

LEGISLATIVE COUNCIL

Thursday 11 July 1996

The **PRESIDENT (Hon. Peter Dunn)** took the Chair at 2.15 p.m. and read prayers.

DE FACTO RELATIONSHIPS BILL

The **Hon. R.I. LUCAS (Minister for Education and Children's Services)**: I move:

That the sitting of the Council be not suspended during the continuation of the conference on the Bill.

Motion carried.

STATUTES AMENDMENT (ABOLITION OF TRIBUNALS) BILL

At 2.17 p.m. the following recommendations of the conference were reported to the Council:

As to Amendment No.1:

That the Legislative Council do not further insist on its disagreement thereto.

As to Amendment Nos.2 to 15:

That the House of Assembly do not further insist on these amendments but make the following amendments in lieu thereof:

Page 5, line 22 to page 7, line 8—Leave out clauses 9 to 20.

And that the Legislative Council agree thereto.

That the House of Assembly make the following consequential amendment:

Long title, page 1, lines 6 and 7—Leave out the words 'the Pastoral Land Management and Conservation Act 1989, the Soil Conservation and Land Care Act 1989,'.

And that the Legislative Council agree thereto.

CARRICK HILL

A petition signed by 1 274 residents of South Australia concerning the proposed sale of Carrick Hill land and praying that this Council will not agree to any motion or legislation which makes possible the sale of any part of Carrick Hill estate was presented by the Hon. R.D. Lawson.

Petition received.

DOCTORS, MOUNT GAMBIER

The **Hon. DIANA LAIDLAW (Minister for Transport)**: I seek leave to table a ministerial statement presented today in the other place by the Minister for Health in relation to rural medical practitioners.

Leave granted.

PAPER TABLED

The following paper was laid on the table:

By the Minister for Education and Children's Services (Hon. R.I. Lucas)—

South Australian Superannuation Scheme—Actuarial Report as at June 1995.

QUESTION TIME

SCHOOL LEAVING AGE

The **Hon. CAROLYN PICKLES**: I seek leave to make a brief explanation before asking the Minister for Education and Children's Services a question about the South Australian Youth Employment Task Force Report.

Leave granted.

The **Hon. CAROLYN PICKLES**: The Government's South Australian Youth Employment Task Force in its report released by the Premier today has recommended that in order to broaden the focus on youth employment to more clearly cover the education sector in South Australia, the Government should 'consider raising the school leaving age incrementally to 17 years of age by the year 2000'. The media report on 5 May said that the State Government believed raising the school leaving age to 16 could cause more problems than it solved and that the Minister for Education and Children's Services said:

If they don't want to stay at school, they don't want to stay somewhere else, they'll head off somewhere or else they'll cause some particular problem.

My question is: given the comment made by the Premier in the *Advertiser* on 8 May 1996 that:

The clear experience is that the longer people stay at school, the greater the chance of getting a job

does the Minister agree with the recommendations of Premier's Task Force on Youth Employment that the school leaving age should be raised incrementally to 17 by the year 2000?

The **Hon. R.I. LUCAS**: The Premier's position is exactly the same as the position I have indicated, and that is that this is a report to the Government and Cabinet. It has not yet been considered by Cabinet and, until it is considered by Cabinet, there will be no Government position on this issue. I have indicated on a number of occasions that I have reserved my position in relation to the recommendations originally made by the Leader of the Opposition, the Hon. Mr Rann, in relation to raising the school leaving age to 16 and then, more recently, the suggestion that the task force might be recommending a gradual increase in age to the age of 17. Whilst saying that the Government and Cabinet will consider their position, I indicate that the education system, and those concerned with our education system, will need to address a number of significant concerns which principals, teachers and others will have about any policy recommending an increase in the school leaving age to the age of 17.

Clearly, it would be a costly issue for the education system. Potentially it will raise a number of significant issues in relation to behaviour management because, if you have a small number of young people—and not so young I guess at 16 and 17—who do not want to be in our secondary schools but who are required by law to be in our secondary schools, then clearly a significant number of behaviour management issues would have to be addressed in terms of any decision to implement that policy.

The other issue that supporters of increases in leaving ages will have to address—and it is one of the points I have made, and the Leader of the Opposition in this Chamber and in another place have talked about it being part of an international trend—is the fact that the research I have undertaken indicates that all the States and territories in Australia, with the possible exception of one, have a school leaving age of 15, which is the same as South Australia. So, the overwhelming majority—

Members interjecting:

The **Hon. R.I. LUCAS**: No, it is. The overwhelming majority of States and Territories of Australia on my advice have a similar school leaving age to South Australia.

The **Hon. T.G. Cameron**: That is a bit different from saying that they are all on 15 years.

The Hon. R.I. LUCAS: No, it is exactly the same—the same leaving age of 15 years, as in South Australia. One State or Territory has a school leaving age of 16 years. We are not atypical in relation to the Australian experience.

The Hon. Anne Levy: Internationally—

The Hon. R.I. LUCAS: There are examples of 15, 16 and 17 years as well. Depending on what argument you want to put, you can find arguments internationally to support an argument of 15, 16 or 17 years. As Minister I readily concede that.

Another issue must be addressed by the proponents of this move to age 16 or 17 years. I have indicated, in sitting down with principals and talking about the practical implications and what this might mean for their schools in terms of education, teaching, learning and behaviour management, and considering the issue of youth employment and jobs, if the situation at the moment is, as is being suggested (and I do not doubt this) that, say, 100 jobs are available in the community at the moment, and those young people who have gone through to year 12 are the ones more likely to get a job than those who dropped out at years 9 or 10, the issue then is that, if you have the same number of jobs and everybody has gone through and achieved year 12—

The Hon. Carolyn Pickles: But you are going to create more jobs. That is what you are promising.

The Hon. R.I. LUCAS: That is the Government's response. But if you are to do that, you do not have to worry about raising the school leaving age. If we are to create more jobs, that would be an argument and you do not have to worry about the school leaving age.

Members interjecting:

The PRESIDENT: Order!

The Hon. R.I. LUCAS: All things being equal, if there are 100 jobs out there and at the moment the students and young people who have undertaken year 12 study are getting the jobs and those missing out are the ones who went through to year 10, if you make everyone undertake year 12 studies and you still have the same number of jobs, the discriminator will not be year 12 but the issue of those who have gone on and done university studies or technical and further education study at a TAFE Institute or in some other way.

That is one of the issues that will have to be addressed because in itself the decision to change a school leaving age does not create one additional job. In itself the decision to lift or drop a school leaving age does not create one additional job. It may well change the mix. Perhaps if more young people go to year 12 (I am not a supporter of this theory, but some might be) more year 12 graduates will be employed rather than adults—perhaps married women—in terms of choices by employers within the work force if you have the same number of jobs within the community.

So, the Government will read with interest the recommendations of the task force, but at this stage, as the Premier and I indicated this morning and on previous occasions, there is not a Government position in relation to the lifting of the school leaving age. That will be considered by Cabinet and the Government before we determine a Government position on it. We will therefore engage heartily in widespread consultation within the community generally and, in terms of education, with our principals, parents and teachers within our schools to get their views as to what the practical effects might be as they see it.

The Hon. Carolyn Pickles interjecting:

The Hon. R.I. LUCAS: We are putting \$60 million extra into schools this year so no-one can say that there is not

additional money going into education. We will need to engage in not only community consultation but also consultation within the education community before we are informed enough to make a judgment as a Government in relation to whether or not we agree with the particular recommendation in relation to raising the school leaving age.

Before concluding, I want to raise one other aspect. The school leaving age has gained attention in the media at the moment, but there are a number of other important aspects of the report that all school systems, including our own, must address in a better and more comprehensive way than we have in the past in relation to vocational education within our schools. Certainly, I have indicated that the Government is prepared to embrace—

The Hon. Carolyn Pickles interjecting:

The Hon. R.I. LUCAS: The criticisms are criticisms of your Government and the sort of education system that was developed over 20 years of Labor Government.

The Hon. Carolyn Pickles interjecting:

The Hon. R.I. LUCAS: The Leader of the Opposition can parrot away if she likes, but the criticisms are criticisms of a system that has developed over 20 years under Labor Governments.

The Hon. L.H. Davis: She might be a parrot but she is an endangered species.

The Hon. R.I. LUCAS: That should be on the record. Other recommendations in the report talk about an emphasis on preparation for employment, managing school-industry links, and transition from secondary schools to the work place. All the work that we are doing at the moment in terms of the programs at Salisbury High School (the enterprise high school) and the Australian Vocational Traineeship System (AVTS) programs, and a range of programs which are trying to combine school work with TAFE study and perhaps a day a week in industry or in business as part of a program for young people to keep them at secondary school, is certainly a direction that the Government is prepared to embrace and we will certainly be making announcements over the coming months in relation to new initiatives in this particular area which are entirely consistent with the broad recommendations of the Youth Employment Task Force report in relation to school, industry and employment links.

PUBLIC SECTOR EMPLOYEES' GIFTS

The Hon. R.R. ROBERTS: My question is to the Minister representing the Minister for Industrial Affairs on the subject of provision of gifts to public servants or employees. My questions are:

1. What guidelines does the Commissioner for Public Employment apply to public sector employees accepting gifts, gratuities or free travel from private sector companies.

2. Does the Commissioner for Public Employment believe that these guidelines were adhered to in the case of the General Manager of Samcor accepting a free trip to Canada from Better Beef Pty Ltd; and what action does he propose to take?

The Hon. R.I. LUCAS: I take the question on notice and will bring back a reply.

YOUTH EMPLOYMENT

The Hon. R.I. LUCAS (Minister for Education and Children's Services): I seek leave to table a copy of a

ministerial statement made today by the Premier in the other place on the subject of the Youth Employment Task Force.

Leave granted.

YOUTH PARLIAMENT

The Hon. R.I. LUCAS (Minister for Education and Children's Services): I seek leave to table a copy of a ministerial statement made today by the Minister for Employment, Training and Further Education in the other place on the subject of the second South Australian Youth Parliament.

Leave granted.

REGIONAL DEVELOPMENT

The Hon. T.G. ROBERTS: I seek leave to make a brief explanation before asking the Minister for Education and Children's Services, representing the Minister for Regional Development, a question about regional development.

Leave granted.

The Hon. T.G. ROBERTS: In my capacity as shadow Minister for the Environment, I have been monitoring the growth of the metropolitan areas on the eastern seaboard and agree with a lot of the expert opinion that believes Sydney and Melbourne have reached proportions of growth that are now starting to internalise and be negative. The quality of life in many of the areas within those metropolitan cities is becoming extremely difficult for residents. There are a number of days when the environment is not healthy and alarms and warnings must be issued in relation to air quality and other reasons and causes for pollution.

The Federal Government has announced a policy of resettlement, and part of the new migration scheme is to encourage migrants to move into regional areas and try to bring about regional investment by bringing in business migrants who have to put up a bond of \$30 000. If they breach the bond, I suspect that the bond will be forfeited which, in some cases, would cause hardship; in other cases it would not. It appears strange that the responsibility for many of our environmental problems associated with growth in those cities is falling back onto our migration plan and not onto a regional development plan of significance that comes to grips with some of the problems associated with our dwindling regional centres.

As a member living on the West Coast you would understand, Mr President, the difficulties that many country areas have in sustaining their regional towns to a size where they do not fall beyond a critical mass and lose their regional centres, including health, education and other services. My questions for the Minister are:

1. When the Federal Government describes regional centres, does this include Adelaide or South Australia?
2. Does the Premier believe that the Federal program as outlined will achieve its aims or is the measure totally misdirected and unworkable?
3. Does the Premier believe that the scheme breaches the United Nations' position on rights and freedom of movement?
4. Does the Premier believe that the scheme breaches the Federal Constitution in any way?

The Hon. R.I. LUCAS: I will refer those questions to my colleague in another place and bring back a reply.

BALFOUR WAUCHOPE BAKERY

The Hon. M.J. ELLIOTT: I seek leave to make a brief explanation before asking the Minister representing the Premier a question about Balfour's bakery.

Leave granted.

The Hon. M.J. ELLIOTT: My question relates to moves to sell off one of South Australia's most well known companies, Balfour's. Balfour's is a State icon, a 140 year old local company that is, I am told, second only to Coca-Cola in statewide recognition. But I have been told that the State Government now wants to sell off Balfour's in a fire sale to an overseas company. I have been told that the Government has offered a package of incentives to overseas companies to buy out this South Australian icon and that the South Australian Asset Management Corporation is pushing for a fire sale. The company is in debt to the tune of \$8.3 million to the Government's South Australian Asset Management Corporation on a loan that has been reduced from \$18 million in 1990.

Balfour's went to SAAMC yesterday seeking a 12 month extension of the loan. As it had missed no principal or interest payments in six years, it was confident that present profitable trade and positive cash flow would help attract a bank prepared to take over the debt. But I have been told that an overseas multinational has been offered incentives by the State Government (including land, a lease-back deal on a new bakery facility and up-front dollars) worth about \$2 million to take over the company.

The Hon. L.H. Davis interjecting:

The PRESIDENT: Order!

The Hon. M.J. ELLIOTT: The louder they squawk, the more you know they are worried. I understand that this Hong Kong based company, Allard, has made an offer of \$8 million for the company—

Members interjecting:

The PRESIDENT: Order!

The Hon. M.J. ELLIOTT:—while US owned Sara Lee has offered \$6.5 million, even though some have put Balfour's value at \$16 million. If this fire sale went ahead, the cost to businesses in South Australia would be substantial and the State would lose another icon. Concern has been raised about the role of the South Australian Government in offering incentives for overseas companies at the expense of local companies, and in SAAMC pushing for such a fire sale. Also, Balfour's David Wauchope was recently reported—

Members interjecting:

The PRESIDENT: Order!

The Hon. M.J. ELLIOTT:—on radio as saying he was having trouble accessing the Premier even to discuss this issue. On radio this morning the Premier refused to answer questions about the Government's involvement in this saga. Many people in South Australia have criticised the Government for its willingness to sell off public assets overseas and its willingness to financially assist interstate companies to move here at the expense of local companies. I am told that SAAMC is trying to sell a successful and viable local company overseas, with the apparent willingness of the South Australian Government to offer incentives for this to happen. My questions to the Minister are:

1. Will the Government come clean and detail what role it is playing in this saga?
2. Is the Government involved in offering incentives to overseas companies to buy out Balfour's, a 100 year old local

company that is second only to Coca-Cola in statewide recognition and, if so, what incentives are being offered?

3. Is the SAAMC push for a fire sale caused by its timetable to wind up its operations?

The PRESIDENT: Right from the word 'go' that question provoked interjection. It is very difficult to control, from where I sit.

Members interjecting:

The PRESIDENT: Order! I suggest that the honourable member cut out unnecessary debating of the subject; and, if he does not believe me, he can read *Hansard* tomorrow morning.

The Hon. R.I. LUCAS: I find it extraordinary to be talking about a fire sale when, as my colleague the Hon. Angus Redford indicates, the company has been involved with the 'Bad Bank' (to use a colloquial phrase) for some time. I think the Hon. Mr Redford indicated that it was up to four years, but I am not aware of the exact length of time. Clearly, when the Hon. Mr Elliott uses certain adjectives to describe the performance of the company, the issue needs to be viewed in the light of the reality and the facts. Another point that needs to be made is that the Hon. Mr Elliott has clearly been given one side of the story, and he is seeking information about the other side—and that is fair enough—but he is doing so in an unnecessarily provocative manner in accepting what he has already been told as fact. It is very dangerous in these sorts of issues if you have not had the background in the area to do some independent—

The Hon. M.J. Elliott: Well, get to the answers then; if you don't have them you shouldn't be saying this now, either.

The Hon. R.I. LUCAS: The Hon. Mr Elliott indicates that he does not know the facts, but he just accepts a view—

Members interjecting:

The PRESIDENT: Order, the Hon. Angus Redford!

The Hon. R.I. LUCAS: The Hon. Mr Elliott just automatically accepts whatever he is told over the telephone. He has not undertaken any independent analysis.

Members interjecting:

The Hon. R.I. LUCAS: I will check with the Minister's office, but my understanding is that the Minister for Industry, Manufacturing, Small Business and Regional Development has indicated that no incentive has been paid to this Hong Kong company which allegedly is interested in Balfour's.

Members interjecting:

The Hon. R.I. LUCAS: None has been offered, I understand. The Hon. Mr Elliott comes into this Chamber trumpeting what he has been told by one side of this issue. As I said, I will check that with the Minister, but my understanding—

The Hon. M.J. Elliott: You tell me I'm wrong.

The Hon. R.I. LUCAS: I checked it this morning.

The Hon. L.H. Davis: You usually are.

The Hon. R.I. LUCAS: As the Hon. Mr Davis indicates, there is a fair chance that in economic and business matters the Hon. Mr Elliott will get it wrong. He needs to be cautious in automatically accepting what he is told over the telephone as to the State Government's position on this. Had he wanted to, he could have contacted the Minister's office. It is a sensitive issue; this is a prominent, South Australian company. Clearly it has had some problems for a little while. I am not at liberty—

The Hon. M.J. Elliott interjecting:

The Hon. R.I. LUCAS: The Hon. Mr Elliott says that, but how he does he know?

The Hon. M.J. Elliott: Are you telling me I'm wrong?

The Hon. R.I. LUCAS: I would ask the Hon. Mr Elliott, 'How has he independently checked whether or not what he claims is correct?' He might be correct; he might not be. I am not suggesting one way or another. I am saying that he has a responsibility, as the Leader of the Australian Democrats in this Chamber, to check his facts first, to make some reasonable inquiries without automatically accepting everything that he is told over the telephone in relation to a criticism of the State Government's attitude or approach regarding what is a very sensitive issue, with the employment of many South Australians at risk. The automatic assumption of the Democrats Leader is that in some way this Government and the Minister want to sell down the tube, as a knee jerk response in some way, any prominent South Australian company and the hundreds of South Australians who might be employed by that company.

Members interjecting:

The PRESIDENT: Order! Members on my left will come to order.

The Hon. R.I. LUCAS: This Minister, the Hon. Mr Olsen, and the Premier are all about trying to protect South Australian jobs wherever they can. There is nobody in public life—even, I suspect, members of the Labor Party, and maybe even members of the Democrats—who consciously go about adopting a policy of trying to reduce employment in South Australia. No-one consciously goes about a policy of trying to do that.

The Hon. Anne Levy: We are debating the State Clothing Corporation legislation—

The Hon. R.I. LUCAS: Maybe the Hon. Anne Levy has a different point of view from that. I will stand right behind Dean Brown and John Olsen in relation to what they are seeking to do in terms of protecting jobs in South Australian existing industries and indeed expanding them. To come into this Chamber and automatically attribute to the Government and to those particular Ministers and the Premier that in some way we are engaged in a fire sale of South Australian assets and are not prepared to look reasonably at what is going on and what particular options might exist for the Government of the day in relation to these issues is an entirely unreasonable position to be adopted by the Leader of a political Party such as the Hon. Mr Elliott.

I am now in a position to indicate what the Minister has said by way of a media release dated today under the heading of Balfours. Minister John Olsen today issued the following statement:

There has been no approach or offer of assistance by the Minister for Industry, Manufacturing, Small Business and Regional Development or his department to any Asian company to buy out Balfours.

All the Hon. Mr Elliott had to do was contact the Minister's office and ask for a copy of the statement or, at least, if the statement had not been issued when he was making his inquiry, ask the Government what the position might be, before he came into this Chamber seeking, in effect, to impugn the motives of the Government in relation to this issue.

I have been able to provide an answer based on what the Hon. Mr Olsen has said. It is clearly not an issue within my direct portfolio responsibility. The other aspects of the question I will refer to the Minister or Ministers and bring back a reply as soon as I can.

The Hon. T.G. ROBERTS: As a supplementary question, has the Government offered to work with Balfours to produce an export management plan?

The Hon. R.I. LUCAS: I will refer that question. All I can indicate in broad terms is that the Government has been bending over backwards for months, if not years, in terms of trying to resolve many of the issues that relate to this company and its problems. Whether that issue or variations of it have been a part of those discussions, I will obviously need to take advice and bring back a reply.

The Hon. M.J. ELLIOTT: As a supplementary question, does the Minister deny that in fact the company has reduced its debts over the last five years from \$18 million to a little over \$8 million, and that it has paid all principal and interest requirements that have occurred in those five or six years?

The Hon. R.I. LUCAS: I am not in a position to confirm or deny those aspects, as the honourable member obviously would know. Therefore, in framing the question as he has, he seeks again to try to place on the record some doubt about all this. The Hon. Mr Elliott knows that, as the Minister for Education and Children's Services, I am not in a position in Question Time in this place to be able to deny anything in relation to these issues, other than obviously the statement that has already been made by the Hon. Mr Olsen.

Members interjecting:

The Hon. R.I. LUCAS: If the honourable member wants to ask whether I will seek the information, clearly I will. However, by framing the question with the words, 'Will the Minister deny', he knows the inference behind that. Given the honourable member's record on a number of previous occasions in relation to business and financial matters, and given the fact that other parts of his question were clearly wrong and based on misinformation, one must at least be very cautious about other aspects of the Hon. Mr Elliott's information and questions.

TAPESTRIES

The Hon. A.J. REDFORD: I seek leave to make a brief explanation before asking the Minister for the Status of Women a question about women's suffrage tapestries.

Leave granted.

The Hon. A.J. REDFORD: Recently members received a letter from the former Suffrage Centenary Committee on the topic of the women's suffrage tapestries. Yesterday the Leader of the Opposition in this place set out very clearly and succinctly and, if I might say, very well the history of those tapestries. To remind members, on 17 February 1993 the House of Assembly voted unanimously in favour of a motion to dedicate space in the House of Assembly Chamber for two tapestries to commemorate the centenary of women's suffrage and this State's distinction as the first democracy in the world to grant women the right to stand for Parliament.

On the same occasion the Hon. Dean Brown said that he looked forward to the next year when the tapestries would be hanging in the House, not just for a year but on a permanent basis. The tapestries were unveiled on 19 October 1994, and I understand that you, Mr President, were present when they were unveiled with acclamation from the whole of the State. Indeed, the donations which were made and based upon their being hung in the House of Assembly included a donation from the Frank and Hilda Perry Memorial Trust in the sum of \$20 000 and from S. Kidman and Co. in the sum of \$5 000. The members for Newland and Coles at that time supported it. However, I note in the *Advertiser* on 5 July the Speaker in the other place is reported to have said:

I think it is important that the Legislative Council have an opportunity of having the tapestries hung in that Chamber for a

certain time because of the role the Council played, in that the legislation had to pass through both Houses.

Indeed, subsequent to that the Premier was quoted as saying he was under increasing pressure for the tapestries to be moved to another part of Parliament House. He said:

I would have thought that at least one of the tapestries should stay in the Assembly, even if the other tapestry was hung in the Legislative Council.

In the light of that, my questions to the Minister are:

1. Does she think it would be appropriate for the tapestries to be hung in this place?

2. What message would such a move be likely to send to the public in the light of the comments in the report of the Joint Committee on Women in Parliament pointing out that the representation of women in Lower Houses is significantly less than their representation in Upper Houses, particularly in this State?

The Hon. DIANA LAIDLAW: I thank the honourable member for his question and recognise his contribution also to the Joint Committee on Women in Parliament. Therefore, his reflection on women's representation in the House of Assembly compared with this place is entirely relevant and also relevant in the context of these tapestries. It is interesting to think that a vote conducted over 100 years ago, which brought such credit to the South Australian Parliament by providing women in this State with the opportunity to be the first in the world to vote and to stand for Parliament, is now being demeaned somewhat principally by men of lesser stature and vision than the men who voted for women's suffrage and franchise over 100 years ago. It is a great disappointment and I find it—

The Hon. A.J. Redford: Distasteful.

The Hon. DIANA LAIDLAW:—distasteful—in fact, I was going to say disgusting—to think that members could even contemplate such actions because those tapestries, as the honourable member said, were accepted not only by a unanimous vote of members of the House of Assembly two or three years ago but also on the basis that they would be permanently placed in the House of Assembly. All the volunteer time by the weavers, all the sponsorship funds—and I acknowledge the contribution from the Hon. Jamie Irwin and his wife Ann—all the support from the National Bank, which for 18 months provided precious exhibition and weaving space in its prominent front window, and so much of the time of the designer and the coordinator of the tapestries, Kay Lawrence and Elaine Gardner respectively, who were moderately paid but not fully paid for their efforts, was given on the understanding that these tapestries were for the House of Assembly and would stay there permanently. It was given on the basis that everyone wished to celebrate the Women's Suffrage Centenary and on the understanding that not only were they for commemorative purposes but, hopefully—and I think this was the wish of the women and many of the men involved in this project—they would also be a basis of inspiration for current and future members of that Parliament.

This Parliament as a whole has a proud and almost unique record in Australian legislative history of pioneering justice before the law for women, and we should be holding our heads high, not demeaning that contribution by a sordid debate in the House of Assembly at this time. It is very important that those tapestries remain where they are and that we do not abuse the goodwill of all who contributed and all

who accepted those tapestries for the House of Assembly on a permanent basis.

It is important that we look at artworks in this wonderful Chamber, but it is not appropriate that those two tapestries be hung in this Chamber. This Chamber was not even built at the time the vote went through the House of Assembly. So, this Council had nothing to do with the vote at that time.

The Hon. Anne Levy interjecting:

The Hon. DIANA LAIDLAW: The Hon. Anne Levy interjects and says she has asked, and I have enthusiastically agreed that we should have some artwork in this Chamber. It is not appropriate on the lower walls, which are sloped for acoustic reasons, but behind—and I am not suggesting we do not enjoy looking at the *Advertiser* or *Hansard* staff—it may be nicer to look at wonderful artwork and possibly a tapestry. The people in the public gallery, if they find our debates a little boring at times, might also like to enjoy some of the work, whether it be tapestries or other works of art. I will continue to pursue that issue now with more vigour than I have in the past year.

I indicate too, that it was really sad that at a time when there were grievance debates in the House of Representatives on 20 June 1996—and unfortunately it was a Liberal member—Mr Ross Cameron representing Parramatta made remarks about the collection of artworks that have been acquired over time for the new Parliament House. They are generally contemporary works supporting current artists.

That honourable member reflected very badly on those works. My own view is that his comments reflect badly on him. It is interesting that at the time that poorly informed contribution was made we in this place were also debating the tapestries—very precious artworks. What I hope will arise from this is that we do look at this place as a basis for a collection of artworks, whether it be photographs, works we acquire or a prize that we give on an annual basis amongst schools or colleges. We should look at this place being used for an exhibition of work by South Australian artists, photographers and sculptors. Perhaps one positive outcome of this debate will not only be to ensure that those work tapestries remain in the House of Assembly as they should but also that it will be a lead for this Parliament's building up a collection of artworks.

The Hon. A.J. REDFORD: As a supplementary question, given that the tapestries cover the pictures of Sir Robert Torrens, who was described as an entrepreneurial charlatan and the Alan Bond of the nineteenth century, and Sir Richard Butler, who was stripped of his position as a Minister because of corruption, does the Minister think that the House of Assembly has lost anything because these tapestries have been hung in those positions?

The Hon. DIANA LAIDLAW: Certainly not—and I am not too sure to whom the honourable member is attributing those—

The Hon. A.J. Redford: The Hon. John Trainer.

The Hon. DIANA LAIDLAW: The Hon. John Trainer, a former Speaker, described the portraits of men in black coats that hang in the Chamber now as hardly distinguished individuals. Certainly, one can say that the women featured in the tapestries, Catherine Helen Spence, Elizabeth Webb Nicholls and Mary Lee were distinguished South Australians. When members think of the tapestry with Catherine Helen Spence looking at the Speaker, as she does with the turn of her head, she has a bit of a frown on her face, and I suspect she might be pretty spitting mad with the Speaker at the moment, and I hope that a glare registers with the Speaker.

The PRESIDENT: Order! I do not think it is very clever to pick on people who cannot defend themselves in this Chamber, whether it is a former Speaker or a present Speaker.

AUSTRALIAN NATIONAL

The Hon. T.G. CAMERON: I seek leave to make a brief explanation before asking the Minister for Transport a question about the Brew inquiry and Australian National.

Leave granted.

The Hon. T.G. CAMERON: There is growing concern over the State Government's attitude and commitment towards Australian National. We understand that a submission may have been made to the Brew inquiry. If a formal submission has been made we have no idea what is in it.

Concerns have been expressed about the future for grain transport on rail in South Australia. AN's freight division, SA Freight, moves an average of 485 000 tonnes annually for the Australian Barley Board. Rail has the capacity to move large volumes of grain quickly and efficiently. Attention to grain quality requires only a fraction of the organisation and planning that is necessary to move similar volumes by road transport. This ability is crucial to the grain industry in meeting shipping schedules and storage in country locations and at port terminals. There is a concern that the importance of a continued and unbroken rail service to the grain industry will be overlooked by both the Federal and State Governments.

Grain growers will face substantial cost penalties in servicing markets, particularly export markets, if this occurs. The interim report from the Deep Sea Port Investigation Committee indicates that Port Adelaide will steadily become more important for grain export, with a major advantage being its rail connections from the north and east. One would expect that, until the anticipated port development occurs, increased tonnages will have to be moved to Port Adelaide. Rail is clearly the most beneficial mode of transport for the grain industry and, by minimising road transport, most beneficial to the community as a whole.

Regardless of what the Brew inquiry determines in relation to AN as an organisation, it should be recognised that grain freight has been a profitable component of AN's business and should continue in future to be a viable rail transport task. My questions to the Minister are:

1. Will the Minister release, such as it is, its formal submission to the Brew inquiry?
2. Does the submission outline the importance of rail to the grain industry? Does it argue for the retention of South Australian freight to continue as an operating entity, preferably a South Australian entity?

The Hon. DIANA LAIDLAW: Did the honourable member quote somebody in saying that SA Freight was a profitable business or was that his own comment?

The Hon. T.G. Cameron interjecting:

The Hon. DIANA LAIDLAW: That was your own comment. I suggest that the honourable member read the last annual report and seek further advice from AN in terms of activities of the last financial year. He will find, regrettably, that no section of AN is consistently profitable and certainly one cannot argue such in terms of the grain business.

The Hon. T.G. Cameron: So you want to get rid of SA Freight?

The Hon. DIANA LAIDLAW: That has never been suggested by me and I will not accept the honourable member

putting words into my mouth in that sense. While not a profitable business and having not performed as such for years, that is not to say that SA Freight could not operate profitably with a change of practice. That change of practice has been explored by Australian National, by representatives of the Department of Transport, the South Australian Farmers Federation and South Australian Cooperative Bulk Handling.

A proposal exists for 30 strategic grain sites around the State. If that is accepted by the farming community (and there will be considerable debate about that and perhaps some regional development impacts on country towns) and proceeded with in that form or with some variation, we will see substantial cost savings in terms of shunting, the number of locomotives required, manpower and general efficiencies, which will ensure that SA Freight could become a profitable business for AN or for any future operator.

I know that AN is looking at partnership proposals. It may be that the Federal Government is looking at commercialisation or privatisation proposals because, arising from the Brew inquiry, one can anticipate that all sorts of proposals will be considered. Certainly it has been my experience in receiving delegations from interstate and locally on behalf of the grain industry, the unions and the like, that there is a whole range of options for rail business in future. As the honourable member knows, it was considered after discussion with the Federal Minister of Transport that the South Australian Government would not make a submission to the Brew inquiry but that it would make a submission to—

The Hon. T.G. Cameron: You said you had made one. You misled the House.

The Hon. DIANA LAIDLAW: No, that we would be making one. It was considered later.

The Hon. T.G. Cameron: You said you made one.

The Hon. DIANA LAIDLAW: We have never made a submission to the Brew inquiry. I indicated in an answer to a question from the honourable member some time ago that we would make a submission. On consideration, and following discussion with the Federal Minister and as I indicated in answers of which I suppose the honourable member was aware in relation to questions asked in the Estimates Committee, it was resolved that the State's position be confirmed in a letter to the Federal Minister of Transport. On previous occasions I read that letter to the Estimates Committee and to this place. That letter indicates that the South Australian Government maintains that there is a good future for AN for rail business in South Australia, either as the same organisation restructured (as that is AN's plan) or in partnerships.

It is important that we establish, maintain and consolidate a strong rail business in this State because of the Government's commitment to the Alice Springs-Darwin railway, to which we agreed that we would commit funding of \$100 million. It is important for the realisation of that project that we have strong rail business in this State to capture the benefits of the Alice Springs-Darwin railway.

The Hon. T. CROTHERS: By way of supplementary question, does the Minister agree that if AN freight services are severely curtailed here, particularly in the area of grain production and grain farmers have to switch to other means of transport, that will adversely affect the cost of production and thereby adversely affect in this State, which is the largest barley growing State in the nation by far, the voluminous amount of exports we have in respect to barley, grain, malt and beer, which are large exports in this State, all based on barley and grain? Does the Minister agree that a switch from

rail transport to other forms of transportation will be detrimental to our ability to compete on the cut throat global market with respect to those three grain related items that we export?

The Hon. DIANA LAIDLAW: Rail business has been losing out on the grain market with the progressive closure of lines since 1975 when we sold the business. It is certainly in the interests of the Government, taxpayers, farmers and rural communities that we stem the loss of business—whether it be grain or any other business—from rail to road. That would certainly be the intent of the Government, which is why the Department of Transport has been working with the South Australian Farmers Federation and SACBH generally to ensure that rail can run more efficiently, effectively and profitably as it will provide benefits to farmers and mean that local councils and the State Government do not have to meet the expense related to the damage of more grain trucks on our roads.

SPARK

In reply to **Hon. ANNE LEVY** (28 May).

The Hon. DIANA LAIDLAW: The Minister for Family and Community Services has provided the following information.

SPARK Resource Centre receives funding under the Department for Family and Community Services' Family and Community Development Program. Funding to this program's family development services has been the subject of an extensive review over the past few years. The review was initiated by the previous Government, and implemented more recently. The objective of the review was to ensure that the types of services for families, and their geographical distribution meet changing community needs.

As a result of this review there has been a redistribution of funding under the program. This is always difficult where agencies such as SPARK have received significant funding for many years. The difficult decisions are, however, necessary to ensure that funds are distributed most equitably to areas of high need. The reduction in funding to SPARK was necessary for these reasons.

The redistribution has resulted in increased services to areas of relatively higher need, including country South Australia. It has also led to an increase in the focus on services for children at risk of being abused or neglected.

SPARK will continue to receive \$83 000 per annum through the program.

There may be other sources of funding which SPARK could pursue, for example the recently announced Positive Parenting program that will enable some degree of funding to organisations with a parenting focus.

THE RING CYCLE

In reply to **Hon. ANNE LEVY** (10 July).

The Hon. DIANA LAIDLAW: It is true that the original budget was assessed at \$6.4 million and that it has been revised subsequently to \$8.355 million. The principal factor in the increase is a substantial upwards revision of the income projections from \$6.458 million in the original budget to \$8.355 million. The basis for this increase is as follows:

1. Box Office: original projection of \$2.5 million revised to \$3.660 million. The increase is due entirely to the finalisation of ticket prices. The original budget was based on a ticket price for a full cycle A Reserve seat of \$700. Since that time the State Opera have been able to study this matter in greater detail, particularly in the light of prices charged overseas. As a result the A Reserve ticket price has been increased to \$950.00 and average ticket prices have been increased by 64%.

2. Sponsorship: original projection of \$0.5 million raised to \$1.488 million. There are two components to the increase. The first is that current indications are that the original forecast was too low. This is a particularly uncertain area. However, some recent developments have suggested that a forecast of \$1.03 million, exclusive of ticket sales is reasonable. The second component of the increase relates to the decision by SORC to value all tickets issued as benefits to sponsors at their face value. Previously, these tickets were placed in the same category as complimentary tickets and were

not given any value for accounting purposes. The decision to now value them was taken as an internal control and has added \$0.458 million to both income and expenditure.

The only significant increases in costs are:

1. Cover cast: original projection of \$0.105 million raised to \$0.543 million as the difficulty of securing adequate cover was under-estimated in the original budget.

2. State Opera administration: original projection of \$0.255 million raised to \$0.863 million. The original budget charged SORC for only part of State Opera's administrative costs in 1998. However, it became apparent that the Company would have to allocate considerable time to The Ring over 1996 and 1997. No charges are being made to SORC for these prior expenditures but State Opera will be compensated by charging its full costs of administration in 1998 to SORC.

The budget has increased in response to these increases in income and expenditure. The best indication of the net change in position is the contingency. This was \$0.250 million in the original budget and is now \$0.589 million. If it can be held to this, the cost to the Government through AME will be \$1.16 million compared with the original expectation of \$1.5 million.

Finally, I advise that:

1. The cost of ancillary events has had no impact upon the change in budgetary position. The income and expenditure for these events is being handled by organisations other than SORC, eg State Opera, Friends, Council of Benefactors.

2. Of the total budget, approximately 75% will be spent within the State, inclusive of the 'refunded' contingency.

3. The State Opera believes that the financial situation now appears stronger than when they began, and that the broader economic benefits for the State have been identified and assessed by an independent authority.

INDUSTRIAL AND EMPLOYEE RELATIONS (MISCELLANEOUS) AMENDMENT BILL

Second reading.

The Hon. R.I. LUCAS (Minister for Education and Children's Services): I move:

That this Bill be now read a second time.

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

Leave granted.

This Bill proposes amendments to the *Industrial and Employee Relations Act 1994* which will remove the requirement that Judges of the Industrial Relations Court must also be Judges of the District Court and extend the sunset provision affecting Industrial Agreements carried over from the *Industrial Relations Act (SA) 1972* from 8 August 1996 to 31 December 1996.

It is the intention of these amendments that they will result in an increase in the flexibility available to the Senior Judge of the Industrial Relations Court in relation to the work of that Court and on the issue of Industrial Agreements, provide a small extension to the transitional arrangements so that the parties to these agreements can attend to their conversion to Enterprise Agreements under the provisions of the new Act.

Industrial Relations Court Judges

Proclamation of the *Industrial and Employee Relations Act 1994* on 8 August 1994 saw the introduction of new administrative arrangements for the South Australian Industrial Relations Court whereby the Senior Judge and Judges of that Court were appointed Judges of the District Court and then assigned by the Governor as Judges of the Industrial Relations Court.

This statutory requirement has had the unintended consequence of reducing the flexibility available to the Senior Judge of the Industrial Relations Court in relation to the work of that Court, in that legally qualified Tribunal members cannot perform judicial functions in the Court, such as sit on Full Benches or hear other matters when single members of the Court are unavailable, unless they are also appointed as Judges of the District Court. One undesirable consequence of this in the Industrial Relations Court has been

the use of two member rather than three member Full Benches during periods of limited judicial resources.

The lack of flexibility which this statutory provision has created for the Industrial Relations Court has not been offset by greater flexibility in transfer of Judges between the District Court and the Industrial Relations Court. Consultation with both the Senior Judge of the District Court and the Senior Judge of the Industrial Relations Court has revealed that there are now no Judges of the District Court anxious to hold appointments as Judges of the Industrial Relations Court, nor are there Judges of the Industrial Relations Court who hold a District Court commission, who wish to sit in the District Court.

The proposals contained in this Bill will provide greater flexibility in the administration and operation of the Industrial Relations Court. They have been developed in consultation with the Senior Judge of the District Court and the Senior Judge of the Industrial Relations Court.

Industrial Agreements—Transitional Provisions

The new Act also provided transitional provisions dealing with the operation of Industrial Agreements made under the former Act. These transitional provisions allow for Industrial Agreements to continue for a two year period only, ending of 8 August 1996. During this two year transitional period it was anticipated that Industrial Agreements would be renegotiated as Enterprise Agreements, or would otherwise lapse.

Progress in the replacement of Industrial Agreements by Enterprise Agreements during the transitional period has been slower than expected partly as a result of difficulties with the maintenance of Registry records as a result of the constant changing of the status, and in some cases existence, of employers, unions or employee associations since 1972 and partly as a result of inadequate attention by the relevant employers or employee representatives as to the requirements of the transitional arrangements.

Failure to extend the transitional period in cases where new Enterprise Agreements have not been made would mean that the Industrial Agreements which currently exist will no longer have legal effect after 8 August 1996 and that industrial rights and obligations would, from that date, automatically reflect award provisions, if any, governing the workplace. This would have undesirable consequences for some employees whose minimum wage entitlements may be lower under an award than under the agreement. It would also have undesirable consequences for some employers who have negotiated a lower cost structure under their Industrial Agreement than under the industry award.

Whilst the Government might be entitled to be critical of the parties to these agreements for having failed to renegotiate Industrial Agreements into Enterprise Agreements, the Government can not ignore the practical consequences of the transitional provisions on 8 August 1996. It is therefore necessary to consider an appropriate amendment to these transitional provisions.

The amendments contained in this Bill have been the subject of consultation with the Industrial Relations Advisory Committee, the President of the Industrial Relations Commission and the Enterprise Agreement Commissioner who all support the proposals contained therein. South Australia's peak employee and employer groups, the South Australian Employers' Chamber of Commerce and Industry and the United Trades and Labour Council of South Australia have both endorsed the amendments contained in this Bill.

Explanation of Clauses

Clause 1: Short title

This clause is formal.

Clause 2: Substitution of Division 4 of Part 2

This clause provides for the appointment of judges specifically to the Court.

Clause 3: Amendment of Schedule 1, s. 7

This clause extends until 31 December 1996 the period on which industrial agreements continue in operation. The Commission is required to take reasonable steps to ensure that the parties to industrial agreements are aware that the agreements will lapse on that date and, as far as practicable and appropriate, encourage the renegotiation of the agreements as enterprise agreements.

Clause 4: Transitional provision

This clause provides that assignments of District Court Judges and magistrates to the judiciary of the Court remain valid and effective for the purposes of the provisions to be inserted by the Bill.

The Hon. G. WEATHERILL secured the adjournment of the debate.

**LOCAL GOVERNMENT (WARD QUOTAS)
AMENDMENT BILL**

Adjourned debate on second reading.
(Continued from 9 July. Page 1670.)

The Hon. P. HOLLOWAY: The Opposition supports this Bill. Under the current Local Government Act the variation in the number of residents within the wards of any council may not vary by greater than 10 per cent. This gives effect to the principle of one vote one value within a council area and mirrors the provisions that apply at State or Federal level. It is a fundamental provision which many past Labor members of Parliament, and I guess a few Liberal members, have fought long and hard to establish. Of course, there are also a few Liberal members who fought long and hard to oppose it but that is another story.

When any Bill seeks to vary this fundamental provision, as this Bill seeks to do, then clearly members on this side of the House can be expected to look very closely, indeed, at such provisions before giving our support. Nevertheless, we do agree with the Government on this occasion that the 10 per cent variation provisions for wards should be set aside in a limited number of cases for a brief transition period to facilitate the council amalgamation process.

The Opposition accepts that situations will occur, in particular where we have small rural district councils (that is, small in population) seeking to amalgamate with much larger adjoining town councils and where the smaller district councils could lose almost all their representation if the ward sizes of the amalgamated council were kept equal. During the delicate transitional stages of a council amalgamation, it is desirable that there should be some continuity of representation for the smaller council. This obviously has the effect of reassuring smaller communities and, therefore, encouraging them to merge, an objective which the Opposition has consistently supported. In the debate on this Bill in another place, the Minister indicated that one council (the District Council of Port Pirie) had lodged a request to be exempted from the 10 per cent variation provision in its amalgamation with the City of Port Pirie. This is a clear example where a small rural district council could be overwhelmed by a larger city council. I believe that it is entirely reasonable that some flexibility should be put into the Act to allow for a transitional arrangement for two such councils to operate jointly for some period until the final form of the merged council takes its place.

There is no doubt that the fear of loss of identity and fear that the interests of their ratepayers will be overwhelmed are major factors in the reluctance of small district councils to merge with larger town or city councils. To the extent that this temporary measure overcomes such fears, it is to be welcomed. I believe that experience from other mergers should help overcome the natural fears of less populated councils. During the recent Victorian election campaign, I helped some of my Labor colleagues in Hamilton to hand out how-to-vote cards. During that experience I had discussions with a member of the Liberal Party, a Liberal supporter who was handing out how-to-vote cards for her Party. We were talking about the impact of council mergers in that region which was a result of the Kennett reforms. She informed me that the new council in that area (I think it was the Southern Grampians council) was formed out of the merger of the town council of Hamilton with some of the smaller surrounding rural councils.

When the new council was formed, it opted not to have wards. In other words, it had an election across the whole of the council area. Apparently, at that election a majority of the councillors were actually elected from the former, much smaller—in terms of population—rural areas which is an indication that they had fought fairly hard to achieve their representation. It need not be a real fear that smaller councils will be totally overwhelmed by the larger towns.

The Hon. T.G. Roberts: Until they wake up.

The Hon. P. HOLLOWAY: That remains to be seen. I thought that was an interesting result from what had happened at council mergers interstate. I would like to reiterate that the Opposition supports the Bill on the basis that it is a strictly temporary measure: it is to apply for only one election after council amalgamations take place and it will apply to only a small number of councils where special circumstances exist. As I said, in another place the Minister said that only one application had been received so far and he did not expect that there would be many more. To be consistent, the Opposition will support this measure because it will facilitate the boundary reform process, but we would certainly not support any extension of such a measure beyond a strictly limited transitional period.

The Hon. ANNE LEVY: I support the second reading of this Bill but wish to make a couple of comments. I am certainly glad to see the reforms of local government which are now occurring. Numerous Governments over many years have tried to promote reform within local government but until recently local government has been obdurate and refused to consider reform. I am glad to see that they are now moving to do so. There are some recalcitrant councils—and I think that is certainly the correct use of the term—which are not undertaking reform measures, and I certainly wish the Local Government Reform Board the best of luck in dealing with those recalcitrant councils.

One matter does concern me in the Bill before us. It provides that there must be a return to the 10 per cent variation so as to enable appropriate changes in the composition in wards of the council to take effect on or before a date fixed by proclamation or, if no date is so fixed, on or before the date of the second general election of the council after the proposal takes effect.

From my reading of that, it would be possible for a Government to proclaim a date up until which the 10 per cent variation need not apply; that a Government could proclaim a date that was beyond the second election. In other words, councils that are amalgamating now need not adjust their ward boundaries to fit the 10 per cent criterion for the elections due in May next year but would need to have so adjusted their ward boundaries for the following election which, under current law, would be in 1999 or, under the proposed changes to the Local Government Act, would be in the year 2000. However, if next year the Government proclaimed a date of 2004, this would enable the council to maintain the disproportionate ward boundaries beyond the two general elections of the council after amalgamations occur.

I understand from the report that has been presented that that is not the intention of the Government, but I feel that laws should be framed in such a way that a different Minister or a different Government would not be able to subvert the original intention by using what could be a loophole in the legislation. I very much hope that, in responding, the Minister will give us any legal advice the Government may have that

the clause could not be misused in this way, because, if it is legally possible for it to be so misused, I feel that an amendment would be necessary to the legislation before us. It is one thing to approve of the 10 per cent variation limit not being applied for one election due to particular circumstances; it would be quite another thing for a Government to enable it to continue for numerous local government elections into the future merely by making use of a loophole in the Bill. I support the second reading.

The Hon. R.D. LAWSON secured the adjournment of the debate.

STATE CLOTHING CORPORATION (WINDING-UP) AMENDMENT BILL

Adjourned debate on second reading.
(Continued from 10 July. Page 1692.)

The Hon. ANNE LEVY: I support the second reading of this Bill more in sorrow than in anger, because the passing of this legislation is the last step in a sad, long process that this Government started quite some time ago. The State Clothing Corporation, which was set up 16 years ago, has now had all its assets sold; the employees have all lost their jobs; the whole thing has been wound up and, in consequence, there is not much point in keeping the shell that exists by virtue of legislation. So, it is an inescapable fact that we must support this Bill. However, I feel that it is extremely sad that the Government has taken this step. It sold off the Clothing Corporation to recover a few measly dollars. The result was that a large number of people in regional areas lost their jobs.

The Minister was talking few minutes ago about how it is the Government's job to create employment. This is a situation where, due to the Government's actions, a whole lot of people have lost their employment, and this particularly in a regional area.

The Hon. R.I. Lucas interjecting:

The Hon. ANNE LEVY: Yes, because the Government sold the corporation; the factory was then closed, and all the people who worked in that factory in Whyalla have now lost their jobs.

The Hon. R.D. Lawson: Frank Blevins supported the Bill.

The Hon. ANNE LEVY: He said exactly the same as I'm saying, too. Most of those people who have lost their jobs as a result of this Government's action were women in a regional area.

The Hon. Diana Laidlaw interjecting:

The Hon. ANNE LEVY: I did. If you look back at my record when I was Minister I did a great deal to secure its future. I put it on a sound financial footing and am very proud to have done so. With the great assistance of my then CEO Bill Cossey, the whole State Clothing Corporation was turned round. It had certainly had its difficulties in the past but, through our efforts, it changed completely and became an extremely valuable generator of employment and a viable enterprise to the benefit of women workers in a regional area of this State. We all know that employment in regional areas is falling and that regional areas are in even greater difficulties than the metropolitan area.

We also all know that it is much harder for women to obtain full-time worthwhile employment than it is for men. Consequently, the State Clothing Corporation at Whyalla not only was a viable organisation producing goods of value to

the State but it provided much needed employment for women workers in a regional area. I am most surprised indeed that this Government can be proud of the fact that its actions have resulted in the closing of that factory, causing women workers in a regional area to have lost their jobs, adding to unemployment. It is not something of which I would be proud were I in Government.

The Labor Government certainly made a huge difference to the State Clothing Corporation—which, I may say, was opened by the Hon. Dean Brown when he was Minister of Industrial Affairs 16 years ago. One would think he might have had some concern for a factory that he personally had opened. But this Government has sold all the assets of the corporation; it has caused the loss of over 40 female jobs in a regional area of this State, not something for which it should be the least bit proud.

As I indicated earlier, there is no point in opposing this legislation, much as I oppose the actions which the Government has undertaken. The factory has gone, the jobs are gone, unemployment is up, and there is no point in keeping the empty shell that is all that is left at this stage. We might as well get rid of the legislation, which is all that is left at this stage. So, with great regret, I support the second reading of this Bill. I am glad that in no way can it be interpreted that the Labor Party supports the degree of regional female unemployment which this Government has caused by selling the State Clothing Corporation.

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

STATE LOTTERIES (UNCLAIMED PRIZES) AMENDMENT BILL

Adjourned debate on second reading.
(Continued from 10 July. Page 1693.)

The Hon. CAROLYN PICKLES (Leader of the Opposition): The Opposition supports the second reading. This Bill introduces reasonable reforms to deal with the problem of unclaimed lottery prizes. The most acutely felt problem is that of a lottery winner who has lost their ticket. The State Lotteries Act has been interpreted to mean that a winner cannot collect their prize at all if they cannot present their ticket to the Lotteries Commission. The Bill resolves the problem by permitting *ex gratia* payments in appropriate cases. The Bill also provides for appropriate distribution of unclaimed prize money, splitting it between the Recreation and Sport Fund, the Hospitals Fund, money allocated to extra prizes in subsequent lotteries, and *ex gratia* payments where appropriate. Some comments should be made about the fact that the legislation is retrospective to a certain extent, and members on both sides of Parliament are normally wary of retrospective legislation. I gather that there is an element of retrospectivity here, because of at least one particularly deserving case, referred to by the Treasurer in his second reading in another place, where the Government believes an *ex gratia* payment would be appropriate. Under the circumstances, the Opposition does not object to the limited retrospective element of this Bill. We support the second reading.

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

STATUTES AMENDMENT (WATERWORKS AND SEWERAGE) BILL

Adjourned debate on second reading.
(Continued from 10 July. Page 1718.)

The Hon. CAROLYN PICKLES (Leader of the Opposition): The Opposition supports the second reading. This Bill has been scrutinised at length by the shadow Minister for Infrastructure, the member for Hart, who is satisfied that there is nothing more to this Bill than a tidying up of the legislation in relation to our waterworks and sewerage infrastructure. Revision of the Waterworks and Sewerage Acts was in order, because the regulations under those Acts expire on 1 September 1996. It is appropriate to make improvements with respect to the administrative practices and procedures which flow from the principal legislation prior to new regulations being put in place.

The Opposition notes that the more significant aspects of the Bill simplify the procedures for declaring water districts and drainage areas, facilitating reduction of water supply if there is a water shortage or if consumers have not paid their water rates, and regulating public entry onto land and by the South Australian Water Corporation. We support the second reading.

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

APPROPRIATION BILL

Adjourned debate on second reading.
(Continued from 10 July. Page 1717.)

The Hon. R.D. LAWSON: In speaking in support of the Appropriation Bill, I want to make a number of remarks on the Government's achievements in relation to the information industries. The schedule to the Appropriation Bill contains an appropriation of some \$26 million for the information industries, some \$646 000 for the information technology work force strategy office, and a further amount of some \$1 million under the Premier's line as Minister for Multicultural and Ethnic Affairs and also as Minister for Information Technology.

The State Government's information technology and information industry policies were previously handled by the Office of Information Technology (OIT). In December 1995, that office was put into a new Department of Information Industries together with some of the industry development functions of the portfolio of the Minister for Industry, Manufacturing, Small Business and Regional Development.

The Premier placed substantial importance upon the information industries in this State, as is well known, and he became Minister for Information Technology, together with his other responsibilities. The fact that the Premier was prepared to undertake this additional portfolio is an indication of the importance which he and the Government place upon the information industries in rebuilding South Australia's economy into one which will prosper up to the year 2000 and beyond.

The Government has a number of key achievements in relation to the information industries. The publication of the IT vision statement in 1994 was one of the first steps in developing a strategy for growing information industries in this State. At the time that the Brown Liberal Government came into power, expenditure on information technology and

information industries in South Australia represented, in national terms, a lesser proportion than our total portion of the Australian population would warrant. No major international companies were engaged in a large way in the information industries in this State. However, a number of small companies were engaged in a great deal of innovative and important work, although the industry was not characterised by a strong outward or export oriented vision.

The IT 2000 report contained a strategy for changing the focus of the information industries in South Australia and for developing them, to give them an outward looking focus, one that was export oriented, and one that was based upon the attraction to this State of at least one large company around which a large number of small local companies would prosper. The strategy also involved—and this was a novel part of the strategy—the use of the South Australian Government's substantial information technology requirements as a lever to secure industry development in this State.

The strategy also involved the Government's adopting a whole of government approach to its own information technology requirements. That strategy had not previously been adopted in Australia nor, so far as we are aware, in other comparable parts of the world. However, the South Australian Government was and remains a substantial user of information technology. By bundling that technology into sizeable chunks of business, the Government was able to extract, and is in the process of extracting, from contractors undertakings and commitments to improve the industry in this State.

There have been a number of significant achievements to date and also a number of initiatives are in the pipeline. I should refer to some of them. The Motorola company, one of the world's leading companies in the field of information technology, based originally in the US but having worldwide operations, has created a software engineering centre at Technology Park in South Australia. The direct investment in that project will be about \$60 million. It has created more than 100 jobs at the moment and will ultimately create up to 400 jobs.

The Tandem company has created its Asia Pacific advanced development centre in South Australia. That centre is predicted to create some hundreds of jobs over the next five years and has resulted in direct investment by the company in this State.

Australis (or Galaxy) has established a facility at Technology Park and created several hundred jobs. Although there has been some public speculation about its future, the company is continuing to plan further developments to strengthen its position.

Westpac has set up its national loan centre in South Australia, and it opened only a couple of months ago. That centre will lead to the creation of 900 full-time equivalent positions in a couple of years and generate an increase in our gross State product of about \$100 million per annum, and it is anticipated that the centre will employ up to 1 500 people within five to 10 years.

Bankers Trust will be locating its funds management functions in Adelaide for Australia and possibly ultimately for the Asia Pacific region. This is once again expected to generate several hundred jobs with \$10 million of new investment by that company in Australia. The Government, through the Department of Information Industries, is actively pursuing other opportunities for the establishment in this State of what are termed back office functions similar to those set up by Westpac and to be set up by Bankers Trust.

South Australia is well located to prosper in the back office market because, as has often been mentioned, owing to the initiatives of the Government, it is cheaper for companies to conduct business in this State than along the Eastern seaboard. This fact gives opportunities to young South Australians—not only graduates in the information technology field but also less highly qualified and, in some cases, especially in relation to software engineering, those with higher postgraduate qualifications. So, the information industries offer great opportunities for this State.

Link Telecommunications is proposing to establish its national customer call centre in Adelaide, leading to several million dollars of new investment. This is another example of a back office facility being established in South Australia.

One of the niche markets identified in the IT2000 vision as offering a great potential for the State is the field of multimedia. The Government is to be congratulated for its achievements and vision in relation to this aspect of information industries. The achievements that have been obtained to date derive from a multimedia task force established by the Government. It included members from all sectors, including industry associations, the Chamber of Commerce and Industry, arts and cultural institutions and those in the publishing, education and Government fields.

That task force produced the Multimedia 2000 report which was officially launched in January of this year. The report identified a number of key objectives for the development of South Australia as an internationally recognised centre. Some of the objectives are that multimedia businesses will grow and prosper; there will be vibrant, productive networks and collaborations of creative technical and business people; multimedia will be commissioned and published; services and products will be distributed on-line; the public sector business and the broader community will be sophisticated and demanding users of multimedia; and multimedia education and training will be equivalent to the best in the world.

Some of these objectives are already being reached by a number of the small and highly active companies in the multimedia field. Many of them are established in a cluster in the east end of Rundle Street in the city of Adelaide, an exciting and innovative cluster. A number of multimedia companies have emerged in South Australia.

Fusion Design was established by the leading industrial design and graphic design students from Underdale's class of 1994. Webmedia recently opened premises in King William street. The Sydney based parent company of Webmedia has identified the significant cost and creative benefits of having all Web design and management work carried out in Adelaide for its Australia-wide client base. Other companies such as Triad Design, Showads Interactive, Optcom and N-scape have established in South Australia. N-Scape recently completed the DEETYA jobs project valued at some \$350 000, and the company has been engaged in a number of other exciting projects.

The Hong Kong based information technology company Vtech established a wholly owned multimedia arm in Adelaide to develop educational CD-ROMs for the global market. The Adelaide centre employs nine people and joins eight other such centres around the world. This company in Adelaide represents Vtech's only Australian investment.

I mention also that Virtual Artists conducted a very successful cyber fringe earlier this year—the first such event in the world. The cyber tent was located in the east parklands. It was totally wireless, being powered by solar energy and

linked to the Internet via microwave technology. The microwave dish was located (by a convenient country innovation) in a tree alongside the tent.

Industry analysts have suggested that the multimedia industry in South Australia is growing at approximately 100 per cent a year and a great deal of this growth is focused in the broader Adelaide creative precinct. Whilst on the subject of multimedia, I mention the Ngapartji Cooperative Multimedia Centre which is to be established in the east end of Rundle Street under the energetic and innovative direction of Mr Michael Harbison. Ngapartji's aim is to play a significant role in Australia's becoming one of the world's key centres in multimedia services. Ngapartji is a consortium involving the three South Australian universities, the Department for Education and Children's Services, the Department of Employment, Training and Further Education and a number of private sector partners, including Telstra, Microsoft, Malcolm Reid Pty Ltd, Camtech, the Media Resource Centre, Silicon Graphics and the South Australian branch of the Australian Interactive Multimedia Association. Each of those shareholders has nominated a member of the board.

Federal funding of \$4.125 million over the next three years has been secured for Ngapartji and the commitment of the South Australian Government is to provide over \$1.5 million of further funding in addition to the funding and expertise to be provided by the universities and private sector partners. Over 30 small and medium sized multi-media companies are already involved with Ngapartji. The centre has established an international advisory board to provide assistance and the panel members include a number of very distinguished and knowledgeable figures in the multi-media field. Mr Harbison is the Managing Director of the company and all South Australians should look forward with great excitement to the opening of the Ngapartji multi-media centre in Rundle Street shortly.

A number of other projects are presently being undertaken by the Department of Information Industries. One of them is the electronic services business project. That project has, as its broad objectives, to build this State as an internationally recognised centre of competence in the development and use of electronic services, to provide leadership for and contribute to building South Australia as an information empowered community and to improve public sector efficiency through changed work practices enabled by the adoption of electronic services.

The Government signed a development agreement with an Australian subsidiary of IBM—the joint venture company ISSC—and IBM itself in April 1996. That development agreement sets out a plan of activity in a number of deliverables. The objects of this development phase of the project are to determine the optimal model for the electronic services business in relation to technical, commercial, contractual and functional requirements, to determine the optimal approach to the electronic services business implementation and to identify the potential ESB opportunities in the South Australian public sector with reference to the market size, delivery mechanisms and links to other Government initiatives. It is proposed that using five initial projects a core of business will be developed as a foundation of a strategic alliance in this field.

The electronic services business is at the leading edge of information technology anywhere in the world. It is ultimately hoped that, by using information technology, members of the community will be able to do all of their business with

Government by electronic means. Accordingly, it is possible that people will be able to renew their driver's licence, register their vehicles, search titles and companies, pay bills and the like all by electronic means through the electronic services business.

It is hoped not only that people will be able to use electronic means to transact business with the Government but also that they will be able to use the same means to obtain information and benefits from the Government. The Internet is one channel which offers great potential in this field. Others that are being examined include the establishment of kiosks and it is possible later that interactive television will be able to be used in the electronic services business. This is all leading edge technology and a further demonstration of the Government's commitment to explore that which is innovative and exciting and which will bring substantial benefits to the community. I am aware that the department is working hard to bring the electronic services business project to fruition and I have every confidence that it will.

Another of the niche markets identified in the IT 2000 Vision was the spatial information systems project. The objective of that project is to develop a spatial information industry in South Australia, to achieve productivity and efficiency gains in the South Australian public sector in recognition of the fact that South Australia is already a place where world-class spatial information products and services have been developed or are in the process of being developed. The purpose of developing this initiative is not merely technology for technology's sake or innovation for the sake of innovation but also for the purpose of securing new investment and jobs in this State and for redeveloping and upgrading the State's existing spatial information structure. We have had, through LOTS in this State, technology which, at the time of its establishment, was leading edge and which has been a leader for some years but which is now in need of upgrading. The opportunity thus presents itself to take us and our existing spatial information infrastructure to the world's best.

The current status of the project is that two companies were selected from a large number that expressed interest. Those companies were Fujitsu and Telstra. They have been asked to provide revised proposals which the Government in due course will appropriately evaluate. This is a most exciting project. I have mentioned the fact that the Government has already been involved in spatial information systems. The South Australian universities have been prominent in the field, in particular the University of Adelaide. Professor Graeme Hugo is a world leader in GIS systems and companies such as Maptek have been producing world-class material in the field of spatial information systems.

The South Australian Government has outsourced or subcontracted a major part of its own information technology requirements, its own processing requirements. That contract was let, as is well known by members, to the American corporation EDS. The transfer of data processing from Government to EDS has been progressing satisfactorily within the past month or so and within the next month or so the major part of the Government's processing business will have been transferred from within Government to the company.

Under its contractual arrangements, EDS was required to offer employment to those within the South Australian public sector who were engaged in providing this service. Such offers were made, and I think some 97 per cent of employees who were eligible to accept the offers made by EDS did in

fact do so and they are now working with the company which is providing data processing services to the Government. This illustrates the whole of Government approach. There are more than 100 agencies that are now having their data processing performed by EDS.

In exchange for that substantial amount of business over the nine years of the contract, EDS was required to participate in a number of industry attraction initiatives. For example, the company was required to establish its Asia-Pacific resource centre in this State. It is required to participate in the establishment of the Information Industries Development Centre and to contribute some \$4 million over two years to the establishment of that exciting centre which will provide great benefits for the small information technology companies in this State.

The EDS company is required, and has agreed, to establish its information processing centre here. This centre is only one of 15 in the world. The company will also establish an information management centre for EDS in this State; again, one of only three in the world. The company is required to establish a program call the 'Channels to Asia Program' (CHAPS) under which South Australian companies will have the opportunity through EDS Asian contacts to market their local products in Asia and the Pacific region.

The EDS contract will result in the creation of additional jobs over and above those employees who are transferring from Government. Already, one of benefits of the EDS outsourcing arrangement is the fact that the processing for the whole of the General Motors Company in this country has moved from Victoria to South Australia. The great advantage seen by the Government in the EDS arrangement is that EDS will be able, and will be required, to perform the Government's work efficiently and in a timely fashion and in such a manner as to save the Government costs over and above those which would have been incurred if the Government had continued to provide the services in-house. Not only does the Government derive that benefit but also the State derives benefits from the establishment of additional centres, additional employment in this State, additional expertise, and the benefits which should be derived by small local companies which will be subcontracting to EDS to provide the work. There are a number of other initiatives in the field of information technology which one could mention. I congratulate the Premier for his vision and leadership in the field and the Government for participating in this most exciting industry. The Government is to be congratulated on its initiatives in relation to information technology and the expenditure in developing this industry in South Australia will pay handsome dividends in the future. I support the Bill.

The Hon. DIANA LAIDLAW (Minister for Transport): I take this opportunity to respond to some of the issues raised by the Hons. Carolyn Pickles and Anne Levy in speaking to this debate. The Hon. Anne Levy asked many questions in relation to the arts. The first addressed the issue of the National Motor Museum redevelopment. The Government stands by its policy commitment made prior to the November 1993 election to support the redevelopment of the National Motor Museum up to a sum of \$5 million. I have kept in close contact with the History Trust over the past two years as the trust has reviewed a range of options for developing the precinct at Birdwood. As I recall, an excellent but very expensive model has been developed costing between \$11 million and \$13 million. I have addressed this

issue with the board and suggested that it may like to reconsider the issue and it is doing so at the present time.

This reassessment is being undertaken by the new Chairman of the trust, the Hon. Murray Hill. I have suggested to Treasury and my colleagues that while this reassessment is being undertaken that no provision be made for a capital fund for 1996-97 and that the priority for the museum redevelopment in this year be shelved while we look at redevelopment options. But I can guarantee the honourable member, as I have the Chairman (the Hon. Murray Hill) and members of the board, that the redevelopment itself is not off the agenda: it is just the earlier options which are off the agenda.

In the meantime, the History Trust is gearing up for a campaign to raise substantial sponsorship assistance from the State's motoring industry for the building and the exhibitions which are to be housed there and which will launch the museum in a new era. I know that the Premier has indicated his strong personal support for this forthcoming fundraising campaign.

In relation to the Bay to Birdwood Run, this Government through Australian major events has done an enormous amount to assist, promote and expand the Bay to Birdwood Run so that it becomes not only a national event but also an international event over the next few years. Our financial support for the run—of course, provided through taxpayers—has also meant that the Bay to Birdwood committee has been able to secure a much better level of sponsorship support. The RAA has committed itself to support the run and the Motorfest (the Festival of Motoring Activities) over the next five years.

Meanwhile, I am pleased to have provided the organisers with contact with overseas motoring enthusiasts, and we will have a strong contingent from Hong Kong participating in the October Bay to Birdwood Run, with some quite exceptional cars that will be imported to Adelaide and possibly go to Sydney for vintage and veteran car runs, classic car runs, later in this year.

The Hon. Ms Levy asked questions in relation to the South Australian Country Arts Trust. The trust's car fleet was transferred on 1 October 1995 and the trust's budget was supplemented later in the financial year by an amount of \$40 300 for a nine year period. In 1995-96 the trust has received full year supplementation of \$61 000, which we understand will continue in future years. I am not sure of the relevance to the \$21 000 figure referred to by the honourable member in the preamble to the question. I am also able to advise that the trust has managed to contain much of the additional cost related to this exercise by discontinuing the lease of two utility vehicles and through a sponsorship arrangement with Mitsubishi, which has enabled the trust to return one passenger vehicle at least for a period of six months.

Questions were asked about the Arts and Industry Development Division of the department, and average full-time equivalent employment positions. The reduced level of average FTEs for the Development of the Arts program mainly reflects the transfer of the strategic policy and planning staff offset by an anticipated increase in the average staffing level managing the funds for the arts in public places.

In respect of triennial funding, financial assistance provided by the Department for the Arts and Cultural Development to arts organisations and individuals in 1996-97 included funding for the Adelaide Festival Centre Trust, but minus any debt servicing costs, and this is estimated to be

\$22.417 million. The estimated annual financial assistance in 1996-97 provided to the State Opera of South Australia, the State Theatre Company, the Jam Factory, the South Australian Youth Arts Board, the Adelaide Festival Centre Trust and the SA Film Corporation is approximately \$13.856 million. The allocations, should all these organisations wish to lock themselves into triennial funding, constitute 61.8 per cent of financial assistance available.

In introducing triennial funding it has been decided that it would be phased in over a three year period so as not to expose the overall arts budget to excessive inflexibility and to allow major assessment and subsequent three year reviews to be spread over a three year time period. The benefits of triennial funding outweigh any funding inflexibility as far as the department and I perceive this issue. Triennial funding gives a company more certainty and enables much longer term planning and audience development. It also reduces the workload in applying for, assessing and monitoring financial assistance. To achieve these benefits companies are required to submit three year business plans with appropriate performance indicators, and they will be monitored on a six monthly basis.

In terms of the Australia Council and related to this issue of funding, I can advise that the Department for the Arts and Cultural Development has initiated a practice whereby general purpose funding applications may be made on the basis of the application form completed for the purpose of Australia Council funding. So, the honourable member's concern about the different funding periods now being considered or implemented by the Australia Council, in terms of one application period a year and the current practice in South Australia of two periods, is unfounded, because of this practice of a general purpose funding application being acceptable for the purpose of Australia Council funding. This obviously reduces the paperwork for putting in submissions. In addition, discussions have taken place with regard to achieving commonality in agreements for triennial funding. I further add that South Australia is looking at whether or not to continue with the current practice of two calls on funds each year plus the quick response scheme, or to reduce that to one call a year plus the quick response scheme.

Questions were asked about Edmund Wright House. The renovations of Edmund Wright House have commenced in the banking chamber to enable the National Museum to set up in that space. There is an excellent exhibition there at the moment, called 'Women with attitude'. Major upgrading of the remainder of the building is due to commence in the next eight weeks, principally addressing fire safety and air-conditioning issues. Considerable effort has been applied to balancing the heritage and safety needs of the building and its occupants. The actual commencement date will be determined once the History Trust's final accommodation needs in the building are determined.

The work should be completed by early 1997, but ongoing minor restoration will continue to be undertaken over a period of approximately 12 months. The current estimate of the renovations is \$800 000, including the cost of re-establishing the State History Centre to the building. This estimate may increase depending on the History Trust's final tenancy arrangement in the building. For the purpose of relocating the State History Centre and upgrading the building, principally for fire and air-conditioning reasons, funds have been set aside in the Services SA budget for 1996-97.

Questions have also been asked regarding the capital grants received by the Adelaide Festival Centre Trust, and I

advise as follows. The estimate of the cost to upgrade the Festival Centre complex as provided in 1992 is \$16.8 million—not, I would quickly add, the \$10 million to which the honourable member referred. This estimate was calculated taking into account the need to keep up with modern theatre technology, to maintain the complex as a premium arts theatre in South Australia and to generally rejuvenate the public areas, and that has been projected to 1997. The estimate was prepared in 1991-92 and was based on information provided by SACON and Entertech, taking into account the needs at the time together with a five year projection plan. Capital grants received since 1993 have been \$1.25 million in 1993-94; \$1.25 million in 1994-95; \$500 000 in 1995-96; and a substantially increased budget for 1996-97 of \$1.7 million. It is not just a matter of deducting the amount of \$4.7 million received from the \$16.8 million projected cost and concluding that a net \$12.1 million is now required, as the cost requirement has also grown over that time, given the advent of new technology and other non-predicted capital requirements.

There has been no attempt to update the capital requirement list since that projected in 1992. It is anticipated that expenditure from this year's grant will be in accordance with the priorities determined by the Adelaide Festival Centre Trust. A major portion of this year's grant will be spent on upgrading areas that have the most impact on the public. Seating is one of the areas identified by the Adelaide Festival Centre Trust as a priority need for upgrading. It has nothing to do with the Premier's seating preferences or those of Her Excellency the Governor, although both have indicated they have been less than satisfied with the seating on the occasions they have attended the Festival Theatre—and those occasions have been many.

I am particularly keen to see the issue of acoustics addressed in the current financial year and in the next few years. This has been a longstanding problem in the past, but not of major significance, because the hall has been designed and used for general purposes. The acoustics should be upgraded so it can increasingly be used for more specialised purposes. Certainly, the Government would be keen, as would the Adelaide Festival Centre Trust, State Opera and Ring Cycle Corporation, to ensure that the acoustics as well as the seating and many of the technical side of the business are upgraded substantially by 1998, in time for the Wagner's Ring Cycle.

In terms of community information services, I can advise as follows. The strategic plan for PLAIN has been distributed for comment and consultation, with the results of the comments now being collated. These responses will be taken into account in refining the plan and in the development of the technology strategic plan now required by Government of all its agencies. Copies of the plan have been circulated widely and further copies are available from PLAIN Central Services or through the State Library of South Australia and other public library services. In terms of the Libraries Board's priorities and distribution of subsidies I am able to advise that in December 1994 the Libraries Board published its first statement of intent with regard to public library development in South Australia for the next five to 10 years. The report 'Future Directions for Public Libraries in South Australia' was widely distributed to all local government councils, public libraries, relevant State Government authorities, some members of Parliament and several other interest groups in South Australia and interstate. It has met with widespread support and has even been used to inform deliberations of the

Cultural Ministers' Council Libraries Working Group and its research program on the role of public libraries in Australia.

The next challenge facing the Libraries Board has been to develop strategies which will enable the implementation of key directions sought in this report. These directions and goals may be summarised as, first, commitment to twin principles of access and equity for public library users; secondly, statewide information provision using the new technologies for delivery, including to remote areas; thirdly, changing the role of the librarian from custodian and gatekeeper to navigator, interpreter, provider and trainer; and, fourthly, the need to draw the focus away from the predominance of book-based services to more widespread use of the electronic media so as to enhance access to worldwide information resources. To achieve all these goals, it is anticipated that some fundamental shifts in the way services are provided may be necessary. To this end, under its new Chairman, Mr Peter Wylie, the Libraries Board has established a working party consisting of State and local government representatives to advise on the necessary ways to secure its key objectives.

Shortly after the establishment of the working party, a successful application for a Commonwealth grant of \$100 000 was made for the purpose of devising a number of options for public library services which the board might consider adopting. A tender document was prepared and the companies invited to respond, with the South Australian company, Hudson Howells, chosen as the successful tenderer to conduct research and to devise the models. This is a fantastic coup for Hudson Howells and also for the State Library, which has championed this project. It is wonderful news for all concerned, not only that the State Library is now rewarded for its efforts with an undertaking of a Commonwealth grant of \$100 000 for the purpose that the State Library has identified but also that another South Australian company, Hudson Howells, was the successful tenderer. The consultants are currently working on the brief set by the board and are due to report within the next month. They will be addressing the board on the progress of their work on 22 July.

I also have some advice regarding changes to the formula for subsidies. It is fairly obvious that implementation of any new service or thrust may require the allocation of funds for such a purpose. This is likely to mean that the existing basis of subsidies to public libraries might be altered to fit the desirable model or models for public library services, albeit within the context of State-local government five year agreements, which have guaranteed a minimum level of sums until 30 June 2000. On the basis of the report now in progress, the board may wish to advise the State Government of alternative means of distributing subsidy. However, this has not been formally considered and will be considered only in the context of the consultants' report if it seems pertinent, and after appropriate consultation and discussion with interested parties. Questions were asked about community information subsidies, and I am able to advise that such subsidies have been incorporated within the subsidies for public libraries in the 1996-97 budget.

A further question was asked about PLAIN Central Services staffing, with the suggestion that there has been a reduction of staff. I can advise that the reduction of three full-time equivalent staff arises from the transfer of these positions to EDS as part of the outsourcing contract. I have some information regarding State Library opening hours which is in table form and which I seek to have inserted in *Hansard*.

Leave granted.

State Library Opening Hours July to October 1993	
Monday, Tuesday & Thursday	9.30 a.m.-6 p.m.
Wednesday & Friday	9.30 a.m.-8 p.m.
Saturday & Sunday	12 p.m.-5 p.m.
October 1993 to February 1994	
Monday	9.30 a.m.-6 p.m.
Tuesday to Friday	9.30 a.m.-8 p.m.
Saturday & Sunday	12 p.m.-5 p.m.
February to September 1994	
Monday to Friday	9.30 a.m.-8 p.m.
Saturday & Sunday	12 p.m.-5 p.m.
September 1994 to Present	
Monday, Tuesday, Wednesday & Friday	9.30 a.m.-8 p.m.
Thursday	9.30 a.m.-5 p.m.
Saturday & Sunday	12 p.m.-5 p.m.

The Hon. DIANA LAIDLAW: Members will note that for 1996-97 the opening hours will remain the same as they are, with some alteration in access arrangements to the rare books and named collections, with materials in those collections being made available for reading in the Historic Treasures Reading Room.

Several questions were asked in relation to the Arts for Public Places Program. This is a program of the Arts and Industry Development Division of the Department for the Arts and Cultural Development and, as such, is reported in the department's annual general report. That same report will address budgets, and it will be noted in the forthcoming budget that, until this time, Art in Public Places was funded on a calendar year basis and was reported under the visual arts program.

The Government's allocations in the calendar years 1995 and 1996 were \$141 000 respectively, of which \$40 000 each year was for project grants. Also, as of the 1996-97 financial year, the Art in Public Places operating and salary expenses will come from the operating and salary lines of arts and industry development. The indication for project funds for 1997 remains at \$40 000 and comes from the grants line.

The total number of projects that were granted funding through Art in Public Places in 1995-96 was 19. No projects have received Art in Public Places funding for 1996-97—at least not at this date. However, some 12 projects have received Art in Public Places funding, some only recently, and have yet to be commenced. They are due for completion this financial year.

A range of significant projects is under discussion, and there are others which have been developed but which may or may not involve Art in Public Places funding. I am able to advise that the Chairperson is Mr Michael Wohlstadt. The other members are: Mr Mark Kimber; Ms Kerrie Lavery; Professor Michael Lennon; Christopher Chapman, representing the Art Gallery; Patricia Les, Services South Australia; and Greg Healey.

I understand that this week my office has received advice in writing from Mr Wohlstadt that due to work commitments he wishes to retire from the committee one year before the expiry of his term of office. He has served the committee extraordinarily well over a number of years, having been originally appointed during the term of the Hon. Anne Levy when she was Minister. However, Mr Wohlstadt is actively involved in Art in Public Places work all over the State, most recently in Kapunda. It will my pleasure to open the southern entrance project on 25 August. If the honourable member would like me to provide her with a list of Art in Public Places projects for which financial assistance grants were received in 1995-96, I will be pleased to do so.

One further matter has been raised by the honourable member, that is, with respect to the Living Health budget. In 1995-96, the board of the then Foundation SA determined a budget based on a three, one, one, one, division among sport and recreation, health, the arts and a board reserve. In preparing the 1996-97 budget, a component described as 'healthy initiatives' was introduced, and this replaced the board reserve, which included some of the original board reserve projects.

In 1995-96, the percentage of Foundation SA expenditure on the arts was 20.4 per cent. For 1996-97, in addition to sponsorship of \$1 850 000 direct expenditure on arts projects under the healthy culture scheme, there is further funding of \$185 000. Arts organisations will also benefit from Healthy Opportunities, Actively Healthy, and Healthy Environment projects—all schemes developed by Foundation SA, which has now been renamed Living Health.

Taking into account the healthy initiatives expenditure, which was formerly designated as part of the arts budget under the board reserve allocation, the percentage of the total living health expenditure allocated to the arts in 1996-97 is 21.1 per cent. This is determined as follows: 33 per cent of Royal Show budget for the Entertainment Pavilion; 50 per cent of Healthy Opportunities; 50 per cent of Actively Healthy; 50 per cent of sponsorship support; as well as 100 per cent of Healthy Culture.

So, the budget, in terms of Living Health and the arts, is more promising than last year when the expenditure was 20.4 per cent. This financial year it is 21.1 per cent. Of course, I would like more money for the arts, but I cannot achieve what I want on each occasion. However, we will keep lobbying for that purpose.

I also have answers to a number of questions asked by the Hon. Carolyn Pickles. The Women's Statement is not intended to be a budget-related document. It reports on planned initiatives using a comprehensive approach to demonstrating progress in a qualitative and quantitative manner. It replaces the practice of retrospective reporting, which was the Government's chief criticism of the former Government's women's budget process. To assist in the preparation of the Women's Statement, agencies are required to report on outputs, and they will be required to provide information on a range of areas, including departmental programs and projects that impact on women, policies of particular relevance to women, gender profile of both employees and external customers where that is available, and gender breakdown on Government boards and committees. The Women's Statement will encourage Government agencies to implement a planned approach to enhancing the status of women by developing inclusive strategic plans. Again, I point out that the emphasis is on outputs and achievements.

Various questions were asked about accommodation costs and a perceived reduction of \$29 000. This money was transferred to the Department for Industrial Affairs for accommodation for the Working Women's Centre. There has been no reduction in accommodation costs for the Office for the Status of Women.

I shall have to seek further information and provide the honourable member with an answer to her questions on women's health centres and funding issues.

The honourable member's fourth question related to the Domestic Violence Resource Unit within FACS which was incorporated into FACS in September 1993 by the former Government and was located in the Office of Family and

Children in May 1995. The Domestic Violence Unit provides specialist training services to Government and non-government agencies and, in particular, human service workers. The unit is currently developing training standards for domestic violence workers through the South Australian Industrial Training and Advisory Board. This will allow domestic violence training to be accredited so that tertiary institutions, such as DETAFE, can incorporate domestic violence training into accredited courses. This is a long overdue, but excellent, initiative.

Meanwhile, the South Australian Police have their own domestic violence training program, and they work closely with the Domestic Violence Unit. Honourable members will be aware that the Domestic Violence Act was introduced by this Government in 1994. I understand that the Attorney-General is presently doing some work on the formation of a ministerial council.

Several questions were asked about the Women's Register. There are presently 460 women on the Women's Register compared with 350 in December 1993. When the Government came to office, women whose names were on the register established by the previous Government were invited to complete a breakthrough register form and advise whether they wished to be included on the breakthrough register and whether they wished to provide an update of skills and experience. This has been successfully completed.

With respect to the question about the Women in Parliament report and the data bank, I can advise that a register of women qualified for appointment to Government boards and committees is held, and its existence will be more widely promoted when the nomination form has been redesigned and reissued in August 1996. In the meantime, the Office for the Status of Women will continue to work cooperatively with the Cabinet office to improve statistical analysis of boards and committees in terms of their information systems. This is a project that I am keen to back strongly.

I can also advise that, in terms of the operation of the women's breakthrough register, there have been approximately 95 requests for women nominees from the Office of the Status of Women for the period January 1994 to June 1996, and these have come from ministerial Cabinet colleagues. An executive search of women suitable for appointment to top level or category 1 and category 2 Government boards and committees was conducted in 1995. Ms Jane Jeffries, a consultant, has been engaged for this purpose. Total membership of category 1 and 2 boards and committees as at June 1996 was 2808, of which 850 or 30.3 per cent were women, and 1958, or 69.7 per cent, were men. These figures identify that there has been a significant increase of over 4 per cent in women's representation on Government boards and committees since November 1993 when the representation of women was 25.6 per cent.

Given the success of the first executive search for women to be appointed to Government boards and committees—and I should add that, of the 20 names first submitted, 17 have now been appointed to this higher level board and four have been appointed as chair of those respective boards on which they serve, and that is a stunning outcome—it has been endorsed by the Status of Women's Ministers conference, and that endorsement has now encouraged us to undertake a second executive search.

One of the reasons we are doing this is that women who accept quite substantial responsibilities in their workplace, whether it be in the Government, non-government or private sector, do not wish necessarily to submit their names and be

on a register. They argue that the Government is seeking executive appointments, and they would like to be head-hunted as any other man in an executive position would expect to be head-hunted for these positions. It is true that women in such circumstances were just not coming forward with the earlier approach of our expecting people to put their name on the register and maintain that on a six monthly basis. That approach was not good enough. We have changed, and the executive search for women initiative is proving to be tremendously successful.

As to the question about migrant women, I can advise that the Government is aware of the abuse of immigrant women and has enacted domestic violence legislation to address many of the issues. It is also working across agencies and through the Migrant Women's Emergency Support Service to ensure that immigrant women know their rights and the Australian law and support them in their choices in a culturally sensitive manner.

I have some advice on funding for the Aboriginal and Multicultural Women's Project. The Department of Family and Community Services provides funding for services for young people, family development services, low income support services, neighbourhood and community development services, industry support and development. The Aboriginal and Multicultural Women's Project tendered for a service to be provided in The Parks area under the Neighbourhood and Community Development Subprogram. Unfortunately, due to the limited availability of funds and the emergence of higher priorities within the Family and Community Development Program, the Minister for Family and Community Services was not able to award a tender to the Aboriginal and Multicultural Women's Project. There is a strong commitment to neighbourhood and community development through the Department of Family and Community Services. The department funds a total of 40 projects.

Questions were asked in relation to the SPARK resource centre. I suggest that the Hon. Carolyn Pickles consider the answer I gave earlier today to a question asked by the Hon. Anne Levy on about 28 or 30 May, as that provides a comprehensive answer. Finally, I advise that, in terms of the Women's Studies Resource Centre, I took representations to the Minister for Further Education when there was a decision by TAFE to review funding for the centre. In December 1995, DETAFE withdrew the staffing allocation and replaced it with a contribution of \$10 000 for its use of the Women's Studies Resource Centre.

Despite my representations, which I thought were reasonable, I was not able to persuade the Minister or TAFE to amend their decision in this regard. I understand that it is working well as far as DETAFE is concerned and, as it is the funding agency, it is entitled to be satisfied with the way in which it allocates its funds and with the services it receives in return. I understand that on both counts it is satisfied at this time. I thank members for their contributions and questions. I trust that my answers have satisfied their queries.

The Hon. G. WEATHERILL secured the adjournment of the debate.

STATUTES AMENDMENT (ABOLITION OF TRIBUNALS) BILL

The House of Assembly intimated that it had agreed to the recommendations of the conference.

TRUSTEE (VARIATION OF CHARITABLE TRUSTS) AMENDMENT BILL

Returned from the House of Assembly without amendment.

OMBUDSMAN (MISCELLANEOUS) AMENDMENT BILL

Returned from the House of Assembly with amendments.

DE FACTO RELATIONSHIPS BILL

The Hon. R.I. LUCAS (Minister for Education and Children's Services): I seek leave to make a statement in relation to the conference on the Bill.

Leave granted.

The Hon. R.I. LUCAS: I inform the Council that the conference on the De Facto Relationships Bill is still proceeding, and that it will be necessary for the conference to continue during the adjournment of the Council and report on Tuesday 23 July 1996. This is covered by Standing Order 254.

ADJOURNMENT

At 5.5 p.m. the Council adjourned until Tuesday 23 July at 2.15 p.m.