence, there will be a meeting tomorrow at 6 p.m. I am not aware of that meeting tomorrow; it is the first I have heard of it.

Mr Quirke interjecting:

The Hon. W.A. MATTHEW: The member for Playford asks, 'Should we go together?' I am not sure how many will be there if it has not been too widely advertised. Certainly, my staff do not seem to be aware of it. There has been a significant amount of public consultation on this Bill. I have detailed that to the House. This is a saga that has gone on for 21 years. Members on both sides of the House will be pleased

to see something finally in the statute that covers the important processes of recording keeping.

Those are the responses to all the questions of the honourable member that I have noted. If the honourable member is satisfied that they have all been responded to, we can pass through Committee. If he is not satisfied, I am obviously in the hands of the House, as we all are, as to the passage of the Bill from here.

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

TAXATION ADMINISTRATION BILL

Adjourned debate on second reading.
(Continued from 17 October. Page 254.)

Mr QUIRKE (Playford): The Opposition supports the legislation and has no real problem with it. We understand the necessity for taxation and for the processes in the collection, enforcement and penalty provisions for taxation. In this Bill we see a streamlining of those processes in accordance with the various taxation Acts that are appropriate in the other jurisdictions of Australia. As a consequence we do not see a necessity for any lengthy debate this afternoon. We see flexibilities within the Bill to give the Commissioner for Taxation the ability to deal with special arrangements. Without any further ado we support the Bill.

The Hon. S.J. BAKER (Treasurer): I appreciate the Opposition's support for this Bill. It is an important Bill in that it talks about improving and streamlining the administration. We finish up with wads of paper with these changes. There has been considerable consultation with our interstate colleagues and we have agreed to streamline and synchronise some of the processes with the processes adopted in other States. Many of the measures contained here are intended to help the taxpayers and others are to provide harmonisation. It is the first major rewrite of the administration provisions for many years. I was hoping to have something more substantial before the House relating to the taxation matters themselves, whether it be stamp duty, FID or BAD tax. I had hoped that all those measures that have been discussed between New South Wales, Victoria and South Australia would be progressed a lot further at this stage.

It would appear that New South Wales may be going its own way in this respect, which means that any capacity for all the States to provide consistent legislation or direction would appear to be broken down by New South Wales. I hope that we can convince that State that the reform of the tax system will occur, so that each jurisdiction will be doing the same things. If we start to break the nexus being developed—and we have had interest from Western Australia and Queensland as well as from the Northern Territory—we will not achieve the reforms we are seeking.

South Australia is at the forefront of reform. I pay tribute to my Taxation Commissioner, Mike Walker. He has been leading the band in the reform process and has been an important part of the discussions that have taken place interstate. He has injected new ideas into the debate and has instituted a number of reforms in this State to make our taxation system more workable through this legislation. I sincerely thank the officers of the Taxation Department and the Under Treasurer for the part he has played in the formulation of these changes. The former Under Treasurer, Peter Boxall, was also involved earlier in the piece. South Australia

is making advances not seen in other jurisdictions, and I would like to put that matter on the record. In so many areas South Australia is now showing the lead. It is important to note that in such areas as this one, which the members of the public may not understand but which certainly the business community understands, we are making substantial progress. I thank the member for Playford for his support of the Bill.

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

STATUTES AMENDMENT (TAXATION ADMINISTRATION) BILL

Adjourned debate on second reading.
(Continued from 17 October. Page 248.)

Mr QUIRKE (Playford): It would be difficult for us not to support this legislation, given that we supported the last Bill and this is just a downstream measure of that. Before the member for Taylor leaves she ought to organise a nice glass of gin for the member for Hanson, who seems to be particularly obstreperous and difficult today and needs a pick-me-up. We support this legislation and understand that it relates to enforcement and is consequential upon the earlier Bill.

The Hon. S.J. BAKER (Treasurer): I appreciate the support of the Opposition.

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

RACIAL VILIFICATION BILL

The Legislative Council intimated that it had insisted on its amendments to which the House of Assembly had disagreed.

Consideration in Committee.

The Hon. S.J. BAKER: I move:

That the House of Assembly insist on its disagreement to the Legislative Council's amendments.

We will not debate this issue: it is simply a matter of getting the Bill to a conference.

Motion carried.

A message was sent to the Legislative Council requesting a conference at which the House of Assembly would be represented by Messrs Atkinson, Brown and Cummins, Mrs Geraghty and Ms Greig.

Motion carried.

POLICE (COMPLAINTS AND DISCIPLINARY PROCEEDINGS) (MISCELLANEOUS AMENDMENT) BILL

Received from the Legislative Council and read a first time.

SOUTH AUSTRALIAN PORTS (BULK HANDLING FACILITIES) BILL

Adjourned debate on second reading.
(Continued from 16 October. Page 203.)

Mr QUIRKE (Playford): Unfortunately, the Opposition will take a little longer (although not much) on this piece of legislation. There are a few issues and a few answers we want on the record. I understand that this is a Bill to authorise the sale of the bulk handling facilities at Port Adelaide, Port

Giles, Wallaroo, Port Pirie, Port Lincoln and Thevenard. Presently, these facilities are owned and operated by the South Australian Ports Corporation. We are told that this asset sale will be complete within the next few months. There are a couple of issues concerning us in this respect. First, the Opposition has no doubt that the South Australian grain industry is fundamental and important to our economy. The Opposition is also well aware that with last year's record season—and one would hope that we are heading towards the same result this year—we will see a massive injection of funds into the South Australian community from the rural sector. However, there are a couple of issues to be considered here. Although the Opposition does not object to this asset sale *per se*, we would like to know, first, what ballpark figure is expected for the sale of this asset?

The Hon. S.J. Baker: Are you mad?

Mr QUIRKE: No, I am not mad; I do not believe that I am deranged in any sense. My firearms licence was renewed some time ago. While the Minister is here, I inform him that I would not mind my photograph being returned soon.

The Hon. S.J. Baker interjecting:

Mr QUIRKE: No, they testified that I was of sound mind for the licence, and I used the Minister as a referee. Having asked the question to which I obviously have an answer, there are other matters to which my Caucus seeks answers. How will this process take place? Will there be a preferred tendering arrangement (as we understand is happening)? Is that in the best interests of taxpayers? Would it not be better to have an open tender for this process? If the Government entered into selective tendering, what was the reason for doing so?

We are interested in what will happen in respect of these facilities in the next few months. One presumes that they will still be operated by the Ports Corporation although, obviously, the Asset Management Task Force would have some overarching responsibility for this sale. Presumably, when this measure is enacted, there will have to be agreement as to how this will operate, particularly given that this is the time of year that we hope the grain bins will be filled at these facilities. Some time ago I saw a television story about a \$4 million extension to a facility out of Roseworthy, which obviously belongs to the Ports Corporation, for the storage of grain from the Gawler area. The Deputy Premier is shaking his head.

The Hon. S.J. Baker: It's not affected there.

Mr QUIRKE: But it is still owned by the Ports Corporation?

The Hon. S.J. Baker: I don't know.

Mr QUIRKE: We will see. In essence, we give conditional support to the legislation, on the basis that we get answers about the tendering arrangements and how that will be done. If we are satisfied with the Minister's second reading reply, we will possibly reflect on that and deal with it further along the corridor.

Mr VENNING (Custance): Before speaking in support of this Bill I declare my interest. I am a grain grower who delivers grain to the South Australian Bulk Handling Authority and, therefore, I am a toll paying member of that company. My father, Howard, was Chairman of Directors of the company. I support this Bill, which hopefully, after agreement and successful negotiation between the Government and the Cooperative Bulk Handling Organisation, will see the sale of these port facilities to South Australia's grain handling authority. Mr Speaker, as you would know, it is the

only grower-owned company that we have. As the member for Playford said, the facilities include the grain loading belts and gantries on the wharves at the ports of Port Adelaide, Port Giles, Wallaroo, Port Pirie, Port Lincoln and Thevenard. They are presently owned and operated by SA Ports Corporation, which we know as the Ports Corporation.

This action has been desired by the industry for many years—right back to the middle 1970s. Subject to successful negotiations, this is yet another commonsense and long overdue measure. South Australian Cooperative Bulk Handling will control the whole grain path from the inland silos to the silo terminals at the ports and, now, also the loading of the ships. Currently, the vital part of the chain is not under the company's control. Costs and charges have to be levied and proportioned, and separate motors, power, electricity and metering infrastructure have to be in place. We have separate management and separate unions involved in the unloading of gantries, as well as in the cooperative bulk handling facilities themselves. This is a commonsense move, but one wonders why it ever happened. When the silos and the outloading facilities, including the weighing bins etc., were built, why did not SACBH build, own and operate these gantries and the belts? The only reason was that they were built on land owned by the Government through the Marine and Harbors Department, now the Ports Corporation.

It is very good economic sense for the Government to negotiate the sale of these facilities. First, it provides a lump sum to assist with our debt repayments. Secondly, many of these facilities have depreciated to a very poor state of repair. Some have out-run their economic life because the output of the belts is too slow to load modern ships. There are also a number of occupational health and safety problems at these facilities because Governments have let them run down and many of the safety features are obsolete, broken or non-existent. Many guardrails have corroded and fallen away and workers walk the gang planks without any rails. These facilities are being sold in a pretty dilapidated condition, particularly in relation to occupational health and safety regulations.

To confuse the matter is the South Australian deep-sea port issue, which is before the industry and Parliament. Most members have read the interim report, as have I, and the outcome of that review will make a big difference to the long-term value of these belts. If one believes the interim report, and I do not, it means that only two of these belts have a long-term value, that is, the one at Port Giles and the one at Port Adelaide. The economic use of the other belts will come to an end in the foreseeable future. I do not believe the report. I believe that Wallaroo has to feature in the proposal, but that is another issue that may confuse things, particularly when the Government is trying to strike up an agreement with SACBH.

However, the present value is what matters, and the Government is just in time in negotiating these deals. Once the final report is out, the price of these facilities will be a lot less. If we knew the final outcome of the deep-sea port issue—and do I not know and nor does anyone else—it would be a lot easier to apportion the exact value. The two belts that get the nod will be worth a lot more, and a couple of the others will be almost worthless. As I said, I do not agree with the interim deep-sea report. I have commissioned my own report which, I am very pleased to say, has been completed today by Miss Jodie Donnan from the University of Adelaide.

Mr Quirke: Is this part of your parliamentary intern scheme?

Mr VENNING: Yes, my parliamentary intern scheme. I praise the scheme and congratulate Miss Donnan because she has done a wonderful job. I invite members to look at this report because in many areas it goes deeper than the interim report, and it has come up with a commonsense recommendation. It is very timely that this report has been released today, and I wish Jodie all the best with it. I am sure that the examiner will see it as a very relevant report. I am most impressed with it and I hope that she gets a full score for it. We have all put in a lot of work on the report and she has been a delight to work with. It is a very relevant issue. The parliamentary intern scheme is a great program, and this work has been of great value to me and to the industry, and I congratulate all those who had anything to do with it.

The member for Playford mentioned price. No-one knows what the price will be, and it will never be revealed. I declare again that I do not know the price, nor am I privy to any of that information at all, nor do I want to be, and nor can I be because of my conflict of interest. I trust the Treasurer to protect the State's interests in this regard.

Mr Quirke: Did you trust him this morning?

Mr VENNING: I certainly did. I always trust the Treasurer. I would bet on him. I was lucky at the Melbourne Cup, and I would bet on him to be successful. I do not back losers. There is no doubt about it at all. I await the final outcome of the negotiations, and I hope that it is not too far in the distant future. My biggest concern at the moment is the industrial situation in relation to the silos, and I hope that the member for Playford can assist us with that. We do not want industrial disputation during the forthcoming harvest, which will be both tricky because of the weather and large because of the volume.

I do not want any explosive situations to develop. If there are problems, I want to see them solved in the next seven to 10 days because, when harvest gets going in a week, weather permitting, we do not want any confrontation. As the member for Playford would understand, this is the worst time for trouble because farmers are anxious about getting their crop in, particularly with the weather being suspect, and we do not want to see any hold-ups. I hope that we can resolve this problem in the next few days, and I prevail on all the powers that be, including the member for Playford, to assist in this regard.

I support the Bill. It has been a long time coming. This industry is very close to my heart. My father often said to me that it was a big blow when Playford allowed the setting up of Cooperative Bulk Handling. Why did he allow this vital link in the grain chain to be in the hands of the Government? I have to say that, in recent days, we have done very well out of the Government because it has been reasonably cheap. It has not pushed up the prices. The company will be up for big costs in upgrading the elevators, particularly those at Port Giles and Wallaroo, because they have to be upgraded to load the bigger ships faster. The demurrage cost of ships at anchor is huge, so money must be spent. I only hope that a realistic price will be struck. I welcome the Bill and support it, and I am thankful for the support of the Opposition.

Mr BUCKBY (Light): I, too, wish to add a few brief comments in support of the Bill. The issue of bulk handling facilities is an example of where a Government often becomes involved in an operation in its early days and then, as the market develops or as times change, the Government can withdraw from that operation. This is one of those operations. In days past, when grain handling changed from

bags to bulk and significant investment was required to undertake that change, the Government became involved in the bulk handling facilities operation.

As we know, the operation has increased, with other ports being opened since Port Adelaide was converted into a bulk storage facility. It has reached the stage where we must question whether the Government should be involved in this area. I believe that it should have no involvement. The transfer of facilities to a private operator will see some benefits to Government in terms of reduction of debt. I am pleased to note that the length of lease to the operator will be 100 years, which gives the operator a long period of certainty. I am also pleased to note that coastal land is to be retained by the Government to ensure that no degradation can occur and so that the environment can be well looked after.

The other issue of note is that these facilities have been in operation for a long time and, in the coastal environment where they sit, maintenance is required. By selling off the facility, the Government will not have to be involved in that—it will be an investment of private enterprise. As a result, the farmers of South Australia will benefit from an upgrading that will undoubtedly occur under investment by private enterprise. I am also pleased to note that the Bill does not restrict the operation of the salt and gypsum facilities in South Australia and that, under the haulage agreements, the existing users of the facilities maintain their existing rights to transport or to shift their product over the bulk handling facilities. I add my appreciation to that of the member for Culance for the Opposition's support of this Bill, which I believe will benefit South Australia.

Mr ANDREW (Chaffey): I am pleased to support the South Australian Ports (Bulk Handling Facilities) Bill this afternoon. I gather that this legislation relates to six out of the 10 ports in South Australia which have bulk handling facilities. These plants are owned and operated by the Ports Corporation at the moment. They provide the formal connection between South Australian Cooperative Bulk Handling's grain storage system and the shipping transport process of taking the grain to the export markets. In addition to grain, which includes wheat, oats and barely, gypsum and salt is exported out of Thevenard, utilising the bulk handling facilities there.

The Bill is very positive and appropriate because of the benefits it will provide across the community. In particular, there are benefits to the South Australian Cooperative Bulk Handling members—the company, the grain industry and the grain growers specifically involved. I certainly believe that, by extending the system of grain handling, this process will provide further integration of handling facilities and will avoid unnecessary duplication. In South Australia, South Australian Cooperative Bulk Handling will then be in line with bulk handling and shipping operations that are undertaken in every other State of Australia and will therefore further assist in making sure that South Australia is specifically competitive with our interstate counterparts in terms of the cost of handling grain here in South Australia.

It will be in the interests of growers and therefore South Australian Cooperative Bulk Handling to maximise the usage of the bulk loading plant by existing and potential new users. There will also be benefits to the Government as a whole and, I believe ultimately because of that, to all South Australian residents. The proceeds from the sale will go towards reducing the State debt, and we all know that that is imperative in making this State productive and competitive. I believe

that in the broader sense it will also enable more responsive and appropriate management of this important industry infrastructure to take place. Importantly, the Ports Corporation will also continue to provide and maintain the public facilities at these ports, jetties and wharves.

I will make a brief comment in relation to the value of the bulk loading plant, which value obviously will be negotiated with South Australian Cooperative Bulk Handling in conjunction with the South Australian Asset Management Task Force. I recognise that the Bill provides that, in negotiating the sale of these facilities, both parties to the agreement acknowledge that considerable expenditure will be required to maintain and (as is obviously necessary) upgrade this plant with respect to occupational health, safety and welfare and efficiency requirements. So, I remain optimistic that a fair and reasonable price will be obtained in the State's interest and also that the result will be a balance, whereby South Australian Cooperative Bulk Handling will pay a price which is fair and reasonable to the State and in terms of SACBH's future commitment to providing what obviously will be a cost input to upgrading that plant.

The majority of the detail in the Bill relates to customer access provisions. I refer members to the charter of the SA Ports Corporation which states that its primary function is the management of the ports and related facilities on a sound commercial basis as a business enterprise. Its key objectives include commercial viability and profitability, service excellence and trade growth. Indeed, as a brief aside, the Ports Corporation is performing rather strongly at the moment. Although not directly related to this matter, there has been a significant increase to record numbers of containers operated and exported via the Ports Corporation out of the Adelaide shipping facility. That is a tremendous record for the Ports Corporation since it was created by the State Government.

This legislation must and does ensure safeguards against anti-competitive practices and establishes workable procedures for resolving disputes in commercial dealings. I am pleased that the Australian Competition and Consumer Commission has inquired into this proposed sale. I understand that wide ranging submissions have been made with respect to this and that the Australian Competition Consumer Commission has determined that it does not intend to intervene in this process. I believe that this reflects the proposed legislation's providing reasonable access to the facilities for all current and potential users, as well as providing workable procedures for resolving disputes and so ensuring that competition mechanisms are intact or maintained.

I believe that these legislative arrangements for the bulk handling facilities will provide a framework for further growth and help to foster a progressive corporate culture on the waterfront. Here in South Australia there will be an overall benefit to growers, to the export industry that the facilities help service here in South Australia and therefore to all South Australians in terms of the economic growth that it will continue to facilitate. I support the Bill.

Mr LEWIS (Ridley): On this occasion I point out that, as on some rare previous occasions, my remarks are on behalf of both the member for Flinders and me. Accordingly, I want to address the matters contained in this Bill in that joint context, so I will put before the Chamber the common elements of our shared views. It is clear that the South Australian grain industry will reap enormous benefits from

having a coordinated, integrated facility for moving the State's harvest of grain from the terminal silos across the wharves and into the vessels that will take it to export markets. It is commendable that the Minister and the Government have recognised that the best means of achieving this is to sell the Government's Ports Corporation interests in the grain loading belt facility.

Both of us acknowledge that agreement must be reached between the Asset Management Task Force and South Australian Cooperative Bulk Handling on the value of the facility before any sale can be successful. In the unfortunate event that SACBH were not the successful bidder or that something else interfered in such an arrangement, it is even more important that SACBH be consulted, given that the grain is bulked up from farms by virtue of the cooperative bulk handling facilities that the SACBH provides.

We both have serious concerns about the way in which value for the transfer can be assessed, or determined, if you wish. In the first instance, the price being asked by the Asset Management Task Force must take into account that the new owners will have to abide by occupational health and safety regulations which the Government itself has established and which govern the operation of every other privately owned and operated business in South Australia. The Government, of course, at this point has been able to treat itself and its Ports Corporation kindly with respect to occupational health and safety but, once the facility falls into the hands, under the purchase arrangements, of a new owner, we can expect that both WorkCover, quite properly, and Department of Industry inspectors, will be out and about, checking to make sure that the public interest is protected.

So the sale price must reflect the cost requirements which will be imposed on the new owners to upgrade the facilities to an acceptable occupational health and safety standard. It is my judgment and that of my colleague the member for Flinders that this will be extraordinarily expensive. It ought not to end up being an expense that unduly falls as a burden on the shoulders of the farmers involved. They did not create the mess: that comes to us historically as a result of the way in which Government chose to design and construct the existing facilities.

The other issue of concern to us both relates to the Government's requirements to meet environmental standards. A sale price for the Ports Corp facilities must reflect the cost of meeting these environmental standards, or again it will be an unfair cost impost on the new owner, SACBH—in effect, on the farmers. Sure, the legislation contemplates that not only primary produce but also other manufactured goods, as well as minerals and petroleum, natural gas and other products of the mining industry, will find their way across the belts and/or through these facilities from the wharf onto the vessels that take them to export markets.

In the process of making the remark about environmental standards, I share with the member for Flinders a common concern that there may be some fools around who have power disproportionate to the size of their wit and who insist on pumping dust back into silos at port facilities instead of extracting and precipitating it separate from the grain. In consequence of that practice, we can confidently look forward to the massive disaster that has been caused in other places, such as occurred at Corpus Christi in the Gulf of Mexico in south-western Texas about a decade ago, when a silo facility belonging to a grain elevator company exploded spewing pieces of concrete, weighing well over a tonne well over one thousand metres.

It was an incredible explosion, the like of which one would have thought had occurred as a consequence of deliberate sabotage by terrorists or something, but it was simply the explosion of dry dust which had come from the husks of the grain when they abrade each other and, being dispersed finely and evenly throughout the atmosphere and being subject also to some decomposition by bacteria, the gas in the silos became a really explosive mixture, which was lethal. I do not want to see that happen, and so far it has not. Provisions are in place, on an *ad hoc* basis, to prevent it, but there is nothing in the regulations which state that it should not happen, and there ought be.

I raise that concern here and now, trusting that the Minister will ensure that the Minister responsible for industries and other things ensures that account is taken of the need to respect that risk. Let us then consider the South Australian grain industry deep sea port report, which outlines, as a first option, the need to increase the capacity of our grain industry to meet the demands of the new panamax vessels, which will involve the upgrading of the Port Adelaide terminal and one other port, at least.

In addition, there is the need to meet world requirements for product differentiation. That is a factor being driven by the marketplace, and anyone who ignores the necessity to grow and supply what the customer wants rather than trying to sell what the grower produces, anyone who ignores the former in favour of the latter, is not just being a little bit ultra conservative but, indeed, quite foolish. We must put in place the infrastructure capability to separate and shift these differing products. Grain which can be used for noodles is different from grain which can be used for stock feed, and again different from grain which has its best use and highest price for premium grade baking flour, and so on. That must be done in an efficient and cost effective manner and will necessarily have to be incorporated into the facilities upgrade that is otherwise being undertaken to meet the need of occupational health and safety standard minimums.

My colleague and I believe that any purchase price that the Asset Management Task Force sets must reflect this additional expenditure (these other constraints) which this most necessary upgrade will impose on the new owners. Whether it is at Port Adelaide or anywhere else, it will still have to occur. I say that also on behalf of the member for Flinders, and I say it in addition to the substance of the remarks contained in the Minister's second reading explanation from the Minister.

We refer to the fact that the Ports Corporation would not be in a financial position to replace the belts at the end of their economic life, even if it retained ownership anyway. So it is not appropriate for the Asset Management Task Force to get too precious about what it has got: it ain't flash and it ain't going to live a long time in its present form. External pressures will quite properly be applied to deal with that, so it is prudent and timely that we deal with this matter through this legislation at this time in the way I have suggested. The member for Flinders and I clearly understand that there must be a consideration in setting the price on the belts that does not put the South Australian taxpayer in a position of having to do a State Bank job any time in the future. That is a risk and ought not to be overlooked.

The Government must always ensure that our farming industry, the grain growers and, indeed, the mining industry, and anyone else that needs access to these facilities, now or in any future form at those ports, has in place an infrastructure that will competitively handle our grain into shipping for

export. If it does not, this legislation, the Government and every other agency involved in the process will have failed.

I believe, as does the member for Flinders, that we must ensure that the grain industry of South Australia stays world competitive in quality, service and price and secures a viable future for grain production. It is all very well for us to cast about to find other industries that we can develop in this State—and, Mr Deputy Speaker, as you know, that is what we are doing at the present time—but we must not ignore that which we have and which underpins the prosperity we enjoy currently. Without that, much of what we are otherwise attempting would be lost, since the very foundation upon which the economy has been built and currently depends would be ripped out from underneath us.

By simply flogging off this stuff at this time and reducing the State's debt in a short run gain but, in the process, placing the future of our number one industry in jeopardy, would be idiocy at the least. It is imperative that the belts remain in the control of either the Government or the grain and farming industry that uses them, or else that industry will be held to ransom by some other merchant middlemen owning that facility who have nothing more or less than profit as their incentive. That would in no small measure detract from the viability of the grain industry by putting profits into the pockets of the agency owning the facilities to the extent that it would reduce the amount of grain we can otherwise at present produce in South Australia and will continue to be capable of producing if we manage this process correctly.

It is for that reason that all members in this Chamber, I am sure, believe that SACBH is the logical purchaser. The price negotiated, though, must reflect the difficulties which we face and which will, of necessity, determine the transfer from the Government to private hands. It must also take account of the need to bring the equipment up to world competitive standards.

With those remarks, I commend the legislation to the House and trust that, to make things more expedient in the process of transfer, we do not overlook the role of other parts in the grain handling facilities that the State has and the management techniques we use to ensure a sensible arrangement for the storage of the grain before its final destination is determined. By that remark I mean it is not appropriate for us to transport all our grain from the farm gate into silos and immediately into coastal ports for storage since in the future, if we are wise, we will aim at adding value to the grain before it is either sold overseas on export markets or used in some other further value adding process for export or for sale locally.

I am now talking about milling it in some measure and perhaps selling some of the product resulting from the milling on overseas markets and using the remainder for feeding livestock. That is in itself a further value adding of the grain since we do not sell the grain but rather the livestock. This means that through sensible planning we need to have storage facilities strategically located adjacent to where we decide to develop those value adding enterprises, be they manufacturing or livestock feeding. In that case, I am drawing attention to the sensible decision which I believe SACBH has taken to establish a large, inland grain storage terminal at Tailern Bend, which provides facilities for the segregation of the grain into its different types, whether it is barley for feed or malting, wheat for noodles, wheat for stockfeed or wheat for milling and human consumption as bread and breakfast food, or anything else such as triticale or even the pulses. It will be a huge facility adequate for the purpose of ensuring that we

have on hand sufficient supplies to meet whatever market may develop for the grain in the medium to longer term so that we do not commit it to silos in, say, Port Adelaide or, worse, Portland, without taking account of the prospects we have of developing those enterprises.

In particular at Tailem Bend we must provide a facility that is safe for various forms of transport to get the grain to and from it. The crazy situation has arisen where Australian National has squandered money given to it to standardise the railway line in that region on two lines of lesser significance and left the Pinnaroo line un-standardised. It is now still broad gauge and, until very recently, was isolated from the silo complex by a few hundred metres. Now a third rail has been put back through the Tailem Bend railway yard to the grain facilities so that the Pinnaroo line can carry grain from the silos in the mallee to the main terminal area. Previously, that was not possible.

In addition, since a good many of the railways throughout the mallee have been ripped up and sold off as they were not viable, it is now necessary to provide adequate road access and, accordingly, I call on both the Government and SACBH to provide that road access facility from the South-Eastern Freeway at the north-western end of Tailem Bend by providing a safe level crossing independent and separate from that in the town which is adequate for B-doubles and other large road transport equipment out of the town. Leave them on the highway and make it possible for them to get ready, safe access to the terminal facility without risk to human life or limb of the kind that there is now, and without stirring up a health problem in the Tailem Bend community through the dust nuisance currently created by the passage of the trucks through the town. It will cost a few hundred thousand dollars but, in the long run, it is worth it.

The Hon. S.J. BAKER (Treasurer): I thank all members for their contributions. Every one of them outlined the situation and added value to the debate. I thank particularly the member for Ridley, who addressed a number of very important issues, although I think he was making a bit of a bid in the process when he was talking about the extraordinary cost of doing up the grain elevators. In terms of the debate, the Government is doing the right thing. According to the May 1994 Meeting the Challenge Statement by former Premier Arnold, the three items for sale were the State Bank, the centres of Elizabeth and the Colonnades, and the grain elevators. As I said previously, when this Government came to office certainly there was a commitment regarding the State Bank but nothing had been done about the land sales associated with the shopping centres and nothing had been done about the grain elevators associated with the bulk handling facilities.

A long process has been involved and one of the issues raised by a number of members is the extent to which the assets owned by the Ports Corporation can be sold into other hands without derogating from State responsibilities in terms of wharfage and other areas. It is important to note that issues of competition have to be clearly embraced in any change: issues of access had to be clearly identified and met, and those things are reflected in the legislation. The legislation does the job of excising these assets from the Ports Corporation, making them available for sale, as has applied to all the other sales.

In all other sales, we have had to take the assets and separate them off from the general assets, and the Bill does that. The member for Playford asked three questions, the first

of which was, 'What was the dollar amount?' I said that I would not answer that question, as I have never answered that question on any asset we have ever sold. However, on the larger assets we have sold, I can say that the results have exceeded my expectations. I am hopeful that the results on this one will exceed my expectations although, listening to the member for Ridley, I think there will be a bit of a battle.

The honourable member asked how the process is managed: the responsibility for the sale of the asset remains with the Asset Management Task Force. The responsibility for the operation remains with the Ports Corporation, which cannot make any decision that would have any impact on the sale of the asset. It is required to maintain in good order all those things that have been its responsibility, whether it be ensuring that the labour force is available or that the elevators are operating. All those matters are still within the hands of the Ports Corporation. The Asset Management Task Force then manages the sale process.

After the Government sorted out how it could make available the land without taking away from the responsibilities of Government—and this is by way of the 100-year lease—the most vexing question the Government faced was the matter of the tendering process. The Government made a decision that it would not go into open tender, and I will explain why. It may not necessarily maximise price. On every other sale the Government has undertaken, we have had a clear direction: we want to maximise price and economic development. Both those factors have been right up front in every sale.

If you look back at those sales, you find that we have done well on both fronts—far better than if we had a process with no direction. That was set down early in Government to make everybody understand that not only will we deliver on price but that it is not just a matter of money going into the coffers and paying off debt: there has to be something there for South Australia. If you have seen each of those sales, you can see those components. If we did not have those components, we might have obtained a reasonable price but not much more. We have achieved a lot in the process, and everybody should congratulate the Asset Management Task Force on achieving those ends. We still achieved price as well. It is fantastic if you can achieve both, and we have done that.

In terms of the process, if we were true to ourselves and every other asset sale, we would simply place the facilities on the open market tomorrow. That is the way all the other assets have been sold, except for the minor ones that have not been the responsibility of the Asset Management Task Force. It was the decision of Government that we need coordinated integrated facilities and that, therefore, the process for this asset only will be modified. However, the risk in not going to an open tender is that we will not maximise price, because it is not a competitive marketplace, and people should be aware of that. We have had our independent valuations of those assets. If, indeed, Cooperative Bulk Handling cannot come up to the mark, the sale will go into the market. They know that and we know it, so there should be no misunderstandings. A competitive price is in the view of the beholder.

I know that the member for Ridley has already made observations about the quality of some of those facilities. I can tell the honourable member that they are all still in working order, and money will always have to be spent on them. The asset price will be reflective of any repairs that have to be effected in normal maintenance or any upgrading. However, it will not be discounted for some enormous value because somebody has said, 'I've spent \$5 million (or

\$10 million) fixing up this facility' when our advice is that that is not so. It will be an interesting negotiation time: indeed, it already has been.

We are relying on a bit of good faith in the system. We see no value in some outside organisation owning a bit of equipment stuck in between the holding facility and the outlet facility: we just see no value in that at all. The ACCC has been approached, and it says that it is not anti-competitive for the SACBH to own the transport equipment. It is relaxed about that; it does not say that there is any breach of competition principle in our having a selective tender. We will go into this system in good faith. Positions have already been taken. We will have to meet somewhere in the middle, otherwise different decisions will have to be taken. There is no way that we will have a huge discount on a value of the asset, because we believe that we have a fair idea of what it is worth, and it will require people of goodwill to sit down and work their way through the process.

There are risks with that—and I will be quite open about this—but we are trying to help the rural community and the SACBH without crucifying the capacity of the State to get a reasonable price for those facilities. That will be the process. On a number of occasions I have negotiated with individuals on other than asset sales, because I have no responsibility in that area, except to sign off the Cabinet documents. We have had deep and meaningful negotiation on a whole range of fronts. Generally, I have found that, even if we start a fair way apart, we seem to come together at the end of the day for the benefit of this State, and we have done a satisfactory job on a number of matters. As the member for Ridley has pointed out, safety and efficiency are important issues with which we have to be satisfied in any transfer of responsibility, and that will be the case.

It now remains for the negotiators to come up with a fair and reasonable price, and then we will have the integrated facility that probably should have been there in the first place but will now be there in the future. I thank all members for their contributions to this debate.

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

ADJOURNMENT DEBATE

The Hon. S.J. BAKER (Deputy Premier): I move:

That the House do now adjourn.

Mr WADE (Elder): Rostrum Voice of Youth has been held each year since 1979 by the Rostrum Club. By way of background, Rostrum Incorporated is made up of a number of public speaking clubs. The original club was founded in England 1923, and the first rostrum club was established in South Australia in 1936. Therefore, the club has been going for a long time. There are 25 rostrum clubs in South Australia, with a combined membership of over 420 persons. The rostrum clubs have conducted a public speaking competition, Voice of Youth, for secondary school students each year since 1979. This competition has grown steadily since 1979.

In 1995 more than 400 students from over 60 schools throughout the State and Broken Hill competed for the State title and the opportunity to represent South Australia in the national final in Canberra. In 1996 the number of entries exceeded 450 students from 75 participating schools. Of course, an unknown but significant number of students took part in the subheats and other public speaking activities in their schools. In at least two schools Voice of Youth has been

incorporated in the curriculum for oral English at year 12 level.

The competition Voice of Youth enjoys the support of the Department for Education and Children's Services, the Catholic Education Office and the Independent Schools Board, as well as the English Teachers Association. Since 1990 the State final of the competition has been held in Parliament House, in the House of Assembly Chamber, in the presence of a number of members of Parliament. I was there last year and this year along with the Hon. Graham Ingerson and Michael Atkinson, MPs. In 1996 the competition was publicised through a series of notices on Channel 7, the Channel 7 News, on the Internet and ABC Radio, and in *Messenger* newspapers and a range of rural newspapers. That is the extent to which the Rostrum Voice of Youth advertises throughout this State to bring youth into a debating and oral speaking environment.

The Rostrum Voice of Youth competition, which is open to all full-time and secondary school students, consists of two sections: first, a junior section for students under 15 years as at 1 January 1997; and a senior section for students under 18 years of age as at 1 January 1997. In each section there are two speaking segments: first, a prepared speech of six minutes in the junior section and eight minutes in the senior section, as well as a short-notice speech of three minutes duration. The adjudication is quite tough. The adjudicators look at the impact on the intellect, that is, the material used in the speeches; the arrangement of that material; how the person progresses through the speech; the language used; and the appeal of the speech.

The adjudicators also look at the impact on the emotions—the visual impact of those making the speech, their appearance and stance. They look at the vocal impact—the quality and clarity of the speech. They look at empathy—putting oneself in the other person's emotional shoes, involving the understanding speakers have for the material and for the subject matter about which they are speaking. The adjudicators also look at the mood, the feelings expressed by the students and the overall appeal. The adjudication is quite a tough business.

In June 1996 when Rostrum Voice of Youth was held in Parliament House it had such titles in the junior section as, 'There is no silver lining' or 'Great adventures' and, the one I liked the best, a quote from Mark Twain, 'I was born modest, not all over but in spots'. The juniors had to work speeches around those topics. The seniors had a similar range of topics, for example, 'Death is just the beginning'; one that is dear to all our hearts, 'The truth is out there—for those who watch television' and 'Miss Piggy'. Again, the intellect of the students was tested to the limit.

Rostrum Voice of Youth prizes are not huge. It is more a sense of involvement than winning that is important. The club heat has prizes of about \$50; the semifinals, about \$70; and the State final—first prize—\$150, a trophy and a trip to Sydney to speak in the national final, which in itself is quite a prize.

The main concern we have with Rostrum Voice of Youth this year is that up until now the Commonwealth Bank and Channel 7 have been its sponsors. The agreement involving the Commonwealth Bank comes to an end in 1996. The organisers of Rostrum Voice of Youth tried for some time, by approaching other firms and organisations, to secure financial, or any assistance at all, to keep this worthwhile competition alive and active in South Australia, but it did not achieve too much joy in 1996, which is a shame. It is indeed

a shame that many of the private organisations that wish to have vocal, intelligent youth working for them are not prepared to put some time, effort and money behind the students and organisations that are trying to prepare our youth for what is quite a tough world out there.

In about September Rostrum Voice of Youth came to me and asked for my assistance. It was at its wit's end and did not know where to go. I wrote to the Premier (Hon. Dean Brown) and explained the situation. I also explained that we are heading towards the end of this century and that our youth need to be trained and confident to handle the twenty-first century. I felt that it would be intolerable and a blot on our State's philosophy of helping our youth work towards the future if we did not in some way help the Rostrum Voice of Youth competition in 1997.

I sat back and waited for the answer. I was pleased that the answer I got about a week and a half ago was a letter from the Government advising Rostrum Voice of Youth and me that the Government has put \$4 000 towards the 1997 Rostrum Voice of Youth activity. That will ensure that Rostrum Voice of Youth in 1997 will proceed, although it will not be enough for it to take place with any generous fatty tissue left over. It will be a lean competition if it remains at \$4 000. I will continue to seek financial assistance from private enterprise firms and other areas to ensure that the 1997 Rostrum Voice of Youth is the best ever. However, I put on record that I appreciate the Government's \$4 000 donation and look forward to a lot more in future.

Motion carried.

At 5.44 p.m. the House adjourned until Wednesday 13 November at 2 p.m.