

HOUSE OF ASSEMBLY

Tuesday 4 December 1990

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

ASSENT TO BILLS

His Excellency the Governor, by message, intimated his assent to the following Bills:

Acts Interpretation Act Amendment,
Administration and Probate Act Amendment,
Fences Act Amendment,
Landlord and Tenant Act Amendment,
Motor Vehicles Act Amendment (No. 2),
Road Traffic Act Amendment (No. 3),
Rural Industry Adjustment (Ratification of Agreement),
Soil Conservation and Land Care Act Amendment,
Statute Law Revision (No. 2),
Statutes Amendment (Shop Trading Hours and Landlord and Tenant),
Summary Offences Act Amendment (No. 2),
University of South Australia.

PETITION: CHEMICAL SPRAYING

A petition signed by 1 052 residents of South Australia requesting that the House urge the Government to conduct a study into the effects upon local residents and school children of the spraying of chemicals at the Waite and Urrbrae agricultural properties was presented by Dr Armistage.

Petition received.

PETITION: FREE STUDENT TRAVEL

A petition signed by 292 residents of South Australia requesting that the House urge the Government to restrict free student travel on public transport to school hours was presented by Mr S.J. Baker.

Petition received.

PETITION: ALCOHOL CONSUMPTION IN PUBLIC PLACES

A petition signed by 1 239 residents of South Australia requesting that the House urge the Government to allow the prohibition of the consumption of alcohol in public places in Port Augusta was presented by Mrs Hutchison.

Petition received.

PETITION: CANAAN HOMES DEVELOPMENT

A petition signed by 108 residents of South Australia requesting that the House urge the Government to supervise and accept responsibility for the proposed Canaan Homes development was presented by Mr Lewis.

Petition received.

PETITION: HALLETT COVE BUS SERVICE

A petition signed by 241 residents of South Australia requesting that the House urge the Government to extend the bus service to Hallett Cove was presented by Mr Mathew.

Petition received.

QUESTIONS

The **SPEAKER**: I direct that written answers to the following questions on the Notice Paper, as detailed in the schedule that I now table, be distributed and printed in *Hansard*: Nos 1, 5, 184, 199, 202 to 204, 206, 215, 218, 221, 223, 225, 228, 230, 244 to 246, 249, 250, 252, 253, 256 to 258, 268, 273, 274, 302, 324, 326 to 329, 334, 335, 342, 343, 350, 352, 356, 364 to 366, 374, 378, 381, 384, 386, 388, 391, 393 and 400; and I direct that the following answers to questions without notice be distributed and printed in *Hansard*.

RURAL ASSISTANCE BRANCH

In reply to Mr **MEIER (Goyder)** 7 November.

The **Hon. LYNN ARNOLD**: The reply is as follows:

	On Hand 31.12.89	Received	With- drawn	Declined	Appro- ved	On Hand 31.12.90
Debt						
Reconstruction	15	778	17	456	282	38
Farm Build-up	15	235	53	46	145	6
Farm Improvement	3	44	13	15	17	2
Household Support	—	43	—	2	39	2
Re-establishment	6	82	3	5	67	13

SAFA INTEREST

In reply to Mr **MEIER (Goyder)** 7 November.

The **Hon. LYNN ARNOLD**: The average weighted percentage used to retire early the Commonwealth debt to SAFA associated with the schemes of the 1970s was 14.27 per cent.

ROXBY DOWNS SACRED SITE

In reply to Mr **BRINDAL (Hayward)** 17 October.

The **Hon. M.D. RANN**: I wish to thank the honourable member for raising with me his concerns over reports of damage to Aboriginal sites in the Roxby Downs area. Such matters are taken very seriously by me and the Government. The Director of Aboriginal Heritage Branch, Department of Environment and Planning, who is responsible for the protection of Aboriginal sites of significance, has advised me that he attended at Roxby Downs on Friday 2 November. The Environment Superintendent of Roxby Management Services took him to a site on the Borefield Road. Written on a claypan were the words 'CLOSE ROXBY DOWN' in letters approximately 2 metres in length and three quarters of a metre wide and dug a few centimetres into the clay.

At the time a number of visitors were in the area and investigations are continuing with respect to breaches of the

Aboriginal Heritage Act. Roxby Downs management has attempted to erase the wording by spraying it with water. This has been partially successful, but it is anticipated that the first heavy rain will completely eradicate the words.

ADMINISTRATION EXPENSES

In reply to **Hon. T.H. HEMMING** (Napier) 8 November.

The Hon. LYNN ARNOLD: The RFDD administers various lending and grant programs and the cost of administration expenses associated with those programs are met from accumulated surpluses held in the special deposit accounts at Treasury. The kind of expenses are salaries and overheads, rental and office expenses, travel and accommodation and the development of a new management information system for RFDD.

The Commonwealth provides some support for administration expenses for the Rural Adjustment Scheme and the details of the Commonwealth and State share of the expenses are as follows:

ADMINISTRATION EXPENSES (\$M)			
	Commonwealth	State	Total
1988-89	.579	1.126	1.705
1989-90	.524	1.331	1.855

EDWARD VII STATUE

In reply to **Hon. J.P. TRAINER** (Walsh) 17 October.

The Hon. M.D. RANN: My colleague the Minister of Local Government has advised that the memorial statue of Edward VII, which was paid for by public subscription, was unveiled in July 1920 at a site chosen by the Adelaide City Council in front of the Institute Building on North Terrace. The statue depicts the late monarch, in his coronation regalia, with symbolic sculpturing of Australia, peace and justice. The Government is at present renovating the Institute Building and examining possible future appropriate uses for it given its location on Adelaide's principal cultural boulevard. The Minister of Local Government would, of course, consult with the Adelaide City Council on any impact of the statue's present location on the revitalised Institute Building. The member is advised that a senior officer of Adelaide City Council has indicated that council has no plans at present to relocate the statue.

TRAFFIC SPEED CAMERAS

In reply to **Mr MATTHEW** (Bright) 24 October.

The Hon. FRANK BLEVINS: Previous legislation relating to motor vehicle registration transfers required the seller of a motor vehicle to forward a notice of sale to Motor Registration within seven days of disposal of the vehicle. In some cases, a notice of sale was either not forwarded to Motor Registration or was handed to the new owner. In many cases where the notice of sale was forwarded to Motor Registration it was received after the transfer had already been completed by the new owner.

New transfer requirements were introduced in July at the same time as the new on-line computer system. The new system both simplified transfer procedures and tightened up procedures to deter manipulation of the system by those involved in car theft rackets and thereby affords protection to motor vehicle buyers. Under current legislation, the new owner must transfer the registration within 14 days. Failure to do so may result in a late transfer fee being incurred.

Provisions in the Motor Vehicles Act allow the Registrar of Motor Vehicles to record a new owner on the register without receiving an application for transfer. This may be done on advice from the previous owner or at any time it comes to the notice of the Registrar that a vehicle has been sold. The disposal notice which is retained by the seller is proof under the Motor Vehicles Act that responsibility for the vehicle has passed to a new owner.

Public acceptance of the new system is being monitored. Media advertising has been undertaken and pamphlets explaining the new system are being made available to raise public awareness of the new requirements. It is expected inquiries from the public will decrease as people become more aware of the requirements which now apply when buying or selling a motor vehicle. It is not considered appropriate to change the transfer system or the design of the transfer form at this stage.

SHEEP PAUNCHES

In reply to **Hon. H. ALLISON** (Mount Gambier) 25 October.

The Hon. LYNN ARNOLD: Scots can look forward to Burns' Night, confident that haggis will be available. SAMCOR is unable to process sheep paunches because the only acceptable facilities are used to process beef tripe. However, my inquiries have revealed that there are alternative sources of supply, which have been passed on to the butcher concerned.

BOOKMAKERS' LICENSING BOARD

In reply to **Hon. TED CHAPMAN** (Alexandra) 23 October.

The Hon. M.K. MAYES: The only expense necessarily incurred by an applicant who does not currently hold a bookmaker's licence is a non-refundable application fee of \$12. As is the case in an application for employment in any area, applicants may, of their own accord, choose to incur other expenses in the preparation of their applications. The members of the Bookmakers' Licensing Board deny the allegation that certain persons have been assured licences. The board has been at pains to ensure that the selection process is fair, equitable and above reproach. It is for those reasons that interviews will be conducted and industry views taken into account before the final recommendations are made. The board is satisfied that it has acted in a professional and proper manner with respect to the selection process.

RURAL ASSISTANCE

In reply to **Mr MEIER** (Goyder) 18 October.

The Hon. LYNN ARNOLD: The stud breeder referred to was helped in May 1987 with a debt reconstruction loan of \$59 200, at 10 per cent initially, for a term of 15 years. On 13 June 1990 the Rural Finance and Development Division was approached by the stud breeder's bank for an increase in priority from \$30 000 to \$70 000 because the client had purchased a new header and was now short of working capital. As capital purchases are not classed as carry-on requirements, the increase in priority was declined. RFDD was also advised that a private debt of \$10 000 had been cleared.

The purpose of RAS debt reconstruction is to restore the profitability of farm businesses that have become unprofitable through circumstances beyond the control of their operators, but which have the capacity to remain profitable after assistance. RFDD does not believe that a capital purchase of \$40 000 on overdraft rates is a circumstance beyond the control of the operator. It has had in this case the effect of returning the farm enterprise to a non-viable position.

Farmers with existing RAS loans are discouraged from reapplying for additional assistance unless there are demonstrable changes to their operation caused by circumstances beyond their control. It is unlikely that further assistance under RAS will be approved within three years of applicants receiving previous assistance. Repeated increases of RAS debt reconstruction provisions would indicate that previous applications of concessional lending had not achieved their purpose. There would be a distinct possibility that RFDD would maintain a group of farmers in business who could not survive without ongoing institutionalised concessional lending. This is not the purpose of RAS.

At the time of the first interest rate review in June this year the client exercised his right of appeal against an interest rate increase from 10 per cent to 15 per cent. As a result of this appeal his rate was increased to 12 per cent only. RFDD policy is that when clients have made a capital purchase their rate should move to 15 per cent. The argument is that if a client is viable enough to borrow \$40 000 for new machinery he should be able to pay 15 per cent RAS commercial rates. RAS concessional funds are not designed to be used to subsidise machinery purchases at 22 per cent on overdraft. When the client rang on 15 October 1990 seeking further funds under another RAS debt reconstruction he was advised that it was not policy to grant additional concessional funds within a three-year period. However, if his circumstances had changed materially through events outside the farmer's control, RFDD would accept a further application. No new application has been received to date.

It seems quite clear that when a debt reconstruction is agreed to, the client who accepts the terms and conditions of the loan is under an obligation to do all in his power to keep his part of the bargain. This includes being prudent in future financial decisions to guard against undertakings which would prejudice the effectiveness of the original debt reconstruction. Clients who have received debt reconstruction assistance who then undertake borrowings from other sources cannot expect the Government to advance further moneys to rectify a self-induced problem. Nor can banks expect to advance money to such farmers in the expectation that an increase in priority will automatically be granted, thus eroding the Crown's security.

PAPERS TABLED

The following papers were laid on the table:

- By the Minister of Health (Hon. D.J. Hopgood)—
South Australian Health Commission Act 1976—Regulations—Compensable and Non-Medicare Patient Fees.
- By the Minister of Education (Hon. G.J. Crafter)—
Accounting Standards Review Board—Report, 1989-90.
Children's Court Advisory Committee—Report, 1989-90.
National Companies and Securities Commission—Report, 1989-90.
Evidence Act 1929—Report of the Attorney-General relating to Suppression Orders.
Royal Commission into Aboriginal Deaths in Custody:
Report of the Inquiry into the Death of Michael Leslie James Gollan.

Report of the Inquiry into the Death of Joyce Thelma Egan.

Regulations under the following Acts:
Legal Practitioners Act 1981—Fees.
Local and District Criminal Courts Act 1926—Fees.
Supreme Court Act 1935—Probate Fees—Registry Fees.

Justices Act 1921—Rules—Fees.
Corporations Law—Consolidation of the Corporations Act 1989 and the Corporations Legislation Amendment Bill 1990.

By the Minister of Housing and Construction (Hon. M.K. Mayes)—

State Clothing Corporation—Report, 1989-90.

By the Minister of Recreation and Sport (Hon. M.K. Mayes)—

South Australian Harness Racing Board—Report, 1989-90.

By the Minister for Environment and Planning (Hon. S.M. Lenehan)—

Coast Protection Board—Report, 1989-90.
Clean Air Act 1984—Regulations—Backyard Burning (Amendment).
National Parks and Wildlife Act 1972—Regulations—Fees.

By the Minister of Mines and Energy (Hon. J.H.C. Klunder)—

Electrical Products Act 1988—Regulations—Safety Switches.

By the Minister of Labour (Hon. R.J. Gregory)—

Occupational Health, Safety and Welfare Act 1986—Regulations—Manual Handling (Amendment).
Workers Rehabilitation and Compensation Act 1986—Regulations—Prescribed Allowances.

By the Minister of Employment and Further Education (Hon. M.D. Rann)—

South Australian Local Government Grants Commission—Report, 1989-90.
'Jollies Boathouse'—Memorandum of Lease
City of Henley and Grange: By-law No. 2—Streets and Public Places.
District Council of Willunga: By-law No. 15—Beach Regulations and Control.

QUESTION TIME

STATE GOVERNMENT INSURANCE COMMISSION

Mr S.J. BAKER (Deputy Leader of the Opposition): Why did the Treasurer tell the *Advertiser* last week that it would be improper for him to direct the SGIC board? Does he support SGIC's approval of the contentious \$4.5 million property transaction challenged at the recent Bennett and Fisher annual meeting? Will he present a full report to the House on the reasons for the SGIC chief executive's active role at that meeting and the position SGIC adopted? Section 3 (3) of the SGIC Act provides:

... in the exercise and discharge of its powers, duties, functions and authorities, the commission shall, except for the purposes of section 16 of this Act, be subject to the control and directions of the Government of the State acting through the Minister.

The Hon. J.C. BANNON: I would be delighted to respond to that question from the Deputy Leader. First, in relation to the statement I made that it was improper to direct the SGIC in that area, I was, of course, restating the policy which has been followed by successive Governments, Labor and Liberal, that the Treasurer of the day should not interfere directly with the investment commercial decisions made by the SGIC and its board, provided we are satisfied with the board's capacity and the various procedures that are undertaken, apart from those areas where specific approval is required. If the SGIC shareholding in a company goes

above a certain level, that specific approval must be sought. In seeking that approval, reasons why that approval should be given have to be presented by the SGIC.

Apart from that, in terms of the conduct of its investments, it is not the practice or policy to intervene, and it is something that I subscribe to very strongly, because, if in the marketplace it was felt that financial institutions were operating under that sort of direction, they would be very bad signals and would impede the proper commercial performance of those bodies. As I said, that principle has been well established and carried through, and I am simply restating that principle. On other matters of procedure and in other circumstances, there are times when ministerial direction may or may not be required. I might say that, in the eight years that I have been Premier, I am not aware of any occasion on which I have had to issue any direction to the SGIC.

Turning to the Bennett and Fisher matter, the criticism that has been levelled is that, by exercising a vote in support of the board recommendation, the SGIC was departing from its principle of passive shareholding, of a passive investment in companies. I think that is very much a matter of debate. It is certainly true that that is the SGIC's policy, and I think it is a policy that should be supported. It is most important that the moneys raised in this State by the SGIC's commercial activities can be placed in various earning areas, not least of which are South Australian companies, and there have been some key purchases of equities, which have resulted in very good profits, I might add, and which have been important to South Australian companies over the years.

All those decisions must be made on a commercial basis. It is not the job of the SGIC to 'white knight' or in any other way intervene economically, but it does have these holdings, and I am very pleased that it does. I am sure that a number of our major enterprises are pleased, as well. Except in particular circumstances, the policy has been for the SGIC not even to have a place on the board but to play the role of a passive investor.

In this particular instance, the circumstances of which apparently arose fairly urgently, for the SGIC either to have remained passive or to have exercised a vote against the recommendation of the board would have been a major intervention, in the opinion of the Managing Director, who exercised that proxy. I am told that the investment subcommittee of the SGIC gave Mr Gerschwitz, the Managing Director, a proxy to vote in favour of that motion and, by doing so, support the *status quo*, and that was effectively what was done.

I believe that, while criticism may be levied at the particular transaction—and indeed there has been, and that is certainly people's right—I do not believe that there was any impropriety at all in that exercise of the vote in those circumstances. I have raised the matter with both the Managing Director, who exercised the vote—and I have received the report on the reasons for that—and the Chairman of the SGIC, who re-stated that basic policy in relation to the SGIC. He tells me that he is perusing all the documents in relation to the issue and will be issuing a board statement; indeed, that may be issued fairly shortly. However, in order to assist the House in its consideration, I table a copy of the Price Waterhouse Corporate Financial Advisory Service opinion which supported the exercise of the vote and which was distributed to shareholders. It was in part on the basis of this information and recommendation that the vote was so exercised.

CITIZENSHIP CEREMONIES

Mrs HUTCHISON (Stuart): Will the Minister representing the Minister of Ethnic Affairs inform the House whether there are any set guidelines for the performance of citizenship ceremonies? If not, will he lobby his Federal colleague to ensure that a formal protocol is established in keeping with the importance of this decision to prospective Australian citizens?

A young woman, in a letter to the editor of the Port Augusta newspaper, stated that she became extremely upset when, after making arrangements for a citizenship ceremony, she was asked to present herself to the refreshment rooms at the railway station in Port Augusta. At that time the Mayor attempted to conduct the ceremony in between serving pies and pasties to passengers off a train. The young woman refused to accept this and subsequently organised for a ceremony in Whyalla because of the importance attached to such a ceremony by her and her Australian fiancé.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order!

The Hon. LYNN ARNOLD: I hear interjections from members opposite that indicate that this may be about to be an attack on the Mayor of Port Augusta. What I would like to know is whether or not members opposite feel that the discourtesy that was obviously shown to this new citizen of this country was in fact reasonable, and whether or not they believe that a person's being asked to treat what is a special occasion in their life—and I became a citizen of this country many years ago, and a number of other members on this side of the House have, too—as something to be relegated between the serving of pies and pasties is reasonable. I happen to believe that that does not happen to be a reasonable proposition. I am certain that members on this side of the House, who appreciate what citizenship means to people, would also agree.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order!

The Hon. B.C. EASTICK: On a point of order, Mr Speaker—

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order!

The Hon. B.C. EASTICK: A licence for the conduct of citizenship ceremonies is a Federal Minister's prerogative granted to the presiding officer of the council: it is not within the province of the State Minister.

The SPEAKER: The point made by the honourable member has some validity. However, the conduct of ceremonies is carried out by State nominated people—

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order!—that is, by citizens of this State. I believe that, having responsibility for ethnic affairs, the Minister has some impact on this, and I will listen to the answer, but I would ask him to be specific in his answer.

The Hon. LYNN ARNOLD: On a point of order, Mr Speaker, I ask that the member for Bragg withdraw the interjection that he made about me when he called me a 'hypocrite' during the taking of the previous point of order. I take exception to that remark, and ask that it be withdrawn.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order! The Chair did not hear that remark. However, as the Minister has taken offence, I ask the honourable member, if he did say that, to withdraw the remark, but I have no power to force him to do that.

Mr INGERSON: I did make that comment, and I do not believe that it is unparliamentary.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order! Under Standing Orders, the practices of Erskine May and the reference books I have read, the comment is not unparliamentary. I cannot force the honourable member to withdraw it; I can only ask him. The honourable Minister.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order!

The Hon. LYNN ARNOLD: It is to be noted that on other occasions when a statement that I have thought is verging closely (although I accept your ruling in this case, Mr Speaker) has been deemed not unparliamentary, the honourable member concerned has normally had the courtesy to withdraw it.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order! I draw the Minister back to the matter before the Chair.

The Hon. LYNN ARNOLD: The honourable member is hiding behind the fact that Erskine May does not deem it unparliamentary.

The point I was trying to make is that this was a special occasion for the new citizen concerned. I have become a citizen of this country, as have my wife and many other people, and the occasion of becoming a citizen is not something that is taken lightly. For it to be treated by a representative of any tier of government in such a cavalier way as happened in this instance is an outrage.

The question has been asked: what responsibility does a State Minister have in this area? It is, clearly, a Federal matter, since it comes under the Minister for Immigration, Local Government and Ethnic Affairs, the Hon. Gerry Hand. It is worth taking the point made by the member for Stuart and asking my Federal colleague whether guidelines should be applied. It would seem to be unnecessary to have to ask for much, because all experience I have had of local government—

Mr D.S. Baker interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order! The Leader is out of order.

The Hon. LYNN ARNOLD: Certainly, I have found that local government is keen to treat the occasion as seriously as the new citizen does. I hope that regulations do not have to be issued, as most people would want this to be seen as a serious occasion.

STATE BANK

Mr D.S. BAKER (Leader of the Opposition): Did the Treasurer give the State Bank approval under section 19 (7) of the State Bank Act to acquire the United Building Society of New Zealand and to invest \$150 million in the society at the end of June this year? Was Beneficial's acquisition of Southstate Corporate Finance in New Zealand within the terms of Beneficial's trust deed, and is the Treasurer satisfied that both major offshore investments in New Zealand were appropriate decisions by this group? Section 19 (7) of the State Bank Act 1983 provides:

The bank shall not acquire more than 10 per centum of the issued capital of a body corporate without the approval of the Treasurer.

The Hon. J.C. BANNON: I do not have the documents before me, but my memory is that such approval was given as was appropriate. Certainly, if it had been formally requested, it would have been supported in relation to the United Building Society. I point out that that acquisition took place on 29 June, with the aim of providing the bank with a substantial retail presence in New Zealand where, in fact, some major activity on the bank had already taken

place. In fact, there was a good offshore opportunity for the bank to operate.

The State Bank was fully aware of the financial position of the United Building Society at the time of the purchase. That was obviously an important aspect relating to purchase price and the conditions under which such a purchase was to be made. While the United Bank recorded a loss in the first nine months of 1989-90, it actually achieved a profit in the three months since it was acquired by the State Bank. United achieved an after tax operating profit of \$NZ10.38 million in the first three months to 30 September 1990. That demonstrates the benefits of United's conversion to a bank and the strength provided by the State Bank's ownership. I am also advised that the latest profit result was achieved after providing fully for bad and doubtful commercial loans.

The State Bank is confident that over a period that acquisition and the strategic reasons behind it will be fully justified. I will have to take on notice the question concerning the Southstate transaction.

THEBARTON OVAL NOISE

Mr ATKINSON (Spence): Will the Minister for Environment and Planning advise the House of the remedies available to residents of the inner western suburbs to prevent breaches of the Noise Control Act such as the Ausmusic 90 concert at Thebarton on Saturday 24 November?

The Hon. S.M. LENEHAN: I thank the honourable member for his question. I understand from an informal discussion with him before Question Time that the honourable member was able to hear the concert, although he lives about two kilometres from Thebarton Oval—

Mr Lewis: You've answered it.

The Hon. S.M. LENEHAN: No, I have not answered it. I was not aware that the member for Murray-Mallee—

The SPEAKER: Order! The Minister will return to the answer.

The Hon. S.M. LENEHAN: Thank you, Mr Speaker, I appreciate your protection. A number of points to be made in my answer are relevant. Really, it is not wise for concerts of this type being held at Thebarton Oval to be stopped during the event. We would probably see some kind of riot if that was the case. The department actually monitors the response of residents to the noise. I understand that the department was contacted on the first working day after the concert and that four responses were recorded. Subsequently, the department rang the local police and was advised that they received seven or eight complaints.

From this information, from reports from a number of people that they could hear the noise over a very large area, and based also on the information provided by my colleague that the noise was very loud, it seems to me that there is an appropriate means of control, and that would be to apply criteria similar to the criteria applied to the Adelaide Oval when concerts are held either on the oval itself or at Memorial Drive. Only a limited number of concerts are allowed—in fact, seven a year—and they must be concluded on week nights by 11 o'clock and on Sunday nights by 10.30. This policy has been in place since 1983, and the member for Adelaide would agree that the policy has worked relatively well. Of course, the problem is that Thebarton Oval is significantly closer to residences than is Adelaide Oval or the Memorial Drive tennis centre. Therefore, it might be expected that the number of concerts held there each year would be fewer than the number permitted at Memorial Drive.

However, it is important that we put this situation into context. I hope that, once the entertainment centre is open, which I believe might be happening before August next year, the problem that my colleague and his constituents are experiencing may well significantly diminish. It is appropriate to acknowledge that the entertainment centre will have a profound effect not only on those people who are attending the centre but also on neighbouring residents who will be spared some of the loud noise that they are currently having to put up with. We should acknowledge that in the overall benefits resulting from the entertainment centre.

STATE BANK

The Hon. D.C. WOTTON (Heysen): Does the Treasurer approve of the State Bank Group's use of the off balance sheet company Kabani Proprietary Limited to bypass the terms of Beneficial Finance Corporation's 1985 trust deed? In a written response dated 10 October to a question on 21 August 1990 from the Leader of the Opposition concerning Kabani, the Treasurer said:

Kabani was specifically formed by the management of Beneficial Finance in April 1985 to overcome restrictions placed on Beneficial Financial Corporation Limited by the debenture trust deed under which Beneficial and its subsidiaries were governed at that time.

If the Treasurer has made no proposals to the bank's board to alter this arrangement, presumably he approves of it.

The Hon. J.C. BANNON: I do not understand the comment at the end of the question because let me repeat again that, providing the State's financial institutions are operating within the law and the appropriate procedures, it is not only inappropriate but, indeed, illegal for me to interfere in those areas. The first group of people to protest very loudly if there were evidence of such interference would be the Opposition. Indeed, it is very interesting that the questions have been phrased in this way because I am quite sure that, if the Opposition could in any way relate me to specific directions to the State Bank or its subsidiaries to undertake or do certain things, it would be braying for blood in this House. The reverse is true because it knows that the State Bank and its commercial charter are protected—protected, I might say, under an Act passed on a bipartisan basis by this Parliament. Memories are very short on the other side—

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order!

The Hon. Jennifer Cashmore interjecting:

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

The Hon. J.C. BANNON: A number of the members who interject are doing so in order to cover their embarrassment for the fact that, when this Bill was debated—

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order! The Leader is out of order; and the member for Bragg is out of order with his interjection.

The Hon. J.C. BANNON: When this Bill was debated, this was a provision that the Opposition was particularly concerned should be so inserted. If the reverse has occurred, because of the change of leadership in the Liberal Party, and there is a new approach to the State's financial institutions and a desire that there should be control and direction by the Treasurer of this State, I believe that the only honest course is for the Leader of the Opposition to introduce a Bill to that effect. He, or any of his colleagues (including the member for Heysen who asked this question), has a perfect right to introduce such a measure. If that is their position, let members opposite state it and let them move to enact it. I will say that I will oppose that view,

and so will my Government, for the very good reasons that we all agreed in 1983-84 were the case.

In relation to Kabani, a response has in fact been provided to the Leader of the Opposition. Indeed, a statement was issued on 2 October—that long ago—by the General Manager of the State Bank, and I would refer the honourable member to that statement. I know it is a bit unfair for me to do this, because he has just had the question handed to him on a typed piece of paper—

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order! The Leader is out of order.

The Hon. J.C. BANNON: —as part of the announced campaign by the Opposition to attack the State Bank. It is pretty rough in a difficult financial environment, with the private banks indicating the difficulties they are experiencing, to have a particular bank singled out in this House under parliamentary privilege in whatever way to have aspersions cast on it simply because it has the misfortune to be State owned. Let me continue—

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order! The Deputy Leader is out of order.

The Hon. J.C. BANNON: As that statement on 2 October made clear, there is no mystery in the State Bank's dealings with the off-balance sheet company. Indeed, it is a common practice in financial circles for any of those institutions, privately or publicly owned, to undertake, and the Leader of the Opposition knows it. I am delighted that he is at least discreet enough to give another one of his hapless frontbenchers the question to ask, because it preserves his integrity in this area since he knows very well—just as his Federal colleague, Dr Hewson, knew very well when he attacked a particular transaction in relation to debentures on the same basis—that this is a normal practice.

The 1960 debenture trust deed restricted Beneficial Finance in acquiring other companies and prevented Beneficial Finance undertaking separate secured borrowings. I make that point as well. Beneficial's business is in the property market. When the property market goes up or down, Beneficial either profits or loses to a greater or lesser extent. It has been extremely profitable to date. It is experiencing loss at the moment, but the loss is there in property in secured assets which, held long term, can yield dividends.

The problem that was created by the 1960 debenture trust deed was overcome through the technique of the off balance sheet company, which is well used and understood in financial circles. It is not a mystery—it is quite clear in the marketplace. The reason it was not listed in the annual accounts of either Beneficial Finance or the State Bank, which is what led to this concept of a mystery, is that it is not required by the accounting standard to be reported in the annual accounts.

It is not a case of hiding losses or assets: Beneficial Finance is the ultimate beneficiary of Kabani. Even if it were to take over some of the bad debts of Beneficial Finance, that would ultimately be reflected in the financial performance of that company. Again, I ask why this old-hat matter is being brought up in this way when it has been fully answered. The reason is that the Leader has announced this strategy or tactic to have a go at the State Bank and its subsidiaries, and anything goes. I think it is a pretty pathetic performance and I believe that, in the current economic climate, it is pretty irresponsible, too.

AGRICULTURAL ESTIMATES

The Hon. T.H. HEMMINGS (Napier): I direct my question to the Minister of Agriculture. Will the Minister advise the House—

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order! The member for Murray-Mallee is out of order.

The Hon. T.H. HEMMINGS:—about the latest agricultural estimates in relation to principal commodities for 1990 and 1991?

The Hon. LYNN ARNOLD: I thank the honourable member for his question, which obviously is of great concern to many members in this place, if not all. I do have the latest figures provided by my department on the predictions for the 1990-91 season. Those figures confirm the seriousness of the situation and the major loss of income that will be going to rural South Australia and, of course, the implications that that has for the State economy at large.

I will deal with each of the major commodities. In the case of wool, production will be down this year at 120.5 million kilograms, greasy (as estimated by the department), compared to 129.6 million kilograms greasy last year. That reflects the fact that there have actually been less sheep shorn in South Australia: the figure is down from 19.1 million to 17.6 million. The gross value of the greasy wool last year was \$602 million, and this year it is \$450 million. Of course, that fall is even greater in terms of real returns to farmers, because last year the wool levy was 8 per cent, which represented a \$48 million total payment, and this year, at 25 per cent, it represents \$113 million. Therefore, the gross value net of levy to producers has fallen from \$554 million to \$337 million, which is a decline of 39 per cent.

In relation to wheat, the situation is that production will again be down. Of course, last year was a particularly good year for wheat production in South Australia. For something like the third time since the war, South Australia was the second largest wheat producing State in the Commonwealth. This year's estimate is that production will be two million tonnes, down from 2.57 million tonnes last year. The price has also collapsed from \$195 per tonne to an estimate this year of \$120 per tonne. Therefore, the value will fall from \$501 million to less than half of that at \$240 million, which is a decline of 52 per cent. For barley, production is estimated to go down from 1.7 million tonnes to 1.52 million tonnes. The price is predicted to go down from \$142 per tonne to \$111 per tonne. Therefore, the value will decline by 30 per cent from \$241 million to \$169 million.

With beef and veal there is an estimate that there will be a modest increase of 4 per cent in the average price per dressed weight. While that is below inflation, at least it is an increase in money terms. For sheep meat the average saleyard price for mutton is forecast to fall by 36 per cent this coming season. Members have already canvassed the issue of the citrus industry in great detail and know the seriousness of it. On 11 October the United States Department of Agriculture forecast a 50 per cent increase for the 1990-91 Florida orange crop and that has had a marked effect. Brazilian citrus juice concentrate prices have fallen to \$1 271 per tonne from around \$2 400 per tonne. Before the drop in world price, the local price for oranges was \$105 per tonne. However, that price of \$105 was regarded as being below the cost of production.

In viticulture, there is an oversupply situation in South Australia for wine grapes, and uncontracted growers are expected to have difficulty disposing of their fruit. Although

there is some apparent optimism regarding dried vine fruits, with apricots it is indicated that high stocks carried over from last season (600 tonnes) will exacerbate the situation with this year's production. It is estimated that there will be an uptake of only 2 000 tonnes in the processing industry of a harvest of 2 800 tonnes, so it appears that there will be a carry-over of some 1 400 tonnes, or about half this year's production. Imported apricots are selling at between 50 per cent to 75 per cent of the price of local produce. These figures indicate the seriousness of the situation in the rural economy and the implications that it will have for the wider economy.

STATE BANK

Mr INGERSON (Bragg): My question is directed to the Treasurer. What is the reason for Kabani Pty Ltd being the original and still current proprietor of the State Bank Centre building? Why is the building site owned by the company 91 King William Street (No. 1) Proprietary Limited, which in turn is owned by the company Ollago Proprietary Limited? Why are these latter companies and their directors not listed in any of the annual reports of the State Bank group? Is the Treasurer satisfied that these financial arrangements are fair and reasonable?

The Hon. J.C. BANNON: Kabani is not the owner of the State Bank Centre. I will find some detailed briefing notes on this matter.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order!

The Hon. J.C. BANNON: In this area, particularly in light of the way in which information can be misused, it is most appropriate that, where possible, as has always been my practice, I check the exact detail, because it is all very well to make estimates.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order!

The Hon. J.C. BANNON: I will supply an answer for the honourable member.

TRAINING PROGRAMS

Mr HOLLOWAY (Mitchell): Will the Minister of Employment and Further Education inform the House of recent grants to local organisations to enable them to conduct training programs? In my electorate, the TOP (Training Office Procedures) program, sponsored by the Edwardstown Primary School council, recently received \$21 300 from the State Government to enable it to conduct intensive 12-week training programs. I am pleased that this high quality program has been recognised by the State Government and I would like to know what other programs have benefited from the scheme.

The Hon. M.D. RANN: I thank the honourable member for his question because he introduced the TOP program to me earlier this year and I was very impressed with its outcomes. I am pleased to announce to the House that \$447 800 has been allocated to local organisations under the WorkReady program. In the past day or so, eight organisations have received these grants which are aimed at providing opportunities for people who are most disadvantaged in the labour market, and the pre-employment training program is aimed at those who have been unemployed for a long time, those who live in areas where there is high unemployment, those who are aged over 40 years, Aborig-

inal people, women, people with disabilities and those from non-English speaking backgrounds.

This scheme is an excellent example of local organisations responding to the needs of the local community, with the aid of the State Government. The sponsored organisations provide training to give people new skills to make them more competitive within the labour market, and some projects seek out employment options. The TOP program is an excellent scheme for adults, mainly women, wanting tutoring in office skills to enable them to re-enter the work force. We have also been keen to assist people from non-English speaking backgrounds through a significant grant to the Migrant Resource Centre, which provides vocational counselling and referral to employers and training providers.

Aborigines would be among the participants in the Port Augusta human services employment program sponsored by the very active Port Augusta Training Committee. This project will provide three 10-week courses in Port Augusta to train people to work in a range of human service agencies.

Members interjecting:

The Hon. M.D. RANN: I heard an interjection—I think from the member for Playford—about the curfew in Port Augusta. Certainly, when I was in Port Augusta on Friday to announce this scheme, there seemed to be very strong support from local people for positive programs for young people, unemployed people and Aborigines.

Members interjecting:

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

The Hon. M.D. RANN: The honourable member asked whether the Mayor would curfew this. Certainly, I think all of us would be concerned that Port Augusta is somehow being stigmatised around this country as some kind of Beirut in South Australia, and I think the message to the Mayor of Port Augusta is that curfews do not work in Beirut and will not work in Port Augusta.

The SPEAKER: Order! The Minister will resume answering the question and not comment.

The Hon. M.D. RANN: Other programs to be funded are the Inner Northern Suburbs Employment Initiative to set up a Women's Employment Training Service; the Western Region of Councils researching employment opportunities and linking adult unemployed to local employers; DOME (Don't Overlook Mature Expertise), which is doing an outstanding job and has done so for some years; the Hackham West Community Centre key skills program, which was strongly supported by the Minister for Environment and Planning; and the Grange Community Centre office retraining program.

The SPEAKER: I remind Ministers that there is the opportunity for ministerial statements instead of using Question Time.

STATE BANK

The Hon. E.R. GOLDSWORTHY (Kavel): My questions are directed to the Treasurer. How many off balance sheet companies exist within the State Bank group? How many were created by Beneficial Finance? What are their total assets and liabilities? Is the Treasurer satisfied that the trust deeds are not being bypassed to the disadvantage of investors and that the true financial position of the group and its taxation responsibilities are not being clouded by off balance sheet arrangements?

The Hon. J.C. BANNON: I am quite satisfied that the bank is conducting its financial affairs in the appropriate way. I have no information to the contrary. I think its

performance over the years has certainly vindicated the support that has been provided by this House in the past to the State Bank in its operations. I will take the honourable member's question on notice and ask the board whether it is able to provide that information.

FAX DIRECTORIES

Mr FERGUSON (Henley Beach): Will the Minister of Education, representing the Minister of Consumer Affairs, inform the House whether the Office of Fair Trading is aware of questionable tactics being undertaken by people selling space in fax directories?

I was recently contacted by telephone by a firm called Australian Business and Fax Directories, which is a Queensland firm and which requested the number of my fax machine and asked whether I was prepared to authorise the entry of my fax number into a fax directory. I requested that correspondence be sent to me on this matter. Correspondence was subsequently sent and I was surprised to find out that charges of up to \$950 are made for entry into this directory.

Further inquiries with other small businesses in the Henley Beach area have revealed that requests of a similar nature are being made from companies with addresses in Switzerland and Denmark. It is extremely unlikely that these directories are actually printed. Small businesses, once having authorised that their name appear in directories, have been surprised to receive invoices seeking large amounts of money for their entry into fax directories. South Australian law stops at the State border, and very little can be done to control these sharp practices which are being undertaken by these firms.

The Hon. G.J. CRAFTER: I certainly will convey this information to my colleague in another place and obtain a report from her on this matter.

STATE BANK

Mr BECKER (Hanson): Will the Treasurer confirm that, contrary to all the State Bank's advice up to the end of last week that only four off-balance sheet companies had been created by Beneficial Finance Corporation, there are 58 off-balance sheet companies in the State Bank group with assets of \$359 million—and 53 of those were created by Beneficial?

The Hon. J.C. BANNON: I have already indicated to the member for Kavel that I will be obtaining that information from the board, and I would ask the honourable member to be patient.

Members interjecting:

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

GROUND WATER QUALITY

Mr HAMILTON (Albert Park): Will the Minister for Environment and Planning advise the House of the principal findings of the report prepared by the AG Consultants group of ground water quality and its management in the South-East, and say what action the Government is taking on the recommendations of that report?

Members interjecting:

The Hon. S.M. LENEHAN: It is very interesting, Mr Speaker, that members opposite find an issue as important

as the quality of the South-East's water something of an amusement. I can assure the Parliament that members on this side of the House take these issues very seriously, and I am delighted to inform the House—

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order!

Mr LEWIS: On a point of order: since the Minister began answering the question, she has not addressed the substance of the question.

The SPEAKER: What is the point of order?

Mr LEWIS: Standing Order No. 98.

The SPEAKER: I accept the point of order and ask the honourable Minister to come to the subject.

The Hon. S.M. LENEHAN: Thank you, Mr Speaker, but it is very difficult to speak over the gaggle opposite. The South-Eastern Ground Water Study was undertaken to address community concerns and publicity which had been propagated before the last State election, involving contamination of the South-Eastern ground water. I commissioned the report because I felt that it was important to assure the residents—both the farming community and the urban residents—of the South-East of the safety or otherwise of their ground water.

I am delighted to inform the Parliament—and I am sure that one of the local members will be pleased to receive this information—that the report has shown no significant or widespread contamination of ground water. In fact, there are only a few selected areas where, with the lessons of hindsight, it can be said that past practices have now been halted.

The report provided recommendations for the future monitoring and management of ground water quality, and we have the opportunity to make those recommendations work by involving the South-Eastern community. Accordingly, I released the report last week for public comment. The South Australian Water Resources Council and the Lower and Upper South-East Water Resources Committees will have a key role to play in coordinating the programs. The Engineering and Water Supply Department will develop a program based on the recommendations of the report and on comments from the public.

One vitally important aspect of the report provides that we must promote public education and community involvement programs which will provide a ground water care ethic and a public commitment to ground water quality management similar to the land care programs so successfully implemented by my colleague the Minister of Agriculture. It is important that we undertake further research and investigation into nitrogen leaching rates, improved treatment and disposal of agricultural wastes and the leaching of other contaminants such as those in the timber industry.

I should like to congratulate the community of the South-East on the positive way in which it responded to the consultants' questions and not only contributed to the contents of this important report but, I believe, will contribute to the successful implementation of its recommendations.

NATIONAL CRIME AUTHORITY

The Hon. B.C. EASTICK (Light): Has the Premier received any advice from the NCA on the latest reported development in its investigation of matters referred to the authority in February last year by the Attorney-General? If not, will the Premier immediately ask the NCA whether it is true that the authority has known for up to a year about the existence of a tape-recording and written business records which it seized only late last week, and seek an expla-

nation for this delay, in view of his previous public statements about the time it is taking to complete this investigation? Can the Premier say whether the authority may now produce a final report on this investigation in the near future?

The Hon. J.C. BANNON: No, I have not had any recent contact with the NCA and certainly do not intend to become involved in its operational methods. Certainly, I am very anxious, as I am sure all members are, for them to complete their investigation and present their report. The sooner they do it the better, but the Chairman has not been able to give a precise date for that. All he can say is that they are making every effort to see that it is completed as soon as possible. As the honourable member mentioned, I have already been on the record as saying the sooner the better: it has been far too long.

RED-BACK SPIDERS

The Hon. J.P. TRAINER (Walsh): In the interests of arachnophobes, can the Minister of Agriculture advise the House of what particular seasonal dangers the community faces from red-back spiders?

Members interjecting:

The Hon. J.P. TRAINER: You should go and see your proctologist. Following the concerns expressed by the member for Napier regarding the pea weavils, leaf cutter bees and yellow paperwasps, I was disturbed to read a press report in the *News* of 7 November headed 'Red-back numbers crawl up', which stated:

South Australia faces an increase in the number of red-back spiders this year, prompting warnings from the Agriculture Department and pest control companies. The contribution of the recent hot spell and the extensive spring rains has caused a marked increase in the red-back population. 'It is the worst we have ever known.' Flick sales manager, Mr Reg Guppy, said. 'We have been plagued by calls from people wanting to get rid of the spiders.'

The Hon. LYNN ARNOLD: I thank the honourable member for his question. Indeed, when I heard that he was going to ask his question and I then heard that the Deputy Premier recently had an incident involving a red-back spider in his motel room, it suddenly brought about the prospect that there may be somewhat of a mini-epidemic of red-back spiders. However, I can say that the Senior Entomologist of the Department of Agriculture (Mr Hopkins) had the implication attached to his comments that he believed there was an epidemic. That is not the case. He did not indicate that when he was interviewed by the newspaper. Indeed, he does not believe that the numbers are any higher than usual for this time of the year.

The red-back spider, whose official name is *Latrodectus mactans hasselti*, occurs throughout Australia with other subspecies found in many other parts of the world. Indeed, it is known as the Katipo in New Zealand, the black widow in North America, the button spider in Africa and the Malmignatte in southern Europe. Red-back spiders live in protected niches such as hollow logs, rock crevices, buildings and under litter—for example, tins and cans—and perhaps in motel rooms, from time to time. An anti-venene for red-back spiders' venom became available in the 1950s and, as a result, although red-back bites are not infrequent today, deaths from bites are extremely rare. Nevertheless, anyone who does have a bite from a red-back spider is advised to seek medical attention promptly.

The Entomology Unit of the Department of Agriculture has not had many inquiries about red-back spiders recently and, as I said, the advice of the Senior Entomologist is that we do not have anything of an epidemic. What might have

sparked some interest is that early in November a *Quantum* program on television reported something that seemed to be taking place in Queensland where red-back spiders may, by cross-breeding, be forming a hybrid species with a new species of spider that has been recently introduced. The implications of that hybrid breed are presently being studied by Dr Robert Raven of the Queensland Museum. We have no advice that that has any immediate implications for people in South Australia.

ST JOHN AMBULANCE

Dr ARMITAGE (Adelaide): Is the Minister of Health aware that, with the introduction of a fully unionised and paid St John Ambulance staff replacing integrated volunteers, patients confined to bed in nursing homes this year will not be transported to their homes for Christmas dinner with their families and returned the same day? Will the Minister give a direction to the St John Ambulance Service to reverse its decision? For 40 years there has been a compassionate practice of ambulance volunteers, particularly younger volunteers, rostering themselves on duty on Christmas day to ensure that sufficient ambulances will be available to meet the requests from patients confined to bed to join their families for Christmas dinner.

Even when a couple of years ago, under the influence of the AEA, volunteers were forbidden to work on public holidays unless the holiday fell on a Saturday or Sunday, the ambulance service continued this Christmas practice. It seems only now that the volunteers are gone, will the Christmas practice disappear.

The Hon. D.J. HOPGOOD: I will check the accuracy of the honourable member's allegations and then take whatever action seems appropriate.

SEAFORD JOINT VENTURE

Mr HOLLOWAY (Mitchell): Will the Minister for Environment and Planning advise the House of progress made by the Seaford joint venture for the development of residential land together with associated services? Will the Minister also advise when allotments will be available for sale?

The Hon. S.M. LENEHAN: I recently had the honour and privilege of opening the Seaford joint venture sales and information centre, and I can inform the House that it will be, I think, a most exciting project. While the Seaford joint venture was established only some five months ago, it has been able to produce the first allotments in record time and, I might add, to the very highest standards. The first allotments went on sale on Saturday 24 November this year. I remind the House that Seaford is the second major joint venture between the Government and the private sector, and illustrates again that South Australia leads the nation in this innovative form of project—

Members interjecting:

The Hon. S.M. LENEHAN: That is interesting, because I hope that the shadow Minister will support this extremely important planning and housing development. The goodwill and the sense of fair play which has been evident between the joint venture partners, the Noarlunga council and the State Government has been to the benefit of all parties concerned and, of course, ultimately the overall winners will be the new residents in the area.

I remind members that this project covers some 726 hectares and that it will eventually house some 20 000 people living in 7 000 new dwellings. I believe that the most

significant part of this development is that half of the 7 000 allotments will be of medium density. At a time when there is enormous pressure on the infrastructure requirements for new suburban areas it is vitally important that our new estates have a mix of housing types. This is an urban fringe development which will reflect the traditional blocks as well as medium density. It is vitally important that every member of this Parliament gets behind such joint venture projects because not only are they successful but they ensure that we can provide affordable, good quality housing, particularly for young married couples and young home owners.

DEATH OF PRISONER

Mr MATTHEW (Bright): Will the Minister of Correctional Services table in Parliament any reports prepared by his department on the murder of Anthony Stone at Yatala prison in October 1989? I seek this information in the light of some very disturbing allegations put to me following the Government's decision to offer a \$25 000 reward in this matter. Anthony Stone had complained previously of maltreatment by departmental staff while he was being held in the Adelaide Remand Centre. A letter to his widow dated 24 September 1987 from the department's Executive Director, Mr Dawes, denied Mr Stone's allegations in the following terms:

The allegations in your letter that your husband is beaten up and treated with contempt are completely refuted by the Adelaide Remand Centre management.

However, I am advised that, on the day of his murder at Yatala, the following events occurred: gaol inmates working as kitchen staff were not searched by the prison officer on duty as they routinely should have been; while the same officer was on duty, cameras keeping this area under surveillance where Mr Stone was murdered were switched off. When a knife was noticed to be missing from the kitchen, no search was undertaken to find it. One prison officer is alleged to have said that he 'knew Stone was going to get his head punched in, but I never knew it was going to go this far'. It has now been put to me that the reward offer has been sought to serve as a bribe to encourage selective information to be provided about this matter and connivance in the murder.

The Hon. FRANK BLEVINS: The answer is 'No'; I will not table any documents dealing with this issue. Of course, it is a matter for police investigation and any criminal activity of this nature, whether in a prison or anywhere else, is dealt with by the police. If the member for Bright has any information dealing with this crime, or any other crime, he has a duty to go to the police. However, I will save him the trouble by asking my colleague, the Minister of Emergency Services, whether he will ask the police to interview the member for Bright to find out what information he may have that will assist them with their inquiries.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order!

The Hon. FRANK BLEVINS: It seems to me that the member for Bright is almost alleging some kind of conspiracy to murder amongst prison officers. That is a pretty serious charge to make. If the member for Bright has any information at all to back up his allegation, the proper place to take that information is to the police. I will see that arrangements are made to interview the member for Bright as early as possible. Who knows, he may qualify for the reward.

BEACH CLEAN-UP

Mr HAMILTON (Albert Park): Will the Minister for Environment and Planning consider a campaign similar to that being undertaken in Western Australia, in which the community cleans up its local beaches and tries to find the source of dangerous marine debris? A report from Western Australia quoting Ms Olson, the head of the Greenpeace department of ocean, ecology and wildlife, states that a similar program has been very successful in New Zealand. In the report Ms Olson says that things are going over the sides of ships at the rate of five million items a day.

Members interjecting:

The Hon. S.M. LENEHAN: The Opposition has some problem with the fact that I am actually answering the questions that my colleagues are asking me. I thought that was the purpose of Question Time. I am sorry if I have been misinformed for the past five years.

An honourable member interjecting:

The Hon. S.M. LENEHAN: I can assure the honourable member that this is not a 'Dear Dorothy' question.

Mr Hamilton: I have just come back from Western Australia.

The Hon. S.M. LENEHAN: Yes, the honourable member has returned from Western Australia with a proposal that I believe must be taken seriously and warrants investigation by my department. I am very pleased to have the department look at this suggestion and the kind of beach clean-up that has been undertaken by communities in Western Australia. I am delighted to see that Greenpeace in Western Australia is getting behind this particular project. I only hope that Greenpeace in South Australia is prepared to put its skills and energy into such a project.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order!

The Hon. S.M. LENEHAN: I do not have any details, other than those provided by the honourable member, but I am very pleased to have the matter investigated, and I will be very happy to provide him with a more detailed report as soon as it is available.

MANAGEMENT OF COASTAL LANDS

Mr LEWIS (Murray-Mallee): I direct my question to the Minister for Environment and Planning. What policy decision has the Government made on the management of coastal lands adjacent to National Parks and Wildlife Act reserves? Will the Minister explain, in particular, how this decision will affect beach access for amateur fishermen, which has been an issue of long-standing controversy in the South-East? Quite simply, does the Government intend removing the control of these beaches from local government?

The Hon. S.M. LENEHAN: I believe that the honourable member is referring to the Coorong area. The first part of his question was fairly general. First, he asked whether I have done anything in areas adjacent to national parks to change their classification. The simple answer to that is 'Yes'. Recently, I announced that I will introduce legislation to change both Katarapko and the Coorong from game reserves and bring them under the national park framework. I am happy to provide the honourable member with a long and detailed explanation about why I think it is vitally important for the conservation and preservation of these very important and sensitive areas. In the case of the Coorong game reserve, it is adjacent to a national park, while Katarapko is a game reserve.

The second part of the honourable member's question related specifically to the Coorong, and I can assure the honourable member that, for a long time, there have been ongoing discussions with the relevant councils—

Mr Lewis interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order!

The Hon. S.M. LENEHAN: The honourable member's question, should he like to read it again, indicated a general approach and would have led a normal person to assume that he asked about the general issues of changing the status of game reserves to national parks. If the honourable member is interested, I will be pleased to provide him with an answer to the second part of his question. Along with other members, including the Opposition Leader, the honourable member would be aware that there have been ongoing discussions and negotiations over some time with the relevant local council authorities, the National Parks and Wildlife Service and the Coorong National Parks and Wildlife Advisory Committee so that a proper management plan can be developed for the Coorong National Park.

Those discussions have resulted in widespread canvassing of the options for the best form of control and management of the beaches. When the Government has made its decision and when the management plan is ready for release, I will be only too pleased to provide the honourable member with a copy of the plan and to more fully answer his question. However, he will have to be patient just a little longer while the management plan awaits conclusion and release.

SITTINGS AND BUSINESS

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

That the time allotted for completion of the following Bills:

Electricity Trust of South Australia Act Amendment,
Debits Tax,
Superannuation Act Amendment,
Boating Act Amendment,
Land Agents, Brokers and Valuers Act Amendment,
Land Acquisition Act Amendment,
Motor Vehicles Act Amendment (No. 5),
Murray-Darling Basin Act Amendment,
Trustee Companies Act Amendment,

be until 6 p.m. on Thursday 6 December.

Motion carried.

STATUTES AMENDMENT AND REPEAL (MERGER OF TERTIARY INSTITUTIONS) BILL

Returned from the Legislative Council with the following amendments:

No. 1. Page 3 (Clause 9)—After line 44 insert new subclause as follows:

(5a) In issuing an award in the name of the college under subsection (4) or (5), the university may cause the common seal of the college to be affixed to the award in the presence of such signatories as the council of the university may appoint for the purpose.

No. 2. Page 4, line 16 (clause 11)—Leave out 'express'.

No. 3. Page 4, line 17 (clause 11)—After 'is' insert 'to lapse or is'.

No. 4. Page 7, line 11 (clause 19)—After 'college' insert 'or, if the student so elects, in the name of the university and the institute or the college'.

No. 5. Page 7, line 20 (clause 19)—After 'university' insert ', in the name of the university and the institute or college'.

No. 6. Page 7 (clause 19)—After line 25 insert new subclause as follows:

(5a) In issuing an award in the name of the institute or the college under subsection (4) or (5), the university may cause the common seal of the institute or the college (as the case may

require) to be affixed to the award in the presence of such signatories as the council of the university may appoint for the purpose.

No. 7. Page 8, line 9 (clause 21)—Leave out 'express'.

No. 8. Page 8, line 10 (clause 21)—After 'is' insert 'to lapse or is'.

No. 9. Page 11, line 3 (clause 29)—After 'college' insert 'or, if the student so elects, in the name of the university and the college'.

No. 10. Page 11, line 11 (clause 29)—After 'university' insert 'in the name of the university and the college'.

No. 11. Page 11 (clause 29)—After line 14 insert new subclause as follows:

(5a) In issuing an award in the name of the college under subsection (4) or (5), the university may cause the common seal of the college to be affixed to the award in the presence of such signatories as the council of the university may appoint for the purpose.

No. 12. Page 14, line 8 (clause 37)—After 'college' insert 'or, if the student so elects, in the name of the university and the college'.

No. 13. Page 14, line 16 (clause 37)—After 'university' insert 'in the name of the university and the college'.

No. 14. Page 14 (clause 37)—After line 19 insert new subclause as follows:

(5a) In issuing an award in the name of the college under subsection (4) or (5), the university may cause the common seal of the college to be affixed to the award in the presence of such signatories as the council of the university may appoint for the purpose.

No. 15. Page 18, line 10 (clause 58)—After 'statutes' insert 'or regulations'.

No. 16. Page 18, line 13 (clause 58)—After 'statutes' insert 'or regulations'.

Consideration in Committee.

The Hon. M.D. RANN: I move:

That the Legislative Council's amendments be agreed to.

I thank members from both Houses of this Parliament for their cooperation on a very difficult piece of legislation dealing with even more difficult changes to tertiary education in South Australia. We have seen the culmination of 11 months of negotiations to establish a new University of South Australia, which is formed from the merger of the South Australian Institute of Technology and its three campuses with three campuses of the South Australian College of Advanced Education, namely the Salisbury, Underdale and Magill campuses. We also see the merger of the Sturt campus of the South Australian College of Advanced Education with the Flinders University; and the merger of the Roseworthy Agricultural College and the Adelaide camps of SACAE with the University of Adelaide.

Obviously, these are major changes. They are not just changes in a cosmetic sense: they are changes of substance, with a significant capital works funding boost to the new university to make sure that it is up and running straight away and, of course, with legislation which puts into place changes to the central mission and objectives of the new university. In particular, there are provisions for access and equity and equal opportunity for broadening educational opportunity for Aborigines.

Throughout this 11 months, there has been considerable goodwill from members of the higher education fraternity. I would like to mention the leadership of the universities: from the University of Adelaide, Dame Roma Mitchell (Chancellor), Kevin Marjoribanks (Vice-Chancellor) and Frank O'Neil (Registrar); from Flinders University, Deidre Jordan (Chancellor), John Lovering (Vice-Chancellor) and Vin Massaro (Registrar); and from the new University of South Australia, Lew Barrett (formerly President of the South Australian Institute of Technology) and John McDonald (President of the South Australian College of Advanced Education). Each has made an outstanding contribution to the merger process, along with Alan Mead (Director of the Institute of Technology) and Denise Bradley (Director of the South Australian college). I would also like

to mention the role of the member for Light, as President of Roseworthy Agricultural College, and also Barry Thistlewaite, the Director. I think that in each of those higher education institutions parochial concerns have been put behind each individual and each individual institution to ensure the best possible outcome for the State in terms of higher education.

I would also like to thank Mr Andrew Strickland, who was Chairman of the merger negotiating committee for the new university. It was a particularly difficult job, considering the complexity of the mergers. Mr Strickland's role was critical in achieving such an excellent outcome. I would also like to pay tribute to my officers, Dr Adam Greycar and his staff, and Peter Chataway on my immediate personal staff, for their role during the merger negotiations. I believe that next year we will have a new university that will quickly achieve international eminence. I am pleased that, in the negotiations with the other Parties, there has been a spirit of goodwill among the Liberal Party, the Australian Democrats and Independent Labor. The member for Elizabeth played an important role in terms of his position on the University of Adelaide.

I am pleased to accept these amendments. As a result of these amendments I believe that we have an excellent piece of legislation and I am, therefore, not surprised that interstate institutions, and also the media nationally, are commenting on the legislation in terms of its provisions. There was one area of controversy involving a plan to establish a select committee of inquiry which would have royal commission powers and which would be, I thought, a sledgehammer to crack a peanut in terms of considering the pharmacy school and other arrangements in the health sciences area. I am also pleased that agreement has been reached from a compromise, which would involve a committee to look at this area of health sciences and to report back next year. I am pleased to agree to use amendments.

Mr S.J. BAKER: The Opposition is not opposed to the amendments. Basically, they do two things: first, they make some of the administrative arrangements clearer; and, secondly, and more importantly, they give students third choice as to which degrees and certificate they get. Under the legislation as it came into this House, a student who was successful would receive a certificate from the university or from the college. Under this proposal, the successful student can receive one of each, or one showing the name on each award, and this is an interesting departure. I would have thought it was the most useful way of pursuing things.

I bring the Minister's attention to some of the grammar of the amendments. My English is not of a world-class standard, but I think it is sufficient for me to suggest that amendment Nos 4, 10 and 13 do not make grammatical sense. I presume that poetic licence can be used to ensure that those words are inserted correctly. However, in my terminology 'either/or' means one of two propositions: one of three propositions is to be provided, and that is poor drafting. Amendment No. 4 is also drafted poorly because the words 'as the case may require' are left in whereas the student may choose which form of award he or she wishes to take. There has been some sloppy work at the ranch in terms of the drafting of amendments. They are matters of minor detail which will be sorted out, I presume, in the not too distant future.

However, one fundamental item remains unresolved, that is, the extent to which the Minister is willing to act as a catalyst in achieving change. Nothing the Minister has said today, or indeed previously when the Bill was before this House, gave us cause to believe that there will be change in the way the institutions will operate, despite the fact that

significant changes have been made to structures and combinations.

I know that the House is fully informed of the situation relating to the pharmacy school, which I attempted to debate when we were considering amendments to the University of South Australia Act. It was the wrong Bill under which to do that, but I was aware at the time the battle to set up a parliamentary select committee, or a parliamentary committee to motivate some change within our august tertiary institutions had been lost. I think it is a pity that wisdom did not prevail in another place, and that we did not see that change provided in the legislation. I believe it would have made for interesting times ahead. All institutions require a certain amount of impetus; they require a little bit of aggravation or, perhaps, a little bit of incentive to make change, and that is still lacking. With those few words, I indicate that the Opposition supports the amendments made in another place.

The Hon. B.C. EASTICK: I thank the Minister for his reference to a large number of people in all the institutions who played a deliberate and, I believe, advantageous role in the discussions. That is not to claim praise for myself, but I know of all the work that these people have undertaken, because I have negotiated with each and every one of them at some stage of the discussions that followed the release of the Dawkins paper. I am a little surprised and concerned that these amendments do not provide what is to be my belief and the belief of a large number of other people a worthwhile protection for the future, that is, a guaranteed review process to allow any inadequacy in the legislation that has been produced thus far or in any circumstance that might arise in any one of the three institutions, ought to be considered and conceivably changed.

I am not suggesting for one minute that the Minister or any Minister who follows him should interfere unnecessarily in the activities of the institutions. The Minister will be aware, as are members on both sides of the House, that there are a number of areas of question within the whole process. Pharmacy is one that has been referred to frequently; law is another. A number of circumstances of agreement exist between various institutions, and the heads of agreement are the bases upon which all actions will be taken in the future.

However, there is a possibility that, because the same players who were in the original discussions leave the scene for any purpose or are not there to seek to oversee the implementation of the various arrangements that have been entered into, or because funds are not made available from the Commonwealth or from other sources, and there needs to be an amendment to the process envisaged in the first instance, we will have no positive backstop to enable us to lay out those problems in a structured way 18 months or three years down the road—

The Hon. M.D. Rann: The sunset clause will see to that.

The Hon. B.C. EASTICK: I am pleased that the Minister has mentioned the sunset clause. It is not precisely as was proposed in a more definitive and more certain role by colleagues in another place. I am not envisaging any problems. I sincerely trust—and my colleagues mentioned this previously—that all matters will proceed to the advantage of the education of the people in this State and to the greater purpose of tertiary education and research. We ought to remember that research is a vital aspect.

However, I want to know at all times that, if there is a need for the reconsideration of particular issues which have been hung up for no good reason, there will be a method of discussion to overcome any such difficulties, to achieve the goal which I have just outlined as being all important.

Mr INGERSON: I rise generally to support the motion and note that we are in this Bill developing a very important institution in this State. This has been done with the support of the Opposition, as the Minister (with his own particular interest in this area) graciously said. However, as I mentioned during my second reading contribution, there is still concern about pharmacy, in particular, in which I have a special interest. I note that the Minister gave the Committee an assurance that another subcommittee will look at the position of pharmacy and of several other professions, as the member for Light stated.

Pharmacy is very concerned about its future. It has, I believe, put its argument to the Minister fairly and reasonably. Its position in relation to a health sciences centre at the University of Adelaide is not an attempt to break up this new university; rather, it believes that it is in the best interests of all in the profession. I wish this new committee success, and wish the new university all success in the future.

Motion carried.

ELECTRICITY TRUST OF SOUTH AUSTRALIA ACT AMENDMENT BILL

Adjourned debate on second reading.

(Continued from 15 November. Page 1944.)

Mr LEWIS (Murray-Mallee): This is an interesting measure, in that it is said to be simply for the purpose of preventing the unnecessary payment of income tax on the earnings of existing superannuation schemes. ETSA's staff and its wage earners have their superannuation provided through two separate schemes: the ETSA Staff Superannuation Scheme for the staff, and the ETSA Retiring Gratuity Scheme for wage paid employees. There are several funds in each scheme, although I do not know how many. They are complex in form and structure, as they have grown like topsy over the years.

The composition of their trustee boards or management bodies is unknown to me. They are established by regulation. I have not been able to obtain that information from any source—not even from my consultations with the Minister. At present, all employees—whether staff members or wage earners—pay 6 per cent of their wages into the scheme. This, in law (this is, established in the regulations), is required to be 30 per cent of the cost of the benefits paid out in retirement to the individual contributor who will be the beneficiary.

ETSA will pay the other 70 per cent, that is, 2½ times the amount that the employee pays. However, of recent times that has not been happening, as there has been a shortfall from sources associated with contributions. ETSA has been paying 75 per cent or more of the money required as benefits for its employees.

I have obtained this information from several sources. In particular, I draw members' attention to the Auditor-General's Reports of recent years and particularly of last year, for instance, wherein it states that in 1986-87 the ETSA staff schemes' actuary found that there was an ETSA shortfall provision of \$17 million. This means that, based on the formula of ETSA's paying 75 per cent of the benefits and the fund's paying only 25 per cent, there is still a shortfall of about \$17 million. The employee component has a shortfall of \$20.4 million in contributions. That being the case, I and other members of the Opposition are genuinely disturbed and concerned.

The wage earners gratuity scheme was worse, so far as I can discover. There is an even greater shortfall from both the component provided by ETSA and that provided by the fund from the contribution made by wage earners in their gratuity scheme. Also, I understood that both these schemes and the various funds within them, as well as the various accounts of which they are comprised, have become worse since. That is very disturbing to Opposition members. In recent times, again, outside the purview of the regulation, ETSA has accepted an industrial—that is, a *de facto*—arrangement to pay all the shortfall of the employees' money, regardless of how much that may be from time to time. To my mind, that is dangerous as a precedent and is unacceptable.

The amounts involved were outside the scrutiny of this Parliament and the purview and accountability of the Minister to the public. Apparently, the Minister did not know, and has not known, these facts about those schemes and the funds and accounts of which they have been comprised. I doubt that he would have said what he did in his second reading speech if that were so.

I am then compelled to go on and point out that I believe that along the line in recent times we have seen a decline in ETSA's efficiency, one way or another, not the least reason for that being the way in which unions have dictated policy and the Minister has allowed the board to accept that dictated position. Consider the policy in this area: it seems to me that the union has said, 'Jump', the trust has said, 'How high?', and the public—ETSA's consumers—have had to take the consequences. They will be the people who pay, as they are the people who already pay and, in the event that ETSA itself cannot pass on those bills for one reason or another, Treasury will pick them up under this proposal.

The Bill provides that there is no change to the payments of benefits already existing and agreed. So, we are in for that if we adopt this legislation. Employees will pay tax on benefits in their hand when they receive them, as applies under the law as it stands now. That is no different for ETSA's employees or for anyone else, so there is no problem there. Under this Bill, the proposed new scheme will not be fully funded. I quote from the Minister's second reading speech as follows:

The Treasurer will meet the cost of all benefits payable in terms of the rules, and may seek reimbursement of the cost of these benefits from both the fund and ETSA.

Of course, if ETSA and the fund do not happen to have the money for any reason (as I just said a short while ago) Treasury will have to find the money. However, as the Minister pointed out in his second reading speech, that is unlikely because it is a monopoly supplier of that form of energy, that commodity and that service: ETSA will simply pick up the tab and pass it on, as I said, to consumers of electricity in this State. We are already suffering a cost disadvantage compared to other electricity consumers elsewhere in Australia. It is jiggered.

The Hon. Ted Chapman: Tell us about—

Mr LEWIS: The other thing I want to say, and I am sure that this is what the member for Alexandra is adverting to, is the fact that disparate charges are made for the same unit of electricity even though consumption rates may be about the same for each of the types of consumer involved. A disparate fee is charge for providing the service, even before there is any consumption of electricity at all.

According to ETSA's subjective classification of the type of consumer with which or whom it is dealing, it determines the service charge and tariff, and it determines the sliding scale upon which the tariff will vary, kilowatt hour by kilowatt hour as consumption per quarter or per unit time of the charge increases. That means that we can expect an

even wider disparity to arise as a consequence of ETSA's having to pass on this unfunded liability from the superannuation scheme which this Bill establishes: pass it on unevenly and unfairly. We know that the current level of revenue earning by ETSA from gross sales to its consumer market is somewhere in the order of \$750 to \$800 million a year. We note that, if ETSA were efficient as it is suggested it should be in an independent authority report to which I have recently drawn attention, that amount of gross revenue could be quite easily cut by about \$200 million.

If ETSA were to be as efficient in its power generation as are other similar utilities within Australia, we find in reference to these independent authorities that we could save about \$96 million a year on our revenue earned in recent times. By this year we could assume that that would be about \$100 million. Indeed, if our Electricity Trust were to be made as efficient as a similar power generating utility in our OECD partner economies, we would find that we could save a further \$100 million.

That means that we could reduce by \$200 million the sum outlaid by consumers for the electricity that they buy. That is \$200 million in \$800 million (in round terms). It does not take a genius to calculate that it represents a 25 per cent saving in tariff. That would certainly make South Australia a competitive place for business enterprises to establish. Moreover, if we avoid this ridiculous situation involved in the deal provided by this Bill, wherein we are likely to run, in present dollar terms, another \$100 million into the cost of electricity, tidy that up and make it a fully funded scheme, so that the contributions made by employees amount to 30 per cent, as is still the case in law, and from ETSA itself 70 per cent, we could save millions of dollars from that general revenue in addition to the \$200 million to which I have just referred. That would mean that we would have power costs 25 to 30 per cent lower than they are at the present time.

That is what I see as being the destruction of the competitive edge, and this is the sort of last bundle of faggots on the poor man's back, or the last straw on the camel's back, that could result in South Australia's being seen to be even more unattractive than it is at present. It will be less attractive to invest in South Australia after the introduction of this measure than it is at present and, goodness knows, it is little attraction enough to have higher power costs than we really need. I was referring to the Comparative Efficiency of State Electricity Authorities, a study by Dennis Lawrence, Peter Swan and John Zeitsch, presented in Sydney to the Australian Conference of Economists as recently as 26 September this year.

It was undertaken by Swan Consultants and presented at the University of New South Wales. The study provides us with an explanation of what is defined and accepted by engineers in this kind of enterprise as total factor productivity. That is an index of the ratio of total output quantity to total input quantity and is an important indicator of economic efficiency. It provides us with information on technical efficiency; that is, the extent to which maximum output possible given existing technology is realised from the inputs which are used. It also provides us with an understanding of technical efficiency and allocated efficiency, and the extent to which inputs are combined in cost minimising proportions. They are the determinants of economic efficiency and, along with the extent to which costs are fully recovered, they represent the major determinant of economic performance.

The conclusions of the paper tell us that multi-lateral TFP indices for State electricity systems show that South Australia achieved the highest total factor productivity lev-

els for the decade from 1975-76 but declined rapidly to have the second lowest in 1988-89. Interestingly enough, since 1985-86 with the SEQEB dispute and its sequel, Queensland has achieved the highest total productivity level by an increasing margin from the much larger New South Wales system. In other words, it is even better still than New South Wales.

What we need is micro-economic reform. An unfunded superannuation scheme for employees does not head in that direction. Employees need to recognise that it is necessary for them to make sure that, where they are employed by a monopoly utility of this kind or, indeed, a monopoly of any kind, it performs at a comparable efficiency with similar utilities elsewhere in similar societies. There is no requirement on them to do that. We could get some incentive and some sharpness imposed on their thinking about efficiency by requiring them to make a more substantial contribution from their own salaries and wages to their retirement benefits and compel them to take a closer look at the outcomes of the utility for which they work than they do at the present time.

As I said, at the present time, when ETSA's costs rise, it simply passes them on to the consumers. Wages and salaries are costs. In this instance we are talking about the add-ons that go with wages and salaries to provide retirement payment benefits to employees once they retire or resign. They are add-ons.

Let me now return to the report to ensure that members know that I am not simply snatching figures out of the hat. It continues:

The analysis indicates that substantial cost savings are possible if the other four States were to achieve the total factor productivity level of Queensland in 1988-89. If all inputs were reduced in equal proportions, New South Wales could achieve cost savings of \$351 million . . . South Australia savings of \$96 million.

They are the points worth making. All electricity generation utilities in Australia, if they aimed at the micro-economic reform that has been introduced in Queensland, are capable of achieving savings, the total level of which within Australia would be \$851 million. That is interesting and amazing, but even more interesting is the fact that, if they were to perform to the standards of the norm—not even the best—of our trading partners in other OECD economies, they would save more than an additional \$100 million in South Australia, in fact, about \$200 million altogether.

The reason for my including that information in my remarks at this time is to make it plain, not only to the House but also to other people who may take the trouble, especially those involved with and engaged in work at ETSA, to look at their own performance and that of the organisation, the utility, which provides them with employment, and endeavour to do something in the name of conscience and fairness for the rest of the people living in South Australia and for the economy of the State, in which economy they function and provide electricity.

I am not knocking ETSA: I am simply putting before it a legitimate challenge. I am saying to it that it should have—indeed, it needs to have—the commercial aptitude of any other body corporate in the private sector in managing its affairs and pursuing its goal of providing the most efficient service possible to the consumers of South Australia. Over the past decade, it is quite clear that that has not happened. It has been too easy for people to sit on their hands or to do less than they might otherwise have done within that organisation towards improving its efficiency.

The Government itself is in no mean measure accountable for what has happened there. Much of the disparate charging that has taken place is a consequence of direct Government intervention in the policy adopted by ETSA

in the way it charges out its costs. For instance, it is unfortunate that there is a disparity between the charges made to the house of the Minister for the electricity which the Minister consumes and the house of God, if you like, in that churches and charitable organisations pay as much as 70 per cent more for their power bills than do householders. How the Minister can justify that is unknown to me, but certainly the public of South Australia will be interested to discover that.

Moreover, ETSA itself needs to either tell us whether the Government has interfered to insist upon this disparate charging for its services and supply of electricity or whether it is a decision that is taken independent of any Government request or submission. It may not even have been a request but just a submission to it from Government, formally or informally. What has happened to date clearly is not good enough. The thing that further disturbs the Opposition about this is that it is similar to the SASFIT arrangements. Let me sketch in the argument I wish to make about this point and go back a little.

Both existing schemes are arguably subject to Keating's tax on super funds. I accept that. The tax on such funds costs over \$50 000 per month. That means that the Federal Government is ripping us off at the rate of \$50 000 per month by virtue of the mechanism that exists in the new laws which Keating has introduced wherein he taxes the earnings on our superannuation fund in our Electricity Trust to that sum. I am grateful to the Minister for providing that information recently because it gives us the opportunity to understand the importance of what is said to be the fundamental purpose of this Bill which makes provision for the ETSA superannuation fund 'to hold and deal in assets of the Crown' which thereby circumvents Keating's tax laws. The Minister would like us to believe that that is the only reason for the Bill and the only matter canvassed by it, and I am sure that he probably thinks so.

However, I need to point out to the House, if members have not realised already, that the Bill goes further than that. It establishes a new board to administer the consolidated affairs of the two existing schemes which provide superannuation benefits for all employees regardless of their status. By that I mean regardless of whether they are salary earners or wage earners. The board of the South Australian Superannuation Investment Trust—we all know it as SASFIT—is, as I said a short while ago, similarly constructed to the board proposed in this Bill, with the one exception that presumably the people on the SASFIT board have greater competence through higher demonstrated professional qualifications and experience in managing funds and doing actuarial calculations, or understanding them when they are done for them by others. However, there has been some incompetence in the administration of SASFIT and its funds. In September it had an unfunded liability of \$3 200 million, and that liability is growing at an alarming rate.

I believe that that represents a cancer on the State's finances more serious than the rate of deterioration through the depreciation and wear and tear of the infrastructure in public utilities, such as sewerage, drains, water reticulation pipes, roads and other things of that kind, to which the Minister drew attention a few short years ago when he was Chairman of the Public Accounts Committee. I agreed with the report that his committee brought into this place, in which it was pointed out that urgent steps needed to be taken to provide a sinking fund somewhere in the State's accounts to ensure that money would be available for the replacement, repair and restoration of those public assets as it became necessary. I equally agree with the same principle

if it is applied to the management of these funds, whether the SASFIT fund or the fund we propose to create by this measure.

The proposed board for the superannuation trust envisaged by this measure does not appear to be comprised of adequately qualified or competent personnel. There is no necessity in this Bill for members to be so qualified or experienced. There are eight members envisaged in the Bill, yet there are only five on the SASFIT board. Of the eight members proposed to be on the board, four will be nominated by ETSA unions, and that is the only qualification they must have. In addition, only one member will be nominated by the State Treasurer and, presumably, that person will be someone who has the existing qualifications to which I have already referred, and the experience necessary at least to understand what other actuaries have calculated and presented to the board for its consideration. The other three members are appointed by ETSA.

The Minister and the Government are to be commended for ensuring that at least some of the incompetence of the board of ETSA has not found its way into, and does not dominate, this superannuation fund. Equally, the Minister deserves to be condemned, as does the Government, for failing to recognise that four unions, just by virtue of the fact that they represent workers in the workplace—whether staff or line, it does not matter—are unlikely to be able to contribute anything to the same sound decision-making in relation to the investment of those funds and the way in which they are deployed, the term of their investment, the type of their investment and the manner in which they are either liquid or, to a lesser degree, more fixed as investments. The board ought to be comprised of competent people. At least we would have some chance of doing as well as SASFIT and, goodness knows, that is bad enough. As it stands, there is no chance of that and the unfortunate consequence will be that we will have an unfunded liability if the measure goes through in this form. It will grow at a rate even greater than the rate at which it is growing on a per capita basis—per employee or per beneficiary—in respect of the SASFIT fund. That is disturbing to me and to other members of the Opposition.

For that reason, whilst the Opposition supports the second reading of this Bill, we intend during the Committee stage to seek a reconstruction of the composition of the board to ensure that we have people with postgraduate qualifications and experience. That experience should also cover financial management of investment trust funds, with associated actuarial skills. If we cannot get that from the Government, I think the matter should not pass the third reading. Most certainly, if we cannot get that, it clearly indicates that the Government is incompetent in its responsibilities to the electricity consumers of South Australia and is allowing a cosy deal or arrangement with the trade union representatives of the ETSA staff and ETSA wage earners to override its responsibilities to the consumers of electricity in South Australia.

Mr S.J. BAKER (Deputy Leader of the Opposition): I will be very brief. Whilst the Opposition generally supports the restructuring taking place here, we appreciate that times are tough and if we can save a dollar of taxation we should do so. I do not wish to comment in relation to the impact on private schemes, where benefits to other people are being affected by the Keating tax-grab, because that has been a subject of contributions on previous occasions. The reason I am making this contribution is that I find it quite pathetic in this day and age that we continue to see the same old slogans and flags that we have seen for the past 20 or 30

years from this Government—that is, 20 years from Labor Governments and probably 50 years from the union movement—about board composition and structures of power, which have no relevance at all to the needs of today.

For a long time, after Premier Playford put it all together, ETSA was a very efficient organisation. In fact, it was one of the most efficient energy generating institutions in the country. In more recent times, under the administration of Labor Ministers, it has deteriorated quite dramatically. Quite simply, Labor Administrations have had no interest whatsoever in providing electricity at the most efficient and effective cost. We now have a situation where the new General Manager of the Electricity Trust is faced with some very difficult decisions.

We have heard reports that 800 employees will no longer be with ETSA—presumably those losses will be by natural attrition—because ETSA is overmanned; because there has been a surplus; because so many practices undertaken by ETSA have been indifferent and second-rate; and because for a long period it has been the tail wagging the dog. Over the past 20 years, ETSA has gone from being the most efficient energy generator in the country to one of the least efficient. Indeed, if we continue with the trend of the past 10 years, we will become the least efficient generator of electricity in the country. That is not good enough. Measures have been taken to turn that around, albeit very late. These measures should have been taken 10 or 20 years ago. In fact, I think we were actually trying to do something 10 years ago, to be quite frank.

That is as it may be. There is now a golden opportunity for the Minister to say that, while we are looking at the way the superannuation scheme is conducted, we should have people with expertise, people who have the confidence of not only the employees but also the employer, and all the contributors—both those still employed and those who have retired—and everyone concerned to do the job that is appropriate.

It would be significant if the appointees or those people elected to the board had qualifications in financial management. It would also be appropriate if they had been exposed to the vagaries of the financial and equities markets over the past five years to see how tough the world can be if one makes the wrong decisions. However, this Bill guarantees none of that. The board will include four union representatives with no guarantee of any expertise whatsoever.

There will not be any democratically elected representative as there is on the Superannuation Board. Both the Superannuation Board and the Superannuation Trust have democratically elected representatives; they do not have a majority of unionists. In fact, the union movement has very minor influence on the Superannuation Board, despite the fact that the board covers far more employees—probably five times as many—than does the Electricity Trust superannuation board. For all those reasons, I believe that it is totally inappropriate to have a structure as is proposed by the Minister.

The Hon. J.H.C. KLUNDER (Minister of Mines and Energy): I thank members opposite for their contribution. I suggest that the member for Murray-Mallee probably saw somewhat more in this Bill than there is. He gave the impression of someone looking for nasty surprises in the Bill and he raised a number of points. I will deal with some of them, but I was not able to make a note of all the points or my response to them in the time available. I am informed that there is only one fund for each of the existing schemes, although the honourable member indicated that there were a number. Regarding his comment about a shortfall provi-

sion of \$17 million, I advise that that is the reason why the Electricity Trust is currently providing 77 per cent versus the contributors' portion of 23 per cent, rather than the 70 per cent to 30 per cent ratio, which is the aim of the scheme.

What the honourable member probably did not know was that both the existing schemes have been closed to new contributors and the new scheme to be put in place is a lump sum provision scheme rather than one of the old schemes, which involved an open-ended provision of two-thirds of salary. In time, that will claw back the 77 per cent contribution by ETSA to somewhat closer to the 70 per cent that is considered to be the aim of the exercise.

Several members of the Opposition raised the union issue, which is a continuation of the existing situation. It is interesting that the member for Murray-Mallee became very irritated with the Government on the one hand for making changes yet on the other hand indicating that change in some other areas was not going far enough. As usual the Opposition wants it both ways. In terms of the financial expertise of members of the new board, obviously, the representative of the Treasurer will be someone with the financial skills to assist the board. I also point out that the two Electricity Trust representatives on both boards were the same people. One of those representatives was Mr John Riddle, who is not only Secretary to the ETSA board but Director of Corporate Affairs in ETSA. He can be seen as someone who has the financial skills necessary to assist the board in its deliberations. Now there will be a considerable number of those people.

The difficulty seen by the Opposition with respect to the union representatives is that very few of them have PhDs in economics, and that is because they happen to work for ETSA. Because they work for ETSA and contribute to the fund, they will provide half the membership of the new board. The member for Murray-Mallee got confused or was not entirely sure about why the new scheme will be set up in the way proposed. It is necessary for the Treasurer to make the superannuation pay out and then recover that money from the ETSA Superannuation Fund in order to avoid paying Commonwealth tax. That is the very basis of the scheme, and I am not sure whether the member for Murray-Mallee got that right.

The honourable member used the Bill to raise general issues regarding ETSA and went on to talk about the Swan report. I do not really think it is appropriate to use a Bill which deals with superannuation to talk about the general efficiency or otherwise of ETSA but, because the honourable member raised those points, I will reply to them very briefly. I have a copy of the Swan report in front of me, and I intend to quote a little piece of it. After Professor Swan indicated that South Australia is second last on the list, he went on to say in the last paragraph of page 15:

Correcting for differences in scale, output composition and geographic spread of the States leads to South Australia having the highest adjusted TFP levels for the entire period, followed by Queensland and Western Australia. Victoria still has the lowest TFP levels although its position is improved by adjusting for its poor fuel quality. Adjusting for gas as a fuel source pegs back South Australia's performance and leads to Queensland having the highest adjusted levels since 1979-80.

The meaning of that statement is that, if one looked at the provision of electricity on a level playing field, one would see that South Australia moves from second worst to second best. That was not acknowledged in the newspaper article on the Swan report and, unfortunately, it was not acknowledged by the member for Murray-Mallee in his speech.

I accept the comment that ETSA should be more efficient, and ETSA is currently looking at an exercise to make itself leaner and more efficient. Members of the Opposition generally commented that it has been only in the past 10 years

that ETSA has become less efficient. Because they were in office 10 years ago, I guess they must share some of the blame. I indicate that, in the past five years, the cost of electricity to consumers in South Australia has risen by approximately half the cost of inflation, so electricity is now considerably cheaper than it was in 1985. It might also be worthwhile pointing out that, despite the claims of efficiency by members of the Opposition and the claims that they were leading to a cheaper and better Electricity Trust, the Opposition in its term of office was responsible for the three highest tariff increases in ETSA's history, namely, 12.5 per cent, 19.8 per cent and 16 per cent.

I accept that members will try to change some parts of this Bill. I will have to look at those amendments, as I do all amendments that are moved by the Opposition. As far as I am concerned, this Bill changes the Act just sufficiently to ensure that the money which would otherwise be paid to the Federal Treasurer stays in South Australia and thereby reduces the costs to the Electricity Trust and to electricity consumers. In most other ways, I have tried to make sure that the Bill does not amend the Act more than is necessary in that regard. Because that is what I set out to do, that is what I will continue to do.

Bill read a second time.

In Committee.

Clause 1 passed.

Clause 2—'Commencement.'

The Hon. J.H.C. KLUNDER: I propose that progress be reported.

Progress reported; Committee to sit again.

DEBITS TAX BILL

Adjourned debate on second reading.

(Continued from 14 November. Page 1853.)

Mr S.J. BAKER: (Deputy Leader of the Opposition): The Opposition is not pleased that we are dealing with this Bill, and I will outline the reasons for that stance. It is not pleased because we believed that, when the financial institutions duty inflicted a whopping 10c per \$100 on the South Australian population, we would have some trade-off with respect to the BAD tax. The BAD tax has been appropriately named; it is the sort of tax that hits people who rely on cheque accounts. People who are disabled and are forced to stay at home or in a nursing home but who still conduct their affairs are reliant on cheque accounts, and they are the people who pay the bills. Indeed, if anyone in South Australia wrote out a cheque for \$1, that person would have to pay 15c for the BAD tax and 10c for the stamp duty on the cheque, that is, 25 per cent taxation on a \$1 cheque. Fortunately, most cheques are not for \$1, but the fact remains that cheques are written out for small amounts, and the relative impost of the BAD tax is high. In the scheme of things, it is not the worst tax on the books, so the Opposition believes that, if it was on the agenda to get rid of a tax, the BAD tax is perhaps not the first we would choose to be quit of.

However, it is disappointing that we have not used the opportunity to reduce the taxation burden on South Australians for the reasons I have mentioned. If this Bill were not passed, there would be a further \$25 million shortfall in the budget, or \$12.5 million for the half year 1990-91. That would cause grave difficulties to a Government which is financially strapped for cash at the moment. We have seen the financial situation of this Government result in some extraordinary behaviour. There have been headlines

that 3 000 jobs will be lost because the Government does not have enough money in its coffers to meet the salary bills. We have seen the teachers singled out for treatment because of the larger than expected salary rises that have been granted. The Government has now decided that there has to be a significant decrease in the number of teachers employed to meet the additional cost of the wages bill.

A number of changes have taken place in relation to blue collar workers. The House has been given evidence of the situation in the Department of Marine and Harbors, where I think about 200 or 300 blue collar workers have lost their jobs over the past year or so, and more are in the pipeline, not only because of the demands on the wharves are diminishing because of mechanisation but because of the imperatives for departments to become leaner and more efficient. Almost all areas of Government are affected, except the ministerial offices: they never seem to cut their cloth accordingly. However, other Government areas have been put on notice by the Minister of Finance to produce some real savings in the system so that the budget floats and does not sink under its own weight.

I should point out at this stage that, despite all the rhetoric, there has been a lack of action in some important areas. If the Government was so interested in improving the efficiency of the Public Service, it should, as one of its first measures, do away with its compulsory unionism policy. That is an anachronism: it is inefficient, and it does not benefit all concerned. Of course, if the Government were really interested in efficiency, it would look at its involvement in such enterprises as the clothing factory in the Minister's own electorate, the Central Linen Service, its entrepreneurial activities in the timber industry and, of course, even the—

The Hon. Frank Blevins interjecting:

Mr S.J. BAKER: And, I was going to say, even the meat industry should come under scrutiny. Every one of those enterprises is inefficient. They are all suffering magnificent losses and contributing to the costs of Government. They do it year after year.

The Hon. Frank Blevins: What about the Egg Board?

Mr S.J. BAKER: The Minister asks, 'What about the Egg Board?' I was not sure that the Egg Board was contributing to the cost of the State budget, whereas I can say that the Clothing Factory, the Central Linen Service, the SA Timber Corporation and SAMCOR have all had a long history. The board's contribution to the budget is absolutely zero, so the Minister can draw his own conclusions as to which organisations should be scrutinised now to improve the performance of Government, particularly in relation to the budget.

The Hon. Frank Blevins: Would you sell SAMCOR?

Mr S.J. BAKER: The Minister asks whether I would sell SAMCOR.

The CHAIRMAN: Order! The Chair believes that debate should be more relevant to the debits tax.

Mr S.J. BAKER: I think it is important that remarks relate to the debits tax, and I will not be sidelined by the Minister of Finance, who is doing a particularly poor job of making decisions in the best interests of the consumers of South Australia and the people paying the tax bills, because these organisations are not being sold off or made to perform. I have a particular preference.

The Hon. Frank Blevins interjecting:

The CHAIRMAN: Order! The Minister will not read out a list of State statutory corporations as part of the debate.

Mr S.J. BAKER: We crave for the Minister to actually show some leadership in bringing this budget under control. To date significant announcements have been made, but there has been a lot of rhetoric and not much action in the

marketplace in terms of meeting what I believe are the imperatives of Government today. It is important in this debate to talk about the BAD tax in conjunction with the tax increases that have taken place under the State Government banner.

Another record of taxation increase has been set this year—an 18.2 per cent increase in State taxes. We increased taxes this financial year by \$140 million or \$211 million in a full year. Most of those taxes ultimately impact on households, although many of them go via businesses that are struggling to survive in the marketplace. We have seen the economic vandalism of Paul Keating, the Federal Treasurer, come to light. Members on this side of the House have pointed out Mr Keating's shortcomings over a long period, but at least now the general populace is becoming aware of the enormous damage that is being wrought on the economy by the misguided policies of the Federal Government, in particular the Treasurer, Mr Keating.

Of course, his economic policies have been backed by the Premier of South Australia. Measures such as the BAD tax are being grabbed with both hands by the Government, because they can ill afford to give them away. We are seeing the Bannon Government's economic mismanagement coming into play again, with respect to not only the huge increases in taxation which are affecting businesses but also the way in which the Government is being managed. I have said before that, had the Government performed economically, we would not have had the massive increase in taxation we saw this year.

I remind members of the way in which Premier Bannon used all the surpluses and overspent during the 1989-90 financial year. I remind them that, if we look at the contribution of the State Bank, of the individual investments, of Public Trustee and of the South Australian Government Financing Authority, we see \$385 million worth of contributions to the budget in 1989-90. This year those contributions are some \$157.4 million less, because of our Treasurer's financial mismanagement.

In respect of this Bill, I wish to make the point that here was a golden opportunity to say, 'We really don't need this tax' or 'Let's give some tax relief in another area', which I think would have been a more important initiative. 'Let's give some tax relief to businesses around town because they have been forced into the situation of bankruptcy and laying off people.' If anyone wishes to be reminded of the difficult economic circumstances facing this country and this State, I suggest that they start reading the financial pages and editorials that now abound.

The depressed conditions we are now facing are no mystery: they were always going to happen under the fiscal management of the Federal Treasurer, assisted most ably—or unably—by Premier Bannon. When the economy is going through very difficult times, the last thing we want is more taxation. In those circumstances, it would have been appropriate for the Minister of Finance to say, 'Yes, we will take the BAD tax on board, but we will provide some relief in other areas far more important to the future economic well-being of the State.' While not going so far as to support this measure, the Opposition certainly will not oppose it.

The Hon. FRANK BLEVINS (Minister of Finance): I thank the Deputy Leader for his non-opposition to the Bill. He is quite right in not opposing it, because, as taxes go, it is quite reasonable and progressive, so it is one that all of us who favour progressive taxation would support. The Deputy Leader earlier during his second reading speech remarked that the taxpayer or a person writing a cheque for \$1 could pay 25 cents, or something like that. Whilst that

may be the case, I point out that this Bill does not change that at all. The provision is already there: it is only a matter of whether it comes to the State or goes to the Commonwealth. There is no change to the taxpayer at all.

I imagine that whether the Federal Government levied it or we levied it and the Federal Government collected it on our behalf would not make a blind bit of difference to the taxpayer. I thought that the Deputy Leader was close to straying from the Bill—although I will not say that he strayed, because you, Sir, would of course have pulled him up—during his second reading speech. However, he spoke only briefly and I will respond only briefly about the alleged mismanagement of this State.

I point out, as I have done during the debate on the last five or six budget Bills, that this State has the second lowest level of taxation in Australia. It has a much better than average level of services than the rest of the Australian States and certainly, on both counts, scores better than New South Wales, the State that the Deputy Leader seems to find most agreeable. However bad we are (according to the Deputy Leader) we are much better than New South Wales and much better than the Australian average.

The Deputy Leader was giving the Government some advice about how it ought to raise funds and what it ought to get rid of in the way of Government business and business enterprises. The Deputy Leader would not respond to the question of SAMCOR, which is a very heavy drain on the State's budget. I asked him directly whether the Opposition would sell SAMCOR, and he was not game to say.

As to the Egg Board, Milk Board, Barley Board and Citrus Board, they are all paid for by consumers. Whether consumers pay by buying the product or pay through taxation is fairly irrelevant: they are paying for these organisations. I am not saying whether that is justified. Obviously, the Government thinks that they are justified, but they come at a cost to the consumer in the same way as taxation does.

The Deputy Leader said that we were all talk and no action as regards slimming down the Public Service. I point out, just off the top of my head, that some of the areas the Government has tackled to date include reductions in teachers and in numbers involving Marine and Harbors, the Department of Correctional Services and the STA, and there is even some mention of action to be taken in the Children's Services Office. All the action that has been taken or suggested in those areas has been opposed by the Opposition. It has opposed every single item. Opportunists to the hilt! Nevertheless, I thank the Deputy Leader for his non-opposition to the Bill.

Bill read a second time.

In Committee.

Clause 1 passed.

Clause 2—'Commencement.'

Mr S.J. BAKER: I am a little perplexed by this clause, which provides:

This Act will come into operation, or will be taken to have come into operation, as the case may require, on the date of commencement of section 4A of the Debits Tax Act 1982 of the Commonwealth.

That is back in 1982, by my reading. Where have I misconstrued? I note that the New South Wales Act has a commencement date of 1 December 1990.

The Hon. FRANK BLEVINS: The Deputy Leader is right to query this clause. However, I have been advised that there is a simple explanation, that is, that there is the Federal Bill to amend the Debits Tax Act which, in Part 2, subsection 4A, provides:

Termination of tax

4A. Tax is not imposed in respect of a debit made on or after the date of commencement of this section.

That provision in connection with this Bill ties in with the State's taking over from the date when the Federal legislation becomes defunct. I told the honourable member that it was simple.

Clause passed.

Clause 3—'Interpretation.'

Mr S.J. BAKER: Why has not the Minister introduced a Bill of his own? The New South Wales legislation is considerable, running into about 36 pages. It embraces the Commonwealth legislation, with some variations, as its own. I understood that all the States would be going along the same path. I have asked this question because, if the Debits Tax Act 1982 becomes defunct, do we then have reference to legislation to which this Bill is tied which will no longer exist?

The Hon. FRANK BLEVINS: All Taxation Commissioners agreed to the approach the South Australian Government is adopting. However, after they went away, New South Wales and Western Australia adopted a different approach. The end result is the same. The other States are doing the same as South Australia, whereas Western Australia and New South Wales are taking a different approach. I do not know why they are doing that, and the honourable member would have to ask them. We believe that the agreement by all Taxation Commissioners to adopt this approach is a proper one and the result throughout the Commonwealth will be the same.

Mr S.J. BAKER: I then have two further questions. When will the Federal Government cease to collect this tax and either credit it to the State or offset it against general revenue grants? At that stage, will that legislation no longer exist on the Commonwealth books which will then require us to enter into our own Act?

The Hon. FRANK BLEVINS: I am advised that it will be in two years, but I understand that discussions are going on for the changeover to occur considerably earlier than that.

Clause passed.

Clause 4—'Incorporation.'

Mr S.J. BAKER: The applied provisions are incorporated and must be read as one with this legislation. I have been asked who is responsible for the administration of debits tax in South Australia. From the legislation, it is totally unclear who is responsible. Normally, we would find with all financial Bills that at the beginning there are definitions and one entity is made responsible. It may be the State Commissioner of Taxation, the Commissioner of Stamps, the Treasurer or the Minister, but in each case we have an authority determined by the legislation to be responsible for the collection or the receipt of the moneys concerned. In these circumstances it is obtuse as to who is responsible in South Australia.

The Hon. FRANK BLEVINS: It is quite clear: it is not obtuse at all. I refer to the interpretation provisions—clause 3—which provides:

'the Commissioner' has the same meaning as in the applied provisions:

I then refer to the applied provisions, as follows:

'Commissioner' means the Commissioner of Stamps;

Mr S.J. BAKER: This is probably the first Bill I have seen where the responsible person is relegated to the second schedule of the Bill. It is obtuse as to the whole way the Bill has been put together. I cannot believe that this is standard drafting from the Commonwealth and I can assume only that it is a quirk of local circumstance.

The Hon. FRANK BLEVINS: What is happening is that the applied provisions are a modification to the Federal Act

and the modification to that Act becomes in effect the provisions for South Australia. It is simple.

Clause passed.

Clause 5—'Imposition of tax.'

Mr S.J. BAKER: Can the Minister tell the Committee how South Australia and the Federal Government will handle the position in respect of the Australian Capital Territory? I have been advised that the ACT will not be introducing a debits tax, so that we will no longer have uniformity across Australia. Some provisions in this clause have interesting application if one State or Territory is not party to the agreement. What will happen in respect of Commonwealth collections? Will the Commonwealth keep those moneys? Will it apply the taxation uniformly across Australia and then credit South Australia with its share of the collections and keep the ACT collection for itself, or will the ACT have no debits tax collected? This will raise some questions about how people conduct their finances in States such as New South Wales and Queensland, which are much closer to the ACT than South Australia. Can the Minister clarify the current situation?

The Hon. FRANK BLEVINS: Apparently at this stage the ACT is not going to pay this tax: that is a decision it has taken. I am not sure what the Commonwealth does about that at this stage. Of course, there is a provision in the Bill for residents of South Australia who attempt to use the ACT as a tax avoidance haven to be covered by this tax and the Commonwealth will collect it on our behalf.

Mr S.J. BAKER: Can the Minister clarify the situation as far as South Australia is concerned? As far as I am aware, from the second reading explanation and the instructions I have received from another place, if we fail to collect the tax, the Commonwealth would continue to collect it, but we would no longer receive the benefit thereof.

The Hon. FRANK BLEVINS: As I said during the second reading debate, we will not be collecting the tax. The Commonwealth will still be collecting the tax but it will be collecting it on our behalf. Presuming that the ACT does not want the Commonwealth to collect it on its behalf, there will be a hole in the ACT's budget. I certainly do not want one in ours, as the Deputy Leader stated in the second reading debate.

Mr S.J. BAKER: Who will actually make the determinations on our behalf for those people who may be using accounts in the ACT? The situation is that we are no longer masters of our own destiny to the extent that we can operate on our own behalf in connection with residents of South Australia. That is a very clear-cut situation. If they are using financial institutions in this State, there is no problem. However, to apply the provisions in clause 5, which are uniform conditions and which are in the New South Wales Act, it seems that a second party has to look after our interests and apply provisions which are in our Act for our good. Will the Minister please clarify how this will be done?

The Hon. FRANK BLEVINS: It will be done in association with the Commonwealth. We do not see it as a problem. Clearly, I have received the same letter as the Deputy Leader from the Australian Bankers' Association raising these queries. I do not see it as a problem. I am sure that, if anyone feels they can avoid this tax by operating through the ACT for that purpose, every State will very quickly talk to the Commonwealth about action that can be taken to prevent that. At this stage, none of the States and none of the commissioners see any great problem.

Clause passed.

Clauses 6 to 18 passed.

Clause 19—'Certificate of exemption.'

Mr S.J. BAKER: I have received a letter from the Australian Bankers' Association. In relation to exemption, the letter states:

The Act has provision to exempt debits made in relation to the Federal Government tax file number legislation. As the debiting of an account for non resident withholding tax is a similar arrangement to tax file number withholding tax, it is recommended that non resident withholding tax also be listed as an exempt debit.

How will these exemptions be changed? Will it be at the wish and whim of the States concerned who will communicate with the Commonwealth accordingly, or are we stuck with the exemptions that are currently in the system? How is this meant to operate if we are to conduct our own affairs? It relates to my original question about whether in fact a full Act may not have been more appropriate.

The Hon. FRANK BLEVINS: The position is that all States will have to act in concert for exemptions. There is no question about that. The Federal Government has made that perfectly clear. If it is to collect the tax on behalf of the States, that is the way the States will have to behave. I understand that identical legislation has passed the Victorian Parliament and, as far as I know, the Australian Bankers' Association did not raise this question in Victoria. It may well be that it is something that has concerned the association since but, again, I am advised that all States will have to act in concert in this area of exemptions.

Clause passed.

Remaining clauses (20 and 21) passed.

First schedule.

Mr S.J. BAKER: To what extent are all States tied in to the rates of tax shown in column 2? I remind the Committee that every amount not less than \$1 but less than \$100 incurs a tax penalty of 15c, and the scale goes up to debits amounting to \$10 000 or more where the tax is \$2. Is that amount variable or does it remain fixed for the next two years?

The Hon. FRANK BLEVINS: Yes, we are all locked into the same rate. I understand that the banks can cope with a zero rate but, apart from that, if the States want a rate, it has to be uniform.

Schedule passed.

Second schedule and title passed.

Bill read a third time and passed.

SUPERANNUATION ACT AMENDMENT BILL

Adjourned debate on second reading.

(Continued from 14 November. Page 1850.)

Mr S.J. BAKER (Deputy Leader of the Opposition): The Opposition supports the Bill presently before the House. There are some matters of clarification that we will raise during the Committee stage because the details provided in the second reading explanation are indecently brief or non-existent. There are some areas of concern. Principally, the Opposition believes that the Bill contains a number of important amendments. Those amendments include the fact that the actuary will have to report on the long-term liabilities facing the Government in respect of superannuation schemes. The Opposition has been asking for this information to be provided as a matter of course for some years. It is quite heartening that, after such a long time, we are now to have a requirement that, whatever superannuation scheme operates under Government auspices, that scheme will have to have an actuary to report on its long-term impact on the Government's coffers. In other words, taxpayers at last will know how much they will have to pay in the long term to sustain people on their pensions. That is

a very healthy initiative and, obviously, one that is applauded on this side of the House.

The second item certainly has some merit but perhaps it is somewhat harder to implement in a constructive fashion. I refer to the scrutiny of persons retiring because of invalidity. I am pleased to see that there is now some reference to employers making considerable effort to re-employ those people who have somehow suffered some form of invalidity that reduces their capacity to operate in a normal sense in the workplace. This is totally in keeping with the Opposition's desire to see the call on the taxpayers' dollar being reduced. It is no secret that people will seek early retirement on grounds of invalidity because they can get paid out at a far higher rate than if they have retired early and, indeed, sometimes even if they retire by the minimum retiring date.

I believe that there have been rorts in this area over a long period. On many occasions I have been provided with instances of people who looked very poorly whilst employed in the Public Service and who then made a miraculous recovery once they had departed the workplace. Part of the reason for the miraculous recovery could, of course, be attributed to the fact that they are no longer at work and suffering the stresses and strains of the workplace. However, having met some of the individuals concerned, I believe that they were taking the system for a ride. It is important that we conserve the taxpayers' dollar as much as possible.

Of course, there is a real problem in the implementation of this measure, but the Opposition realises that in a number of laws the signposts are perhaps just as important as the capacity of the system to carry out the dictates of the law. We set a speed limit of 60 kilometres per hour for that very reason, knowing that we will catch perhaps only 5 per cent of offenders. However, if we do not set up a 60 kilometre per hour limit, people will travel at 80 kph or 90 kph. There is a whole range of other good examples where we can set in law the principle that we would like to see achieved. I think that it is appropriate to have those obligations enshrined in the law, even though we know that scrutiny by the system and its capacity to carry out the dictates of our legislation may be a little difficult.

The third item relates to the provision to enable small public sector schemes to come under the ambit of the superannuation fund. I believe that there is good sense in that proposal. There has been some criticism of the proposal by assurance companies, which operate large numbers of very small schemes. We now find that, with a large number of non-contributing superannuation schemes across Australia, which came into being with the productivity disposition under the national wage case, whilst they do have a trust or a board operating them, one of the recognised assurance institutions is actually the guardian of the moneys. Ultimately they are responsible for the running of the schemes in an efficient and effective fashion.

The insurance industry suggested to me that there is a number of public schemes that it believes it is servicing quite adequately. It also maintained that perhaps its performance was somewhat better than the performance in the public sector. Therefore, the situation under the circumstances is not as clear cut as it is in relation to the other two issues. Nevertheless, in principle, it is appropriate to reduce the amount of individual attention and effort needed to run smaller schemes—the unit cost of running smaller schemes—and, against a background of the number of requirements placed on those schemes, to have them within a professional outfit such as the superannuation fund.

There is also a provision that will allow the ultimate benefits accruing to employees on retirement to reflect periods of higher duty. There is also a capacity for people

in smaller schemes coming into the superannuation fund to preserve their benefits, even though those benefits may be of a higher order than those provided by the superannuation fund. However, I am not sure whether schemes providing lower benefits are absorbed in the superannuation fund, that those lower order benefits are also preserved and the higher order benefits of the superannuation fund do not apply. That is one matter on which I do not have sufficient information.

Having said that, I take this opportunity to commend the Government for its initiative, and also to remind the Government that it has perhaps failed to act responsibly in a number of areas in respect of superannuation. Members will recall that for the past eight years, on and off, I have talked about the long-term liabilities facing the future taxpayers—our children and grandchildren. Superannuation is one of the most important areas because it is the area with the greatest long-term liabilities. If we look at the accrued liability for sick leave and long service leave, we will see that they pale into insignificance when we look at the contribution that is necessary from the Government. Quite candidly, if we had our time over again, 50 years ago we would have made all schemes contributory. We would also have made all schemes contributory by the Government so that the funds would accumulate at the same rate as those contributed by the employees and would never be underfunded.

In his speech on the Electricity Trust of South Australia Act Amendment Bill the member for Murray-Mallee mentioned a figure of \$3.2 billion as the Government's long-term liability for the public sector superannuation fund. I will ask a question about that during the Committee stage to determine whether that is the case. However, \$3.2 billion is an extraordinary amount when one considers that it relates to today's Public Service. If someone were to do the calculations, that is just over \$2 000 per capita in South Australia just to fund the Government's contribution for superannuation. In fact, it is quite scary to think about how we will afford that liability because, unfortunately, we still do not fund the Government contribution.

The other area of some criticism is the extent to which the South Australian Superannuation Fund Investment Trust has actually been doing its job of late. Members will recall that the performance of the fund has slipped a little in recent years. I remind members that in 1989-90, on a market value basis, the annual investment return was calculated to be 5.5 per cent. That is 1.5 per cent below the rate of inflation. Even if that figure were modified on a market value basis, one would find that it is slightly above inflation.

The police superannuation scheme was somewhat higher than inflation, but both schemes could hardly be judged as top performers around Australia. Some questions need to be asked and answered in relation to the superannuation fund. Earlier this year, Opposition members brought to the attention of the House what we believed were inappropriate policies on behalf of the people involved in the trust fund. We brought such famous names as Qintex and Interchase to the attention of the House.

It was not only the fact that the Superannuation Fund Investment Trust put money into those ventures, because anyone can make a mistake, but that further contributions were made when serious question marks were placed over the capacity of those two organisations to perform in the long term. Some of the question marks concerning the Skase operations were well and truly in front of the public before the superannuation fund followed up with a further investment. It just raises the question to me as to whether the

people who are making decisions on behalf of the taxpayers of South Australia are making them wisely.

Because of the formula that is applied under the old schemes, there are guarantees about the level of superannuation that will be paid to contributors upon their retirement. Those things are guaranteed. Therefore, if the fund fails to perform, the Government has to find more than it had to find previously. It is absolutely imperative that the superannuation fund operates as effectively as possible—as a top earner in the marketplace—and does not suffer the loss of earnings that it has suffered in recent days. That is not to say that everyone can pick winners, but we have seen too many losers.

I have serious doubts about the superannuation fund when it makes decisions like it made in relation to the Qintex contribution. I also have serious doubts about the role played by the Government in relation to the ASER development. Three years down the track, we are still uninformed as to the final outcome of that project. We do not know how much equity is in the ASER development, how much is on loan, what are the terms and conditions of those loans, and what will be the ultimate liability of the taxpayers.

There has been considerable upgrading of the asset or book values shown in the superannuation fund report. I am not sure in my own mind whether those valuations will stand the test of time. Indeed, if those property valuations were looked at today, the 5.5 per cent return that was mentioned in the 1989-90 report may well be a gross overstatement. Everyone can see that the Riverside development has been a monumental disaster because the only people who occupy it are employees of the State Government. No-one wants to take up that space. In itself, that is not unusual, because at least 15 per cent of office space is vacant at the moment. Large investments have been made, which were poorly determined, as far as I can gather, by people from whom I would expect much better.

The huge over-investment in commercial development in recent years has led to an abundance of leasable or rentable space in the marketplace. However, it is interesting that the Riverside development was available for lease long before most of the other developments came on stream and flooded the market. If it had been offered at the right price, the Riverside development could have filled its office space, had it been demanded. However, the price was not right and, when it was made right, no-one wanted the space because there was a glut.

There are questions about the way in which people manage money, and significant entrepreneurs across the length and breadth of Australia have made decisions which, in hindsight, were wrong and which led to corporate failures and serious problems for fine, old, established firms in this country. I merely sound the warning that, despite the fact that those company crashes have taken place and there have been serious scandals in Western Australia, Victoria and New South Wales, to a lesser extent, I require my home State and the people who serve me to make the right decisions and to be less entrepreneurial in the way in which they conduct business so they protect my tax dollars in the process.

While some suggest that, in hindsight, mistakes have been made, I maintain that anyone with a modicum of foresight would have seen the difficulties that have arisen. I go back to that point. It is absolutely imperative that the superannuation fund should perform to its absolute maximum potential because of the guaranteed returns of the fund to those people who will go out of the old scheme on a fixed pension. During the Committee stage, I will ask a number

of questions about the fund itself, its long-term liabilities, and the number of people who are receiving pensions on invalidity grounds, and I am sure that they will be answered adequately at that time.

The Hon. FRANK BLEVINS (Minister of Finance): I thank the Deputy Leader for his support of the second reading. As was stated, essentially, this Bill contains a number of technical amendments to the Superannuation Act. For that reason, my second reading explanation was brief. I am not sure that it was obscenely brief, as stated by the Deputy Leader.

Mr S.J. Baker: Indecently brief.

The Hon. FRANK BLEVINS: I am sorry, indecently brief. I think it was necessarily brief because of the technical nature of the amendments. The Deputy Leader indicated that he will ask some questions in Committee, and I will respond at that time. I commend the second reading to the House.

Bill read a second time.

In Committee.

Clauses 1 to 3 passed.

Clause 4—'Reports.'

Mr S.J. BAKER: This clause introduces the requirement that the cost of the scheme to the Government be made apparent and calculated by an actuary. What is the current estimate of the Government's long-term contribution to the fund?

The Hon. FRANK BLEVINS: It is approximately 6.5 per cent of total payroll.

Mr S.J. BAKER: What does that mean in terms of billions of dollars?

The Hon. FRANK BLEVINS: For two years, 20 years or 200 years? The amount is 6.5 per cent of payroll in perpetuity.

Mr S.J. BAKER: It is normal with any superannuation fund to consider the amount of money paid in by contributors and the long-term payout. The difference between contributions and their earnings and the long-term payouts of those in that scheme is commonly regarded as the long-term liability. Can the Minister provide an approximate estimate? Is it \$3.2 billion, is it less, or is it more? Can the Minister provide a reasonably accurate estimate of the long-term liability, that is, the amount that must be paid in by the State Government to meet the liabilities of the existing contributors?

The Hon. FRANK BLEVINS: It is precisely 6.5 per cent of payroll, forever, or as long as the State keeps going with benefits at this level, I do not have the total payroll figure. I can put a dollar figure on that for this year, but not just at the moment. Whatever the 6.5 per cent of payroll works out at for this year, it will work out the same next year, the year after and so on.

Clause passed.

Clause 5—'Entry of contributors to the scheme.'

Mr S.J. BAKER: Every insurance company in this country actually does that calculation, yet the Minister could not provide an answer. However, I will go on to my next question and hope that there is an improvement from hereon. Why are the words 'is a member of' struck out and the words 'is a contributor to' inserted? It was my understanding that a person could be a member of a fund whether he or she was still employed or was a net recipient after retirement. However, the words 'a contributor' suggest that such a person is no longer eligible.

The Hon. FRANK BLEVINS: The Deputy Leader suggested that I could not provide a figure for long-term liability, but that is incorrect: I can give him the precise figure,

but he must tell me over what period, because the cost of meeting the State superannuation liabilities is 6.5 per cent of payroll. That was stated in the actuary's report, which was tabled. Of course, it is a simple calculation to extrapolate that for as long as one would like. If, on reflection, the Deputy Leader and I are somehow at cross-purposes, before the end of the Committee stage, or in another place, I would be happy to supply whatever figures the Deputy Leader requires. Ours is an ongoing liability that will go on forever and a day: the present level of contributions and benefits will always cost us 6.5 per cent of payroll. I am not trying to be difficult, but that is the position.

Mr S.J. BAKER: I thank the Minister for his explanation. He is technically incorrect in his last statement in that, if the number of people on, say, the lump sum scheme is reduced and the number on the guaranteed pension scheme is maintained, there is a change. I will clarify my example. An actuarial assumption is made as to whether all those in the scheme will retire as part of the scheme or leave the scheme in the interim. The total liability of each person at this date is calculated. The largest funds do this calculation to spread the benefits and their bonuses across all people equally not only according to the amount but according to their long-term liability.

Obviously, a person closer to retirement has a life expectancy that is different from that of a 20-year old; there will be differences in a relative sense. I can assure the Minister that there is a figure. My previous question relates to the change from 'member', which I believe is quite clear, to 'contributor'. If we use the word 'contributor', we imply that that person's membership of the fund ceased the moment that person no longer contributed, whereas they could still remain a member of the fund. Why is that change to be made?

The Hon. FRANK BLEVINS: One of the problems is that, if a person resigns but the benefit is preserved and they continue as a contributor, and if they come back, they cannot join as a member because they are already a member. I was almost right, but I will get it in writing for the Committee so that nobody is in any doubt. Under existing preservation provisions, a person is not necessarily a member of the scheme but is a contributor to the scheme. If that individual comes back into the scheme at some future date, apparently under the present legislation the trustees cannot accept that person as a member, unless this change is made so that he or she was previously known as a contributor. I will ask my adviser to reflect on this advice and see whether it can be written more clearly, and I will convey that to the House.

Clause passed.

Clause 6 passed.

Clause 7—'Contribution points.'

Mr S.J. BAKER: I am quite content with the change being made here, but has there been any estimate of the cost or is the cost neutral?

The Hon. FRANK BLEVINS: The cost is negative.

Clause passed.

Clause 8—'Attribution of additional contribution points and contribution months.'

Mr S.J. BAKER: This clause causes me some concern. I remind members that section 25 of the Act provides:

(1) The Minister may, in appropriate cases—

(a) attribute additional contribution points to a contributor;

(b) attribute additional contribution months to a contributor.

(2) Before acting under this section, the Minister must obtain a report on the proposed action from the board.

This is the provision that allows Governments to give an extra superannuation benefit to attract people into the service for a limited time but with a significant remuneration

component when those people leave that contract. Under the current provision, the Minister had to obtain a report on the proposed change before the board, so that, if the Minister wanted a particular employee to come in under contract, and one part of the package was to have a number of units contributed to that person's account, the Minister had to take the matter before the board. That matter was pursued by the Liberal Opposition at the time the 1980 Bill was before the House. This provision changes that. Clause 8 provides:

(2) The Minister must provide the board with details of the attribution of contribution points or months under subsection (1) and the board must include those details in its report to the Minister under Division IV of Part II.

I want to know why that change has taken place. Under the previous provision, every Minister would have been forced to consult the board. I guess that one benefit is that, under the circumstances, the details must be published but, if my memory serves me aright, there is a provision in the old Bill under which the same process had to be followed. With this provision, a unilateral decision can be made, and the board informed only, not consulted. As I have some difficulty with this, will the Minister explain?

The Hon. FRANK BLEVINS: The board itself has asked for this provision, because the Superannuation Board does not have the actuarial and superannuation technical skills to be able to make comments on the appropriateness of a proposed attribution under the existing wording of the subsection. In fact, it is Treasury that provides the Minister with advice on the appropriateness of a special superannuation build up.

Mr S.J. BAKER: I suggest that, between this and the other place, this explanation finds its way into legislation, and that the Minister has to refer it to Treasury.

Clause passed.

Clause 9—'Resignation and preservation.'

Mr S.J. BAKER: If a person fails to make an election, how long does that failure last in terms of the automatic provision, which says that the contribution has been vested?

The Hon. FRANK BLEVINS: I am not sure I understood the question. Looking at this provision in the Bill, I find it states quite clearly 'within three months'.

Mr S.J. BAKER: It says that, if the contributor has failed to elect, he or she is deemed to have vested. How long is he or she deemed to have vested? Is it until the age of 55, the age of 60, or until which age? It seems that there is no right then to come back, unless the board feels inclined to accommodate that wish.

The Hon. FRANK BLEVINS: It is preserved until the age of 55.

Mr S.J. BAKER: This seems unfair to those people who have overlooked this provision because, if that person retired at 52 or 53 without making the appropriate arrangement, it is then at the whim of the board whether that person will be able to take out the benefit. Will the Minister explain the reason for this amendment?

The Hon. FRANK BLEVINS: We have to have some provision. I should have thought that (1b) was as liberal as we could be. Someone who does not elect cannot be fined. Some arrangement must be made. New subsection (1b) states clearly:

If the board is of the opinion that the limitation period referred to in subsection (1a) would unfairly prejudice a contributor, the board may extend the period as it applies to the contributor.

That provision can really be very liberal. If the board makes an assumption, as it is obliged to do under the Act, and that assumption turns out to be unduly harsh, the board can do something else. It is perhaps more in keeping with the wishes of the contributor when the contributor even-

tually gets around to doing something about it. It seems to me eminently sensible and non-controversial.

Clause passed.

Clause 10—'Rehabilitation etc., of disability pensioner.'

Mr S.J. BAKER: How many people who went out under the disabled benefit currently receive retirement benefits from the fund?

The Hon. FRANK BLEVINS: There are 61 new people in that category, and the total involved is 1 110. The board's annual report with all these figures in it will be tabled shortly.

Mr S.J. BAKER: That is 1 110 people out of what total?

The Hon. FRANK BLEVINS: Including children, it is 11 311.

Clause passed.

Clause 11—'Termination of employment on invalidity.'

Mr S.J. BAKER: There is a change in the denominator from 420 to 360, which I believe increases the benefit by 16.66 per cent. Why has that change been made?

The Hon. FRANK BLEVINS: It does not increase the benefit but actually reduces it slightly.

Mr S.J. Baker: That's by reducing the denominator?

The Hon. FRANK BLEVINS: Yes.

Mr S.J. BAKER: I regard myself as a reasonable mathematician. If one reduces the denominator, which is the divisive influence that controls the benefit, and the denominator decreases in value, I would have thought that the benefit increased in value. Perhaps I have not worked through the total formula. If the Minister at his leisure provides me with an explanation indicating where I have gone wrong with my calculations, I will be happy to accept that the benefit has reduced.

The Hon. FRANK BLEVINS: I am not privy to the workings of the Deputy Opposition Leader's mind, but apparently he has overlooked—and I am sure he will pick that up immediately when I draw it to his attention—that he is using the age of 55 when, in effect, it is the age—

Mr S.J. Baker: I have got it.

The Hon. FRANK BLEVINS: I knew that the honourable member would pick it up as soon as I mentioned the missing link.

Clause passed.

Clauses 12 and 13 passed.

Clause 14—'Resignation and preservation of benefits.'

Mr S.J. BAKER: Is the vesting arrangement to last until 60 years, as the last one lasted until 55?

The Hon. FRANK BLEVINS: Yes.

Clause passed.

Clauses 15 and 16 passed.

Clause 17—'Regulations.'

Mr S.J. BAKER: Where is subsection (1a) (b)?

The Hon. FRANK BLEVINS: I will have that examined. It may be a typographical error.

The CHAIRMAN: Typographical errors can be corrected, if that turns out to be the case.

Clause passed.

Clause 18—'Amendment of schedule 1.'

Mr S.J. BAKER: This clause inserts new section 3a to the schedule. It provides:

(1) . . . (c) where the amount referred to in paragraph (b) was not credited to the contributor's contribution account on 1 July 1988, an amount determined by the board to be the return that would have been attributable to the investment of that amount if it had been credited to the account on 1 July 1988.

I should have thought that all the funds would have been well and truly credited prior to July 1988. Why has that provision been included?

The Hon. FRANK BLEVINS: It is a technical amendment. There is a deficiency in the wording of the Act that

this amendment overcomes. My advice is that it does not confer any further benefit or detract from any benefit: it merely clarifies the provision that was deemed to be technically deficient.

Clause passed.

Clause 19—'Insertion of schedule 1a.'

Mr S.J. BAKER: Which schemes can be brought under the umbrella of the superannuation fund?

The Hon. FRANK BLEVINS: For example, there are about 60 small hospital schemes with between five and 12 members.

Mr S.J. BAKER: Can the Minister provide a more extensive answer? I would appreciate knowing what could be covered under these proposals. There has been criticism about bringing everything under the umbrella of SASFIT. It would be useful to have the names of all the schemes that could be covered under these provisions.

The Hon. FRANK BLEVINS: It is mainly small hospital schemes.

Mr S.J. BAKER: What is the status of the taxation situation in respect of the Commonwealth's view on whether the scheme should not be taxed?

The Hon. FRANK BLEVINS: I am not sure that I can answer that, other than in general terms by stating that on every occasion when it has appeared appropriate we have brought legislation before the Parliament to ensure that the Commonwealth legislation was complied with, and that no unnecessary taxation is paid out of any of these superannuation schemes. There was one such Bill before the House earlier today in respect of Electricity Trust employees. I am not sure whether that answers adequately the Deputy Leader's question. Obviously, I cannot speak for the Commonwealth and what it believes is appropriate from time to time.

Clause passed.

Title passed.

Bill read a third time and passed.

BOATING ACT AMENDMENT BILL

Adjourned debate on second reading.

(Continued from 21 November. Page 2104.)

Mr MEIER (Goyder): The Opposition supports this Bill. I remind members that it makes three changes to the Boating Act. First, it extends to selected boat dealers the right to issue temporary motor boat registrations when Department of Marine and Harbors offices are closed, such as on Friday nights or Saturday mornings. Secondly, it corrects a drafting error so that the Governor rather than the Minister approves apparatus for conducting alcohol breath-testing. Thirdly, it imposes a division 9 fine (a fine not exceeding \$500) for failing to apply for transfer of registration within the required 14 days of the sale or disposal of a boat.

I am pleased that this legislation has been introduced. It is a step in the right direction and will certainly help those boat owners in the coming summer months who make a snap decision to purchase a boat on a Friday night or a Saturday morning, because they will now be able to use the boat on that weekend. I have some questions for the Minister during the Committee stage. I give notice that the key issue is who will be the selected boat dealers, to use the Minister's words, and how the temporary registrations will be issued. As I said, the Opposition supports this Bill and we wish it a speedy passage through Parliament.

Mr FERGUSON (Henley Beach): I want to make a very short contribution to this debate. I refer to the correction

of the legislation with respect to breath testing. That is something that I believe is very worthwhile because of the problems that have occurred with certain craft with respect to the waterways and beach fronts of Henley and Grange in particular. I refer particularly to jetskis or personal water craft as they are known. Breaches of this legislation have involved these craft because people using them are not wearing flotation jackets; they travel too close to swimmers; then imbibe alcohol; and generally they misbehave when using them.

However, the greatest problem with these craft relates to the noise level. The noise level causes problems for my constituents. It has been explained to me that it is like having a sawmill next door. These craft are out on the water in the very early hours of the morning, sometimes from 6 a.m., and they are still buzzing around at 7 p.m. I understand that there is a need to pass this legislation as soon as possible and, for that reason, I conclude my remarks with the hope that the appropriate authorities, including Marine and Harbors, Environment and Planning and the Minister of Transport, do something about this particular problem.

Bill read a second time.

In Committee.

Clause 1 passed.

Clause 2—'Delegation.'

Mr MEIER: The Bill provides that the Minister may delegate to a person who carries on the business of selling motor boats the power to issue permits. Will the Minister explain who will be able to issue the permits? Will they be restricted to just the larger dealers; will it apply across the State generally or only to the metropolitan area; or will it be a case of people applying for the facility to issue these permits?

The Hon. R.J. GREGORY: A number of words could have been used here. If it were to be obligatory, the words 'shall' or 'should' would have been used. However, the word 'may' denotes a discretionary power. A number of dealers in country areas would sell enough boats during the week or the weekend to warrant having the appropriate permits on hand. We want the department to have the discretionary power to be able to say to a dealer, 'We don't think you warrant having the permits'. For all dealers it will be determined on a needs basis. It would be stupid to give this power to a boat dealer who opens between Monday and Friday with his boat yard next to a facility for obtaining registrations, but it would make a lot of sense to give it to a dealer in an area such as Thevenard or in towns along the Murray River where there are no registration facilities.

It is discretionary. We want to facilitate the sale of boats so that, if a dealer sells a boat on a Saturday morning, the purchaser can use the boat that afternoon, knowing that it is registered in his or her name. All the purchaser must do is take the details to the office very early in the piece. There is no formal provision to enable the department to take away a dealer's ability to issue permits, but I would say that, if a boat dealer abused this right, the department would look upon it very unfavourably and tell the dealer that he or she no longer had the facility. When one thinks about it, it is a concession that we are giving the dealers. I think it should be discretionary and ought to be taken away if it is abused.

Mr MEIER: Supplementary to that, would the measure therefore include small country dealerships that might also be hardware stores, and so on, but which also sell boats and perhaps outboard motors and also do repairs? Would such businesses be able to apply, and would there be much chance of their being successful? How will registration numbers be assigned? Will dealers be given a set of numbers—say, a

dozen—which they will use from the lowest to the highest and, when all the numbers have been used, the dealer will be required to apply for more?

The Hon. R.J. GREGORY: I do not know how it will be done; I have not asked about it. The legislation will allow officers of the department to do this, and they will do it. I would think that a major dealership would be given a large number, and a small dealership would be given a small number. I thought I said earlier in the piece that there will be an arrangement for people in country towns or remote areas who are in business and who have limited access. If someone selling boats can show that they sell a certain number over a year, I am sure that the department would have a sliding scale so that in every quarter the dealer would be supplied with an adequate allocation of registration numbers for new boats. However, one must remember that, if one is selling a secondhand boat, the registration number stays on the boat unless it is a specific type of boat, where the number is transferable; for example, sea rescue and the yacht squadron have certain vessels where, for their reasons, the numbers remain the same. Apart from that, if anyone else were selling a boat, the number would go with the boat.

I do not see any reason why anyone who runs a business as a boat seller or dealer and who can establish their credentials by selling so many boats in a year, no matter how small that number, should not have access to this facility. It is to allow people selling boats to satisfy the public demand and to make it easier for the public to get boats and to take them out on the water on the day that they purchase them.

Mr MEIER: I am surprised at the Minister's reaction to my question because I said in my second reading contribution that the Opposition supports this. I said that it is a commonsense measure; there is no problem with that. I am just surprised that the Minister does not know how it will work. Hopefully that will be determined later.

Clause passed.

Clause 3—'Transfer of registration.'

Mr MEIER: Why does the Bill provide for a division 9 fine, which is less than \$500, whereas if one fails to notify the transfer of a motor vehicle—when one sells a vehicle or disposes of it—the penalty is a division 10 fine, which is less than \$200. This seems to be a fairly harsh penalty for boat owners.

The Hon. R.J. GREGORY: I think it is a very reasonable penalty.

Clause passed.

Remaining clauses (4 and 5) and title passed.

Bill read a third time and passed.

The Hon. R.J. GREGORY (Minister of Labour): I move: That the sitting of the House be extended beyond 6 p.m.

Motion carried.

ADJOURNMENT

The Hon. R.J. GREGORY (Minister of Labour): I move: That the House do now adjourn.

Mr HAMILTON (Albert Park): Reference was made today to my recent visit to Western Australia. Members will recall that in this House over a period I have addressed the issue of crime prevention in South Australia and some of the measures that can be taken. At a recent international seminar in Melbourne this year I had the opportunity and the privilege to meet with a Mr Mike Doherty, who is the principal building surveyor to the City of Gosnells. I was

so impressed by Mr Doherty's contribution at this international conference that I decided last week to go to Western Australia to see the sort of programs in which the Gosnells City Council has been involved. I was very impressed by the council's approach.

Before going into that, I must place on the record the manner in which I was welcomed by the Mayor, Councillor Pat Morris, JP. In my view, her knowledge and understanding of this matter was profound. I taped a lengthy interview with her so I could bring it back for all my parliamentary colleagues to view. I throw out the challenge to Liberal members to view the tape, because it is quite remarkable. The mayor's response to my question about her academic qualifications in this area was equally remarkable: she said that she had brought up three children. From the contribution she made and the manner in which she assisted me, I suggest that this woman is unique. She is involved in so many programs in that city, which is a very progressive city, as is the chief surveying officer, Michael Doherty.

These people do not just sit on their hands. They have been able to get out into the community to find out what the kids want—not what we want, but what the young adults want in terms of vandalism, graffiti and the measures they want local government and the State Government to adopt. The ability of Pat Morris and Michael Doherty to relate came across clearly to me. They talked about calling public meetings to find out how these young adults view what is happening in their own community. The meetings were held not in the council chambers but in a park where the young adults would not feel threatened or intimidated by the bureaucracy.

In my view, some of the programs that they have introduced are excellent. They have been able to get these young adults to assist in beautifying some parts of Gosnells with what they call urban art—here it is called graffiti. The young adults have painted many of the bus shelters and other parts of Gosnells city. In 1985, I visited Western Australia with my wife and saw these painted bus shelters. I thought that the ability of these young people was extraordinary. Today in Gosnells, the young adults are doing exactly the same thing, although, as the mayor said, it is art of the twenty-first century.

I have actively encouraged Mrs Morris and Mr Doherty to come to South Australia and, likewise, they have thrown open the opportunity for those people who purport to be interested in teenagers to visit their city and talk with them at any time. I hope that some of my colleagues will take up that challenge.

I turn now to the specifics. Each month, the council issues comparative crime statistics in Neighbourhood Watch areas in all suburbs. I believe that all councils in South Australia should look at these issues. It also provides to the general public information in relation to police coordination programs, and it is important that people understand quite clearly what the police are doing. In South Australia, the police could be involved, and I hope that the Government will take up this issue and look at the positive relationship, and the initiatives that have been taken, between the police and the community in Western Australia.

I also had the opportunity to look at the community centre, with which youth are involved. The local people were asked how they felt about these issues and, initially, there was some backlash against it. As I understand it, some trepidation was felt by police, the local business community and other sectors in Gosnells. However, with the patience, the will and the desire to try to reduce the incidence of crime in the area, the success rate has been very good. The

mayor indicated that they would like more money from the Government, but crime has been reduced.

One of the ways in which that has happened has been through truancy officers. In their report, those officers indicated that, by talking to these kids on the street during school hours, they have been able to reduce considerably the incidence of crime. The Government of this State has an opportunity to embark upon a similar sort of program and to take a look at what is being done in Western Australia. I have listened to the Government's response and to that of Opposition members. I throw out a challenge to Opposition members to go to Western Australia and take a look at the programs and initiatives that have been taken by that council.

It is very easy to come down on kids with a big stick. In this State plenty of legislation is available to law enforcement agencies to crack down on crime. Conversely, we need to look at the social problems and the social needs of these young people because, in many ways, it is important to find out what they want, not what we want. It is not for us to impose our views on them and tell them what we believe they should be doing. We should find out what they want. They are saying, 'Listen to us. Don't try to impose your will upon us. We have our own views and our own ideas about where we should be going.' That is the message that comes across time and time again. If we impose our views on them, they will rebel. The Mayor of Port Augusta is trying to impose her will, and it just does not work.

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

Mr S.G. EVANS (Davenport): I commend a lot of what the previous speaker said, except that I remind him that, if he wants cooperation, he should not attack unnecessarily the member for Bright, the member for Hayward and the member for Fisher, who have all made the point that we should give young people the opportunity to paint bus shelters in an artistic way and look after them. That subject has been raised publicly and in this place by those members. The purpose for my speaking tonight relates to a letter from the Deputy Premier (Don Hopgood), published in the *Advertiser*. In reference to the *Advertiser's* article of 23 November, the Deputy Premier said:

I have seen some misleading headlines in my time, but your page 3 'Government poker bungle may cost millions' must surely take the cake.

There was a bungle by the Government—a big bungle—and I will refer to that in greater detail later. The Deputy Premier went on to say:

The whole matter is about the installation of video games in the casino and it is certainly true that, potentially, a lot of public revenue will be made from this venture.

The article, written by Rex Jory, suggested that the Government had made a bungle, therefore it has lost a lot of money. I agree with the Deputy Premier: there was no loss of money by the Government at all. Rex Jory's article also stated that the Deputy Premier had spoken to me, and that is a misunderstanding between Jory and me, because I said it was the Deputy Leader of the Opposition who had spoken to me. However, at no time has any Government Minister spoken to me, or the Deputy Premier, except about nine weeks before the Hon. Frank Blevins spoke to me on the subject. There has never been a request to me as an individual by any Government member to bring on that vote. It is a private members' matter: it is not between the whips, and that should be remembered. The Deputy Premier went on to say:

The installation has been delayed because Stan Evans, MP, has introduced a motion for disallowance of the enabling regulations,

notwithstanding the defeat of a similar motion in the Legislative Council.

That is a great statement. I will refer to that in a moment. He also said:

Mr Evans has also refused a Government proposal to allow his motion to be debated . . .

That is not the case at all: I have not been approached by the Government. I told my own Deputy Leader that it was a private members' matter, and I stick by that. If the Government wants to bring on all private members' matters, those that suit the Opposition as well as its own members, good, but it cannot be selective unless there is joint agreement.

On 29 November I wrote to the *Advertiser*, and I thought it might have had the courtesy to publish my letter in response to the Deputy Premier, but I realise that the Deputy Premier carries a bit more power than an ordinary backbencher. I realise that, if I read it into *Hansard*, it is unlikely that many people will read it. I think a few more would read the *Advertiser*, although I cannot be sure of that. In my letter I said:

Dear Editor,

Re: Deputy Premier Hoggood's letter to the *Advertiser* of 29 November 1990.

His assertion that a decision of the Upper House should be accepted by the Lower House is amazing. Of course, if his Government is prepared to give a commitment that any decision of the Upper House would be binding on the Lower House, for this Parliament, it would be great.

And I stick by that: it would be fantastic if the Government would accept decisions of the Upper House as being binding. I then said:

What he could have written is that—

The prohibition of pokies in the Act applies because his Government promised no pokies as a condition of the casino being created. An inquiry into the effect of gambling on our community was also promised. That has not occurred.

A Bill to amend the Act was the appropriate method if the Government wanted a speedy resolution to the matter—it still has that option. The 'video machines' are for all intents and purposes poker machines.

Don Hoggood and his Cabinet colleagues knew many MPs would oppose poker machines and someone would move disallowance. Therefore, they knew the casino regulations would face the usual gauntlet of months of delay.

They chose regulations because they did not want to open up a full debate on the Act which would highlight the two broken promises.

Don Hoggood states my motivation escapes him: so does the Government's escape me, if credibility is a criterion. If this sole right to pokies was put to tender it would command at least \$100 million. The Government then would not have to carve up the State education system.

The Deputy Premier's motion sought to achieve the same as mine. If that is his Government's genuine intent, the matter is settled—pokies are out.

Let us pick up some of those points. The Deputy Premier said, towards the end of his letter:

That the motion was inadmissible is the cause of some mild embarrassment to me but it is certainly not costing the South Australian community revenue, either actual or potential.

Sure, it should have been an embarrassment to him: a man who has been the Deputy Premier, and who has been the Leader of the House in organising business, the tactics man, did not remember the Standing Orders of the Parliament. He went ahead and tried by that means to have it debated. The Deputy Premier also said:

In the circumstances, my notice of motion was a device—
and take note of the word 'device'—

albeit misinformed it seems, to have the matter aired and resolved at the earliest possible occasion.

It was a devious device to try to get over a private members' resolution, to have it debated, to move that regulations be disallowed but then to vote in favour of them. One could

not get more devious or go lower than that when it comes to private members' business.

I refer to my view that video machines, for all intents and purposes, are poker machines. Three games are played on those machines: one is draw poker, and that clearly is poker, there is no doubt about that; another is keno, and there is no skill in playing keno—one selects numbers and it is a straight out gamble, as in relation to poker machines; and the other game is blackjack, but not the blackjack played at the tables—it is entirely different. Let the Government know that it has broken two promises. Yet we read in the paper in recent times that there is a gambling problem in this State; many people are going into debt because they are short of money or out of work, hoping against hope that they will win, but knowing that in all probability they will lose.

That is what is in front of us; the Government wants to increase that opportunity against the promise it gave to Parliament when the casino was established, that is, that there would be an inquiry into the effect of gambling on individuals, and on social welfare benefits and other matters that relate to the cost of running the State. It failed to do it; the Government did not honour that promise. I think that is quite disgraceful. There were two broken promises. The Government did not have the intestinal fortitude to bring before Parliament a Bill; it could have done that in Government time. Tonight we will finish at 6.30 p.m. or thereabouts: we will not sit in the evening, which is traditional, and the Government says that it is short of time. What a lot of hogwash! What a sham!

Each and every member opposite knows what they tried to do was to cheat by not having the legislation open to debate. I believe that the Government stands condemned for that. I hoped that the *Advertiser* would see some merit in my providing a view opposite to that of the Deputy Premier, given that his letter attacked me, although it was a slight attack; I believe I was entitled to a response.

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

The Hon. T.H. HEMMINGS (Napier): I would like to express disappointment at the Government's recent decision, made by the Premier, not to proceed with the \$21 million upgrading of Parliament House. Members would be well aware that the recommendation stems from a report by the Minister of Public Works, who is sitting on the front bench. I congratulate him for commissioning that report: in my term as Minister of Public Works, I did not have the guts and courage to put down on paper exactly what is necessary in this establishment. When one looks at the problems in relation to this area, one can only wonder why we are not proceeding with that \$21 million upgrading. The report speaks for itself:

The accommodation standards and facilities for members and staff at Parliament House should be at least equal to those applying elsewhere in the South Australian Public Service, and should be primarily related to function rather than status. Occupational health, safety and fire requirements have to be met.

There has to be optimum utilisation of space at Parliament House before any extensions or relocations are considered.

The provision of adequate working space for members and staff takes precedence over the provision of recreational and dining facilities.

Under the heading 'Non-compliance with current regulations and standards', the report states:

Currently, Parliament House is deficient relative to the following regulations and standards: fire safety; handicapped access and facilities; health, safety and welfare; ergonomics (furniture and equipment selections); and heritage.

And so it goes on. I hasten to make the point that I have no problem with the reasoning given by the Premier in making the decision that \$21 million coming from consolidated revenue was just not on in our present economic climate. That is a sad fact of life and, as I say, I have no problem with the Government's making that decision. We do live in tight economic times.

My disappointment stems primarily from the fact that the Government did not think the matter through completely. There are other ways by which we could achieve the upgrading, at no cost whatsoever to taxpayers and without superseding other important aspects of the public works program. How could that upgrading be achieved? A solution has been put to this House many times in relation to other Government and public agencies. The points made there are just as relevant when we think of Parliament House.

I pay tribute to the Leader of the Opposition in promoting this remedy. Too often we dismiss the utterances of the Leader of the Opposition as the ravings of a fool—and that is where the Government fell down, because on this aspect the Leader of the Opposition is dead right! And we should acknowledge that. The solution to the problem of funding the \$21 million upgrading of Parliament House is purely and simply summed up in one word—privatisation!

We should privatise Parliament House. If one follows the line of the Leader of the Opposition, then if it is good for Marine and Harbors, for the Department of Correctional Services, for SACON and for all the other areas the Leader of the Opposition wants to privatise, I say it is good for Parliament House. Let us look at the criteria the Leader uses in relation to those agencies I have already mentioned.

Urgent need of capital investment: that is certainly as true here as it is with Marine and Harbors and with the Department of Correctional Services. Need to expand to cater for a more efficient operation: I have no problem with that. We certainly need that here in Parliament House. This is a classic example as quoted by the Leader of the Opposition of non-performance by those engaged in the industry. Nothing is truer than here at Parliament House. What do we do to ensure that this cradle of democracy is still in the hands of the people?

The SPEAKER: Order! Did the honourable member just reflect upon members?

The Hon. T.H. HEMMINGS: No, Sir—I am praising them. I am saying that the community of South Australia needs to retain 51 per cent of this august Chamber, so that it is always in the hands—

The Hon. JENNIFER CASHMORE: On a point of order, if I heard the member correctly he suggested that all members of Parliament were non-performing.

The SPEAKER: The Chair was of the view that something along those lines was said.

The Hon. T.H. HEMMINGS: If I gave that impression to the member for Coles, I apologise. I would be the last person to say that the member for Coles is a non-performer. In fact, if one looks at past *Hansard* reports, one will see that I have paid tribute to the member for Coles more times than has my colleague the member for Henley Beach!

We sell off only 49 per cent of Parliament House, of the membership of this place, to the private sector, ensuring that the public of South Australia retains a controlling inter-

est. Who will make up that 49 per cent of the membership that will be sold to the private sector? I should not like the member for Coles or any other member opposite to say that I am actually reflecting on members opposite, so I will use one of their ex-workers, Alex Kennedy, who writes a fairly unbiased article each week denigrating either the Opposition or the Government. In this case, for about six weeks non-stop she has been having some harsh words to say about the Liberal Party. When talking about the contrasting Liberals, she says:

They are undisciplined, have no team spirit and have only themselves to blame. Apart from cowardly and ignorant anonymous letters and the stupidity of old hand Heini Becker's headlines saying there is no evidence smoking is a health risk, the new members have not quite worked out that grabbing headlines can lose more votes than it gains.

I did not say that. You, Sir, know that I did not say that, because you have read this article yourself. Alex Kennedy said it, so no-one from the other side can say that I am reflecting on members. If we take the advice of Alex Kennedy and other political commentators, we could sell the 49 per cent of this place that consists of the Liberal Party!

Who will we sell it to? We can sell it to the Chamber of Manufacturers, Chamber of Mines and Energy, Chamber of Commerce and Industry, United Farmers and Stockowners Association, the Stock Exchange, the Small Business Association, the Employers Federation and the Master Builders Association.

Mr BRINDAL: On a point of order, if I heard the honourable member correctly he is referring to members on this side of the House and suggesting that we do not occupy our places.

The SPEAKER: What is the point of order?

Mr BRINDAL: I think he is reflecting on us.

The SPEAKER: I did not pick that up, but I will ask the honourable member to be very careful with the words he uses.

The Hon. T.H. HEMMINGS: I will deal with the price. For what price could we sell this place? To all those organisations I have just mentioned, a fair going price would be \$150 million. We need to spend only \$21 million on the upgrading and \$23 million to pay off those people who will have to go. That is \$1 million each, and I cannot see anyone who makes up that 49 per cent knocking back \$1 million to leave this Chamber!

The rest will go into a sinking fund to ensure that Parliament is maintained at the level commensurate with what the public of South Australia wants. I worked out my solution in the car coming in today, and, if the Government has not been able to think that one out, shame on it!

I urge the Government and the Minister on the front bench, the Minister of Housing and Construction, to go back to Cabinet with the scenario I am putting forward, and at no cost to the taxpayer we will be able to ensure that all those organisations supposedly represented by the Liberal Party will be able to have some input into what is going on.

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

Motion carried.

At 6.28 p.m. the House adjourned until Wednesday 5 December at 2 p.m.

HOUSE OF ASSEMBLY

Tuesday 4 December 1990

QUESTIONS ON NOTICE

TOURISM SOUTH AUSTRALIA

1. The Hon. JENNIFER CASHMORE (Coles) asked the Minister of Industry, Trade and Technology representing the Minister of Tourism:

1. What will be the total expenditure of Tourism South Australia on marketing South Australia in the current financial year?

2. How much is being spent in each country and what is the breakdown of expenditure in each country?

3. What contribution has South Australia made to the Australian Tourism Commission 'Australia Land of Dreams' campaign?

4. What bookings have so far been made on a country by country basis in response to marketing efforts in South-East Asia over the past two years?

The Hon. LYNN ARNOLD: The replies are as follows:

1. \$10.1 million	
2. USA/CANADA	\$A
Advertising and promotion	240 000
Representative costs	
(Salaries/contract fees, etc.)	80 000
Office overheads	
(including office staff salaries)	100 000
	<u>420 000</u>
UK/EUROPE	
Advertising and promotion	340 000
Representative costs	
(Salaries/contract fees, etc.)	N/A*
Office overheads	
(including office staff salaries)	15 000*
	<u>355 000</u>
*All major costs covered by South Australia's Agent-General in London through Department of the Premier and Cabinet.	
SOUTH-EAST ASIA	
Advertising and promotion	260 000
Representative costs	
(Salaries/contract fees, etc.)	154 000
Office overheads	
(including office staff salaries)	67 000
	<u>481 000</u>
NEW ZEALAND	
Advertising and promotion	110 000
Representative costs	
(Salaries/contract fees, etc.)	66 000
Office overheads	
(including office staff salaries)	71 000
	<u>247 000</u>
JAPAN	
Advertising and promotion	200 000
Representative costs	
(Salaries/contract fees, etc.)	200 000
Office overheads	
(including office staff salaries)	50 000
	<u>450 000</u>

3. During the 1989-90 financial year, Tourism South Australia entered into a cooperative television advertising campaign with the Australian Tourist Commission, which featured a specially made 30 second television commercial promoting Adelaide.

This television commercial made use of the musical soundtrack from the Australian Tourist Commission's 'Australia, Land of Dreams' campaign, but featured specific film footage and a voice-over that highlighted key features of Ade-

laide as a tourist destination—based on the theme that Adelaide was where the 'Australian dream could begin'.

Tourism South Australia contributed \$35 000 towards this television campaign.

4. Tourism South Australia is not involved in booking any travel between South-East Asian countries and South Australia.

The booking records of tour wholesalers, inbound tour operators, international travel retailers and major transport carriers are not generally available for public perusal.

COAL

5. Mr LEWIS (Murray-Mallee) asked the Minister of Mines and Energy:

1. In relation to coal from Lochiel, Bowmans, Sedan and Arckaringa, respectively—

(a) what is the percentage range of sulphur content of the dry weight;

(b) what other significant impurities occur; and

(c) what net energy output can be expected (per tonne after allowing for losses and uses in production of electricity)?

2. When will the Leigh Creek pit be abandoned and why will it be abandoned at that time?

3. What is the anticipated average cost per tonne of mining Leigh Creek coal each year from now until the pit is abandoned and what is the increasing cost per tonne of removing the overburden as the pit gets deeper?

4. What arrangements have been made to secure Cooper Basin gas for ETSA from 1994 and what volume of gas has been contracted?

5. What is the cost of overburden removed at Leigh Creek which has been capitalised in the accounts and depreciated over 30 years and what will happen to this accumulated cost when production finally ceases?

6. Has the commercial viability of circulating fluid bed combustion technology for coal of the Lochiel type been assessed and, if so, what are the findings and where else in the world is this technology being used?

7. Is East Germany increasing or decreasing its usage of high sulphur brown coal similar to the type found at Lochiel?

8. What are the energy demand forecasting procedures and methodology and the consequent estimates used by ETSA and other relevant authorities?

9. What are the Government's plans for the future ownership and financial arrangements relating to power generation?

10. What is the Government's strategy to reduce the cost of industrial power?

11. What industries or proposed projects have been lost to Victoria which would have proceeded in South Australia if electricity was cheaper or the same price as offered by Victoria?

12. What is the current status of the Lochiel proposal and is it still the preferred option of the Government as recommended by ETSA to the Legislative Council Select Committee in 1989?

13. What was electricity demand in the first quarter of 1990 and if it was higher than the forecast increase in demand of 2.5-2.9 per cent, what were the reasons?

14. What use has South Australia made of power drawn from the interconnection grid so far, when was power from the grid required to prevent possible shut-down due to overload and, if South Australia has an excess of generating capacity over demand, why was this necessary?

15. Did the Government in its negotiations with the Victorian Government for the establishment of the inter-connection attempt to strike an arrangement to enable South Australia to compete on a more equitable footing with Victoria for those industries which were proposed for the Green Triangle region?

16. When will the Government release the State Energy Plan Green Paper referred to in item 46 in the address by the Governor at the opening of Parliament in February 1990 and how does the Government propose to ensure that the paper will be widely circulated and that there will be broad based community consultation?

The Hon. J.H.C. KLUNDER: The replies are as follows:

1. (a) Testing for average dry ash-free sulphur levels in the Lochiel, Bowmans, Sedan and Wintinna (Arckaringa) coals have indicated the following content:

	%S
Lochiel	1.1
Bowmans	2.2
Sedan	2.3
Wintinna	1.2

(b) Other significant impurities in all the above coals include moisture and sodium chloride (salt). Dry ash-free chlorine for the coals is as follows:

	%Cl
Lochiel	0.18
Bowmans	0.50
Sedan	0.08
Wintinna	0.04

(c) The higher heating values (on average) of the four coals are as follows:

	MJ/kg
Lochiel	9.1
Bowmans	10.6
Sedan	9.4
Wintinna	18.5

The efficiency of electricity generation and hence the net energy output can vary with the technology to be utilised. The technology would need to be optimised for each coal so as to optimise the generation efficiency.

2. There is no clearly identified timetable for the end of operations at Leigh Creek at this time. *Ceteris paribus* the pit could be utilised until well into the next century; however, there are significant uncertainties involved (for example, the development and availability of other primary energy sources).

3. It is not possible to provide information about the cost per tonne of Leigh Creek coal. To do so would be to provide suppliers of alternative fuel sources with information that they could use to their advantage.

4. The present gas sales agreements with the Cooper Basin producers provide gas coverage to the State (and ETSA as the major consumer) until the end of 1993.

Provided the Cooper Basin producers discover specified additional reserves by the end of 1991, a 10-year contract to provide about 60 per cent of present gas needs from 1994 to the end of 2001 will be in place. The contract should provide coverage on a 'rolling' 10-year basis, with the eleventh year being specified 10 years in advance.

From 1994 with the rolling cover in place the South Australian Cooper Basin will provide 65 PJ per annum of gas. A further gas supply will be required to supplement South Australian demand. This supplementary supply of gas could be sourced from a number of places; for example, South West Queensland and the Amadeus Basin in the Northern Territory.

Negotiations are presently taking place with representatives from both of these areas with the expectation of formalising an agreement early next year.

5. As at 30 June 1990, the portion of the cost of overburden removal which has been capitalised in the accounts totalled \$72.192 million. In 1977, an 'average' annual cost of overburden removal was calculated, based on the estimated total cost of overburden removal, and the life expectancy of the mine. Every year since, excess expenditure on overburden removal (over and above this average figure) has been capitalised in the accounts. The figure of \$72.192 million represents the total accumulation of each year's excess expenditure since 1977.

During the later stages of the mine's development the situation will be reversed, with the annual cost of overburden removal falling well below the 'mine-life' average. The accumulated cost figure will consequently then decrease year by year, and it is expected that when production finally ceases, the figure will have reached zero.

The concept is aimed at achieving equity in the distribution of the cost of coal charged to present and future consumers.

6. The suitability of circulating fluid bed combustion (CFBC) for the utilisation of Lochiel coal is currently being investigated. The first phase of this work, which is being supported by NERDDC, involved combustion tests in a CFBC test facility by Lurgi, Germany. The results of these tests were promising and arrangements for the second phase of these investigations are presently being considered.

Circulating fluid bed combustion is an established commercial technology for hard coal in use in Europe, often for high ash or high sulphur coals.

The development of circulating fluidised bed combustion in the United States of America, Scandinavia and Europe is being driven by emission controls and in some cases the need to utilise low grade fuels.

Commercial boilers are presently in 80-90 MW(e) sizes, while 120 MW(e) boilers are being constructed in Trona (USA), Thames (USA), Vaskiluodon Voima (Finland), and Carlington (France); and 150 MW(e) boilers are under construction in Texas and New Mexico, USA (2 units). These 120 and 150 MW(e) boilers will be commissioned in the 1990-92 period.

In 1989, the manufacturers of these 150 MW(e) plants also received expressions of interest from Nova Scotia; East Midlands Electricity Board, United Kingdom; and from ENDESA, Spain; the present status of these inquiries is unknown. The feasibility of 250 MW(e) boilers is being investigated by EDF France and a cost comparison between 150 and 300 MW(e) boilers is being carried out for a UK organisation. Presently commercially operating CFBC boilers are delivering available capacity factors comparable with pulverised coal-fired boilers.

7. East Germany never has used high sulphur brown coal for commercial power generation. The majority of East German brown coal has low to moderate sulphur content, by world standards. From information that is available, only one East German coalfield is characterised by high sulphur content. Coal from that deposit has around three times the sulphur content of Lochiel, and has never been used for commercial purposes.

8. ETSA's forecasts are based principally on an econometric approach with some end-use data incorporated where available.

The 1989 forecasts were based on the modelling of sectoral sales over the past 21 years. For each sector, a casual relationship was identified between sales and both sector specific and economic variables by means of regression analysis. The variables found to have a significant effect on sales were:

- electricity and competing fuel prices;

- customer numbers;
- household disposable income;
- labour market variables;
- labour cost;
- inflation;
- industrial value added.

These variables were then projected 15 years into the future using forecasts sought from expert sources such as SYNTEC, Centre for Economic Studies—Adelaide University, Department of Environment and Planning and the State Bank of South Australia.

While the forecasts produced in this manner represent the best estimates given current available data, alternative scenarios have been identified to take into account different levels of economic growth and changing circumstances.

As a result of this analysis, electricity demand in South Australia is expected to grow at an average annual rate of between 1.3 per cent and 3.4 per cent over the next 15 years. In comparison with other Australian States, these are neither the highest nor the lowest forecasts of future electricity growth.

9. The current electricity generation, transmission and distribution system in South Australia is almost entirely within Government ownership. This Government has, however, previously demonstrated that it is prepared to consider any private sector proposal for development of a major power station, on the basis of its merits relative to other proposals. This Government indeed formally called for such proposals in the mid-1980s. Three were received from the private sector, and one from ETSA. Each of these proposals has been analysed in detail, and the Government is consequently fully cognisant of the State's potential for the development of additional power generation facilities. However, the Government considers that current projections for energy demand in this State do not warrant such a major development.

The current situation regarding ownership and control over power generation is thus not expected to change significantly in the near future.

10. The Government's approach to reducing the cost of industrial power has two inter-related components. First, since 1985 the real average cost of electricity to industry has fallen by about 15 per cent. This reduction has been made possible through the stabilising of natural gas prices, productivity improvements within ETSA, and consequent deferment of new additions to the generating system. Secondly, ETSA has commenced the process of introducing tariff structures which provide opportunities for industry to reduce the cost of their electricity. It is proposed that these tariff arrangements will be expanded in coming years.

11. The factors which determine the selection of one location in preference to another are numerous and varied in nature. I am advised there are no instances of projects lost to Victoria purely on the basis of electricity prices.

12. There is no change in the status of the Lochiel proposal. It is the preferred brown coal option based on present information. However, the relative economics of this option compared to other fuels is frequently reviewed.

13. In the first quarter of 1990, total actual electricity demand (ETSA generation plus imports) was 2 311 GWh, 1 per cent higher than for the corresponding period in 1989.

The difference between short-term variations in demand and long-term trends, however, must be emphasised. It is unrealistic to expect demand in any 3-month period to match a forecast growth rate which is intended as an indication of the trend over a 15-year period.

14. ETSA first synchronised the interconnection with the SECV/ECNSW system at 1108 hours on Thursday, 30

November 1989. No energy was transferred on that day. In the 5-month period from December 1989 to April 1990 the following transfers have taken place.

	GWh
Imports to South Australia	393.2
Exports from South Australia	7.0
Net imports	386.2

To the present time there has not been any occasion when imports have been needed to prevent load shedding due to inadequate available generating plant in South Australia. However, on three occasions, unit trips were prevented by drawing on interstate contingency reserves through the interconnection. Previously, these unit trips would have resulted in plant overload, requiring load shedding to stabilise the system until other available ETSA plant could respond to meet the demand.

Immediately prior to interconnection with the eastern States, the ETSA-installed plant capacity (2 380 MW) was only just sufficient to meet the established reliability criteria. (In assessing system reliability, the peak load levels on all days of the year are taken into account.) Thus, the interconnection project has provided South Australia with an appropriate margin of capacity—sufficient to optimise the objective of reliability and security of supply for South Australians—at a fraction of the cost of the alternative of installing additional generating plant.

15. Agreements related to the interconnection with the Victorian grid were negotiated on behalf of the then Minister of Mines and Energy by the Future Energy Action Committee chaired by Mr Doug Stewart. Those negotiations were undertaken with the aim of serving the overall best interests of the State, including improvement of the overall competitiveness of all South Australians' electricity tariffs.

16. The Green Paper will be released later this year. It will be distributed to a wide range of community organisations and to the public generally. Community consultation as regards the Green Paper will be coordinated by the Office of Energy Planning.

CFS THEORETICAL FIRE STANDARDS

184. The Hon. D.C. WOTTON (Heysen) asked the Minister of Emergency Services:

1. Has the CFS validated its theoretical standards of fire cover on a brigade basis by simple inspections of the areas involved and, if so, why do Kingscote and Ceduna have a higher structural hazard than Mount Barker and Nuriootpa, and why does Stirling North have a higher rural hazard than Belair and Blackwood and, if not, is there any intent to test the validity of the theoretical methods used?

2. Why are serviceable and maintainable CFS fire appliances that have had very little use being decommissioned simply because of an arbitrary 20-year replacement ruling?

3. What reduction has occurred in the CFS fire appliance fleet since the introduction of the arbitrary 20-year ruling and the application of the standards of fire cover and how many brigade-owned appliances funded by the communities are required for satisfactory fire protection by the CFS field management and is this method of resourcing the CFS field units to continue?

4. How will resources be provided to aid single unit CFS brigades to tackle a fire which is beyond their resources on those days of high fire danger when adjoining single unit brigades are reluctant to remove from their own communities the protection of their own single fire appliance?

5. Why will councils that are prepared to provide fire cover resources above the minimum specified by the stand-

ards of fire cover be penalised by a reduction in the subsidy from CFS?

6. What action is the Minister planning to take to retain the services of capable and experienced CFS officers who are on the verge of resigning because of low morale in the brigades which are threatened with reduction from several units to one appliance?

The Hon. J.H.C. KLUNDER: The replies are as follows:

1. The CFS standards of fire cover is not theoretical. It is a system designed to provide information for planning at State level for the Country Fire Service. At this broad policy level, objective techniques have been used to assess fire and special service problems and the relative need for resources to combat these problems. The SFC currently uses the past 10 years of records of reported brigade attendances at fires and other emergencies. The data base now consists of 40 000 turnout records and is continually updated to ensure the best possible information is available to evaluate the fire and incident problems faced by brigades and the community.

To assist the honourable member's understanding of the standards of fire cover, a definition of hazard and other terms used in the methodology would be useful.

Hazard is defined as the danger/control difficulty if an event occurs. To calculate rural hazard the actual fire danger was calculated over a seven-year period from Bureau of Meteorology weather records and CFS fuel state reports. It is an objective measure of hazard, not an observation. Structural hazard was calculated from claims data supplied by the Insurance Council of Australia and applied to Lands Department data for all properties in South Australia. Vehicle accident hazard was calculated from 208 000 accident reports from 1980-86 obtained from the Road Safety Division of the Department of Transport.

Risk is the probability of an event occurring. Risk is calculated from brigade records, insurance data and vehicle accident records.

Threat combines hazard and risk and is used as the basis of policy development to compare objectively and evaluate problems and to prioritise resources needed to combat these problems.

Value of assets threatened is taken from the Valuer-General's Department records.

In developing the standards of fire cover the CFS board has ensured that the methodology uses an objective, rational analysis of CFS data and data collected from recognised external agencies.

'Simple inspections of all areas' were undertaken State-wide in 1985 by CFS groups, according to a *pro forma* published in the SFC methodology report. Such local assessments have been an ongoing responsibility and form the basis of local and group response plans. Detailed data at this level is most useful for identifying local hazards and risks for pre-incident planning at brigade and group level.

Resources allocation is prioritised on the basis of fire threat and value of assets. Consideration is also given to factors such as isolation and the density of brigades and resources available. The basis for calculating hazard has been explained. The relative structural hazards of Kingscote, Ceduna, Mount Barker and Nuriootpa and the broadly calculated rural hazard of Belair and Blackwood compared with Stirling North cannot be considered in isolation of all other components of the standards of fire cover model.

In developing the standards of fire cover a world-wide literature search was conducted. On the basis of that search, the CFS appears to have the most objective, low-cost, efficient system in the world to help it meet its statutory obligations. It will continue to be reviewed, updated and

used for fire cover management, policy development and planning.

2. Prior to the introduction of the CFS board 20-year replacement policy, CFS appliances in the fleet were up to 60 years old and there are well documented instances of up to half the number of appliances called out to major fires breaking down on the way to, or at, incidents. Initial inspections of the CFS fleet by the Department of Road Transport showed that 60 per cent of CFS appliances were unroad-worthy. This situation was deemed to be totally unsatisfactory by the CFS board and CFS volunteers from both an occupational safety and health viewpoint and rational asset management and replacement principles.

The CFS 20-year limit was indeed arbitrary; however, it was set with the capacity of the State to pay for the upgrade clearly in mind. Most other fire services in Australia have replacement criteria varying from 12 to 15 years and manufacturers only guarantee parts for a similar period.

Continuing mechanical inspections indicate that the maintenance standards have improved dramatically in the past 12 months. The board is prepared to allow in certain circumstances vehicles older than 20 years to remain for a limited period provided they are fully maintained to CFS board standards.

3. Since 1985 the numbers of approved appliances have reduced from over 750 to 573. The board has advised Treasury that its total appliance requirements for asset management purposes is 565 over a 20-year period.

No brigade-owned appliances are required to resource the CFS standards of fire cover requirements.

4. The CFS incident management system specifies responsibilities for all levels in the chain of command. Group response plans provide backup and support arrangements within and between groups, ensuring additional support is available when required.

The honourable member may also consider the long-term impact of the CFS board's bushfire prevention planning initiatives:

- fewer fires and incidents to fight;
- safer fire fighting strategies, hazard reduction and better access;
- less damage to better protected community assets.

5. Section 22 of the Country Fires Act 1989 obliges every rural council to provide adequate fire fighting equipment in its area. The CFS board's standards of fire cover specifies the minimum resources required to meet this statutory commitment. CFS board subsidy policy is intended to help councils meet their statutory obligations to provide adequate equipment for fire fighting. Councils or brigades that wish to provide additional fire cover beyond that which is prescribed must do so at their own cost. In terms of equity, subsidy of additional resources by the CFS board penalises ratepayers elsewhere.

Until all brigades and groups are upgraded to SFC specifications, there will be no funds available to provide fire cover in excess of prescribed levels.

6. CFS membership is growing and shows little membership turnover (resignations). The most common reasons for resignation is that a member has left their brigade area.

Demand for training still far outstrips resources—a strong indicator of high morale. For example, some 3 500 volunteers successfully completed training courses last financial year.

The growth of the Volunteer Fire Brigades Association and interest in being a member of Regional and State Management Committees in order to influence the policies and development of the organisation is another example of the strength of the volunteer movement. The overwhelming

majority of volunteers understand the importance of the standards of fire cover in relation to the implementation of a cost efficient and effective fire service in country areas. The honourable member would be well advised to seek counsel from the broader ranks of CFS volunteers rather than the disaffected few who do not recognise the need to upgrade fire cover standards across the State.

SAFA

199. Mr D.S. BAKER (Leader of the Opposition) asked the Treasurer: Will the Treasurer provide an itemised breakdown of SAFA's \$15.5 million income from equity investments and \$1.3 million income from land and buildings in the past financial year?

The Hon. J.C. BANNON: The reply is as follows:

Equity Investments	\$ million
Dividends on shares held in SAGASCO Holdings Ltd.....	12.6
Distribution of surplus from the Enterprise Investments Trust.....	2.6
Interest on Convertible Notes issued by Enterprise Investments (South Australia) Ltd.....	0.3
	<u>\$15.5</u>
Land and Buildings	\$ 000's
Rental income from Mobilong House Murray Bridge.....	529
Income from properties held under the Native Vegetation Management Scheme.....	681
Lease of school buildings to Minister of Education.....	62
Lease of property to the State Clothing Corporation.....	8
	<u>\$1 280</u>

AYERS HOUSE

202. Mr D.S. BAKER (Leader of the Opposition) asked the Treasurer: Why did actual receipts for rental of Ayers House in the 1989-90 year of \$66 500 represent only half the budgeted receipts?

The Hon. J.C. BANNON: The following information was provided on 10 October 1990 by the Minister of Housing and Construction for inclusion in *Hansard* in response to a question in Estimates Committee B from the Member for Bright.

The amount budgeted \$123 000 comprised the agreed rental of \$114 000 per annum plus the June 1989 of \$9 500 which was in arrears at 30 June, that is \$123 500 which was rounded to \$123 000.

Actual rent receipts during 1989-90 \$66 500 covered the period June to December, 1989—7 months at \$9 500. The lessee has defaulted with rentals due for the six months January to June 1990 and in July of this year receiver managers were appointed.

In view of the current economic situation and the financial difficulties experienced by the lessees it was decided to maintain the budgeted rental at the previous year's level.

This will continue only until the outcome of negotiations regarding the new lease.

DEPARTMENT OF THE PREMIER AND CABINET

203. Mr D.S. BAKER (Leader of the Opposition) asked the Premier: Why did spending on the purchase of office machines and equipment under 'Intra Agency Support Services Items Not Allocated to Programs' of the Department of the Premier and Cabinet exceed budget estimates by

almost \$14 500 in the past financial year and what were the major items purchased?

The Hon. J.C. BANNON: The department commenced a phased implementation of a computerised office automation strategy in 1987. This has involved purchasing computers and supporting equipment to provide access, throughout a network, to word processing, records management, and other applications.

The equipment has had to adapt to the strategic needs of the department. During 1989-90 the department purchased additional computers to improve availability to staff. This included initial support to the new planning review, which was established in March 1990. To incorporate portable access to the system, two laptop computers were purchased. To improve the quality of printed documents a Postscript laser printer was also purchased.

The decisions on the purchases were made with regard to the increased needs and the overall departmental expenditure situation during the year. The expenditure is detailed as follows:

	\$
1. Computers.....	34 055
2. Computer Accessories.....	26 943
3. Printers.....	14 065
4. Computer sundry items.....	9 418
Total.....	<u>\$84 481</u>

204. Mr D.S. BAKER (Leader of the Opposition) asked the Premier: Why did spending on administration expenses allocated under 'Intra Agency Support Services Items Not Allocated to Programs' of the Department of the Premier and Cabinet exceed budget estimates by almost \$50 000 in the past financial year and what were the major items of expenditure?

The Hon. J.C. BANNON:

The department's expenditure exceeded budget in two areas:

	\$
1. Maintenance of the office automation equipment was greater than budgeted as a result of accelerated purchase of equipment and software.....	42 000
2. An officer together with a vehicle were transferred into support services, incurring an additional expense to that section. The increase was offset by a compensating decrease to the officers originating section of intergovernmental relations.....	7 000
Total.....	<u>49 000</u>

The major items of expenditure within administrative expenses under 'Intra Agency Support Services Items Not Allocated to Programs' are detailed below:

	\$
Printing and Stationery.....	55 500
Office Automation—Maintenance	
Hardware.....	53 700
Software.....	28 300
Travel Expenses.....	41 700
Entertainment Expenses.....	28 400
Computer Processing Charges.....	27 500
Postage.....	25 900
Motor Vehicle Expenses.....	24 700
Energy Charges.....	22 200
Office Automation—Sundries.....	20 700
Workers Compensation—Premium.....	19 500
Personnel Committee.....	18 800
Fringe Benefits Tax.....	14 300
Audit Fees.....	13 500
Photocopier Expenses.....	12 900
Subscription/Magazine/Books.....	12 900
Total.....	<u>\$420 500</u>

CABINET COMMITTEE STRUCTURE

206. Mr D.S. BAKER (Leader of the Opposition) asked the Premier: In relation to the new Cabinet committee structure, who are the members of:

- (a) the Economic and State Development Committee;
- (b) the Natural Resources and Infrastructure Committee;
- (c) the Justice and Consumer Affairs Committee; and
- (d) the Human Services Committee,

how often does each committee meet and what is the budgeted cost of servicing each committee this financial year?

The Hon. J.C. BANNON: The replies are as follows:

The members of Cabinet's committees are:

- (a) Economic and State Development Committee

Chairperson: Mr Bannon, Premier, Treasurer, Minister of State Development;

Members: Mr Sumner, Attorney-General, Minister of Corporate Affairs; Mr Arnold, Minister of Industry, Trade and Technology, Minister of Agriculture, Minister of Fisheries, Minister of Ethnic Affairs; Mr Blevins, Minister of Transport, Minister of Finance; Ms Wiese, Minister of Tourism, Minister of Small Business; Ms Lenehan, Minister for Environment and Planning.

- (b) Natural Resources and Infrastructure Committee

Chairperson: Mr Blevins, Minister of Transport, Minister of Finance;

Members: Mr Arnold, Minister of Agriculture, Minister of Fisheries; Mr Mayes, Minister of Housing and Construction, Minister of Public Works; Ms Lenehan, Minister for Environment and Planning; Minister of Water Resources, Minister of Lands; Mr Klunder, Minister of Mines and Energy, Minister of Forests; Mr Gregory, Minister of Marine; Ms Levy, Minister of Local Government.

- (c) Justice and Consumer Affairs Committee

Chairperson: Mr Sumner, Attorney-General, Minister for Crime Prevention, Minister of Corporate Affairs;

Members: Dr Hoggood, Deputy Premier, Minister of Family and Community Services; Mr Blevins, Minister of Correctional Services; Ms Wiese, Minister of Consumer Affairs; Mr Klunder, Minister of Emergency Services.

- (d) Human Services Committee

Chairperson: Dr Hoggood, Deputy Premier, Minister of Health, Minister of Family and Community Services, Minister for the Aged;

Members: Mr Crafter, Minister of Education, Minister of Children's Services; Mr Mayes, Minister of Housing and Construction; Minister of Recreation and Sport; Ms Levy, Minister of Local Government, Minister for the Arts; Mr Rann, Minister of Employment and Further Education, Minister of Youth Affairs, Minister of Aboriginal Affairs, Minister Assisting the Minister of Ethnic Affairs.

Cabinet Committees meet monthly.

The Cost of servicing the Committees is met within the amount budgeted for Program 4—Support to Executive Council/Cabinet in the Department of the Premier and Cabinet.

ASSET MANAGEMENT AND REPLACEMENT

215. Mr D.S. BAKER (Leader of the Opposition) asked the Premier: In relation to 'the preparation of a separate budget paper on asset management and replacement' referred

to at page 58 of the Public Accounts Committee's 57th Report into asset replacement, was such a paper ever prepared and, if so, will a copy be released to the Opposition?

The Hon. J.C. BANNON: A separate budget paper on asset management and replacement in 1988-89 was not prepared for the consideration of Cabinet. However, since the release of the report of the task force, when submitting their capital works proposals for consideration by the Capital Works Budget Committee, agencies have been required to differentiate between projects which are new and those which involve replacement and maintenance. This process conforms with the task force recommendations set out in the first dot point on page 58 of the Public Accounts Committee's 57th Report.

As part of its task of formulating recommendations for the coming year's capital works program, the Capital Works Budget Committee takes into consideration the relative needs and priorities of individual projects, and the question of balance between new and replacement works within the total program. The Capital Works Budget Committee reports to the Treasurer, and its report forms the basis of the capital works proposals subsequently submitted to Cabinet for consideration in the context of the budget. The committee's report has, over each of the past three years, included a section on asset management and replacement issues. Although a separate budget paper for submission to Cabinet has not been produced, the intentions behind the task force recommendations in this area outlined in the Public Accounts Committee's 57th Report are being met.

POLICE SUPERANNUATION

218. Mr MATTHEW (Bright) asked the Minister of Emergency Services:

1. When will the 3 per cent productivity superannuation benefit for police, as advised to retired members on 1 June 1990, be made available to them and what has been the reason for the delay?

2. Are the calculations for these payments and subsequent printing of cheques and group certificates to be done using automated means or are they to be done manually and, if manually, what plans are in place to computerise future payments?

The Hon. J.H.C. KLUNDER: The replies are as follows:

1. The Police Department commenced distributing payments from the productivity scheme to members who have retired on 11 October 1990. The delay in payment was due to policy being established in terms of funding the payments and formulating administrative procedures.

2. The calculation and payment of benefits is currently being produced manually as the Police Department's computerised payroll system is unable to produce them. The computerisation of these payments will be considered as part of the new human resource management system planned for the Police Department.

SOCIAL WORKERS

221. Mr MATTHEW (Bright) asked the Minister of Family and Community Services: How many people with social work qualifications are employed by the Department for Family and Community Services and of these:

- (a) how many are undertaking the duties of a social worker;
- (b) how many are employed in 'desk jobs', and not being paid under a social work classification; and

(c) how many are on stress leave or other leave due to illness?

The Hon. D.J. HOPGOOD: 557 people with social work qualifications are employed by the Department for Family and Community Services:

(a) 510.

(b) It is not understood what the honourable member means by 'desk jobs'.

(c) As at 5 October 1990, three workers were on stress leave.

STATE BANK MORTGAGE TRUST

223. **Mr BECKER (Hanson)** asked the Treasurer:

1. What is the basis for the State Bank of South Australia Mortgage Trust advertising 'A return that could secure your future. 16.09 per cent quarterly distribution rate for the quarter ending 30 June 1990'.

2. What was the distribution rate for the quarter ended 30 September 1990 and what is the reason for any variation from the June quarter rate?

3. Can the State Bank Mortgage Trust substantiate a continuation of a rate in excess of 15 per cent per annum and does the Government guarantee the State Bank Mortgage Trust?

The Hon. J.C. BANNON: The replies are as follows:

1. The State Bank of South Australia Mortgage Trust has invested predominantly in first registered mortgages over quality real property located in South Australia. All valuations of property are less than eight months old and were performed by members of the Australian Institute of Valuers. No trust loans have been or are in arrears. The balance of the trust's funds not invested in mortgage loans are invested in at-call bank deposits and short-term bank bills.

2. The trust distribution rate for the quarter ended 30 September 1990 was equivalent to 15.5 per cent per annum. During the September quarter, interest rates were reduced as a result of the easing of monetary policy. This resulted in the trust's gross earning rate on loans and short-term investments decreasing, lowering the rate of income distributed to unit holders.

3. The rate of distribution achieved will be dependent on the rate of income earned by the trust on its investment portfolio. This, in turn, depends on movements in general interest rates. Accordingly, the trust cannot substantiate a continuation of a rate in excess of 15 per cent per annum.

The State Government does not guarantee the State Bank Mortgage Trust. The trust's advertising and prospectus state that the State Bank of South Australia does not guarantee the performance of the trust or repayment of capital.

TOURISM SITES

225. **Mr D.S. BAKER (Leader of the Opposition)** asked the Minister of Industry, Trade and Technology representing the Minister of Tourism: What specific action has been taken to implement the commitment made in the press statement dated 3 November 1989 that the Government would undertake 'a State-wide study to identify projects and sites with major tourism potential'?

The Hon. LYNN ARNOLD: The replies are as follows:

1. Tourism South Australia has established an internal task force to consider and review potential tourism projects. To assist this task force a development consultant has been appointed with specific responsibilities for:
research

market analysis
site identification and analysis
concept development and specification
investigating planning issues
documentation
and other duties as directed.

The task force has set a priority of identifying opportunities that will make a substantial difference to the tourism product within the State.

2. Tourism South Australia has adopted a development strategy based around the identification of emerging market demands and product to suit. The Development Initiatives Task Force has the responsibility of defining South Australia's product gaps, and identifying locations suitable for such development.

3. Specific tourism product gaps identified to date include a Barossa Valley retreat and a Barossa Valley country club, an Adelaide coastal accommodation development, a nature resort on Kangaroo Island and additional low cost accommodation in the city of Adelaide. All of these concepts are either being implemented or are under serious consideration by the private sector.

4. Tourism South Australia's data base has been significantly increased enabling ongoing analytical work to match demand and product gaps thereby providing information on development opportunities.

TRAVEL CENTRES

228. **Mr D.S. BAKER (Leader of the Opposition)** asked the Minister of Industry, Trade and Technology representing the Minister of Tourism: What specific action has been taken to implement the commitment made in the press statement dated 3 November 1989 that the Government would commission a feasibility study into the establishment of a fully-fledged travel centre in Brisbane and Perth to promote South Australia more aggressively and, if the study has been commissioned, when, who is undertaking it and at what cost and, if it has been completed, what were the recommendations and will the Minister make the report available to the Opposition and, if no study has been commissioned, why not?

The Hon. LYNN ARNOLD: The State Government has not yet commissioned any feasibility studies into the potential establishment of fully-fledged travel centres in either Brisbane or Perth, but this commitment will be undertaken in due course.

HERITAGE TOURISM

230. **Mr D.S. BAKER (Leader of the Opposition)** asked the Minister of Industry, Trade and Technology representing the Minister of Tourism: What specific action has been taken to implement the commitment made in the press statement dated 3 November 1989 that the Government would 'make South Australia a 'heritage tourism' centre, capitalising on the balance between the State's historic buildings and new tourism developments'?

The Hon. LYNN ARNOLD: Legitimate attractions offering interesting and authentic experiences based on South Australia's tourism strengths of heritage, food, wine, culture and festivals underpin the State's tourism industry and these images are constantly used in Tourism South Australia's marketing campaigns and promotional literature to position the State in the marketplace. In a number of key publications recently produced by Tourism South Australia as a

guide to the industry, the importance of the State's heritage and the need to build upon this has been highlighted. These publications include 'South Australian Tourism—Product Strategy', 'Planning for Tourism', 'Environmental Code of Practice', 'The South Australian Tourism Plan' and the 'Cultural Tourism Discussion Paper'.

In addition, to ensure that a managed balance of conservation and development can occur, Tourism South Australia works closely with developers and investors encouraging them to consult with relevant government agencies, special interest groups, and the community at an early stage to identify key issues. In this way the standards are set by existing attractions such as the casino, Mt Lofty House, the Burra, Mintaro and Port Adelaide historical precincts, the Grand Hotel, Glenelg plus other traditional 'pub' redevelopments can be maintained and will be applied to future developments.

Tourism South Australia commits a substantial proportion of its annual \$500 000 infrastructure grant scheme to environmental and cultural protection projects and has done this for many years. Tourism South Australia also plays a major role in the new Cultural Tourism Committee which aims to identify cultural tourism opportunities and encourage their development. A current project aims to rejuvenate or highlight the cultural attractions of the North Terrace precinct.

SECURING THE FUTURE

244. **Mr D.S. BAKER (Leader of the Opposition)** asked the Premier: What specific action has been taken to implement the commitment made in the October 1989 document *Securing the Future* that the Government would appoint an Adelaide-based Japanese specialist from the private sector to develop and implement a comprehensive Japanese market strategy aimed at promoting trade and investment connections between Japanese and South Australian-based companies; if the specialist has been appointed, what is the name of that person and what salary or fee is he or she being paid; and, if the appointment has not been made, why not and when will it be?

The Hon. J.C. BANNON: Action was taken in the last quarter of 1989 to appoint an Adelaide-based Japanese specialist. Mr Eric Olsen was appointed under a three-year contract commencing on 1 January 1990 to the position. The Government announced the appointment which received some coverage in the media and industry publications.

Mr Olsen is well qualified for the job, having held senior management positions with Santos and Amdel as well as operating his own North Asia consultancy business. Mr Olsen was substantially involved this year with a trade mission to Japan in May. He is now playing an increasing role relating to liaison with the MFP-Adelaide proposal. Mr Olsen is being paid the salary of an Administrative Officer grade 5 plus an allowance of \$5,000 to compensate for out of hours work due to his frequent and substantial visits to Japan.

245. **Mr D.S. BAKER (Leader of the Opposition)** asked the Premier: What specific action has been taken to implement the commitment made in the October 1989 document *Securing the Future* that the Government would upgrade representation in the Japanese market through the appointment of a Senior Adviser, additional to current representation, and located in Tokyo, charged with facilitating market access of South Australian companies through Japanese Government and industry channels; has the adviser been appointed; if so, who is that person and what salary or fee

is he or she being paid; and, if the appointment has not been made, why not and when will it be?

The Hon. J.C. BANNON: Action has been taken during 1990 to appoint a senior adviser in Japan. In September 1990, Mr Mizuo Kuroda accepted my offer to serve in this capacity. Mr Kuroda is being briefed on the detail of South Australia's relationship with Japan and will be making his first visit to Adelaide in his capacity as Senior Adviser, early next year.

Mr Kuroda is well qualified for the position having been a former Ambassador to Australia from 1980 to 1982. He is currently a member of the Executive Committee of UNESCO and Special Adviser to Nippon Steel Corporation. Given Mr Kuroda's continuing commitments to the Japanese Government, he will serve in an honorary capacity.

246. **Mr D.S. BAKER (Leader of the Opposition)** asked the Premier: What specific action has been taken to implement the commitment made in the October 1989 document *Securing the Future* that the Government would increase resources devoted to the Asian/Pacific region to help South Australian companies fully exploit trade and investment opportunities?

The Hon. J.C. BANNON: To help South Australian companies fully exploit trade and investment opportunities with Japan, the Government has significantly increased its resources through the appointment of a senior adviser and an Adelaide-based Japan specialist. Details of this are advised in answers to Questions On Notice Nos 244 and 245. The Government has recently established an independent South Australian representative office in Tokyo. The Japan specialist is also knowledgeable on Korea, and marketing assistance is being provided to South Australian companies seeking trade and investment opportunities with Korea. The department of Industry, Trade and Technology also supports an array of activity in Asian and Pacific countries, including China, and is currently reviewing the best way of further delivering its services to this region.

ETSA PAYMENT ASSISTANCE

249. **Mr D.S. BAKER (Leader of the Opposition)** asked the Minister of Mines and Energy: How much was paid out in 1989-90 by ETSA under the scheme announced by the Minister on 21 December 1988 to assist people with acute financial problems to meet their electricity payments and how many consumers received this assistance?

The Hon. J.H.C. KLUNDER: The amount was \$79 434.04 and there were 491 beneficiaries.

POLICE TRAINING PROGRAMS

250. **Mr D.S. BAKER (Leader of the Opposition)**, asked the Minister of Emergency Services: Following alleged action by two police officers in Hindley Street on 6 January 1988, which was the subject of a complaint to the Police Complaints Authority (reference C 1145), what action has been taken to deal with weaknesses identified in this case relating to general orders and the training program for officers who are issued with batons, and when was that action taken?

The Hon. J.H.C. KLUNDER: The replies are as follows:

(a) Police Department General Orders: As a result of this and other incidents, and the introduction of the PR24 (Monadnock) baton, policy meetings were conducted to frame appropriate orders to control the carriage and use of PR 24 batons. The existing general orders were amended to prohibit issue of the baton to members of the Police Force

other than in circumstances where they have attended an approved course and have attained the required standard of proficiency. Police Officers may carry only the PR24 baton or the short baton issued by the department.

Batons are supplied to members for their protection. Their use should be resorted to in only extreme cases for the following purposes:

- Protection of the member in self-defence;
- Protection of members of the public from actual violence;
- Containing or preventing serious breaches of the peace;
- Effecting the arrest of a person whose actions have caused a situation where its use, other than in a striking fashion, is necessary and appropriate.

Batons should not be used against the head or other vital parts of the body (collarbone, left side of chest, groin, knees and kidneys). Parts of the body less vulnerable to injury should be selected as target areas whenever possible.

(b) When was that action taken? These changes to general orders were published in the *South Australia Police Gazette* on 9 November 1988, and were in operation from that date.

(c) The training program for officers who are issued with batons: The training program for police recruits and other members of the force required to be issued with batons was amended in November 1988, to include the changes reflected in the General Orders. From that date all course participants were required to prove their competence in both the skill and theory applications of the use of the baton. These student evaluations include examinations relating to the General Orders, techniques and attitudes concerning use of the baton.

SAAB REPRESENTATIVES' VISIT

252. **Mr D.S. BAKER (Leader of the Opposition)** asked the Premier: Following his visit to Gothenberg in October 1988 and his statement reported in *The News* on 27 October 1988 that the SAAB company would send technical experts to South Australia to look at the possibility of buying South Australian made components for its cars, when did the technical experts visit South Australia and what has been the result of the visit?

The Hon. J.C. BANNON: Following the visit to the SAAB company in Sweden in October 1988, a number of actions were taken, including a follow-up visit in November 1989 by a senior officer of the Department of Industry, Trade and Technology. Discussions were held regarding the possibility of SAAB purchasing automotive components from South Australian suppliers, but negotiations are currently in abeyance due to the takeover of SAAB by General Motors Corporation of the United States of America.

FOREIGN INVESTMENT

253. **Mr D.S. BAKER (Leader of the Opposition)** asked the Premier: Following his press statement from Stockholm dated 25 October 1988 after a meeting with the Swedish Defence Minister, Mr Carlsson, that they had 'discussed the possibility of Swedish companies establishing operations in South Australia and engaging in joint ventures with Australian companies', how many Swedish companies have established operations in South Australia, how many joint ventures have been established and what is the estimated value of the investment in South Australia and the number of jobs created as a result?

The Hon. J.C. BANNON: Three Swedish defence companies (Kockums Pacific, Bofors Electronics Pacific and SAAB) are located in South Australia. In addition a team of Swedish defence engineers is working with DSTO personnel at Salisbury on phased array radar technology development. Ericsson is keen to participate in this project and is discussing the possibility with a South Australian defence company. Further, a Swedish precision tooling company is looking at establishing an operation in South Australia and has been liaising with the Swedish Consul and Kockums Pacific. A number of other non-defence related Swedish companies are also located in South Australia.

Kockums Pacific has examined numerous business opportunities since it was established in Adelaide. It has recently finalised two proposals, including one involving a South Australian firm, and it is currently pursuing several others including pollution control equipment.

The establishment of BEPAC at Technology Park has significant implications. BEPAC has won the largest single contract to be awarded by AMECON from the ANZAC Ships Project and it plans to use this as the base for further involvement in the Asian Pacific Market. This company is now actively considering other collaborative projects in Australia and South Australia. Estimates on the value of investment as a result of these developments is not available.

The Swedish companies established in South Australia currently employ 38 people and this is expected to grow to 86 by June 1991. In addition they have relationships with local companies which also have employees working on related projects.

256. **Mr D.S. BAKER (Leader of the Opposition)** asked the Premier: Following his press statement from London dated 21 October 1988 that 'he anticipated a strengthening of links between British and South Australian defence companies', in what specific ways have these links been strengthened, what has been the value of investment in South Australia as a result and what is the estimate of the number of jobs created?

The Hon. J.C. BANNON: Links between British and South Australian defence firms have been enhanced following visits to South Australia by the UK Defence Manufacturers Association and the UK defence export services organisations and marketing trips to the UK by a number of local firms. A number of business opportunities and ventures have resulted including:

Computer Sciences of Australia (CSA) has been subcontracted by Link-Miles (UK) as part of that firm's contract with Australian Submarine Corporation to develop and install a ship control simulator (SCS) and a propulsion control simulator (PCS) at HMAS Stirling in Western Australia. CSA is undertaking system design work on the project and has five staff assigned to it.

CSA has discussed with Ferranti the possible use of their radar simulator in the shore facilities being developed by the company for the ANZAC Ships Project.

Strachan and Henshaw (UK), which has the contract to design, develop and deliver the weapons discharge system for the submarine project, has established its Australian headquarters at Technology Park and is using British Aerospace Australia as its major subcontractor.

Perry Engineering has developed associations with a number of UK firms, including Michell Bearings, McTaggart Scott and several members of the Vickers Group, for equipment being offered to the submarine and ANZAC Ships Project. To date it has been successful on the Michell Bearings contract with ASC and is waiting on other decisions.

British Aerospace Australia has strengthened its relationship with its parent company and is using BAE Plc's extensive capabilities to strengthen its bids on a number of Australian defence contracts. A recent example has been the tie-up with the Sowerby Defence Research Centre to provide research and development facilities for the infra-red radar system to be installed on the Sea Hawk Helicopter Project.

AWADI is contracted to Barr and Stroud (UK) to manufacture the periscopes for the Collins Class submarines and is developing another collaborative opportunity with that company relating to optical technology.

It is not possible to quantify the value of investment to South Australia as the relationships relate to individual projects and in many cases these are still developing. However, these have assisted local defence firms to bid for and, in many cases, win orders and this has helped to support the growth in the defence industry in South Australia.

257. **Mr D.S. BAKER (Leader of the Opposition)** asked the Premier: Following his press statement from Munich dated 18 October 1988 that Mercedes Benz officials had 'agreed to hold further talks on the possibility of using South Australian components in the manufacture of their cars', have those talks been held and if so, when, what was the result, what has been the value of investment in South Australia and sales of components and what is the estimate of the number of jobs created?

The Hon. J.C. BANNON: Following the visit to the Mercedes Benz factory in Munich in October 1988, a senior officer of the Department of Industry, Trade and Technology made a follow-up visit in November 1989. However, Mercedes Benz has decided not to pursue supply from local component suppliers at this stage. Nevertheless, a local component supplier has secured contracts to supply after-market alloy wheels to a German distributor who supplies Mercedes Benz.

258. **Mr D.S. BAKER (Leader of the Opposition)** asked the Premier: Following his press statement from Regensburg on 18 October 1988 that 'at the State Government's suggestion BMW has already begun discussions with component manufacturers, Clyde Apac, Castalloy and ROH industries to supply components. Contact has also been made with Mitsubishi Motors about the possibility of supplying components to BMW' what has been the value of investment in South Australia and sales of components and what is the estimate of the number of jobs created?

The Hon. J.C. BANNON: Following the visit to BMW's Regensburg plant on 18 October 1988, BMW Australia Ltd has further discussed the possibility of purchasing components from South Australian suppliers. Discussions are continuing between the various parties to identify appropriate supply opportunities, but at this stage no specific agreements have been reached.

STATE SUPERANNUATION FUND

268. **Mr BECKER (Hanson)** asked the Premier:

1. Why has it taken two years to provide information to public servants on the amount of superannuation under the 3 per cent productivity scheme they are entitled to at the moment and upon retirement?

2. Why have public servants not been provided with financial statements as promised?

3. Has the impact of the 3 per cent been calculated for each public servant and if not, why not and has the sum of money relating to the 3 per cent been allocated to the

State Superannuation Fund or a similar fund and if not, why not?

4. Why is it necessary to fill in a claim form upon retirement to find out the value of the 3 per cent productivity scheme superannuation?

5. Why cannot any public servant find out now, before retirement, the amount they would receive on retirement?

The Hon. J.C. BANNON: The replies are as follows:

1 & 2. A contract, with a completion date of 1 July 1989, was let for the supply and implementation of a new computer system for the State Superannuation Scheme. It was intended that work on the productivity scheme would commence when this system had been installed. As a result of the inability of the contractor to fulfil this contract in a timely fashion, it was decided to develop inhouse the system to administer the productivity superannuation scheme. Development of the system has now proceeded to the point where the issuing of statements of entitlement for the period 1 January 1988 to 30 June 1989 commenced in October 1990.

As data from agencies is verified, statements covering this period will be issued on a phased basis over the next few months. It is intended that all members will receive a statement by the end of February 1991, subject to accurate employee data having been received from agencies by 31 December 1990. Work will then commence on statements for the financial year 1989-90.

3. No; the productivity scheme is an accumulation scheme. The entitlement of each individual, therefore, is dependent upon such things as wage increases, timing of retirement or resignation and interest rates. It is difficult to see what purpose would be served by trying to calculate the impact of the scheme by individual employee. No funds have been allocated to the State Superannuation Fund or similar fund. The cost of benefits is being met by the Government as they emerge.

4. A person must complete an application form when claiming his/her entitlement from the productivity superannuation scheme to protect the scheme from fraudulent claims. The productivity scheme is administered by the small unit in Treasury under the direction of a board of administration with employee representation. Because of the large number of members (approximately 116 000) it is not feasible to respond to casual inquiries for estimates of benefit. As an interim measure, former employees have been asked to complete an application form if they wish to have their productivity entitlement calculated at the time of their termination of public sector employment. When statements are issued annually it will be a comparatively easy matter for members to calculate their approximate entitlements when assessing options for forthcoming retirement.

5. See answers to questions 3 and 4 above.

ADOPTION PROCEDURES

273. **Mr BECKER (Hanson)** asked the Minister of Family and Community Services:

1. How many persons have applied for information concerning their relinquished child or parent and how many adoptees and relinquishing parents have lodged a veto since the amendments to the Adoption Act in 1989?

2. What publicity has been given on an on-going basis concerning obligations of the five year veto?

The Hon. D.J. HOPGOOD: The replies are as follows:

1. Since February 1989, until 7 November 1990, a total of 1 077 vetoes were recorded. Seven hundred and four

vetoed were placed by adopted people, and 373 from birth parents. From September 1989 to 7 November 1990 a total of 1 600 people have applied for information about their relinquished child or birth parents. To date approximately 950 have received information. Of the 1 600 applications for information, only 63 have had a veto placed against them.

2. The provisions of section 27 of the Adoption Act have been the subject of ongoing publicity since the launch of the Family Information Service in February 1989. Just prior to and during the six months after the launch, a public relations agency was engaged to design the poster, pamphlet and booklet explaining people's rights under the Act, as well as to arrange publicity in all States in all forms of the media. Another large burst of radio, television and newspaper publicity accompanied the proclamation of the Act in August 1989. The Family Information Service posters and pamphlets have been distributed throughout Australia, and the pamphlets and booklet have now been reprinted twice. The most recent reprinting, about to be distributed, gives more prominence to people's rights to restrict the release of information.

The department has had an ongoing commitment to bringing the provisions of the Act to the attention of the public through the media, with most emphasis being placed on the South Australian Media. In the week following the program produced by Channel 10 in October of this year about a South Australian adoption link-up, the Family Information Service had more than 100 applications for information. That program presented both the information and veto provisions of the legislation. Other media coverage has included country and metropolitan radio broadcasts, national television stories and a number of newspaper and magazine stories in the metropolitan and country areas. The recent launch of the Aboriginal Link-Up Service, established through the Government's Social Justice Program, provided further publicity to the provisions of the Act, through media coverage, and with the launch of the poster and brochure. Other recent publicity has prompted a rush of inquiries for information, with only one new veto being placed.

LIRA INVESTMENTS PTY LTD

274. Dr ARMITAGE (Adelaide) asked the Minister of Health:

1. What specific financial considerations were given to the leaseholders (Lira Investments Pty Ltd) of the Quadrangle Shop at the Queen Elizabeth Hospital when they were directed not to sell cigarettes, despite their original lease defining that they were obliged to sell them?

2. Were prospective purchasers of the shop from Lira Investments Pty Ltd informed they would be required to do a shop fitting costing between \$60 000 and \$100 000 during the term of their lease?

3. Who is now responsible for running the shop since Lira Investments Pty Ltd sold its lease on 29 June 1990?

4. Has any money been spent on re-fitting the shop since 29 June 1990 and if so, how much?

5. What are the plans for management of the shop?

6. Was the shop ever subject to a business valuation and if so, what was the most recent valuation and what was the purchase price paid to Lira Investments Pty Ltd?

The Hon. D.J. HOPGOOD: The replies are as follows:

1. The Queen Elizabeth Hospital Board of Directors determined that the sale of cigarettes in the shop was to cease from 2 August 1988. L.J. Hookers were engaged to

review rental charges and arrived at an annual rent effective from 3 August 1988 based upon the non-sale of cigarettes.

2. During the leaseholding by Lira Investments Pty Ltd, the interior of the shop had deteriorated. Although prospective purchasers of the business during 1989 indicated a willingness to spend some moneys in refurbishing the facility, no cost estimates were obtained.

3. The Queen Elizabeth Hospital purchased the lease from Lira Investments, with effect from 29 June 1990, and is now running the shop through a manager appointed on contract for three years. Profits are to be retained for hospital use.

4. Three new cash registers at a total cost of \$9 887 and a refurbished dishwasher have been added to the business since the end of June 1990. There have already been changes to that part of the shop selling gifts, toys and magazines and detailed plans are being prepared to cover a major change in the layout of the shop, particularly the area supplying food.

5. Refer answer to question 3.

6. An independent valuation of \$345 000 plus stock at valuation was obtained from Valuation Consultants, Raymond J. Taylor & Associates Services Pty Ltd dated February 1990. The hospital subsequently negotiated a purchase price from Lira Investments of \$370 000 plus stock at valuation on 1 May 1990.

ADOPTION PANEL

302. Mr BECKER (Hanson) asked the Minister of Family and Community Services:

1. Who are the members of the Adoption Panel and what are their specific qualifications, terms of appointment and annual remuneration, if any, including out-of-pocket expenses?

2. How many times has the panel met in the past 12 months?

3. How many times have vetoes been overridden by the Minister or the Department for Family and Community Services or by the panel in the past 12 months and what were the reasons?

The Hon. D.J. HOPGOOD: The replies are as follows:

1. The South Australian Adoption Panel is appointed by the Minister under section 5 of the Adoption Act 1988, and its functions are defined in section 6. The nine members of the panel, who are appointed for a period of two years are: Ms Christine Dawe (Chairperson), solicitor and nominee of the Law Society of South Australia; Ms Sally Castell-McGregor, Executive Officer of the Children's Interests Bureau, and nominee of the Chief Executive Officer of the Department for Family and Community Services; Ms Karen Tierney, social worker, and nominee of the Australian Association of Social Workers, S.A. Branch; Dr George Blake, paediatrician, and nominee of the S.A. College of Paediatricians; Mr Geoffrey Pope, psychologist, and nominee of the Australian Psychological Society, S.A. Clinical Section; Dr Simon Dunstone, obstetrician and gynaecologist, nominee of the Royal College of Obstetricians and Gynaecologists, S.A. Branch; Dr Margaret Fereday, psychiatrist, nominee of the Royal Australian and New Zealand College of Psychiatrists, S.A. Branch; Ms Valma Gay, member of the public, nominee of the South Australian Council of Social Services; and Ms Liz McKenzie, member of the public, nominee of the South Australian Council of Social Services.

Remuneration for panel members is determined by the Commissioner for Public Employment, and at 1 July 1990

was set at \$76 per four hour session for the Chairperson, and \$64 per four hour session for members. However, Cabinet circular 100 provides that these fees are not payable to persons who are employees of the Government or officers of the Crown, except where specific Cabinet or Executive Council approval has been granted (which has not occurred in this case). There is no provision for out-of-pocket expenses to be paid in addition to these fees.

2. The panel has met on eight occasions during 1990, and is likely to meet bi-monthly next year.

3. Section 27 (5) of the Adoption Act 1988 allows the Minister to authorise the release of information contrary to a direction or veto, if disclosure is in the interests of the welfare or the adopted person. Only the Minister may authorise such disclosure. No such applications have been received by the Minister, or the department, and on no occasions has information been released contrary to a veto.

MINING PRODUCTION TENEMENTS

324. **The Hon. B.C. EASTICK (Light)** asked the Minister of Mines and Energy:

1. What is the nature of the mining opportunity associated with mining production tenements in claims 2474, 2475 and 2476 as notified in the *Government Gazette*, page 1 106, on 4 October 1990?

2. Who lodged the claims and have they any experience in the type of development intended?

3. Are there any other such tenements registered within a two kilometre radius of these claims and, if so, what are the details?

The Hon. J.H.C. KLUNDER: The replies are as follows:

1. The applicant, Mr Kupke, has identified a sand resource suitable for construction purposes. He proposes to extract this sand using open cut mining techniques. He will progressively return the mined areas to pasture.

2. The applications were lodged by Mr C.V. Kupke. He has experience as the owner and operator of EML 5612, an existing sand mining operation.

3. There are no other such tenements registered within a two kilometre radius of the claims except for EML 5612, which is owned and operated by Mr Kupke and which is within the proposed area of operations. This tenement is small, being only 60 metres by 40 metres, and the sand resource is almost exhausted. Mr Kupke has overpegged this lease in order to ensure continuity of sand supply.

GOVERNMENT VEHICLES

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

1. To which Government department is the vehicle registered UQU 045 allocated?

2. Is the driver of this vehicle authorised to take the vehicle home at nights and at weekends?

3. Are Public Service Circular No. 30 guidelines for use of Government vehicles being strictly adhered to by the driver and, if not, why not?

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

1. The vehicle registered UQU 045 is allocated to Sacon.

2. The vehicle is allocated to two drivers, by rotation, who are authorised to garage the vehicle at home at nights and on the weekend for service requirements.

3. Both drivers are aware of their responsibilities and have satisfied inquiries that they have acted in accordance with the guidelines of Commissioner's Circular 30.

GAS SUPPLIES

327. **Mr D.S. BAKER (Leader of the Opposition)** asked the Minister of Energy: Is the Government examining the option of securing natural gas supplies from the Bass Strait or North West Shelf in addition to supplies from the Cooper Basin, Queensland and the Northern Territory to the extent necessary to eliminate coal-fired power stations in this State? **The Hon. J.H.C. KLUNDER:** The Government's approach to the issue of securing energy supplies for the State involves, *inter alia*, a continuing examination of all possible options for securing natural gas supplies. The contracts signed in early 1989 with the South Australian Cooper Basin producers provide for all of the State's gas requirements until 1993, and then for about two thirds of our current requirements from 1994. The objective with these producers is to be able to achieve a 10 year forward contracted cover by the end of 1991, and the rate of additions to reserves since the contracts were signed has been such that the achievement of this objective is on target.

Negotiations by the Office of Energy Planning (OEP) on behalf of the Government are well advanced with both the South West Queensland producers and the Amadeus Basin producers in the Northern Territory. The OEP is also examining the option of securing gas supplies from Bass Strait and/or the North West Shelf.

Negotiations with the Bass Strait producers have not progressed to any significant extent despite a number of attempts on behalf of the Government. The commercial terms expectations by the Bass Strait producers have so far been in excess of our other options. To be a viable proposition, the North West Shelf option would require a significant gas load to justify a transcontinental pipeline. This would most likely be achieved by the South Eastern States combining their gas requirements to provide such a large load, as has been advocated by the Australian Gas Association. This is not anticipated until possibly some time early next century.

The extent to which supplementary gas will be secured depends on the commercial terms which the Government is able to negotiate, and as indicated above commercial negotiations are currently taking place with two producer groups. Providing favourable terms relative to alternatives can be renegotiated, the Government will be seeking to extend the security of supply of natural gas.

ETSA

328. **Mr D.S. BAKER (Leader of the Opposition)** asked the Minister of Mines and Energy: Why does ETSA's statement of mission, purpose, vision and guiding principles not include a requirement for an appropriate return on assets to the Government unlike comparable bodies interstate, and what guidelines has the Government provided to ETSA for such a return in 1990-91 and future years?

The Hon. J.H.C. KLUNDER: In mid-1988 ETSA developed its Purpose, Vision and Guiding Principles (PV&Gs) which provided the overall strategic direction and context for the organisation. During 1990 ETSA has further focused the broad direction of the PV&Gs with the development of its 'Mission' and 'Values'. These statements are designed to cover key corporate strategic direction, and as such would not be expected to include specific reference to a matter such as a rate-of-return requirement.

Whilst there is no reference of rate-of-return in ETSA's PV&Gs and Mission and Values, the importance of such measures in assessing financial performance is recognised.

In this context ETSA, in conjunction with Treasury, is currently in the process of examining rate-of-return principles.

DEPARTMENT OF ENVIRONMENT AND PLANNING COMMITTEES

329. Mr MATTHEW (Bright) asked the Minister for Environment and Planning: How many formal and how many informal committees exist within the Department of Environment and Planning and in relation to each:

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

The Hon. S.M. LENEHAN: Specific details of departmental committees were provided to the House in response to questions asked during Estimates Committees. A copy of the details relating to the Department of Environment and Planning has been provided to the member for Bright. It provides the type of information sought by the honourable member, although the majority of the committees listed therein could be considered 'formal committees' which have been authorised by a departmental director.

With regard to 'informal committees', there are numerous *ad hoc* and local committees in existence at any given time which are used as a legitimate management tool. It is not possible to provide the information requested in relation to 'informal committees' without incurring considerable costs in both time and funds.

DEPARTMENT OF INDUSTRY, TRADE AND TECHNOLOGY

334. Mr MATTHEW (Bright) asked the Minister of Industry, Trade and Technology: How many formal and how many informal committees exist within the Department of Industry, Trade and Technology and in relation to each:

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

The Hon. LYNN ARNOLD: The Department of Industry, Trade and Technology has the following formal committees.

1. (a) Industry Development Committee (IDC)
- (b) The committee approves government assistance to industry.
- (c) 1941.
- (d) Ongoing.
- (e) Parliament.
2. (a) Industry Screening Committee.
- (b) This committee screens applications for industry assistance to review the *prima facie* eligibility for assistance and makes recommendations in principle to the IDC.
- (c) 1979-80 financial year.
- (d) Ongoing.
- (e) The IDC.
3. (a) Occupational Health and Safety Committee.
- (b) It addresses issues under the Occupational Health, Safety and Welfare Act.
- (c) 1986-87 financial year.
- (d) Ongoing.
- (e) Executive committee.
4. (a) Staff Consultative Committee.
- (b) To act as a conduit for the flow of information on industrial relation issues between the Executive and the staff.
- (c) 1990-91 financial year.
- (d) Ongoing.
- (e) The Executive committee.

5. (a) Finance Committee.

- (b) To give advice to the Executive Committee on financial matters and to review effectiveness of the department's programs.
- (c) 1990-91 financial year.
- (d) Ongoing.
- (e) Executive committee

6. (a) Executive committee.

- (b) To administer the department.
- (c) Since the incorporation of the department.
- (d) Ongoing.
- (e) The Director.

The department has a number of informal committees which meet on an *ad hoc* basis as part of the department's day to day operations. These committees are action outcome oriented and are disbanded as soon as the goal has been achieved. The large number and transitory nature of such committees means that it is not practicable to provide a listing.

STATE SERVICES DEPARTMENT

335. Mr MATTHEW (Bright) asked the Minister representing the Minister of State Services: How many formal and how many informal committees exist within the Department of State Services and in relation to each—

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

The Hon. M.K. MAYES: There are currently five committees in existence within State Services. They are:

Supply Policy Statement Review Committee

Reason formed:

The committee was established with the following terms of reference:

- to examine, refine, assess and comment on the appropriateness, accuracy and relevance of draft supply policy statements and to recommend supply functions that should be covered by formal policy statements.

Date formed:

August 1981

Date for meeting objective:

Ongoing

Reports to:

State Supply Board

State Clothing Corporation

Reason formed:

The board was established to exercise management of State Clothing Corporation, after its transfer to State Services Department from SA Health Commission.

Date formed:

1 May 1990

Date for meeting objective:

Ongoing

Reports to:

Minister of State Services

Forensic Science Advisory Committee

Reason formed:

The role of this committee is to ensure the ongoing monitoring, coordination and quality control of forensic science services in South Australia.

Date formed:

5 August 1986

Date for meeting objective:

Ongoing

Reports to:

Minister of State Services

State Supply Board
Reason formed:

The role of the board is seen as:

- being the principal source of advice to the Government on the conduct of supply
- overseeing any centralised supply activities, that is, tendering, contracting and warehousing; and
- reviewing, guiding and assisting in the improvement of the performance of decentralised supply functions.

Date formed: 1888 as Supply and Tender Board. State Supply Act 1985 established new board.

Date for meeting objective: Ongoing
Reports to: Minister of State Services
Corporate Executive Group: The role of the Corporate Executive Group (CEG) is in corporate decision making in line with the inherent responsibilities of the Chief Executive Officer (CEO), and to act as an advisory panel to the CEO on issues affecting State Services.

Date formed: 1 August 1982
Date for meeting objective: Ongoing
Reports to: Minister of State Services

The above information does not include details of *ad hoc* departmental working parties.

NATIONAL CRIME AUTHORITY

342. Mr D.S. BAKER (Leader of the Opposition) asked the Minister of Education representing the Attorney-General: Has Operation O in the schedule of operations of the South Australian office of the NCA tabled by the Attorney-General on 5 April 1990 been reactivated and, if not, when is it expected it will be reactivated and, if so, when and has there been any conclusion yet?

The Hon. G.J. CRAFTER: No report or any information as to the status of Operation O has been provided to the State Government by the National Crime Authority since the statement by the Attorney-General on 5 April 1990. The South Australian Government would expect the investigation in respect of Operation O to be considered when the current major investigations by the National Crime Authority into blackmailing allegations involving senior public officials, politicians, lawyers and police are completed.

343. Mr D.S. BAKER (Leader of the Opposition) asked the Minister of Education representing the Attorney-General: Has Operation D in the schedule of operations of the South Australian Office of the NCA tabled by the Attorney-General on 5 April 1990 been concluded by the Anti Corruption Branch and, if so, what was the outcome?

The Hon. G.J. CRAFTER: The Anti Corruption Branch has advised me that it has completed its investigation of this matter and has passed on certain intelligence to the Drug Squad. No details of this case will be released at this time.

350. Mr S.J. BAKER (Deputy Leader of the Opposition) asked the Minister of Emergency Services: Will the Minister provide a reply to the question without notice asked on 5 April 1990 by the Member for Mitcham relating to NCA Operations E and K (*Hansard* p. 1291)?

The Hon. J.H.C. KLUNDER: The question asked by the member for Mitcham was asked in the First Session of the current Parliament. Unfortunately, I was unable to bring a reply back to the House before the end of the session. As a

consequence, and as is normal practice, I wrote to the honourable member on 25 July 1990 with my response to his question. If the honourable member has lost this response, I would be only too pleased to provide him with a copy.

VEHICLE LEASING

352. Mr S.J. BAKER (Deputy Leader of the Opposition) asked the Premier: Further to the answer of 2 October 1990 concerning the number of cars on lease to the Department of Premier and Cabinet—

- (a) how many of the new vehicles have private registration plates;
- (b) do the figures include the Government Management Board and, if not, what are those details; and
- (c) what are the same details for the Treasury Department?

The Hon. J.C. BANNON: the reply is as follows:

- (a) The Department of the Premier and Cabinet has five vehicles with private plates.
- (b) The figures did not include the Office of the Government Management Board. Its details are:
 - (1) the office has one vehicle;
 - (2) the vehicle has private plates;
 - (3) the vehicle is available for general use during working hours.
- (c) The Treasury Department currently operates 12 privately plated vehicles on long-term hire from the Government car pool. All vehicles are available for general use during working hours.

ARENA PROMOTIONAL FACILITIES

356. Mr S.J. BAKER (Deputy Leader of the Opposition) asked the Premier: Further to the answer of 2 October 1990 concerning Arena Promotional Facilities, what is the breakdown of the \$1.7 million worth of assets into various components such as:

- (a) physical, that is, land, buildings, equipment;
- (b) goodwill; and
- (c) deposits, debentures, shares, etc., and who valued the assets?

The Hon. J.C. BANNON: The \$1 657 879.29 of assets of the company at date of takeover is comprised totally of physical assets, that is, plant and equipment and working capital. These are valued at cost less appropriate depreciation. The value was verified by Coopers and Lybrand as part of the 1989 audit.

POLICE SECURITY FILES

364. Mr BECKER (Hanson) asked the Minister of Emergency Services—

1. Do the South Australian Police still inquire into and establish security files on all union officials and office bearers and, if so, why?
2. When did this practice first commence and were such files culled and destroyed in the mid-1970s or were they retained when some Special Branch files were culled and destroyed and, if so, why?

The Hon. J.H.C. KLUNDER: The reply is as follows:

1. No.
2. No-one presently employed in the successor to Special Branch, the Operations Intelligence Section, is able to state

whether or not this was once the practice. Presumably, if it were those files would have been culled and destroyed following Justice White's inquiry into Special Branch.

MEDIAN STRIPS

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

1. What is the Department of Road Transport program this financial year in relation to renovating or removing and replacing soil in median strips?
2. Why was it necessary to replace the soil in the median strip on Tapleys Hill Road, West Beach and Fulham?
3. Where else in the metropolitan area has similar work been undertaken and what was the cost for each job and why is it necessary to undertake such work?
4. How often is the soil level topped up in median strips?
5. How much is spent annually on this type of program?

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

1. A three year program has been in operation since 1988 in the Department of Road Transport's Grange maintenance area to reshape and repair rubble median surfaces. Of the five metropolitan maintenance areas, the need for this type of repair work was most noticeable in the Grange maintenance area. However, similar programs are undertaken from time to time in other maintenance areas when required. Median surface repair work remaining to be undertaken during the current financial year includes the Tapleys Hill Road and Trimmer Parade intersection, some sections along Trimmer Parade at Seaton, and various minor localised areas.

2. Implementation of this program was necessary due to the poor condition of the rubble surface of older medians which is attributed to the disturbance of loose surface material by the slipstream of passing vehicles. In addition, large vehicles turning at median openings often mount a wheel onto the median surface causing heavy wear at those locations.

The result of this is an uneven surface which poses a hazard to pedestrians and allows water to pond and, through soakage, creates the potential for damage to the adjacent road pavement.

To overcome these problems, deteriorated median surface areas have been sheeted with bitumen treated sand and, in the high traffic wear areas (e.g. close proximity to median openings), the existing median infill material was removed and replaced with the more traffic wear resistant bitumen treated sand.

All newly constructed medians are infilled with a superior wearing material which will reduce the need for this type of repair work in the future.

3. Other metropolitan roads which have recently received similar treatment are Addison Road, Old Port Road, Bower Road, Churchill Road, Marion Road and Semaphore Road. The cost of this particular activity is not segregated from the normal median maintenance work which includes mowing of grassed medians, maintenance of vegetation, and kerbing repairs.

4. This type of work is undertaken when deemed necessary and the frequency is dependent upon deterioration due to traffic volumes, vehicular turning movements, and pedestrian usage.

5. Costs for this work are not segregated from the other activities associated with maintenance of medians.

NATIVE TREE PLANTING PROGRAM

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

1. What is the success rate of the Australian native tree planting program in the median strip on Anzac Highway and when will the whole of the program be completed?
2. Why are there more native trees planted between Morphett Road and Brighton Road than other sections of Anzac Highway?
3. When will the old trees be removed?
4. How many trees are either dead or badly diseased to warrant removal along Anzac Highway and when will these trees be removed?
5. What type of native trees have proved successful in this program?

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

1. The success rate in planting Australian native trees on the Anzac Highway median is close to 100 per cent and the program will continue until the existing trees die and are replaced.

2. There are few native trees planted in the median between Morphett Road and Brighton Road. The Glenelg council has planted Claret Ash trees to supplement the trees in this section of the median.

3. The trees will be removed as they die.

4. Most, if not all, the existing Cupressus Pine trees are in poor health. They are suffering from canker (a form of tree cancer) and old age.

5. Native trees that have proved successful are those presently being planted i.e. *Eucalyptus Citriodora* (Lemon Scented Gum).

STATE LIBRARY

374. Mr BECKER (Hanson) asked the Minister for Environment and Planning representing the Minister for the Arts: Will the State Library Lending Service continue to receive the same support now that the Department of Local Government will disappear and, if so, to what extent?

The Hon. S.M. LENEHAN: Negotiations are proceeding with the Corporation of the City of Adelaide to establish a major public library in the city to replace most of the services currently provided by the State Library Lending Service. The Government believes that the City of Adelaide, like other capital cities in Australia, should provide a central public library which would complement the suburban and rural public libraries provided by other councils in South Australia. Specialised services provided by lending services and not normally expected of public libraries, such as the computer resource area and the Kurzweil reading machine, would be retained by the State Library. The actual split of services between the two libraries will be determined during the negotiation process.

COWANDILLA PRIMARY SCHOOL

Mr BECKER (Hanson) asked the Minister of Housing and Construction: Why was it considered necessary to establish a new car park for staff at Cowandilla Primary School, what was the total cost of constructing it, how long did construction take and why did it take that length of time?

The Hon. M.K. MAYES: The Education Department requested a new car park as there was no on-site car parking facility at the school. Vehicles had to travel through the school yard resulting in a safety hazard. In addition vehicles

used an old sand pit and many people became bogged. The total cost was \$33 968.

Construction took five weeks and was within the time period agreed for the contract and as agreed with the school. It is regarded as normal for this type of work.

PASTORAL RENTS

381. Mr GUNN (Eyre) asked the Minister of Lands:

1. What was the basis for determining the new pastoral rents effective under the Pastoral Land Management and Conservation Act 1989 and were the current depressed economic conditions taken into account?

2. Which properties were revalued to form the basis to set the new pastoral rents?

3. Will pastoralists facing severe financial difficulties be given any remission on their rents?

4. What is the expected total revenue for this financial year from pastoral leases?

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

1. The Pastoral Land Management and Conservation Act requires the Valuer-General to determine a market rent for each individual pastoral lease. In reaching this determination the Valuer-General is required by section 23 of the Act to have regard to:

the maximum rents payable as defined in the Act (up to 80 cents per sheep or \$2.40 for cattle, based on the lesser stocking figures);

the capacity of the land to carry stock;

the numbers of stock actually carried on the land during the previous year;

the proximity and accessibility to markets and facilities affecting the profitability of the commercial enterprise under the lease; and

any other factors that affect the determination of a fair market rental for the land.

The Valuer-General has exercised his professional judgement to determine a methodology which will be fair and equitable. The approach of assessing rental evidence is considered, by him, to be relevant to the task set by the Parliament—which is, of course, to determine a market rental for the Crown's interest only. While capital values and sales evidence provide information about the value of lessee owned improvements it should be borne in mind that the Pastoral Land Management and Conservation Act requires the setting of a rent, not the determination of a capital value for individual leases.

The rentals set reflect the market conditions at the time of determination—that is, 7 March 1990, which is the operative date of the Act. It is certainly acknowledged that the market has since become further depressed and I am confident that the Valuer-General will take this into account when setting next year's rentals.

This is, in fact, the great strength and advantage of the rent setting process in this Act, rents are paid in arrears which means that pastoralists are not subject to the vagaries of prediction about future market trends and have already received the commercial benefit of the use of the Crown's land during the preceding year.

As a further indication of the extent to which the rentals do reflect the market conditions at the time of determination, it should be noted that about 90 per cent of sheep properties have been assessed at values under the maximum rent of 80 cents per sheep.

2. In determining the rent for the Crown's interest, a number of properties were fully inspected and valued. These

included properties which have been subject to subleases or recently sold.

As a further check, five benchmark properties were selected for comparative valuations by the valuer retained by the Government and the valuer retained by the United Farmers and Stockowners Pastoral Task Force. These properties were selected as representative of different locations and types of enterprise, covering cattle stations north of the Dog Fence, mixed sheep and cattle enterprises, and sheep properties in the 'inside' country.

The properties were:

South Australia	Northern Territory
Old Koomooloo	Phillip Creek
Parcoola	Tennant Creek
Lords Well	Ooratippra
Spring Dame	Mulga Park
Wheal Motley	
Wompinie	
Kolendo	
Mount Vivian	
Mount Lyndhurst	
Allandale	
Arckaringa	

All South Australian pastoral lease properties were visited to ascertain what the land provided or lacked by way of natural resources and the effect that these or any other factors applicable to the Crown's interest would have on the management of the property and thus on the rent.

3. The Act provides that the Pastoral Board may, if it thinks that a case of hardship exists, waive or defer payment or part payment of any rent, unconditionally or subject to such conditions as the Board thinks fit (section 23 (5)).

I understand that the Board will be discussing this matter at its next meeting, in order to establish criteria for determining hardship. The Board will publish an information package once this process has been agreed.

Applications for hardship considerations should be directed to the Executive Officer for the Pastoral Board. Each case will be considered on its merits.

4. The total revenue expected in this financial year is \$403 264 which covers the eight month accounting period after deduction for prior payments.

ROAD SAFETY CENTRE

384. Mr BRINDAL (Hayward) asked the Minister of Transport:

1. Which portion of land at the Road Safety Centre at Oaklands Park is or may be considered surplus to the requirements of the Government, and is it still the Minister's intention that extensive community consultation will take place before any decision is made? If so, when will the consultation take place?

2. What criteria are used to establish that land or facilities are surplus to requirements?

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

1. The area of land is still being determined. A detailed drawing and survey of the area is being prepared and will be submitted to me for decision regarding declaring it surplus.

I have agreed to community consultation and will determine the extent and timing of that as part of the decision regarding the proposed area of land to be declared surplus.

2. The criteria so far used to determine the proposed area of land are to examine its day to day use for road safety training and, where the land is little used or not used at all for road safety training, it will be deemed surplus. Driver standard and licence testing functions will still be offered at the Road Safety Centre, Oaklands Park.

GOVERNMENT MOTOR VEHICLE FLEET

386. Mr **BRINDAL** (Hayward) asked the Premier:

1. Who is the comprehensive insurer in respect of the Government motor vehicle fleet and, if the Government carries its own risk, where is this provision found in the Budget?

2. What extra provision has been made for the increased liability accruing to the Government in respect of use of such vehicles by public servants using cars for private purposes interstate and, if no provision has been made, what is the estimated liability for this financial year?

The Hon. J.C. BANNON: The replies are as follows:

1. State Fleet carries its own comprehensive insurance. An analysis is undertaken annually to assess whether the fleet should be fully insured, partially insured or continue to be self-insured. The cost of repairing accident vehicles is included in State Fleet's income and expenditure statement (see Auditor-General's Report) and does not appear as a separate item in the budget papers.

2. The lease charges for vehicles on long-term hire increase according to the kilometres travelled. This charge includes an escalating cost factor to cover the possibility of additional accidents. No distinction is made between use in South Australia or interstate.

GRAND PRIX INCOME

388. Mr **BECKER** (Hanson) asked the Premier: What was the total of ticket sales for the 1990 Australian Formula One Grand Prix and what was the total of other income received by the Grand Prix Board?

The Hon. J.C. BANNON: The Australian Formula One Grand Prix Board is required, before the end of April each year, to report on its operations during the preceding calendar year. This report, which must incorporate the audited statements of accounts, must be laid before each House of Parliament. The information sought by the honourable member is subject to audit by the State Auditor-General and will be released on receipt of his certification as required by legislation.

LOCAL GOVERNMENT ADVISORY COMMISSION

Mr **MATTHEW** (Bright) asked the Minister of Employment and Further Education representing the Minister of Local Government:

1. When will the Local Government Advisory Commission announce decisions on the City of Glenelg proposal to append part of the City of Marion, the City of Sturt proposal and the City of Holdfast proposal?

2. When will the commission announce decisions on petitions presented by Marino residents and Seaview Downs and Seacliff Park residents to become part of the City of Brighton?

The Hon. M.D. RANN: The Local Government Advisory Commission is currently considering proposals for boundary change lodged by the cities of Glenelg, Brighton and Marion, and two proposals lodged by residents of Seaview Downs/Seacliff Park and Marino. The commission met with the three councils in September this year to discuss the status of their proposals and the procedures which might be adopted to complete inquiries into those matters. As the honourable member would be aware, the commission has recently adopted new procedures and it was therefore necessary for the commission to discuss how councils wished to proceed

with their proposals in light of those new procedures. I understand that, at that meeting, some discussion took place with regard to the possibility of the councils withdrawing their proposals.

I have been advised that the commission is currently considering the two residents' proposals and expects to be in a position to give a clear indication of its views on these matters by early December. The commission has further indicated that it will deal with the councils' proposals after that time. The commission is an independent body with responsibility for the investigation of proposals referred to it by me and which will in due course report to me on those matters. The processes for consideration of proposals and the timing of the inquiries are therefore matters for the commission to determine.

CROUZET TICKET SYSTEM

393. Mrs **KOTZ** (Newland) asked the Minister of Transport:

1. Has the introduction of free travel for students effectively reduced the number of ticket validations recorded by the Crouzet ticket system causing difficulty recording passenger numbers?

2. How many passengers have been recorded by the Crouzet system since the introduction of free travel for students?

3. How many passengers were recorded by the Crouzet system immediately prior to the introduction of free travel for students over a similar period of time?

4. Has STA successfully contracted to install an automatic passenger counting system and, if so, at what cost, when will the system be installed and what are the particulars of its operating procedure?

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

1. Yes.

2. For the nine months since the introduction of free travel for students (that is, from the beginning of February 1990 to the end of October 1990) a total of 30 663 436 passengers were recorded by the Crouzet system.

3. For the same period in 1989, a total of 39 993 080 passengers were recorded.

4. The State Transport Authority has not yet contracted to install automatic passenger counting (APC) equipment on board fleet vehicles, but registrations of interest are presently being sought for the supply of such equipment.

SEED TESTING LABORATORY

400. Mr **MEIER** (Goyder) asked the Minister of Agriculture: How many people are employed in the Seed Testing Laboratory at the Northfield Research Centre, when is it proposed to shift the laboratory to the Waite site, and what restructuring, if any, will be required when the move occurs?

The Hon. LYNN ARNOLD: There are presently 16 staff employed in the Seed Services Section at Northfield. Of this total, eight are employed in the Seed Testing Laboratory, four are employed in seed certification and four are employed in clerical and managerial support roles. It is proposed to transfer the section to the Waite site on completion of the proposed new facilities. This is expected to be in late 1993. The exact date will depend on satisfactory progress in the ongoing consultation with local groups in the Netherby area and the normal variation in building time for projects of this nature. No restructuring of the section is required as a result of the relocation.