HOUSE OF ASSEMBLY

Tuesday 23 March 1993

The SPEAKER (Hon. N.T. Peterson) took the Chair at 10.30 a.m. and read prayers.

ASSENT TO BILLS

Her Excellency the Governor, by message, intimated her assent to the following Bills:

Dog Control (Dangerous Breeds) Amendment,

Public Finance and Audit (Miscellaneous) Amendment.

PANALATINGA ROAD

A petition signed by 231 residents of South Australia requesting that the House urge the Government to reconstruct Panalatinga Road from Pimpala to Wheatsheaf Road was presented by the Hon. Dean Brown.

Petition received.

CAPITAL PUNISHMENT

A petition signed by 196 residents of South Australia requesting that the House urge the Government to reintroduce capital punishment for crimes of homicide was presented by Mr Becker.

Petition received.

LIQUOR LICENSING

A petition signed by 5 residents of South Australia

requesting that the House urge the Government to rescind the increase in liquor licence fees was presented by the Hon. B.C. Eastick.

Petition received.

AUDITOR-GENERAL'S REPORT

The SPEAKER laid on the table the supplementary report of the Auditor-General for the year ended 30 June 1992.

Ordered that report be printed.

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 202, 256, 301, 312 to 316, 318, 323, 326, 331 to 333, 335, 338, 344 to 346, 348, 351, 357 to 359, 361, 364, 365, 368, 369, 371, 372, 374, 390 to 395, 397 to 399, 401, 423, 426; and I direct that the following answers to questions without notice be distributed and printed in *Hansard.*

REMM-MYER

In reply to **Mr S.J. BAKER** (3 March).

The Hon. FRANK BLEVINS: The Myer Centre-Adelaide is now effectively owned by Group Asset Management. Group Asset Management assumed effective control on 21 April 1992 by the exercise of an option which formed part of the Bank's overall security arrangements. During the first half of calendar 1992 there was a dispute between the bank and other banks which comprised a syndicate that provided funding for the Myer Centre project relating to the obligations of State Bank to the other banks following the default of the developer.

This dispute was resolved by a negotiated settlement concluded in early July 1992. The settlement required that the terms of the settlement remain confidential. Given the commercial nature of these arrangements the bank and the Government must honour the confidentiality obligations. However, the settlement has resulted in the cessation of all non-State Bank funding of the Myer Centre.

DEVIATION ROAD

In reply to **Mr ATKINSON** (18 February).

The Hon. M.D. RANN: The closure of Deviation Road was proposed in a 1991 planning investigation report into the replacement of the existing Port Road Railway Bridge at Thebarton. The existing bridge is in poor condition and a consultant was commissioned by a committee representing the State Transport Authority, Department of Road Transport and Adelaide City Council to plan a replacement bridge. The consultant's recommended replacement bridge scheme included the proposal that Deviation Road be permanently closed at Port Road to improve traffic management in the vicinity of the bridge.

The recommended bridge scheme, including the proposed closure of Deviation Road, was placed on public display from 19 August to 6 September 1991 at various locations that were advertised in the press. In addition, adjacent landowners and other regular users of Deviation Road, such as the Engineering and Water Supply Department, Police, South Australian Cricket Association, as well as the Thebarton Council, were consulted regarding the replacement bridge and the closure of Deviation Road.

No objections to the closure of Deviation Road were received during this public consultation. Following the completion of the public consultation phase, the consultant's recommended bridge scheme was accepted by the committee. Final design and documentation for the replacement bridge was carried out and tenders subsequently called for construction of the replacement bridge.

To enable construction of the new bridge and roadworks to commence, Adelaide City Council, at its meeting on 26 October 1992, resolved to temporarily close portion of Deviation Road, pursuant to Section 359 of the Local Government Act.

Council's resolution to temporarily close Deviation Road under Section 359 was published in the *South Australian Government Gazette* on 5 November 1992 and also in the local newspaper. Council, at its meeting on 23 November 1992, resolved that procedures be commenced under the Roads Opening and Closing Act to close portion of Deviation Road to facilitate construction of the Port Road Railway Bridge. These procedures are under way and when completed will result in the closed portion of Deviation Road reverting to parklands.

A contract has recently been awarded to the successful tenderer for construction of the new bridge. To allow the bridgeworks and associated roadworks to commence, Deviation Road was physically closed at Port Road on 24 February 1993. The closure was advertised in the local newspaper and road signs have been erected advising road users of the closure. This

closure for roadworks has been carried out in accordance with Council's resolution of 26 October 1992, pursuant to Section 359 of the Local Government Act.

PAPERS TABLED

The following papers were laid on the table:

By the Treasurer (Hon. Frank Blevins)—

Friendly Societies Act

General Laws of the Friendly Societies' Medical Association Incorporated

Gaming Machines Act 1992—Regulation—General

Police Superannuation Act 1990—Regulation—Aboriginal Police Aides

By the Minister of Housing, Urban Development and Local Government Relations (Hon. G.J. Crafter)—

Magistrates Court Act 1992—Rules of Court—

Forms—Amendments

Port Adelaide—Trial Court

Summary Procedure Act—Various

Planning Act 1982

Regulation—Moveable Business Signs

Crown Development Report on proposed land division application, Hundred of Caroline

By the Minister of Environment and Land Management (Hon. M.K. Mayes)—

Liquor Licensing Act 1985—Regulations—

Dry Areas—Whyalla Foreshore

Exemptions—Accommodation

Real Property Act 1886—Regulation—Revocation—Lodgement Surcharge

By the Minister of Education, Employment and Training (Hon. S.M. Lenehan)—

Non-Government Schools Registration Board—Report, 1991-92

Teachers Registration Board—Report, 1991-92

By the Minister of Public Infrastructure (Hon. J.H.C. Klunder)—

Sewerage Act 1929—Regulation—Examination and Registration Fees

Waterworks Act 1932—Regulation—Registration and Renewal Fees

By the Minister of Health, Family and Community Services (Hon. M.J. Evans)—

South Australian Health Commission—Report, 1991-92.

GENTING GROUP

The Hon. FRANK BLEVINS (Deputy Premier): I seek leave to make a ministerial statement.

Leave granted.

The Hon. FRANK BLEVINS: Mr Speaker, several questions were asked in the Parliament on 4 March 1993 about the suitability of the Genting Group to remain associated with the Adelaide Casino. Those questions were based principally on a report prepared for the Federal Parliamentary Committee on the National Crime Authority by Mr L.D. Ayton who is an Assistant Police Commissioner in Western Australia. I referred the matter to the Chairperson of the Casino Supervisory Authority and I now table, with leave, a copy of her response.

The response makes several relevant points and I will summarise them for the benefit of the House. In the first place, it is clear that the submission by the consortium with which Genting was involved in Western Australia for the establishment of the Burswood Casino was a superior one. The recent Royal Commission in Western Australia found that a reasonable person could readily conclude that it offered most benefits to the economy of Western Australia. The choice of the Genting consortium to develop the casino was therefore readily supportable on economic grounds. In the second place, it is clear that certain information came to the attention of Mr Ayton in the course of his investigations at that time which was adverse to the Genting Group. Most of that information proved to be unfounded.

Thirdly, some time after Genting had been appointed as technical advisers to the operator of the Adelaide Casino two directors of the company were alleged to have made false statements in connection with the issue of the prospectus for the Burswood Property Trust. The allegation was that the construction cost of the project was deliberately understated with the intention of misleading prospective investors.

A thorough investigation was carried out by a senior officer of the Western Australian Corporate Affairs Commission with assistance from Mr Ayton. The point at issue was whether it was realistic to expect that an estimate of $180 million for the construction cost prepared just prior to the issue of the prospectus could have been reduced to the figure of $146.5 million used in the prospectus. After much consideration and with the benefit of expert legal advice the Commissioner of Corporate Affairs in Western Australia decided not to prosecute. The case rested heavily on inference and it was not possible to exclude other views of the facts which were consistent with the genuineness of the proposed reductions.

The Royal Commission in Western Australia subsequently concluded that the decision not to prosecute fell within the range of proper discretion of the prosecutor. In reaching this conclusion the commission observed that while Mr Ayton was an upright and conscientious investigator they discounted his suspicions a good deal. It is not necessary to question the sincerity with which Mr Ayton holds his belief to conclude that they have not been established as fact.

In conclusion, the Casino Supervisory Authority is aware of the matters which have given rise to the questions asked in the Parliament on 4 March 1993 and has pursued them through every avenue open to it. On the information presently available to it the CSA has no basis to find that Genting's role as technical adviser to the Casino exposes the Casino to management by people of suspicious backgrounds.

QUESTION TIME

STATE BANK

The Hon. DEAN BROWN (Leader of the Opposition): Is the Premier prepared to take the people of South Australia, as owners of the State Bank, into his confidence and reveal what the Government regards as a minimum price below which the State Bank will not be sold and, if not, why not? In extended radio interviews

on Sunday night and again yesterday, the Premier repeatedly stated that the Government would not sell the bank if it could not get a fair price. Since the Premier's statements, calls to talkback radio and other public comment reflect widespread concern about the failure of the Premier to be more specific about the Government's policy for selling the bank and, particularly, what the Government regards as a minimum price below which the bank would not be sold.

The Hon. LYNN ARNOLD: It is quite obvious that the Leader himself did not listen to the programs, otherwise he would have heard my extensive answers on the process that is being gone through at the moment. First, we must have a valuation process and report on the various sale methods that could be considered by the Government, and that report has not yet been received by the Government. I expect that we will receive that report in the very near future, and that will advise us both on the various ways in which a sale process could be undertaken and also on what general valuation could be expected to be received for the bank by various sale methods.

Until that information comes I think it would be quite irresponsible of me simply to pluck a figure out of the air, which is what the Leader wants me to do, and simply say 'This is a figure that we will achieve for the bank.' It also depends upon what the income stream from the bank will be in the future, now that it has got back to basics. We need more advice on that situation as well. I know that the Leader is quite prepared to be so irresponsible. In fact, he himself has on radio programs plucked figures out of mid-air then, when he plucks the figure out of mid-air, he changes his mind and a week later has to pluck another figure out of mid-air, and then a week later, when he discovers that that does not add up either, he has to pluck a third figure out of mid-air. I will leave him to follow that kind of irresponsible path. I will follow a responsible path, wait for the advice to come and then—again, if he had listened to the programs, he would have heard me say it—I will give a full statement on these matters when a decision has been made by the Government.

GOODS AND SERVICES TAX

Mr FERGUSON (Henley Beach): Will the Premier guarantee that he is not planning a goods and services tax as part of

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order! At the end of the previous sitting there were external pressures on this Parliament and quite a lot of leeway given. Those pressures have been removed. We are back to our forum of the State Parliament and we will conduct ourselves correctly, and anyone who does not will be dealt with under the Standing Orders.

Mr FERGUSON: Thank you very much, Sir; I needed your protection. Can the Premier guarantee that he is not planning a goods and services tax as part of a Fightback style package before the next election?

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

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order! The House will come to Order! The member for Henley Beach will resume his seat. The Deputy Leader.

Mr S.J. BAKER: Sir, not only is the question hypothetical but the Federal Constitution does not allow for that to happen.

The SPEAKER: Order! I do not uphold the point of order because I understand that the question referred to a type of goods and services tax. I will allow the question.

Mr FERGUSON: In the months leading up to the recent Federal election the State Opposition Leader on many occasions voiced his support for both the Fightback package and the GST proposed by the Federal Coalition. However, in recent days the Opposition Leader has distanced himself from State and Federal Liberal Party policy. Given that the Premier has been a firm opponent of Fightback and the GST, it raises the question whether the Premier is planning a policy change.

The Hon. LYNN ARNOLD: I say at the outset that it might be worthwhile for various people to do a bit of a book on how quickly the besieged Leader's cavalry, the member for Hayward, comes in to raise a point of order to save him. Mr Speaker, you know he does that every Question Time. Let us see how long it takes him to get to his feet and raise a few points of order. I can say that unlike the Leader, who can be otherwise characterised as 'U-turn Dean' or 'Back-down Brown', I have no intention of introducing any sort of goods and services tax in South Australia. My refusal to do so will be entirely consistent with the views that I have expressed about a goods and services type tax over many years, unlike the Leader of the Opposition whose comments will come back to haunt him.

Despite his attempt in the past few days to do a back-down, a flip or a U-turn on this matter, his unequivocal support for Fightback and the Fightback package will go with him and will drag like a dead weight as long as he remains in politics. I say that because he will not be able to deny his own words. Back in May 1992 the Leader said:

> Fightback offers the only real alternative to structuring the Australian economy so we again become world competitive. Without it we'll become the classic banana republic.

The Leader said that. He then said—

The SPEAKER: Order! I ask the Premier not to debate the response.

The Hon. LYNN ARNOLD: I certainly take the point, Sir, and I do not intend to debate the point because I am not going to change on this matter. I am a fundamental opponent of the Fightback package, just as the Leader was a fundamental supporter of the Fightback package, yet last week he did a U-turn and backed down on the total issue. His credibility is absolutely at zero level and he will not be able to shake that albatross from around his neck, whereas I, before and after the election, have had the same view on this matter. My view is that a goods and services tax would not have helped this country or this State and I have no intention of introducing such a tax into South Australia.

CREDIT RATING

Mr S.J. BAKER (Deputy Leader of the Opposition): Turning back to matters more important,

will the Treasurer confirm that in the latest discussions between Treasury officials and international credit ratings agencies, the State Government has been warned of a further downgrading in South Australia's credit rating unless there is a significant reduction in the ratio of State debt to gross State product? Without the sale of the State Bank, and based on budget assumptions about growth in gross State product, State debt will represent almost 30 per cent of gross State product by June this year, an almost doubling of the debt burden on the State's economy in only three years.

The Hon. FRANK BLEVINS: The contrast between Question Time today and Question Time 10 days or so ago is quite remarkable.

Mr Ingerson interjecting:

The Hon. FRANK BLEVINS: The member for Bragg raises his head. Everyone is putting a brave face on it today: they are all trying to laugh today and say, 'Ha! Ha! Ha!'.

An honourable member: Eight seats to four.

The Hon. FRANK BLEVINS: It doesn't—

The SPEAKER: Order! The Treasurer will resume his seat. The member for Heysen is out of order. I have let everyone know what the attitude will be here. As I say, the member for Heysen is out of order. I take note of his behaviour. The honourable Treasurer.

Dr Armitage interjecting:

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

The Hon. FRANK BLEVINS: Thank you, Sir. I was attempting to answer the question when I was interrupted. The question of discussions between Treasury and Standard and Poor's certainly has not been passed onto me. I doubt very much whether Standard and Poor's would confide in the member for Mitcham, and I am quite sure that Treasury would not. Nevertheless, it is something that I will have investigated for the Deputy Leader. As regards the level of State debt, that will be disclosed when the budget comes down, approximately towards the end of August—that is the usual date—and we will all be a lot wiser then.

TARIFFS

The Hon. J.C. BANNON (Ross Smith): My question is directed to the Premier. Will the Premier continue to highlight his concerns about the impact of tariff reductions on South Australia in any discussions he has with the Prime Minister and other Federal Ministers, and has the South Australian Government's position with respect to tariff reductions changed in the past week in the light of the events of 10 days ago?

The Hon. LYNN ARNOLD: Again, I can assure the member for Ross Smith that the very principled stand that he, when he was Premier, took on this matter of protecting South Australian industry so that it can develop and grow from strength to strength, which I have always actively supported, remains the view of this Government. We have always stated—not only post-election but also pre-election—that we support South Australian manufacturing industry and that we actually believe there is a role for a slowing down of the tariff phase-down. I expressed those views before and after; I have made that statement to my Federal colleagues—to Paul Keating and to John Button when he was Industry Minister.

I said quite forcibly over various periods of time that we wanted to keep a very close watch on what was happening and that we would be telling them when damage was being done to the industry. In fact, we felt that the initial figure they talked about for the automotive industry—10 per cent by the year 2000—was too harsh. Indeed, what finally happened was that that became 15 per cent, plus a 35 per cent effective level after taking into account the export assistance programs that the Commonwealth has put in place.

However, we now have the Leader of the Opposition having the absolute gall to say that for months he has been talking to Hewson trying to get him to change his point of view. I stood up publicly and expressed my concerns about various matters of Federal policy over many years. When we prepared two letters, in the true spirit of bipartisanship on behalf of South Australian industry I offered him the opportunity to sign them. It was not just a political go at John Hewson but a letter to go to both the Prime Minister and the Leader of the Opposition—in other words, at both sides in Federal politics. What did the Leader do? He rebutted me. He simply said that this was a stunt; he was not going to be a part of it.

Indeed, he wrote me a letter after the first draft letter. I remind members that the quote I am about to cite comes from the person who now says that he was beavering away for many months in secret, in the dark—and obviously without any success, if he is telling the truth, because not a single whit of change took place in Federal Liberal Party policy except in the sugar seats. So, obviously he had a little bit of impact there if he is telling the truth, which I seriously doubt, I might say. His letter to me says what he really believed on this matter. He states:

I have made it clear to my Federal colleagues that I support these business—

Mr BRINDAL: Mr Speaker—

The Hon. LYNN ARNOLD: I see; 2.25 p.m.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order! The Premier will resume his seat. The member for Hayward.

Mr BRINDAL: On a point of order, Mr Speaker, I believe that Standing Orders require that the Premier respond to the substance of the question. I do not believe that he is doing that and, further, I believe that he is debating the answer.

Mr Hamilton interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order! The attention of the Chair was distracted in discussion with the Opposition Whip. I did not hear the content, but I ask the Premier, if he was wandering from the substance of his response, to be more specific.

The Hon. LYNN ARNOLD: Certainly, Sir. I will finish the sentence so that we can all be clear on the point that needs to be made. The words of the Leader of the Opposition were:

I have made it clear to my Federal colleagues that I support these business taxation and industrial relations reforms—

Fightback's reforms, Fightback's taxation, Fightback's initiatives—

as a means of encouraging industry across the board to become more competitive.

That is what he is now trying to dump on, that what he is now trying to do a total back down or a U-turn on, and that is what the electorate will not let him get away with.

STATE BANK

Mr BRINDAL (Hayward): Does the Treasurer agree with the statement of the Chairman of the Economic and Finance Committee that State Bank executive salaries remain 'totally unrealistic' and, if so, why has the Government failed to use its powers under its indemnity of the bank to ensure that salaries are not out of kilter with those generally applying in the banking industry? After the committee received information in a public hearing last week, the member for Playford complained in public statements that State Bank executive salaries were generally above the average applying in the banking industry. One executive was quoted as receiving in excess of $400 000, while at least five other executives were receiving well over $200 000, having packages up to 25 per cent above the industry average for their particular position.

The Hon. FRANK BLEVINS: Like everyone, I look forward to receiving a report from the Chairman—

An honourable member interjecting:

The Hon. FRANK BLEVINS: Don't point. That is very rude.

The Hon. Dean Brown interjecting:

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

The Hon. FRANK BLEVINS: That is five questions. It almost gives me an open go. I look forward to a report, as does everyone else. If any action is required, it will be taken, as it always is.

Mr Ingerson interjecting:

The Hon. FRANK BLEVINS: Don't you believe we ought to wait for the report? You do not believe—

The SPEAKER: Order! The Treasurer will address his remarks through the Chair.

The Hon. FRANK BLEVINS: I am sorry, Sir; I know that you believe it—it just seemed unnecessary. However, is it not correct that we ought to wait until the report is handed down to Parliament, and at that stage—

Mr Hamilton interjecting:

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

Mr Hamilton interjecting:

The SPEAKER: I warn the member for Albert Park.

The Hon. FRANK BLEVINS: Thank you, Sir, for attempting to get me a fair go. All I ask is a fair go.

The SPEAKER: The Chair will get a fair go for the Treasurer; I guarantee it.

The Hon. FRANK BLEVINS: I will, as always, take any action that is required after considering the report. As regards salaries in the State Bank, like everyone else in Australia, I heard of the salary that was being paid to the new executive of Westpac, who came riding in from America to attempt to salvage Australia's oldest bank. When I heard what that salary was, I expected the telephone to ring, the CEO of our State Bank drawing to my attention the comparison between the salary that was being paid to the imported CEO of Westpac and his salary. Nevertheless, I am sure that, in a period of restraint, the General Manager of the State Bank decided not to ring me after all. Obviously, I will take note of any report from any parliamentary committee and, if any action is required, the Government will consider what action to take.

FEDERAL ELECTION

The Hon. J.P. TRAINER (Walsh): Can the Premier please advise the House of the benefits to South Australia resulting from the re-election of the Federal Labor Government?

The Hon. LYNN ARNOLD: The advantages are many, and the avoidance of severe costs is also significant.

Mr Meier interjecting:

The Hon. LYNN ARNOLD: The member for Goyder laughs, but he full well knows the package that his own colleagues supported. He was in here a couple of weeks ago gloating about what they anticipated to be a Liberal Party victory at the Federal level. At the time, they were wearing their 'Fightback!' badges, standing on the steps of Parliament House, as was the Leader, getting himself into the photograph all the time right behind John Hewson and making sure he could be seen. As John Hewson was stirring up the crowd, there he was cheering as well, and when John Hewson said, 'Come on now, let's all boo!', he booed as well. It made good film on TV, although it looked pretty foolish.

Mr S.G. EVANS: On a point of order, Mr Speaker, I ask whether the Premier is replying to the substance of the question.

The SPEAKER: I uphold the point of order, and I ask the Premier to be specific in his response. I also point out to the Premier and Ministers the advantage of ministerial statements with long responses. The honourable Premier.

The Hon. LYNN ARNOLD: Mr Speaker, I hear the odd interjection from time to time, but I notice there is some silence over there. The member for Newland is particularly silent—she has read some articles today—and a few others over there are a bit silent, too. They have done the figures a bit differently.

Anyway, the answer is this: fortunately, we have been saved by not having John Hewson as Prime Minister of this country. I detailed what that would cost South Australia—that it would cost us $200 million in the 1993-94 year alone. Then, given the removal of fiscal equalisation, in which the Federal Liberals believe and with which—obviously by his own statement that he is a fundamental supporter of Fightback—the Leader in this House also agreed, all the other things would have cost this State Government—and therefore South Australians—over $1 billion over a four-year time frame. It is quite clear that we have been able to avoid that heavy impediment that would have cut into services that this State Government can offer.

Those figures, of course, included savage cuts to Government grants. That is how John Hewson was going to finance his package: by talking billions of dollars out of the State Governments of Australia. He made that public in his own package, and the Leader of the

Opposition said that he was a fundamental supporter of that. Two days after the election he said he was personally disappointed that it did not get up. He changed his view later in the week, but two days after the election he said, 'I was disappointed that the Liberal Party's Fightback program was rejected.' Yet later in the week he tries to change his words on that. I am looking forward with great interest to see him circumlocute his way through this area.

The other issue that will benefit South Australia as a result of the re-election of the Federal Labor Government is in the area of tariffs, and I have made this point on many occasions. The 100 000 South Australians who work in factories in this State can now feel more secure in not having to worry about the zero, or that odd little term 'negligible', tariff level that Ian McLachlan wanted to foist on industry in this State.

Then we have the State Bank package—that if the State Bank is to be sold we get $600 million from the Federal Government. John Hewson was saying that that was a very generous offer. He came out publicly and said that it was a very generous offer. He came out before the election and said, 'We can't match that'. So there again we are ahead, not only on points but by a knockout.

Then there is the matter of fiscal equalisation to which I referred previously, which is worth $380 million a year to this State budget and which is now being protected, whereas what was being offered by the likes of John Hewson and Peter Reith was the removal of that to favour Victoria and New South Wales at a cost to us.

STATE BANK

The Hon. JENNIFER CASHMORE (Coles): Will the Premier include in his economic statement an analysis of the economic impact of the State Bank losses, including the deferral of major Government capital works projects and the extent to which the standards of key services in health, education, community safety and passenger transport have been and will continue to be eroded; and, if not, why does the Premier want to avoid giving a true picture of the very serious and continuing economic impact of the bank's losses and the consequential decline in the standards of key Government services?

The Hon. LYNN ARNOLD: I suggest that, if the honourable member wants to see how things are going in this area, she look at the figures that have been given by the Grants Commission, I think, which supplies information as to what are the various levels of services in each of the States of Australia. I might say that it is used by the States of New South Wales and Victoria as a reason why we should lose out on fiscal equalisation. They use this as something to beat us with, yet the member for Coles wants us to highlight these issues.

The figures show that, because Labor has been in Government for most of the past two decades, we have higher than the national average in a great many areas of services in this State. Those figures are not mine. They are not my conjecture. The figures are provided by the Grants Commission and they tell us that the education system is better resourced per student than the national average and that in so many other areas we are better resourced than other parts of Australia. For the member for Coles to say that we are worse off than the national average indicates that she does not know about the figures, although she has been in this place long enough to have some idea about them. Indeed, as a former Minister, she should have some idea.

The Hon. Frank Blevins: A very poor one.

The Hon. LYNN ARNOLD: She was a very poor Minister and she did her best when she was a Minister to bring us back to the national average and to put us below it in various areas. We have not lived with that. We have been doing the best we can to deal with the serious problems provided by the bank's failure for all South Australians, but not with the kind of recipe the Opposition wants. It must be remembered that, when the member for Victoria was Leader, he had a financial solution for South Australia's problems. His was the 9 000 jobs solution. His solution was to take 9 000 people off the Public Service payroll, simply to get rid of them. What would that have done to the services that the member for Coles talks about so hypocritically? What would that have done to the schools, the hospitals and the law and order system in this State? It would have badly affected every single one of them. That was your solution when you had him as Leader.

The solution of the present Leader, by his own words, is to cut 15 to 25 per cent off the budgets of various Government departments. What would that do to the level of services that are provided? This Government has been about ensuring that the actual level of services provided to South Australians by Government is kept as high as is reasonably possible given the very difficult financial circumstances that we face. That is the agenda in which we believe. That is the charter that we pursue. Ultimately, that is the charter that South Australians want to see pursued.

FEDERAL ELECTION

The Hon. D.J. HOPGOOD (Baudin): My question is directed to the Treasurer, prompted as it is by the last two answers from the Premier. Will the Treasurer detail to the House what specific financial advantages—financial in the sense of budgetary advantages—will now flow to this Government and hence to the people of South Australia as a result of the return of the Keating Federal Labor Government?

The Hon. FRANK BLEVINS: The short answer, of course, is, 'A damned sight more than it would have been had the Fightback team been elected on 13 March.' I want to draw the House's attention to *Hansard* of 2 March when I told members opposite that they would wake up on Sunday 14 March saying, 'We have lost it for the fifth time. How on earth did we do it?' I will tell you how they did it, Sir. One does not have to be a genius to work out how they did it. They did it, all of them, by supporting a program that was anathema to the majority of people in this country.

Mr Olsen interjecting:

The Hon. FRANK BLEVINS: The member for Kavel interjects. I remember, Sir—

Mr Olsen interjecting:

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

The Hon. FRANK BLEVINS: I recall the member for Kavel stepping off a plane from Canada saying, 'Canada has done the GST all wrong. I am going to tell them how to do it right.' The author of the GST is right here in this Parliament. I heard the interview, with his boasting when he got off the plane from Canada, 'They have done it wrong. I will get it right.'

Mr S.G. EVANS: I rise on a point of order. The question asked what benefits will come to South Australia. The Minister has not answered the question.

The SPEAKER: The Treasurer is debating the question, so I ask him to come back to its substance.

The Hon. FRANK BLEVINS: I apologise, Sir, because I was tempted and responded to interjections. In general Government services, we will not have to—

Mr Brindal interjecting:

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

The Hon. FRANK BLEVINS: We will not have to experience the level of cuts that were promised by the Fightback package.

Mr D.S. Baker: So there won't be any cuts?

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

The Hon. FRANK BLEVINS: The Fightback package stated clearly that 5 per cent alone would come off our financial assistance grants, and that would have made a huge difference to our ability to deliver the services that the people of this State expect and to which they are entitled. There are two areas in particular that I would like to highlight. The first concerns Medicare. For people in this State and for this State Government to have had to deal with a Government that was pledged to the abolition of Medicare as we know it would have meant enormous financial strains on ordinary South Australians and also on the budget of this State. I was absolutely delighted that the people of Australia rejected the Liberal Party, including its champions here, over the dismembering of Medicare because it would have been extraordinarily difficult for this Government to provide those services to which all Australians are entitled.

With respect to the question of industrial relations, the strains that the changes would have made to this Government and the State budget in dealing with its employees would have made things extraordinarily difficult. There is no question that it would have had to involve some kind of legislated pay cut, where that was possible under State awards. That is a frightening prospect, which I suppose is still on the cards if the people opposite get into office. With the return of the Federal Labor Government, we no longer have that threat while this Government is in office. In short, the financial difference between a Federal Labor Government and a Federal Liberal Government pledged to Fightback is that, due to the win on 13 March, we in South Australia and in the whole of Australia will have a much better and much fairer society.

HEALTH SYSTEM

Mr MEIER (Goyder): When will the Minister of Health admit that our hospital system is in crisis when, through lack of beds, patients are forced to receive pre-surgery procedures while sitting in chairs and then return to those chairs in the day care wards after their operation and remain there for several hours? Are such patients additional victims of the State Bank losses?

A constituent of mine from Wallaroo was to be admitted to the Modbury Hospital on Wednesday 10 March for a tube to be inserted into her kidney because of continual kidney stone problems. She had been waiting for admission since last October. On arrival, she was told that a bed was not available but that she could occupy a chair in the day care ward until her operation at 2 p.m. After the operation, which required full anaesthetic, she was readmitted to the chair. When her husband arrived at 4.30 p.m. to visit her, she was still in the chair, she was vomiting and she felt absolutely awful. The hospital asked whether she had friends in Adelaide with whom she could stay overnight because the staff wanted her nearby in case complications set in. This could not be arranged, so at 7 p.m. her husband drove her back to her home at Wallaroo. Two weeks later, she is still passing blood, she is still in great pain, and she has lost all faith in our public hospital system.

Dr Armitage: Let's hear it for Medicare.

The SPEAKER: Order!

The Hon. M.J. EVANS: I am amazed by the interjection and by the fact that the member for Adelaide is not prepared to ask questions on health in this place. Clearly, that says something about his attitude in relation to the results of 10 days ago. Quite clearly, the circumstances of any individual patient are difficult matters to discuss in this Chamber because, obviously, many of the matters relating to it cannot be fully discussed because of the nature of patient confidentiality and the like, but I am quite pleased to take the details—

The Hon. Dean Brown interjecting:

The Hon. M.J. EVANS: The Leader of the Opposition is surely not suggesting as a general proposition that the Minister of Health or any Opposition member with responsibility for health should come into this place and discuss individual patient details—

The Hon. Dean Brown interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order! I warn the Leader.

The Hon. M.J. EVANS: I certainly have no intention of breaching that kind of privacy arrangement, and I certainly give the House that undertaking. However, I am more than prepared, as I always am in this place, to take details from members of the Opposition (or the Government for that matter) who have an individual case they want investigated, and I will have that investigated thoroughly. I would remind the member for Goyder however, because this is not his principal area of activity in this House, that day surgery is a very important part of the process of medical care now, and the medical profession and patients alike have found that the day surgery procedures are of significant benefit to them. Patients have found that day surgery is a significant improvement—

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order! The Minister will resume his seat until the House comes to order. I cannot hear the response.

The Hon. M.J. EVANS: Day surgery has been a significant innovation in this country in the way of providing very efficient and very appropriate treatment of patients, and I would not want the public to

understand from the question asked by the member for Goyder that that process is not acceptable in any way. Because medicine is about individuals, people will always have an individual reaction to a procedure or an individual circumstance that we need to investigate. Quite clearly, in some cases that can be difficult for the individual patient, but day surgery as a matter of principle is very appropriate and, if the honourable member wishes to give me details of that procedure, I will have it investigated.

LIBERAL PARTY DOCUMENT

The Hon. T.H. HEMMINGS (Napier): In view of the Government's interest in preserving historical documents as part of the State's heritage, would the Premier prevail upon the Leader of the Opposition to make available the document he signed with Dr John Hewson which surrendered the rights of the people of South Australia, and could that historic document be placed on display at the Mortlock Library? It has been put to me by numerous ecstatic constituents that the Hewson/Brown document has now reached the same status as that which John Batman signed with the Victorian Aboriginal community when the land which now incorporates the city of Melbourne and its suburbs was sold for a handful of beads, some mirrors and the odd blanket or two.

Mr BRINDAL: On a point of order, Mr Speaker: I believe this is a question for which the Premier has no responsibility to the House, and I ask you to rule it out of order.

The SPEAKER: The question was asked of the Premier in his capacity as Premier of South Australia, for which he does have responsibility to this House. I assume it was asked in good faith.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order! The Chair always assumes that questions are asked in good faith in this House from whatever side they come. I take it that there is nothing in it that is out of order in the sense that it is a straight question.

Mr Oswald interjecting:

The SPEAKER: There is nothing in Standing Orders about frivolous questions; if the member for Morphett wishes to point it out to me, I will be pleased to see it. -However, it was made in good faith to the Premier as Premier of this State; I believe he has that responsibility as Premier to this House.

The Hon. LYNN ARNOLD: I noted, by way of conversation across the Chamber, the Leader's indicating that it is already in the public arena and that he is therefore quite happy for this—

Members interjecting:

The Hon. LYNN ARNOLD: I would have thought there were lots of people trying to rip it up very quickly, but he is still quite happy to be associated with it. He is still quite happy to support this document, where he sold out South Australians, where he sold us out on a bad deal in terms of what would happen if John Hewson got elected. The compensation we would have got following the removal of payroll tax would have been quite inadequate. That point was publicly made and supported by one other Government in this country that was a signatory to the same document and then regretted it. The Victorian Government had the courage before the last State election to regret its having signed away Victoria in this matter, because it knew it had not bothered to check the fine print either, just as the Leader in this Chamber did not bother to check the fine print. However, the people did check the fine print, and that is quite clear indeed.

There is one other thing which I will be interested to see, and I hope the Leader will make available the original copy that he has. We will put it on display and it will be something to marvel at; something like Chamberlain's agreement from Munich, as he waved that bit of paper—

The Hon. J.P. Trainer: Or the Molotov-Ribbentrop Pact.

The Hon. LYNN ARNOLD: That is right; this goes into the category of lots of documents. John Hewson has now been re-elected as Leader of the Liberal Party, and it would be interesting to be a fly on the wall when John Hewson rings up Dean Brown to say, 'Dean, can you come over? I would like you to sign a piece of paper.' I wonder what he will do now, when the Federal Liberal Party tries to look at where it wants to go.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order!

The Hon. LYNN ARNOLD: What will this Leader do, given that he was so prepared to sell out South Australia, which even his Victorian colleagues were not prepared to do?

Mr S.J. Baker interjecting:

The SPEAKER: I warn the Deputy Leader.

The Hon. LYNN ARNOLD: Even his Victorian colleagues realised they had to get out of it

The SPEAKER: I would point out to the Premier that Standing Order 98 provides that in answering a question the Minister or member will reply to the substance of the question, and I do believe that the Premier is debating this response at some length.

STATE BANK

Mr BECKER (Hanson): Will the Treasurer inquire into the circumstances of a luxury 60 foot motor launch chartered by the State Bank of South Australia in New Zealand in January 1991 to host the bank's senior managers from offices around the world for fishing and leisure activities at an estimated cost of about $200 000? I have been reliably informed that the 10 berth boat was hired for about a month at a cost of $5 000 a day in January 1991. On board were State Bank managers, wives and crew. The boat was moored while not at sea at Opua in the Bay of Islands near Auckland from 14 January.

The cost of the charter is estimated at about $140 000. When adding to this the cost of food, drink and air fares to and from Auckland from around the world, the total cost was estimated to be about $200 000. I am told that the managers and wives were flown in groups for about a week at a time. I am also reminded that this luxury jaunt was held a month before the former Premier was forced to announce a $1 billion bail-out of the State Bank and more than a year after continuous questions were being

asked by the Liberal Party about the State Bank's performance.

The Hon. FRANK BLEVINS: If that was true, I draw the attention of the House to the date. I understood the member for Hanson to say that this was in January 1991: is that correct?

Mr Becker: Yes.

The Hon. FRANK BLEVINS: I point out that that was before the change of board, before the change of management.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order! The Leader has been warned this afternoon.

Dr Armitage interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order! The member for Adelaide has been warned.

The Hon. Jennifer Cashmore interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order! The member for Coles is now warned.

The Hon. FRANK BLEVINS: I can say quite honestly that, while I do not divulge what goes on in Cabinet (and I know my Cabinet colleagues will forgive me), such a function on such a vessel was never brought to Cabinet; it was never something which was discussed with us, nor of which we had any knowledge. I know nothing about that function on that date. I will ask the bank, and I will not be the least surprised if the answer is 'Yes.'

HOUSING TRUST TENANTS

Mr McKEE (Gilles): Does the Minister of Housing, Urban Development and Local Government Relations intend to introduce short-term leases for public housing tenancies? It was reported in the *Weekend Australian* of 20 March that the Housing Industry Association, in a submission to the Industry Commission, has called for the introduction of short-term leases for public housing tenancies. Given that the Housing Industry Association has a bit of a record of writing the Liberal Party's housing policy, I presume that this is also the Opposition's policy for public housing tenants. Short-term leases would change the Housing Trust as we know it into a short-term welfare housing program and mean the end of housing security for thousands of trust tenants.

The Hon. G.J. CRAFTER: Whilst it is very desirable that there be a greater range of options available for lower income groups to access adequate housing, the short answer to the question that the honourable member raises is 'No.' The Federal election made it very clear that the public does not support the sort of free market nonsense that was espoused by the Federal Coalition and, of course, its associates, the Housing Industry Association. Very clearly, from the debate that took place during the Federal election campaign, we saw a rejection by the community at large of the Coalition strategy to sell the public housing stock to the AMP Society and to superannuation funds, as was very clearly stated by the shadow housing spokesperson during a debate I had with him on an ABC radio program.

The Housing Industry Association proposal stems from what I believe to be a misguided view that the housing market should be a free market and that the only place for Government is where the market fails. It would see a housing system where the rich own their own homes and the poor get to move every time their circumstances improve, only to rejoin the waiting list for public housing every time their situation gets worse. The proposal does not allow people to choose public housing as their preferred housing choice. It wrongly assumes that everyone can be and wants to be a home owner. The proposal means less choice in housing, and we should be aiming for more choice for that group of people in our community.

In this place and in the community we often hear arguments about how some policies discourage people looking for jobs. What would act as a greater disincentive than a lease that is renewed only if you remain poor and unemployed? Housing policy is not about robbing Peter to pay Paul but about increasing housing choice so that everyone can have a home of his own and, by any measure, this Government's record of housing is by far the most impressive in this nation and, indeed, across the western world.

Since 1983 we have built more than 23 000 new units of public housing, and since 1989 the State Government has provided more than 11000 home loans to low income home buyers through the very successful HomeStart program. Whereas HomeStart has opened up the market for home buyers previously unable to gain bank finance, we now intend to expand housing choice further with a new range of housing finance products. Punitive leases and a free market are not the way to go. They would bury housing need, not reduce it. They would lead to a major downturn in the housing industry and put at risk the jobs of the 6 000 housing industry workers who benefit directly from the Government's current housing policies, a fact all too glibly overlooked by the Housing Industry Association in its political antics of recent weeks. South Australia has, by a long way, the finest housing system in Australia. The Government has built on that proud tradition by expanding housing choice—not by narrowing the doors to its services.

APPRENTICES

Mr SUCH (Fisher): What current steps is the Minister of Education, Employment and Training taking to correct the alarming drop in apprenticeships since 1991, which has seen a reduction of 27 per cent in the number of apprentices being trained in South Australia? In 1991 the number of apprentices in training was 7 700 compared with 5 615 this year. First year apprentices this year number 1 478 compared with 1 781 two years ago. Such reductions, it has been pointed out to me, raise legitimate questions about the Government's professed claim to be training our youth to take advantage of any economic recovery when it comes.

The Hon. S.M. LENEHAN: If I heard the honourable member's question correctly, I understood him to talk about apprentices right across the State, not just within Government. So, we are talking now not just about apprentices who are employed in Government departments, statutory authorities and semi-Government departments but, indeed, employed in the private sector. I do not have the figures in front of me but I understand—and I am prepared to give the honourable

member these figures—that we have started to increase the number of apprentices undergoing contracts of training in South Australia in the past year or two.

It is certainly correct, as the honourable member has said, that there has been a marked reduction in the number of apprentices undertaking training in South Australia in the past number of years. However, to suggest quite glibly, as the honourable member does, that this is somehow totally the responsibility of Government I am sad to say reflects a total and complete misunderstanding of the nature of the South Australian private sector, because the honourable member knows, as I know, that it is a matter of—

Members interjecting:

The Hon. S.M. LENEHAN: Indeed, and the honourable member knows that because he has been involved with me in a number of joint initiatives. The private sector is now looking very much within its own ranks to increase its confidence, to increase its participation in the South Australian economic recovery, and to employ young people. Indeed, the Kelty and Fox visit—

The Hon. Frank Blevins interjecting:

The Hon. S.M. LENEHAN: I am about to get to that. I thank my colleague for reminding me of that. It is interesting to note that as we come out of the recession, and certainly all the indicators before the Federal election were showing that, we will see an increase in the number of businesses and firms taking on apprentices. In fact, the Government has shown the lead with respect to the economic recovery by committing 400 places for unemployed people as a means of training those young—and in some cases not so young—people. In fact, they will be offered training positions under the very generous Federal Government JobStart program and the traineeship program.

The next stage of this recovery is to work with the business community and to ensure that we can turn around this very important area. It is interesting that the honourable member asks me this question on the very day that I have announced the formation in South Australia of institutes. We are looking at bringing together the 19 TAFE colleges around South Australia to form 10 institutes of vocational education. This is a very positive response to ensure that we can provide state of the art training, teaching and learning for training young people in South Australia to take their place in the work force. Of course, it is the TAFE colleges that deliver the formal component of the apprenticeship scheme. I can assure the honourable member that a number of programs and schemes are in place. I am sure that I will have his support when we move to implement those schemes, and I thank him for the question.

UKRAINIAN FARMERS

Mrs HUTCHISON (Stuart): I direct my question to the Minister of Primary Industries. What was the background to the training scheme for the young Ukrainian farmers currently in South Australia? What is his assessment of its success and what benefits will accrue to South Australia from continuing the program with the Ukraine? It has come to my notice that South Australia has been hosting five Ukrainian young farmers for practical training and that the group will be returning to its homeland this week.

The Hon. T.R. GROOM: I am obliged to the honourable member for asking this question. It is most significant, because South Australia is the first State in the western world to have instituted a farmer training scheme with the Ukraine. The five young farmers arrived in South Australia last November and will be leaving South Australia on 23 March. Most of the farmers have been involved with collective farming—

Members interjecting:

The Hon. T.R. GROOM: Yes, I am glad you are awake.

The SPEAKER: Order! The Minister will direct his remarks through the Chair.

The Hon. T.R. GROOM: The farmers will be leaving on 26 March, I am sorry, and there will be a reception for them today, on 23 March, here at Parliament House. Most of the farmers have been involved with collective farms in the Ukraine and have no experience with private enterprise farming techniques. The arrangement was made by the Director of Australian Meat and By-Products Pty Ltd, Mr Jack Didyk, who approached the then Department of Agriculture early last year and, with the active assistance and support of the Premier, arrangements were made to enable five young farmers from the Ukraine to visit South Australia in pursuance of this training program.

Financial assistance was arranged to enable the farmers to have a return airfare. I stress that our farming community in South Australia, despite the very difficult times being faced in this State by our rural community, was able actively to financially assist with board and in other ways in maintaining these farmers from the Ukraine. Initially, the five farmers stayed with farming families in Naracoorte, Minlaton, Bordertown, Tailem Bend and Mount Compass. It has been an extremely valuable exchange and has laid down the foundations for future exchanges with the Ukraine.

Obviously, there is a human dimension to this. It will also strengthen our commercial ties with the Ukraine, because the Ukraine is particularly important in respect of our primary industries because it, too, is involved with meat production, wool, pasture seeds, agricultural equipment and technology. The Ukrainian community in South Australia is a particularly vibrant community. Much goodwill has been created by the presence of these five young farmers in South Australia. The media has been particularly good in the areas where they have been staying and have actively promoted their visit. It augurs well for South Australia and the Ukraine in terms of the goodwill that has been created, and I believe overall that positive benefits will flow both to the Ukraine and to South Australia.

STATE SERVICES

Mr INGERSON (Bragg): Will the Minister of State Services investigate State Supply procedures for delivering minor items of stationery to members of Parliament and Government departments to ensure that they are cost effective?

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order! The Chair did not hear any of that question. I ask the House to come to order, and I ask the member for Bragg to repeat his question.

Mr INGERSON: Will the Minister of State Services investigate State Supply procedures for delivering minor items of stationery to members of Parliament and Government departments to ensure that they are cost effective. With your concurrence, Mr Speaker, and that of the House I would like to explain.

The SPEAKER: I trust that the honourable member is not going to make a display.

Mr INGERSON: No, Sir. In October 1991, after I raised in this House the fact that State Supply had used a courier service to deliver one pencil worth 20¢ to my electorate office, the Government promised to review these electorate procedures. However, I now have to report a similar experience which occurred only last week. Twenty small fold-back paper clips were express delivered to my electorate office at Toorak Gardens by courier service even though they had been ordered only as part of my overall routine stationery requisition. The total value was only $1. Further, I was told that the courier service was making more than 20 similar deliveries of very small Government orders on the same day. It would appear that much of this is unnecessary delivery costs and could be avoided.

The Hon. M.D. RANN: I was told that the member for Bragg, after discarding Fightback, was about to launch his comeback for the Deputy Leadership today, but I do not think that this will be it. I shall be happy to investigate the circumstances surrounding his ordering of paper clips, rubbers, pencils or whatever it is. If he wants to be cut off the courier list, I shall be happy to do that. I will investigate the matter and ascertain the position.

TRAVEL BOOKINGS

Mr ATKINSON (Spence): Can the Minister of Tourism advise the House whether—

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order! The member for Spence.

Mr ATKINSON: Can the Minister of Tourism advise the House whether savings have been made by putting out to tender State Government travel bookings and ticketing, including MPs' travel.

The Hon. M.D. RANN: I am happy to respond, because I know this is a matter of considerable interest to members, as it affects members of Parliament as well. Next time the Leader of the Opposition wants to fly off to sign a press release saying, 'GST in our time', perhaps he will be doing it under different arrangements. I can announce that Westpac Travel will take over from Tourism South Australia next month as the booking and ticketing service for State Government agencies and employees. The State Government called for tenders in October last year—

Members interjecting:

The Hon. M.D. RANN: I hope that the honourable member is not suggesting that we should in some way have breached or broached the tender requirements; I hope he is not doing that. The State Government called for tenders in October last year to replace the current Government bookings section, which will cease accepting bookings from Thursday 8 April. As the successful tenderer, Westpac Travel will open its new account on 13 April.

The contract is estimated to be worth between $6 million and $9 million in bookings annually. Certainly, I want to congratulate Westpac Travel on its successful tender. The move will sit comfortably with the focus of the new Tourism Commission, for which I hope there will be unanimous support later today and which will replace Tourism South Australia in July. The commission can then have a sharper focus on marketing South Australia and setting long-term goals for the overall direction of tourism in this State. It is important that the commission concentrate on the bigger picture rather than worrying about bookings.

The loss of commission revenue from the bookings service bill will be offset through cost savings on overheads and revenue rebates on fares from Westpac Travel. This could bring the Government a net benefit of up to $400 000 a year. Westpac Travel will open an account for all users of TSA's Government bookings service prior to its commencing operations. A unit will be established on the seventh floor of the Australian Airlines building at 144 North Terrace.

Westpac Travel won the contract because of its considerable experience in the provision of corporate travel services—I understand it faced tough competition—and in the flexibility it offered customers in determining their travel arrangements. I will make sure that the member for Bragg does not have his tickets couriered around.

COURT SERVICES DEPARTMENT

The Hon. G.J. CRAFTER (Minister of Housing, Urban Development and Local Government Relations): I table a ministerial statement made by my colleague in another place today regarding the Court Services Department award.

GRIEVANCE DEBATE

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

The Hon. P.B. ARNOLD (Chaffey): As the member for Chaffey, representing the major Riverland towns of Renmark, Berri, Loxton, Barmera and Waikerie, I want to take this opportunity to commend the Mayor of Albury and his city councillors for the decision they have taken in moving to total off-river disposal of sewage effluent from that city. That is a significant decision that has been taken by that city. I recognise the problems that Albury has in moving to a full off-river disposal of sewage and industrial effluent waste because of the terrain in which Albury is situated and because of the much higher rainfall that that city receives compared with the rainfall in most other towns and cities in the Murray-Darling Basin.

As the Vice Chairman of the SAFE committee, comprised of Parliamentary members from Victoria, New South Wales, South Australia and the Commonwealth, and local government representatives from the three States, I had the opportunity to visit Albury last year. The Mayor did us the courtesy of making available the city engineer who, in turn, took us on a conducted tour of the sewage effluent treatment plant at Albury. The engineer went right through the process of the treatment prior to material going into a holding basin before being released into the river. While we accepted the process that the council had entered into in the treatment of its sewage waste and the high quality of effluent coming from the plant, there was still the basic principle that it was in conflict with the total approach to solving the pollution problem of the Murray-Darling Basin, that is, that no effluent of any type should enter the Murray-Darling system.

Pollution in the Murray-Darling system comes from a number of sources—from city and town sewage effluent, industrial effluent, irrigation—induced effluent, dry land salinisation and surface run-off, and natural saline ground water inflows. They make up the main ingredients of the pollution problems that we are confronted with in the Murray-Darling system. Of course, in South Australia, as one goes further down that great river system, the greater the pollution load becomes.

As I said, the decision of Mayor and the city council of Albury to go to total off-river disposal in the form of wood lots is indeed a major breakthrough, because it sets a benchmark for the rest of the Murray-Darling Basin. The reason why it was a difficult decision for that city to make was the natural terrain in which Albury is situated. If we go further down the river system, we find that many other cities are already much further advanced than is Albury. However, I must say that the opportunities for some of the other cities and towns are greater in that they are situated in flatter terrain and in an area of lower rainfall. Albury has been able to come to grips with and face up to its responsibility and, if more cities and towns follow that lead, it will be a major breakthrough for the whole Murray-Darling Basin.

The Hon. D.C. Wotton: Do you think Canberra will follow suit?

The Hon. P.B. ARNOLD: Of course, as my colleague the member for Heysen has just said, one of the remaining major problem cities in the Murray-Darling Basin is Canberra.

The SPEAKER: The honourable member's time has expired. The honourable member for Albert Park.

Mr HAMILTON (Albert Park): How sweet it is to be able to stand up here today and look at those silvertails opposite who brayed and bragged about how they were going to win. How sweet it is. They bragged: 'We will take five seats. We will decimate you.' They were led by the nose like a mob of sheep, and the media followed behind them. It is very interesting for members on this side.

Where are the investigative journalists? When I first came into this Parliament, we had investigative journalists. Where are they now? They talk about politicians with their snouts in the trough: what about the journos with their snouts in the trough? It is an unspoken subject in some areas of the community. I am not frightened to raise the issue. No way! They swan around with some of the high fliers and what do they do on the big jets and in the big barbecue areas? They all want the luxuries of following these leaders.

A bit of investigative journalism would have found out that the people in the community were angry. I think it was an interesting article in the *Sunday Mail* of 27 October. 'Shut up,' it said, 'Hewson warns Liberal tax rebels.' How right they were. There is an old saying that you can fool some of people some of the time, and we all know the rest.

The community was not prepared to buy this tax. People were not prepared to accept the policies of a very conservative, extreme right wing Government which, in my view, was aided and abetted by the media—a media that was, in many respects, damn lazy. It was not prepared to go out and question Hewson as he should have been questioned. They should have been more rigorous in their approach in questioning what he was going to do in relation to the tax.

It was interesting to see that, in the *Financial* Review of last Friday, Sir William Cole said that the tax was too complicated and would not create jobs, despite what the Liberal Party's Federal Director, Mr Andrew Robb, said. He went on to say that it would not create even one new job. Why, I would like to know, was the media not more vocal? Why did they not grill him more? Rather, we had this Americanisation of politics in this country.

The Hon. T.H. Hemmings: Because they had been bought off.

Mr HAMILTON: I am not prepared to go that far. I just want to put my point. I am not saying that all the media are bad: I have had good response from the media over the years. However, having said that, I believe I have the right to stand in this place and ask: where are the investigative journalists? They do not hound these blokes as they should. Then we saw the spectacle of the Victorian Government suddenly going soft on its industrial laws. Now it finds it will have to negotiate with the trade union movement and, indeed, with the Federal Government in relation to a whole range of issues.

There are people like me on this side of the Parliament who come from the working class, who are proud to be working class and who believe we reflect working class values. I have no problem in standing up, because I was elected into this Parliament by the trade union movement and, indeed, by the electors of Albert Park. Sir, as you well know, I have been re-elected on a number of occasions, as have you. It might hurt some members opposite, but that is what this place is about—being able to stand up and say, without fear or favour, what we believe to be the case.

I make no apology for standing up here. The Liberal Party got it wrong, the media got it wrong, but the Labor Party got it right. Indeed, the workers of this country and our supporters got it right for the fifth time in a row—and does it hurt! For the fifth time in a row the silvertails opposite got done like a Sunday dinner.

The SPEAKER: Order! The honourable member for Goyder.

Mr MEIER (Goyder): In the time available I wish to highlight the continuing problems in Goyder of mains water supply—or lack thereof. One of latest examples was brought to my attention by constituents of mine, Mr and Mrs Willment, who, some nine months ago, purchased a property of 95 acres. They were under the impression that that property was serviced by a water meter located on the adjoining paddock—section 914, whereas the Willment's property was section 915. The water meter that they were using had always served their house as well as their stock troughs, the Willments being charged for the water that was used. However, a little while ago the adjoining property was sold and they received notification from the E&WS that the meter belonged to that property and that the Willments would have to put on an indirect service, which delivers a flow of only about five litres per minute.

Mr Venning interjecting:

Mr MEIER: As the member for Custance interjects, it is a ridiculous situation. How can they hope to provide sufficient water for their stock? Further, they had sought to upgrade that property in many ways since they purchased it, not the least being that they have planted dozens of young trees and shrubs as well as having propagated a garden. The Willments wrote to me and detailed all their problems. In fact, they spoke to my office as well. I took up the issue with the Minister of Public Infrastructure, who handles water resources. An extensive reply was received, but the Minister pointed out very clearly that there were only three options for my constituents.

The first option is that they enter into a neighbours agreement, and I will go into that shortly. The second option was the one I have just highlighted, namely, a remote water connection, which would restrict them to a maximum flow of five litres per minute. The Minister suggests that they install a tank and store water for the longer term. People who have installed a decent sized tank lately know that the cost of a 5 000 gallon tank is approximately $2 000; that a pump costs about $400 ($500 now because of Keating's extra taxes); and that with pipes the total cost of installing a reasonably sized storage tank on a property would be about $3 000. That is a massive extra cost burden and, therefore, somewhat unrealistic. The Minister's third option is that the Willments provide $100 000 and the E&WS lay 1 200 metres of new main—totally unrealistic. That brings them to the only possible option: an agreement with their neighbours.

This whole system needs to be reconsidered. It is a totally iniquitous situation when some people have to work with a limited rate of five litres per minute while others have a full water supply. The reason for this is obvious: the Government has not upgraded or maintained pipes in the E&WS system for 20 to 30 years, and this situation has finally caught up with it. There is only one possible solution; that is, for the Government to undertake a complete restructure and upgrade of the pipe system throughout South Australia, because if it does not the situation will get progressively worse.

The Government has misappropriated—and I use that term deliberately—funds into the wrong areas and, as a result, our infrastructure is failing. If we want this State to get on top again, we need to provide incentives for people to move back into rural areas. One of the basic necessities is water, and the supply of water is failing in many areas. I hope to be able to cite examples of where people will not have any water supply in the future.

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

Mr QUIRKE (Playford): I will begin my contribution this afternoon by asking the question: how could they have done it again? In the past 10 days, someone ought to have made a close analysis of what happened on that day to show how the Liberal Party in Australia could do it again. In the 1990 Federal election, many members were cocky because they thought for a while that they had the chance to win, but in the last couple of weeks of that election they looked at Andrew Peacock and knew a loser when they saw one. The next time around they thought they were on a winner; they thought that in Hewson they had a Messiah, one who would lead them to the promised land.

Members on this side of the Chamber put up with a good deal of abuse and high spirits from members opposite in the week or so before the election. All sorts of comments were being made, such as, 'We're going to fix you blokes up after next Saturday.' Every time the news was on, members opposite would give us a running commentary in the television room and tell us all about it. When the *7.30 Report* was on, Leigh McClusky was supported every time for getting stuck into the Labor Party. Members of the Liberal Party had false hopes, and those hopes, sadly for them, were cruelly dashed on Saturday 13 March.

On that occasion, the member for Napier asked me whether I sympathised with them. I was a scrutineer at the Para Hills polling booth. There were two tables: one for our votes and one for theirs. It was not long before our table had to be added to, and that was done by taking one of the tables away from them. At that point, I had the pleasure of going to the Liberal scrutineer, a lovely lady who, as far as I know, does not have anything to do with Para Hills or anything in the north-eastern suburbs, and telling her that I thought it was time for her to go home. She said that that was the indication from only that box, and I said that I suspected it was the same over the whole countryside—and I proved to be correct.

Mr Matthew interjecting:

Mr QUIRKE: The member for Bright should not interrupt, because I think they are trying to get information out of him in another forum. I will not say more about that, but if I were the member for Bright I would save my answers for someone else. The member for Bright and one or two others told us that life would be different after 13 March. On 13 March I made a couple of predictions. I predicted that on the next sitting Tuesday in this House two things would happen. First, I predicted that the Opposition would not want to talk at all about the Federal election in this place or, for that matter, anywhere else around here. So far today, with two of the three speakers in the grievance debate, that has proved correct. The other prediction that I made on that day was that they would not be a happy lot, because if Hewson's crowd could not pull it together in those circumstances what hope would they have with even less talent? That is a very serious question.

Another point that needs to be made is that the election on 13 March was a disaster for the Liberal Party and a great win by the Keating Labor Government—the greatest win that I have seen in my lifetime. I do not want to crow about it, but I chewed a lot of cud as a result of comments from members opposite in the past couple of weeks. I enjoyed the day. I am sure that many books will be written about it and that eventually there will be rights to a movie. I look forward to seeing that movie which I do not think will be entitled *John Hewson: Born on 4 July* but *John Hewson: Born on 1 April,* because if you wave a bucket of smelly fish under the electorate's nose you will get what is coming to you. You might fool some of the people some of the time, but on 13 March members opposite did not do too well at all.

Mr BECKER (Hanson): I am disappointed that part of this debate has been taken up by members of the Government gloating over the 13 March win. There is an old saying, 'The winners can gloat, the losers can cry', but when I saw Paul Keating being interviewed on the night of the election—

Mr Ferguson: You cried.

Mr BECKER: No. I assure members opposite that I am worried, and not just in the political sense. You could see that he was the most relieved man in Australia, because I believe that he thought he could not win. Each and every member of the Government knows full well that their pollster, the person who advised the Prime Minister and the Federal office of the Labor Party, told them that they could not win, that they would lose. By jingo, was Paul Keating relieved when the figures came out showing that he had won the position of Prime Minister in his own right! Paul Keating is a Capricorn. I do not believe in astrology, but Paul Keating's birthday is on the same date as mine—18 January. I can read him like a book. I pray for Australia and that the taxpayers of this country will never regret the decision they made.

The issue that I now want to raise is of grave concern to me. I am terribly disappointed with the performance of the Minister of Health, Family and Community Services, who bragged about introducing freedom of information legislation. He was responsible for giving us the opportunity to obtain information about Government departments. I have had tremendous difficulty in trying to obtain information for Mr Bruce Yates of Lockleys. Mr Yates has been frustrated by the Department for Family and Community Services in his attempts to obtain information to which I believe he is entitled. If any Government department or organisation keeps a dossier on an individual, that individual should have the right to vet that documentation and to correct any false or misleading statements. I upheld that principle when I was president of our union, the Bankers Association. It was a principle I upheld as a manager responsible for several staff. When I wrote staff reports about them I showed them those reports and gave them the opportunity to add anything to those reports they wanted. I believe that is true democracy.

If Government departments are going to keep dossiers on people based on false allegations, based on allegations that have never been proved in court—as a matter of fact they have been thrown out of court— here is one individual who has been very badly treated by the Department for Family and Community Services. He has been hounded by that department, he has been victimised by it, he has been almost physically, mentally and financially destroyed by it as a result of the vindictive manner in which it has pursued him. That department has placed barriers to the gathering of information under the Freedom of Information Act. The latest quote for that information runs into several thousand dollars.

It is impossible for an individual member of Parliament to seek that information on behalf of a constituent when we are plagued with a limit of $350 per inquiry. But it is not going to be hard for me to obtain the support of my colleagues. We will all sign an application and we will insist on that information, but it will not end there. The department will take the statutory 42 days, it will fool and fiddle around again and come up with half of the information and it will delay the matter further.

On behalf of Mr Yates, I plead with the Minister—the Minister met with the member for Heysen and me during the summer break—to answer Mr Yates' questions, to provide him with the information that he is entitled to see and give him the opportunity to vet the files and the dossiers that have been raised on him so that, if there are any faults of misleading statements, if there are any inaccuracies, Mr Yates will at least have the opportunity to correct them.

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

The Hon. T.H. HEMMINGS (Napier): It is certainly true that all the world loves a winner. Perhaps that is why I have been so successful all my life. It is certainly true that all the world loves a lover, even if they do their loving in the gym; but generally all the world loves a lover. It is certainly true that no-one in the world loves a loser. John Hewson and the current Leader of the Opposition in this State are definitely losers because they fought for Fightback all the way down the line. It is also very true that no-one likes any person who does a backflip, and in the 12 months leading up to the election and immediately afterwards the Leader of the Opposition carried out the most embarrassing backflip I have ever seen.

Let me digress about the fact that no-one loves a loser. Our dearly beloved Lord Mayor, Steve Condous, hired the whole of the Renaissance Centre at a huge cost, either to himself or to the ratepayers of Adelaide—I do not know—and had hundreds and hundreds of posters printed in English and Greek with the words 'Congratulations, Dr John Hewson'. Not one person turned up at that function.

The Hon. T.R. Groom interjecting:

The Hon. T.H. HEMMINGS: Angela did, as the Minister reminds me. So there was big Stevie Condous and Angela in the Renaissance Centre with all these posters, waiting for the adoring crowds to come in, and not one person turned up. But let me return to the main theme of this grievance debate. In the beginning, on 17 May 1992, the Leader of the Opposition said:

> Fightback offers the only real alternative to restructuring the Australian economy so we again become world competitive. Without it we will become the classic banana republic.

That is putting his whole political life on the line. Three weeks later he was still running hot and strong and the blood was flowing through his veins. That is the problem with the Leader of the Opposition: the blood flows through his veins and does not go into his brain. He said:

I stress that I support the introduction of the Fightback package.

That was said on 4 June 1992, and six months later we were still getting the same message. On 14 December 1992:

Can I stress the point: I'm a fundamental supporter of Fightback.

Even then he was under stress. He was stressing everything all the way down the line. Nine days before the election, when their own polling was showing that there was a dramatic shift out there in the electorate and that the people did not like that little package that they dressed up and were refusing to open, he was still going down that line:

There is no doubt that at long last Fightback will give some chance for Australian industry, particularly South Australian industry, to become internationally competitive again.

Then, two days after the Federal election:

Well of course personally I was disappointed that the Liberal Party's Fightback program was rejected ...

That was on 15 March. But then, in true Liberal style, the organisation that feeds all these lines into the mouth of the Leader of the Opposition suddenly realised that something was dramatically wrong, that it was not a negative scare campaign that the Labor Party ran and that we were actually reflecting people's values at that time. Then we had the classic statement on 19 March:

Federal colleagues I believe tried to put a hard-line economic model down that had an adverse impact on people in the community, and that is unacceptable ... I think Fightback had some fundamental problems with it, and it is equally important, or even more important, to understand what the needs of people are and to be able to answer those needs.

Whilst we have a biased press, we are not living in the days of Goebbels where we could rewrite history to suit the Government of the day—

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

CONSTRUCTION INDUSTRY TRAINING FUND BILL

Returned from the Legislative Council with amendments.

SITTINGS AND BUSINESS

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

That the time allotted for completion of the following Bills:

Barley Marketing,

South Australian Tourism Commission,

Workers Rehabilitation and Compensation (Review Authorities),

Guardianship and Administration (Mental Capacity) and

Mental Health

be until 6 p.m. on Thursday.

Motion carried.

CORRECTIONAL SERVICES (CONTROL OF PRISONERS' SPENDING) AMENDMENT BILL

The Hon. R.J. GREGORY (Minister of Correctional Services) obtained leave and introduced a Bill for an Act to amend the Correctional Services Act 1982. Read a first time.

The Hon. R.J. GREGORY: I move:

That this Bill be now read a second time.

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

Leave granted.

The purpose of this Bill is to amend the *Correctional Services Act* so as to provide a more flexible and appropriate prisoner pay scheme and to ensure that those prisoners who refuse to work are not able to have access to monies brought into prison from outside for the purchase of tobacco and other personal goods. At the direction of the Government, the Department of Correctional Services has for some time been working to improve the relevance, culture and productivity of its prison industries. The aim is to maximise the opportunities for the training of prisoners in good work habits and educational skills and so as to enhance opportunities for prisoners to obtain paid employment upon release from prison. The revenue generated will also assist the Department to maintain various prisoner programs.

The Government has decided that as a matter of policy it will support appropriate joint ventures between prison industries and some private sector entrepreneurs.

The Government has made it clear to the Department of Correctional Services that the development of prison industries must occur in a way which is sensitive to the needs of South Australian industries, and employment in the private sector. A differential pay system which recognises security classification and location would act as an incentive to encourage prisoners to behave and earn lower security classification ratings.

The proposed amendment will allow the Minister to provide a scheme of prisoner allowances which rewards effort and productivity and which is tailored to the needs of the new industries shortly to be established in South Australian prisons.

The aim is to provide a financial incentive for prisoners to work by ensuring a significant difference in the income of prisoners who work and those who choose not to work. That would mean very little if the Manager of the prison could not lawfully control the spending of trust funds by those prisoners who choose not to work. Prisoners' purchases of tobacco and other personal goods must be limited by the amount earned in prison industries, regardless of the funds paid into trust from outside sources.

Under the Act as it stands at present, it is possible by regulation to limit expenditure (from whatever source) by all prisoners in a prison. However the Manager of a prison cannot validly be given a discretionary power by regulation to restrict expenditure of a particular kind by some prisoners (those who refuse to work) while continuing to permit other prisoners (who are prepared to work) to have access to accumulated funds for the same type of expenditure.

I commend this Bill to the House.

Clause 1: Short title

This clause is formal.

Clause 2: Amendment of s. 31—Prisoner allowances and other money

This clause makes a number of amendments to section 31 of the principal Act.

Subsection (1) of section 31 provides for the payment of an allowance to prisoners in a correctional institution at a rate fixed by the Minister with the approval of the Treasurer. Under subsection (2) an additional allowance (at a rate fixed by the Minister with the approval of the Treasurer) is payable to prisoners who perform work. Subsection (3) empowers the Minister to vary the rate of the work allowance according to the class of work performed. This clause substitutes new subsection (3), which retains that power to vary the rate of the work allowance according to the class of work performed, but adds a 0power to vary the rate according to the correctional institution concerned or the security classification of the prisoner (or according to any combination of these factors).

This clause also inserts new subsection (5a) into section 31. New subsection (5a) provides that where a prisoner in a correctional institution receives money (other than allowances paid under section 31) that is to be held in trust for the prisoner, the manager of the correctional institution must establish an account in the name of the prisoner into which all such money will be paid.

This clause also inserts new subsection (7) into section 31. New subsection (7) provides that, subject to the principal Act, withdrawals from an account held in the name of a prisoner, and the purposes for which withdrawals are made, are at the discretion of the manager of the correctional institution. The new subsection then specifies that, without limiting this discretion of the manager, withdrawals may be refused where the manager thinks that the refusal is justified in the interests of the good management of the prisoner or of the correctional institution generally.

Clause 3: Amendment of s. 32—Purchase of items of personal use by prisoners

This clause amends section 32 of the principal Act. Section 32 requires the manager of a correctional institution to make available for purchase by prisoners such items of personal use or consumption as may be prescribed and empowers the manager to make available for purchase such other items as the manager thinks fit. This clause amends section 32 to make it clear that the withdrawal of money by prisoners to purchase the items made available under section 32 remains at the discretion of the manager in accordance with section 31 (as amended by clause 2).

Clause 4: Amendment of s. 89—Regulations

This clause amends section 89 of the principal Act, the regulation—making power. Section 89(2)*(k)* of the principal Act empowers the Governor to make regulations prescribing the purposes for which and the manner in which money held to the credit of a prisoner may be applied, or limiting the amount that may be drawn by a prisoner at any one time or during a specified period. This amendment repeals section 89(2)*(k)*.

Mr SUCH secured the adjournment of the debate.

WHISTLEBLOWERS PROTECTION BILL

Second reading.

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

That this Bill be now read a second time.

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

Leave granted.

The public disclosure of information which is confidential - or thought to be confidential - but which exposes criminal activity, malfeasance, public danger and the like, is commonly called "whistleblowing". Campaigns against corruption and malfeasance in high places, in Australia and overseas, have traditionally placed emphasis on the need to provide protection for those "insiders" who disclose information in the public interest, and who may be prosecuted, sued or victimised for having done so. There are a number of notorious examples of this phenomenon both in Australia and elsewhere.

In his Final Report, Commissioner Fitzgerald stated in relation to his investigations into public malfeasance in Queensland:

"There is an urgent need ... for legislation which prohibits any person from penalising any other person for making accurate public statements about misconduct, inefficiency, or other problems within public instrumentalities. What is required is an accessible, independent body to which disclosures can be made, confidentially (at least in the first instance) and in any event free from fear of reprisals. The body must be able to investigate any complaint. Its ability to investigate the disclosures made to it and to protect those who assist it will be vital to the long term flow of information upon which its success will depend".

This view has not been an isolated one. The Fitzgerald recommendation on this matter was taken up with great thoroughness by the Queensland Electoral and Administrative Review Commission, and had resulted, in April 1992, in endorsement of the principles and the detail by the Queensland Parliamentary Committee for Electoral and Administrative Review. In December, 1991, the Review of Commonwealth Criminal Law (known as the Gibbs Committee after its Chairman, Sir Harry Gibbs) published its Final Report, which also recommended a form of whistleblowers' protection. The Government of New South Wales has tested the waters by making public a draft Bill of its own. Support has also come from the Australian Press Council, which stated in September, 1991:

"First, whistleblowing should be protected because it represents one aspect of freedom of speech — and a basic right of the Australian people. Second, an independent system, not a supplement to the current common law, should be established in order to compensate for the lack of a clear guarantee of freedom of expression under the [State] and the Australian constitution. Third, the protection of whistleblowers should not be limited to the public sector only. However, the protection should be wider in the public sector".

In late 1991 it was announced that the Government would introduce whistleblowers protection legislation as a part of its public sector anti-corruption policy. This undertaking was repeated in a Ministerial Statement to this House on tabling the Final Report of the National Crime Authority on South Australian Reference No 2. This Bill is, therefore, an integral part of the Government's comprehensive anti-corruption programme which has included:

- the establishment of a Police Complaints Authority;

- the development of codes of ethics and conduct for police officers and public sector employees;
- the enactment of the *Statutes Amendment and Repeal (Public Offences) Act 1992;*
- the launching of a Public Sector Fraud Policy and the establishment of the Public Sector Fraud Co-ordinating Committee;
- the establishment of the Anti-Corruption Branch of the South Australian Police Force.

While it is clear that the desirable form of such legislation has not been agreed on a national basis, the Government is of the opinion that action must be taken in order to provide protection for those who disclose public interest information in the public interest. Such legislation is not only about freedom of speech, it is also a useful weapon against corruption for personal gain, incompetence and danger to the public interest. These considerations make it clear that the scheme should apply beyond the public sector. Apart from that, it is also the case that the distinction between the public sector and the private sector is artificial and in practice blurred— and, in the present climate, is likely to become more so.

A first draft of the Bill has been made widely available for public consultation. I would like to say that I am very grateful to the considerable number of those consulted who took the time and the trouble to provide very valuable comments on the difficult issues that such legislation must address. Many of these comments have resulted in changes to the draft Bill so that it has reached the form that it takes today.

The Bill sets two kinds of balances. The first is the substantive policy balance. If the Bill makes it too hard for whistleblowers to get the protection which it offers, then it will be ignored and whistleblowers will risk reprisals as they do at the moment. This would be counterproductive and wasteful. If the Bill makes it too easy for whistleblowers, it will undermine the integrity of government and the private sector, and risk justifiable governmental or commercial and industrial confidentiality.

The Government does not believe that legislation in this area should restrict a whistleblower to go through the appropriate authority. This is, fundamentally, an issue of freedom of speech. But there are also more practical reasons. It may be that the disclosure relates to that authority. Or it may be that there is, in relation to the disclosure, no appropriate authority. Or it may be that the situation is so urgent that an appropriate authority would not be appropriate. And an appropriate authority may well have to disclose the information in order to investigate it properly. So the Bill encourages the use of an appropriate authority but makes it clear that the whistleblower may go elsewhere if it is reasonable and appropriate in the circumstances to do so.

The second kind of balance is the style balance. One of the objects of the Bill is to inform all who read it of their rights and duties, and to channel disclosures if at all possible to responsible investigating authorities. Therefore, the Bill should be as clear and as comprehensible as possible. Both the Queensland and New South Wales Bills are considerably more lengthy and detailed than the form which is advocated here. But they are also less understandable and informative to the reader.

The Government does not believe that this State needs more investigating authorities and more bureaucratic structures for dealing with these disclosures. The best course is to facilitate the work of the investigating authorities and the safeguards that currently exist here, some of which have been established as previous parts of the anti-corruption policy. That is why the Bill seeks to leave the investigation of disclosures and the administrative protection of whistleblowers to such bodies as the Police Complaints Authority, the Auditor-General, the Police and the Anti-Corruption Branch and the Equal Opportunity Commissioner.

The effect of the Bill will be to enact a regime of protection for those who disclose public interest information in the public interest, which is in addition to any other protection that the law may supply. The scope of any protection currently existing at common law is uncertain. The traditional rule dates from 1856 and requires "iniquity". What that means is uncertain and at best requires the court to weigh the public interest in disclosure against the public interest in confidentiality. It also requires disclosure to the "proper authorities". The courts will also look to the motives of the informer. In all of these respects, the Bill provides an enhanced regime for whistleblowers. It recognises that certain information is *prima facie* in the public interest to disclose. It does not require disclosure to the "proper authorities". And it takes the view that a reasonable belief in truth is more important than the motive in disclosure.

This Bill does not require a whistleblower to go to an appropriate authority, but it encourages them to do so. It protects the confidentiality of their identity, but it requires them to co-operate with any official investigating authority. The protections involve immunity from criminal and civil action, and the right to seek redress for victimisation under the *Equal Opportunity Act.* A right of action in tort was inserted by amendment in the other place. That matter will need to be addressed in the Committee stages.

I commend the Bill to the House.

The provisions of the Bill are as follows:

Clause 1: Short title

This clause is formal.

Clause 2: Commencement

This clause is formal.

Clause 3: Object of Act

This clause provides that the object of this proposed Act is to facilitate the disclosure, in the public interest, of maladministration and waste in the public sector and of corrupt or illegal conduct generally.

Clause 4: Interpretation

This clause provides for definitions of terms used in the Bill, including the definition of "public interest information". The clause further provides that the question whether a public officer (which is defined) is or has been involved in an irregular and unauthorised use of public money or in substantial mismanagement of public resources, or whether a public officer is guilty of maladministration in or in relation to the performance of official functions, is to be determined with due regard to relevant statutory provisions and administrative instructions and directions.

Clause 5: Immunity for appropriate disclosures of public interest information

This clause provides that a person who makes an appropriate disclosure of public interest information incurs no civil or criminal liability by doing so. The circumstances in which a disclosure of public interest information is appropriate for the purposes of this proposed Act are-

- if the person believes on reasonable grounds that the information is true or, where the person is not in a position to form such a belief about the truth of the information but believes on reasonable grounds that the information may be true and is of sufficient significance to justify its disclosure so that its truth may be investigated; and

- the disclosure is made to a person to whom it is, in the circumstances of the case, reasonable and appropriate to make the disclosure.

Subclause (3) further provides that a disclosure is taken to have been made to a person to whom it is, in the circumstances of the case, reasonable and appropriate to make the disclosure if it is made to an appropriate authority. It is not intended to suggest, by this subclause, that an appropriate authority is the only person to whom a disclosure of public interest information may be reasonably and appropriately made.

An appropriate authority for the purposes of this clause is a Minister of the Crown or, depending on the nature of the information, any of the authorities listed in subclause (4); including, a member of the police force, the Auditor-General, the Commissioner for Public Employment, the Ombudsman. Provision is made where the information relates to a person or a matter of a prescribed class, that an authority may be declared by the regulations to be an appropriate authority in relation to such information.

Subclause (5) provides that if a disclosure of information relating to fraud or corruption is made, the person to whom the disclosure is made must pass the information on as soon as practicable to—

- in the case of information implicating a member of the police force in fraud or corruption—the Police Complaints Authority;
- in any other case—to the Anti-Corruption Branch of the police force.

Clause 6: Informant to assist with official investigation

This clause provides that a person who discloses public interest information must assist with any investigation of the matters to which the information relates by the police or any other official investigating authority. Such a person is not, however, obliged to assist with an investigation by an authority or body to which, or a person to whom, the public interest information relates. A person who fails, without reasonable excuse, to comply with the obligation imposed by subclause (1) forfeits the protection of this proposed Act.

Clause 7: Identity of informant to be kept confidential

This clause provides that a person to whom another makes an appropriate disclosure of public interest information must not, without the consent of that person, divulge the identity of that other person except so far as may be necessary to ensure that the matters to which the information relates are properly investigated. The obligation to maintain confidentiality imposed by this proposed section applies despite any other statutory provision, or a common law rule, to the contrary.

Clause 8: Informant to be informed of outcome of complaint

This clause provides that if an appropriate disclosure of public interest information is made to a public official, that official must, wherever practicable and in accordance with the law, notify the informant of the outcome of any investigation into the matters to which the disclosure relates.

Clause 9: Victimisation

This clause provides that a person who causes detriment to another on the ground, or substantially on the ground, that the other person or a third person has made or intends to make an appropriate disclosure of public interest information commits an act of victimisation. An act of victimisation under this proposed Act may be dealt with as a tort or under the *Equal Opportunity Act 1984* as if it were an act of victimisation under that Act. If, however, the victim commences proceedings in a court seeking a remedy in tort, he or she cannot subsequently bring proceedings under the *Equal Opportunity Act 1984* and vice versa. Additionally, where a complaint alleging an act of victimisation under this Act has been lodged with the Commissioner for Equal Opportunity and the Commissioner is of the opinion that the complaint has already been adequately dealt with by a competent authority, the Commissioner may decline to act on the complaint or to proceed further with action on the complaint.

Clause 10: Offence to make false disclosure

This clause provides that a person who makes a disclosure of false public interest information knowing it to be false or being reckless about whether it is false is guilty of an offence the penalty for which is a division 5 fine ($8 000) or division 5 imprisonment (2 years). A person who makes a disclosure of public interest information in contravention of this section is not protected by this Act.

Clause 11: Non-derogation

This clause provides that this proposed Act is in addition to, and does not derogate from, any privilege, protection or immunity existing apart from this Act under which information may be disclosed without civil or criminal liability.

Clause 12: Regulations

This clause provides that the Governor may make regulations for purposes contemplated by this Act.

Mr D.S. BAKER secured the adjournment of the debate.

BARLEY MARKETING BILL

Adjourned debate on second reading.

(Continued from 10 February. Page 1904.)

Mr D.S. BAKER (Victoria): This Bill has a very interesting history. It encompasses both South Australia and Victoria but the legislation has not been amended since it was introduced in 1947. Because in tonnage terms barley production in South Australia is somewhere near that of wheat, it is very important to this State. When some three or four years ago a working party was established to look at barley marketing generally in Australia and particularly in South Australia and Victoria, there was some angst among producers. However, in my opinion, that working party had some very competent people on it, including Mr Glyn Webber, who was Director of Plant Services in South Australia, and Mr John Tansell, General Manager of the Australian Barley Board.

The Australian Barley Board, which, in effect, looked after barley marketing in South Australia and Victoria, has done a very good job over a long time. It is also factual to say that Australia has fallen behind in its penetration of world markets and their price in recent years. The working party looked at ways to upgrade, improve and make more effective barley marketing in Australia and, if there could be agreement all round Australia, to have an Act that encompassed all States. It became evident during the life of the working party that that was not an option. However, it is quite feasible for South Australia and Victoria, once again, to cooperate under the banner of the Australian Barley Board and to upgrade the Act to something more relevant to the twenty-first century. The consultative committee made quite clear that, at some time in the future, the other States might come in, but they would have their own

marketing boards, which would be on a State basis only and much smaller than the Australian Barley Board. The sunset clause in this Bill comes into effect in five years time. It is fair to say that, if this proposal is successful, at the end of that time the working party considered that it would be feasible for other States to become part of the Australian Barley Board.

Since the working party has handed down its findings, there has been extensive consultation throughout South Australia and Victoria among growers and their representatives on how this Bill should be drafted for its presentation to Parliament. It is fair to say that some minority views have been expressed as to what should happen and that there has been extensive consultation on the contentious issue as to whether there should be election or selection. Victoria seems to have had less of a problem than South Australia, and the former Labor Government and the present Coalition Government in Victoria agreed to go along with the selection process of board members in Victoria. However, in South Australia there is some problem as to whether we have election or selection. Looking at the bigger picture, I can say that the discussions I have had with the Victorian Minister back up the urgency of getting this Bill through this Parliament and the Victorian Parliament so that the measure can be in operation when next season's barley harvest is sold overseas.

There is some concern on the marketing side of the barley industry that we have lost our pre-eminence in world markets. To that end, the Minister and I were present recently at the Waite Institute when a new $5 million to $10 million program was initiated as a result of an agreement between the maltsters (Joe White Maltings, Barrett Burston and Adelaide Maltings), the Grains Research and Development Corporation and the relevant departments of both States to institute barley research to improve malting barley and its penetration of world markets. One of the things that growers sometimes forget is that they are always the best people at growing barley, but that they have to grow the varieties that are relevant to the changing trends in world markets, and we must make sure that, in marketing that barley, we have the best expertise in marketing that product.

In my experience in agri-politics over many years, farmers often believe that not only can they grow barley very well themselves—and no-one would question that—but that they can sell it as well, but I have always held the view that we need other expertise to join with them in the marketing of the product. There have been some dramatic failures in the agri-political world of boards that believed they could market on behalf of growers, and the wool industry is a good example. A commodity that should have been bringing the wealth into this nation that the growers deserved has all but collapsed. In many cases, I do not believe that the boards and the marketing groups had their finger on what was going on in the real world and what the world wanted.

One of the things that the 1990s will show us all is that we are price takers and we have to become world competitive and ensure that we penetrate world markets, especially in South-East Asia, which will give us a greater share of it. At the end of the day, we have the potential to be the lowest unit cost producer of agricultural products anywhere in the world. People can say that there is cheap labour somewhere else but our agricultural expertise and our mechanisation methods mean that the farm gate unit cost of production here is the cheapest or among the cheapest in the world. It is most unfortunate that it is from the farm gate to the consumer where most of the reforms have to take place. Therefore, if people who have expertise in marketing work with primary producers, we may help break down that chain from farm gate to consumer to give the consumer what the consumer needs at a price that the customer can afford.

Because this Bill is such a dramatic change from what was envisaged in 1947, and because it will take us through the next five years, the wording of the Bill has to be absolutely clear as to what it means to the growers and to other people who are involved in the chain. We will spend a long time going through the clauses of this Bill because, in my opinion, there are some anomalies that need clarification. I have spoken to the new Minister in Victoria about these matters and there is much agreement as to what should happen. Most of the questioning of the Minister about this Bill will concern the ramifications of the clauses contained within it.

I will not speak for very long at this stage because I know that some members on this side of the House who represent large barley-growing constituents want to make a contribution. I must also declare an interest because I am a barley grower and I have had some experience in the industry. I am one of those people who live near the border with Victoria and I have had the luxury, as many others in South Australia have not had, of being able to exercise my option under section 92 and trade across the border if I thought that was more beneficial, or to trade within the barley board system.

I have no criticism of the Barley Board system, but it must be relevant to today's marketing arrangements and, at the end of the day, whether it be the Australian Barley Board or Cooperative Bulk Handling, it must deliver to the grower the best possible price it can. If either side falls down in that equation, if the grower has the ability under section 92, he will then seek to sell grain elsewhere to the traders. Of course, we do not want to undermine the market but, near this State's borders, the pressure is always on people who have the ability under our Constitution in this country to trade freely on the open market.

All those people who want to close down markets must realise that, as they do that and as we have a marketing arm, that marketing arm is very competitive in what it does and it constantly looks at its operations. There is nothing that allows one to become inefficient more quickly than having a compulsory marketing situation and losing sight of where one's markets are. That is one of the reasons I recommend and welcome the initiative of the two States in getting some barley research going into new malting varieties as something that has the potential to give a great lift to production in South Australia as well as Victoria.

South Australians keep telling me, as they would tell many members in this House, that South Australia grows by far the most tonnage of barley in the two States. With correct research, the longer term potential for barleys with malting quality is in the high rainfall districts, because they are more reliable and they have the

potential to increase production. So, if the profitability of the industry can be held up and increased, there is tremendous potential for an increased production into export markets from those two States. I hope other States become involved in the Australian Barley Board in the future and that, when this Act is up for review in five years, that research continues because as a country we have tremendous potential to increase our exports of barley. I noted that, under the ODR, the recent review in the Department of Primary Industries, it was recognised that wheat had potential. I would have thought that barley had great potential for increased production and productivity throughout the high rainfall areas in southern Australia.

I would like to comment on some of the amendments to the Bill I have on file, and then other members will want to have a say before we go into Committee. I think it is terribly important that we scrutinise this Bill with a fine tooth comb. An immense amount of discussion has taken place, and a lot of compromise has been made on the Minister's behalf with the interested groups around South Australia. There are still some people who believe the Bill should be constructed in a different way. However, I would like to go through some of the views that I have on the amendments I have on file.

Clause 11 is one of the most contentious issues, and some members on this side will not only speak about that but will also move some amendments. I think it is very important in the first instance that we make sure that we have the best available expertise to be elected, selected or appointed to that first Barley Board, to ensure that all the interests are looked at. The amendment I have on file to clause 11 provides for the election of members in South Australia, and then those people who fail to be elected are given the opportunity to be selected or appointed to the board by the Minister, and the losing candidate in both those operations then has the ability to go forward to the selection panel so their expertise can be recognised.

That is something that I will question the Minister closely about, because this whole process can fail if we do not have the very best people on it in the initial stages, because there is some division out there amongst barley growers. There will be a melding together of the selection and election process in South Australia and Victoria and, if we cut off any group of people from having their chance to put themselves forward, it will not be in the longer term interests of barley growers in both States or in the longer term interests of our export markets, and that is very important.

The next area I think we should look at is the selection committee. One of the amendments I will move to clause 12 provides for two persons to be appointed from a panel of not less than four persons nominated by the South Australian Farmers Federation Incorporated, but not necessarily a financial member of that association. Once again, this is an attempt to ensure that we have the widest possible number of applicants, and there is no reason whatsoever why those people should be financial members of the South Australian Farmers Federation.

I turn now to clause 35 which, I am told, was in the original draft but somehow slipped off. I believe it is a most important area, because it provides that only the Barley Board is authorised to receive and sell barley on behalf of growers in both States and that no-one else, although authorised to receive barley, can go away and start doing its own marketing because, if the Australian Barley Board is the sole marketer, it must not in any circumstances have that marketing authority undermined. So, clause 35, which somehow mysteriously slipped out of the draft Bill, makes very clear that no-one else can be involved in the buying and selling of barley unless authorised by the Barley Board. I think it is most important that it go back in.

Clause 42 applies to stockfeed permits, which is the area where the Victorians had the most problem and probably where the most negotiations took place, from their point of view. It provides that a person may apply to the board, in a form approved by the board, for a permit for a specified season authorising that person to purchase barley harvested in that season. I take exception to the fact that, in this day and age, when people have to move very quickly in many cases by fax machine or by telephone, if they want a stockfeed permit or a maltster's licence, they must apply in a form approved by the board. Quite rightly, clause 42(2) provides that an application must be accompanied by such reasonable fee as is set by the board.

To make quite clear that the board has to act quickly in the interests of modern business practice, we on this side of the House suggest that we should delete from clause 42(1) the phrase 'in a form approved by the board' and insert in clause 42(2) 'an application must be accompanied by such reasonable fee and such information as is set by the board.' It really does not matter whether it is on the back of an envelope or on a piece of fax paper; the important thing is that the board gets hold of whatever information it wants to fax or phone back a stockfeed permit or a maltster's licence. I believe that is not in the best interests of modern business practice.

Clause 58 is very interesting. I do not know how this one slipped in, but the Minister may be able to tell us. Clause 58(6) provides:

> The regulations may provide that it is compulsory for growers whose names appear on the roll to vote at the poll.

That must be a political stunt by the Minister, because I cannot find any growers who tell me that they want compulsory voting in the election of their delegates or in the election on any poll that may be conducted under clause 58. In fact, in the discussions I have had interstate, no-one can quite understand how that got in. Of course, we are moving that that be taken out because it is not in the best interests of the growers, and I do not think that it reflects their wishes. Under clause 62, again, we say that we add the names submitted by the South Australian Farmers Federation Incorporated, but not necessarily a member of that organisation.

Barley growers are worried, I think falsely, that the South Australian Farmers Federation may try to take over the selection process and it may be a little club just for South Australian Farmers Federation members. I can assure the South Australian Farmers Federation that I would oppose that, because if we are to get the best Barley Board and the best committees we will need to open it up in the widest possible fashion and make it very clear that anyone can stand for those positions and that it will not be a closed club. That is the sort of

commonsense amendment that makes it quite clear to the growers—who, after all, are the people whose product we are dealing with—that there is confidence in what they are doing and that it will not become a closed shop. That is why, of course, we support the negotiated position, which has some people elected and some people selected.

Then, of course, we come to the final clause in relation to the amendments that I am proposing, that is, clause 76, which really formalises the ability of the Minister of the day to have a poll on the question of election or selection, and that is only fair and reasonable. Like other members in this House I pushed for some 12 months for the previous Minister to have a poll of growers to decide this issue before this Bill was drawn up. There was ample time. I had a lot of negotiation behind the scenes to try to have that poll held, as did former shadow Ministers on this side of the House. There was a stumbling block every time.

The Government was not prepared to put its share of the cost towards that, even though the barley growers and the South Australian Farmers Federation were prepared to. The Government was not prepared to say, 'We will bear some of that cost'—and a very minor cost it was; in fact, it was much less than what it spent sending by courier small items of pencils and rubbers around to electorate offices in the past 12 months—to make sure that issue was out of the way before this Bill came to Parliament. The amendment that I am putting forward makes it very clear that, 12 months after this Bill comes into play and before the end of the first term, the Minister may hold a poll to decide whether there shall be a change in the nomination of the successors of members in the Barley Board.

All that really means is that, after this legislation has settled down and the board has got going and gets onto the functions it is supposed to do, which is to manage and market the Australian barley crop, there is a chance for those growers who have been denied the option of a poll in the past, because of the intransigence of the Government, to have that option. It gives adequate time for it to settle down and also leaves it to the discretion of the Minister. In other words, under clause 58, if the Farmers Federation and the growers go to the Minister and say 'We think it is time this matter was finally put to the test', the Minister acts on their advice and then we can have a poll.

I firmly believe that this Bill can be very successful if there is some cooperation, some negotiation to make it work, and some goodwill. From the discussions that I have had with the Victorian Minister, he is prepared to look at ways of correcting anomalies in the Bill. There is no question that there are anomalies in this Bill, and I will push very hard for some of these amendments to be properly dealt with by the Minister. It is very easy to throw something through this House as a compromise, which a lot of legislation is, only to find out that it constricts good business management or constricts the producers in ultimately having the final say over the destiny of their product.

That is why it is important that we look at this Bill very carefully. It is a classic Committee Bill and, no doubt, after members on both sides have made their contribution, we will be in for a long Committee debate on this Bill. It is very important that we all realise that we are dealing with something that is potentially one of the fastest growing commodities in this country, and one which, if the research takes place as we think it can and the production increases as I know it can, has the potential to export a dramatic increase in tonnage of barley, especially into South-East Asian markets.

If we are competitive, instead of letting that market gradually slip away to other countries such as Canada, the United States and France, we can have that market if we are prepared to get off our bottoms and fight for it. This is modernising barley marketing in South Australia and Victoria under the Australian Barley Board. With the research which may take place and which I hope will take place in the future, there is the potential for this State and for Victoria to become pre-eminent in those markets for the good of South Australia and Victoria.

Mr MEIER (Goyder): This Bill has been a long time in coming. In fact, as the member for Victoria pointed out, the reason for this Bill goes back to a report released in April 1990 on barley marketing in South Australia, which was prepared by Department of Agriculture staff in South Australia and Victoria along with farmer and Australian Barley Board representatives. It is a reflection on the Government that it procrastinated for such a long time. It did not know which way to turn and, in fact, showed real weakness in trying to direct discussion and in trying to assist the barley industry. That procrastination has, unfortunately, hurt many people associated with the barley industry. It has created divisions within the industry that did not need to occur.

I have some sympathy with the Minister, because he came in near the tail end. The previous Minister, the now Premier, should have dealt with this a long time ago. It is quite amusing to look back on newspaper articles and to see those articles suggest that the Bill would come in in 1991, then in early 1992 and certainly late 1992, and now this is 1993. 1 guess that this Minister had no other option than to see this Bill proceed, because the end of this financial year is somewhat critical for the Australian Barley Board and for the industry, and the debate at long last is proceeding. I will give credit where credit is due, because this Minister, at least, did not decide to procrastinate for another year or two. However, I get back to the argument that I was endeavouring to develop.

When the report came out it recommended several important initiatives. One was to move gradually towards a national barley export authority in the next decade. In the meantime, the report stated that the Australian Barley Board should be strengthened and allowed to operate in wider markets. Part of this strengthening process was to create a grower panel, which would select the Australian Barley Board, replacing the election of board members by growers.

It is important to consider the history of the Australian Barley Board, and in that regard a constituent of mine produced relevant details for me about the establishment of the Barley Board. My constituent points out that during the 1930s production of barley gradually increased but the price structure was very unstable due to the fact that the maltsters were the people who set the price and they had a habit of withdrawing completely

from the market for a period, leaving growers quite bewildered. Some growers elected to store their barley with local agents, pending future demand.

It is interesting that in this past season we have had tragedy strike both barley and wheat. What looked to be a golden harvest and a goldmine for farmers in some cases turned into a mud heap. In other cases it turned into a position where farmers got the lowest possible price for their barley. A small percentage of the crop turned out to be malting barley and a massive percentage was low quality feed barley. The House can imagine what would have happened if an orderly marketing system had not been operating. It would have been an extra catastrophe for farmers. Merchants would have been sitting there laughing and could have said to many of those growers with the poor quality barley, 'We are not interested, and you can throw it away so far as we are concerned.' Growers would not have known where to turn. We must keep that in mind when we remember that it was way back in the 1930s when moves were first made for the orderly marketing of barley.

On 18 August 1939 a deputation from Yorke Peninsula Barley Producers Ltd met the then Minister for Commerce, Senator George McLeay, in Maitland and placed before him the difficulties of barley growers. The Minister promised his consideration. Shortly after war broke out the Minister called a meeting of barley interests in Melbourne and it was decided that it was in the interests of barley growers that the crop about to be harvested be acquired by the Commonwealth Government and its disposal be placed in the hands of the Australian Barley Board. That was put in place under the national security war time regulations.

Some years later, during 1946, a public meeting was called at Minlaton to discuss the future of the Australian Barley Board following the cessation of the national security regulations. It was resolved that State legislation be drawn up to enable the Australian Barley Board to continue. Legislation was duly passed and the Australian Barley Board was established under an Act of Parliament with strong grower representation on the board. Grower representatives were nominated by barley growers and every barley grower had the right to vote, should an election become necessary. That brings me to one of the key points of the debate. As I said, the Bill has taken a long time to come before us and I am pleased that it is finally here. There is much good in the Bill, but it disappoints me that barley growers will not have the right to elect their grower members.

There will be some selection, and a barley grower majority on the board is not guaranteed. In respect of this latter point, there has been no dissension between members in the industry, who have all agreed that a grower majority should be guaranteed. It is disappointing that the Government has not seen fit to embody that in the legislation. As it relates to election of grower members versus selection, that is where the key differences have occurred. The arguments have been bandied around amongst members of this House outside this place; they have certainly been bandied around amongst the growers. One of the most interesting meetings on this issue occurred in April 1991 in my home town of Maitland. I had to smile at one of the Government representatives who attended the meeting and who told me later, 'I was told, "There probably will be only a handful of farmers who will attend the Maitland meeting. I know it is a long way to go, but could you go over and just indicate the Government's position." '

That person was surprised and more than a little impressed by the 454 growers packed into the Maitland town hall. *A Yorke Peninsula Country Times* article stated:

> ...they filled the seats, sat in the aisles and packed the doorways...

I was present at that meeting and certainly the arguments were put from both points of view. As the meeting chairman said, there were 450 votes for the election of members and three or four votes against. In other words, three or four votes supported the selection method. That meeting heralded the start of the obvious concern amongst barley growers about what would occur in the industry.

It would be easy for me to attack people or organisations opposed to the election principle. It is no secret that early in the piece the United Farmers and Stockowners said that selection was its preferred position. In fairness to that organisation, part of the reason for its stance was that the Government at that stage said, in relation to the report to which I just referred prepared by the Department of Agriculture staff in South Australia and Victoria, farmers and barley board representatives, 'If you do not accept the report, which clearly says that selection has to occur, we will deregulate your industry and you will no longer have orderly marketing.'

We will never find out whether that was the true reason for the farmer organisation taking that stance. Whatever the case, a subsequent annual general meeting in 1990 confirmed that policy. The Maitland meeting, to which I have just referred, occurred sometime after that and set a new agenda. Growers also met at Balaklava, and again I was present, and the vote was of a similar number to the vote at Maitland. Growers also met at Gladstone, Palmer and in many other areas around the State that might not necessarily have been designated as official meetings considering only the issue of selection versus election of grower members to the Barley Board.

Whatever the case, it became clear, certainly to the Liberal Party and, I would suggest, to most members, that barley growers throughout the State of South Australia had a preference for election. However, at the same time, the farming organisation officially supported the principle of selection. The Liberal Party at that stage—and I was then shadow Minister of Agriculture—put its position clearly: it indicated that it supported the principle of election of grower members to the Barley Board and, furthermore, that should the industry fail to agree on its preferred position, a poll of barley growers should be undertaken. That is where the big stumbling block occurred, because the legislation does not make provision for a poll of barley growers. In that respect this legislation before us is considerably advanced.

The remaining alternatives were for the Minister to pay for a poll so that the issue could be resolved or for the farmer organisation—the then UF&S, the now South Australian Farmers Federation—to pay for the poll, with the group known as the Concerned Barley Growers,

which had organised a meeting at Maitland and subsequent places, contributing. Considerable discussions were held. I was very upset with the then Minister of Agriculture, the Hon. Lynn Arnold, for refusing to budge. He virtually washed his hands, as Pontius Pilate washed his hands some thousands of years ago, and said it had nothing to do with him and that the growers would have to work it out.

For a cost of possibly $15 000 to $20 000 the Minister could have had the answer from the growers and the industry would have been spared a lot of unnecessary argument and delay, but he refused to commit that money. Today in this House we heard a question about a State Bank jaunt on a yacht somewhere. I did not get down all the figures, but I think $200 000 was mentioned as a starter. The barley industry was looking for $15 000 to $20 000, a tenth of that sum. We are talking about State Bank problems of $3.15 billion, and one tiny little drop of that would have been $15 000 to $20 000. But, no, the then Minister of Agriculture refused to budge: he kept steamrolling on. I doubt we would have this legislation before us if he were still Minister. At least this Minister did have enough commonsense to realise he had to try to compromise somewhere. I am not happy with the compromise and I will be moving amendments accordingly in Committee. I believe we have to ensure that growers are elected to the board and that there is a grower majority on the board, and I will be seeking to do just that.

Certainly, the Liberal Party did everything it could to assist the industry. I held meetings with the then UF&S members on more than one occasion. I had many telephone calls on this issue. In addition, at its rural council meeting the Liberal Party held an election versus selection debate; the two sides of the argument were listened to and duly acknowledged by all those present on that occasion.

However, for the sake of the record, why do I believe election is so important? First, I believe it is the most democratic method of electing members to the board. Secondly, grower-elected boards around Australia are renowned for their excellence. One such example is the existing Australian Barley Board. If time permitted, I would have loved to quote extracts from its latest annual report. Other examples are the South Australian Cooperative Bulk Handling Authority and the West Australian Bulk Handling Authority. They are all elected boards. We can compare those with the boards facing real problems, particularly in the eastern States, where boards such as the New South Wales Bulk Handling Authority have selected membership; that board has had huge debts written off and has now been sold. Victoria's Bulk Handling Board has large debts and it, too, is up for sale. Is that what we want to head towards?

My third key point is that it is what the growers want, as indicated at the public meetings at Maitland, Balaklava, Gladstone and Palmer, and at other meetings around the State. Fourthly, I believe that members of the Labor Party, particularly those members who are cognisant with the barley legislation, know that the compromise before us is not what the industry wants; it is not in the best interests of the industry. Fifthly, we need to ensure not only that grower members are elected to the board but, through the amendment I will be moving later, that a grower majority on the board be guaranteed—a position that is supported both by the South Australian Farmers Federation and by barley growers generally.

Finally, let us remember that the elected board, like any responsible board of directors, will employ experts and will take advice from those experts in management, marketing, finance, exporting and product promotion. When people say that we need to get those responsible people onto the board at the outset, they do not acknowledge the fact that all those experts can be hired and fired by the board members. I believe that the growers know their industry better than anyone. The Australian Barley Board has an excellent record under grower elected members, and let us continue it in that way.

Mr LEWIS (Murray-Mallee): The Opposition's position has been spelt out concisely and clearly by the shadow Minister, our spokesman, the member for Victoria, soon to become the member for MacKillop. From the annual report, which all members would have received in recent times, it is easy to see just how important this crop is to rural South Australia. We are well placed to produce high grade barley because of our peculiar geography. The three peninsulas and the presence of those huge estuarine lakes in the area have a moderating effect on our climate in summer so that the growing period during which rain falls in winter provides for steady but not excessive rank growth of the plant in most seasons, and the ripening period, with normally dry but mild sunny conditions, gives us that very high quality grain. It is much sought by maltsters around the world. We can make the highest quality beer in the world here in Australia because we have such outstanding barley as well as hops from other parts.

Nationally, it is our second most valuable cereal crop. Here in South Australia the bulk of our best barley comes from areas which are maritime in climate consequence such as I have described. Other parts of State can and do still grow, at little expense, this outstanding cereal for feed purposes, in the main. It is a successful crop because it is easy to grow, it competes well with weeds, it can be sown very late in the season and attracts a stable price. That is the nub of why it is a reliable income provider for growers. The member for Goyder has eloquently; put that information on the record. The board as it is has done a very good job in handling the interests of the producers in the industry when selling that crop. It has handled its work in a responsible fashion. I have had some quibbles and quarrels over the years about the way in which the board has handled its work but they have been only peripheral; they are not significant as regards my longstanding conviction, backed by the facts, that the board has done an outstanding job. It has been low profile, but it has been more than adequate to its task and very effective.

The board does not cover the entire nation but only two States: South Australia and Victoria. We provide the floor for the market; we are the leading seller. Other growers in other States and the interests that receive their grain use our board to indicate the level at which they fix their price—most commonly below ours— because they are not in a strong position to supply a significant

quantity as we can through our board. In some measure, I resent that, because our growers pay the research costs of ongoing market analysis and the market development costs in discovering where new markets can be found. Once those prospects are uncovered and commercial arrangements made, other sellers can move in underneath us and cut away the good work we have done. That is always the case with any market leader, which is selling commodities. So, we find that the board is not privileged in its position as a monopoly supplier to the market even in this country. It must contend with section 92 in its national markets. That is not a bad thing and the board does not mind it; in fact, it copes very well, better than any other produce board which has existed in this country I have analysed and it has done it in a continuing way.

So, after my first five minutes of contribution to this debate, I ask the question: if it works, why the hell fix it? I do not understand why it is necessary to meddle. No-one has yet produced for me one jot of evidence that the board, whatever mistakes it might have made in the past, will avoid making those mistakes in the future by our changing its composition—not one jot of evidence. What is behind these proposals to change the structure of the board? I will come to that in a minute. I have said that the board received 2.3 million tonnes last year. According to the report of the General Manager of the board for the 1991-92 season, about 500 000 tonnes of that was destined for export as malt; that means that it was value added. The domestic demand for feed barley reached a record level of about 289 000 tonnes in that year because of the drought conditions in much of Queensland and north-western New South Wales. The board exported a lot of feed barley as well. While the world feed grain markets are price sensitive, it is a tribute to the board's ability to identify its product in grading it so effectively that demand for our local product remains strong.

I have already said that the board has spent a lot of time and money on finding new markets. Once those markets are uncovered, all our competitors have to do is to move in and make an offer that beats our price, and we have to try to match their price. Those sorts of things are a bit of a worry. We exported a total of 1.127 million tonnes of feed barley. One of our biggest customers continues to be the Japanese market, which used 300 000 tonnes of feed in controlled environment animal protein production. Those statistics are interesting not only because they illustrate what the board has been doing but because they indicate that the board is alert to its task and to the threat of competition to work.

Notwithstanding all those facts, the board has been able to pay a first advance to growers of about 85 per cent of the ultimate price—that, too, is commendable. Not many other coarse grain or cereal marketing boards that compete in an open market context with the same product offered by other merchants can manage the level of competence in determining price relevant to demand and returning to growers an early and high advance for sales, given that the board has in-house costs that must be spread across the total tonnage of the pooled result in any given year. I could go on to talk about consistent total annual values of $A200 million to $A250 million—in 1990 we had a record high of $400 million—and the fact that, although world barley exports total only between 16 million and 19 million tonnes altogether, total world production is about 10 times that level.

The more important matter to consider in the context of this debate, (having made all those points about how well the board has developed its market, sold its product, covered its commercial position by understanding currency fluctuations and the necessity to hedge, and also written contracts to ensure that there is continuing sale and so on) is the problem of fixing the board even though it is working, and the reasons for doing that. I can only guess what they might be. However, it seems to me that the Minister of Primary Industries and the Farmers Federation have knocked up this notion that there will be another card on the table, which the Minister can hand out as a plum job to someone who does not have to face election. In the dispatch of all these prerogative positions, which the Minister of Primary Industries will be able to hand out a number of people will have their ruffled feathers smoothed, and the Farmers Federation can whack them all up and keep everyone happy. This extra one will provide a little more elbow room to manoeuvre.

Clearly, the Farmers Federation has sought to represent the industry of production and its marketing arrangements right across the board, but it has no particular commitment to barley more than to any other grain or commodity, perhaps less, for that matter. It does not have strong membership from among barley growers. The change which the Minister originally intended to introduce in the legislation certainly does not carry the support of the majority of barley growers. That means that there is something crook afoot. If democracy works, I see no reason to change. Indeed, I am suspicious of people who advocate alternatives to the democratic process in determining who shall represent what.

As for the argument that it is necessary to have people with these professional qualifications and competence, I have no quarrel with that notion, and I am sure barley growers around this State are every bit as intelligent as I am, by whatever degree I am intelligent, and understand the same principles and the necessity for them to elect candidates to the board who had those qualifications and the competence in those areas from among their ranks to do their work on the board. To suggest that they would do otherwise is an insult to their intelligence, yet that is what the Minister has done, and it is what the Government sought to do to an even greater degree than is now proposed in this legislation.

Mr Deputy Speaker, it is a tribute to the negotiating abilities of the member for Victoria, and before him the member for Goyder, to have compelled the Government and the other elements involved in this process to come to their senses in getting the Government to understand that it is not the growers' will to have had their positions determined by some paternalistic group; it is the growers' will to elect their representatives and to be given the rightful prerogative to determine who can best represent their interests.

To suggest that we need to have a panel nomination is similar to someone outside South Australia, who is an expert on what happens in South Australia, nominating a panel of people to come and sit in this Parliament to

make laws on behalf of this State, presumably to select the best people to run this State. That is what we are implying if we pursue the argument of selection of grower representatives.

Mr D. S. Baker interjecting:

Mr LEWIS: The member for Victoria properly points out, of course, that, given the current majority in this Chamber, they could not have done any worse than creating the botch we have on our hands. So it is a tribute to the negotiating abilities of the member for Victoria and the member for Goyder before him in the political arena to have got the Government to at least come some distance along the way and understand the necessity for elected representation.

It would not be lost on you, Mr Deputy Speaker, that some 200 years ago there was a bit of a tea party in Boston Harbor over things like this, and they called it the Boston Tea Party, where the people of the American colonies were being told that they had to pay taxes and do their daily duties for the benefit of the King and the country without any elected representation in the process, without any say whatever in who represented them in the place where their laws were made. That resulted in the War of Independence and the birth of the United States. We are talking about exactly the same principle here.

The growers themselves sought the establishment of this marketing authority—not this Government, not any of the Ministers in this Government—and it is not the product of this Government. God help us if the Government is ever left to produce the barley crop of South Australia. I doubt if we would have anything on which to feed our own chooks, let alone make our beer. They would make such a mess of it, given the illustration we have seen of their competence.

The Liberal Party has always understood the need for democracy. I want to conclude my contribution by quoting a letter, written by the member for Victoria when he was my Leader, to several growers in late 1990 on behalf of all of us. He said:

> Thank you for your letter of 22 October regarding the proposed changes to the Barley Board. This matter has been the subject of extensive discussion in the Party Room and the decision was determined this week. The Liberal Party supports the principle of election of grower members to a reconstructed Barley Board and also supports the principle of a national marketing authority for barley. However, if such a proposal in practice is perceived to bring difficulties, such as inherent debts from many other States, then a referendum of growers should be held to decide the issue. Currently there is no legislation before Parliament, but it is anticipated that such legislation could be brought before the Parliament in the first half of 1991. We will continue to work closely with the growers on this important issue.

My colleague the member for Victoria, then as Leader and subsequently as spokesman on primary industry matters, has continued to do just that. Now we have at least two members on the board to represent grower interests with the growers having a say in it. Hopefully even more people will be elected by the growers to do the job on their behalf and accept responsibility for so doing.

There is no doubt that the industry should have been more effectively consulted before this, because South Australia is the biggest barley producer on the Australian Barley Board. At meetings which have been held over the past few years the South Australian growers and all the growers who speak to me—I do not even go out canvassing their opinions—have been saying to me, 'It is no deal to have someone patronising us by telling us who we should have on the board; it is better for us to be left with the opportunity and the responsibility to elect our representatives, Peter, and if you get it wrong do not expect any support from us in the future. We thought that you were consistent in your view that democracy was the best way of doing things.' Well, I am reminding them right now, I agree. I have always had that view, I still have that view and I will have that view as long as I remain in this place. If that means that I am removed from this place, in consequence of my continuing to advocate that view, then so be it; at least I will be able to rest easy.

Mr GUNN (Eyre): I strongly support the continuation and the operation of the Australian Barley Board because I believe in the orderly marketing of primary products. The Australian Barley Board has served the grain industry, the barley growers and the citizens of this State in a manner of which they can all be proud. It has been a very good organisation and one which we should ensure continues to operate for as long as grain is grown in South Australia. It has been successful because it has been controlled by people who understand and come from the industry. It is very simple.

I am happy to declare my interest in the industry. I am a barley grower and I will benefit from the passing of this legislation. My family has participated in barley growing for as long as I can remember. We intend to continue in that process as long as we are involved in farming pursuits in South Australia. Therefore, it perturbs me greatly that, in my view, a completely unnecessary controversy has been created in relation to the future membership of the board in this State. I have always been of the view that, if something is working well, do not interfere. Why have change for the sake of change?

Unfortunately, a few years ago some academics decided that they knew better than the practical people in the industry. They tried out this selection process on the Australian Wheat Board. We had some people involved in the selection panels, and what happened? They were fairly weak individuals, in my judgment. We ended up with no-one on the Australian Wheat Board.

Mr Venning: There are two now, though.

Mr GUNN: The honourable member can speak for himself when the time comes. There was a time when we were the third largest producer in Australia and we had no-one on the board—it was a disgrace—because John Kerin, the then Minister for Primary Industry, wanted to put his mates on it. That is what happened: it was a mates appointment. It was a damned disaster. If anyone wants to stand up and support that, they can, but do not count on my support. This process, which was then to be implemented on the barley growers, was an unwise course of action. I know a few people who support it. The public meetings that I attended were overwhelmingly in support of the election of people to this board. Since that time, there has been some retreat and we have gone to a 2:1 arrangement. I have never found it

difficult to allow people to exercise their franchise. It happens in this place and it should be done at all levels. Therefore, if the barley growers in South Australia elect the wrong people, they are the ones who will have to pay the price. In the past, they elected people who had a great deal of common sense, and that is the greatest thing one can bring to any organisation, as you would know, Mr Deputy Speaker. It is important to have an ear to what the producers think.

There were—and still are—people who wanted not only to get hold of the selection process for the barley board but also to apply it to the bulk handling cooperative. In my experience, whenever there has been a dispute or people have not been happy with the Cooperative Bulk Handling Company, two things have happened: they have attended the annual general meeting and expressed their views at great length, and I have participated in that process on many occasions, even before I came into this place, and I look forward to continuing to do so because I believe it is a good organisation; or they have removed the directors of the board and replaced them with others. It is a democratic process with which I am sure you, Sir, with your background in the industrial movement, would agree. If members are not happy with the union secretary, they have the right to elect someone else: that is their prerogative. The same thing applies to the people who will make the decisions in relation to the Australian Barley Board.

I am of the view that the growers should select their representatives and I therefore intend to support the amendments that will be moved by the member for Goyder, as he explained them in detail. It is most unfortunate that this matter has been allowed to degenerate in a manner that has not been productive for the industry. It has distracted people's attention when they should have been thinking about far more important things. It should never have come to this, and the immediate past executive officer of the grain section of the UF&S has a great deal to answer for. He was an antagonistic character whom, on a number of occasions, I witnessed make attacks on elected representatives that were unnecessary, completely uncalled for and quite improper, in my judgment. It is good riddance to have him out of South Australia. Had there been another person in that position, we would not have reached this stage today.

Mr Venning: That is unfair.

Mr GUNN: I make no apology for what I have said. If my colleagues do not agree with me, they can put their point of view. I have been in this place for only 22 years. I have some limited experience of the grain industry. I know a little about it and I have seen these debates take place over a long time. I have always supported what I believe to be the will of the people involved in the industry. As I have said from day one, if there were a referendum of growers, I would support whatever they determined. If they wanted total selection of the board, that would be fine with me. I will not vote to impose a solution that they do not want and I have said on a public platform that, even if I am the only member, I will ensure that the House is counted, and I do not go back on my word.

I am not here at the behest of a few power brokers. I am here to reflect the will of the people in that industry, people who have done a great deal for the benefit of this State, and that is why I believe that the approach taken by the member for Goyder is correct. Therefore, I intend to support his amendments. I do not believe it is necessary to say any more. I have been blamed for being one of the people who originally set out to lead the fight in relation to election as against selection. I believe it has not been successful in the Australian Wheat Board, and it is intended to return to the system of election in the not too distant future. I am of the view that the proposition put forward by the member for Goyder is correct. I will support the Bill to the second reading stage, I will support the amendments, and I will consider my position on the third reading.

Mr VENNING (Custance): Initially, as a barley grower, I declare my interest in this Bill. Without being too big-headed, I must say that I am, or was, one of the largest growers, and that was particularly so when I farmed with my brothers before entering Parliament. We could have been in the top 10. It is interesting to hear the debate on this side of the House, because there is some difference in the arguments of my colleagues, and that division has been reflected in the whole industry for some time.

I support the Bill, with the proposed amendments. This has been a sad saga over a matter that should have been one of only a minor nature. There has been no difficulty with the Government over this Bill, which is a change, but the trouble has been with the industry and the farmers. The Bill arises as a direct result of a full review in 1988-89 of the marketing of barley in South Australia and Victoria by a working group, appropriately named the Barley Marketing Review Group. While many of the provisions in the Bill are taken from the Act, the proposed measure adds refinements that will place the Australian Barley Board in a better position to respond to a grain marketing environment that is facing a period of change. These changes involve the deregulation of the domestic wheat market (which I never supported and which I still do not support), the expanded powers of the Australian Wheat Board (and we all know what that has done with its marketing of many grains), and the financial position within the grain industries.

The sad reality of this Bill is that it should have taken so long to get to this stage. It has been ridiculous and the fault has been on all sides. I cannot level the blame at particular people and I must say that the Government has been reasonably compromising, trying to do the right thing with the industry. I hope we have got our act together at long last. The bitter issue as to the way the board was to be set up was the most minor part of the review findings. The most important issue has been ignored. The real issue was the ideal that we ought to have a full Australian Barley Board to market all of Australia's barley, as it used to do. As the Australian Wheat Board does for all Australia's wheat, why is it that the Australian Barley Board does not market all of Australia's barley? That is pretty simplistic and basic. The question needs to be argued again: why is there a difference? Why is there an argument? There used to be an Australian Barley Board.

In October of 1939, following the outbreak of the Second World War, the Commonwealth Government, using powers conferred by the National Security Act of 1939, established the Australian Barley Board, whose purpose was to advise on matters concerning any regulation or control of the barley industry necessitated by the effects of war. For the next three years, the board acquired and disposed of the whole Australian barley crop using facilities provided by the Australian Wheat Board. I wonder whether history will repeat itself. The board functioned under those regulations until 1948 when the Governments of Victoria and South Australia brought down legislation whereby the Australian Barley Board was constituted in accordance with State Barley Marketing Acts, as we know them today.

We should be debating that issue instead of this trifling matter that has got out of control. It is ridiculous that we cannot return to a full Australian Barley Board. It was discussed a few weeks ago at ABARE, which I attended, as you know, Sir. It has been suggested time and again that we have too many Australian boards competing overseas, often putting down each other's product. That is inexcusable in the current marketplace.

We have too many boards. We often wonder whether we ought to have one sole Australian grain marketing board. That is a very contentious issue, but it needs to be considered. At least we ought to be talking right now about a true Australian barley board. It is a totally ridiculous and frustrating situation. We should be debating this now. What are we debating? What has taken all that time, and what has all the vitriol been about? How we should select or elect members of the board. The Victorians got their act together very quickly, with full selection, and they have no hassles at all. What is the difference between Victoria and South Australia? I say it is mainly the personalities involved-a few hotheads in the right places, and away the issue went, and it was very easy to fire it up.

The working party originally recommended total selection. The previous speaker referred to the discussions. At the moment we have two South Australian members on the Australian Wheat Board, Andrew Inglis and Maurice Crotti, of San Remo fame. I would think that that is more than our share on the Australian Wheat Board, but we have two, because of their expertise and quality. The whole issue is personality based. As we all know, farmers (and I am one of them) will always resist change; they want to go back to the heady old days of the 1950s and 1960s, and so do I. I would like to go back to those days, but I know and we all know that that is not on. Today's world is a smaller, more competitive and market driven world, and to dream that we could go back to those days is lovely but we know it is not a practicality or reality. It just will not happen.

It is easy to get out there and scare people, saying, 'You will lose all you have. The board has done well but, if you move this way, you will lose all you have.' It is quite ridiculous. Being a farmer myself, I know what is said; I know how easy it is to stir farmers and that most farmers will always go with the *status quo*. I am pretty conservative, but I am a radical amongst some of my peers, because they certainly resist change. We have to drag some of them kicking into the modern age. I can only say I hope they trust me to protect and watch over the well-being of the many things they do on the various boards.

How is it that all farm leaders agreed with the selection process? The South Australian Farmers Federation Grain Section is meeting across the road tomorrow, and twice I have been to a meeting there, twice this has been discussed and twice the decision was made. Even my own zone four in Jamestown twice discussed this issue and twice made the decision in favour of selection, but it goes on. We all know how difficult this has been: it has been very difficult indeed. We all know that we cannot go back to the old days; it cannot and will not happen.

The Australian Barley Board itself was in favour of this change and half of it still is, and I refer to Colin Rowe and Graham Ashman, two very good people in the barley marketing area. Others that have been involved in this wrangle include the Advisory Board of Agriculture, the South Australian Farmers Federation (previously the UF&S) and the Department of Agriculture. They are all in favour of a change. Most of the zones in South Australia are in favour of the change, but two or three of the key zones, particularly Yorke Peninsula, are not.

The member for Murray-Mallee previously asked what right the South Australian Farmers Federation has to have all this say. In the wash-up of this compromise, in effect it has achieved a third of its say. I think that is reasonably democratic, because the South Australian Farmers Federation Grain Section is a duly elected board of growers. Every grower has the right to join; every grower has the right to go along, as applies in a union. We do not make it compulsory (although sometimes I think we should), and everyone has the right to go along and have their say. If the decisions are not made correctly, they have no-one else but themselves to blame. Is it not ironical that most of the leaders agree with this change?

This is a compromise, and I understood that, apart from one or two, the Concerned Growers of Yorke Peninsula agreed to it. In fact, I saw a delegation of its members in the corridors of Parliament. I understood they were quite happy to agree with this compromise. This issue is ridiculous. The important parts of this Bill have been ignored and even left out. When we look at the original findings of the review, we see that they were just left out and we are left with this ridiculous argument about how we select the board. The damage has been very high, with all the resignations from the South Australian Farmers Federation. The friction between previous friends and between leaders in our industry is totally ridiculous, and the deliberate beat up and scare tactics being used can only be described as a tragedy.

It has always been my opinion from when I first began in agri-politics (and it is lovely to repeat my old beef in this forum) that too few people have been wearing too many hats. People sit on several boards and then there are cross board rows. All board members should be regularly accountable, as you and I are as members of this Parliament, Sir. We are accountable every three or four years, and so should all board members be.

The Australian Barley Board, by one way or another, has not changed very much over the years. I have to say that it has tried to hide the times when elections were

due. I have looked for the advertisements and notifications of when the board elections were due, and I found them in the public notices of the *Advertiser,* and one could not see a smaller advertisement. That is quite ridiculous. That is the sort of thing that has been revealed, and it should not go on. We need more competition on our boards. Our board has had some very good members on it. I refer to two whom I knew well: Herb Petras and Des Chenery, two excellent board contributors. Of course, there are others who have made great contributions over many years.

The board has done well, but nobody amongst the growers would say it could not do better, particularly in today's rough and tough climate, as it is out there. New people want to get on the boards, but they waste their time. Even if one comes up with an absolute whiz bang of a candidate, that candidate is not accepted because the *status quo* continues, and that person cannot get his or her position across. The Australian Wheat Board selects its members. I remind members that two South Australians are on the Australian Wheat Board. The selection of Barley Board members is controlled by growers, so how can the growers lose control?

Our grain research committees are now selected, and one Malcolm Sargent, a person who is well known to me and who was very much in favour of selection, lost his position by a selection panel. He accepted that-a very admirable gesture. He accepted that the principle was correct, even though it cost him his job. Malcolm is still in there fighting for the industry, but he was selected off because somebody else was seen to be needed on the board, and his spot was sacrificed. I would call that the ultimate sacrifice. The selection panel in South Australia is grower controlled. If I look at that very hard, I think that gives us an advantage, even an unfair advantage, over the Victorians, because the same selection panel will be used on both sides of the border. So, the Victorians can come back to us and say, You guys are getting more than your fair share of the say.'

I would like to put to members of the Government who may not understand all this that, if one is playing bowls, who picks the team? Does the whole team get out there after the match and argue who will be on the team next week? No: we elect a selection panel who weekly selects the team, so what is the difference? There is no difference. If we do not like the selectors, at the end of the year we give them the flick (and members know that bowls selectors are often in trouble), and exactly the same rules apply to the Australian Barley Board.

This is a compromise Bill with a fallback position at the end of it: a poll of growers. That is there and I would make sure it always remains there. If things do go awry, and they often can, the poll of growers is there to get them out. I am very confident that, after four or five years of this legislation, the growers will be very happy with the board and there will be nary a ripple on the Barley Board pond, because the personalities will have gone, the heat will have gone and the Barley Board will continue the way this compromise Bill says it will. I am disappointed that we are not fully selecting, but I accept the compromise quite gladly, and most growers have also accepted it.

I appreciate the member for Goyder's position, because he represents the growers of Yorke Peninsula and, to say the least, he is locked into a position for which he has to argue. The growers want the best board and want to get the best price for all our growers. That is the hope and intention of us all, although we have a different way of reaching that goal. The South Australian Farmers Federation Grain Section has stuck to its guns and stuck its neck out and pushed initially for selection and now for this compromise. I put on the record my support for the South Australian Farmers Federation Grain Section and, indeed, for the South Australian Farmers Federation itself for its position against some pretty torrid debate.

I remind the House again that I am a barley grower, and I am entitled and qualified to have my point of view. We all have the well-being of the barley growers at heart but just have different ways of doing it. I congratulate the stance taken on this issue by the President of the South Australian Farmers Federation (Tim Scholz), the past grain section Chairman (Ken Schaeffer) and the Secretary (Neil Fisher). I refute the remarks made by my colleague the member for Eyre about Neil Fisher. Neil was an asset to the industry. He made us think; he was very provoking. He was always a very interesting person to have at our meetings because he often made us think of the alternative, and his having gone is South Australia's loss. I really mean that, and I hope that one day he will see fit to come back and take some part in the industry.

I also note that in the Gallery today we have the new President of the grain section (Allan Glover), who is doing a wonderful job. I also note the new Executive Officer (Ian Desborough), who has just taken up his position, and I wish him well. Hopefully, he will not have the same torrid pitch to bowl on as did his predecessor, Neil Fisher. I note that David Boundy, also from the Yorke Peninsula area, was with us earlier.

In the old days it was okay to have a row of farmers on the board, but things have changed. I have heard and considered the argument that the board should be made up entirely of growers and that expertise could or should be brought in when needed. I disagree, because you need expertise on the board. Why has the Australian Wheat Board chosen Maurice Crotti, a South Australian, to sit on the Australian Wheat Board? Because he is an outstanding contributor to the value adding of Australian wheat. He owns San Remo, makes pasta—spaghetti, ravioli, etc.—a world quality product; that is why he is on the board. I bet that he would not have been put there by growers initially. He has been selected in the best interests of growers. I am confident in that.

Why has Andrew Inglis, a personal friend of mine, been on the Australian Wheat Board for a few months now? Because he is a grower, yes, but also because he is the past President of the Grains Council of Australia. So, that is why he was selected there. These are changing times and I am afraid we have to roll with them. We need to question all our activities in relation to the growing, handling and marketing of our primary products. The Department of Agriculture has much improved our production. The McColl royal commission report into the handling and storage of grain has led to many changes, and now this step is targeted towards marketing.

Changes must be made, although some I do not agree with, especially the deregulation of the Australian wheat market. The industry did not and still does not want it. Next year, I believe, we will be discussing in this House the South Australian Grain Handling Act, and that brings with it some very big questions. In closing, I support the Bill, and I do regret all the previous injurious debate it has caused. I know that my point of view is not held by all my constituents but by a majority, especially by zone 4, who twice voted for it. Orderly marketing is the issue, and I will always fight to maintain it. I give my unqualified commitment to all barley growers that I will fight to keep the control of the board with the growers, as their well-being is tantamount—

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

Mr BLACKER (Flinders): This Bill has been some years in the making and reaching this stage. I guess it is rather unfortunate, because in my view the Bill is late getting here and may well be prejudicing the managerial opportunities available to the current board or whoever the new management board might be, pending our coming barley harvest. For that reason, this Bill must proceed through all stages of this House in the quickest possible time so that the managers of the Australian Barley Board are given the ability to get into world markets and, more particularly, to arrange the finance that is necessary to lock in next season's harvest on their forward contracts, and things of that kind. That is the overriding reason why this Bill must go through in a matter of hours, hopefully, from this House and through all stages of the Parliament so that the new Australian Barley Board can be put in place.

The history of the Australian Barley Board has been well documented and has been referred to here this afternoon many times. I do not think that any of us could offer one word of criticism of what the board has done under very adverse conditions, and perhaps the delay this Bill has had in reaching this stage might be fortuitous. What it has done is give us the experience of the past harvest, which was probably the most difficult we have had in 50 years, with weather damaged grain and literally hundreds of thousands of tonnes of grain effectively unsaleable in a normal trading market that would be left there, and the growers would be left destitute. They would be endeavouring to store on their own property, endeavouring to keep the grain that they might be able to use in some way. They would be trying to feed it to livestock and in some cases they would have been burying it with a thick layer of soil over the top to keep the air out, so that it might keep for them to use in the future. That has been done but, fortunately, because of the board and the ability of the statutory marketing authorities, in both the barley and wheat industries, they have been able to receive the grain this year, weather damaged as it might be, and have been able to relieve the farmers of that particular problem.

That incident is worth noting at this time, but another aspect that also needs noting is what the maltsters were endeavouring to do to deregulate the industry. They saw their ability to go out in the field and negotiate on a one to one basis with growers, and to buy their grain. It is worth noting that attempts were made by maltsters in various States to do just that, using section 92 of the Act to buy across the border and to malt and send that grain overseas. I believe that some maltsters got caught, because the grain they bought from across the border was not true to type and, of course, when it went through the malting process, they found that it did not all malt in an even way and, therefore, the quality was not up to scratch.

I believe that those maltsters who experimented in that way got their fingers caught and are now more than happy to come back to the Australian Barley Board and say, 'We are happy to deal with you because we know the quality of the grain you provide.' So, whilst I think we all regret the delay, because we would have liked to have this legislation in place before, it has been of benefit inasmuch as we have learned on two counts: first, that it is important, and the maltsters now realise that it is a desirable aspect, to have a grain marketing or quality control organisation that is able to guarantee a standard of product from which they can buy and therefore process; and, secondly, from a farmer's point of view, the comforting thought that any grain produced, provided it was of a reasonable standard, has been able to be accepted and put into the system. Growers have been able to get their money in the due process of the 12 or 14 days from delivery to their first advance, and the normal farming operations have taken place in that way. Those two aspects need to be noted.

When the first draft Bill came down, there was much community concern within the industry. Mention has been made about the concern of barley growers on Yorke Peninsula. I attended a meeting there and stated publicly my preferred choice that the grower representatives of the barley industry be elected by a vote of growers. I hold to that basic principle. We are now in a position where the Minister, through negotiations with various organisations, has come up with a compromise much better than I would have expected. I did not anticipate that the Minister would be able to come through with two of the three members being elected and one being selected. I did not believe that that was a likely outcome. As to what the Minister negotiated, we must bear in mind that he was not dealing with just two groups of farmers: he was dealing with two State Governments and, incidentally, the Victorian State Government has changed in terms of its political philosophy. The Minister started negotiations with the State Labor Government and continued with the Liberal/National Coalition Government. I know the Minister of Primary Industries in Victoria, Bill McGrath, and I know full well of Bill's sincerity and his intention is simply to get the best situation for the barley industry.

The Minister's position was affected by virtue of the fact that the Victorian Farmers Federation opted for the selection method. A standard was set by the federation and the Government was willing to accept that, because it was the recommendation of the industry. It went in support of selection. In this instance, the Minister has responded to calls from sections of the industry and has shown a basic understanding that election is a desirable way to go. Another aspect also needs to be taken into account, that is, the role that the board is now required to undertake (and that is not to say that it was not

required to do that before), but the Bill, in respect of functions of the board (page 10), provides:

The functions of the board are—

(a) to control the marketing—

(i) of barley and oats grown in this State; and

(ii) of barley grown in Victoria;

(b) to market and promote, efficiently and effectively, grain in domestic and overseas markets;

(c) to cooperate, consult and enter into agreements with—

(i) authorised receivers relating to the handling and storage of grain;

(ii) carriers relating to the transport of grain;

(d) to determine standards for the classes and categories of grain delivered to the board;

(e) to determine standards for the condition and quality of grain delivered by authorised receivers to purchasers;

(f) to provide advice, as requested, to the Minister and the Victorian Minister about the marketing of grain.

I highlight those functions of the board simply to outline that we are not talking just about a farmer oriented operation: we are getting into a highly specialised field of marketing, promotion, research and all other aspects of a product that farmers effectively and efficiently are able to grow. That could well support the argument for selection. It is a point that needs to be taken into account in the whole scenario.

I note the amendments flagged by the member for Victoria, who has recommended that there be an order of priority of the positions to be filled. That is a good move because, if the election process was undertaken and then ministerial appointments brought in at the second level with the selection process involving the last person coming at the end, that mechanism would meet all the objectives of all groups and, therefore, it would have the ability to provide South Australia with the best possible board.

An issue of concern relates to one of the arguments raised in favour of the deregulation of the industry, that is, that growers should be able to deal amongst themselves. I have never been able to subscribe to that view. Where that necessity does arise as a result of unfortunate circumstances, such as natural disasters or the need for seed or the like, the ability to use permits to keep control of the grain is provided in the legislation, and I believe it should remain.

I hope that the requirements for permits are based on the correct interpretation of the law so that unnecessary costs are not imposed on growers who have a genuine requirement for that grain. I do not believe that a percentage of all handling costs should be attached to grain if there is *a bona fide* reason why two growers have a genuine requirement to negotiate the sale of grain between themselves. Provided it is done with the concurrence of the board and within certain criteria, I see no great hassles with that. The board needs to know where the grain is and it needs to know that whatever negotiations are going on are not to be seen to be in direct competition to the board, which is out there trying to sell the grain on the wider world market and to get the best possible price for the growers concerned.

As I said, this is a Committee Bill and has about 75 clauses, each of which will be dealt with individually in Committee. Doubtless other members and I will debate individual clauses. I support the Bill thus far. My single and overriding concern is that this Bill is passed in this House today and in the Upper House within a few days, because the industry is at risk if we delay for too long. As a barley grower myself, although a minor grower compared with many others, I am aware of the necessity for the Barley Board to be able to negotiate financial arrangements for forward contracts for grain and any other marketing means that need to be put into place.

I understand that the board has been effective this year. I believe that all the grain from the season just past has been placed, and that is the earliest that an entire season's harvest has been placed. Although I do not have more specific figures and I base my remarks on the general comments passed onto me, that is a credit to the Australian Barley Board and the way in which it has managed our industry. I believe that all farmers would recognise that it has handled the industry in a responsible and productive way to the benefit of the grower community.

Mrs HUTCHISON (Stuart): In supporting the Bill, I point out that the overriding and paramount importance of it for me is set out in the objectives, which provide:

(a) to supply, effectively and efficiently, marketing services to South Australian and Victorian growers and to produce other grain; and

(b) to maximise the net returns to South Australian and Victorian growers who deliver barley, oats or other grain to a pool of the board by securing, developing and maintaining markets for grain and by minimising costs as far as practicable.

One of the problems with the Bill has been not only that it has taken a long time to get before Parliament but that there have also been many peripheral issues that have had to be dealt with in the meantime. The Bill has been subject to the most intensive consultation of any Bill since I have been in this House. To add to the difficulties, two Ministers have handled it: the Premier was the previous Minister and the current Minister is the Hon. Terry Groom.

There were also some difficulties in that it was legislation which had effect across the border into Victoria. The marketing of the South Australian and Victorian barley crop has been a joint statutory venture since 1947. So, there was the added difficult of having to discuss the legislation with two successive Governments, which proved to be a difficulty in the Bill's coming before the Parliament. I have a lot of sympathy with the comments made by the member for Flinders with regard to this issue.

Again, one of the big difficulties has been the wide divergence of view points, and the selection/election issue has been subject to that divergence. The member for Flinders touched on another of those issues, which mainly had its basis in Victoria, I believe, although to some extent it was an issue here, and I refer to the matter of the maltsters. That also complicated the whole issue of barley marketing. However, the Barley Marketing Board has to be brought into the twenty-first century. I believe this legislation will do that. It is very important to this State and it is very important to our growers in this State that we get the best Barley Marketing Board that we can. The board has been very efficient in the past, but we cannot rest on our laurels:

we have to ensure that we get the best possible board that can take us into the next century. Given the fact that competition is now so fierce in overseas markets, I think we need to have people who can go over there and sell the barley for us, ensuring that we get a fair share of the markets, wherever they may be.

I, like every other member in this House, I would imagine, have had numerous requests from the Anthony Honner group, who favoured election of all board members, and also from the UF&S, which favoured selection as opposed to election. Again, there was a complication, as the member for Flinders said, with the fact that the Victorian side of the agreement favoured selection. There we had a divergence across the State borders. It has been a real problem. Even in this House today, there has been a wide divergence of view points. This highlights the great difficulty that both Ministers have had in getting agreement.

I commend the Minister at the table for being able to achieve what I feel is a reasonable compromise in that two members will be elected and one selected. I know that I am correct in saying that the Minister will still be looking to ensure that that works effectively in the interests of the growers of this State and the State itself. Given all those peripheral interests, what we have come up with is something of which we can be justifiably proud, because there has certainly been consultation right down the line. I have had my fair share of that with the various people who have been interested in the issue.

One of problems has been that there are about 7 400 growers in South Australia, but, as far as I know, only a limited number of people have been involved in the decision-making process in relation to the election/selection issue. I am sure that the Minister could elaborate on that. Again, that has been a real problem. Nonetheless, I still believe that what we have come up with is something that we as a Parliament and the people of South Australia and Victoria can live with in terms of getting the best possible deal for all our growers and for the State as a whole.

I would like to add to what the member for Flinders said in relation to the northern areas of the State. From my consultation with members in the northern areas who have been barley growers, I have found that they have been grateful that they have been able to get their grain—even though it was substandard, as was pointed out—to some point where it could at least bring in some money for them. That has been of vital importance.

Also of vital importance is the swift passage of this Bill through this House and the other House in the interests of continuity for the board and in relation to its getting out there with the business of marketing barley for the benefit of this State and for Australia as a whole. With those few words, I have much pleasure in offering my support for this Bill, which I think is very important for South Australia.

The Hon. T.R. GROOM (Minister of Primary Industries): I will ensure that I finish my contribution in closing this debate before the dinner adjournment. I want to thank the various members who have participated in the debate: the members for Stuart, Eyre, Victoria, Goyder, Custance, Murray-Mallee and Flinders. I think the contribution of the member for Custance was most constructive and reflected a commonsense approach to this legislation. The member for Victoria has, likewise, been most constructive in relation to this industry. I cannot agree with some of positions he is going to adopt, but I find one can rely on his word. I hope that he will be able to rely on the position that I will need to adopt in relation to some of the undertakings I may or may not have to give in respect of any amendments.

The member for Stuart was also most constructive in her contribution and reminded the House that, at the end of day, the Bill is designed to benefit growers and marketing and to assist South Australia and Victoria to get on the with the job of research and development, retaining the leader position in world markets.

It really was most disappointing to hear the member for Goyder. I think he marred his contribution by accusing the Government of procrastination, which was really just a cheap political shot. That has not been the case at all— I simply want to put on record that this industry has not been reviewed since 1947; successive Liberal and Labor Governments in South Australia have had the carriage of the Barley Act, and this Government has actively contributed to the review process. That commenced in June or July 1989, the report of the working party being put out for comment in April 1990. The industry then sought a process of commenting on the various positions that had been adopted.

The difficulty has never been with the Government: the difficulty has been with the industry. I believe that the member for Goyder marred his contribution by making a cheap political shot when he knows that not to be the case. Indeed, he has his own difficulties on Yorke Peninsula, because the Concerned Barley Growers, of course, have their base on Yorke Peninsula. It is appropriate that he should respond as the local member to a strong lobby group in his area.

There have been divisions of opinion right across the board in Victoria and South Australia in terms of the various farmers federations, the maltsters in Victoria and so on. To try to turn it around and make a cheap political shot at the Government when everyone really knows that there is no force in that shot marred his contribution.

The member for Flinders was also particularly constructive in his contribution. He came to grips with the fundamental issue, that is, that this Bill is designed to enhance barley marketing and the prospects of growers in South Australia and Victoria. It is true, as the member for Flinders has said, that I have come into quite a lengthy process. I came into a situation that had not been agreed within the industry. The maltsters were another problem in relation to the selection versus election issue. It was quite clear that that situation had not been resolved at industry level.

I did intend to introduce a Bill towards the end of last year, but there was a change of Government in Victoria and the Victorian Government's position changed in relation to the maltsters. Because it is complementary legislation, that change of stance had to be accommodated and respected; the newly elected Government had a position to put on this and other matters. So, because it is complementary legislation, I have had to harness those forces that have been at work. I did arrange for the protagonists to come together at a

meeting in my office in December to see whether the industry could finally resolve the South Australian situation. It went close, but it simply could not attain the requisite degree of consensus.

So, it was necessary for me s Minister to effect a compromise and to balance a number of competing views. There are competing views from the change of Government in Victoria and from the Victorian and South Australian Farmers Federations. As a matter of propriety, I intend to and must respect the position adopted by the Farmers Federation in this State. This group represents growers and farmers in a variety of ways. In my view, it is the leading industry group in South Australia and its integrity as an organisation should be respected. Its view on the selection versus election issue is a compromise from the decision of the original working party, which came down in favour of all being selected. I remind members that it came down in favour of selection to ensure that marketing was placed on a more corporate footing.

An honourable member interjecting:

The Hon. T.R. GROOM: I will not question the wisdom or otherwise of that decision. That was a consensus view of the working party—it came down in favour of selection—and that position was adopted by the Victorian Government and the Victorian Farmers Federation, with the South Australian Farmers Federation adopting a similar position. However, there was a reaction in South Australia, because the previous composition of the board allowed for all the growers from South Australia to be elected and not to be subjected to a selection process.

In fact, the Farmers Federation accommodated a position to enable two growers to be elected and one selected. I will not question the decision-making processes of the Farmers Federation. As a body I respect its integrity, and I will take its decision as being that of its organisation. The way in which it obtains the views of its constituent members is not a matter for me to question. I intend to respect the integrity of the Farmers Federation and not to indulge in petty criticisms of personalities, as I heard this afternoon from some members opposite. I do not think that is productive. Any person in an organisation does the job required by that organisation and represents the views of that organisation in the way in which it is determined from within.

Simply because a person is aggressive or puts forward a forceful point of view, that does not warrant criticism, because at the end of the day that person will do the job for that organisation. The member for Eyre was vociferous in his criticism of a particular member of the grain section of the Farmers Federation. In my view, that person was simply responding to the decision-making processes of that organisation in the same way as the concerned barley growers group is responding to the wishes of its constituent members. It is entitled to put a forceful—it may well be a militant—view if need be to ensure that its voice is heard.

I have had to take into account the change in the Victorian Government. I respect the integrity of the Farmers Federation in this State and I have accommodated its point of view. I must also respect the wishes of the Barley Board and the matters it has put to me, the position of the maltsters—obviously, this legislation will affect Victoria more than South Australia in this respect—and the position of the concerned barley group, acknowledging that it represents a point of view that needs to be accommodated. So, I have had to harness all these different positions that have been adopted right across the board and try to respect the integrity of all those organisations in arriving at what is a consensus Bill.

However, at the end of the day I cannot indulge in some of the petty problems that people have with selection versus election. I do not think that is productive. I am not going to the wall arguing that all have to be elected with no selection, or *vice versa,* because at the end of the day this Parliament and the Parliament of Victoria must pass a Bill that does the job for the industry and has consensus support right across the industry. If I went the whole hog and said, 'All right, it's all election', we would have an antagonistic group and, in my view, I would have downgraded the role of the Farmers Federation in this State to the detriment of farmers in South Australia. Likewise, I would not be respecting the views of the Barley Board, the maltsters, the Victorian Government or anyone else. So, I have had to reach a reasonable compromise in relation to this matter, and at the end of the day this Parliament and the Victorian Parliament must provide a Bill that will work for the industry. In other words, it must have industry support and a sufficient level of consensus to ensure that it works.

Regarding the amendments, I simply remind members that there could be merit in some of the proposed amendments, but it is very late in the day, they would be extremely difficult to accommodate and they would detract from the main requirement of getting this legislation through. As the member for Flinders and the member for Custance said, it is absolutely essential that this legislation pass intact, as it is complementary in Victoria and South Australia. Whilst I can look at minor amendments subsequently, I do not intend to disturb the agreement I have reached with the Victorian Minister to ensure the passage of this Bill. Other minor matters can be reviewed by a consultative committee further down the track—I see no problem with that process. The Bill is a compromise Bill, as the member for Custance correctly said, but it will do the job, because it contains a bit for everyone, and I have tried to accommodate the wishes of every organisation.

Regarding the concerned barley group, I have incorporated in the legislation provision for a referendum or a poll of growers subsequent to the event, but because it is complementary legislation it is essential that the board be in place. If that degree of feeling is still around after the passage of this Bill, there is sufficient power in the Bill for me to arrange a poll of barley growers in South Australia.

As the member for Stuart correctly said, when we look at the number of barley growers who have participated in surveys, we see that they are concentrated to some degree in the Mid North but essentially on Yorke Peninsula. Just over 700 people participated out of 7 400 growers who are registered with the Barley Board. It is a vociferous group, one that cannot be ignored, and we must respect its position. However, I point out that in percentage terms it represents a very small proportion of

barley growers in South Australia. The *Stock Journal's* survey was responded to by only about 386 people, 328 of whom supported election. After this Bill is in place and after the board is in place there will be an opportunity for mature reflection on what is in the best interests of the industry. I think I have been able to accommodate that particular viewpoint as well.

In concluding my remarks, I stress that it is absolutely vital and in the interests of growers in this State and in Victoria that this legislation pass quickly, because the board still has to be put in place and has to be functioning by 1 July. So, at this late stage there is not enough time for minor amendments, while there might be some merit in them, that are only going to delay the process, because the Victorian Parliament also has to pass its legislation very quickly. It has taken three or four years for the amendments to be considered. There has been ample time in the past 18 months. But every time an amendment, even of a minor nature, has been put up, it has to go through the consultation process. It has to go to all groups to have a bit of a say as to whether it is desirable. At this late stage I do not think there is scope for that process to ensure that this legislation is in place.

I remind members that a consultative committee is proposed under the Bill and these are proper tasks and functions for that committee. I want to put this in context. Until the new legislation is in place we cannot market or undertake any associated activities for the 1993-94 season. That means it is absolutely critical, as the member for Flinders correctly identified in his contribution, and in many ways it may well be fortuitous that we have reached this point and have to pass legislation in this time frame. I think we have learned a lot in the last six months, and I think it will be of benefit to the industry, but we cannot market or undertake associated activities for the 1993-94 season until this legislation is passed.

I also want to remind the House of the problems that the Barley Board confronts if there are any further delays in the passage of this legislation because it effectively expires on 30 June. Financial institutions are taking a very keen interest in the situation because they have securities involved as well. Every document that is now executed by the Barley Board comes under intense scrutiny, because the limitation of power is only to 30 June, and that is an impediment to marketing and all the research and development. I think financial institutions have enough confidence in this Parliament and the Victorian Parliament to know that the legislation will be in place, but I want to put in context the stance that I might have to adopt in Committee and hope members will understand. There is simply no authority on the part of the Barley Board to act beyond the current 1992-93 season. Every transaction in which the board is now involved comes under intense scrutiny to ensure that its powers are not exceeded.

So, I do stress that it is absolutely critical that the Bill pass intact during this session and that it is complementary legislation. With those few remarks, I thank members for their input to this Bill.

Bill read a second time.

In Committee.

Clauses 1 and 2 passed.

Clause 3—'Definitions.'

Mr MEIER: I move:

Page 1—Leave out lines 23 and 24.

The consultative committee is actually set up later on in the Bill under part 9. This amendment therefore creates a bit of a problem as to whether or not each of these additional references that come up throughout the Bill need to be considered now or later on. However, I take this opportunity to put down my reasoning as to why I seek to delete the definition of 'committee', which of course means that I seek to delete the Barley Marketing Consultative Committee.

The reason is very simple. I hope that members will see wisdom in supporting my foreshadowed amendments relating to clause 11 and ensuring two things: first, that grower members are elected to the board; and, secondly, that a grower majority is guaranteed on the board. That is what my amendments to clause 11 seek to do. Assuming that they pass, it would be completely unnecessary to have this Barley Marketing Consultative Committee, because the key reason for having that committee originally was to set it up as a liaison between growers and, at that stage, a grower minority board to ensure that growers' views were appropriately represented.

However, if members agree to my amendments in clause 11, we will not need the consultative committee because a grower majority board will be guaranteed. Therefore, it is probably a little premature to be dealing with a vote on this particular definition now, and I would seek to reconsider this clause, if necessary, after considering clause 11.

The Hon. T.R. GROOM: I am agreeable to the way the honourable member has outlined that proposition.

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

The Hon. T.R. GROOM: I oppose the honourable member's amendment to delete the definition of 'committee'. This is tied up with part 9—the establishment of the consultative committee. If the member for Goyder is using this as the basis for his arguments, I would like to put a few things on the record now so I do not have to repeat them subsequently. In relation to the consultative committee, it is certainly correct that it was not envisaged by the working party, nor is there an equivalent position under the current Act. The functions of the committee are very appropriate, particularly in light of the powers of the new barley marketing legislation in relation to financial reserves and joint ventures. It has a quite a clear role to play in ensuring that the legislation is administered properly and sensitively, bearing in mind that there is a complete selection process in Victoria, notwithstanding that here we will have two elected and one selected.

I think the consultative committee can play a very contractive role, particularly after the passage of this legislation, with regard to assessing the feelings of barley growers in South Australia in so far as the composition of the board is concerned and in other ways dealing with the financial reserves and the potential power of the board to enter into joint ventures. So, in the context of contemporary conditions, the consultative committee will have a very constructive role to play under this

legislation, and I therefore have to oppose the honourable member's amendment.

Mr MEIER: To refresh the Minister's memory, I point out that, at the conclusion of my comments before the dinner break, I said that this clause should be reconsidered, if necessary, after clause 11.

The CHAIRMAN: Yes; the amendment will not be put at this stage.

Clause passed.

Clauses 4 to 10 passed.

Clause 11—'Members.'

Mr MEIER: I move:

Page 4—

Line 21—Leave out 'two' and substitute 'three'.

Line 22—Leave out 'one will be a person' and substitute 'two will be persons'.

Lines 24 and 25—Leave out this paragraph.

In essence, this is a combination of three amendments that seek to alter the number of persons either elected or selected. My first amendment seeks to have three persons elected by a poll of growers, instead of two; my second amendment provides for two people to be nominated by the selection committee; and my third amendment seeks to delete paragraph (e). This really is the crux of the debate that has been occurring for nearly three years on this whole issue, and I was disappointed to hear the Minister say in his second reading explanation that certain members were dealing with the petty problem of selection *versus* election. I was disappointed, because they have not been—

The Hon. T.R. Groom: I have not said it is a petty problem.

The CHAIRMAN: Order! The Minister will get ample opportunity to reply.

Mr MEIER: I will be happy to check through the official record on this and, if the Minister says he did not say it, that is fine, but I did not think my ears were deceiving me when he gave the impression that he felt it was a petty problem that the industry had been dealing with. However, I will check the record. Whatever the case, it is the crux of this whole Bill, and I certainly put forward some of the arguments in my second reading contribution as to why we should be considering the election of grower members to the board. There is no doubt that the area which I represent, namely, Yorke Peninsula, is a very important (in fact, I would regard it as the most important) barley growing area of the State.

Mr D.S. Baker: One of them.

The CHAIRMAN: Order!

Mr MEIER: It was disappointing to hear the Minister indicate that this push was coming from (I believe, in his words) 'a small section of barley growers'. Good grief.

The Hon. T.R. Groom interjecting:

The CHAIRMAN: Order! I will give the Minister loads of opportunity to reply. I ask him not to interject and to let the member for Goyder say what he wishes to say. The Minister can rebut it in due course.

Mr MEIER: Thank you, Mr Chairman. It will be interesting when the Minister is in Opposition later this year, and the interjections will come thick and fast on other issues—

The CHAIRMAN: Order! I ask the honourable member not to be provocative and to speak through the Chair.

Mr MEIER: Yes, Mr Chairman. I am surprised that the Minister did not hear me say during the second reading debate that the first significant meeting of barley growers was held on 30 April 1991, when some 454 growers packed the Maitland town hall. When the vote was put as to whether they wanted election or selection, there were some 450 votes in favour of election and three or four against and, I assume, in favour of selection. That was also repeated in several other places. I would like to refer briefly to the Gladstone meeting, where some 170 growers met, including the member for Custance. At that meeting 134 growers voted in favour of election and 16 voted against. If it were in order, I would ask the member for Custance whether he was a member of the 134 or the 16.

Mr Venning interjecting:

The CHAIRMAN: Order! The honourable member is not entitled to ask questions of members of his own side, and I would ask him to direct his remarks through the Chair.

Mr MEIER: Yes, Mr Chairman. The thing is that this is a very serious matter, and it has certainly caused me a lot of concern over the years. I have spent months on this matter, particularly when I was shadow Minister but also as the member for Goyder representing the Yorke Peninsula area; it has been a matter of continuing concern. I received some rather unflattering letters from members of the present South Australian Farmers Federation (and at that time it was known as the United Farmers and Stockowners) indicating among other things that they were disappointed with the stand I was taking, and in each case I either wrote back or, if they were constituents of mine, I went and saw them. The constituents seemed somewhat concerned that I was one of the parties holding up the Bill. I hope I put clearly on the record tonight where the blame lies for the Bill's being held up—it is quite clearly with the Government. I indicated very clearly the position I have held from very early days—from November 1990, if not before. When it came to the point, I argued the case for election.

In each case, those persons said to me, 'Look: we, too, believe that the grower members should be elected. However, because our farmers representative body has now gone along with the selection process concept, we will accept its concept and we will not argue any more on that issue.' It interested me, because they still were holding very much that this barley Bill had to go ahead—and I have no disagreement with that and, in fact, it is not my intention to hold up this Bill this evening. Certainly, I will make my points very clear and hope that the Committee will still reconsider its stand on election.

The thing is that the grower members as a body want election, even though their organisation may not support it in that case. I hope that members will see fit to support these amendments. Yorke Peninsula is a very important grower of barley, and I have in front of me a letter from

Mr Anthony Honner, one of the members of the current board. It is dated 8 July 1991, so it is over 18 months old, but the main reason for the letter is that it is the one document I have with me tonight indicating the importance of Yorke Peninsula. The letter reads:

Dear John,

Enclosed are the official South Australian Cooperative Bulk Handling figures to support my claim that on the last five year

average 40 per cent of South Australia's barley was delivered to the three Yorke Peninsula ports. Ken Schaeffer and Malcolm Sargent are saying that 25 to 27 per cent of South Australia's barley is grown on Yorke Peninsula. As the figures show, Port Giles and Ardrossan amount to 376 828 tonnes or 29 per cent of the State's total. In addition, direct receivals to Wallaroo account for 113 558 tonnes, plus Bute, 11 279 tonnes and Paskeville, 8 053 for a total of 132 890 tonnes, which most would consider is Yorke Peninsula.

Port Giles, Ardrossan, Wallaroo, Bute and Paskeville, on a five year average received 509 718 tonnes of barley or 39.16 per cent of the State's barley. The 40.78 per cent figure is the Wallaroo division, which feeds the Port of Wallaroo (Nantawarra, Brinkworth, Snowtown for an extra 19216 tonnes). Those figures indicate that, whether you agree 100 per cent with every last tonne, Yorke Peninsula is the largest barley producing area in this State and in this country, and it needs to be acknowledged as such. Therefore, I am absolutely amazed that the Minister has not given more credence to what the farmers on Yorke Peninsula and virtually throughout most parts of South Australia want as it relates to the election of grower members, and I urge all members to support the amendments I have moved.

The Hon. T.R. GROOM: I oppose the honourable member's amendments. If I accepted them, it would fly in the face of agreements that I have made with the Victorian Minister and, indeed, complementary legislation that is passing through the Victorian Parliament. As the honourable member correctly identified, it goes to the crux of the issue of selection as opposed to election. The compromise that has been worked out is a reasonable one, and one that the Parliament should adhere to. It does respect the integrity of all the organisations and relevant players involved, and the position of the Victorian Government, the South Australian Government and the Farmers Federation in each State.

I think their integrity as organisations should be respected. The Barley Board, the maltsters and the concerned barley growers have been able through legitimate means, through proper lobbying and through holding meetings, to effect a compromise in which instead of all being selected two will be elected and one selected. That is a reasonable compromise. The honourable member keeps somehow or other to problems that have persisted in this industry since the barley review took place, somehow or other trying to turn it all back on the Government as if it is the Government's fault—it is not that at all.

It has been correctly identified by the member for Custance: it has been an industry problem. The petty attempt at politics simply demeans the contribution of the honourable member because he well knows that it is not correct. He knows that the position is not correct. He has a peculiarly local problem on Yorke Peninsula because it is the centre of the resistance movement, so to speak, with regard to this issue. I know that there are other areas involved but Yorke Peninsula is a very significant barley growing area, and it is proper that people want to stand up for the position they adopt.

I remind members that so far 715 people have voted in some form or other or attended meetings at Maitland, Gladstone, Balaklava and at Palmer, which attracted only 35 people; and 386 people were involved in the *Stock Journal* survey. The Barley Board has 7 400 growers on its books. It is one point of view that is to be taken into account, but I do not think the honourable member should stand up after this process has taken place, after a significant number of lobby groups and interest groups have been involved, and say that the Government has been procrastinating. That is just not right.

It is no wonder that when I was on Yorke Peninsula with the honourable member, and we dealt with this issue, people wanted to know how they could vote for me at the next election, let alone the honourable member. If the honourable member is carrying on in his district as he is carrying on in this Chamber, it is no wonder that when I am on Yorke Peninsula they say, 'How can we vote for you?'

The Hon. JENNIFER CASHMORE: It may come as a surprise to other members to see a metropolitan member in whose electorate no barley has ever been grown, as far as I am aware, rise to speak on this clause.

Mr Lewis interjecting:

The Hon. JENNIFER CASHMORE: I am assured by the member for Murray-Mallee that his forebears grew barley, presumably in the north-eastern foothills which do fall partly within my electorate. I simply want to defend the member for Goyder and to commend him for doing what we are all supposed to do in this Chamber, that is, represent the people who put us here. The member for Goyder has in his electorate a town that bears at its boundary the grand title of the barley capital of the world. I am not sure whether that claim can be successfully put to the test, but it indicates quite clearly the extreme importance in the electorate of Goyder of the barley growers and of their view of representation, which I believe the member for Goyder has amply fulfilled and demonstrated tonight.

I have given this matter great thought, as we in the Liberal Party were all required to do and, although on a matter of principle I would normally tend to the view that election is the most effective way of ensuring that the wishes and views of people whose interests ought to be taken into account are taken into account, on balance, having heard all the arguments, I do not propose to support the amendments because I am convinced by the merit of the argument that a balance of expertise that goes beyond growing expertise and into the area of marketing research and development will be in the interests of the Barley Board and therefore in the interests of the State. I will not hear the member for Goyder being criticised for doing what he has done so well and for what I, for one, admire him for doing, that is, standing up for the people he represents.

Mr VENNING: I want to put the record straight. I commend the member for Goyder for representing his electorate, as the member for Coles has just said, and I congratulate him. I support the fact that he supports his growers, his electorate. However, I cannot support his amendments tonight because, as I said in my second reading contribution, I support the compromise situation of electing two growers, as was initially stipulated; and then, after everyone else has been appointed, the third one is selected.

I wish to pay tribute to the barley growers of Yorke Peninsula, but I do query the member for Goyder's

description of Yorke Peninsula, because I deliver grain to both Bute and Wallaroo and I did not think that I was a Yorke Peninsula grower. Apparently I am, so I will bask in that reflected glory. Perhaps I can pat myself on the back because I have always considered Yorke Peninsula growers to be world class in barley growing, especially in the technological side of barley growing, because those growers were some of the first to introduce barley rolling in Australia and then barley wind rowing.

They imported some of the first machinery used to pick up wind rowed barley. They have been pioneers, and I refer to families like Greenslade, Schultz and others who have led the way in Australian barley growing. It might appear that I am being critical of Yorke Peninsula growers, but I am certainly not. I have learned much from the member for Goyder's constituents in respect of barley growing and I am sorry I cannot support the member for Goyder nor some of the Yorke Peninsula barley growers in this issue.

The Hon. T.R. GROOM: Perhaps the member for Coles had a pre-position here, knowing that the member for Goyder was going to move amendments and defend the interests of his barley growers, who have made representations to him. I almost think the speech was predetermined, because the honourable member was not in the Chamber when I made my contribution. I am not criticising the honourable member for sticking up for barley growers: I was criticising him for his claim that the delay in the passage of the Bill is due to the Government's procrastination. That is just nonsense. It has been an industry—

Mr Lewis interjecting:

The Hon. T.R. GROOM: That just goes to show just how much in tune the member for Murray-Mallee is on this issue. I repeat: it has been an industry problem. That was my criticism of the member for Goyder in drawing a long bow and trying to play politics with the issue, and not for defending the rights of his constituents, which is his proper duty. I somehow think that everyone in the Chamber was probably aware that the member for Goyder would have to move amendments of this nature, and I cannot help thinking that the speech may already have been prepared.

Mr MEIER: For the Minister to say that it is not the Government's fault and that the Government has not been procrastinating is wrong. I will say it again: at the meeting in Maitland in April 1991, almost two years ago, the Liberal Party spelt out clearly that, if the industry could not decide for itself whether it wanted election or selection, it should poll its growers. We made the Minister well aware of our thoughts on that matter. I made the Minister well aware of it because I was the shadow Minister at the time.

There is absolutely no doubt that the one person who could implement that poll was the then Minister of Agriculture, and the reasons were simple. There was no provision in the Barley Marketing Act for a poll to be held, so a poll could not come under the Act. There was insufficient money so far as the then United Farmers and Stockowners organisation was concerned for it to carry out a poll of all barley growers. The United Farmers and Stockowners was happy to carry out a poll of members, but it was essential that all barley growers, whether United Farmers and Stockowners members or not, were polled. So, it left it to the Minister. The Minister had the option of providing $15 000 to $20 000 to enable the poll to proceed. That is an absolute drop in the ocean compared to the wastage that we have seen in so many other areas, as I alluded to in my second reading contribution.

That did not occur. We would have had the Bill at least 18 months earlier if the Minister had gone ahead and made that $15 000 to $20 000 available to conduct the poll. Therefore, one cannot blame anyone else for the procrastination that has gone on but the Minister and the Government. Hence, we have the argument that has been stated, and I hope that the current Minister understands the background to the issue.

The Hon. T.R. GROOM: I do not want to prolong the agony of this clause, but it is just not properly put by the honourable member that this delay is somehow due to the Government. If the Government had gone ahead and just held a poll as the honourable member suggests, we would have been ignoring the major players and the integrity of the groups involved. We would have been ignoring the position put by the South Australian Farmers Federation, the Victorian Government—both Victorian Governments in relation to this issue—the working party's recommendation, which was for all selection, the view of the Barley Board, the maltsters in Victoria and so on.

There is just no proper basis to advance the argument that the Government should run roughshod over all these groups who have a legitimate interest. The concerned barley growers are one group who have a legitimate interest and voice to be heard and, so far as the final position of this Bill is concerned, they have achieved a substantial amount. They have obtained from the Farmers Federation a movement from all being selected to two members being elected and one being selected, and they have achieved the ability to have a referendum or a poll on this matter.

To somehow turn this legislation around and claim that the delay is the Government's fault is just arrant nonsense. I saw that firsthand when I came into the portfolio. I met with industry groups and saw that they were polls apart. At that time I had to combat a change of Government in Victoria, which meant a change in stance on a number of issues. The fact is that one has to respect the integrity of the major players such as the Farmers Federation and the other groups I have mentioned. To do otherwise would have downgraded those organisations as bodies representative of farmers and growers in South Australia.

One does not just ride roughshod over them. In relation to this issue, in the context of the major issues that this Bill addresses, on 26 September 1991 the *Stock Journal* wrote:

> Election push, but do farmers really care? The debate to select or elect the Australian Barley Board could be the biggest yawn rather than the biggest issue facing South Australia graingrowers...

And so on. I will not go on because it then goes into a number of paragraphs. The opening phrase is 'Election push, but do farmers really care?' I believe that farmers want the board to get on with marketing, research and development to ensure that they are enriched in that

process, as indeed South Australia will be. I will not allow the honourable member to make those sorts of statements, claiming that it is the Government's fault and the Government's procrastination when in fact it is not and when all sections of the industry know that that is not the case.

Mr LEWIS: My view about the present debate and the amendment arises from my observation of the way the Labor Party has worked in government in this State since 1982—the basic tenets that it has held. It is my judgment that it has conned the Liberal Party all the way down the line on this deal. What the Government is determined to do is to ensure that a union rep gets onto an industry body. That is what it amounts to. It matters not whether that union rep really represents the workers and producers in that industry. The Government is determined to make that model stick. In this case, the union rep is the person who will be selected in consequence of the involvement of the South Australian Farmers Federation, not the barley growers.

As the member for Custance has pointed out, and as the Minister knows and as everyone else in here who knows anything about the industry at all knows, this issue and the attitude taken by the Grains Council in SAFF has so divided the barley growers that they have resigned in their droves from the Farmers Federation in protest at that policy. I have not been to Yorke Peninsula meetings at all: but I have been in my own electorate, and I am sure that it is no different on Yorke Peninsula. Barley growers have constantly reminded me that it is their industry and their product. They understand that the board, as part of its policy, must address the advancement and improvement of quality and marketing techniques, and so on. They understand that, and it is like the hide of the Government to tell them what they ought to think when, in fact, they were quite willing to have a poll.

So, regarding the point being made about a poll by the member for Goyder, I point out that the Government has had three years in which to conduct a poll. It could have done it at any time until now. There has been plenty of time to do it, but the Government has not wanted to do it, because it has known that the outcome would be an overwhelming rejection of selection. That is the way my barley growers put it to me and that is the way those people in the industry outside the electorate have bothered to put it to me in correspondence. I was getting plenty of stick on Friday at the Borrika Field Day, which the Minister attended, not only over his closure of Wanbi but also regarding this legislation, and if he did not pick up any of that he must have had his ears full of dust.

What the Government could have done is simply to provide the necessary funds. If this had been a matter such as Aboriginal affairs or the E&WS water rating problem, the outcome would have been different. The Government dragged out $100 000 straightaway to call in a consultant to resolve the water rating problem and to argue its case. It could not find the money in this case. It paid some of its old apparatchiki—the horses it had put out to pasture: Hudson and Dunstan. Dunstan did not do a damn thing for his money in Aboriginal affairs. He took the 50 grand and ran. I could have written the report overnight with my eyes closed. It was predictable what he was going to say, and the Government simply quoted him as an outstanding authority. Any ordinary thinking person, from any one of the community groups, would think that what he wrote was a lot of nonsense. It was not representative of what they thought. He did not even consult them. Yet, the Government paid him the money to do it, and the same went for Hudson: because he got it wrong the first time, they gave him another serve of money to have a second chop at it on water rates.

The Government can find money to solve its own internal policy problems in that way, and it has had three years in which to find a meagre $20 000 to do this, but it is too stingy because, first, it knows what the result will be before it sets out to discover and, secondly, it will mean that it goes against the general philosophical position that the Government must have 'a union rep' on an industry body of some kind or other. It sticks easily: it fits. For the Minister to claim that we are ignoring the South Australian Farmers Federation and other representative bodies is ruddy nonsense. They are not barley growers' representatives. That is why the barley growers resigned and that is why they keep coming back to me and chewing me around the back of the neck or wherever else they can get their teeth in over this whole issue.

Mr Venning interjecting:

Mr LEWIS: Of course, there are some barley growers in the South Australian Farmers Federation. I do not mind agreeing with the member for Custance on that point. But the fact is, as he pointed out himself, many barley growers resigned from the Farmers Federation because of its policy of selection against election. It was their industry and their proposal to get a board up in the first place. They do not understand now why they have to be subjected to this patronising attitude of 'You don't really know what is best for you, Sonny. Shut up! We are going to select your representatives on the board. Just be quiet. Let us get on with it. We will draft the legislation and do the selection. We know what is better for you than you do.'

All the arguments that have been put forward in support of the notion of selection—that expertise is needed and so on—are all legitimate parts of the election process, where candidates offer themselves and their skills and argue the point about the relevance of those skills to the industry and its advancement. That is what Parliament is about, for goodness sake. We do not need the patronage of kings to determine the law by which we govern ourselves. We threw that yoke off long ago. Why should the Minister therefore assume the mantle unto himself and to such other unrepresentative groups as may claim to be competent to act on behalf of the growers?

If the growers wanted selection, a poll would have decided that: if they wanted election, a poll would have decided that. Nothing could have been more democratic than to settle the matter there. I put to the House, if two can be elected and if it is competent and sensible to do that, why cannot three? Does it mean that the third one be would be incompetent and that the process would be nonsensical? Does it mean that the industry cannot be trusted to elect people who are capable of responding to what the industry needs and providing the policies that will guide its direction and development? If either of those questions has to be answered in the affirmative, as

I have said, Parliament ought not to exist: we should go back to having kings to make our laws for us.

The Minister's quoting the *Stock Journal* article really set the fire flaring again and the cat among the pigeons once more. Messages went in all directions after that article came out, as I recall. It was definitely not going to be a yawn if ever a poll were called: it was most definitely going to be a poll in which there would have been very willing debate, at least as willing and committed in the conduct as the debate about the Wheat Board and its retention a few years ago. That was conducted civilly and sensibly right across Australia.

I do not see any reason for us to suspect the capacity of barley growers themselves to decide, in the first instance, whether they wanted to elect their representatives to the board or have them selected on their behalf. At least they could have been asked that, and I believe they must be asked at the earliest possible and sensible opportunity. More is the pity the Government chose, for its own philosophical reasons, to procrastinate, defer, delay and deliberately obfuscate on that question. It simply did not have the will to do what it has done in every other instance, because it is not an electorally critical decision for the Government: it will not stand or fall at any point in the next 20 years on the outcome of this debate, but it certainly inflames the passions of the people who grow barley around South Australia.

The Government therefore knew that it had nothing to lose and everything to gain if it could put forward a proposition that seemed to gratify the primary industry group overall. The South Australian Farmers Federation does a fine job as an umbrella organisation for all primary industries. The Government saw an opportunity to ingratiate itself with the organisation and at the same time drive a wedge into the Liberal Party. That is the source of the Government's position. It is clever politics but absolutely despicable.

The Hon. T.R. GROOM: With the greatest respect to the member for Murray-Mallee, that is just nonsense. In fact, the way in which the honourable member has presented his arguments proves the case that the reason why this legislation has taken considerable time to reach this Parliament to be debated is the divisions that have taken place within the industry and, quite obviously, within the Liberal Party.

The Liberal Party has adopted a number of positions in relation to this matter. Because the Liberal Party itself has not been able to reach a form of consensus within its own Party room, it has taken those divisions out into the community and perpetuated the difficulty that has persisted with regard to resolution of these matters. Contributions of that nature are just not productive. With the greatest respect to the honourable member, it is a contribution that is designed to divide rather than to harmonise and reach agreement.

The combined views of the South Australian Farmers Federation and the Victorian Farmers Federation on this issue are quite simple and direct. They want, as does the Government, the best available expertise on the board. Their original joint position was that this was best achieved by selection. It was to the credit of the Farmers Federation, when it recognised that there was a difference of position with regard to barley growers, that it sought to accommodate that position and still keep faith with the findings of the working party, which will benefit barley marketing across two States and, hopefully, lead to some national export authority to coordinate the other States. However, it did move to a substantial extent to achieve a compromise, not a divisive position, as the honourable member is now pushing.

In August 1991, the Advisory Board of Agriculture stated its position—and it remains its position today, not being altered in any way. In a letter to the then Minister of Agriculture, the board stated:

> It is our belief that a selection process should encourage a healthy nomination process, in terms of numbers of candidates, and to eliminate misdirected loyalties that give disproportionate amount of attention to length of service, geniality or area representation. It should give the candidates an equal opportunity before an impartial selection committee, each and all with the one fundamental aim—to have a board with a balance in experience, qualifications and knowledge in the fields of production, promotion and marketing of the products under its care. The board has to be accountable for its decisions and demonstrate its expertise in business and financial management in order to establish and retain the confidence of producers, handlers and end-users of these products.

What I have been seeking to achieve, in the way in which this legislation is a series of compromises, is to promote harmony and consensus among barley growers. Instead, the member for Murray-Mallee wants to go out and perpetuate the same sort of myths and the divisive nonsense that will make it extremely difficult for the board and, indeed, the Farmers Federation and any other relevant group properly to function in this area.

The honourable member's recipe is a recipe for instability. I think the honourable member wants to wake up to the fact that this is a commonsense position. It has been arrived at in conjunction with the Victorian Government—a Government of his political persuasion—and as a result of negotiations between the Victorian Farmers Federation and the South Australian Farmers Federation. I have taken on board the views of the Barley Board, the Concerned Barley Growers and all relevant players and industry groups to achieve a consensus to ensure that, when this legislation is passed, as it must be, it does actually work in the best interests of the industry. All the divisive arguments have been perpetuated and have persisted for some time because the Liberal Party itself has not been able to a reach a consensus position on this to get on with the job and market barley in South Australia and Victoria for the benefit of the industry and for the benefit of farmers and growers.

Mr MEIER: I referred earlier to the absolute necessity for a poll to have been held earlier as that would have resolved the issue and the Bill could have, therefore, been brought on up to 18 months earlier. The Minister then asked, 'How on earth would the various players agree to the results of a poll?' This was before his time as Minister of Primary Industries, but it was agreed by all players—the Farmers Federation, the Concerned Barley Growers, the Liberal Party and, I suggest, the Government—that whatever the result of the poll, if the poll was clearly in favour of election or selection, so be it. The view of the Victorian people was

excluded completely. They made their view clear—they wanted selection. The result of our poll would not have influenced them at all and our Bill would have been able to proceed much earlier. I will not continue the argument as to who was right and who was wrong, but having had much to do with this issue and with this legislation over a long period I get a little upset when things are misrepresented by the Minister.

The Committee divided on the amendment:

Ayes (3)—G.M. Gunn, I.P. Lewis and E.J. Meier (teller).

Noes (43)—H. Allison, M.H. Armitage, L.M.F. Arnold, P.B. Arnold, M.J. Atkinson, D.S. Baker, S.J. Baker, J.C. Bannon, H. Becker, P.D. Blacker, F.T. Blevins, M.K. Brindal, D.C. Brown, J.L. Cashmore, G.J. Crafter, M.R. DeLaine, B.C. Eastick, M.J. Evans, S.G. Evans, R.J. Gregory, T.R. Groom (teller), K.C. Hamilton, T.H. Hemmings, V.S. Heron, P. Holloway, D.J. Hopgood, C.F. Hutchison, G.A. Ingerson, J.H.C. Klunder, D.C. Kotz, S.M. Lenehan, C.D.T. McKee, W.A. Matthew, M.K. Mayes, J.W. Olsen, J.K.G. Oswald, N.T. Peterson, J.A. Quirke, M.D. Rann, R.B. Such, J.P. Trainer, I.H. Venning and D.C. Wotton.

Majority of 40 for the Noes.

Amendment thus negatived.

The Hon. T.R. GROOM: I move:

Page 4, line 21—Leave out this paragraph and substitute the following paragraph:

(c) two will be growers by whom or on whose behalf barley is grown in South Australia (who are entered on the roll of growers in accordance with section 58) elected in accordance with the regulations; .

This amendment tidies up and is ancillary to the main clause.

Amendment carried.

Mr MEIER: My remaining two amendments relating to clause 11 depended upon my first amendment being successful, and that did not occur. I still hold firmly to the view that it would be fair and proper if the *status quo* had been retained, as I sought to do. We could have had a poll further down the track, but it would appear that that will not be the case, so I will not proceed with my amendments.

Mr D.S. BAKER: I move:

Page 4, after line 33—Insert:

(1a) The appointments under subsection (1) must be made in the following order:

(a) firstly—members under paragraph (c);

(b) secondly—members under paragraphs (a) and (b);

(c) then—members under paragraph (d); and

(d) as to the remaining members—in such order as the Minister and the Victorian Minister see fit.

Now we have decided the election/selection process, in the interests of getting the best people on the board, and especially that first board, the amendment seeks to have the board members appointed in sequence. So, first of all, nominations would be called for those who wished to be elected to the board and, when that was resolved, any of those people who were not successful at that election would then have a chance to be appointed to the board by the Minister. Then, after that, all of those people who were not successful and believed they had the ability would be able to nominate before the selection panel, to consequently get the best people for the board.

So, it is quite simple. All the amendment is saying is that in the initial board there should be a sequence—and that is going to take some time—to make sure that everyone has a chance, and in the conciliatory vein that the Minister says he is in it will allow, especially the grower members who are so vocal about election/selection, to follow the process through and have a chance at all stages. If the Minister is saying that we are here in a spirit of compromise, he would accept this amendment.

The Hon. T.R. GROOM: I cannot accept the amendment. I can certainly understand the spirit and the purpose in which the honourable member puts the amendment forward. I think it is a proper purpose. However, this is complementary legislation with Victoria, it is not supported by the Victorian Government and, as a consequence, I have to oppose the amendment.

From my own point of view, I think that in many respects some of the sentiments that the honourable member has expressed are proper, but I think that to put it in the Act would hamper the formation of the board and would in future require things to be operated in a straitjacket. A lot of the points and the purposes which underline the honourable member's position can be properly accommodated through an administrative arrangement between the Victorian Minister and the South Australian Minister. At the present time, my contact with Victoria is quite explicit. The Victorian Government is opposed to an amendment of that nature which would straitjacket the appointment of the board. Nonetheless, I think both Ministers can properly take on board the spirit of what the honourable member is putting.

Mr D.S. BAKER: I challenge the Minister for saying that the Victorian Coalition does not agree, because I have had discussions with it. However, it is nothing to do with the Victorian Minister, because it is our Bill. Just because they control us in the football world does not mean that the Victorians have to control us in the barley world. I would like to see the Minister stand up for the rights of South Australians and look at this amendment in a more kindly light. It is quite simple: all it does is ensure that in South Australia we get the best people on the Australian Barley Board.

The Hon. T.R. GROOM: It is much wider than that, and the honourable member knows it. It affects both States. It is not a question of pitting State against State. This is a matter of cooperation of States—of cooperation between South Australia and Victoria. This is not about doing Victoria over on the football field or Victoria doing South Australia over. I have spoken to the Victorian Minister, too, and officers of my department have been in contact with the officers of his department.

Mr D.S. Baker interjecting:

The Hon. T.R. GROOM: I am quite happy to have a conversation with the Victorian Minister in between the time that the legislation leaves this Chamber and the time it goes to the Upper House, but I also have a position in relation to this matter, irrespective of the Victorian Minister's position. We do have to try to harmonise and

reach agreement. I do not think a legislative straitjacket should be put on the formation of the board or the re-election or reappointment of people to the board in future.

I acknowledge that underlying the purpose of the honourable member's amendment are some positives, but I think those positives can be harnessed administratively between the two Ministers. But it is something that affects both States. I stress that this is not a contest between South Australia and Victoria. It is a matter of cooperation between the two States, reinforcing and strengthening the marketing authority in the best interests of growers in Victoria and South Australia.

Mr VENNING: I am very disappointed in the Minister. I thought we were getting on very well and in the spirit of compromise. I fully support the comments of my colleague the member for Victoria. I think this is quite a reasonable amendment. In fact, I thought the Minister would have agreed to it without any hassle. I am actually quite shocked to hear the Minister say that he will not accept it. He is blaming complementary legislation in Victoria. I remind the Minister who is the major barley growing State—it is South Australia by 70:30 ratio. I am sure the Victorians would be only too happy to cooperate and make this fit, if it needs to be made to fit in that way.

As I say, we are the dominant State in relation to barley, and Victoria would be the first to acknowledge that it is the junior partner. I think this amendment is critical. My earlier comments on the issue were for the compromise and I find this part very critical to it. It was in a spirit of compromise that we first of all allowed the election of two board members and then the selection process comes at the finish to see who has already been elected, and that gives the board the balance that only selection can give.

I am quite surprised. I know the Minister is an intelligent fellow, being a lawyer, and I compliment him on the way he has picked up his portfolio area, but I think he has got it wrong with this one. I hope he has time to think this over and he will see the folly in his previous comments. I think this Bill is all about the true spirit of compromise, and this part is critical: elect first and then select. I think in this instance the tail is wagging the dog.

The Hon. T.R. GROOM: I will put this in proper context. By supporting an amendment of this nature I will outline what members opposite are doing. There is a very short time frame for this legislation to pass both Houses: it is very late in the day to go bringing in amendments of this nature which are not agreed to at this point by the Victorian Government or the South Australian Government. The position regarding clause 11 has been worked out over nearly three years—at least 2 1/2 years. There has been extensive consultation with all relevant players in this industry, including the constituent members here: the South Australian Farmers Federation, the Victorian Farmers Federation, the Barley Board, the Advisory Board of Agriculture here in South Australia and all other relevant players.

Mr Venning interjecting:

The Hon. T.R. GROOM: The honourable member should listen. He ought to be very cautious of disrupting the passage of this legislation this side of the election. If this legislation does not proceed, the only alternative is to extend the existing Act and board. I ask members not to put me in the position of having to do that. This is not some ancillary question: it is a fundamental question relating to the formation of the board. It is not something incidental and it is not something trivial. It is a fundamental requirement in relation to the formation of the board that the Ministers have some degree of flexibility to ensure that the sentiments of the working party with regard to the relevant expertise, experience, and so on, find their way on to the board. In moving this amendment members opposite are affecting both States. Let us just analyse the amendment: the first part of it provides that 'Firstly, under paragraph (c)' two will be growers elected by a poll of growers.

Before the rest of the board can be constituted and up and running between now and 30 June, we have to delay to have a poll of growers. I remind members that this legislation expires on 30 June, so there can be no further marketing of barley into the 1993-94 year. So, there will be a further delay, and I have already stressed the difficulties the board is encountering with financial institutions, because they are scrutinising every document to ensure that the board does not exceed its powers in relation to the contracts and arrangements it has to enter into. So, before a new barley board can be put in place, the regulations have to be passed. There will be a further delay in getting the regulations up in relation to the way in which a poll of growers is to be conducted. A number of issues are involved, but it would place both the Victorian Minister and the South Australian Minister in a legislative straitjacket if before anybody could be appointed we had to have a poll of growers. And what if there is a dispute?

An honourable member interjecting:

The Hon. T.R. GROOM: It does. It provides that the appointments must be made in the following order: first, members under subparagraph (c); that is, two will be growers elected by a poll of growers. What if we have a poll, there is a dispute and one of the growers takes the issue to the Supreme Court and to the High Court or what have you, because feelings are so deep in this industry? What if that occurs? I cannot constitute the board. I cannot at least constitute sufficient members of the board to run the Barley Marketing Act. That is the danger: that is the straitjacket. That is what the honourable member would be doing, and he would undermine the whole purpose and intent of the legislation in getting the Barley Marketing Bill up this side of the election.

Members should not think that it is fanciful that someone might challenge the result of a poll, because it is not fanciful. I have visited Yorke Peninsula with the member for Goyder, and I know the position he is in. He has to defend the interests of a significant number of his constituents, and he has done that very well, except for his descent into the bear pit of politics and trying to boomerang something that he knows is not the Government's problem back to us. Apart from that, he has consistently come to me and discussed the issue with me. He has consistently put the view, as he sees it, which springs from his electorate, and properly so.

That is one thing, but at the end of the day if as a Parliament we succumbed to these local agenda we

would never get anywhere. That is the danger in this amendment. I know the sentiments behind it and I think they are quite admirable. It has nothing to do with the spirit of compromise to give away the whole Bill. I will not do that, because the Victorian Minister and I as State Minister could not proceed to constitute the board until a poll of growers was held. There could be a challenge on the methodology of the election, whether the rolls are up to date or anything else, and so on, and someone could take that challenge to the courts. The Victorian Minister and I can only proceed to make appointments when the all clear is given.

The next matter relates to paragraphs (a) and (b), which provide that one member will be nominated by the Minister and the other by the Victorian Minister. That is the pecking order, and it may not be all that difficult to achieve. Under paragraph (d), one member will be a person by whom or on whose behalf barley is grown in Victoria, nominated by the selection committee. The remaining members will be appointed in such order as the Minister and the Victorian Minister see fit. However, we are delayed, inhibited and prohibited from making the necessary appointments to the board.

So, I cannot accept the amendment, and I suspect the Victorian Minister would adopt the same approach. He will have to speak for himself in the Victorian Parliament when this legislation is debated there this week or next week. I did advise members that I would have a further discussion with the Victorian Minister in relation to this clause, but I do not want to delay the passage of the Bill, and I do not want to put something in the legislation that makes it unworkable, despite the sentiment that is attached to the amendment. I think that a lot of the sentiments that have been expressed can be accommodated.

It is not me, and it is not a South Australian Labor Government acting alone. I will be acting in conjunction with the Victorian Minister, who is of the same political persuasion as members opposite, and we will work this out properly and rationally and take into account the sorts of sentiments that the member for Victoria has properly pointed out. I know what is behind it, I understand it, and I think there is a degree of credibility. If members opposite cannot see the danger of putting these things in legislative form, straitjacketing the Victorian Minister and me from making appointments, running the risk that someone might challenge a poll, that we cannot get the legislation up and running, that we therefore might have to extend the present Act (which I simply do not want to do), I can tell them that, when we weigh up the risks, they are not worth it.

If members persist with the amendment, as they are entitled to do, and if they pass it in this Chamber, I believe it will undermine the Bill, and I do not think that is the wish of members opposite. I think that, judging from the vote on the last amendment, all members of the Parliament want to see a workable Bill emerge from the Committee but, if they support the amendment, they will not be doing that. They will just have to accept the advice I have obtained. I have spoken to Bill McGrath directly in relation to this matter, and the advice I have been given is that they are opposed to this.

Mr D.S. BAKER: For a start, it does not matter when it is held; after the poll of elected growers there can be a challenge at any time, and that does not affect whether it is held tomorrow, next week or in 12 months, so the Minister's argument is quite false. However, in the spirit of compromise, and if the Minister does claim that it puts a straitjacket on him, can he provide a guarantee that the South Australian members that sit on that board will be appointed in the spirit of the amendment, as was proposed? So, those who are from South Australia are elected first, then the ministerial appointment, and then the selection process occurs.

There are transitional provisions at the end of this legislation which I suggest will have to come into play at any rate if we want to have this Bill enacted by the end of June, and those transitional clauses could quite easily be that the members of the South Australian section of the old board carry on for a period while South Australians get a fair and reasonable chance to be elected, selected or appointed to the Barley Board to make sure that we have the best people. I am quite happy to withdraw the amendment if the Minister will give an undertaking to help South Australia. Let the Victorians help themselves, if he is not game to take the Minister on, but that is the only undertaking I want.

The Hon. T.R. GROOM: I have no difficulty in going down that path, and giving an undertaking, albeit in somewhat loose terms. I want to retain that flexibility with regard to the appointments, so I do not have to delay. The main concern is the poll that would be required first. I will go down the path of giving the undertaking the honourable member wants to a very significant extent, but I want to retain flexibility to act in a commonsense way in case there is an undue delay or a difficulty with the election of the growers. I will go one step further and consult with the shadow Minister with regard to the selection of people who come from South Australia to the board.

Mr MEIER: I support the member for Victoria in this amendment. I believe it is a step in the right direction, and I am interested to hear the Minister say that, certainly as it relates to South Australia, he will give an undertaking in somewhat loose terms. That is fine while the Minister is in this portfolio but, if he should be removed from office tomorrow, the position would be different with the next Minister. That always worries me. I believe that the correct procedure would be, first, to accept the member for Victoria's amendment. The Minister has expressed his reservations, but we should at least look at it very carefully between now and when the matter is debated in another place. I was somewhat concerned at the Minister's indicating that it is complementary legislation with Victoria and that we cannot go changing things without proper consultation. That is agreed, but let us consider the situation.

During the past 10 seasons of barley production in Australia, South Australia has produced 1 515 000 tonnes on average, whereas Victoria has produced 574 000 tonnes on average. In other words, Victoria produces on average one-third of the amount South Australia produces, so let us remember that we are the big player in this. I have said this to the Minister and to the previous Minister: let us not be dictated to by the Victorians. South Australia has too much at stake to follow what the Victorians may want. We have the right to determine what we want in this area, and I believe

that the member for Victoria's amendment is a sensible step in the right direction.

Mr BLACKER: I support the basic concept of what the member for Victoria has said, but I do understand what the Minister has said in relation to the timing. We have just three months to go before this legislation is to be in place, and it is paramount that the legislation get through this place as quickly as humanly possible. The concept of people being nominated and appointed to the board in order has considerable merit and, I think, should be pursued. If it cannot be done legislatively, the Minister should give an undertaking that he will use that basic concept in pursuing the appointment of the board in that way.

In view of what the Minister has said, does it mean that the declaration of the poll of the growers is paramount and would need to be in place before the board can actually be constituted? If that is the case, the only difference in timing will be between the declaration of the poll and the appointments that would be made by the Minister. Presumably, decisions would be made in the meantime or, conversely, the other way round. It may well be that we are talking of only a few days or a week between the two scenarios.

The Hon. T.R. GROOM: This is one of the difficulties with the election process, and I have no doubt that the reason why the working party brought down its report in favour of a selection process is essentially as put forward by the member for Custance, that is, that when you do have a selection process and not an election process a different set of procedures apply. With regard to selection, you do not have the sorts of problems with regard to disputed elections so, as the honourable member said, you elect your selection panel and then they select the team, so to speak, and your confidence is in the people you elect as a selection panel to select the team. I want to stress that this is the difficulty with introducing elections into boards of this nature. Of course, on the Wheat Board and other boards there is a trend completely away from this method of appointing people to the board through the election process.

The Citrus Board is another example of a selection process, and there are many others. The problem is, of course, that because we have effected a compromise and brought in two people who are now elected, when the working party and everyone else wanted all to be selected for very good reasons, to build up a corporate structure on the board and to build up the necessary expertise and not have people just put on the board through an election process representing a sectarian-type interest, it was to be done through a very reasonable and commonsense way by selection panel, which would have given growers an adequate say in relation to the board.

But the point that the member for Flinders has identified can arise irrespective of what I said. Putting it in legislative form in this way just doubles the difficulty of constituting the board. It could be a few days but, if I accepted the amendment and there were a dispute, there is no doubt that it would need to be done technically, in a very legal sense, because it says that two will be growers properly elected. Therefore, if there were a challenge and a prohibition order were applied in relation to the election process to the effect that people were not validly elected, I could not proceed to make the other appointments and there could be a very significant delay, and we would need to recall Parliament if that occurred.

I can see that it will be a very hotly contested election, one in which people will take differing positions. There could be challenges to the role of growers, and a whole range of things. It happens in union elections, and they can get very messy and take a long time to resolve. On the other hand, because the Victorian Minister and I are able to constitute the other positions on the board, because we have a sufficient quorum, it may well be that, as normally happens on election night, people recognise that, if there is a clear majority, that is it, and they do not worry about the challengers. But if that were not the case, this would be a very advantageous weapon for anyone to use, to be able to hold up the rest of the board and to effect a further political compromise by being able to do these things.

So, the member has correctly identified that it still could be a problem in the process, but it would be a double problem if it were straightjacketed. The member for Victoria indicated that he would be prepared to accept an undertaking in some reasonable form, and I can give that, but I want to retain that flexibility to overcome the very problems that will still be in the system, which the member for Flinders has properly identified. I will need to overcome those, and I will consult with the shadow Minister in relation to the South Australian people to be selected to the board.

I will do that because I do have great faith in the member for Victoria. He has kept his word on every occasion, and in what he says and does he is totally reliable, and you can rely on the honourable member's sticking to his word. I hope that he will reciprocate and understand that I will do my best to implement the sentiments that the member for Victoria has put forward. However, I must have that degree of flexibility in case there are any unforeseen problems, as the member for Flinders has identified.

Mr BLACKER: I thank the Minister for his explanation. Can I deduce from what he has just said that, should a difficulty arise with the election process, and the appropriate appointments can be made through the other criteria, that the board can be constituted before 30 June and put in place even though the two elected members at that time have not been appointed, or is it a situation where all the positions must be filled before the board can be properly constituted? If I can just take it one step further: could the Minister also indicate at which point in the passage of this legislation the present Barley Board can proceed with arranging finances for next year's crop, with the reasonable expectation that the legislation is in place?

The Hon. T.R. GROOM: Under clause 11 as it stands, if there were a dispute in the election process we will have a sufficient quorum to constitute the board, so it will proceed. There is no question of that. But under the amendment, and this is the straightjacket, if there were a dispute there is an order by which people can be appointed, and that dispute could well extend beyond 30 June and we would not be able to constitute the board. That would present a conundrum. It is a situation I do not think anyone would wish on the Barley Board. But under the clause as it stands, we do have sufficient

numbers to constitute a quorum irrespective of that election process.

Mr BLACKER: And at which point in the passage of the legislation can the Barley Board proceed with the arranging of finances and so forth for next year's crop? At what time do we get through here that the board can confidently say, 'The legislation is in place: we can go ahead.'

The Hon. T.R. GROOM: As soon as it has been proclaimed, and we are working on the regulations now; as soon as it has passed both Houses, on the assumption that occurs. We certainly want this Bill to come into force well before 30 June.

Mr D.S. BAKER: Because of the Minister's conciliatory attitude and his flattering remarks, I am left with no option other than to withdraw my amendment, because to do otherwise would be unsporting. Because of the undertaking he has given to the Committee, I seek leave to withdraw my amendment.

Leave granted; amendment withdrawn.

Clause passed.

Clause 12—'Selection committee.'

Mr D.S. BAKER: I move:

Page 5, line 6—After 'persons' (second occurring) insert '(who may be—but need not be—members of the South Australian Farmers Federation Incorporated)'.

The amendment makes it perfectly clear that this little club, as some members have been talking about it, the South Australian Farmers Federation, does not have control of members appointed to the selection committee. It is a simple amendment, which formalises something that is meant. This matter is of concern to barley growers. They are concerned about appointments being confined to members of the club. I believe the appointments should be open to those who are and those who are not members of the South Australian Farmers Federation.

The Hon. T.R. GROOM: I cannot support the amendment, because the clause is not binding. Only four persons are nominated by the federation. The clause does not say that they have to be members. That situation and discretion is already incorporated in the Bill. I cannot accept the amendment, because it does not affect only South Australia. Paragraph (b) provides that exactly the same position obtains in relation to the Victorian Farmers Federation. I can assure the honourable member that the Victorian Government will not change the legislation to incorporate such an amendment. From my point of view, I cannot accept such a difference, although the Committee may have a different point of view. I would not impinge on the integrity of the South Australian Farmers Federation *vis-a-vis* the Victorian Farmers Federation and draw a distinction between the two.

I do not believe that that is reasonable, particularly when subclause (1)(a) does the same thing. The amendment simply highlights that somehow we have put a dead weight around the South Australian Farmers Federation in South Australia, that we do not have the same confidence in that organisation as the Victorian Government has in the Victorian federation. I do not want to be drawn into the position of delineating between the two federations. It is a commonsense approach. Somehow, we would be displaying the Parliament's displeasure at the South Australian Farmers Federation, but for what? For looking after farmers and growers, for pursuing its legitimate course and pursuing the way it sees that it should be looking after this industry. I would be downgrading the federation if I accepted the amendment.

I do not think that that is the motive behind the amendment at all. The member for Victoria simply wants to make it quite clear that members of the committee do not have to be members of the South Australian Farmers Federation but, because the Victorian Government will not alter its clause, there is no legitimate reason why there should be a distinction. It would be interpreted in the wider community as some displeasure in the South Australian Farmers Federation when none exists, certainly from my point of view. It would simply encourage further division in the industry with regard to this piece of legislation. The position that the honourable member seeks already applies: they do not have to be members of the federation. I would rather leave paragraphs (a) and (b) to mirror one another so that there is no suggestion that the federation has incurred the wrath or displeasure of this Parliament in some way, because that would be a wrong construction.

Mr D.S. BAKER: I am willing to withdraw the amendment if the Minister gives an assurance that paragraph (a) means that the four persons do not necessarily have to be members of the South Australian Farmers Federation. If he gives that assurance to the Committee, I would be willing to withdraw my amendment.

The Hon. T.R. GROOM: At first reading one might legitimately hold the view that the honourable member had in moving the amendment, but there is no question, as a matter of legality, about this and I can give the assurance that he seeks. The provision refers to four persons nominated by the South Australian Farmers Federation. It allows the federation to nominate people who are or who are not members. I can readily give that assurance.

Mr D.S. BAKER: I seek leave to withdraw my amendment.

Leave granted; amendment withdrawn.

Clause passed.

Clauses 13 to 34 passed.

Clause 35—'Authorised receivers.'

Mr D.S. BAKER: I move:

Page 14, after line 21—insert:

(5) An authorised receiver appointed to receive barley or oats in South Australia must not, except in that capacity, have a direct or indirect interest in a business involving the buying or selling of barley, oats or other grain or in a body corporate carrying on such a business.

I understand that this provision was in the draft Bill circulated earlier. It makes clear that only the Barley Board can be involved in buying and selling barley and oats. The amendment is legitimate. Evidently there was some fear at some stage that another organisation might be able to be involved. To clear up the anomaly I ask the Minister to accept my amendment, which reintroduces subclause (5) as contained in the earlier draft, because it makes it clear that the board alone can receive and market the product.

The Hon. T.R. GROOM: I indicate to the honourable member that there is substantial merit in the amendment. I do not want to alter what I have already agreed with the Victorian Minister, although this does not affect Victoria and its Bill could pass without having the amendment in it. However, out of courtesy to the people involved, I would like to explain the amendment to the Victorian Minister and the relevant organisations entitled to have a say. I will do that before the Bill is considered in the other place. The amendment is desirable and, unless I am contradicted by the Victorian Minister or one of the relevant organisations (and I undertake to notify the honourable member immediately if opposition is raised), it can be moved in another place.

I am acting in an excess of caution because I do not want any disagreements to occur. Already there has been an attempt to have stock feed permits taken out of the Bill, but I have reached agreement that that will not take place. Every time we open it up another organisation wants to come in with another position. I want to make completely sure that it is not going to have any other consequences in relation to any other provision of the Bill. I do not think that will be the case and I thank the honourable member for drawing our attention to the matter because it is an amendment that probably does need to be incorporated in the Bill.

Mr VENNING: I am pleased the Minister has chosen to support the amendment. It is an important one, because this was a door that we needed to close firmly; not only could we have other people coming in on the marketing but we could have our own cooperative bulk handling company becoming involved in marketing. The precedents are already there for that, and I refer to Queensland. I am not saying there is necessarily anything wrong with that. We want to be clear at this point in respect of what we are doing with this legislation.

I believe that next year we will be discussing the grain handling legislation, which I believe will expire with the fluctuation of time, and we could be discussing the other side of this issue. If we do not seal off this door now, we could have a can of worms. There are many questions that could be raised before the discussion on grain handling is completed, such as: should our bulk handler be involved in marketing; should it own wharves; should it own belts; and should it run its own trains? There are various people in the organisation pushing this way, so I am pleased that the Minister has supported the door staying firmly closed.

Mr D.S. BAKER: Given the assurance of the Minister, I seek leave to withdraw my amendment.

Leave granted; amendment withdrawn.

Clause passed.

Clauses 36 and 37 passed.

Clause 38—'Pools.'

Mr MEIER: I do not wish to proceed with my amendment, because it is not guaranteed that the Barley Board will have a grower majority, as I had sought. It is a shame that, therefore, we have to insist on the establishment of the Barley Marketing Consultative Committee. This committee was to be, amongst other things, a liaison between the growers and a possible grower minority on the board. I was hoping to save the salaries of some five persons and to stop the establishment of another bureaucratic institution. That will not be the case. I will not proceed with my amendment.

Clause passed.

Clauses 39 to 41 passed.

Clause 42—'Permit to purchase barley for stock feed.'

Mr D.S. BAKER: I move:

Page 18, line 4—Leave out ', in a form approved by the board,'.

This amendment makes it easier for a person requiring a stock feed permit, or a maltsters licence, to obtain that licence. Further, it does not close off the form in which information can be provided. It is good business practice that a person not be required to apply to the board 'in a form approved by the board'. In this day and age of phones and faxes, such information as is required by the board quite rightly should be given, but it does not really matter whether it is given on the back of an envelope. I would hate someone who wants to get a stock feed permit in a drought situation or in any other situation where a permit is required urgently not to be able to obtain it in a matter of hours because they did not give the board the appropriate form. Of course, they must give the board the appropriate information, and this amendment tidies up the legislation.

The Hon. T.R. GROOM: Unfortunately, I cannot accept the amendment, and the same argument applies to the subsequent amendments. The legislation has been through an exhaustive process, and I guess both States have come to a position that, where amendments that affect both States are involved, we should not open it up. This is a bit of tidying up. Again, I can appreciate the reasons behind the honourable member's moving it. If I were a sole player in this, I would probably have no hesitation in accepting the amendment, but I am not a sole player and I have to recognise that the Victorian Government has also been through an exhaustive process. Because this is one of the specific matters that has been taken up with the Victorian Minister, who has indicated that the Victorian Government is opposed to amendments of a joint nature that would affect two States, I likewise oppose it. That is not to say that the door is closed in this regard.

As with the amendment to clause 35(5) that the honourable member moved, I will take up this matter with the Victorian Minister to establish whether that is a concrete position on the Government's part. If it is not, an amendment can be moved in the Upper House. However, the indication that I have at the moment is that, for the purposes of expediting the legislation and not opening up clauses of this nature, not having to go back to the board and not seeking input here or there simply to get the legislation through, we can use the consultative committee to tidy up anything that needs to be rectified later. At this stage, I oppose the amendment.

Mr BLACKER: I seek further information regarding the point raised by the member for Victoria. Is the Minister assuring the Committee that the board could give approval where an application is made via a facsimile machine to the board, or does a prescribed form, number 27(a), have to be used?

The Hon. T.R. GROOM: At present, the person applies to the board in a form approved by the board, in other words, following the correct procedures. I take this as a matter of procedure. However, it also has a

substantive application; I think it is wider than a procedural step. I take it that the actual form approved by the board goes into substantive issues such as the nature of the information that the board might want.

I think the member for Victoria has probably identified that in his second amendment because, if we took out those words, we would have to reinsert much the same provision to do the same sort of work. The only work it has to do is to set the procedure and empower the board to require particular information. That appears to me to be its work—both a procedural and a substantive step. However, if we take those words out of clause 42, we have to do exactly what the member for Victoria proposes through his later amendments and effectively reinsert the provision. I am advised that there is not a prescribed form at the present time.

Mr D.S. BAKER: There might not be a prescribed form at the present time, and it frightens the hell out of me that there will be one at some future date. That is the whole point: the Ministers in both States are surrounded by bureaucrats who probably do not understand that someone at Wanbi or Ceduna might not have the approved form. Many times I, as an elected member, look after constituents' problems because they have not applied in the approved way. If the provision refers to the gathering of such information as is required by the board, I do not have a problem. However, to clear up the matter, I can assure the Committee that, if there is a change of Government, I will be seeking talks with the Victorian Minister to ensure the provision is changed to be a simple form and to mean what we think it means. It is unclear, and it allows someone who does not understand that business has to go on to hold up that process.

The Hon. T.R. GROOM: Again, I think there is some merit in the proposition being put forward by the honourable member. As I understand it, there is not a prescribed form at the present time, and the type of information the board would require relates to whether or not the research levies have been collected, in which case the board would proceed to take appropriate action. I say there is some merit in the what the honourable member is advancing because, from a legal practitioner's point of view, 'in a form approved by the board' could mean either a procedural or a substantive step.

However, what I want to get across is that, because it is really peripheral and incidental, it would still have exactly the same work to do, and it really gets down to a preference in wording. Logically, the honourable member cannot leave it at that, because the board has to have power to obtain such information as is required. The honourable member would have to move a subsequent amendment to insert 'the information required' to give the board that express power. So, it is actually doing the same thing. If I were the lone player, I probably would have no hesitation in saying that the tidying up that the honourable member proposes is reasonable and commonsense.

However, because this is complementary legislation and because the issue has been expressly raised with the Victorian Minister, I would like the opportunity to raise it again with the Minister. I will undertake to do that, although I do not think it is a matter that needs to go around in a circle too much. It is not a major amendment: it involves a preference in wording as to where the various powers appear. That is the difficulty I have with regard to this legislation, and I undertake to raise the matter with the Victorian Minister. I have to oppose the amendment now, because we have had a conversation with the Victorian Minister and the Victorians are opposed to it at present.

The honourable member may care to ring the Victorian Minister himself, and that could be done between now and when the legislation goes to the Upper House. However, because the position of the two Ministers is that the Bill just has to proceed and that we cannot open up everything and go around in a circle—the time frame just does not permit that—I would rather proceed in the way I have indicated and take up the issue in writing with the Victorian Minister. Most of the communications at this late stage have been virtually on a car phone, and that is just not satisfactory for a piece of legislation of this nature.

An honourable member interjecting:

The Hon. T.R. GROOM: Well, it is because they are coming at this late stage. What I would like to do, after the debate in this Chamber is completed, is to write immediately to the Victorian Minister and set out the matters on which I have given undertakings, asking for his view in writing before the Bill is debated in the Upper House.

Amendment negatived; clause passed.

Clause 43—'Licence to purchase barley for malting or other processing.'

The Hon. T.R. GROOM: I move:

Page 18—

Line 23—Leave out 'with' and substitute 'within'.

Line 33—Leave out 'containing'.

These amendments correct typographical errors and represent minor tidying up.

Amendments carried; clause as amended passed.

Clauses 44 to 50 passed.

Clause 51—'Separate accounts for different pools.'

The Hon. T.R. GROOM: I move:

Page 24—

Line 5—Leave out 'Subject to section 38(4), the' and substitute 'The'.

Line 8—After 'grain' insert 'of a season'.

Again, this is a tidying up matter regarding clerical errors. Victoria picked up these errors in our Bill.

Amendments carried; clause as amended passed.

Clauses 52 to 57 passed.

Clause 58—'Provisions as to polls.'

Mr D.S. BAKER: I move:

Page 27, lines 30 and 31—Leave out these lines.

I do not know what the Minister is getting at. This provision seems to have slipped in. The Victorian Minister did not know anything about it. He says that this was a typographical error. If someone does not vote, will the Minister take away their crop or their tractor or, if they need that, their wife and children? The mind boggles! I do not think that any grower organisation would want compulsory voting at a poll by their growers, and I ask that the Minister withdraw it.

The Hon. T.R. GROOM: I am not prepared to withdraw it. It is in the Victorian Bill, and it is not a minor typographical error: it is a particularly important clause. I can tell members where I stand on compulsory

voting. If you want to have elections, if you want to participate on the board, in my view all barley growers who are registered with the board should go to the ballot box and vote, because otherwise this sort of distortion creeps in: a small proportion of barley growers claiming to represent 7 400 barley growers in South Australia. This is the traditional problem with having elections for boards of this nature.

Regarding the number of attendances at meetings, 719 people attended the four meetings: Maitland, 454; Gladstone, approximately 150; Balaklava, 80; and the fourth meeting at Palmer attracted 35 people. Of 7 400 barley growers in South Australia that is a small proportion. When the *Stock Journal* surveyed all barley growers in 1991, 386 or 5 per cent of the total number participated in the poll. That leads to the assertion that this is what barley growers right across the board want in South Australia—everyone elected.

An honourable member interjecting:

The Hon. T.R. GROOM: Well, that is the position that is advanced. Regarding the argument for compulsory voting, with an election I would always go down that path because, if you assert that this is what barley growers want, all barley growers should have a say, so that you ensure that whatever you are voting on has the support of the majority of barley growers in South Australia. But subclause (6) does not provide that. It states that the regulations may provide that it is compulsory for growers whose names appear on the roll to vote at the poll.

There may be a circumstance where it is desirable to have a proper poll of barley growers and not rely on a particular section to go to the poll with the majority hoping that the Government or other industry groups or the Farmers Federation would bail them out. It is a discretionary provision, it is in the Victorian Act and there is no reason why it should not be inserted in the South Australian Act. It does not make compulsory voting mandatory although, as I said, as a matter of philosophy I support compulsory voting. That does not mean to say that I would do that as Minister.

In this industry, I would go to the interest groups and seek the view of the Opposition through the shadow Minister, the Barley Board and everyone else to see what they think is appropriate. I would also consult with the concerned barley growers because their voice should be heard as well. I would seek their views as would the Victorian Minister. There may be an occasion when it is desirable to have a poll of all barley growers. That does not mean that they would have to go to a polling booth, as we do on election day; it could be done by postal ballot.

Mr S.G. Evans interjecting:

The Hon. T.R. GROOM: I do not think the member for Davenport can throw any boomerangs in that regard.

The CHAIRMAN: The Minister will not be drawn by interjections; he will address the Chair.

The Hon. T.R. GROOM: I do not think the member for Davenport has any platform in this place to say that someone is speaking for too long following his record of making speeches. We could end up arguing this *ad nauseam* when it is not a major event. It is in the Victorian Bill; they want to keep it in their Bill and we want to keep it in ours. It is desirable to have these powers in case you want to use them. However, I make it plain that there is no way that as Minister I would impose compulsory voting if that was completely against the wishes of all industry groups.

Mr Venning interjecting:

The Hon. T.R. GROOM: That may well be, but at a dinner before the Federal poll the honourable member was absolutely confident that Hewson would get up, so I cannot place any reliance upon his judgment.

The CHAIRMAN: I ask the Minister to come back to the Bill.

The Hon. T.R. GROOM: When passing legislation of this nature, it is desirable to provide the maximum range of powers that one can use. The Minister of the day will exercise those powers responsibly. As far as I am concerned, I would consult with all the relevant groups before making such a decision.

Mr D.S. BAKER: In the light of the Minister's views on compulsory voting, I am not prepared to accept that he would not force it through.

The Committee divided on the amendment:

Ayes (22)—H. Allison, M.H. Armitage, D.S. Baker (teller), S.J. Baker, H. Becker, P.D. Blacker, M.K. Brindal, D.C. Brown, J.L. Cashmore, B.C. Eastick, S.G. Evans, G.M. Gunn, G.A. Ingerson, D.C. Kotz, I.P. Lewis, W.A. Matthew, E.J. Meier, J.W. Olsen, J.K.G. Oswald, R.B. Such, I.H. Venning and D.C. Wotton.

Noes (22)—L.M.F. Arnold, M.J. Atkinson, J.C. Bannon, F.T. Blevins, G.J. Crafter, M.R. DeLaine, M.J. Evans, R.J. Gregory, T.R. Groom (teller), K.C. Hamilton, T.H. Hemmings, V.S. Heron, P. Holloway, D.J. Hopgood, C.F. Hutchison, J.H.C. Klunder, S.M. Lenehan, C.D.T. McKee, M.K. Mayes, N.T. Peterson, M.D. Rann and J.P. Trainer.

The CHAIRMAN: There being an equality of votes, I give my casting vote for the Noes.

Amendment thus negatived; clause passed. Clause 59 passed.

Clause 60—'Establishment of Barley Marketing Consultative Committee.'

Mr MEIER: I do not wish to proceed with my amendment as it relates to clauses 60 to 68.

Clause passed.

Clause 61 passed.

Clause 62—'Members.'

Mr D.S. BAKER: I think this involves the same matter as the earlier one. The Minister is giving an undertaking to the Committee that it will not be restricted only to South Australian Farmers Federation members but that it will be open to all people to be involved in that process.

Clause passed.

Clauses 63 to 75 passed.

Clause 76—'Transitional provisions relating to the board.'

Mr D.S. BAKER: I move:

Page 32, after line 17—Insert:

(6) Before the expiry of the first term of office of members of the board elected from growers by whom or on whose behalf barley is grown in South Australia (see section 11 (1)(c)) but at least one year from the commencement of this Act, a poll under section 58

may be held to decide whether the Act should be amended to allow for a change in the method of the nomination of their successors.

This has been the principle behind many of our arguments concerning this Bill. It was always envisaged, and many of the speakers on this side have said, that a poll of growers should have been held before this Bill came into the House so that the matter could be resolved. All we are providing for here is that at a future date, a year after the commencement of the Bill, a chance be given if required by industry to clear up the election/selection matter. I think it is only right and proper that we give the industry that chance if it requires it.

The Hon. T.R. GROOM: I oppose the insertion of this subclause. The compromise position that has been arrived at has not been an easy matter to achieve. I want to make that quite clear. This actually disturbs a fundamental position of that agreement, that position being that we had the Bill amended, which was not in accordance with the wishes of the Farmers Federation. The Farmers Federation thought it had gone far enough with regard to altering the stance of the working party in relation to the selection versus election issue, and it had.

For the sake of a legacy of the 1947 Act and against the recommendations of the working party, cutting across almost every other board now being set up to function on corporate lines, with efficiency, with proper processes regarding the selection of personnel for the various boards, and contrary to the Wheat Board, this measure cuts across the general movement towards boards being selected for expertise, for people who can do the job, not necessarily representing a sectarian type of interest or throwing someone up because a group of people decide that is appropriate.

As a consequence, against the wishes of the Farmers Federation, I effected a form of compromise which was acceptable to the Victorian Government. Quite frankly, I do not think it is exactly rapt in the division that has taken place in South Australia. On the other hand, of course, they have had the problem with the maltsters. They have been able to arrive at that situation in a very satisfactory way, even though it is a change in the stance taken by the previous Victorian Government. Nevertheless, I was able to accept that.

Likewise, at the end of the day, there is the position of the integrity of the farmers' organisation here in South Australia. It has gone a very substantial way towards meeting many of the aspirations of the Concerned Barley Growers in South Australia; that is, they modified their position to have two elected and one selected, contrary to the initial position of that organisation. To accommodate the Concerned Barley Growers, because I recognised that it had a genuine point of view—it had an integrity of its own to protect—I have gone a very significant way in incorporating in clause 58 a requirement for a poll. Subclause (7) does much of the job that this amendment does, as follows:

A poll may be taken under this section—

(a) for a purpose contemplated by this Act; or

(b)—

which has the dominant function—

for the purpose of determining any other question that should, in the Minister's opinion, be submitted to a poll.

If I accept the amendment to this clause this would not allow the board to settle down. It would not allow the board to get on with the job. The board would be under the sword of Damocles with regard to its operations: people knowing that there has to be a poll and it has to take place within a certain time. An enormous amount of reform and good work goes into this measure in so far as the new marketing arrangements of the board are concerned. There are an enormous number of tasks for the board to embark on. There are improvements in a variety of areas. It requires commitment on the part of board members. Some of those reforms are of a very significant dimension in relation to the creation of reserves and better pooling arrangements in relation to marketing. The board has to be able to get on with the job, without these threats hanging over its head all the time.

I have incorporated a provision that enables me as Minister, or any successive Minister, if this issue is still around, to determine whether there should be a poll. I will facilitate a referendum after a period if that is the wish of all the interested groups and all the players, but I would ask the Committee to reject the amendment—not because it is something that might not take place; it may well be something that does take place. After the election has taken place and the personnel have been appointed to the board, I would like to end the instability that surrounds the barley marketing arrangements and the composition of the Barley Board. I would like people in the industry to have the opportunity to start working together. To put a mandatory requirement in legislation of this nature will perpetuate the divisions on the board, and in a negative way, not a desirable way.

I have gone a substantial way towards meeting the Concerned Barley Growers position. I have respected the integrity of the Farmers Federation in this State, which is the major player; it is the major industry body. I have indicated to it that, as a matter of propriety, I would have to meet some of the wishes of the Concerned Barley Growers. I urge members to look at the practical consequences of inserting this amendment in the legislation. It will not end the divisions; it will perpetuate the divisions and the instability of the board, and I think there is sufficient power in clause 58(7)(b) for a poll to take place. Clause 59 provides that the board must bear the costs and expenses of a poll under this legislation. I will say to the Committee that, if this issue of selection versus election is still in the system after the passage of the legislation, as Minister I will facilitate the holding of a referendum, because I could not do otherwise.

An honourable member interjecting:

The Hon. T.R. GROOM: Well, a successor Minister; it doesn't matter. Ministers give undertakings on the basis that their successors can or cannot pick up those undertakings. One has to deal with contemporary events. In putting that position, I am not the sole player in relation to this legislation. I have done this mindful that this might take place. I have consulted with all the relevant groups in the industry, and the desirable thing for this barley marketing legislation is to end the divisiveness, to allow the board to settle down and allow the industry to get together. Everyone in this Chamber would know that, if this amendment is passed, the

practical consequence will be to perpetuate the instability surrounding the board. I have to get the message across.

Members interjecting:

The Hon. T.R. GROOM: I will say it a fifth time.

Mr Olsen interjecting:

The Hon. T.R. GROOM: The honourable member has not done a bad job in his time, either. This is quite a critical amendment, and I want to stress that it is complementary legislation, worked out with the Government of the honourable member's political persuasion in Victoria. It has been worked out as complementary legislation. If it passes in this form—

Members interjecting:

The Hon. T.R. GROOM: It has something to do with Victoria, because it perpetuates the instability surrounding the board, and Victoria—

Members interjecting:

The CHAIRMAN: Order! If anybody wishes to enter the debate I will give them the call next time. The Minister.

An honourable member interjecting:

The Hon. T.R. GROOM: I do not think the member for Kavel should deal with the matter in that flippant way. This is of considerable significance to the Barley Board in South Australia, and everyone knows that, including the member for Custance. I would not be putting this position so forcibly and repeating it so many times in the hope that the message gets across if members appreciated that I have taken into account the views of all the players in this industry, including the Farmers Federation, which backed the GST.

Mr MEIER: I am very disappointed with the Minister's attitude towards this amendment. I certainly support it. The Minister is completely wrong when he says that it would increase instability within the industry and generally. The amendment is very clear. If a problem is still occurring in the method of nomination of the board (in other words, it is not left to general purposes), after the expiration of at least one year but before the next board—in other words, within the next one to three years—a poll may be held. It does not say that a poll must be held, as the Minister indicated in one of his comments. It may be held. It is simply putting beyond doubt, making it very clear that the assurance given to various members and groups in the industry is genuine.

I think the Minister is now backing away from his earlier commitments, and it worries me terribly that, when this Minister is no longer Minister of Primary Industries, it will just disappear and, if a group does come forward, the new Minister will say, 'Hang on, we have no definitive undertaking here regarding the nomination of the members of the board.' Let us make it very clear. This has been a point of contention for so long now. All sides agreed that the poll is the way we should have gone a long time ago. I cannot understand why the Minister is backing away from this. It will not make a scrap of difference to the Victorian legislation. They can leave it out if they want to, that is fine, but in South Australia it is critical. It is a key feature that needs to be in place in this legislation.

The Hon. T.R. GROOM: I directed the Committee's attention to the practical consequences of the passage of this amendment and the spirit and wishes of this Parliament. The practical consequences are that, whether the wording incorporates 'may', 'shall', 'should' or whatever, once we put an express amendment of this nature into the legislation, the practical consequence is to raise the clear expectation that a poll will take place after one year.

Members interjecting:

The Hon. T.R. GROOM: Let's stick to the clause, because that is the practical consequence. Members opposite know exactly what will occur. Every person who has an interest in holding a poll will be out there immediately canvassing for a poll, and it will divert the Barley Board from its proper task—the reforms that have been long overdue and long held up because of divisiveness within the industry. What I am saying is not fanciful; this is of great concern to the Barley Board and other sections of the industry and to the Farmers Federation. Members should make no mistake about that, because the practical consequence is to perpetuate the divisiveness, the agitation and the campaigns that have surrounded the composition of the board.

The board has some very vital tasks to undertake. I have already indicated that I have amended the earlier Bill to incorporate the fact that a poll can be taken, but I have sought to do it in a responsible way, without straitjackets, in a way which does not perpetuate instability surrounding the board and which does not enable people immediately to go out campaigning the day this legislation is proclaimed. That is the practical consequence of what will occur, and the member for Goyder knows it, because the centre of activity for this industry is Yorke Peninsula. Of course they will campaign: there is no doubt about that.

There is nothing wrong with the Concerned Barley Growers maintaining that position. But I think that the Parliament has a wider task to perform, not necessarily to look after sectarian interests in that way, but to look after the fact that the Barley Board must function. If you are going to put balls and chains around the Barley Board's proper operation, just look at what has happened with the Wheat Board. There has been reform of the Wheat Board, and that board is functioning in an extremely positive way that is in the best interests of the industry. We cannot tell the Barley Board that we are going to bring it out of the 1940s but, because of the interplay that is taking place within the industry, the Parliament will perpetuate the instability and divisiveness that surrounded this issue. That is the practical consequence.

The reason why I am opposing it is not that I have any view on whether or not any poll should be taken. I have indicated that I will facilitate a referendum, but it will be done responsibly and in accordance with the wishes of all the players in this industry, one of which is the Concerned Barley Growers. And if that view is still around after the election process takes place, after the board is in place and barley growers start seeing what can be delivered by way of better pooling arrangements, creation of reserves, better marketing arrangements, better research and development, I as Minister will facilitate a referendum.

It does not require an undertaking. A successive Minister would need to do the same, because obviously the board would not have satisfied the barley growers. If

you do put in a clause of this nature, make no mistake: the practical consequence is to raise the expectation. The campaign will start on day 1 and all you will do is impede the Barley Board's getting on with the job. You will divert it. I just think that members ought to have some faith in the industry, in the interest groups. I have gone a long way to achieve a compromise. It has been very difficult to achieve. It is a very delicate balance.

Mr VENNING: I support and, in fact, insist on the amendment of my colleague the member for Victoria. I have spoken today, as members would know, along a fairly radical line, as many of my constituents would realise. I have taken a line different from that of many of the traditional barley growers, because we need to have change. I am confident that we will not need to implement this provision and have a poll but, if things do go awry, and I am proven wrong in my position today, I want that escape route, as do the growers and the Barley Board. They must have that ability to return to the *status quo.*

If we cannot agree on this tonight, and this is probably the key part, I feel that I would be letting down the growers, the people whom I represent. This is the escape route, the pressure valve, so that if things go wrong we can get out of a situation we did not want to go into. I must do this, and I will work towards the fact that this will not be needed but, if it were, I would give that commitment. If we are not successful tonight, I give a commitment to the Committee and to all barley growers out there that I would support its retention when we get into Government, which will be in a few months. I am disappointed with the Minister. He is apparently quite inflexible at this late hour, and it is disappointing that we cannot complete this Bill in a spirit of total compromise.

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

That the time for moving the adjournment of the House be extended beyond 10 p.m.

Motion carried.

The Hon. T.R. GROOM: In response to the member for Custance, the reason why the industry has had to put up with the instability that it has is that members opposite, with the greatest respect to the member for Custance, just cannot see plain commonsense. That is what is needed to be applied to ensure that the Barley Board can properly function and that the industry can function and be cohesive. The fact of the matter is that clause 58(7) (b) does exactly the same job, with one exception; that is, it does not insert the time limit of one year from the commencement of the legislation. That is the only thing that is lacking. I will not go through the arguments again. Clause 58(7) (b) was inserted to do exactly this job, and it does that job in relation to a poll. But if you put it in this way, you will perpetuate the instability surrounding the board.

The Committee divided on the amendment:

Ayes (22)—H. Allison, M.H. Armitage, D.S. Baker (teller), S.J. Baker, H. Becker, P.D. Blacker, M.K. Brindal, D.C. Brown, J.L. Cashmore, B.C. Eastick, S.G. Evans, G.M. Gunn, G.A. Ingerson, D.C. Kotz, I.P. Lewis, W.A. Matthew, E.J. Meier, J.W. Olsen, J.K.G. Oswald, R.B. Such, I.H. Venning, D.C. Wotton.

Noes (22)—L.M.F. Arnold, M.J. Atkinson, J.C. Bannon, F.T. Blevins, G.J. Crafter, M.R. De Laine, M.J. Evans, R.J. Gregory, T.R. Groom (teller), K.C. Hamilton, T.H. Hemmings, V.S. Heron, P. Holloway, D.J. Hopgood, C.F. Hutchison, J.H.C. Klunder, S.M. Lenehan, C.D.T. McKee, M.K. Mayes, N.T. Peterson, M.D. Rann, J.P. Trainer.

The CHAIRMAN: There being an equality of votes, I cast my vote for the Noes.

Amendment thus negatived; clause passed.

Schedule and title passed.

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

That this Bill be now read a third time.

Mr MEIER (Goyder): As the Bill comes out of Committee, I am naturally disappointed that the House did not agree to make the board an elected grower majority board. I am disappointed, because it has clearly been the wish of so many barley growers throughout the State over the past two years, and even before that. I guess it is another clear case where the Minister in his wisdom has decided that he has had to compromise.

I acknowledge that compromise is necessary in this game. However, whilst the Minister was compromising on the election versus selection issue, he was at the same time saying that he would hold a poll if members want to change the method at some time down the track. My argument is that the Minister put the cart before the horse. Surely he should have sought to ensure that the *status quo* remained.

The SPEAKER: Order! The member for Goyder will resume his seat. The member for Napier.

The Hon. T.H. HEMMINGS: I rise on a point of order, Mr Speaker. The member for Goyder is reiterating his second reading contribution and not speaking to the Bill as it comes out of Committee.

The SPEAKER: I do not uphold the point of order. The member for Goyder is making a point about the non-acceptance of the amendments and thus is debating the Bill as it came out of Committee. The member for Goyder.

Mr MEIER: Thank you, Mr Speaker; I am amazed that the member for Napier, who did not participate in the debate at all, should take a completely irrelevant point of order. Thank you for your protection, Mr Speaker. It is certainly disappointing—

The Hon. T.H. Hemmings interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order!

Mr MEIER: —to me that the proviso for the election guarantee is not in the Bill and, likewise, that a guarantee of a grower majority is not there. I am sure that that will upset all barley growers throughout the State. Additionally, it is disappointing that the last amendment on which we voted, namely, that relating to a poll of growers, was not carried, because it would have ensured that the growers were able to determine whether or not they wanted a poll.

As the Bill comes out of Committee, we still have a situation where the Minister will determine whether or not a poll is to be held. The growers will not have the

final say, and it worries me that, whilst the Minister has given some outward assurances that he will listen to growers, when it came to the point it seemed that the Minister was backing away.

Despite my concerns about the Bill as it comes out of Committee, I have been involved with this issue for nigh on three years and I recognise that the key and critical issue is that the barley industry be given every chance to continue to be one of South Australia's greatest industries, that it continue to provide the massive injection of capital into this State that it has provided for so many years, and that the barley industry continue to be efficiently run, showing the rest of the world that Australia is a leader in barley production and marketing. Because there are many things in the Bill that are positive and a step in the right direction, despite my reservations as expressed, I will support the third reading.

Bill read a third time and passed.

GOVERNMENT MANAGEMENT AND EMPLOYMENT (MISCELLANEOUS) AMENDMENT BILL

Returned from the Legislative Council with amendments.

MEMBERS OF PARLIAMENT (REGISTER OF INTERESTS) (RETURNS) AMENDMENT BILL

Received from the Legislative Council and read a first time.

SOUTH AUSTRALIAN TOURISM COMMISSION BILL

Adjourned debate on second reading.

(Continued from 10 March. Page 2450.)

Mr INGERSON (Bragg): The Liberal Party welcomes this Bill and aims to support its passage through the Parliament. At long last there is some recognition by the Government that tourism is an important industry for South Australia. The woeful record of recent years must be turned around if we are to put ourselves into the No. 1 position for tourism in the future. In applauding the decision to establish the Tourism Commission, I would like to address three main issues: the tourism potential of South Australia, the impact of the Labor Government on tourism and the need for a plan for the future.

There is no doubt that South Australia is a terrific State with every natural advantage. It puts us in an ideal position to capture a large share of the growing tourism market. We have the Flinders Ranges, with their rugged natural beauty, picturesque Kangaroo Island with its wildlife, the famous wine growing areas to the north and south, and the well planned and preserved heritage City of Adelaide itself. We have it all. I believe there is a keen sense amongst all South Australians that we are a very proud State, and we want visitors from all over the world to enjoy it to the full. Yet what we have seen in the past 10 years has been a sorry tale of missed opportunities and badly handled developments by this Labor Government.

We have the greatest potential for tourist development of any State in Australia, yet one would imagine from our deteriorating position that there was something wrong with this place. I ask the Minister, 'Is South Australia ugly and unattractive? Does nothing ever happen here?' Of course not. We have an enormous amount to offer, but we are in an increasingly competitive world market. We have to compete with Rome, Paris, the Swiss Alps, the Rocky Mountains and, of course, all the Australian icons. We need self-confidence to compete with the rest of the world. We must cast off the apologetic and introverted attitudes of the Government which have seen us slip down the ladder of popularity into the doldrums in which we find ourselves today.

Labor has ensured that we have a mediocre tourist industry that could have been, but still could be, good. By the year 2006 tourism will be the world's largest industry, yet in South Australia we are witnessing a decline in our share of that lucrative market. For instance, let us look at a few of the major events in South Australia: the Festival of Arts; the John Martin's Christmas Pageant; the Adelaide Grand Prix; the newly instigated WOMAD festival; the Barossa vintage and bushing festivals; Glendi; the Italian festivals; and many other multicultural festivals. And let us, of course, not forget the Adelaide Crows—our own AFL team. I know I am a little bit biased, having a son playing in the team, but the AFL provides weekly competition and brings interstate visitors here whenever they play. I understand it is of the order of some 4 000 to 5 000 every second week; some 50 000 visitors come to South Australian because of the Crows.

These are just a few of the attractions, and we run them well. We are proud of them as South Australians, and so we should be. With our natural advantages and with many organised events such as that, why is tourism in South Australia in such a sorry state? If we look at the Government's performance, we see that the cause is not hard to find it is because of the incoherent policy of a succession of Labor Tourism Ministers. At one stage there was no Minister and no department head, and this has meant general confusion and ineptitude.

We want tourists to come to South Australia, but they are not going to come unless we develop strategies to attract them and, once they are here, we must look after them well. An analysis of statistics from the Bureau of Tourism shows that the level of tourism activity in South Australia's international, interstate and intrastate markets is quite small in comparison with the level in the eastern States. There have been minor fluctuations within these markets but, overall, the present Labor Government's inability to listen and accept advice from business people within the industry and its poor marketing and development strategies are the primary reasons for that failure. These sentiments are felt by many of the major players within South Australia's tourist industry.

For an indication of the Labor Government's failure to act in this area of tourism let us look at the number of visitor nights spent here by tourists as they visit our State. I seek leave to have inserted in *Hansard a* statistical table.

Leave granted.

TABLE I
SOUTH AUSTRALIA'S SHARE OF AUSTRALIA'S TOURISTS

	84-85	85-86	86-87	87-87	88-89	89-90	90-91	91-92
Interstate Visitors	7.5%	8.2%	8.3%	6.8%	7.2%	8.7%	8.5%	7.8%
Intrastate Visitors	7.9%	7.8%	8.7%	7.9%	8.9%	7.4%	7.3%	8.5%

	1984	1985	1986	1987	1988	1989	1990	1991	91-92**
Inter-national Visitors*	11.6%	11.3%	11.5%	no survey taken	11.3%	12.6%	11.4%	10.2%	9.9%

*International visitors category is calculated on a calendar year.
**Figures for the last 6 months of 1992 are unavailable

TABLE II
VISITOR-NIGHTS, SOUTH AUSTRALIA'S SHARE OF AUSTRALIA'S TOTAL

	84/85	85/86	86/87	87/88	88/89	89/90	90/91	91/92
Interstate Visitor-Nights	8.5%	9.3%	8.3%	7.3%	7.3%	9.5%	9.0%	8.7%
Intrastate Visitor-Nights	7.2%	7.1%	7.3%	7.0%	7.2%	6.7%	6.5%	7.7%

	1984	1985	1986	1987	1988	1989	1990	1991	91/92
International Visitor-Nights	6.1%	8.0%	7.2%	no survey taken	5.9%	6.3%	6.1%	5.21%	5.2%

TABLE III
SOUTH AUSTRALIA'S SHARE OF AUSTRALIA'S POPULATION

1984	1985	1986	1987	1988	1989	1990	1991	1992
8.7%	8.7%	8.6%	8.6%	8.5%	8.5%	8.4%	8.4%	8.3%

Instead of looking at pure visitor numbers, visitor nights are used, because that gives a more accurate assessment of the real tourism activity.

There has been a spectacular decline in our market share of international visitor nights from as high as 8 per cent in 1985 to 5.2 per cent in 1991. If members look at this table they will see the spectacular decline. In 1985, we had 8 per cent visitor nights for the national average and in 1986 it was 7.2 per cent. In 1987 for some reason no survey was undertaken. In 1988, the figure was 5.9 per cent; in 1989, 6.3 per cent; in 1990, 6.1 per cent; in 1991, 5.21 per cent; and in 1991-92 combined, 5.2 per cent. So, in every single year, except 1989, there has been a decline in visitor nights in South Australia. These figures relate to international visitors—the most critical and most important market for us in the tourism field.

However, there has been growth in visitor numbers, because the Australian market has grown as Table I shows. But, the important factor is our drop in visitor nights in percentage terms. At a bare minimum we should have a market share comparable to our population, which is about 8.3 per cent of the Australian total. Instead, we have only 5.2 per cent, some 60 per cent below where we should be. Interestingly enough, that has occurred in just eight years of Labor Government—eight years of involvement of the Labor Government in tourism in South Australia.

The Government and the Minister should be ashamed of those figures. The trend is catastrophic, and it poses a significant problem for South Australia's international tourism market. It is vital that South Australians reverse this decline, as the international market is the growth area for Australia. Further, interstate visitor nights have

dropped in the past three years, while the numbers for intrastate visitor nights have never reached more than 7.7 per cent of the Australian total over the eight year period listed in the table. The Minister knows all too well that these figures are bad and that things have to change. As the Arthur D. Little report pointed out:

It is disturbing to note that, in all visitor categories, growth in visitor nights has failed to match the growth in visitor numbers over the past six to seven years. Clearly, average length of stay per visitor is slowly shrinking—it was less than five days in 1990-91.

This situation requires urgent action for us to see any improvement in tourism opportunities in South Australia. There are more tourists in Timbuktu than there were five years ago, yet here in South Australia we have the Minister of Tourism presiding over an industry that is losing market share. What has gone wrong? Obviously, the Labor Government has failed to see the potential that tourism has for South Australia. It is an example of its 'She'll be right; leave it alone and it will grow by itself' syndrome.

I would like to remind you, Mr Speaker, that for every 17 international visitors we have one job is created, compared to one job being created for every 180 Australian visitors. So, the significance of international visitors to Australia and, in particular, to South Australia is enormous. It should be a matter of concern that this decline in the international market has occurred. That job statistic emphasises the importance of increasing international visitor nights in South Australia. In a State where unemployment is running at 12 per cent in general and nearly 40 per cent among young people, creating jobs should be what we are all about. Tourism, being a people business, is our best present and future opportunity to create new jobs.

There is no better example of the Government's incoherent policies in this area than the way it has dealt with major tourist development projects in our State. Let us look at them. There was Jubilee Point, Wilpena Pound, Mount Lofty summit and Flinders Chase on Kangaroo Island. They were all Government-backed developments. Years later we know what happened at Glenelg. Where is the development in the Flinders Ranges? What has happened to the Government's promises of the Ophix development at Wilpena? What has happened at Mount Lofty? Ten years after the Ash Wednesday bushfires one cannot even buy a cappuccino or a packet of chips at the summit. What has been done at Kangaroo Island to develop that beautiful place? The answer is: nothing.

It seemed that the Government consulted the experts. Environment and local community interest groups were not listened to. There was a continual compromise and we can all see the result. The outrage created by the proposals has given South Australia a reputation as a State where tourism development is not acceptable. The Labor Government set South Australian against South Australian in a series of disastrous disputes over tourism developments, but it never had the strength to make the decisions based on good advice.

The Minister knows that there has been an inconsistent and haphazard approach to tourism development. There has been a lack of structured definition in the planning process, which has led to minimal advances in this tourism development area. Potential tourist developers are led to believe that South Australia is the last place where they should invest their money. There is a sense among general investors in South Australia that tourism is too risky in this State. Yet, we live in a world where tourism is acknowledged as the way to go. We Liberals believe sensitive tourism development with community cooperation is a priority in this State.

The Hon. M.D. Rann interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order!

Mr INGERSON: It is fascinating, Mr Speaker; as usual the Minister does not know what he is talking about. I was not in the Parliament when the Casino Bill was debated. If he goes back and has a look he will find out that again he is wrong. We Liberals believe sensitive tourism develop with community cooperation is a priority for this State. We need action in this area now. I notice development has been shoved into another department. I hope the Tourism Commission will insist on input into this very important infrastructure development area. After all, one cannot promote eco-tourism unless the facilities are accepted by the international travelling community as reasonable and up to expectations.

Despite all this navel gazing that has gone on, I do not wish to decry all the work done so far by Tourism South Australia. Some of its marketing and advertising has been excellent. As an example, the 'Out of the Ordinary' and 'Shorts' programs are magnificent campaigns and need to be continued. May I suggest that this is the reason why the interstate visitor nights have increased and intrastate visitor nights are holding up. The Minister's proposal under the newly created commission to increase expenditure on marketing from 60 to 75 per cent of budget is essential.

However, somewhere amidst the hype and the glamour the Government has missed the point. The Labor Government has not penetrated the markets, particularly the international markets, nor has it targeted our audience as well as it should have done. This must change. I believe this is the most important issue for the new commission: international marketing must be at the forefront of any program.

Other keys to the Labor Government's failure are its attitude to infrastructure generally and education in the tourism area in particular. The amount of money dedicated to infrastructure has been badly handled as it relates to tourism when one looks at the roads, water supply, sewerage problems, waste management, power supply, transport problems, airports and signage, which are all vital to the future of tourism in our State. For instance, it is crazy that we advertise the Cleland Conservation Park all over the world by saying, 'Come to Adelaide, visit Cleland, and cuddle a koala' and there is not even an STA bus to take the poor tourist to the place.

The Hon. M.D. Rann: What about the private sector?

The SPEAKER: Order!

Mr INGERSON: Again, the Minister's interjection shows the difficulty he has with coping with his portfolio. If he asked the STA he would find that the normal service through the Hills runs within 200 yards of Cleland, yet the STA cannot work out a simple way to do the loop around the summit and down to Cleland. I reiterate it is important to note that the STA does not

even have a bus service to Cleland National Park. The Government has not realised that we have to have the infrastructure in place before we serve visitors with marketing campaigns to attract them here. Before we take any further steps ahead, we must go behind the scenes and say to ourselves: are we looking after the people we bring here and are we providing the services and everything else they need to enjoy their stay so that they will come back again and tell their friends? The fact that people who come to our State should then go home and tell their friends how good it is, is a vital and critical part of the development of all future tourism programs.

Education and training will play a vital role in the future development of tourism. As a community, we must recognise the importance of tourism. I believe that recognition will be a big and important step forward for the promotion needed by this commission. We have the fine TAFE School of Tourism, which produces excellent, qualified graduates. Sadly, many of them go interstate for jobs because they cannot find work here as this Government has made sure that tourism is going nowhere. The tragedy is that recently over 1000 children applied for 40 positions in tourism studies at TAFE. Surely the Government recognises that tourism opportunities in our TAFE colleges must be expanded.

Another level of education is required in tourism. Over 80 per cent of tourism is in the hands of small business people. Many have no official qualifications in either tourism or business, but they do have vision and enthusiasm. They do not have the time to attend seminars and courses which the Government in its wisdom has set up, because they are too busy running their business. They need training programs and open learning through TAFE to direct them in how to be more successful. It is the small business people who count in this industry. Visitors come back to places because they like the people, they feel they are welcome and, as visitors, they know they are respected and valued. They want to have a good time and enjoy their holiday. The Government must recognise this principle and encourage our operators in this regard. We must encourage small business all to perform well.

Let us now look to the future, to what should be part of this new plan. As I said before, I support the establishment of a Tourism Commission, but I point out that to be effective it must be properly structured with full private sector involvement. In accepting the new commission we accept the importance of an industry driven organisation—a dramatic change in direction compared with the bureaucratic Tourism SA. I urge the Minister to ensure that we get the best possible leaders in the field to run the commission. While I acknowledge the importance of Government bureaucracy, let us make sure that in this case the Tourism Commission has little of that in its make-up. We need professionals from the field who are recognised leaders. We want staff with vision, vitality and enthusiasm for South Australia.

The tourism industry is about making money for South Australia, creating an international and national reputation and, above all, creating jobs for the people of our State. Every member of the commission board should be able to demonstrate an understanding of South Australia as a special place and show appreciation for its unique features. It must be a very different board in order to create a very different approach to tourism with unsurpassed efficiency and effectiveness. We need practical business and community leaders who can sell this State's tourism potential strongly in the marketplace, whether it be in London, Tokyo or Brisbane. They must command respect in the community and be able to articulate why we are the No. 1 holiday destination in Australia. We do not want another of this Government's lacklustre, lame duck boards with the same old faces. The Liberal Opposition does not want to see pay-offs for favours as there have been in the past. We need a new approach.

How will this new commission once it is set up fulfil its lofty ambitions? The Act provides that it should promote; it should identify opportunities; it should contribute to economic development plans relating to tourism; it should prepare strategies for implementation of plans; it should assist the regions; it should provide information and booking services; it should work with tourist operators and encourage Government, the community and industry in tourism activities. So, let us make sure this time that it does happen. Will the Government continue to fiddle around and argue or will it have a future plan?

The Liberal Opposition believes it is essential to have a clearly defined plan. We must maximise our appeal to all tourists, whether they be interstate, intrastate or international visitors. We must pick out themes and follow them through. We believe that the commission must make the most of all available opportunities. The solid commercial thinkers we need on the board will need to sell South Australia more strongly than ever before. Competition for the tourist dollar in Australia or overseas will be enormous. The commission will need direction and focus. It is up to the Minister to make sure that happens.

The Liberal Party believes that the areas that need to be developed are: international marketing; a stronger and more coordinated regional approach; linking with other States; and increased packaging of existing products. The international marketing done by the Australian Tourism Commission thus far lacks a clear image of what South Australia actually is. It is all very well to sell New South Wales with its Sydney Opera House or the Northern Territory with Uluru, but what is South Australia? We need a new positive approach to South Australia from the Australian Tourism Commission. Do our potential international visitors realise what a haven we have in this State? We need to project an image of South Australia as a civilised place in an increasingly violent world, one which they must visit. We have peaceful, wide open spaces and a huge variety of nature to experience. We have superb architecture in our towns and cities and plenty of options, all within easy reach of Adelaide. One of the most telling comments in the Arthur O. Little analysis of our tourism attraction concerned accessibility. We must develop campaigns along the lines of 'South Australia is accessible'.

I have already mentioned focusing on our marketing as an important step for the future. We must realise, for example, that while a Japanese visitor comes to Australia in search of nature and wide open spaces his or her counterpart in Hong Kong wants shopping and exciting night life. We must be more courageous and focus our

marketing on specific international target groups. There are many categories of visitor, whether they be in need of five star or backpacker accommodation, and we must convince them that we have the lot. Many tourists would like to see the outback, but they need to be reassured that just because they are visiting the mountains they do not have to sleep on a rock.

I do not believe that our marketing approach has convinced them so far, so we must make changes to existing strategy. Part of our international marketing strategy should be to introduce more international and national tour operators to the State. More familiarisation visits must be a priority, with the commission taking groups around our many facilities. The airlines, hotels and restaurants will all want to participate in this investment in our future. Once the media and travel consultants become more aware of South Australia, they will be confident in recommending visits to the State. A stronger regional approach is also essential to future tourism development. The regional tourism boards need more autonomy, particularly in terms of self-promotion.

We must invest in training for self-marketing and provide assured funds for improved local tourism strategy plans. Regional tourism boards need to strengthen their links with local councils. Government, at every level, and the community as well, must acknowledge the importance of tourism in order to guarantee success in this vital area. We need to concentrate on more imaginative packaging. There is an obvious link in our outback holiday experience with the Northern Territory, but why not also add on links between other major capital cities?

I can see great wine and food holidays starting in the Hunter Valley in New South Wales, travelling through Rutherglen in Victoria, through the Coonawarra to McLaren Vale, the Barossa Valley and Clare and finishing at Margaret River in Western Australia: a fine wine and food holiday in Australia focussing around South Australia.

For the bed and breakfast heritage tourist, we could share international visitors with Tasmania, which offers many similar experiences to our own. With imagination and flare, the new commission could develop a whole series of contra deals which will benefit other States as well as ourselves. There is an add on effect and we must ensure that the new commission adds South Australia on wherever possible.

What about the Government's involvement in the new commission? The Government must listen carefully to the advice of experts in the field. One of the positive aspects of the Arthur D. Little report was the proposal for South Australia's strategy for tourism. Obviously, Government involvement must encourage the private sector to invest in areas where it is recognised we need additional development to improve destinations. The Little report suggests we should narrowly focus our product development in the next few years. As we examine our regions, research shows the concentration should be on the Flinders Ranges, Kangaroo Island and the Barossa Valley. Nothing new, but really reinforcing what has to be done.

As we move out of recession, there will be more money to invest. The faltering Flinders Ranges development indicates we may need to concentrate on the assets we already have in the region and re-develop these. Kangaroo Island offers incredible potential because of its natural environment, but we need to develop increased access, at a lower cost, and offer a wider range of accommodation. The Barossa Valley is a first class wine-growing area with great appeal and we could expand and build on what is already there with additional high quality accommodation.

We should look at developing themes to attract tourists. We have so many exciting tourism opportunities that we must exploit them thematically. The development of tourist themes will attract specific target audiences. It enables us to capitalise on our enormous number of attractions. I will mention a few of the more important ones the Opposition believes the commission should look at. They are: wine and food (wine and food State); dreamtime (centre of Aboriginal culture); the outback (gateway to the outback): our events (arts, sport and culture); cultural heritage; our shopping; our beaches; camping; and our wildlife. We should use our convention and incentive travel opportunities to promote all the above themes.

Let us look at some of these in a bit more detail, and I refer, first, to the wine and food industry. Our wine industry is world class. We are acknowledged as the premier wine producing State. We also have more fine restaurants per head of the population than anywhere else in Australia. In Australia we all love to worship our heroes, and that is just what we need in South Australia. What better characters are there than our wine makers? As an aside, I noticed the other day that it was suggested that we use Mel Gibson to sell South Australia. What about using a South Australian?

The Hon. M.D. Rann interjecting:

Mr INGERSON: The Minister seems to be getting a bit tangled up and a bit excited tonight. I suggest we could use Maggie Beer from the Pheasant Farm; David Dryden the artist; Anne Middleton, who is an expert on diamonds and who is doing very well at promoting her product overseas; John Fitzgerald the tennis player; Dorinda Hafner, a performer and star of a television series on African food; Peter Lehmann, a well known wine maker; Robert Stigwood, a promoter; Colin Hayes, a race horse trainer; Kay Hanaford in Tourism and the list goes on. There are many South Australians: why not use them in the promotion of our State?

Returning to wine, we all saw the success Wolf Blass had when he promoted himself along with his wines. The bow ties were everywhere and we all knew why. This is an area the commission should exploit and develop. Our wine industry is the best in Australia and is recognised internationally, so let us make the most of it as a tourist opportunity. Let us promote South Australia as the wine State.

I turn now to dreamtime. This is the International Year of Indigenous Peoples and there is a growing awareness of the important role Aboriginal people played in the history of this continent in the thousands of years before European settlement. We have world acclaimed collections of artefacts at the Museum and, with the Tandanya Aboriginal Cultural Institute, we are in an excellent position to push for the National Aboriginal Museum to be based here in Adelaide, and we should be doing so. This is an area where we could link up with

other States to provide package holidays for those specifically interested in this vital area. As visitors move out of the city into the farflung corners of the State, Aboriginal guides could be trained to provide them with valuable insights into their culture.

The next one is the outback. We have witnessed an increasing fascination by visitors for our outback. For urban dwellers, these open spaces are an endless source of pleasure. We need to celebrate the activities of early South Australians as they explored the interior and tie this into the general promotion of the outback. Here we should link up with the Northern Territory and promote Adelaide as the gateway to the outback. We should connect Adelaide to Kangaroo Island, to the Flinders Ranges, to Coober Pedy, to Uluru, to Kakadu, and then Darwin. Of course, we should also be promoting the reverse trip in consultation with the Northern Territory commission. We should promote central Australia as the "key to the outback. "

I refer now to cultural heritage. Our cultural heritage is of enormous significance. Adelaide offers a vast array of diverse experiences with the North Terrace institutions and magnificent architecture, which should be preserved for all time. We are a city with a difference, especially for visitors from the concrete jungles of the world. Our National Trust owns more buildings than any other State in Australia and we need packages which will enable architectural enthusiasts to visit the smaller towns out of the city as well. As an example, Hahndorf and Strathalbyn are within easy reach even for the short stay visitor, and Burra is only a short distance to the north of Adelaide.

The South Australian contribution to the arts needs no introduction and, for a visitor interested in cultural heritage, we provide many attractions. The Festival Centre, the Lion Arts Centre and the Art Gallery are the showpieces, but there are many smaller galleries and working artists who must be brought to the forefront of attention. We have numerous local theatre groups and a great musical heritage to offer those interested in the performing arts.

Let us look at our shopping. The recession has led to a decline in retail sales in our State. Tourists offer a great opportunity for the progressive retailer. We need to arouse all retailers to this opportunity to increase sales. There are some tourists who come with enormous amounts of money in their pockets and we must ensure they spend it in our State.

Private enterprise, particularly small business, must be encouraged to recognise the potential of the 'shopping tourist' market and the exciting role it can play in developing tourism. We have many distinctively South Australian high quality products which are available and which should be placed conveniently in the paths of unsuspecting tourists, as they are urged to buy. S.A. Great and the Tourism Commission must get closer together to promote South Australian businesses and retailing opportunities.

I have spoken of the wildlife attractions in the Flinders Ranges and on Kangaroo Island, as well as the success of the Cleland Conservation Park. One must not forget the Warrawong sanctuary, which has an international reputation—mainly created by the dynamism of John Walmsley. The Australian continent features a unique collection of animals, and international visitors love them. They have seen kangaroos and koalas only in zoos, but in South Australia we can show them to tourists in the wild. This is an extremely important feature of the State, and we must ensure it is developed to the full so that no visitor leaves here without having had the opportunity to enjoy this truly Australian experience.

I turn to the convention and incentive markets. I must mention the importance and the comparative success Adelaide has had as a convention city. Presently we run behind Sydney and Melbourne as the convention capitals of Australia, but we should aim to be number one in that area. Adelaide is an ideal convention city, with first-class hotels and easy access for all conference functions. The Convention Centre and the Exhibition Hall are well run and offer a wide range of facilities. Our parklands constantly amaze conference visitors, and there are so many 'accessible' areas of interest for free days. We do suffer from the lack of national and international flights into Adelaide, and that is an area in which not only the business visitor sector suffers but also tourism generally in our State. The Government should continue to push this issue.

Finally, let us not forget sport: the promotion of and support for the Grand Prix, the racing industry, with its Adelaide Cup and Oakbank, football, netball, cycling, and the recent gem in this whole sporting field, basketball. They are critical to the future of tourism and, a few people realise, are large employers of people: any growth means more jobs. What about future Government responsibility? There are other Government departments which must be more aware of tourism. The Government must concentrate on ensuring that all Government actions look to the impact on tourism. This is a private sector driven industry, but it must be assisted by sensitivity from Government through the Tourism Commission.

Tourism is too important to the future of our State to let things continue to slide by. We have a Minister who is more concerned with the challenge he will make to Lynn Arnold after the next election than worrying about the future potential of tourism. Tourism is yet another area of neglect which will ensure that we are elected as the Government of this State. In supporting the establishment of the Tourism Commission, we are giving South Australia a chance to let the private sector. drive the industry. Let us make sure we do not let the Government allow bureaucracies to get into the driving seat and continue to take us down the path of mediocrity which we have travelled with so little success in recent years. Time is running out. Other States are getting too far in front. The drop in our market share is significant. We believe that the Government cannot let this situation continue. We support a new direction for tourism in South Australia, using a private sector driven Tourism Commission as its key.

The Hon. JENNIFER CASHMORE (Coles): I am pleased to support the Bill and also to congratulate my colleague the member for Bragg on a very comprehensive analysis of South Australia's tourism product and the direction in which this State should be travelling in promoting itself as a tourism destination. I recall my three years in the tourism portfolio from 1979

to 1982 and the six years subsequently in the shadow portfolio with great pleasure and a combined sense of satisfaction and frustration at what I thought should be done and could be done but in many instances was not done.

I would like to begin by saying that I believe that South Australia has at the base of its tourism industry a group of people of extraordinary commitment and dedication. They are thoroughly genial, hospitable, easy-going and friendly people who can and do bring this State great credit when they are given the opportunity to promote their product and to extend hospitality to visitors. That is not to say that enough has been done in the past or that what has been done has been done in the best possible and coordinated fashion. For that reason, I not only welcome the Bill but I also approve of its timing.

The proposal for a tourism commission has been bandied about for more than a decade and, had this Bill been introduced early in the 1980s, I doubt that I would have supported it, because I do not think the private sector in tourism in South Australia was sufficiently well developed and sophisticated to be able to make the contribution and give the sense of direction to the tourism industry that is required as a result of the establishment of this commission. I am pleased to say that I think that developmental stage has now reached the point where a South Australian tourism commission is a viable proposition, and that commission will be able to make a real contribution and give a sense of direction.

To refer directly to the provisions of the Bill, I approve of division 4, which sets out the composition of the board. It will consist of not fewer than seven and not more than 10 directors, and its membership must include persons who have expertise in the operation of tourism businesses, regional tourism, business and financial management, marketing and industrial relations. I presume that the latter means that there will be a representative of the Liquor and Allied Trades Union on the commission, and certainly that union has had a constructive working relationship with the hospitality industry in South Australia. It seems reasonable that directors be appointed for a term not exceeding three years and that they be eligible for reappointment at the expiry of their term.

The key clause in the Bill is clause 19, which outlines the functions of the commission. One is to identify tourism opportunities for the State, including opportunities for regional and cultural tourism. It is pleasing to me to see reference to that term 'cultural tourism'. It was virtually unheard of 10 years ago. When I presented the Liberal Party's tourism policy in 1985, considerable stress was placed upon cultural tourism, and I hope that, in debating this Bill, the House recognises that cultural tourism means much more than simply tourism that is directed to promotion of the arts. In my judgment, cultural tourism should be based on a much broader social and intellectual foundation—

The Hon. M.D. Rann: Authentic.

The Hon. JENNIFER CASHMORE: —which deals not only in aspects of the State which are, in the Minister's words by way of interjection, 'authentic' but which identify the very best of what South Australia has to offer culturally. By 'culturally' I embrace the term politically, socially, scientifically and in every area of intellectual endeavour. By 'cultural tourism' I mean, for example, that South Australia's expertise in certain areas of medicine can be used to promote Adelaide as a destination for medical conventions.

I mean that our expertise in dry land farming can be used to promote South Australia as a destination not only for conventions but for people from all over the world who wish to come and learn what we have to teach and, in the process, to enjoy South Australia as a destination, and to bring their family, friends and colleagues with them. This is the kind of tourism for which South Australia is suited. We are not, never have been and, I believe, never will be suited to mass tourism, but we do need to attract specialist markets which could be described as being akin to the kinds of guests we would wish to invite into our own homes because we have an affinity with those people.

If we look at the State as we would look at our own homes, and if we look at the tourism industry as extending the hospitality on a broad scale that we as individuals extend, we know that our favourite guests are those with whom we have an affinity. That is what I think South Australia should be doing as a broad basis for its tourism policy. Clause 19, which as I said outlines the functions of the commission, also refers to the commission's function of contributing to the preparation and implementation of economic development plans for or relating to the tourism industry of the State.

That is what I tried to set in train as Minister of Tourism in 1982, when the very first South Australian Tourism Development Plan was established. It was an initiative at that time unique in Australia, a cooperative venture between the Government, the private sector and what I would call the voluntary sector, that is, the regional tourism bodies, who all worked together to look across the board at what was required for an integrated approach. The first efforts may have been faltering and inadequate but, at least, the framework for a cooperative, coordinated approach was established.

In mentioning regional tourism, I would like to pay tribute to the volunteers who work in the regional tourism associations. Some of them have been working steadily since I was first involved in the portfolio, which is now 14 years ago. The same people are still putting considerable effort into their local regional associations, and they deserve the gratitude of South Australians for what they are doing. As to the economic development aspect of tourism in South Australia, I think the Government has a great deal to learn in integrating tourism with other aspects of State development from which it is presently separated. It is astonishing to me that there is no central funding body in Government to coordinate and assess the value to this State of the various festivals and to provide funds for those festivals that are worthy of funding by Government.

I must declare my interest as Chairman of the Honda Adelaide Music Fiesta and let the House know that I and the other board members of Fiesta are currently approaching no fewer than seven different Government departments, each of which we believe has a valid reason for providing some funds for this new broadly based music festival. But that is a time consuming task and there is no central body to look at that festival or,

indeed, at any other, and say, 'This is worthy of Government support.' It need not come as quarter of a pint from 20 different buckets; it can come as 10 pints, because it is worthy and it should come out of the one funding body. I mention that and also mention that there is an important need for future Governments in South Australia to recognise the very close interrelationship between South Australia as the State of the arts and South Australia as the Festival State, and South Australia as a tourism destination.

If there is one thing, aside from the wine industry, that distinguishes this State from all other States in this country as a tourism destination, it is our reputation as the State of the arts. In saying that, I do not in any way detract from the other rich qualities that South Australia has, including our unique asset, the South Australian Museum, which is without doubt the pre-eminent place in the world in which visitors to Australia can see and understand and learn about Aboriginal heritage in this country. It is a priceless asset, which has been grossly ignored to the point of indifference in terms of its potential economic value to the State. I am insistent that the relationship between cultural value and economic value must be recognised if each is to reach its full potential.

In speaking about festivals, I believe that South Australia needs to develop a much more coherent festival policy. As well as the Festival of Arts we have an enormous range of festivals, from the vintage festivals in the Barossa Valley, the Clare Valley and the McLaren Vale area; WOMADelaide; the Barossa Music Festival; Fiesta (and I put in another word for the Honda Adelaide Music Fiesta); the Blue Lake Festival; Kernewek Lowender; the Schutzenfest; the South Australian Country Music Festival, which has the potential to bring enormous numbers of visitors to this State; Glendi and other multicultural festivals; the Hills Affare; smaller local festivals; and the rose festival, which is coming up in April and which will be based in Adelaide.

It gives me great pleasure to know that that festival is going to be established. I called for such a festival in 1984 and suggested at that time that it be linked with our wine industry and be called Days of Wine and Roses. I thought that was an evocative name that really spoke volumes about South Australia. It has not turned out quite as I thought but, at least, we are having a rose festival.

To continue with the functions of the commission, a further function is to prepare a plan or series of plans and to encourage cooperative tourism marketing programs; to assist regional bodies engaged in tourism promotion; and to ensure the provision of appropriate tourism and travel information and booking services. At this point I would like to quote from the 1992 annual report of the Australian Tourism Commission, which states that the World Tourism Organisation has identified the Asia Pacific area as the world's fastest growing region between now and the end of the decade.

It believes that the region's share of total world arrivals will reach 22 per cent by the year 2 000. The Australian Tourism Commission's target for that year is 6.8 million short-term arrivals. It is instructive to look at the ATC's annual report and at its target and then, by comparison, to look at Tourism South Australia's annual reports and note two astonishing facts or, rather, the absence of two facts. One is that in the objectives of the agency, identified each year for the past four successive years of reports that are lodged in the Parliamentary Library, under the objectives of the agency there is a list of six objects:

Develop the most effective tourism identity for South Australia.

Provide in the most cost-effective way information and sales outlets which service all potential visitors to South Australia.

Identify the most effective means of realising South Australia's tourism potential.

Encourage investment and facilitate appropriate plant, product and infrastructure development.

Improve the effectiveness of tourism activity at the regional level.

Improve efficiency and effectiveness by responding to client needs.

What is missing there? What is the most obvious thing that is missing? There is no mention whatsoever of visitor targets, yet what is this State's tourism policy supposed to be about?

It is supposed to be about encouraging visitors to come to this State. To do that, one must have a target. When one has a target, one sets about strategies of achieving that target. Not once is there any mention of visitor targets and, significantly, not once in these annual reports is there any mention of visitor numbers. In other words, we have a tourism agency which has no gaol to increase visitor numbers and which has no record of how many visitors actually come to the State. That is simply not good enough, and I trust and hope it will be redressed by the Tourism Commission.

There is much more that one could say about this Bill, including the fact that one of the goals of the commission is to ensure provision of appropriate tourism and travel information and booking services. Again, the Australian Tourism Commission, in its annual report, states:

> Consumers today are more demanding. The main travel segment comes from the post war baby boom generation, who know exactly what they want and how much they are prepared to pay. More needs to be done to give them what they want, make the product more bookable and improve the information flow to the consumer. In other words, we need an integrated marketing approach.

That is what this Tourism Commission must establish from the outset. I would say that, as the basis of that marketing approach, three words need to be written in stone and observed by every operator and by the Government, those three words being 'service, quality and value'. Without that, we cannot hope to succeed. Each of us knows what we look for when we go on holiday. First, we want service, we want quality and we want value for money. These days we have to insist upon each, because money is so hard to come by.

There is much more that could be said about the industry. It is invidious to mention names, but after more than a decade of working with these people there are two names that I would mention as having been, in my opinion, great contributors to the industry in South Australia. One is Mr Bill Spurr, who has held various positions in the industry over the past decade, and another is Ms Kay Hannaford, who has been an advocate

for the tourism industry and whose sensitive and sensible observations on the industry's needs have been an encouragement and a source of sound advice to many people, including Governments of both persuasions.

Because their positions are about to be abolished with the abolition of the overseas travel booking unit of the Government's tourism agency, I would also mention the travel consultants who have serviced all members of this Parliament and many members of the public. I refer to Mr Albert Ninio, Mr Andrew Gaal and Ms Jan Gorman, whose professional skills in my judgment are unparalleled in the travel industry, who have provided superlative service to all members and whom we will miss, notwithstanding the fact that I have no doubt we will receive excellent service from Westpac, which has obtained the contract from the Government.

I conclude by saying that the people who are appointed to this commission will determine whether or not it works. Finally, I firmly endorse the words of the member for Bragg in urging the Minister to give this issue the utmost thought and to put onto the commission people who know what they are talking about, who are not worn out figures who will simply recycle old policies but who have a clear vision for the future of tourism in South Australia and who see it as part of our economic as well as our cultural and social future. I support the Bill.

Mr LEWIS (Murray-Mallee): I support the proposition. The majority of my remarks will not duplicate the comments that have been made in such erudite and excellent fashion by those two speakers who have gone before me—the Liberal Party spokesman, the member for Bragg, and my colleague the member for Coles, who was his predecessor.

It may sound as though what I have to say is a grab bag full of ideas and/or grievances, and in some measure that is true, but my remarks all have coherence and relevance to the measure before us, particularly if one looks at part III of the measure, which relates to the operations of the commission. Let me commence by saying that the biggest single impediment to our capacity as a community in South Australia to realise our potential in developing our economy in the next phase of its development is to be found in clause 19(i).

It ought to rate somewhat more significantly in the remarks that have been made by both the Minister and others to this Chamber tonight. In my judgment, the biggest single impediment is that there is not sufficient encouragement of understanding in the wider community of the importance that tourism should and will have ultimately to our State's economy.

We have the raw material resource to market, and it has not yet been developed in anything like the way it could be to fulfil the potential it has. The reason is that people do not understand just how important and how easy it would be to achieve that measure of importance in a shorter time than otherwise if we leave it to the 'Topsy' factor, that is, that it would just grow.

There needs to be greater attention paid to the encouragement of industry and community action to enhance visitor experience of South Australia. There needs to be greater understanding in the wider community of the benefits the industry will bring to our State. Not only will it provide jobs but also it will enhance our self-esteem, because we will better understand what the world will see of our State as unique and worth their attention, interest, and participation in terms of activities.

Before I go any further, let me say that I have several interests, and they will become apparent as I make my remarks. First, I wish to disclose that I have been a member of the Lower Murray Regional Tourist Association ever since such associations were established, and that was one of the first to establish itself when tourism associations became feasible during the term of the Tonkin Government. Currently, I am its Treasurer.

Before I go further, I point out that, in regional tourism development, this Government is particularly stingy, and has been so. It spends only as much in total in grants to the development of its regional organisations to get the industry off the ground as the Victorian Government spends in one single region, and there are more regions in Victoria than here. That is how parlous and insignificant it is.

I can understand that from a pragmatic point of view. There are no votes in tourism, because no great number of people have been involved in tourism until now. One will not offend the trade union movement, whether you do or you do not, and one will not offend any industry, because to date it has not been significant enough in the State's economy and the communities in which it has been operating. It is becoming more significant, and those people who are committed to the industry are beginning to understand the actual significance and importance it will have in the future as figures about it are reported to them about the provision of their services individuals and in aggregate provided by the industry to the economy.

I refer to figures such as the fact that it is Australia's second biggest export income earner. Every dollar spent in Australia by a tourist is an export dollar, because it is a dollar that comes into this country to buy goods and services produced here. Let me continue. The Government has again stood by silently and said nothing about an opportunity to further promote an international awareness of South Australia and, indeed, a national awareness of South Australia. That opportunity was provided through the suggestion made by the Federal Government, through no less than the Prime Minister, that he would consider making opal the national gemstone. It is already our State's gemstone and appears on our own House mace on the table.

Yet not one of the Government Ministers—neither the Minister of Mineral Resources nor the Minister of Tourism— took the opportunity to grab easy publicity for us by saying, 'Yes, why not? We produce most of the world's opal in this State anyway, and it is a good thing for South Australia.' Let me tell members that most of the opal that has been sold through Lightning Ridge in the past 10 years has been mined in Mintabie, not in New South Wales, and that is a little known fact.

The Hon. M.D. Rann: Is it a personal interest in this area?

Mr LEWIS: I have already declared that I have several; indeed, I have a very personal interest in this area, as the Minister knows. I do not see any reason why

we should not have encouraged, and indeed should not from this point forward encourage, the Federal Government to make the opal Australia's national gemstone. Not only does South Australia produce most of the world's opal but by very definition Australia must produce most of the world's opal, a gemstone with a wide array of colours and fascinations. As the Minister properly observes, I am involved in the wholesaling and retailing of it. That is not to say that it is any less worthy of being promoted. It ought to be. It is like most other things that I am involved in, it is for the purpose of trying to get appropriate development of the services that I have become involved in, and not necessarily for personal gain.

Let me also say that the Minister, having asked, when the member for Bragg spoke about the lack of public transport access to Cleland National Park, 'What about the private sector?', now takes the point—and I acknowledge it—that the Government has overlooked that predicament in which people wishing to go to Cleland find themselves. They must either hire a cab or risk the uncertainty of the distance and the terrain they would have to traverse to get from the STA bus route to Cleland, if they could discover where to catch the STA bus that goes up Greenhill Road to provide that access, and obtain the timetable to do so. They really have to be pretty keen to dig out all that information, yet the promotional brochures provided do not say anything about it. More is the pity that the antiquated public transport licensing arrangements we have in South Australia are causing an access log jam for our product for people. from overseas. We know that they are going to come here in greater numbers.

More than 6.5 million budget price and backpack tourists will come into this country every year by the turn of the century. That is less than seven years away. The growth will be dramatic. We are not going to get our share of that market unless we provide a much better means for those backpackers to get around in South Australia. They do not necessarily want to come to Adelaide every time they wish to visit another place. In any other country, they can cross the nation; indeed, they can crisscross Europe on both rail and bus transport.

In the US, as I have said recently in this place, they can travel north-south or east-west on the national freeway grid on any one of a number of bus lines. The two most prominent that I am aware of are Greyhound and Redline. They can get off and get onto one of those buses at a bus terminal, not one minute from freeway interchanges where freeways intersect in the network, and they can go from anywhere to anywhere and book their fare at a bus terminal. They can cash up vouchers or tickets and rearrange their journey according to their desire.

One might say it is a chicken and egg argument. Well, the Government has to do something about it in the first instance by facilitating the rearrangement of the vital part of our service to tourists in that category by completely renovating public bus licensing arrangements. They are a botch at present. They simply serve the necessity 50-70 years ago for pioneering settlers to get from country areas to Adelaide and back again, for whatever purpose. They do not serve the emerging needs of tourists who would or could come here to provide jobs for ourselves and our kids and expand our economy.

I have only recently had the good fortune as a member of the Australian Tourism Industry Association (ATIA) to attend the seminar the association jointly sponsored with the Australian Tourism Commission on 18 March in the Convention Centre. I believe that it would have done any member in this place a great deal of good to have put in some time there, or at least to have read some of the summary papers provided by the speakers at that seminar. Segmentation of market was explained, the definitions of it were provided and the market research to date was placed before us for our benefit as an industry. Too few people were there, especially the policy makers. I saw no-one there from the Minister's office.

The Hon. M.D. Rann: They were.

Mr LEWIS: Well, they did not make themselves known to me—not that they necessarily should, but I would have expected them to be a little higher in profile.

The Hon. M.D. Rann interjecting:

Mr LEWIS: The Minister may jest, but let me tell him that they would have a better chance of a more prosperous and happy life had they the good grace to say 'Hello' once in a while. As I said at the time, maybe what we ought to do is recognise that we are basically a friendly nation and that the rest of the world should be encouraged to understand that by our adoption of a slogan, something along the lines of 'Australia: we're friendly; let's make friends'. It would do a lot for us as well as our tourists to adopt that attitude in the way in which we relate to them. In the context of the remark that the Minister just made, it might do him a lot of good to bear that in mind in relation to the way in which he says things as well.

I also wish to make it plain that the Arthur D. Little report had a great deal of useful, sensible comment to make about the need for accessibility, which underlines the point I was making, for instance, about providing appropriate transport for backpackers. Whilst Adelaide, and indeed South Australia, is central to this continent, nothing has been done to promote that. We still allow the Australian Tourism Commission, the Federal Airports Corporation and the Federal Government, more particularly, to get away with investment of public dollars raised through the Loan Council in improved airport facilities interstate instead of here in South Australia.

It is not just the terminal itself that is causing a problem but other parts as well. Neither the Government nor this Minister—and I give him credit; he has done better than his predecessors, particularly the last one—has done anywhere near enough to get the Australian Tourism Commission, and subsequently the Government in spending dollars in the name of tourism in this country, to do something about the development of our market. We have a good product here and it is cheap and accessible. However, every time Australia is featured overseas we get this compounding of the chicken and egg problem, or the catch 22 problem. They show images of the Opera House and the Sydney Harbor Bridge, Lizard Island out of Cairns and Uluru or Ayers Rock—and whatever else they show—and they show nothing of South Australia.

If it is the wine industry being featured they show the Hunter Valley or the Margaret River. There is nothing of South Australia. Why do we not kick them in the slats or wherever else it will hurt enough to make them realise that they have to give our fair share of tax dollars to the promotion of opportunities for people to come here? There is no other way, it seems to me; they do not respond to correspondence or anything one has to say to them. It is about time we got our fair share.

The Sydney International Airport at Botany Bay and the Melbourne International Airport at Tullamarine were both established at taxpayers' expense. Now, of course, the Federal Airport Corporation under micro-economic reform—so Keating called it—has to accept responsibility and operate as if in the private sector, so there is no money available. They say that no-one wants to come here. Well, no-one wants to come here because it is not being advertised when our tax dollars are being spent on advertising other places; there are no damn facilities for them to arrive at and no way for them to get around when they get here. That is all Government responsibility.

It is about time the Government told some of those fellows in Canberra who are supposed to be its mates to get their act together and stop being so ruddy parochial and hegemonistic and patronising in their attitude to South Australia and the nation.

Mr Hamilton interjecting:

Mr LEWIS: It is second rate because, if we did not take it, we would have got nothing and we would still have nothing. It is better to have something than nothing. If you can get a broody bantam to hatch one egg, at least you have a chicken.

Mr Hamilton interjecting:

Mr LEWIS: You would wait forever for a dodo and there are no eggs for the dodo to hatch and the dodo has gone anyway. Nothing has been done to get our share of public capital invested in the infrastructure here in South Australia. More emphasis needs to be put on dealing with the Federal Government and its dereliction of duty in that respect.

I agree with both the member for Bragg and the member for Coles about the full ambit of cultural tourism. I pay credit to the Minister for understanding and acknowledging that. It involves not only festivals or the Art Gallery: it is also about the prehistory of this continent and the people who lived here before Europeans. It is surprising to me that no-one yet knows that I encouraged those people from the Ngarrindjeri to get themselves some management qualifications. I acknowledge the good work they did in that direction, in conjunction with the Australian Institute of Management, to acquire those qualifications provided through courses there to then go and set up enterprises, one of which is a place called Camp Coorong just south of Meningie. I have encouraged the families operating that enterprise—and they are all descendants of Ngarrindjeri—from six years ago to get on with it. They have done extremely well.

The enterprise is worth over $500 000 and its visitor numbers are growing rapidly. Yet, I now see that, because it is there and because it is working, the dumb Government has decided to put a competitor in there, remove the lease (from part of the land where the tucker trail and the bush trail are) from the care, custody, control and development of access facilities from the Camp Coorong group and give it to someone else who has not been in the area for the bulk of her life—she has relatives and connections there but has grown up in Adelaide and then become a public servant. She does not know anything about the place, but she is about to claim and be given by the Government—because she is a fellow traveller and a mate of Government—the money necessary to set up in competition and destroy the viability of the existing enterprise. That is crazy; it is absolutely stupid. I supported the whole existing facility along the way, and ATSIC provided the necessary support and some of the capital to make it possible and now the Government is going to destroy both enterprises by letting the avarice of one individual who is a mate to move in beside it and split the income. I think that is absolutely crazy.

In addition, this Government has done nothing about using FM transmission. I have an interest in this: I own a company that owns an FM radio station called FM 88 Narrowcasters, which provides tourism information to people travelling through the Lower Murray. I financed it and got it set up and broadcasting to provide information to travellers along the highway in the Murraylands and the Lower Murray area.

It is easier to travel from there to anywhere, whether it is the Barossa Valley, the Adelaide Hills, Adelaide itself, the wine districts or the Fleurieu. It is quicker to get to and from all of those regions if one stays in the Lower Murray than if one stays in any one of the regions and travels to the rest of them; and there are so many things to do locally.

With respect to narrowcasting, this Government could provide multi-lingual services or encourage regional associations to do so, because it is now possible to advertise on that facility. There are multi-lingual services and information bays where people can pull in and hear on radio what is written on the board in German, Japanese, French, Chinese or whatever one wants to read. However, if travellers turn on their FM transmitter to 87.5FM they can hear the message about the district, in whatever language they want to hear, in solid state transmissions. It is pity, I think, that the Government has not recognised the enormous potential which this medium has to provide support, reinforcement and satisfaction of backpackers and others touring South Australia.

The Hon. M.D. RANN (Minister of Tourism): I enjoyed the depth of the debate tonight, particularly the remarks of the member for Coles, who I think made a valuable contribution, although perhaps lacking the vitality of the prepared speech of the member for Bragg. We are embarking on something that is very important. We are talking about an industry driven Tourism Commission. I assure the House that of the nine members proposed to be appointed to the commission board at least eight will be from the private sector and the remaining member will be from the arts industry. So it will be very much a private sector driven board with strong and clear powers in the area of marketing.

I should point out a few things that are going on, one of which is closer integration of the marketing thrust of both Tourism SA and the Grand Prix, and I will say something about that shortly. It is important, too, that

people recognise that there has been a stronger thrust in terms of cultural tourism, WOMAD being the first example of that, and also eco-tourism, an initiative announced this week. Whilst we are building on what Tourism SA has done, there is a slight change in emphasis. We are about to announce major initiatives in marketing both interstate and overseas, and we look forward to the contribution of the private sector in that process.

In the area of development, which has been mentioned tonight, the Tourism Commission is essentially about marketing, because we want to have a much stronger focus on marketing. We are talking about increasing the contribution to 75 per cent of the total of TSA's budget, concentrating on marketing. Marketing is not just about advertising. Let us face the facts. If you wanted to pay for a 30 second advertisement on Japanese television it would cost hundreds of thousands of dollars. Recently, for a very small cost (a few thousand dollars) we were able to encourage a Japanese television crew to come to South Australia to film two programs on South Australia for broadcast in Japan: one was on Kangaroo Island and the other was on Adelaide and its surrounds, involving a series of locations. I was interviewed as Minister of Tourism, and the films were broadcast recently in Japan. Obviously there was some promotion, and there was an audience of 40 million for both programs on evenings a week apart. That is much better value for dollar out of a few thousand dollars than spraying money against the wall in terms of advertisements.

The member for Bragg asked why we were approaching Mel Gibson to be a tourism ambassador for the State. The answer is that we are not; there has been no suggestion by anyone, least of all by me, that Mel Gibson be a tourism ambassador for South Australia. That was a fabrication by the *Advertiser*. However, we are approaching people such as Dr Mohri, who was educated at Flinders University—a couple of his degrees come from that university—and was Japan's first astronaut, a national hero of Japan who was recently appointed as the head of the Japanese Space Authority, to be our first tourism ambassador. We want a mix of tourism ambassadors who come from South Australia and who can represent what we stand for and believe in and can offer internationally and also people from overseas with credibility in their market who have special ties with this State. Whilst I am pleased to hear honourable members' endorsements, they should not believe all they read in the newspapers. When they have more experience they will realise that. I would like to pay tribute to the members who have contributed to this Bill.

We widened the former advisory board of Tourism South Australia to bring in a considerable number of key players from the industry. We have virtually unanimous support for the provisions of this Bill, because it comes from them, from a process that went on for months with regular meetings which produced these ideas, and we are looking forward to a continuation of that approach. We are separating development out of the Tourism Commission and putting in a specific unit within the business and regional development portfolio simply to avoid conflicts of interest which could occur with a private sector board which should be focusing on marketing, although obviously there will need to be a close relationship. I am pleased with the contributions of members tonight, and I have pleasure in commending the Bill to the House.

Bill read a second time.

In Committee.

Clauses 1 to 5 passed.

Clause 6—'Board to be governing body of commission.'

Mr INGERSON: Subclause (1) establishes the board of directors. When does the Minister expect to announce the board, and will all 10 members, as suggested in this Bill, be appointed?

The Hon. M.D. RANN: We are currently talking with a number of key players in the industry, and I have approached a number of people to see whether they would be prepared to serve on the tourism board. The legislation provides for the commission to be established from 1 July, and I propose to announce an interim board in the next couple of weeks.

Clause passed.

Clause 7—'Ministerial control.'

Mr INGERSON: Subclause (3) provides for a performance agreement to be entered into between the Minister and the commission. Does this mean that there will be a business plan and general direction from that plan? Will the Minister explain in reasonable detail what is meant by that?

The Hon. M.D. RANN: Obviously, we are looking at a business plan and a marketing plan with clear objectives. We will set out some broad objectives, and I will say something about that in the next few weeks, but we will then want vital input from the industry to ensure that those objectives become reality.

Clause passed.

Clause 8—'Chief Executive Officer.'

Mr INGERSON: Subclause (3) provides that the Chief Executive Officer will be appointed by the Governor. What are the terms and conditions of this position, and how will the Government call for applications?

The Hon. M.D. RANN: We are trying to ensure that the sense of partnership between the public sector, the Government, me as Minister and the private sector is enshrined right from the start. It is true that some commissions would have the Chief Executive Officer appointed by just the board and others, including the recent EDB, appointed by the Governor. We propose under this clause that the Chief Executive Officer be appointed by the Governor but on the recommendation of the Minister and the board.

We are looking for consensus and agreement to avoid conflict, because I am accountable to this Parliament and to Estimates Committees for the expenditure of money. Obviously, the Chief Executive Officer will have clear responsibilities to both the Chairperson of the board and the board as well as to me as Minister. So we need to make sure that that partnership is enshrined from the outset.

Mr INGERSON: Is it intended to advertise for this position outside the public sector?

The Hon. M.D. RANN: Yes. Clause passed.

Clause 9—'Composition of the board.'

Mr INGERSON: Clause 9(3) provides that the membership of the board shall be made up of persons ho have, for example, experience in industrial relations. Does that imply that a person will have union membership to relate to industrial relations, or does it just mean someone of much broader experience?

The Hon. M.D. RANN: We are trying to ensure that there are no representatives on this board. Quite frankly, if I had appointed to the board or proposed appointing to the board the range of people that has been suggested to me by various groups, every regional tourism association would want to have someone on the board—the Travel Agents Association and various other bodies. We are saying that we want to pick individuals of talent who can make a contribution, but we also want to get a spread—rather than representatives who are nominated by somebody else—of people with experience in areas such as industrial relations, whether from the employer or employee's point of view, and also people with experience of airlines, the retail sector and so on. We want to get a clear spread of talent and not have people who are sort of there as the nominees of other bodies. That way we can ensure that there is a clear commitment to the commission and its success rather than reporting back to other organisations.

Mr INGERSON: Clause 9(5) provides that a director will be appointed by the Governor to chair the meetings o f the board. Will it be a full-time position and, if so, will it be salaried?

The Hon. M.D. RANN: No, it will not be full-time. It is proposed that it be a part-time position, but I would imagine that it would attract the usual remuneration as established under clear precedent.

Clause passed.

Clause 10 passed.

Clause 11—'Vacancies or defects in appointment of directors.'

Mr LEWIS: Can the Minister point out why the role and function of the person who is the holder of the licence referred to in clause 11 has to be so licensed?

The Hon. M.D. RANN: It appears the honourable member is looking at the wrong Bill. There is no mention of a licence under this clause.

Mr LEWIS: I have got it wrong.

Clause passed.

Clauses 12 to 18 passed.

Clause 19—'Functions of commission.'

Mr INGERSON: A considerable amount of concern has been expressed by the tourist regions or regional groups as they are currently formed. They would like to know what is the position in relation to the tourism regional boards and the regional development boards. As the Minister would know, they are two different categories. What are the likely marketing plans, if there are any, to be specified? Where do regional advisers sit in this new structure?

The Hon. M.D. RANN: Obviously, we want to see the commission reach agreement and have a close relationship with regional tourism associations and, as we do already, to reach agreement in terms of the funding that is provided—not just to be handing out cheques for anything, but to look at a proper approach. It is important that regional tourism is run from the regions. I am sure that the honourable member would agree that it is not our role to tell Port Lincoln how to market itself, or to tell the South-East how it should market itself, or to tell the southern suburbs, which I know the honourable member and I have had meetings with in recent months, about how to arrange their own united efforts.

It is very important to recognise that the regions be respected and supported in the work that they are doing, and that they have a close relationship with the new Tourism Commission, and it is also very important that the regions themselves get their act together. I know the honourable member's question relates to the regional tourism associations and the regional development boards. There is a bit of insecurity. I have said that, if regional tourism associations and regional development boards choose to join together—and there are a number of examples of that in progress—if they choose of their own free will, we will assist and facilitate but, if they do not want to do that, we will not force them to join together, because obviously anything that is enforced from above rather than growing organically will not work. I do not take the East German model of tourism as my model.

Mr LEWIS: There are several points I want to raise in relation to this clause. I will carry on with the one which the Minister has just addressed in response to a question put to him by the member for Bragg. It is my judgment that we need to be pretty careful about regional development boards and any relationship that they may have with regional tourism associations. Regional development boards, in the main, where they are not already established and operating effectively and successfully as a result of heavy subsidies of funds ceded by Government several years ago, are desperate for money and power—that is, their bureaucracies. More particularly, though, in the main they are comprised of people who are appointed to them by local government bodies in the region.

Those local government bodies are comprised of people elected by a poll of ratepayers and electors in the local government area, but they have a separate agenda and responsibility altogether than that of regional development. They have a parochial interest in the district council or corporation of which they are a delegate and a parochial interest in the electorate which put them into that district council in the first place. No way is there any necessity for them to contribute in an altruistic fashion to the development of a model for regional development.

It is therefore very dangerous indeed for us to presume that just because those people live in that general regional locality they will be inclined to do things which will be in its interest where they are delegates to the regional development association from the local government body. That category predominates in representation. These regional development board members have a steep learning curve ahead of them, in my judgment, if they are to make regional development boards function properly. The board's purpose should be to get the most rapid expansion possible of the economic base in their region. But the way in which these members set about doing that will be as much to do with their own survival in the district council or the corporation to which they have been elected, as it is in

achieving altruistically determined goals for regional development boards. So much so that I would discourage (indeed, I would be critical in the extreme) of any Government or Minister who made funds available to regional tourism through the mechanism of the regional development board. I think that would be a sad and sorry thing.

The Hon. M.D. Rann interjecting:

Mr LEWIS: It is more a speech than a question, if the Minister must know, because I am warning him of what I have already seen happening. There will be considerable conflict if that course of action is followed. Does the Government have any plan whatsoever to provide funds to regional tourism through regional development boards, and will it allow regional development boards to the funding power they then have to effectively choke off the money that has been contributed to regional tourist associations by the local government bodies of which the regional development boards are comprised?

The Hon. M.D. RANN: I will explain the answer to the previous question, that the regional tourist associations will continue to have a relationship with the Tourism Commission in terms of funding. Regional development boards are funded under a separate ministry, which happens to be in my portfolio area. Any analogies between regional development boards and regional tourism associations are ones of marriage and not some enforced slavery.

Mr LEWIS: I am pleased to hear the. Minister give me that assurance, and I thank him very much. I know that we have consensus on that point in this place. I believe it is vital, more so perhaps because of my intimate contact with what has been going on.. Since a function of the commission is to look after the tourism industry, in effect, under this clause, can the commission get stuck into the Federal Government to make sure that regional tourist associations will not have their income taxed by the Australian Taxation Office, as is presently possible? Tourism associations are subject to the Income Tax Act and may very well have to pay income tax on the revenue they raise in the name of tourism development. I think that is iniquitous: for the Federal Government to step in and knock off a great slab of their income as tax is to my mind the worst kind of parasitism I can imagine.

I have another question which is relevant to the operation of the commission. Will the Minister give the commission an additional brief to promote an import substitution marketing plan for international holiday-makers who are Australians and to get that understood? Part of our problem in this country is that we allow our own citizens to fall prey to the seductive overtures made to them to take holidays outside our market, outside South Australia, and even outside Australia. If holidays within Australia are adequately packaged, it will encourage our citizens to holiday within their own country, which means that their dollars do not go out of our State and our nation, and they will help us to develop our industry more by adding profitability to it. At present we overlook that, and I hope the Minister understands the significance of what I am saying, not only because of the extra jobs we will get if we properly package and sell our product locally but also because it helps our national balance of payments position. So, they are the two things: the necessity to get rid of income tax and the necessity to promote our tourism locally, and I congratulate the Minister for what he has done in that regard in the Shorts Program, for instance.

The Hon. M.D. RANN: Thank you. I will certainly make sure that the tourism board is made aware of the honourable member's comments.

The Hon. FRANK BLEVINS: Mr Speaker, I draw your attention to the state of the House.

A quorum having been formed:

The Hon. M.D. RANN (Minister of Tourism): I move:

That Standing Orders be so far suspended as to enable the House to sit beyond midnight.

Motion carried.

Mr LEWIS: I have one other point under this clause. It seems to me that very often we do things extremely well in South Australia in one context, but fail to do anything to tell the world about it or derive other value added benefit from it in another. Let me make it plain: we make arguably the best wine and cheese in the world. Moreover, we have some of the most successful environmental rehabilitation programs of almost totally devastated natural environment of the and regions anywhere on earth caused by rabbits and other feral animals, yet tourism has not done anything about cashing in on that, and it could. I am asking the Minister to say whether he would be willing to draw the attention of the commission to the benefits that could be derived, for instance, from encouraging people, both Australians and South Australians but also overseas tourists, to take a close look at what is happening in places like Roxby Downs and Moomba.

In Roxby Downs the Western Mining Company has excluded feral animals (rabbits, cats and the like) from the area near the mine and the town, and the rehabilitation has been quite dramatic. It is probably also because we have had a run of good seasons. Other mining companies could be encouraged to do the same in locations in which they are operating. Indeed, other businesses in remote parts of South Australia could be encouraged to do likewise and provide us with not only the double-barrelled effect but a greater benefit for everyone, meaning that the operator of the business gets a lift in PR, the tourists get the gratification of seeing it the way it really was, and the environment benefits from our having restored an ecosystem niche in that locality. I wonder whether or not we can make that also something to which the commission pays attention.

The Hon. M.D. RANN: Last week we announced a major initiative in the area of eco-tourism and the appointment of someone with enormous international reputation in that area, and I will certainly be happy to pass on the honourable member's remarks to her.

Clause passed.

Clause 20—'Powers of commission.'

Mr INGERSON: Clause 20(2)(b) enables the commission to employ staff. First, are the staff of the commission likely to be transferred public servants who currently work within Tourism SA? Secondly, has any agreement been entered into with existing public

servants? For example, have three year contracts been offered to them as a swap over to the new commission?

The Hon. M.D. RANN: These matters are obviously being progressed, but I want to point out that under the legislation an employee of the commission will not be a member of the Public Service, but the board may employ a person who is on leave from the Public Service or with an instrumentality or agency of the Crown, and negotiation is already under way with the Public Service Association with a view to entering into contract relationships.

Mr INGERSON: Does that mean that the existing staff in total have been offered transfers to the new commission? My reason for asking is that there has been much concern in industry that all that is really happening is that the Government is introducing a new board but that all the staff, the people who fairly or unfairly have been criticised for the running of tourism in this State, are really just going to be swapped over so that we are really not going to get a new commission but only a new name.

The Hon. M.D. RANN: Not all the staff.

Mr INGERSON: Does that mean that there has been a selection process in which some of the staff have been chosen to be offered contracts or has it purely and simply been a jobs for the boys process, or a jobs for the girls process, in which those who might be favourable to the Minister or the Government are likely to get jobs, or has it been done, as we would hope, using private sector methods of choosing people on merit and having the best people for the job?

The Hon. M.D. RANN: We certainly want to get the best people in those jobs, and there have been no offers as such as we are currently in negotiation, because the commission does not start until 1 July. A number of vacancies have deliberately not been filled, and we would be advertising those vacancies generally. There would be some staff of TSA who would be redeployed into other areas, and a number of those people are excellent officers. And I want to just put this on record today: we have outstanding staff in Tourism South Australia

Mr S.J. Baker interjecting:

The Hon. M.D. RANN: And, I must say, an outstanding Minister as well. I am glad that came from the Deputy Leader of the Opposition. What an endorsement! I will put that in an ad at the next election. But the point of the matter is that we have outstanding staff whom I do not want to see disparaged in this Parliament, because most of them do a darn good job, and I am very surprised to hear that kind of negative approach to people in TSA who, I believe, have been of great service to members of Parliament, both to the Opposition, particularly when the member for Coles was the Minister, and to members on this side of the House. Many, I hope, will have positions in the new Tourism Commission. There will also be other people brought in from outside, because a major restructure will occur.

Mr S.G. EVANS: Will the Minister make available to the shadow Minister details of those persons who are now expected to be definite in the new commission and those who are in Tourism SA at this stage and who are not definitely moving into the commission, the positions they held and the positions they are expected to hold?

The Hon. M.D. RANN: It will be up to the Chairperson of the commission, because I want to get the advice of the board. I am not going to treat them with contempt by telling them what they can and cannot do before they are even appointed. But I will be happy to discuss this and other things with the shadow Minister, as I did this Bill, and also as I have prospective members of the commission.

Mr S.G. EVANS: If the Minister finds it hard to let us know who are likely to be there, who have been recommended or suggested or whatever, I ask the Minister, if he is still in the position, whether he will tell us which persons did not make it to the commission from Tourism SA and the positions they held.

The Hon. M.D. RANN: I am happy to discuss that with the shadow Minister on a confidential basis.

Mr S.G. EVANS: I think it goes deeper than a confidential basis. They are public servants. The structure is being changed, and I believe each member of Parliament is entitled to know. The reason I thought the shadow Minister should know is that he would let all his colleagues know, and I believe that the information should be made available to the Parliament, if the Minister likes, but at least we should know who they are, and not just on a confidential basis, as that restricts the shadow Minister from telling any other Minister the exact position. We are entitled to know.

The Hon. M.D. RANN: The previous question was whether I would provide the information to the shadow Minister, and I have said 'Yes.'

Clause passed.

Clause 21 passed.

Clause 22—'Budgets.'

Mr INGERSON: Before asking a question, I would like to put on record that the Minister did provide me with a list of people and, as the Minister is aware, whilst I was not prepared to comment on whether they should or should not be appointed, I made very clear to the Minister that, in essence, it was his final decision and that there were no people on that list that we would not consider. There was no question as to whether we supported any of those people at all, and I wanted to make that clear.

The Hon. M.D. Rann interjecting:

Mr INGERSON: Yes, and I accept that. Clause 22(3) provides that there will be a general setting out of budgets. There is no mention whether ASA or standard accounting standards are to be used. In other words, is the budget to be done on an accrual accounting basis or using the traditional cash flow system that Governments normally use?

The Hon. M.D. RANN: Obviously, I would want the clear advice of both Treasury and the private sector board on this. I do not want to tie down this board in red tape. Let me make that clear from the start. We are putting people in, as we have been urged to do for years by all sorts of people. We are putting in place a private sector board to drive the commission, and I will not be tying it up in red tape beforehand.

Clause passed.

Remaining clauses (23 to 26) and title passed.

Bill read a third time and passed.

EVIDENCE (VULNERABLE WITNESSES) AMENDMENT BILL

Received from the Legislative Council and read a first time.

ADJOURNMENT

At 12.12 a.m. the House adjourned until Wednesday 24 March at 2 p.m.

HOUSE OF ASSEMBLY

Tuesday 23 March

QUESTIONS ON NOTICE

GOVERNMENT VEHICLES

202. **Mr BECKER:**

I What was the driver of the vehicle registered VQA-594 attending to on Thursday 24 September 1992 at 8.35am on Kensington Road?

II Who was the elderly female passenger?

III To which Government department or agency is this vehicle attached?

IV Were the terms of Government Management Board Circular 30/90 being observed by the driver of this vehicle and if not, why not and what action does the Government propose to take?

The Hon. M.D. RANN: The replies are as follows:

I I am unable to respond to this question, as the vehicle in question is leased to the Children's Services Office and is based in Naracoorte. According to the vehicle's log book, this vehicle was located in the South East during the period in question.

II As per Part 1.

III The vehicle is registered to State Fleet and is leased on Long Term Hire to the Children's Services Office.

IV The terms of the Government Management Board Circular 30/90 are observed by the driver of this vehicle.

BURBRIDGE ROAD

256. **Mr BECKER:** Does the Government intend to widen Burbridge Road and if so, where, why and when and at what estimated cost?

The Hon. M.D. RANN: The Department of Road Transport currently has Burbridge Road between South Road and Brooker Terrace on the Metropolitan Adelaide Road Widening Plan for future widening. In addition, both this Government and the City of West Torrens have endorsed a joint State and City of West Torrens commissioned report entitled 'Adelaide Arrive' which proposes major urban design improvements to Burbridge Road.

The aim is to make the road a major gateway entrance boulevard to the City of West Torrens, City of Adelaide and the State of South Australia for visitors and tourists. The City of West Torrens and the State have already started stage one of works which involves the undergrounding of power lines, tree planting and an upgrading in street furniture for the section between Brooker Terrace and Marion Road. The endorsed report has recommended a concept design for the section between Brooker Avenue and South Road which requires road widening. The aim is to present a quality design and village atmosphere for the commercial and civic heart of West Torrens and to promote a quality lifestyle image for South Australia.

Priority in terms of road widening for this section is currently low from a road network point of view given the low traffic growth rate, relatively low accident rate and other Statewide priorities. Timing and costing of the road widening will require consultation and negotiation with a range of agencies. Total cost of the entire upgrading of Burbridge Road for all agencies was estimated at $11.15 million in 1992 of which $2.09 million was estimated for land acquisition for the section requiring road widening. As the work is progressing as a staged process these costs will be spread over a number of years.

COUNCIL DUMP

301. **Mr BECKER:**

I What studies and surveys have been undertaken concerning the safety and potential pollution of the environment at the old Glenelg and West Torrens Council rubbish dump located in West Beach Trust land at Tapleys Hill Road, West Beach?

II What action is proposed to beautify this area and what is the estimated cost?

III Can the methane gas in the dump be used commercially and if not, why not?

The Hon. G.J. CRAFTER: The replies are as follows:

I I am advised by the West Beach Trust that it has not undertaken any studies or surveys concerning the safety and potential pollution of the environment at the old Glenelg and West Torrens Council rubbish dump located on West Beach Trust land at Tapleys Hill Road, West Beach.

II The Trust has not made plans for the future use and beautification of this area.

III I am advised that no assessment has been made about the potential for methane gas in the dump to be used commercially, however, given the size and profile of the dump, methane is unlikely to be available in commercially viable quantities.

HARRISON REPORT

312. **Mr BECKER:**

I When did the Greyhound Racing Board receive the Harrison Report into the industry, how long did the Report take to compile and what was its cost?

II What were the findings and recommendations of the Report, which recommendations have been implemented, when will all of the findings be implemented and what are the reasons for any delays?

The Hon. G.J. CRAFTER: The replies are as follows:

I The report was received July 1991. It took 2 months to compile and the SA Greyhound Racing Board made a payment of $5 000.00.

II The report was commissioned to provide a Corporate Plan for the SA Greyhound Racing Board, as well as the Adelaide Greyhound Racing Club and the Gawler Greyhound Racing Club - being the major finance contributors to the industry.

The Board accepted the Harrison report with some reservation in that some of his recommendations, such as reduction in prize-money, were already planned to be put into place.

The Gawler Greyhound Racing Club's building project which was anticipated to commence in 1993 will take a longer period.

The recommendation that Racecourses Development Board (RDB), should create a reserve for Gawler facilities has been put into action, as seen in the RDB annual report.

With regard to the repayment of interest on the complex improvements, the Adelaide Greyhound Racing Club have effected payments on time, as requested by the RDB and the club did not require an extension as suggested by Mr Harrison in his report.

The Greyhound Racing Board has taken up Mr Harrison's recommendation for a Capital Fund. This is in place plus the Board has added reserves for Long Service Leave and holiday loadings which were not provided for previously.

Mr Harrison suggested that racing clubs should forward a capital plan to the RDB covering three years. This was deemed not practical as the clubs have over the past 8 years made all major capital improvements required. It is not envisaged that any major improvements will be carried out over the next three years by the racing clubs with the exception of Gawler and South East Greyhound Racing Clubs.

A report on the Gawler and Adelaide Greyhound Racing Clubs was included in the Corporate Plan in order to give them a guide to future income and expenditure and to enable them to plan budgets over the next three years. This has been put into place by both clubs and has improved their budgetary performance.

In accordance with recommendations, the SA Greyhound Racing Board has put into place the TAB tavern at Angle Park and the club is pursuing the introduction of video gaming machines and their viability—this is a club matter and not a direction of the Board.

ENGINEERING AND WATER SUPPLY DEPARTMENT

313. **Mr BECKER:**

I Did a consultant, Mr M. Colley, investigate the E&WS stores and transport system and recommend rationalisation of those functions throughout the State and if so, why and what was the cost of the consultancy?

II What were Mr Colley's findings and recommendations, what action has the Department taken and what is the estimated saving?

III What faults were found with the operation of the warehouse and distribution stores at Ottoway?

IV Are two new stores to be established in the metropolitan area and if so, where and at what cost?

V What cash flow studies have been undertaken to ensure the viability of the proposal and when will a breakeven time be arrived at?

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

I Yes. Dr M. Colley was chosen due to his extensive experience in improving supply operations in several major public utilities throughout Australia. The review was undertaken as it was recognised that there would be opportunities for supply to improve the service to its customers and its efficiency of operation following the implementation of a new on-line supply management system and the adoption by the department of a more commercial, decentralised approach to business. The cost of the consultancy to date is $233 000 and the estimated total cost is $340 000.

II The review has recommended a restructuring of the procurement, stores and transport operations. Implementation teams are currently being formed with representatives from Corporate Supply and the Major Operational units to implement the various key actions highlighted in the recommendations. Estimated direct savings are $10m annually in a present total expenditure of $120m annually. A proposed rationalisation of the number of persons engaged in the supply function has been identified, reducing the number of persons from 156 to 86. To date a reduction of some 56 persons has been achieved.

III Opportunities for cost reductions have been identified throughout the whole departmental supply and transport operations. Opportunities for specific improvement at Ottoway relate to stock layout and method of operation to improve customer service.

IV Changes to work procedures and organisational arrangements will be necessary to enable the realisation of the potential savings. No new stores will be established.

V A thorough cash flow analysis has been undertaken to determine the viability of the proposals. Implementation of the review findings to date is already returning savings of approximately $2 million per annum.

KEARNS BROS (AUCTIONS) PTY LTD

314. **Mr BECKER:**

I How many complaints have been received of misrepresentation of motor vehicles sold at auction by Kearns Bros. (Auctions) Pty. Ltd. for each of the past three financial years and what action was taken in each case?

II How many times in this period were compliance plates found to be misleading and what action was taken in each case and if none, why not?

III On how many occasions in the past three financial years were rebuilt wrecked motor vehicles auctioned which did not conform to compliance plates?

The Hon. M.K. MAYES: The replies are as follows:

I The Commissioner for Consumer Affairs has received two complaints in the past three financial years concerning the misrepresentation of motor vehicles sold at Kearns Bros. (Auctions) Pty Ltd. The matters were investigated by the Office of Fair Trading. One complaint was considered not to be justified and in the case of the other the seller of the vehicle rejected the purchaser's claims of misrepresentation. (The seller is the person or company who put the vehicle up for auction).

II The Commissioner for Consumer Affairs has not received in this period any complaints concerning Kearns Bros. (Auctions) Pty Ltd and misleading compliance plates.

III The Commissioner for Consumer Affairs has not received any complaints in the past three financial years concerning rebuilt motor vehicles auctioned by Kearns Bros. (Auctions) Pty Ltd which did not conform to compliance plates.

TUDOR TURF CLUB

315. **Mr BECKER:** How many complaints has the Department of Consumer Affairs received concerning the advertising and other activities of the Tudor Turf Club, Gold AMP Building of 10 Eagle Street, Brisbane with respect to selling computer software for a horse racing gambling system for $3 500 and what action has been taken?

The Hon. M.K. MAYES: The Department of Public and Consumer Affairs has received one enquiry concerning the Tudor Turf Club of Gold AMP Building, 10 Eagle Street, Brisbane.

As the promoter of the computerised racing system was Queensland based, the enquiry was referred to the Trade Practices Commission for their attention. The Department has taken no other action in relation to the activities of the Tudor Turf Club.

STATE BANK

316. **Mr BECKER:**

I Has the State Bank called tenders and sold NAFA Pty. Ltd. and Wheelease and if so, when and for what price?

II Was any software of these companies sold to the Queensland Government for approximately $300 000 and if so, why and for what advantage?

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

I Commencing 10 November 1992, Asset Risk Management Limited, a subsidiary of State Bank, sought registrations of interest for the acquisition of NAFA Fleet Management Pty Ltd, Wheelease Pty Ltd and an associated portfolio of operating fleet lease assets (collectively called "the NAFA Business"). Requests for registrations of interest were advertised in the Australian Financial Review on 18 November 1992.

Negotiations for the sale are still being undertaken and it is anticipated that these should progress to a successful conclusion by 30 April 1993.

II Prior to the involvement of the State Bank Group, on 23 November 1990 NAFA Pty Ltd responded to an open tender issued by the Queensland Government for the supply of a fleet management computer system. NAFA Pty Ltd sold a licence for the software (for use but not re-sale) to Q Fleet, a department of the Queensland Government.

Disclosure of the price paid for the licence could compromise negotiations for the sale of the NAFA Business, a part of which comprises the current version of this fleet management software.

DESK PADS

318. **Mr BECKER:**

I How many 1993 desk pads were printed by the Intellectual Disability Services Council and to whom were they distributed?

II What was the cost of producing and printing the desk pads, how was the cost arrived at and what were the component costs of graphic art cartoon work etc?

III From which budget line were the funds provided?

The Hon. M.J. EVANS: The replies are as follows:

I IDSC produced 500 pads. They were distributed to all members of the House of Assembly, all members of the Legislative Council, Heads of Government Departments, members of the media including on-air personalities and key people in management positions. In addition, local IDSC offices were invited to purchase copies to give to Mayors, Principals of Schools, General Practitioners and case workers from other service providers.

II The cost of producing the pads was as follows:

Design, typesetting, finished art	$240.00
Printing 500 x 30 page pad	$2500.00
Cartoon work	$240.00
	$2980.00 for 500 pads

III Since the purpose of the pads was to raise consciousness about issues important to people with an intellectual disability and to reinforce positive attitudes with regard to this group, the costs were met through the public relations budget at IDSC.

POLICE UNIFORMS

323. **Mr MATTHEW:**

I What is the name of the company which provides jumpers to the Police Department?

II What is the name and address of the manufacturer?

III When was the contract signed, for what period of time is it valid, what are the names and addresses of other companies who tendered for the contract and what price is the Department paying for the jumpers?

The Hon. M K MAYES: The replies are as follows:

I Calcoup Inc Pty Ltd
11-15 Harp Street
BELMORE NSW 2192

II As Above

III The contract was signed on the 17th July 1992 to expire on 30 June 1994. The following are names of companies who tendered for the contract:

Florence Knitwear
40 Stradbroke Road
NEWTON SA 5074

Silver Fleece Knitting Mills Pty Ltd
Corner Freeman and Richardson Avenue
TRANMERE SA 5073

Johnstyles Accessories
13 Leigh Street
ADELAIDE SA 5000

Elegant Knitting Company
Lot 14 Altair Place
PENRITH NSW 2750

Bromley Knitwear
139 Boundary Road
NORTH MELBOURNE VIC 3051

The cost to the Department is $34.95 per unit

GOVERNMENT VEHICLES

326. **Mr MATTHEW:**

I How many plain plated (or unmarked) vehicles are owned by, and how many are leased by, each department or agency under the Minister's responsibility?

II For what purpose is each vehicle used?

III How many vehicles are allocated to officers as part of their salary package and to which officers are they allocated?

IV From where are each of the vehicles leased and under what terms and conditions?

The Hon. G.J. CRAFTER: The replies are as follows:

I Owned - nil
Leased - 19

II Fourteen of those vehicles are used for office use and private use. The remaining 5 are allocated to Government investigators for official use and home to office use.

III There are 14 vehicles that are allocated as part of officers' packages and these officers are as follows:

1 Solicitor-General
1 Commissioner for Equal Opportunity
1 Chief Executive Officer
1 Director of Public Prosecutions
1 Crown Solicitor
7 MLS-2 Legal Officers
2 MLS-2 Acting Legal Officers

IV All our departmental vehicles are government vehicles through State Fleet. The terms and conditions of these vehicles are the standard conditions issued by State Fleet.

COURT SERVICES DEPARTMENT

I Owned - 20
Leased - 48

II Each vehicle is utilised as detailed below

(i) Leased Vehicles

1 Chief Executive Officer (Mr. J. Witham)
1 Chief Justice of the Supreme Court
1 Chief Judge of the District Court
12 Judges of the Supreme Court

24 Judges of the District Court

4 Masters of the Supreme Court

5 Commissioners of the Planning Appeal Tribunal

These vehicles are all for official and private use

(ii) Owned Vehicles

I Director Corporate Services (EL-2) - official & private

1 Registrar Supreme Court (EL-1) - home to office

3 Circuit use by resident magistrates (Pt Augusta Court; Mt Gambier Court; Whyalla Court)

8 Circuit use (Coober Pedy; Mt Barker\Murray Bridge; 2 at Elizabeth; Pt Adelaide; Berri; Pt Lincoln; Supreme Court)

1 Deputy Registrar Magistrates Court (Mr W Johns) for intrastate travel required of the position

1 Sheriff (Mr. J. Carr) - home to office use

5 Pool vehicles - official use

III There are a total of 50 vehicles allocated to officers as part of their salary package. The officers are as follows:

1 Chief Executive Officer (Mr. J. Witham)

1 Chief Justice of the Supreme Court

1 Chief Judge of the District Court

12 Judges of the Supreme Court

24 Judges of the District Court

4 Masters of the Supreme Court

5 Commissioners of the Planning Appeal Tribunal

1 Director Corporate Services (EL-2)

1 Registrar Supreme Court (EI-1)

IV This agency uses the government's leasing agency State Fleet. A set monthly fee is paid for each vehicle which includes fuel and servicing.

NB: As any Court Services Department vehicle may be used for Judicial purposes they are all private plated.

STATE ELECTORAL DEPARTMENT

I Owned – nil

Leased - 1

II Official and private use.

III This vehicle is allocated to the Chief Executive Officer as part of the salary package.

IV Long term lease from State Fleet.

OFFICE OF PUBLIC SECTOR REFORM

I Owned – nil

Leased - 4

II All vehicles are for official and private use and available for general office use during the working week.

III These vehicles are all allocated as part of salary packages.

1 Chief Executive Officer

1 Associate Chief Executive Officer

2 EL-3 Directors

IV All vehicles are leased from State Fleet on a monthly rental on standard terms and conditions.

OMBUDSMAN'S OFFICE

I Owned - nil

Leased - 1

II Official and private use.

III This vehicle is allocated to the Ombudsman as part of his conditions of employment.

IV Leased from State Fleet.

LEGAL SERVICES COMMISSION

I Owned - nil

Leased - 3

II Each vehicle is for official and private use and is available for office purposes during the working week.

III The vehicles are allocated to the following contract employees as part of their salary packages

1 Chief Executive Officer

1 Chief Counsel MLS equivalent

1 Deputy Director MLS equivalent

IV These vehicles are all on long term lease from State Fleet.

331. **Mr MATTHEW:**

I How many plain plated (or unmarked) vehicles are owned by, and how many are leased by, each department or agency under the Minister's responsibility?

II For what purpose is each vehicle used?

III How many vehicles are allocated to officers as part of their salary package and to which officers are they allocated?

IV From where are each of the vehicles leased and under what terms and conditions?

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

I SACON has four privately plated vehicles.

II The vehicles are available for use by departmental officers during the day and the after hours use of executives.

III All four vehicles are allocated to executive level officers as part of their remuneration packages. These officers are the Chief Executive, and the three senior Directors: Director Program Services; Director Maintenance and Construction; and Director Corporate Services.

IV All four vehicles are leased from State Fleet under the normal lease conditions applicable to long term hire vehicles.

Engineering and Water Supply Department

I Ten.

II The vehicles are available for use by departmental officers during the day and the after hours use of executives.

III Ten vehicles allocated to officers classified at EL2 or higher:

Chief Executive
Deputy Chief Executive
General Manager Services
General Manager Metropolitan
General Manager Headworks and Country
Director Planning and Strategy
Director Corporate Finance
Group Manager Engineering Services
Group Manager Scientific Services
Group Manager Headworks and Treatment

IV State Fleet. Terms and conditions are as set down in Commissioner's Circular No 30 Para II (1).

Electricity Trust of South Australia

I ETSA currently has 21 plain plated (or unmarked) vehicles in its fleet. Other registered fleet items such as trailers and mobile plant that have been in the fleet for many years have SA (black and white) plates, however these are clearly identified as ETSA items. All new items purchased by ETSA and requiring motor registration have SA Government plates.

ETSA does not lease plain plated (or unmarked) vehicles.

Note: ETSA vehicles are purchased through public tender arrangement and the asset is owned by ETSA.

II Business and private use.

III ETSA currently has 21 private plated vehicles which are allocated to senior officer positions in accordance with the Public Service guidelines. Officers to which these vehicles are allocated are as follows:

Station Manager Torrens
Director Corporate Services
Project Manager Restructuring
Director Operating Support Services
Business Manager Metro North
Director Generation and Transmission
Business Manager Metro Central
Director Corporate Planning and Finance

Business Manager Country West
General Manager
Director Customer Service and Supply
Manager Leigh Creek
Business Manager Country East
Director Human Resource and Corporate Services
Manager Technical Services
Station Manager Augusta
Secretary
Business Manager Metro South
Manager Power Grid
Manager Generation Planning
Manager Coal Resources

IV Not applicable.

Pipelines Authority of South Australia

I The Pipelines Authority owns nine plain plated vehicles.

II Business and private use.

III Eight vehicles are allocated to officers as part of their salary package. One vehicle is used by Senior Managers as authorised by the CEO. Details are:

1 Chief Executive Officer
4 Executive Level Officers
3 Senior Engineers
1 Used by Senior Managers as authorised by the CEO

IV The Pipelines Authority does not lease vehicles.

332. **Mr MATTHEW:**

I How many plain plated (or unmarked) vehicles are owned by, and how many are leased by, each department or agency under the Minister's responsibility?

II For what purpose is each vehicle used?

III How many vehicles are allocated to officers as part of their salary package and to which officers are they allocated?

IV From where are each of the vehicles leased and under what terms and conditions?

The Hon. R.J. GREGORY: The replies are as follows:

Department of Labour

I The Department of Labour owns one private plated vehicle and leases 14 private plated vehicles.

II The Departmental owned vehicle is used by the Occupational Health Division on emergency services "call outs" for chemical spills. The leased vehicles are used for departmental business during office hours and for the private out of hours use by the Department's Executive Officers and members of the Judiciary.

III Fourteen vehicles are allocated to officers as part of their salary package in accordance with Cabinet approval and guidelines for the provision of vehicles, as follows:

Director and Commissioner for Public Employment
Deputy Commissioner for Public Employment/Director Human Resource Management
Director, Corporate and Planning Services
Director, Regional and Technical Services
By determination of the Remuneration Tribunal.
Industrial Court and Commission:
President
Three Deputy Presidents
Four Commissioners
The Commissioner for Public Employment is also responsible for "Unattached Executives". There is currently one officer who is provided private plated vehicle.

IV All vehicles are leased through State Fleet under their standard terms and conditions.

WorkCover

I The Corporation is currently leasing 118 vehicles from State Fleet, all of which are private plated. The Corporation does not own any vehicles.

II 43 vehicles are tool of trade and are used for business use, although the employee may elect to pay 30% of the cost of the vehicle on a salary sacrifice basis for after hours private use.

7 vehicles are pool vehicles and are used by Corporation employees for business purposes; 68 vehicles are salary sacrifice.

III 111 Vehicles are allocated to officers as part of their salary package, including 43 tool of trade. Of the 111, the remaining 68 vehicles are allocated to senior officers on a salary sacrifice basis, with the full cost of the vehicle including sales tax and FBT being paid by the - employee.

IV All Corporation vehicles are leased from State Fleet under the following terms and conditions:

the retention period of the vehicle is 2 years or 40 000km
an accident excess of up to $500 applies if the driver is at fault and $250 if the third party is at fault.
The vehicle must be serviced through State Fleet, in accordance with the manufacturer's recommendations
Mobil cards are issued by State Fleet and are for the purchase of regular unleaded fuel and oil only

Department of Correctional Services

I This Department currently has two (2) private plated vehicles. Both of these vehicles are leased from State Fleet.

II Both of these vehicles are allocated for business and private use.

III Both of these vehicles are allocated to officers as part of their salary package.

The officers which these vehicles are allocated to are: -

Mr John Dawes, Executive Director
Mr Barry Apsey, Director, Offender Services

IV Both of these vehicles are leased from the State Fleet on a long term hire basis.

SA Occupational Health and Safety Commission

Nil.

333. **Mr MATTHEW:**

I How many plain plated (or unmarked) vehicles are owned by, and how many are leased by, each department or agency under the Minister's responsibility?

II For what purpose is each vehicle used?

III How many vehicles are allocated to officers as part of their salary package and to which officers are they allocated?

IV From where are each of the vehicles leased and under what terms and conditions?

The Hon. M.K. MAYES: The replies are as follows:

I Arts and Cultural Heritage

	Owned	Leased
Department	-	4
State Opera of SA	-	1
SA Film Corporation	-	2
SA Country Arts Trust	5	-
Adelaide Festival Centre Trust	6	-
Consumer Affairs Department	-	4

II Arts and Cultural Heritage-

Department — Private and general staff use

State Opera of SA — Private and general staff use

SA Film Corporation staff use	Private and general
SA Country Arts Trust business use.	General staff and
Adelaide Festival Centre Trust business use	General staff and
Consumer Affairs Department staff use	Private and general
III Arts and Cultural Heritage Department	Chief Executive Officer Director SA Museum Director State Library of SA Director Artlab Australia
SA Film Corporation	Managing Director Financial Accountant
State Opera of SA	Finance Director
SA Country Arts Trust	Nil
Adelaide Festival Centre Trust	Nil
Consumer Affairs Department	Chief Executive Officer Liquor Licensing Commissioner Director, Office of Fair Trading Public Trustee
IV Arts and Cultural Heritage Department hire	State Fleet, long term
State Opera of SA basis at long term	State Fleet, monthly hire rates
SA Film Corporation hire	State Fleet, long term
Consumer Affairs Department hire	State Fleet, long term

335. **Mr MATTHEW:**

I How many plain plated (or unmarked) vehicles are owned by, and how many are leased by, each department or agency under the Minister's responsibility?

II For what purpose is each vehicle used?

III How many vehicles are allocated to officers as part of their salary package and to which officers are they allocated?

IV From where are each of the vehicles leased and under what terms and conditions?

The Hon. M.J. EVANS: The replies are as follows:

South Australian Health Commission

I There are no plain plated (or unmarked) vehicles owned by Central Office or the Public and Environmental Health Services.

There are seven (7) plain plated (or unmarked) vehicles leased by Central Office and two (2) plain plated (or unmarked) vehicles leased by Public & Environmental Health Services.

II All vehicles are used by Commission staff for business purposes and are allocated to officers above EL-1 as part of their salary package.

III There are seven (7) vehicles allocated to officers of the Central Office as part of salary packages. The vehicles are allocated to:-

The Chairman, (CEO)

Executive Director, Country Health Services.

Executive Director, Disability Services

Executive Director, Metropolitan Health Services

Executive Director, Planning and Executive Services

Executive Director, Finance and Information

Executive Director, Human Resources

There are two (2) vehicles allocated to officers of the Public and Environmental Health Services, as part of salary packages. The vehicles are allocated to:

Executive Director, Public & Environmental Health

Director, Epidemiology Branch

IV All vehicles are leased direct from State Fleet, on a monthly basis, under State Fleet's terms and conditions.

Department for Family and Community Services and Commissioner for the Ageing

I The Department owns 14 and leases 3 privately plated vehicles.

II The 3 leased vehicles are allocated to senior officers as part of their entitlements under their employment contracts. The other 14 vehicles are allocated to various District Centres in the suburban areas to protect client confidentiality when making home visits in sensitive circumstances.

III Three officers are allocated privately plated vehicles in the Department. They are:

The Chief Executive Officer

The Executive Director, Operations

The Commissioner for the Ageing

IV The leased vehicles are provided by State Fleet under the normal long term hire arrangements.

338. **Mr MATTHEW:**

I What is the name of the fleet management system used by each department and agency under the Minister's responsibility to assist in the administration and maintenance of vehicles, from whom was the system purchased and under what terms and conditions (including cost)?

II If any department or agency does not use a fleet management system what manual methods are used?

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

Treasury Department

I The Treasury Department does not operate a fleet management system.

II Vehicles for use by the Department, including the South Australian Superannuation Board, the Public Sector Employees Superannuation Scheme Board, the South Australian Superannuation Fund Investment Trust and the South Australian Government Financing Authority are hired from, and managed by State Fleet.

State Bank of South Australia

I The State Bank uses the "Q-Fleet" System to administer its motor vehicles. The system was purchased from Formative Software Pty Ltd at a cost of $18 000.

II n/a

Lotteries Commission of South Australia

I The Lotteries Commission does not use a fleet management system.

II Vehicles for use by the Lotteries Commission are hired from, and managed by State Fleet.

State Government Insurance Commission

I The SGIC uses the Figtree Fleet Management System to administer its motor vehicles. The system was purchased from

Figtree Systems Australia at a cost of $8 000. In addition, $0.20 per week per vehicle is paid for data stream and support.

II n/a

Casino Supervisory Authority

I & II The Casino Supervisory Authority does not own, lease or hire any vehicles, and therefore does not have a fleet management system.

Department of Mines and Energy

I & II The Department of Mines and Energy monitors its fleet manually by the following methods.

1) All vehicles are issued by an authority form.

2) All vehicles have log books—giving details of mileage etc.

3) There is a vehicle committee comprising of users and administrators which determine the numbers of vehicles and types required based on information gathered from users.

4) There is a data base through the fixed asset register which provides a printout collating details on registration number, Department number, vehicle description, proposed disposal date (based in kms travelled), purchase date, total kms, kms in month, average kms.

344. **Mr MATTHEW:**

I What is the name of the fleet management system used by each department and agency under the Minister's responsibility to assist in the administration and maintenance of vehicles, from whom was the system purchased and under what terms and conditions (including cost)?

II If any department or agency does not use a fleet management system what manual methods are used?

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

SACON

All of SACON's passenger and light commercial vehicles are leased from and managed by State Fleet.

Although SACON owns its fleet of heavy commercial vehicles these are managed on its behalf by State Fleet.

Engineering and Water Supply Department

The Engineering and Water Supply Department uses the following computing systems to assist in the administration and maintenance of vehicles.

- Integrated Major Plant Management Information System - IMPMIS
  - This is a fleet management system and was developed in-house.
- Mincom Information Management System - MIMS3
  - This system is used as the Department's corporate financial management system. Certain modules of the system are used for fleet management, in particular fleet costing.
- Vehicle Identification and Service Agenda System - VISAS
  - This system is used to assist with vehicle servicing and was developed in-house.
- Minor Plant System
  - This system is used to assist with management administration and maintenance of towed vehicles such as trailers and caravans.

Electricity Trust of South Australia

I ETSA currently uses a DBase data system for administration and management of it's fleet activities. This system was designed and developed in-house approximately five years ago. ETSA is currently undertaking a feasibility study aimed at replacing this system with a more comprehensive package solution which will allow more effective and efficient fleet management.

II The system mentioned above is supported by some manual systems. These are primarily for the recording of some maintenance and management information, and for the generation of management reports.

Pipelines Authority of South Australia

I The Pipelines Authority does not use a fleet management system.

II The administration and maintenance of the Authority's vehicles is controlled by allocating responsibility to cost centre Managers. Monthly expenditure reports, including comparison to budgets, are provided to Managers for cost control. Officers of the Finance and Administration Department also monitor the monthly expenditure closely.

345. **Mr MATTHEW:**

I What is the name of the fleet management system used by each department and agency under the Minister's responsibility to assist in the administration and maintenance of vehicles, from whom was the system purchased and under what terms and conditions (including cost)?

II If any department or agency does not use a fleet management system what manual methods are used?

The Hon. R.J. GREGORY: The replies are as follows:

Department of Labour

I The Department of Labour has not purchased a fleet management system to assist in the administration and maintenance of vehicles.

II Maintenance and replacement of leased vehicles is the responsibility of State Fleet. For vehicles owned by the Department, Departmental Managers are responsible for the maintenance of vehicles which are serviced in accordance with each vehicle's service manual. Each vehicle is replaced in accordance with State Supply Board guidelines, ie every 2 years or 40 000 kms whichever is earlier.

SA Occupational Health and Safety Commission

The SA Occupational Health and Safety Commission does not use a fleet management system to assist in the administration and maintenance of vehicles. The Commission makes use of the short-term hire facilities of State Fleet when the need arises and is charged an hourly rate for use.

WorkCover

The Corporation does not operate a fleet management system as all the WorkCover vehicles are leased. The leasing agency, State Fleet operates a fleet management system.

The Corporation records all vehicles leased on our Finance Management Asset System.

Correctional Services

I The name of the fleet management system used by the Department of Correctional Services is the PC Focus System Asset Register, fixed assets and motor vehicles.

This system was purchased from State Systems.

The only terms and conditions from State Systems was a 90 day warranty period from date of purchase.

The cost of this system was a fixed price of $6 000.

II N/A.

346. **Mr MATTHEW:**

I What is the name of the fleet management system used by each department and agency under the Minister's responsibility to assist in the administration and maintenance of vehicles, from whom was the system purchased and under what terms and conditions (including cost)?

II If any department or agency does not use a fleet management system what manual methods are used?

The Hon. M.K. MAYES: The replies are as follows:

I The Department for the Arts and Cultural Heritage and arts statutory authorities do not use a purchased fleet management system.

The Department of Public and Consumer Affairs does not operate a purchased fleet management system.

II The Department for the Arts and Cultural Heritage and arts statutory authorities operate manual methods which consist of a booking system for vehicles, and log books detailing vehicle use.

The Department of Public and Consumer Affairs perform constant checks of vehicle usage to determine if it is more cost efficient to have vehicles on long term hire or short term hire. By checking log books which are maintained by staff using the vehicles, the department can identify how much usage is made of long term hire vehicles and when they are due for service. The short term hire vehicles are controlled by State Fleet with regards to maintenance.

348. **Mr MATTHEW:**

I What is the name of the fleet management system used by each department and agency under the Minister's responsibility to assist in the administration and maintenance of vehicles, from whom was the system purchased and under what terms and conditions (including cost)?

II If any department or agency does not use a fleet management system what manual methods are used?

The Hon. M.J. EVANS: The replies are as follows:

South Australian Health Commission

I The Health Commission central office and Public and Environmental Health Services use the Office Automation Application on the WANG Network for its Fleet Management System. The WANG system provides a booking service for vehicles and usage statistics are extracted from the system on a monthly basis. There was no cost to establish the system, however $750 was paid to set up a program to enable statistics to be extracted from the Wang database.

II Not applicable.

Department for Family and Community Services

I The computer based fleet management system used by the Department was developed'in house' by the department's Information Systems and Technology Branch.

II Not applicable.

351. **Mr MATTHEW:** How many traffic infringement notices were issued in each of the years 1991 and 1992 to drivers of vehicles owned or leased by each department or agency under the Ministers responsibility, what was the reason for each notice, who paid the fine and if the fine was paid by the department or agency, why was it decided not to make the driver pay?

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

Treasury Department

The Treasury Department leases vehicles for its use as well as for the use of the South Australian Superannuation Board and the Public Sector Employees Superannuation Scheme Board. The Treasury Department keeps no record of the number or type of traffic infringement notices issued in respect of vehicles which it leases because as a matter of course notices received are immediately passed on to the driver responsible for payment. This is consistent with the requirements of Circular 59 issued by the Commissioner for Public Employment.

State Bank of South Australia

The State Bank of South Australia keeps no record of the number or type of traffic infringement notices issued in respect of vehicles which it owns because as a matter of course notices received are immediately passed on to the driver responsible for payment. This is State Bank policy and is detailed in a list of 'Conditions of Use of Packaged Vehicles.'

Lotteries Commission of South Australia

During 1990/91 one traffic infringement notice was issued and in 1991/92 two notices were issued in relation to vehicles leased by the Lotteries Commission. These notices were both for exceeding the town speed limit of 60 km/ph. In accordance with Lotteries Commission policy, the fine was paid by the driver of each vehicle.

State-Government Insurance Commission

The State Government Insurance Commission has kept records on the number of traffic infringement notices issued to drivers of vehicles it owns since 29 July 1991. During that time 216 traffic infringement notices have been issued and all have been paid for by the responsible driver.

Casino Supervisory Authority

The Casino Supervisory Authority does not own or lease any motor vehicles.

Department of Mines and Energy

The Department of Mines and Energy have not kept details on traffic infringement notices.

On each occurrence the infringement notice is forwarded to the driver to pay. The Department has not paid any infringement notices for drivers during 1990/91 or 1991/92.

357. **Mr MATTHEW:** How many traffic infringement notices were issued in each of the years 1991 and 1992 to drivers of vehicles owned or leased by each department or agency under the Ministers responsibility, what was the reason for each notice, who paid the fine and if the fine was paid by the department or agency, why was it decided not to make the driver pay?

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

SACON

SACON has implemented the Government policy that states that where a traffic infringement notice is received the driver of the vehicle at that time is responsible for the payment of the expiation fee. All notices received are passed straight to the officer responsible. SACON does not maintain a record of traffic infringement notices issued to drivers of vehicles owned or leased by it once individual responsibility has been accepted.

In situations where the driver cannot be identified the officer who has responsibility for the vehicle is responsible for the infringement notice.

Engineering and Water Supply Department

The number of traffic infringement notices that have been recorded as being issued to drivers of vehicles owned or leased by the Department is as follows:

1990/91 - 48
1991/92 - 112

158 notices were for Exceed Town Speed Limit

2 notices were for Disobey Traffic Light

All notices are recorded as having been paid by the driver.

Electricity Trust of South Australia

ETSA's Fleet Services Department has only kept records in relation to traffic infringement notices since 1 February 1992. These records reveal that for the period 1 February 1992 to 30 June 1992, 69 notices were received by ETSA.

Notices received by ETSA are distributed to relevant managers who are responsible for identifying drivers and passing notices forward for payment.

Since 1 February 1992 ETSA managers have reported one occurrence of ETSA making payment of a fine. This fine arose from a speeding offence. The payment of the fine was made

only after investigations failed to reveal the identity of the driver involved.

Actions have since been taken to improve the record keeping of motor vehicle usage in the department concerned. It remains ETSA's policy that notices served for traffic infringements are the responsibility of individual drivers.

Pipelines Authority of South Australia

It is the Pipelines Authority's Policy that the driver of the vehicle pay for the fine imposed for traffic infringement. Any traffic infringement notices received are forwarded to the employees concerned. As a result, the Authority does not keep a record of the number of infringement notices received.

358. **Mr MATTHEW:** How many traffic infringement notices were issued in each of the years 1991 and 1992 to drivers of vehicles owned or leased by each department or agency under the Ministers responsibility, what was the reason for each notice, who paid the fine and if the fine was paid by the department or agency, why was it decided not to make the driver pay?

The Hon. R.J. GREGORY: The replies are as follows:

Department of Correctional Services

The number of traffic infringement notices issued to the Department of Correctional Services in each of the years starting from 19th October 1990 to 30th June 1992.

	Parking Fines	Speeding Cameras	Red Light Cameras
October 1990 to June 1991	1	11	-
lst July 1991 to 30th June 1992	4	33	2

The fines were all paid by the employees of the Department of Correctional Services in control of the vehicle at the time of the offence.

Department of Labour

All infringement notices (speeding and parking) are forwarded to the offending drivers for payment. Commissioner's Circular 59 does not specify any requirement to keep records of infringement notices (numbers or reasons) received; therefore no individual records are kept in this agency. The Department of Labour has not paid any infringement notices on behalf of departmental officers.

In accordance with Commissioner's Circular 59 all departmental motor vehicles are issued with log books making identification of the offending driver possible.

WorkCover

During the period June 1991 to February 1993, the WorkCover Corporation has received 75 traffic infringement notices. A breakdown of these notices is as follows:

1 red light camera

57 speed camera

17 parking fines

All employees incurring the fines have been responsible for the payment.

SA Occupational Health and Safety Commission

Nil.

359. **Mr MATTHEW:** How many traffic infringement notices were issued in each of the years 1991 and 1992 to drivers of vehicles owned or leased by each department or agency under the Ministers responsibility, what was the reason for each notice, who paid the fine and if the fine was paid by the department or agency, why was it decided not to make the driver pay?

The Hon. M.K. MAYES: The Department for the Arts and Cultural Heritage and arts statutory authorities have received nine known traffic infringement notices for the period 1 July 1990 to 30 June 1992, all for exceeding the speed limit. All traffic infringement notices are paid by the offending driver of the vehicle.

The Department of Public and Consumer Affairs was issued with the following traffic infringements notices for the period 1 July 1990 to 30 June 1992:

13 Parking Infringement Notices

8 Exceeding the Speed Limit Notices

In all but one case the driver of the vehicle was identified via State Fleet short term hire records or long term hire log book. With one exception, the driver concerned had the notice passed onto them and they were notified of their responsibility to pay the fine as set out in Commissioner's Circular No. 59.

One traffic infringement notice was paid by Public Trustee Office as the driver was unable to be identified. Since then extensive measures have been implemented to ensure that the driver of any Government plated or private plated vehicle can be identified.

361. **Mr MATTHEW:** How many traffic infringement notices were issued in each of the years 1991 and 1992 to drivers of vehicles owned or leased by each department or agency under the Ministers responsibility, what was the reason for each notice, who paid the fine and if the fine was paid by the department or agency, why was it decided not to make the driver pay?

The Hon. M.J. EVANS: The reply is as follows:

South Australian Health Commission

Central Office and the Public & Environmental Health Service do not keep records of officers who receive infringement notices as there is no value in keeping such records. In accordance with Health Commission Administrative Circular 6.5 staff are responsible for the payment of all infringement notices.

Department for Family & Community Services

The Department does not keep a record of the number of traffic infringement notices issued to drivers of vehicles owned or leased by the Department. It is the policy of the Department to require the offending driver to pay the fine within the time set in the expiation notice. If that does not occur, a statutory declaration is provided to the Police identifying the driver so that the expiation notice can be reissued directly to that person.

There has been one occasion in the current financial year when the Department paid a fine of $128.00 on a notice issued in June 1992 as the offending driver could not be identified from the vehicle booking sheet.

Commissioner for the Ageing

Nil.

BOATS

364. **Mr MATTHEW:** How many boats are used by each department and agency under the Ministers responsibility, what is the name of each boat, who owns it and if it is not owned by the department or agency, what are the terms and conditions of its lease?

The Hon. FRANK BLEVINS: Treasury

No boats are used by Treasury, the Lotteries Commission of South Australia, the South Australian Superannuation Fund Investment Trust, the South Australian Government Financing Authority, the Casino Supervisory Authority, the South

Australian Superannuation Board, or the Public Sector Employees Superannuation Scheme Board.

The State Bank does not own or lease any boats, but two of the Bank's executives have undertaken a partnership agreement in joint ownership of a boat located in New Zealand. The boat is financed through a commercial loan facility held by the State Bank. Up until December 1990 the vessel was occasionally used for business purposes, but has not been used on Bank business since. There is no intention to use it again for that purpose.

The State Government Insurance Commission has for some years been a corporate sponsor of *The Falie.* In the past such sponsors have been allocated one free day-trip per year on the boat. This has generally been used to entertain key clients. Last year however SGIC's free day on the boat was given to a group of Aboriginal children from the Outback Radio school. SGIC's sponsorship is in the form of hull insurance, valued at $26 000. A new sponsorship agreement has recently been agreed to.

SGIC is also a sponsor of the *Archie Badenoch,* an historical boat owned by the SA Police Force Historical Club. The boat is used by the club in its work with disadvantaged groups. SGIC's sponsorship amounts to $1 500 per year.

Department of Mines and Energy

The Department of Mines and Energy does not own or lease boats.

365. **Mr MATTHEW:** How many boats are used by each department and agency under the Ministers responsibility, what is the name of each boat, who owns it and if it is not owned by the department or agency, what are the terms and conditions of its lease?

The Hon. G.J. CRAFTER: Nil.

368. **Mr MATTHEW:** How many boats are used by each department and agency under the Ministers responsibility, what is the name of each boat, who owns it and if it is not owned by the department or agency, what are the terms and conditions of its lease?

The Hon. M.K. MAYES:

Department of Environment and Land Management

The Department of Environment and Land Management is an amalgam of the former Department of Lands and the Department of Environment and Planning. The full transfer of assets from Office of Planning and Urban Development will not take place until 1 July 1993. However, for the purposes of this question the assets are assumed under my control and responsibility.

The Department of Environment and Land Management owns thirty boats. Boats may be named if they are under survey by the Department of Marine and Harbors. The Department of Environment and Land Management has two craft that are named :

NP99 – MACUMBA

TW215 - GEM

The remaining craft are licensed boats as required by the Department of Marine and Harbors.

Department of Aboriginal Affairs

Nil

Metropolitan Fire Services

The South Australian Metropolitan Fire Service owns one boat—fire boat 'Karloo', which is currently out of survey due to the condition of the hull and will be disposed of shortly.

The SAMFS is currently leasing the boat 'Kowarra' from the Department of Marine and Harbors for the sum of $500 per week plus mooring fees of $308 80 per annum (effective from 1st January 1993)

Country Fire Service

Nil

South Australian Police Department

The South Australian Police Department own and use five boats. The names are as follows:

Warrendi	Water Police Services
Protector	Water Police Services
Challenger	Water Police Services
Pedro Warman	Underwater Recovery Section
Martin Harnath	Underwater Recovery Section

369. **Mr MATTHEW:** How many boats are used by each department and agency under the Minister's responsibility, what is the name of each boat, who owns it and if it is not owned by the department or agency, what are the terms and conditions of its lease?

The Hon. S.M. LENEHAN: The reply is as follows:

	EDUCATION		DETAFE		SSABSA	CSO
Number of boats	567		2		—	—
Name/type	Power Boats	8	Dingy	1	—	—
	Sailing Boats	34	Rubber	1		
	Rowing Hulls	56				
	Small Boats	25				
	Canoes/Kayaks	443				
	House Boat 'Queen Laura'	1*				
Owned Leased	All boats owned by school councils.		1 owned			
	* Queen Laura owned by Minister of Family and Community Services-based at Murray lands Aquatic and River Study Centre-used by Education Department for school children and educational groups.		1 borrowed short term from local citizen			

* Those agencies/authorities which do not appear in the above collation submitted not applicable responses.

371. **Mr MATTHEW:** How many boats are used by each department and agency under the Minister's responsibility, what is the name of each boat, who owns it and if it is not owned by the department or agency, what are the terms and conditions of department and agency its lease?

The Hon. R.J. GREGORY: The reply is as follows:

Department of Correctional Services

The Department of Correctional Services currently owns one (1) boat located at Port Lincoln Prison. The details of the area as follows:

Brand	Model	Length
Gannet	Runabout	4.750 metres

* No other Agencies under my control own or lease any boats.

372. **Mr MATTHEW.** How many boats are used by each department and agency under the Minister's responsibility, what is the name of each boat, who owns it and if it is not owned by the department or agency, what are the terms and conditions of its lease?

The Hon. M.K. MAYES: The Department for the Arts and Cultural Heritage owns a total of four boats. One Hutchinson boat, Registration number MZ715, is owned by the South Australian Museum. Three boats, a steam tug named the 'Yelta', and two motor vessels named the'Nelcebee', and the 'Archie Badenoch', are owned by the History Trust of South Australia.

The Department of Public and Consumer Affairs does not own or lease any boats.

374. **Mr MATTHEW:** How many boats are used by each department and agency under the Minister's responsibility, what is the name of each boat, who owns it and if it is not owned by the department or agency, what are the terms and conditions of its lease?

The Hon. M.J. EVANS: The reply is as follows:

South Australian Health Commission

There is one boat used by Public and Environmental Health Services for mosquito control activities at Torrens Island. The boat is a small dinghy and does not have a name; however, identification is provided by the registration number.

Department for Family & Community Services

The department is the owner of seven boats as follows:

15ft Fibreglass	Runaboat	(Maid Marion)
15m	House Boat	(Queen Laura)
	(Leased to Education Department)	
23ft	Timber Yacht	(Blade Runner)
16ft	Fibreglass Runabout	(Unnamed)
17%	Fibreglass Runabout	(Unnamed)
18ft	Fibreglass Runabout	(Unnamed)
16ft	Timber Runabout	(Unnamed)

ENGINEERING AND WATER SUPPLY DEPARTMENT

390. **Hon. D.C. WOTTON:** Further to the answer to question on notice No. 98—

(a) what period is covered by the averages;

(b) what is the range of THM levels for each of the sources given;

(c) are THM levels monitored for other sources and if so, which and what is the range of THM levels for each;

(d) is there a seasonal pattern to THM levels and if so, what is it and what influences it;

(e) when did the E&WS Department introduce tests for THM levels and what prompted the introduction;

(f) have the levels of THM increased since tests were commenced;

(g) are tests for THM levels still made on the Mannum/Adelaide pipeline and if not, when were they stopped and why?

(h) why has the Australian guideline value for THM been set at 200ug/L, when the value in Germany is 25ug/L; and

(i) how often has the level of 200ug/L been exceeded and what is done when the level is exceeded?

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

(a) The THM averages cover the 1991-92 financial year.

(b)

System Source	THM Level Range (µg/L)
Barossa	45 - 198
Hope Valley	77 - 175
Happy Valley	39 - 142
Anstey Hill	42 - 241
Myponga	106 - 344
Morgan/Whyalla	3 - 136

(c) Many sources are monitored for THM levels on a routine basis including the following:

System Source	THM Level Range μg/L Average Range
Mount Bold/Blackwood (unfiltered & chlorinated)	1 391 - 267
Mount Gambier (unfiltered & chlorinated)	187 - 30
Kangaroo Island (unfiltered & chlorinated)	19 424 - 425
Murray Bridge/Onkaparinga (unfiltered & chlorinated)	991 - 243
Mannum/Adelaide (unfiltered & chlorinated)	12357 - 195
Swan Reach (unfiltered & chloraminated)	254 - 81
Yorke Peninsula (unfiltered & chloraminated)	346 - 67
Tailem Bend/Keith (unfiltered & chloraminated)	394 - 135
Strathalbyn/Milang (unfiltered& chloraminated)	323 - 340

(d) There is a minor increase in THM levels in summer due to higher temperatures.

(e) The E&WS Department began THM testing in 1977 after overseas studies identified THM formation during the disinfection of water with chlorine.

(f) THM levels have decreased since the monitoring program began following studies overseas and by the E&WS where the factors affecting THM formation have been characterised. The E&WS has conducted the majority of research on this issue in Australia.

(g) The Mannum/Adelaide pipeline is routinely monitored for THM levels.

(h) The Australian guideline value for THM was set at 200µg/L by the National Health and Medical Research Council/Australian Water Resources Council after full consideration of the available data. The low German guideline was influenced by the fact that most German water supplies have very low levels of THMs. This is due to their high use of groundwater containing low levels of natural organic matter.

(i) The level of 200µg/L has been exceeded in two of the major systems. The Myponga system did not comply with the guideline value in 55% of the samples tested while the Anstey Hill system exceeded the value in 16% of the routine tests.

No action can presently be taken in either case without compromising disinfection efficiency. Levels of THMs will be reduced in the Myponga system following commissioning of the Myponga Water Filtration Plant.

SMOKE DETECTORS

391. **Mr BECKER:**

I What progress has been made with respect to the mandatory installation of smoke detectors in all residential, commercial and business properties since the reply to previous questions in June 1992?

II Has the Building Code of Australia been amended and if not, why not?

The Hon. M.K. MAYES: The replies are as follows:

I Current Building legislation, as prescribed in the Building Code of Australia (BCA), does not require that smoke detectors be installed in Class 1 Buildings (dwellings).

The only types of buildings required to have this facility are Class 9a Buildings (Hospitals) and certain types of Class 3 Buildings accommodating more than 20 residents such as residential parts of schools and accommodation for the aged, children or disabled persons.

South Australia does not vary from the BCA requirements.

It is not proposed, at this stage, that smoke detectors be required to be installed in commercial or business properties. The BCA does require, however, that these properties be, depending on size and complexity, equipped with various fire safety facilities such as smoke and fire compartmentation, hose reels, exit/emergency lights, sprinkler systems etc.

II The responsibility for any Amendments to the Building Code of Australia lies with the Executive of the Australian Uniform Building Regulations Co-ordinating Council (AUBRCC) and would not be appropriate to predict if and when any of the proposals outlined in the answer to question 1 may be incorporated as amendments to the BCA.

WATER QUALITY

392. **Mr BECKER:**

I What water quality tests were taken at Glenelg North, West Beach and Henley South beaches in 1992 and if none, why not?

II Is the sea water near the Patawalonga and River Torrens outlets safe to swim in and if not, why not and what action is being taken to clean up the quality of water at these locations, what is the estimated cost and when will action be taken and completed?

The Hon. M.K. MAYES: The replies are as follows:

I Sea water samples are collected by the EWS Department on a monthly basis from several locations along the metropolitan bathing beaches. The samples are examined for coliforms and faecal coliforms.

II The results for 1992 at the River Torrens and Patawalonga outlets conform to the guidelines of schedule 1 (primary contact recreation) in Australian guidelines for recreational use of waters, published by the National Health and Medical Research Council 1990.

It is possible that at times of significant storm events the areas impacted by the plumes from the River Torrens and the Patawalonga would be unsuitable for primary contact recreation.

The faecal coliform indicators of pollution found in the water at those times would be derived from animal droppings washed from the catchment area.

Existing road cleaning programs of local government go some way to minimise the numbers.

A trial use of floating booms in the Patawalonga Basin system is planned for this year to reduce trash in the basin. This measure will not affect the bacteriological quality of stormwater discharged into the sea. Improved quality in this regard would require the provision of extensive wetlands in this and other water systems under arrangements being investigated jointly between the State Government and the Local Government Association.

SWIMMING POOLS

393. **Mr BECKER:** Do the proprietors of the Unley and Burnside Swimming Pools flush their pools regularly and if so -

(a) are they flushed into local creeks and drains and if so, which ones, where do they flow to and how much is flushed into each; and

(b) what is the condition of the water and its impact on the environment and water quality at final destination and how do these compare with world health standards?

The Hon. M.K. MAYES: The replies are as follows:

The respective city councils would be in the best position to advise on the arrangements for flushing of the Unley and Burnside Swimming pools since such arrangements are not as a matter of course subject to environmental regulation. The exception is pools discharging into the marine environment.

Under the Marine Environment Protection Act some coastal swimming enclosures and pools will be licensed without fee. The purpose of this is to have some basic testing of water quality during the first two years of licensing. These regulations are due to commence on 25th March 1993.

Unley and Burnside pools do not discharge into waters within the purview of the Marine Environment Protection Act.

HOUSING TRUST MAINTENANCE PROGRAM

394. **Mr BECKER:**

I Has the Maintenance Program budget of the South Australian Housing Trust for vacancy and prior occupation been reduced for this financial year and if so, why, by how much, how do the budgets for 1989-90 and 1990-91 compare and how many contractors have had the value of their work reduced or cancelled and how many employees were made redundant?

II What will happen to normal "wear and tear" refurbishing and painting programs in the future?

The Hon. G.J. CRAFTER: The replies are as follows:

I The funds allocated for vacancy work state-wide have increased in dollar terms since 1989-90 by 15% ($1.5M).

Funds allocated for vacancy work are as follows:

	Vacancy	Total Budget Allocation
1992/93	$11,434,829	$43,872,467
1991/92	$11,139,910	$42,322,504
1990/91	$ 9,910,659	$39,980,318
1989/90	$ 9,917,790	$38,696,951

As the work on Trust dwellings is contracted through private enterprise, the Trust does not have access to records relating to redundancies within its contractor work force.

II There is no change anticipated in the practice of allocating funds for normal "wear and tear" refurbishing and painting programs of the Trust rental stock.

MURRAY RIVER

395. **The Hon. D.J. HOPGOOD:**

I What was the peak River Murray flow into South Australia over the past six months and when did it occur?

II What is the current flow?

III In the circumstances of flow envisaged in I above, how long would it take for the peak flow to pass from the border to the Murray mouth?

IV When were the navigable passes removed from the weirs along the Murray in this State, have they been reinstated and if not, when will they be?

V When were the barrages opened, have they now been closed and if not, when will they be closed?

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

I The peak River Murray flow into South Australia over the past six months measured at a gauging station near the border was 95 000 megalitres per day on 8th to 11th December 1992.

II As at 5 March 1993, flow into South Australia was 6 000 megalitres per day.

III In the circumstances of the flow in I above, it would take the peak flow about 4 weeks to pass from the border to the Murray Mouth.

IV The navigable passes were removed from the weirs along the Murray in this State, during November 1992, and December 1992 as the river flow increased. They have since been reinstated.

V The barrages were progressively opened as river flows increased. By the end of October there were 170 gates open, by the end of November, 240 and 330 gates of a total of 590 were opened during the peak outflow in early January 1993. Ten gates are currently open. Small numbers of gates are likely to remain open in the foreseeable future.

STATE DEBT

397. **Mr BECKER:**

I What was the gross and net State debt as at 31 January 1993 and how were these figures arrived at?

II How is the debt being financed, what funds have been borrowed overseas, at what rates and from which sources?

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

I

	$million
Total SAFA external debt(a)	18,750
less SAFA Loans to Public Sector Financial Institutions (PSFIs)(b)	8,199
add External debt of public sector agencies other than SAFA(a)	629
equals Gross Debt attributable to Non Financial Public Sector (ABS definition)	11,181
less external Financial Assets(c)	3,612
equals Net Indebtedness(d)	7,569

(a) Borrowings from parties outside the SA non financial public sector.

(b) Includes South Australian Finance Trust, South Australia Finance Ltd, State Bank, HomeStart Finance, State Government Insurance Commission, Local Government Finance Authority.

(c) Financial claims on parties outside the SA non financial public sector.

(d) The above net debt figure excludes any allowance for any future payments to State Bank under the Indemnity arrangements in addition to the $2.3 billion paid at 30 June 1992 and also excludes any allowance for possible return of capital and dividends from the Bank.

Data for end January 1993 is not available for all authorities. The above data relates to 31 December 1992 and encompasses results of a survey of the major public sector bodies. Estimates for some items are included.

II The vast majority of the State's debt has been financed through SA Government Financing Authority (SAFA) Borrowings, from promissory note and inscribed stock issues, issued to retail and professional investors in both domestic and international capital markets. The other main source of debt is the Commonwealth Government—State Government obligations to the Commonwealth Government under the Financial Agreement and Specific Purpose Agreements amounted to $2.0 billion at 31 December 1992.

At 31 December SAFA's overseas borrowings used to fund the non financial public sector (ie total overseas borrowings of $5.0 billion less loans to PSFIs of $2.7 billion) amounted to AUD2.3 billion. This includes overseas borrowings both in Australian dollars and foreign currency borrowings swapped to Australian dollars. The sources of these borrowings are retail and professional bond and commercial paper markets in Europe, United States and Asia. SAFA has undertaken numerous such issues. No unswapped (unhedged) foreign currency borrowings are used to fund the non financial public sector. At 31 December the weighted average interest cost of the $2.3 billion, after taking associated interest rate and foreign currency swaps into account, was estimated at 7% pa. It should be noted that a significant proportion of overseas borrowings have been swapped to variable rates and so the average cost of funds will vary as market rates change. The only other Public Sector authority to undertake overseas borrowings was ETSA which owed in Japanese Yen at an interest rate of 5.7% fully swapped into AUD 33 million.

STATE BANK

398. **Mr BECKER:**

I How many vacancies are there on the State Bank Board and how long has each vacancy existed and for what reasons?

II Will vacancies be filled by South Australians in future and if not, why not?

III What is the Government's policy relating to the appointment of suitably qualified women to the Board?

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

I The State Bank Act provides that the Board of the State Bank is to consist of not less than six nor more than nine persons appointed by the Governor. As at 8 March 1993, there were 8 directors appointed to the Board.

As a consequence there is no vacancy on the Board which must be filled.

A further appointment to the Board to bring the number of directors up to the maximum number permitted may be considered as and when suitable persons are nominated. In the meantime I have been advised that the Board can operate well with eight directors.

II The first priority in filling future vacancies on the State Bank Board will be to appoint individuals who have the knowledge, skills and expertise that will enhance the decision making process of the Bank, as well as complementing the skills of existing Board members. It is hoped that South Australians will be found who are willing and able to meet these requirements.

III The Government is committed to increasing representation by women on all Government Boards and Committees, including the Board of the State Bank. To this end, in February 1993 the Government adopted as policy, a target of achieving representation by women equal to 30% by the end of 1994, 40% by the end of 1996, and 50% by the year 2000. To facilitate this the Women's Information and Policy Unit is installing a computerised Register of women with appropriate skills, experience and qualifications available for appointment to Government Boards and Committees.

CASINO

399. **Mr D.S. BAKER:** Do the terms of the agreement for Technical Assistance and Management Services for the Adelaide Casino (TAMS Agreement) require the Treasurer to give written approval for any person to receive any moneys, benefit or advantage of any kind which is calculated according to, or is in any way dependent upon or related to the gross gambling revenue, net gambling revenue or profits of the Casino and if so—

(a) what was the date on which each such approval was given, what was the amount or nature of the moneys, benefit or advantage involved and who was the person or entity in receipt of the moneys, benefit or advantage; and

(b) was the Treasurer's approval required for the payment by AITCO Pty Ltd to the Genting Berhad Group of $250 000 for

"services rendered prior to the opening of the Casino" and for "other quite substantial pre-opening expenses"?

The Hon. FRANK BLEVINS: The reply is as follows:

There is nothing in the terms of the agreement for Technical Assistance and Management Services for the Adelaide Casino (TAMS Agreement) requiring the Treasurer to give such approval.

401. **Mr D.S. BAKER:**

I How many responses did the Lotteries Commission receive to its public notice published in May 1984 seeking expressions of interest for the establishment and operation of the Adelaide Casino?

II How many of these respondents were investigated to enable the Commission to fulfil the requirements of Clause 3 of the terms and conditions of the Casino licence and if all respondents were not so investigated, why not?

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

I The Lotteries Commission received five responses to its public notice published in May 1984.

II Four of the five respondents were investigated to enable the Commission to fulfil the requirements of Clause 3 of the terms and conditions of the Casino Licence. One respondent was not investigated due to the lateness of its expression of interest.

333 COLLINS STREET

423. **Mr S.J. BAKER:** What is the total current annual value of rent free periods provided to tenants of the SGIC in 333 Collins Street, Melbourne?

The Hon. FRANK BLEVINS: Lease terms including incentives being offered to attract tenants to 333 Collins Street are in line with the requirements of a depressed Melbourne commercial office market.

It is normal practice in this market to keep details of lease terms, including incentives, confidential. While such confidentiality does not inhibit market comment and speculation about lease terms being offered to attract tenants, it would not be appropriate to provide publicly the information being sought by the Honourable Member. This information would, on its own, provide only a partial view of the lease terms applying to tenanted space in 333 Collins Street and would be misleading.

A confidential briefing on 333 Collins Street could be arranged for the Member for Mitcham through the General Manager of the South Australian Government Financing Authority at which he would be provided with details of lease terms for 333 Collins Street.

PRISONER, EDUCATION

426. **Mr MATTHEW:**

I How much funding was transferred from DETAFE to the education budget allocation for each of Yatala Labour Prison, Mobilong Prison, Cadell Training Centre, Pt Lincoln Prison, Mt Gambier Prison, Pt Augusta Prison and Northfield Prison?

II What is the name of the officer employed to undertake prisoner education at each of these institutions, when was each officer employed in that position, what are the officer's present classification and educational qualifications and if no education officer has yet been employed, when is it expected that the position will be filled and what measures have been introduced in the interim to provide prisoner education?

The Hon. R.J. GREGORY: The replies are as follows:

I The agreed amount to be transferred to Department of Correctional Services from DETAFE is $593 000. To date $381000 has been transferred. Allocations for education services and materials are as follows:

Yatala Labour Prison	$ 36 400
Mobilong Prison	$ 85 000
Cadell Training Centre	$ 31 300
Pt Lincoln Prison	$ 19 600
Mt Gambier Prison	$ 28 000
Pt Augusta Prison	$ 18 000
Northfield Prison Complex	$ 55 000
Adelaide Remand Centre	$ 13 000
TOTAL	$286 300
Salary Costs	$ 86 000
GRAND TOTAL	$373 300

The balance is being utilised for special support including community corrections education projects.

II The officers employed by Department of Correctional Services to coordinate education services are not required to be teachers. Department of Correctional Services sub contracts both individuals and agencies to provide the education expertise required to teach prisoners. Consequently it is not essential that the education coordinators have education qualifications but rather that they are supportive of education programs and are able to manage the delivery of a service.

Yatala Labour: Mr Keith Wheeldon (AS03) Sheet Metal Tradesman, appointed September 1992.

Mobilong Prison: Mr Michael Barron (Senior Lecturer DETAFE) teaching qualifications, appointed by DETAFE.

Cadell Training Centre: Ms Carolyn Millhouse (AS02), clerical qualifications, appointed July 1992.

Pt Lincoln Prison: Currently vacant, have been using a contract part time instructor to provide a service, position will be interviewed on 11th March 1993.

Mt Gambier Gaol: Currently vacant support has been through a redeployed officer at OPS 2 level. Position will be filled in the next month in an acting capacity until the new prison is completed.

Pt Augusta Prison: Ms Sue Della Santa (acting OPS3 appointment for six months), experiential qualifications in training and management positions.

Northfield Prison Complex: Mr David Williamson, DETAFE Lecturer (B.Ed) appointed by DETAFE.

Adelaide Remand Centre: Mr Ken Gutte, contracted part time instructor, teaching qualification, formally appointed in January 1993, prior to this has worked as an education volunteer at the Remand Centre for four years.

In addition to these management positions the Department employs approximately 30 part time instructors all of whom have educational qualifications and most of whom have worked and some still work for DETAFE.

The education program in Department of Correctional Services prisons and community corrections offices is coordinated and managed by Mr Bernard Meatheringham, (ED1), Dip T SEC; Grad Dip School Admin: M.ED (Admin) currently admitted to canditure for Ph.D, appointed in January 1989.