

SOUTH AUSTRALIA

PARLIAMENTARY DEBATES

(HANSARD)

Second Session of the Forty-Seventh Parliament (1990)

Parliament, which adjourned on 11 April, was prorogued by proclamation dated 10 May. By proclamation dated 10 May, it was summoned to meet on Thursday 2 August, and the second session began on that date.

LEGISLATIVE COUNCIL

Thursday 2 August 1990

The **PRESIDENT (Hon. G.L. Bruce)** took the Chair at 12 noon.

OPENING OF PARLIAMENT

The Clerk (Mr C.H. Mertin) read the proclamation by His Excellency the Governor (Sir Donald Dunstan) summoning Parliament.

GOVERNOR'S SPEECH

His Excellency the Governor, having been announced by Black Rod, was received by the President at the bar of the Council Chamber and by him conducted to the Chair. The Speaker and members of the House of Assembly having entered the Chamber in obedience to his summons, His Excellency read his opening speech as follows:

Honourable members of the Legislative Council and members of the House of Assembly:

1. I have called you together for the dispatch of business.
2. South Australia is entering one of the most innovative phases of its development, and in the immediate future we should all witness advances which will set this State on an exciting course. However, these initiatives must be set against a pattern of difficult national and international economic conditions.
3. The recent declaration by the Federal Government that it is to pursue a new program of co-operation and efficiency of services with the States is one window of opportunity that will be examined as this year progresses.
4. But of immediate concern for the State's financial position is the outcome of the Premiers' Conference in Canberra. South Australia suffered a setback in Commonwealth funding which translates into a shortfall of some \$180 million on what we could reasonably have expected to receive.
5. This has put my Government in an unenviable position, trying to maintain services while coping with cutbacks

from the Commonwealth and a general downturn in income from State taxes related to economic activity.

6. Important for the long term future for this State has been the selection of Adelaide as the site for the development of a multifunction polis in Australia. We are at the beginning of a long and challenging process, and a development program which, if adopted, will span at least the next two decades.

7. This project provides a focus for the wider economic strategy, highlighting five key areas of growth—manufacturing, agriculture, defence and aerospace, tourism, and those service and high technology industries which rely on a high level of intellectual input.

8. My Government is committed to extensive infrastructure support to help expand our economic base. This includes a communications network, involving the latest voice and print technology, greater emphasis on our State as a transport hub for Australia, and accelerated growth of our outstanding education and research base.

9. Parallel to this activity is the work of the Planning Review, which is dealing with planning and development activity in Adelaide, and with the upgrading of South Australia's system of land use planning and development control.

10. The review has been instructed to work in an open and responsive way, seeking comment from all interested groups and individuals. A major report has already been issued, identifying social, economic and environmental trends which will help shape the work of the review.

11. My Government is committed to economic growth and sustainable economic development for all South Australians, whether they live in the city or the country. This is reflected in major development efforts to add value to primary resources, including new horticulture programs in the South-East.

12. The excellent agricultural season of 1989, which helped farmers on Eyre Peninsula to recover some of their losses from a prolonged drought, has been followed by a very dry Autumn with opening rains in the cereal belt almost the latest on record. By contrast, the pastoral areas above Goyder's Line are experiencing an excellent season.

13. A very late opening and subsequent cold weather, together with the fall of the live sheep trade and continuing concern over wool prices, will create problems for many farmers, especially for those relying on wool for their income.

14. My Government is planning significant new legislation which will impact on the agricultural community. The Stock Diseases Act, which has been in force for more than 100 years, does not address chemical residue problems in animals and animal products. New legislation will cover both chemical residue control and disease control in animals, including exotic diseases.

15. In recent years the citrus industry has experienced falling juice prices, requiring greater emphasis on the marketing of fresh fruit. New legislation will restructure the Citrus Board to better meet current industry needs and allow the Board to undertake initiatives to develop new markets for South Australian citrus.

16. The retention of native bushland on private land through the Native Vegetation Management Act 1985, has been a success, leading to agreements covering more than 200 000 hectares. This protection will be part of a new program which will establish management systems for native bushland on private land, and for significant native vegetation on public land outside the reserves system.

17. The Marine Environment Protection Bill will be reintroduced this session. The redrafted Bill will impose stringent standards and regulations governing pollution control of the coastal waters.

18. My Government will again move in this session for the introduction of all day shop trading on Saturdays in all districts. Previous initiatives in this area have not been successful but there has been a further shift in attitude to support extended trading hours, and wage rates for shop employees have been determined following negotiation between retailers and the unions. The Bill to be introduced will also address the issue of the sale of foodstuffs or convenience store items from service stations.

19. Following extensive consultation with employer and employee bodies, amendments to the Workers' Rehabilitation and Compensation Act 1986 will be introduced. These are primarily designed to clarify aspects of the Act, including tighter definition of approved medical expenditure and extension of time for fraud prosecutions. These changes will help WorkCover in its administration as it prepares to enter its fourth year of operation.

20. My Government recognises the vital role of small business in the State's economy. Amendments to the Landlord and Tenant Act will be reintroduced to improve the level of disclosure to those entering into commercial leases and to expand the protection given to small businesses under leases executed by them.

21. Legislation will be introduced this session to create South Australia's third university. This will come about as a result of an amalgamation of the South Australian Institute of Technology and three of the five campuses of the South Australian College of Advanced Education.

22. In streamlining the tertiary education system, legislation will endorse the amalgamation of Roseworthy Agricultural College, the City Campus of SACAE and the University of Adelaide to form an enlarged University of Adelaide. Flinders University will be enlarged by its amalgamation with the Sturt Campus of SACAE.

23. The 1989-90 financial year showed continuing growth within the employment-based vocational training system throughout our State. It is estimated that the number of apprentices and trainees currently exceeds 13 000, the highest number of apprentices in South Australia for at least 15 years.

24. My Government's work in the field of education continues to reflect the high standing that South Australia has achieved as a centre of learning.

25. An open Access College is being planned for the 1991 school year to provide high quality support for distance education teaching in all schools, so that students may gain access to a wider range of subjects involving languages, the arts and science. The college will retain a newly reconstructed South Australian Correspondence School and School of the Air and create a new Secondary School of Distance Education.

26. A number of legislative changes are planned in the field of education. The Senior Secondary Assessment Board of South Australia Act 1983 will be amended to provide for a new Certificate of Education for Year 11 and Year 12 students. This certificate will involve a two-year study program, and should be issued to graduating students by 1993.

27. My Government proposes to introduce legislation to license supported residential facilities for the aged. State and Commonwealth legislation already covers standards in nursing homes and hostels, but other facilities such as boarding houses and guest houses fall outside the licensing framework. This consultation will continue, with a view to introducing licensing legislation in the Autumn session of Parliament.

28. My Government continues to be concerned about issues raised by residents of some retirement villages, particularly funding arrangements and village management. A further examination is being undertaken to see how the interests of those who choose this form of accommodation for their retirement years may be better understood and more clearly protected.

29. The administration of justice and the treatment of those who break the law will be subject to various legislative changes by my Government in this session. Amendments to the Correctional Services Act and the Criminal Law (Sentencing) Act are proposed, which will deal with the segregation of prisoners, the broadening of eligibility for home detention, and the enforcement and variation of community service orders.

30. Discussion papers will be released on the continuing reform of the criminal law. An important reform relating to offences of dishonesty, including larceny and false pretences, will be among new measures to be introduced this Session.

31. My Government's Crime Prevention Strategy continues to expand its work throughout the South Australian community, with particular emphasis on the relationship between alcohol, drugs and crime and the allocation of Police resources to areas of increased crime activity.

32. The Freedom of Information Bill tabled at the conclusion of the last Parliamentary session will be reintroduced.

33. The Social Justice Strategy, launched by my Government in 1987, continues to impact on a widening range of Government policies and decision making. It deals particularly with the distribution of resources to areas of need, such as families with children, disabled people, the elderly, and the aboriginal community.

34. In Children's Services, my Government will continue to increase access and participation. This includes new occasional care programs for mothers who stay at home, and the establishment of five new pre-schools.

35. In looking at the cost of services to South Australian households, it is pleasing to note that an undertaking to hold the price of electricity below the Consumer Price Index is being achieved, with a 22 per cent fall in real terms over the past five years.

36. A further significant step in the restructuring of electricity tariffs was taken on 1 July this year to assist our industrial sector to become more competitive. On average

this has meant no increase in tariffs for industrial, general purpose and farm customers while off-peak users may benefit from a 7.25 per cent reduction in rates.

37. Provisions will be made in the Water Works and Sewerage Acts for a new and more equitable rating system, and a more commercial approach to charging. This will result in the majority of South Australian households paying the same or less in real terms for these services.

38. In this session my Government plans to introduce the South Australian Housing Co-operatives Act to provide a new legal, administrative and financial framework for housing co-operatives.

39. My Government continues to be encouraged by the growth in the travel and tourism sector within South Australia, one of the key components of this State's economic development. Tourism spending in this State has increased from \$300 million in 1979-80 to \$1.5 billion last financial year, with tourism projects totalling more than \$650 million either under construction or in the planning stage. Under a new three-year State Tourism Plan my Government will continue with responsible promotion of the State's tourism resources and the careful management of environmental concerns involved with tourism expansion.

40. My Government, in partnership with the Adelaide City Council and supportive groups and individuals, is mounting a strong bid to gain the rights to stage the 1998 Commonwealth Games in Adelaide. The Australian Commonwealth Games Association will select the Australian site for the Games in nine days' time.

41. The Commonwealth Games in Adelaide would bring sporting, social and economic benefits to South Australia and Australia. Should our bid be successful at the Australian level, my Government will continue to allocate resources and to conduct an enthusiastic campaign to work for our city's nomination when the international decision is made in Barcelona in August 1992.

42. I now declare this session open and trust that your deliberations will be guided by Divine Providence to the advancement of the welfare of the people of this State.

I take this opportunity to thank you all for your support during my time in office.

The Governor retired from the Chamber, and the Speaker and members of the House of Assembly withdrew.

The President again took the Chair and read prayers.

[Sitting suspended from 12.40 to 2.30 p.m.]

PETITION: ASH WEDNESDAY BUSHFIRES

A petition signed by 234 residents of South Australia concerning the events leading up to and after the Ash Wednesday bushfires of 1980 and praying that the Council establish a select committee to inquire into matters relating to the 1980 Ash Wednesday bushfires was presented by the Hon. R.I. Lucas.

Petition received.

PETITIONS: SELF-DEFENCE

Petitions signed by 33 298 residents of South Australia concerning the right of citizens to defend themselves on their own property and praying that the Council support legislation allowing that action taken by a person at home in self-defence or in the apprehension of an intruder is exempt from prosecution for assault were presented by the Hons K.T. Griffin, Diana Laidlaw and I. Gilfillan.

Petitions received.

PUBLIC WORKS COMMITTEE REPORTS

The **PRESIDENT** laid on the table the following interim report by the Parliamentary Standing Committee on Public Works:

City Watchhouse Relocation.

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

The Establishment of a Living Arts Centre, Flinders University—Information Science and Technology and Engineering Buildings,

Hallett Cove East (Karrara) Primary School,

Northern Adelaide Plains Water Supply EL 076 Zone Establishment—Stage I Angle Vale-Virginia-Two Wells Area,

Redevelopment of Institute of Medical and Veterinary Science Frome Road Complex,

RN 6203 South Road Upgrading and Widening—River Torrens to Hale Street,

West Beach Marine Research Laboratory—Stage II.

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

City Watchhouse Relocation,

Eyre Peninsula College of TAFE—Ceduna Campus,

Port Adelaide Outer Harbor No. 6 Berth—Wharf Extension,

Royal Adelaide Hospital, Kitchen Redevelopment and Central Plating System,

Tea Tree Gully College of TAFE—Stage II.

JOINT SITTING

The **PRESIDENT** laid on the table the minutes of the proceedings of the Joint Sitting of the two Houses held on Monday 7 May 1990 to choose a person to hold the place in the Senate of the Commonwealth rendered vacant by the resignation of Senator Anthony John Messner, whereat Mr John Wayne Olsen was the person so chosen.

PAPERS TABLED

The following papers were laid on the table:

By the Attorney-General (Hon. C.J. Sumner)—

Police Pensions Fund—

Report, 1988-89.

Actuarial Report, 1988-89.

Remuneration Tribunal—Report relating to Determination No. 1 of 1990.

Rules of Court—

Local Court—Local and District Criminal Courts Act 1926—Pre-Trial Conferences and Medical Reports.

Supreme Court—Supreme Court Act 1935—

Appeals, Admiralty Rules and Facsimile Transmission.

Bail Authority.

Commercial Proceedings.

Concurrent Writs and Commercial Matter.

Criminal Jurisdiction Forms.

Regulations under the following Acts—

Boating Act 1974—Mannum Swimming Zones.

Boilers and Pressure Vessels Act 1968—Fees.

Classification of Publications Act 1974—

Classification Guidelines.

Exemption.

Dangerous Substances Act 1979—Fees.

Explosives Act 1936—Fees.

Lifts and Cranes Act 1985—Fees.

Long Service Leave (Building Industry) Act 1987—Various.

Lottery and Gaming Act 1936—
Instant Lotteries.
Licences.
Marine Act 1936—
Certificate of Competency.
Examination Fees.
Occupational Health, Safety and Welfare Act 1986—
Asbestos Licensing and Application Fees.
Construction Safety—Asbestos Removed.
Registration of Employers.
Police Act 1952—Consular Agreement.
Police Superannuation Act 1990—Pension Com-
mutation.
Shop Trading Hours Act 1977—Hardware.
Stamp Duties Act 1923—
Corresponding Laws.
Private Company.
Summary Offences Act 1953—Police Entry.
Workers Rehabilitation and Compensation Act
1986—
Claims and Registration.
Disclosure of Information Repeal.

By the Minister of Corporate Affairs (Hon. C.J. Sum-
ner)—

Regulations under the following Acts—
Associations Incorporation Act 1985—Fees.
Business Names Act 1963—Fees.
Co-operatives Act 1983—Fees.

By the Minister of Tourism (Hon. Barbara Wiese)—

Commissioners of Charitable Funds—Report and State-
ment of Accounts, 1988-89.
Riverland Development Corporation—Report, 1988-89.
Architects Act 1939—By-laws—Fees and Advertising.
Racing Act 1976—
Greyhound Racing Board Rules—Definitions,
Inspections and Disqualification.
Harness Racing Board Rules—Fees.
Regulations under the following Acts—
Drugs Act 1908—Labelling of Poisons.
Fisheries (Gulf St Vincent Prawn Fishery Rational-
ization) Act 1987—Licence Transferability.
Fisheries Act 1982—
Central Zone Abalone Fishery—Licence Trans-
ferability.
General—Licence and Net Fees.
Gulf St Vincent Prawn Fishery—Licence Trans-
ferability.
Lakes and Coorong Fishery—
Licence and Net Fees.
Licence Transferability.
Marine Scale Fishery—
Licence and Net Fees.
Licence Transferability.
Northern Zone Rock Lobster Fishery—Licence
Transferability.
Restricted Marine Scale Fishery—Licence and
Net Fees.
Southern Zone Abalone Fishery—Licence
Transferability.
Southern Zone Rock Lobster Fishery—Licence
Transferability.
Spencer Gulf Prawn Fishery—Licence Trans-
ferability.
West Coast Prawn Fishery—Licence Transfer-
ability.
Western Zone Abalone Fishery—Licence Trans-
ferability.
Health Act 1935—Nursing Home Licensing Fees.
Medical Practitioners Act 1983—
Fees.
Specialist Register.
Mines and Works Inspection Act 1920—Fees.
Mining Act 1971—Fees.
Optometrists Act 1920—Board Membership.
Physiotherapists Act 1945—Fees.
Psychological Practices Act 1973—Registration Fees.
South Australian Health Commission Act 1976—
Medicare Patient Fees.

By the Minister of Consumer Affairs (Hon. Barbara
Wiese)—

Regulations under the following Acts—
Births, Deaths and Marriages Registration Act 1966—
Fees.

Builders Licensing Act 1986—Fees.
Commercial and Private Agents Act 1986—
Fees.
Licensing Deferral.
Licensing Deferral (Amendment).
Commercial Tribunal Act 1982—Fees.
Consumer Credit Act 1972—Fees.
Consumer Transactions Act 1972—Fees.
Fees Regulation Act 1927—
Hairdressing Examination.
Overseas Student Fees.
Places of Public Entertainment Fees.
Goods Securities Act 1986—Fees.
Land Agents, Brokers and Valuers Act 1973—
Disclosure Exemption.
Fees.
Liquor Licensing Act 1985—Fees.
Places of Public Entertainment Act 1913—Fees.
Second-hand Motor Vehicles Act 1983—Fees.
Trade Standards Act 1979—
Elastic Luggage Straps.
Pedal Cyclists Helmets.
Travel Agents Act 1986—Fees.

By the Minister of Local Government (Hon. Anne
Levy)—

Botanic Gardens Board—Report, 1988-89.
Environmental Protection Council—Report, 1988-89.
S.A. College of Advanced Education—Report, 1989.
State Transport Authority—STA Superannuation
Scheme—STA Pension Scheme—Report, 1988-89.
Local Government Act 1934—Amendment—Local Gov-
ernment Superannuation Scheme.
Planning Act 1982—Crown Development Reports—
Pregnancy Advisory Centre and Domiciliary Care
Centre at Woodville.
Land Division at Coonalpyn Station Yard.
Primary School at Hallett Cove (Karrara).
Construction of Lift Shaft.
Regulations under the following Acts—
Beverage Container Act 1975—Refunds.
Bills of Sale Act 1886—Fees.
Building Act 1971—
Documents.
Site Assessments and Swimming Pools.
Crown Lands Act 1929—
Definition Fees.
Fees.
Proclamation Fees.
Dog Control Act 1979—Registration.
Electrical Products Act 1988—Safety and Energy
Labelling.
Fees Regulation Act 1927—
Hairdressing Examination.
Overseas Student Fees.
Places of Public Entertainment Fees.
Local Government Finance Authority Act 1983—
Southern and Hills Local Government Associa-
tion.
Metropolitan Taxi-Cab Act 1956—
Ballotted Licences.
Fares.
Motor Vehicles Act 1959—
Probationary Licence Exemptions.
Registration and Licensing.
Registration and Permit Fees.
Tow Truck Fees.
Planning Act 1982—Goolwa Development Control.
Real Property Act 1886—
Fee Exclusions and Division Fees.
Registration and Entry Fees.
Staged Land Division.
Registration of Deeds Act 1935—Fees.
Roads (Opening and Closing) Act 1932—Fees.
Road Traffic Act 1961—
Photographic Detection Devices.
Rear Vision Mirrors.
Sewerage Act 1929—
Certificate Qualifications and Fees.
Fees.
State Transport Authority Act 1974—Fees.
Strata Titles Act 1988—
Fees.
Strata Plan Deposits.

- Surveyors Act 1975—
 - Fees.
 - Seaford Survey Area.
- Waste Management Act 1987—
 - Liquid Waste Disposal.
 - Waste Contribution Fees.
- Water Resources Act 1976—Fees.
- Water Resources Act 1990—General.
- Waterworks Act 1932—
 - Certificate Fees.
 - Fees.
- Corporation By-laws—
 - City of Tea Tree Gully—
 - No. 1—Permits and Penalties.
 - No. 2—Streets and Public Places.
 - No. 3—Park Lands.
 - No. 9—Caravans.
 - No. 10—Flammable Undergrowth.
 - District Council of Cleve—
 - No. 1—Permits and Penalties.
 - No. 2—Animals and Birds.
 - District Council of Loxton—
 - No. 36—Council Land.
 - No. 37—Permits and Penalties.
 - District Council of Willunga—
 - No. 15—Beach Control.
 - No. 18—Parklands.

MINISTERIAL STATEMENT: SOUTH AUSTRALIAN FILM CORPORATION

The Hon. ANNE LEVY (Minister for the Arts): I seek leave to make a statement.

Leave granted.

The Hon. ANNE LEVY: Over recent months there has been considerable speculation concerning the South Australian Film Corporation's production of *Ultraman*.

The purpose of this statement is threefold; first, to set the record straight; secondly, to advise members of the difficulties being faced by the corporation; and, thirdly, to provide details of the decisions which have been taken by the Government to overcome the present difficulties.

Ultraman difficulties: members may recall that in late 1989 the corporation announced that it had secured the production of a 13-episode series of *Ultraman*, a highly successful Japanese television program. The total budget for the series was \$4.214 million, with the funding being provided by the Japanese production company, Tsuburaya (\$3.770 million), the South Australian Film and Television Finance Fund (\$196 500) and the deferral of fees by the corporation (\$247 500).

It is now clear that the expenditure on the series will total \$6.062 million. This represents a total budget overrun of \$1.848 million. This overrun has occurred as a consequence of the following actions: first, changed production arrangements. In February 1990 it was agreed between the corporation and Tsuburaya to improve the quality of the production by using actors in live sequences rather than models for the special effects. This approach increased the production costs by approximately \$960 000. Tsuburaya agreed to pay \$400 000 towards these costs. The Government also provided an additional grant of \$400 000 to the Film Corporation to ensure that the quality of series was not compromised. The corporation made up the balance of the costs (approximately \$160 000) by reallocating funds within the organisation. This funding package was put in place during the 1989-90 financial year.

Secondly, delivery dates. What the corporation did not foresee when the changed production arrangements were agreed were the delays which would result in completing the series. The *Men in Suits* filming and related production activities put the series back by around eight weeks. To complete the series by as close as possible to the contracted

delivery date, the corporation has incurred significant additional expenditures in the post-production areas of the series.

In total, the expenditures, due to delays in completion, together with other minor casting expenditures, will exceed the budget estimates by approximately \$890 000. The series will be completed by 17 August 1990 against a delivery date of 31 July 1990. It is this overrun which has placed the corporation in a difficult financial position.

I refer also to Government action. As soon as I became aware of the implication of delivery delays, I convened an urgent meeting with the board of the South Australian Film Corporation and sought explanations regarding these overruns. During the meeting I expressed my concern and disquiet at the manner in which the production of this series had been managed. Following this meeting, the Government has acted swiftly to address the corporation's situation and has developed a two-pronged strategy. The Government has resolved, first, to provide an advance to the corporation which will ensure that the series will be completed by 17 August 1990. This advance will be funded by redirecting existing Government allocations made to the corporation for other specific purposes. Accordingly, the corporation will be able to complete its contractual obligations with Tsuburaya without any additional burden being placed on South Australian taxpayers.

Secondly, it has also been resolved to seek an urgent reassessment of the corporation's organisational and management structure. Given the commercial environment in which the corporation operates, combined with its difficult financial position, it is crucial that such a reassessment be undertaken. If the corporation is to remain viable into the future, it must reduce its overhead costs and establish a firmer funding base for project development.

This urgent reassessment will be undertaken by an independent consultant, under the guidance of a steering committee comprising the Chair of the corporation, one member of the board of the corporation and a senior officer from each of the Department for the Arts and the Office of the Government Management Board. Unlike the Milliken report, which focused on the broad role of the corporation, this independent assessment will concentrate on the organisational and structural arrangements of the corporation.

In making these decisions, the Government has put the South Australian Film Corporation on notice. It will give the corporation three years to repay the advance and restructure its organisation. If the corporation is unable to achieve this target, the Government will have no alternative but to reassess the role of the corporation and, if necessary, consider the possibilities of the corporation ceasing to produce films in its own right or even closing down the corporation.

Despite the financial difficulties which have occurred with the *Ultraman* series over the past seven months, there are several important outcomes for both the corporation and the State. First, the finished product is of extremely high quality and should enhance the corporation's reputation internationally as a leading Australian film maker; secondly, the series has generated significant local employment; thirdly, it has increased the skills of many film industry personnel who worked on the series; and, fourthly, it has stimulated local economic activity for goods and services.

Since February 1990, when the initial problems of the corporation were first brought to my attention, I have initiated a program of restructuring the board of the corporation and have put in place a new Chair and two new members, both of whom are experienced film makers. I am convinced that the board is now committed to and capable

of a total reassessment of the corporation's organisational arrangements and the re-establishment of its financial base.

I believe that these budgetary and organisational decisions taken by the Government will provide the corporation with the opportunity it needs to get its house in order. The board acknowledges that it has been placed on notice, and I am confident that over the next three years it will develop long-term strategies to ensure the continuity of its film making responsibilities.

MINISTERIAL STATEMENT: DISTRICT COUNCIL OF STIRLING

The Hon. ANNE LEVY (Minister of Local Government): I seek leave to make a statement.

Leave granted.

The Hon. ANNE LEVY: On 4 April 1990 I informed members that I had appointed Mr Geoffrey Whitbread as investigator, under section 30 of the Local Government Act, into the affairs of the District Council of Stirling. The purpose of his appointment was to report to me on all aspects necessary to enable me to conclude whether or not an irregularity had occurred in the conduct of the affairs of the District Council of Stirling.

The circumstances that gave rise to this action are, I am sure, known to all members. The District Council of Stirling had borrowed \$14.3 million from the Treasurer to enable damages settlements to be made in relation to the 1980 Ash Wednesday bushfires. That loan was repayable on 31 March 1990, unless the District Council of Stirling had concluded arrangements with the State Government about the level of financial assistance that the Government was prepared to provide.

These arrangements had not been concluded by the required date, Mr President, and there appeared to be no prospect of a negotiated settlement on the matter. The District Council of Stirling did, however, make it clear that it had no intention of honouring its legal liabilities under the debenture agreement. Mr Whitbread reported to me on his investigation on 29 May 1990 and, in accordance with section 33 of the Local Government Act, I now seek leave to table Mr Whitbread's report.

Leave granted.

The Hon. ANNE LEVY: Mr President, the Whitbread report leaves no doubt that a serious irregularity did occur in the affairs of the District Council of Stirling. This is not only my very strong opinion, but it is also the opinion of Mr Brian Hayes, Q.C., a highly respected expert on local government law; it is also the view of the Crown Solicitor; and finally, Mr President, although he was not required to draw such a conclusion, it is also the opinion of Mr Whitbread himself. The serious irregularity that the Whitbread report confirms is the failure of the District Council of Stirling to make the necessary arrangements to meet its legal responsibilities in relation to the formal contract it had entered into with the State Government.

This situation could not be tolerated. The District Council of Stirling is not above the law and it must face its responsibilities, most particularly those responsibilities that it entered into with its eyes wide open to the consequences that would follow from a serious failure to comply.

Much has been said about the comment in the investigator's report that it would be in the best interests of the district for the then current council to continue to manage the affairs of the district. Mr President, I could not agree more, and I deeply regret the fact that the Stirling council

was not prepared to take the responsible decisions that would have avoided the events that followed.

For the sake of balance, I point out that Mr Whitbread also made a number of other highly relevant comments. He said, quite unambiguously, that an irregularity had occurred. He said that the council had been badly managed and that its financial planning and management was in chaos. He also said, Mr President, that Government intervention in the affairs of the council was necessary. Interestingly, he also said that rates in the Stirling area were not extraordinarily high, but that the debt servicing ratio was extraordinarily low in comparison with other metropolitan councils.

In short, Mr President, the Whitbread report paints a picture of a council with a history of bad management and decision making that needs help to lift its game. I agree fully with that, and I have indicated a clear willingness to assist in that process. Whatever the background, however, I will not condone, or excuse, any deliberate attempts by any council to renege on its legal and statutory responsibilities. In the case of the District Council of Stirling, this was the situation confronting the Government in relation to Stirling council's debenture agreement securing its loan of \$14.3 million.

It is largely a matter of public record, Mr President, the efforts which the Government has made following receipt of the Whitbread report to avoid the very serious step of suspending elected local government in the Stirling area.

I met the Chair and Deputy Chair on 31 May 1990 to discuss the content of Mr Whitbread's report and to make it perfectly clear that the Government was still prepared, and willing, to negotiate an amicable resolution to Stirling's dilemma. At that meeting, I went to great lengths to point out that, whilst the Government's stance on \$4 million was unchanged, I was prepared to consider all reasonable proposals that would assist Stirling council in managing the consequences of this additional loan.

Stirling council representatives were asked to provide comments on the Whitbread report by 7 June 1990. At council's request, in order to consider some further matters which council's Chair, Michael Pierce, said could positively advance the settlement of this issue, I agreed to an extension of time up to 13 June 1990. These further efforts by me and my officers were to no avail and culminated in refusal by the Stirling council to change its position.

Stirling's formal comments on the Whitbread report provided absolutely no new information that would justify reconsideration of the Government's position. As has been the case with other submissions by Stirling council on this matter, the response lacked objectivity and failed to acknowledge the realities of the situation.

The Government had, at all times, looked for an objective assessment of the level of financial assistance which we were prepared to provide to Stirling council. Our compassionate offer to relieve Stirling of \$10.3 million or 72 per cent of that debt was never seriously considered by the council. The outcome was inevitable, Mr President.

On 14 June 1990, the Governor declared Stirling council to be a defaulting council under section 33 of the Local Government Act and appointed Mr Desmond Glyn Ross, A.M., as administrator of the affairs of the council.

Mr Ross will be known personally or by reputation to most members in the Legislative Council. He is a man who has given long and distinguished service to local government as councillor, as Chair of his district, as State President of the Local Government Association, and as Federal President of the Australian Council of Local Government Associations.

Mr Ross has already made tremendous progress in solving the difficulties that he inherited in taking on the task of administrator. He has discharged Stirling's legal liabilities in relation to the debenture agreement. He has also introduced a budget which provides for considerable service and infrastructure improvement within the Stirling area but which still limits rate increases to an average of 8.5 per cent—the same percentage increase being applied by many councils throughout the State at this time.

I would add that the budget for 1990-91, together with the outcome of the previous year's budget, is incontrovertible proof of the Government's claim that a \$4 million contribution by Stirling to the resolution of the bushfire saga is equitable and eminently affordable. Mr Ross's budget has no fire-sale of assets, and certainly not the 22 per cent increase in rates threatened by the suspended council to result from the \$4 million commitment.

In conclusion, Mr President, I most sincerely hope that an elected council will be reinstated in Stirling before very long, and that the credibility of responsible local government in South Australia will be restored.

QUESTIONS

TOBACCO PRODUCTS ADVERTISING

The Hon. R.I. LUCAS: I seek leave to make a brief explanation before asking the Minister representing the Minister of Health a question on the subject of Bannon Government broken promises.

Leave granted.

The Hon. R.I. LUCAS: In 1988 the Government introduced the Tobacco Products Control Act Amendment Bill which legislated for an end to all outdoor advertising of tobacco products. The ban was to be phased in over a three-year period beginning on 1 July 1989. At that time a number of meetings were held with representatives of the Outdoor Advertising Association of Australia and the then Minister of Health, the Hon. John Cornwall, and his advisers.

I have obtained copies of two recent letters on this issue, one dated 6 July 1990 from the Federal President of the OAAA, Mr G. Wawn, who wrote to the Premier, and I quote:

Dr Cornwall has said that you had not wanted any employment losses in South Australia because of this legislation and we assured the then Minister that, provided we received similar support to that received in Victoria, via advertising funds from the Victorian Health Promotion Foundation, we would retain all industry employees.

Further on in the same letter Mr Wawn wrote:

Mr Premier, we seek your intervention in this matter in order that the commitments made to this industry by the then Minister of Health are honoured, and that this industry does not have to shed valuable employees.

The second letter to which I refer was dated 18 July from Claude Neon Limited to Foundation SA as follows:

At this meeting it was outlined what the Government intended to do in its proposed legislation, and a guarantee was given by the Minister that the outdoor advertising industry could be assured that the Government would not permit loss of jobs because of this legislation and that provisions would be made in the Act to enable this guarantee to be upheld.

The simple fact is that the promise made by the Government has been broken and the outdoor advertising industry is in dire straits in South Australia. One of the major companies in South Australia has estimated its loss of revenue due to the legislation and the broken promise at \$1.068 million and a reduction in its estimated profit of \$338 000.

The Federal President of the Association, in his letter to the Premier, stated that there will be a probable loss of 60 jobs in South Australia if the Government continues to refuse to keep the promise that it made to the industry. My questions to the Minister are:

1. Why has the Bannon Government broken the promise it made to the representatives of the OAAA?

2. What action, if any, is the Government planning in order to try to save the jobs of the 60 people which could be lost due to the Government's broken promise?

The Hon. BARBARA WIESE: It has yet to be established whether the Government has in fact broken a promise or not. I will certainly be happy to refer the honourable member's allegations and question to my colleague the Minister of Health, and I will bring back a reply as soon as I can.

FINE DEFAULTERS

The Hon. K.T. GRIFFIN: I seek leave to make an explanation prior to asking the Attorney-General a question about fine defaulters.

Leave granted.

The Hon. K.T. GRIFFIN: A report in Saturday's *Advertiser* brings into sharp focus the problem of overcrowding in the State's prisons. The report deals with truck drivers who default on payment of fines for overloading, and other offences. These drivers, according to the report, list South Australia as their home State, even if it is not, because they know that they will have fines written off more quickly here than in other States. For every one day in prison that is meant to ensure the writing off now of \$250 in fines. Previously it was \$50 per day. These fine defaulters surrender a few minutes to midnight and by doing so a full day is written off. There is no doubt that truck drivers are exploiting the system.

However, it does not stop with truck drivers. My information is that it is happening with a wide range of other offenders who are fined. The 'revolving door' policy means that fine defaulters report to a police station and do not even spend time in custody prior to having the fine written off.

There is growing concern among law abiding citizens that the Government's policy makes a mockery of the law, the courts and the administration of justice. A wrongdoer on whom a penalty is imposed by a court effectively escapes any debt to society. Ordinary people wonder what the purpose of prosecuting offenders might be if penalties are to be written off in this way. My questions to the Attorney-General are:

1. Does the Attorney-General agree that the 'revolving door' policy with respect to fine defaulters brings the administration of justice into disrepute?

2. What steps will the Government take to ensure that those who are required to pay fines do not exploit the system and pay their debt to society in one way or another?

The Hon. C.J. SUMNER: I will look at the question as far as the allegations relating to truck drivers are concerned to ascertain whether or not the allegations in the media are correct. There is no doubt that the prisons in this State, and indeed in every other State in Australia, I think except Tasmania, are full. This has occurred principally because of increased sentences which have been imposed on prisoners, particularly longer-term prisoners, than operated previously. The Hon. Mr Griffin of course has been at the forefront of advocating such a policy and he supports it completely. In fact, he believes that the sentences imposed on those offenders are already too light.

The fact that there is now a problem with the number of prisons and the capacity of our prison system to cope with the number of prisoners is principally due to the increase in sentences over the past few years—an increase which I also believe has been justified in relation in particular to violent offenders. However, with increased sentences one has to ensure that there is adequate accommodation in the State's prisons to meet them. A number of initiatives have been taken over the past few years to increase the capacity in South Australian prisons, and a program is still in place to further increase that capacity.

With respect to the particular issues raised by the Hon. Mr Griffin, obviously it is a matter of concern if the circumstances outlined by him have to be resorted to in order to ensure that prison places are available for the more serious offenders. I do not believe that such a situation necessarily brings the administration of justice into disrepute. Indeed, the Government has been encouraging alternatives to prison to try to deal with the question of minor offenders. Those alternatives, including community service orders, home release and home detention, have all been put into place to try to relieve the pressure on the prison system and, in particular, to provide alternatives for minor offenders and fine defaulters.

In his speech today, the Governor announced that the Government would be introducing a number of measures to deal with sentencing. The honourable member will have to wait for those Bills to be introduced before commenting on the details of them. I will have some inquiries made with regard to the honourable member's allegation relating to truck drivers and will bring back a reply.

RUHE COLLECTION

The Hon. DIANA LAIDLAW: I seek leave to make a brief explanation before asking the Minister for the Arts a question about the Ruhe collection.

Leave granted.

The Hon. DIANA LAIDLAW: Most members may not be aware, but it is 12 months to the day since the South Australian public was first made aware that the family of the late Professor Ruhe was offering the South Australian Museum the opportunity to purchase the Ruhe collection of Aboriginal artefacts. During the past 12 months both the Premier and the Minister for the Arts have made a lot of noise about the importance of the collection to our national heritage. However, we have neither seen nor heard of any firm commitment by the Government to purchase the collection. The offer represents a once in a lifetime opportunity for the South Australian Museum to purchase the collection at the bargain price of \$1 million, which is about half the amount Japanese and United States investors are willing to spend.

Does the State Government ever intend to make an offer to the family of the late Professor Ruhe to purchase the collection and, if so, when? Would such an offer include public sector support and private sponsorship, including sponsorship from the ACTU?

The Hon. ANNE LEVY: I endorse all the remarks made by the honourable member regarding the value of the Ruhe collection. I again indicate the Government's desire to have the Ruhe collection obtained for the South Australian Museum. Not only would the collection be obtained in its entirety, but also all Australians would be able to benefit from its exhibition and presentation in the South Australian Museum.

The Hon. Diana Laidlaw: Are you going to make an offer? Wishing it to come here is not going to get it here.

The PRESIDENT: Order! The honourable Minister has the call.

The Hon. ANNE LEVY: You have asked your question; if you want an answer I will give it. The alternative arrangements suggested by the honourable member do, of course, involve splitting up the collection so that its entirety would be destroyed and there would not be the opportunity for any individual to benefit from the collection as a whole. Obtaining the necessary finance is not an easy matter. As I have reported previously to the Council, approaches have been made to the Federal Government on several occasions, both by me and by the Premier. I think that on at least three occasions since the Parliament last sat further discussions have taken place with Federal Ministers. As the honourable member indicated, there have also been discussions through the ACTU and with various other people.

I regret that I cannot indicate at this stage any finalisation of these discussions. Certainly, discussions are continuing and will be held with members of the family in the very near future. I certainly hope that there will be a positive outcome to this matter. However, \$1 million is a very large sum and, despite the promise of some assistance from the Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander Commission, there is a large gap to be filled before the total purchase price can be either negotiated or satisfied. The Council can rest assured that if there is any information leading to a resolution of this matter I will inform members at the first available opportunity.

The Hon. DIANA LAIDLAW: As a supplementary question: as it is a year since the Government first became aware of the availability of the Ruhe collection, has the family, in its most recent discussions with the Minister, the Government or the South Australian Museum, provided a timetable or a deadline within which it would expect an offer to be made? Will the Minister consider this matter for another two months, six months, one year or five years?

The Hon. ANNE LEVY: I, personally, have not as yet had any discussions with the family, although I may have the opportunity to do so before very long. I am not aware of any recent timetable having been suggested by members of the family, but can certainly make inquiries to ascertain whether that is the case.

MULTIFUNCTION POLIS

The Hon. I. GILFILLAN: I seek leave to make a brief explanation before asking the Attorney-General a question about the multifunction polis.

Leave granted.

The Hon. I. GILFILLAN: One of the props to the Government's statement of widespread public support for the MFP was an ANOP survey, involving a sample of 1 200 adult residents of the Adelaide metropolitan area who were asked a series of questions about the MFP in order to determine community attitudes. The survey was broken into four main metropolitan areas: the northern region, southern region, city and the remainder. However, the presentation of the ANOP survey material failed to present all the findings. The researchers devised a list of tables from A to J to present statistical information relating to individual questions on the MFP. However, in all the tables it failed to produce a single result or figure from two of the four regions surveyed, namely, the city and the remainder.

The implications of what can only have been a deliberate move not to present all the findings is enormous, especially given that 51 per cent of the survey sample was in the regions not published. A number of conclusions may be

drawn from this, but it is fair to assume that the publication of all survey results from all four regions would undoubtedly have significantly altered, if not destroyed, the Government's argument of widespread community support for the MFP in Adelaide.

We are left, therefore, with a survey result based on 49 per cent of the sample audience, or just 588 people. From the findings and their analysis it is very questionable that the assumptions which Premier Bannon chose to claim publicly for broad-based support for the location of an MFP in Adelaide could be sustained. The most surprising aspect of the Premier's statement of support is the claim of 71 per cent which the Premier used to indicate 'the majority of South Australians would either welcome the MFP or are interested in finding out more'. This is not true, because the survey found that, of the 49 per cent of the published sample, 32 per cent (188 people) supported the MFP while the remaining 68 per cent (400 people) were either against it or undecided.

Table A of the survey shows quite clearly that the level of ignorance about the MFP among the sample is extremely high, with 42 per cent not even aware that such a concept exists while, among the 58 per cent who have heard of it, only 8 per cent know anything substantial about it. Table J of the report shows 31 per cent support for the MFP to be built in Adelaide, with 18 per cent suggesting New South Wales and smaller percentages for the other States.

The survey claimed that this means more people want the MFP in Adelaide than elsewhere but, again, it deliberately ignores another figure of 31 per cent of people who oppose it completely and 38 per cent who believe it should be in another State, making a total of 69 per cent who are either against it or do not want it in South Australia.

The Premier claims that there are a number of recognisable advantages to locating the MFP in Adelaide but, clearly, the majority of those questioned by the ANOP survey do not support that statement. For instance, in the northern region (where the preferred Gillman site is located), 53 per cent of people surveyed were unable to see any advantage in having the MFP in Adelaide. Premier Bannon stated that Adelaide would become a 'major world centre of communications technology, environmental management and . . . learning . . .'—and that that was not reflected in the survey of benefits to South Australia.

Table E, dealing with this question, showed that 44 per cent of the total were unable to think of any benefits, while, of the remainder, only 13 per cent believed that there would be benefits in technology, and, more revealing, was the figure of less than 3 per cent who believed there would be any international recognition or learning advantages.

The majority of people appear to expect benefits to tourism and jumps in local employment—quite the contrary to what Premier Bannon stated and envisaged. In fact, of those who actually support the concept of an MFP, just 7 per cent believed that it would directly benefit South Australia. With that background of analysis of the ANOP survey, and bearing in mind that that was the basis upon which the Government claimed major South Australian support for the project, I ask the Attorney-General the following questions:

1. With those statistics showing up in that survey, how can the Government argue that there is massive support for the MFP among the population of South Australia?

2. Will he comment on the move, which was announced today, to consider changing the name on the basis, I suspect, that, because there is so much suspicion and opposition to the MFP, the Government is now scurrying round to try to find more window-dressing to present it in a different form?

3. Do the Attorney-General and the Government still claim massive support for the MFP concept in South Australia? If so, on what evidence?

The Hon. C.J. SUMNER: I do not recall the Government's ever having used the words 'massive support' that the Hon. Mr Gilfillan used in his question. The words used in the Government publication on the MFP, based on the ANOP survey, were that 'overall support for the MFP is very healthy'. Only 29 per cent opposed the concept. The publication further states:

One problem the South Australian Government will not have is significant anti-Japanese feeling if the MFP is sited in Adelaide. That, obviously, is not to say that there is no opposition to the MFP in South Australia. Clearly, it is a project which requires further community consultation and information. A group in Victoria—the so-called Rainbow Alliance—successfully sank the Victorian bid for the MFP and have now got together to try to spread their opposition and negativism to South Australia.

That group sank the project in Victoria, and I believe that most thinking people in that State very much resent the fact that Victoria had to dump the project and are envious of the fact that South Australia has been able to secure the MFP. I am disappointed with the Democrats' attitude to the MFP, but I suppose it fits the pattern they have exhibited in this State over recent years, which has been generally to oppose development, particularly a development of this kind.

They have collected some very strange bedfellows along the way in their opposition to the MFP, and the fairly unholy alliance put together in Victoria of, the extreme Left (if I can refer it to as that), the extreme Right (the National Front), the conservation movement, etc., which includes the Democrats, seems to me a strange collection of interest groups which has come together to oppose this proposal. The Democrats will have to live with getting into bed with the National Front and the racists on the MFP. They will have to justify this matter to their constituents and the South Australian public at large.

We should all congratulate the Premier and the Government for having secured the site for the MFP in South Australia. It was not an easy task, and an enormous amount of work had to be done. By no means were we at any stage the front-runners, but one by one the other States that were promoting it have dropped off. Contrary to what they say publicly, I assure the Council that the Government and the thinking people of those States are envious of the fact that we were finally able to put together a project which saw the MFP sited in South Australia.

Obviously, an enormous amount of work still needs to be done on the MFP both in terms of planning, public consultation and, just as importantly, public information. It is true that the exact nature of the MFP was not specified before the search for a site was embarked upon. The South Australian Government's submission tried to give some substance to the MFP proposal and to put forward some practical ideas of what the MFP would be all about in its bid to get it sited in Adelaide. That process has to continue and, of course, there are still final decisions to be made as to whether or not the MFP will go ahead. If it does go ahead—and I certainly hope that it does—it will be sited in Adelaide.

This is a tremendous achievement for the South Australian Government and, in particular its Premier, the Minister who had the most direct involvement in it. It will be interesting to see whether or not the Democrats in this Council join with their national counterparts in opposing the MFP. We would like to see them on the record in this respect at

some time, but it would seem that they have joined with that motley group that I have mentioned to oppose the MFP. Let them come out at State level so that we can see exactly where they stand.

Certainly, there are questions in relation to the MFP which are legitimate to raise and which the Government will have to answer to the community as the proposal is developed. At least the Liberal Party has seen it as a project that deserves support, and I think it should eventually get the support of the whole South Australian community.

I do not recall the words 'massive support' being used by the Government. The official words in the document that has been released by the Government are that support for the MFP is very healthy. I expect that that support will build as time goes by and more and more people become aware of the nature of the project.

The Hon. I. GILFILLAN: I ask a supplementary question. From the answer that the Attorney has given, is it true that he and the Government acknowledge that there is still substantial concern about and opposition to the MFP by the population of South Australia?

The Hon. C.J. SUMNER: I have already answered that question. The Government view, as determined by the ANOP survey, is that overall support for the MFP is very healthy. This does not mean that there is not opposition within the South Australian community. I would have thought that, if the honourable member had the interests of the community at heart, instead of trying to curry favour with people who oppose it, he would have studied what it was about and attempted to—

The Hon. I. Gilfillan: Nobody knows what it's about.

Members interjecting:

The PRESIDENT: Order! The honourable Attorney-General has the floor.

The Hon. C.J. SUMNER: That is not entirely correct. Obviously, the honourable member has not read the material that has been put out by the Government or the submission that was made.

The Hon. M.J. Elliott: The submission is a joke.

The Hon. C.J. SUMNER: The honourable member says that the submission is a joke. But it was good enough to secure the project for South Australia. That is some kind of a joke, given that we were not in the race to get the MFP when we initially entered it. The submission that actually secured the MFP for South Australia is described by the Democrats as a joke.

The Hon. M.J. Elliott: Ask any planner who has had a look at it—I have.

An honourable member: Well, you wouldn't know.

The PRESIDENT: Order! The honourable Attorney-General.

The Hon. C.J. SUMNER: I doubt whether the Hon. Mr Elliott would have a great deal of knowledge in this area. I am sure that, if I wanted to, I could get a planner to make some critical comments about it, just as I could get other people to make critical comments about the Australian Democrats if I wanted to. All I can say is that, obviously, there is some opposition in the South Australian community to the MFP and that more work has to be, and will be, done. But, if South Australia cannot get up and try to get projects like this and run with them, we do not have much of a future.

AUSTRALIAN CONSTITUTION

The Hon. M.S. FELEPPA: I seek leave to make a brief explanation before asking the Attorney-General, as Leader

of the Government in the Council, a question about the Australian Constitution.

Leave granted.

The Hon. M.S. FELEPPA: Just over a month ago a short news item from London stated:

Australia is set to officially receive a copy of its historic 'birth certificate' after a special measure completed its passage through both Houses of the British Parliament. The Lords gave an unopposed third reading to the Australian Constitution (Public Record Copy) Bill allowing Britain to hand over one of the two original vellum copies of the Act setting up the Federation of former colonies in 1900.

As yet there has been no official announcement of the arrival of this historic document in Australia and, as this document is as important to South Australia as it is to the other States, will the Attorney-General indicate any personal knowledge of this document and say whether, in due course, such a document could be displayed in Adelaide for some time at a suitable venue and with some sort of ceremony?

The Hon. C.J. SUMNER: I think that would be appropriate, and I will ensure that the Federal Government is written to in order to ascertain where this document will be housed and, in particular, whether or not it will be available to the States for display around Australia.

BANKRUPTCIES

The Hon. L.H. DAVIS: I seek leave to make a brief explanation before asking the Attorney-General, as Leader of the Government in the Council, a question about bankruptcies in South Australia.

Leave granted.

The Hon. L.H. DAVIS: The recently released bankruptcy figures for the last quarter of 1989-90—that is, the three months of April, May and June—reveal the second highest ever number of bankruptcies recorded in South Australia for that period. In fact, a check of the *Government Gazette* would suggest that in June 1990 there was an all-time record level of bankruptcies for that month, with over six bankruptcies for every working day in June. These figures clearly show an economy in deep distress. Indeed, it can be argued that the figures considerably understate the gravity of the situation as both credit providers and counsellors are more active now in assisting people and advising them about options other than bankruptcy.

As the Attorney-General is well aware, bankruptcy administration is the province of the Commonwealth Attorney-General's Department. Bankruptcy figures are tallied in each State on a monthly basis. Since February 1986 I have been ringing the Office of Bankruptcy Administration in Adelaide each month for the latest bankruptcy numbers. However, I was surprised when recently the Office of Bankruptcy Administration in Adelaide advised me that it had been instructed to stop supplying me with bankruptcy figures on a monthly basis. Of course, this is just ahead of freedom of information legislation that is coming in.

The Hon. Diana Laidlaw: Are they still collecting the figures?

The Hon. L.H. DAVIS: They are available, but the office is just refusing to make them available to me. I should make clear that, in over four years, there has never been one occasion where the monthly bankruptcy figure given to me has subsequently been revised, so that cannot be a reason for this instruction. Quite clearly, bankruptcy statistics are an important indicator of the strength and direction of an economy. There are very strong and compelling reasons to argue that bankruptcy figures should be made available on a monthly basis, as are those for retail sales, housing

approvals, motor vehicle sales, employment and unemployment, and many other key economic indicators. As it is, the bankruptcy figures for each quarter for Australia and, indeed, for each State, are now published a full month after the quarter has ended, which limits the relevance and usefulness of those important figures.

My question to the Attorney-General is simple: will he, as a matter of urgency, and in the spirit of freedom of information legislation, contact the Commonwealth Attorney-General and ask him to arrange in future for the monthly public release of bankruptcy figures as a matter of community interest and, if he is not prepared to do that publicly—and it is not a very hard task, I would imagine—will he say whether those figures can be made available at least to anyone such as me who might want them for information?

The Hon. C.J. SUMNER: I will not embark on a discourse on the state of the South Australian economy, unless the honourable member wants—

The Hon. L.H. Davis: The question deliberately desisted from giving you that opportunity.

The Hon. C.J. SUMNER: I am pleased to see that the honourable member has finally desisted from asking questions that enable me to expound on the state of the South Australian economy. Needless to say, I did have the opportunity to do it, but I would refer the honourable member to the recent quarterly economic report by the State Bank on South Australia and also to the report from the Centre for Economic Studies which has also been released recently and which I am sure the honourable member has read. So, I will accept that he has deliberately not been provocative so as to make my response a broad one, going into those two reports. I am sure that he can read them for himself and will make his own assessment in due course. I am not aware of any instruction that has been given relating to bankruptcy figures, but I will make some inquiries and bring back a reply.

CHLOROFLUOROCARBONS

The Hon. M.J. ELLIOTT: I seek leave to make a brief explanation before asking the Minister of Tourism, representing the Minister of Agriculture, a question about CFC regulations.

Leave granted.

The Hon. M.J. ELLIOTT: Last year, with support from all Parties, amendments were made to the Clean Air Act in relation to the release of CFCs, which were affecting the ozone layer. Under those amendments there was provision for making regulations to affect users of CFCs. In particular, there was the potential to grant exemptions to people and, by those exemptions, to grant licences to use CFCs. I have recently been approached by representatives of the Dairy Farmers Association here in South Australia who are concerned that, under the proposed regulations, each individual dairy farmer will have to pay a \$50 licensing fee so that he may use refrigeration equipment which clearly, at this stage, relies upon the use of CFCs. They put it to me that they felt it was particularly unfair that such a charge be levied here in South Australia whilst it was not levied interstate. It is worth noting that all other States, I believe, now have similar legislation to that in South Australia in attempting to control the use of CFCs. In fact, they argued to me that, under health requirements, they must keep milk below 4 degrees and get it down to that temperature rapidly. They could not possibly afford to have inefficient refrigeration equipment, or they would not be able to sell their milk

under the health regulations, so they are unlikely to be culprits of losing CFCs into the atmosphere.

The SADFA has argued that it is willing to supply to the Minister a list of all dairy farmers and what equipment they have so that the Minister has a list of users and so that no cost may be imposed on the Government with respect to this information. It has been argued that this flat fee of \$50 is unfair to people who are doing the right thing. I put two questions to the Minister. First, is she willing to accept the offer of the SADFA to supply a list of all dairy farmers and what equipment they have, so that such a proper list may be kept by the responsible authorities? Secondly, if there is a need to raise money to support the legislation, rather than doing so by way of a flat fee that hits everybody, regardless of how well they look after their equipment, will the Minister consider imposing some form of levy on the CFCs themselves? Such a levy would hit the people who wasted CFCs and who had faulty equipment that leaked, and would give them an incentive to fix the problem.

The Hon. BARBARA WIESE: I shall refer the honourable member's question to my colleague in another place and bring back a reply.

The PRESIDENT: Order! Normally, we have an hour's Question Time, but today, as members are aware, there are no Standing Orders providing for the hour. I am therefore prepared to grant a bit of latitude, but I would ask members to recognise that, traditionally, we do not go too long over the hour.

HENLEY AND GRANGE COUNCIL

The Hon. J.C. IRWIN: I seek leave to make a brief explanation before asking the Minister of Local Government a question regarding Henley and Grange council.

Leave granted.

The Hon. J.C. IRWIN: Honourable members will be well aware of the long drawn-out saga surrounding the Local Government Advisory Commission and the councils of Henley and Grange, Woodville and West Torrens. The commission finalised its work on 3 July 1989, advising the abolition of Henley and Grange and that the area of Henley and Grange be distributed between the Woodville and West Torrens councils. A political decision was made prior to the 1989 State election for the Minister of Local Government to refer the decision back to the commission for further public consultation. The Minister asked the commission whether there had been adequate consultation. In part, this position arose during the Mitcham boundaries fiasco. The commission's original decision was for the Henley and Grange split-up to occur prior to 1 July 1990. That time has gone. It is a year since the commission's original decision, and we are already one month past the 1 July deadline.

Inextricably tied to this saga is the ministerial statement setting up a committee of review to look at better ways to address boundary issues. The Minister, in brief, said that no boundary decisions would be made until the committee had given a final report. I raise this point because a final review report may indicate the best ways for the advisory commission to interpret poll and market research results. The Minister steadfastly refused to say one way or another how she will use the committee's final report and any new recommendations from the Local Government Advisory Commission regarding the Henley and Grange issue.

Since the close of the last parliamentary session, market research has been undertaken and a poll conducted regarding the wishes of the residents of Henley and Grange. The poll was conducted on 28 April this year, and the commis-

sion would have had the report on aspects of that by early May, as well as the market research. The poll—the largest turnout on a local government issue—backed by market research, showed conclusively that the people of Henley and Grange did not want to go to another council area; they wanted to retain their council. They voted in excess of 60 to 40 against the merger proposal. It is now three months since the results of the poll and market research were known. The people of Henley and Grange are tired of the games that are being played with their future. Budgeting and future planning must be two areas that are suffering.

Has the Minister made a submission to the commission, as she did and as the Premier did with regard to Mitcham, requesting the commission to reverse its decision of 3 July 1989? If not, why not?

Does the Minister support her spokeswoman who, as reported in the *Advertiser* on 27 April this year, said: 'It has always been the policy that if affected residents don't want a change there won't be one'?

Is the commission under-resourced if it cannot make a decision on a poll result after three months of deliberation?

If the commission puts its report on the Minister's desk this week, will she ignore the committee of review recommendations?

The Hon. ANNE LEVY: I cannot help feeling that some of the questions asked by the Hon. Mr Irwin are in the category, 'Have you stopped beating your wife yet? Answer Yes or No.'

The Hon. J.C. Irwin: Think about the people of Henley and Grange.

The Hon. ANNE LEVY: I am sure that the honourable member is well aware—and I certainly agree with the chronology that he presented regarding the Henley and Grange matter—that I have not yet received the report from the Local Government Advisory Commission relating to the questions put to it about consultation on the Henley and Grange matter. I am sure that the honourable member is aware that, following my putting this query to the commission, it has had several meetings with representatives of the three councils, sometimes separately, sometimes all three councils together. There has been extensive consultation in the area and there has been the market survey and the poll to which he alluded. While he accurately gave the overall results of those who voted in the poll which was conducted in the affected area of Henley and Grange, he omitted to mention that about 50 per cent of those eligible took the opportunity to register their view.

I assure honourable members that as soon as I receive the report from the commission I will consider it very carefully and form a recommendation to Cabinet resulting from it. I understand that I should receive that report within the next few days. I keep being told that it is a couple of days away. I am sure that the honourable member has received similar information. I expect to get it very soon. When I do, I will obviously consider it very seriously and take the matter to Cabinet. I do not wish to pre-empt any content of the report. In consequence, I feel that it is futile to answer hypothetical questions about the content of the report.

The Hon. J.C. Irwin: You say that you always take the commission's advice.

The Hon. ANNE LEVY: Obviously, when I receive a report I am going to read it, and I will—

The Hon. J.C. Irwin interjecting:

The PRESIDENT: Order!

The Hon. ANNE LEVY: I will read the report and, following that, I will take a representation to Cabinet resulting from that report. I expect that this will be in the very

near future, but I am not able to give a precise date because no precise date of delivery has been given to me.

WATER METERS

The Hon. J.C. BURDETT: I seek leave to make a brief explanation before asking the Minister of Local Government, representing the Minister of Water Resources, a question about water meters.

Leave granted.

The Hon. J.C. BURDETT: The water resources regulations 1990 provide, *inter alia*, that the Minister or the department may require water meters to be installed on ordinary farm wells and bores. Constituents from the South-East of the State in particular have expressed concern about this. They point out that already there are accepted procedures for monitoring water use according to an internationally accepted standard. If monitoring is what is intended to be done, that is not a problem. If meters are installed, the regulations provide for substantial installation fees and annual servicing fees, and that gives rise to the concern of constituents.

My constituents tell me that, when they have complained about this to the department, the department has informed them that it is not intended to require meters to be installed on ordinary farm wells and bores. They have been given that assurance by the department, but the regulations enable that to be carried out. Will the Minister give an undertaking that it is not the intention to require meters to be installed in respect of standard farm wells and bores?

The Hon. ANNE LEVY: I will refer the question to my colleague in another place and bring back a reply.

SELECT COMMITTEE ON CHILD PROTECTION POLICIES, PRACTICES AND PROCEDURES IN SOUTH AUSTRALIA

The Hon. CAROLYN PICKLES: I move:

That the select committee have power to sit during the present session and that the time for bringing up the report be extended until Wednesday 21 November 1990.

Motion carried.

SELECT COMMITTEE ON THE REDEVELOPMENT OF THE MARINELAND COMPLEX AND RELATED MATTERS

The Hon. ANNE LEVY (Minister of Local Government): I move:

That the select committee have power to sit during the present session and that the time for bringing up the report be extended until Wednesday 21 November 1990.

Motion carried.

SELECT COMMITTEE ON THE ADELAIDE CHILDREN'S HOSPITAL AND THE QUEEN VICTORIA HOSPITAL (TESTAMENTARY DISPOSITIONS) BILL

The Hon. R.R. ROBERTS: I move:

That the select committee have power to sit during the present session and that the time for bringing up the report be extended until Tuesday 21 August 1990.

Motion carried.

ELLISTON HOSPITAL

The Hon. PETER DUNN: I seek leave to make a brief explanation before asking the Minister representing the Minister of Health a question about the Director of Nursing position at the Elliston Hospital.

Leave granted.

The Hon. PETER DUNN: There has been dialogue between the Health Commission and the Elliston Hospital regarding the finances of that hospital. I have been approached regarding that dialogue. There has been a request to the hospital to downgrade the Director of Nursing position to the point where that position would be shared by the Elliston Hospital and the Central Eyre Peninsula Hospital—which is the Wudinna Hospital. I will quote the response I received from the Elliston Hospital, as it aptly describes what is taking place:

The joint sharing of Director of Nursing with Central Eyre Peninsula Hospital or other neighbouring hospitals based on two days per week attendance at Elliston on a salary level payable to the Director of Nursing of RN5 Grade 1 (current salary payable). Cost comparisons indicate a net salary saving of \$35 per week and this must be offset by travel costs including depreciation of vehicles, etc., and a minimum of six hours (39 per cent) non-productive time lost in travelling between the two sites.

The distance is some 80 km over a very rough dirt road. The reply continues:

Geographic isolation raises serious concerns re on-site staff management. Likewise when emergencies arise there needs to be a Director of Nursing to meet the crisis or organise extra help. These observations are made in the light of a minimal staff situation of one registered nurse and one enrolled nurse each shift.

In the light of the evidence provided, do the Minister of Health or the Health Commission intend to continue to pursue their objective of causing the Elliston Hospital to share a Director of Nursing position?

The Hon. BARBARA WIESE: I will refer the honourable member's question to my colleague in another place and bring back a reply.

SOUTH AUSTRALIAN FILM CORPORATION

The Hon. DIANA LAIDLAW: Further to the ministerial statement from the Minister for the Arts on the South Australian Film Corporation and, in particular the comment that, as soon as she became aware of the implication of delivery delays, she convened an urgent meeting with the board, will the Minister advise when she first became aware of the implication of the delivery delays, when the urgent meeting was convened, and who attended that board meeting? Also, how long afterwards did the Government act to address the corporation's situation, and what advance was provided to the corporation? Finally, who is the member of the board on the steering committee which is looking at the management structure of the corporation?

The Hon. ANNE LEVY: I was first informed on Friday 20 July of the problems that had arisen. I immediately requested a meeting with the board and that the board

provide me with further information. I was not able to meet with the board until 31 July because it requested that time be made available to collect information from outside; that is, from production accountants, and so on.

The Hon. Diana Laidlaw: That is Monday of this week?

The Hon. ANNE LEVY: No, Tuesday of this week—31 July. The board wished to prepare a report for me. I cannot recall whether that report was available on Friday 27 July. It might have been available then, but not until very late in the day. Because of the Cabinet meeting on Monday and the commitments of members of the board, it was not possible to have a meeting on that day. Tuesday morning was the first opportunity available for us to meet.

In relation to attendance at the meeting, only two members of the board were not present, so four members of the board attended: Mr Bachmann (Chair), Mr Jarvis, Mr Burke and Mr Hicks. Representatives of the corporation and the department also attended. The amount of the advance is the \$890 000 required to enable the production to be completed. The membership of the steering committee was discussed at our meeting on Tuesday and it was agreed that Mr Bachmann, as Chair, and Mr Scott Hicks would be the two board representatives on that committee. I am not sure whether that must be ratified formally at a board meeting, but certainly there was agreement around the table that they be the two representatives of the board on the steering committee.

SESSIONAL COMMITTEES

Sessional committees were appointed as follows:

Standing Orders: The President and the Hons K.T. Griffin, R.I. Lucas, Carolyn Pickles and C.J. Sumner.

Printing: The Hons Peter Dunn, M.S. Feleppa, R.J. Ritson, R.R. Roberts and T.G. Roberts.

The Hon. C.J. SUMNER (Attorney-General): I move:

That for this session a library committee not be appointed.

Motion carried.

ADDRESS IN REPLY

The PRESIDENT having laid on the table a copy of the Governor's speech, the Hon. C.J. Sumner (Attorney-General) moved:

That a committee consisting of the Hons M.S. Feleppa, Diana Laidlaw, R.I. Lucas, Carolyn Pickles and C.J. Sumner be appointed to prepare a draft Address in Reply to the speech delivered this day by His Excellency the Governor and to report on the next day of sitting.

Motion carried.

ADJOURNMENT

At 4.15 p.m. the Council adjourned until Tuesday 7 August at 2.15 p.m.