HOUSE OF ASSEMBLY

Thursday 26 August 1993

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

HOLIDAYS (PROCLAMATION DAY AND AUSTRALIA DAY) AMENDMENT BILL

The Hon. R.J. GREGORY (Minister of Labour Relations and Occupational Health and Safety) obtained leave and introduced a Bill for an Act to amend the Holidays Act 1910. 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.

This Bill will amend the Holidays Act to provide for—

(a) the observance of the Australia Day holiday on 26th January in each year except when that day falls on a Saturday or Sunday in which case the holiday will be observed on the Monday following; and

(b) to provide for a change in the day of observance of the Proclamation Day holiday each year to more closely align with the 'Boxing Day' holiday observance in other States.

The present prescription of the Holidays Act provides that when the 26th January (Australia Day) falls on any day other than the Monday, the following Monday shall be observed as a public holiday. In some years this has meant that the public holiday in South Australia has been observed six days after the celebration of our national day.

This amendment will ensure that in the future Australia Day shall be celebrated by a public holiday on the actual day i.e. 26th January, except when that day is a Saturday or Sunday when it shall be celebrated on the following Monday. Such a move is consistent with national uniformity and accords with arrangements put in place in the majority of other States.

Observance of the Proclamation Day holiday as prescribed in the Holidays Act provides that the day shall be observed on 28th December, except when that day occurs on a Saturday or Sunday, at which times it is celebrated on the following Monday.

Regularly over the past 10 years or so the Industrial Relations Advisory Council has considered the question of the observance of the Proclamation Day holiday and made recommendations to the Government that the observance should be transferred in specific years to avoid stop/start work patterns, particularly in the retail industry. In addition it facilitates family gatherings and travel arrangements over the Christmas period which provides a longer break for workers than would otherwise have occurred. At its meeting on 18th March 1993, the Industrial Relation Advisory Council supported the proposal to amend the Act to accord with the concept of observing the Proclamation Day holiday on the 'work day' immediately following the Christmas Day holiday. This support was based on the inevitable fact of the variations being proclaimed in future years. This proposal is also consistent with national uniformity arrangements.

I commend the Bill to the House.

Explanation of Clauses

Clause 1—Short title

This clause is formal.

Clause 2—Commencement

This clause provides for the commencement of the measure on a date to be set by proclamation.

Clause 3—Substitution of s. 3

This clause replaces clause 3 of the principal Act. Proposed clause 3 removes reference to Part III of the second schedule and provides that the working day following the Christmas Day holiday will be a public holiday and a bank holiday.

Clause 4—Amendment of second schedule

This clause amends the second schedule of the principal Act by removing Part III of that schedule (holidays which are, unless they fall on a Monday, to be observed on the following Monday).

Reference to 26 January is moved from Part III to Part II of the second schedule (holidays which are, if they fall on a Saturday or Sunday, to be observed on the following Monday). The reference in Part II to 28 December is removed as this holiday is now dealt with in proposed clause 3(2).

Mr INGERSON secured the adjournment of the debate.

STATUTES AMENDMENT AND REPEAL (POWER AND WATER) BILL

Adjourned debate on second reading.

(Continued from 4 August. Page 57.)

Mr S.J. BAKER (Deputy Leader of the Opposition): I indicated during the debate on the Southern Power and Water Bill that it was a cognate debate. If members wish to study our position on this whole matter of the amalgamation of the Electricity Trust of South Australia and the Engineering and Water Supply Department they should refer to that debate. It was a cognate debate, and it is not my intention to redebate those issues in respect of this Bill.

The Hon. J.H.C. KLUNDER (Minister of Public Infrastructure): I intend to be every bit as brief as the Deputy Leader of the Opposition. I thank him for his contribution to this debate and recognise that what he has indicated about the two Bills being joined in a common debate is accurate.

Bill read a second time.

Mr S.J. BAKER: Mr Speaker, I draw your attention to the state of the House.

A quorum having been formed:

The SPEAKER: I point out to the Deputy Leader that it would be convenient if the Chair was informed when motions are to be moved, otherwise we would have gone straight into Committee.

Mr S.J. BAKER (Deputy Leader of the Opposition): I move:

That Standing Order No. 364 be suspended during consideration in Committee of this Bill.

Motion carried.

In Committee.

Clauses 1 to 3 passed.

Clause 4—'Insertion of schedule 2.'

The Hon. J.H.C. KLUNDER: I move:

Page 2, lines 1 to 32—Leave out 'Builders Licensing Act 1986'.

The amendment is to enable appropriate work under the Electricians, Plumbers and Gas Fitters Licensing Bill, which will come before the House later, to be dealt with under that legislation rather than the Builders Licensing Act.

Mr S.J. BAKER: I must admit that I have not seen the amendment, but it may be my fault and not the Minister's. It may have got lost in the records, given the amount of research being done. The Opposition will be opposing the amendments dealing with electrical workers. I therefore ask members of the Committee to bear in mind that we are opposed to the next Bill that will be considered by the House. That therefore has a bearing on the Minister's amendment. Clause 4 inserts schedule 2, which provides:

1. Regulations may be made under this Act—

(a) providing that a licence of a specified kind under the repealed Electrical Workers and Contractors Licensing Act. . .

We always have this difficulty with legislation as to what comes first: the horse or the cart. In this case we have assumed that the Electrical Workers and Contractors Licensing Act—

The CHAIRMAN: I point out to the Deputy Leader that if the amendment is successful, the whole clause goes.

Mr S.J. BAKER: I understand that, Sir. I do not intend to pursue that matter.

The CHAIRMAN: You will get a chance to pursue it next time around.

Mr S.J. BAKER: I want to make it quite clear that the Opposition is opposed to the very concept; and I am dealing with the clause and the amendment at the same time.

Amendment carried.

Clauses 5 to 7 passed.

Clause 8—'Interpretation.'

Mr S.J. BAKER: It is only a minor point, but I would ask the Minister to a look at the drafting of this clause. The definition of 'the corporation' follows immediately after the definition of 'authorised person'. I believe there should be one or two definitions in between. If the Minister refers back to the principal Act, he will see that a number of other definitions appear between (a) and (c).

The Hon. J.H.C. KLUNDER: I can see what the honourable member is getting at, and I am sure that can be looked at in due course.

Clause passed.

Clause 9—'Repeal of part II.'

Mr S.J. BAKER: It is going to be one of these exercises where we go from one Act to another. Clause 9 proposes that Part II of the principal Act be repealed. Part II of the Act deals with the Electricity Trust of South Australia, the constitution of the trust and other related matters. The Minister intends to delete three sections of that Act, that is, section 21, which deals with monetary reserves, and sections 26a and 26b, which deal with electricity districts. The reserves may well be covered in a broad sense, but I believe that it is absolutely vital that legislation covering particular corporations contains direct reference to the reserves. Section 21 of the principal Act provides:

> The trust—

and, of course, it would not be the trust in this case; it would be the corporation—

> may at the end of any financial year set aside out of its revenue such sums as it thinks proper as payments to reserves or sinking funds, and may invest any such reserves or sinking funds or use them in its undertaking.

I believe that that principle should be included in the Southern Power and Water Bill—if it eventually survives. To my way of thinking, it should have been amended, not deleted.

I turn now to sections 26a and 26b, which deal with electricity districts. They are deleted under the provision which deletes all of part II of the principal Act. It is quite clear that, in the revamped corporation and because of the discrimination that has been shown—not only in the legislation that we have here but also in other legislation which provides licences for country areas to operate separate electricity supply systems—they have rights given to them in legislation. We will discuss that legislation later.

Electricity districts are an important part of the electricity distribution system, and they are there to protect people who do not have the same power as people in the metropolitan area. There is a clear understanding by all country and metropolitan people that, if we charge the full cost of supplying electricity to country people, it would be exorbitant and some would no longer be able to afford power. For equity reasons, we believe it is important to maintain the balance that exists at present. There is a subsidy for both water and electricity that goes to disadvantaged areas. Electricity districts are part of that whole framework, as with other provisions in Acts that are to be repealed. I bring these items to the Minister's attention and ask how they will be dealt with, because they are not explicitly covered by the proposals for Southern Power and Water.

The Hon. J.H.C. KLUNDER: Section 21 of the Electricity Trust Act is one of the sections to be repealed by what we are doing now. The relationship between the Treasurer, the Minister and the authority is prescribed under the Public Corporations Act. Therefore, it will be possible to make it part of the charter, so it is covered in that way. I am informed that sections 26 and 26(b) have never been used in the history of the Electricity Trust. Consequently, there does not seem to be an enormous amount of pressure for them to be continued.

Mr S.J. BAKER: I thank the Minister for his explanation, particularly on the second part, although we will be pursuing in more detail later the rights of country people. In relation to the first reference, I suggest that the Minister should consider the insertion of section 21 in an amended form in Southern Power and Water, if it should survive the test of time and the select committee. I believe it is important that Government trading enterprises have sufficient reserves. I am well aware of the general framework within which we are operating—the Public Corporations Act—but I believe it is important that that reference is transposed should the whole project survive the test in another place. I do not wish to pursue that matter. I merely bring it to the attention of the Committee.

Clause passed.

Clauses 10 and 11 passed.

Clause 12—'Substitution of ss.36 to 38 (inclusive).'

Mr S.J. BAKER: This clause involves new sections 36 to 38. What power is exercisable? I understand that under the existing arrangements if ETSA wishes to put in overheads through a council area it is required to get the agreement of the council, not simply to notify the council. I shall be dealing with this again in one of the repealed Acts. It would appear that there is no protection for a council in the changes that are being made here. I hope that we shall have a cooperative arrangement between the two tiers of Government, because it has been brought to my attention that the corporation could exercise power to the extent that local councils would have no say in the siting of wires associated with the supply of electricity.

The Hon. J.H.C. KLUNDER: Again, this is one of these fairly antiquated provisions. It was section 7 of a 1897 Act. If the honourable member has gone that far back, I congratulate him on his research skills. That provision goes on to say:

> The councils may require the South Australian Electric Light and Traction Company to remove any poles or wires that they might have erected.

It is, therefore, very clearly a situation which applies right from a time when electricity was a new commodity; nobody knew quite what was going to happen. Since then, we have moved a long way. Councils and ETSA have developed a close working relationship, and it is reasonable to say that electricity is no longer a new commodity; people have learnt what it is about. It appears to me that the provision is redundant, because the working relationship that there is and will be between ETSA and Southern Power and Water and the councils is of such a nature that this is now a redundant provision.

Mr S.J. BAKER: I refute that contention strongly. There is a good working relationship because responsibilities are incorporated in the original Act. We can all contemplate why those reasons were put there, but one would assume, going back to 1897, that it was to balance the rights of people. The last thing that councils want to be told is that some gigantic transmission lines will be going through their area and they have no say in the matter. Councils should have a right to be able to put a strong point of view. No council will dismiss the chance to have electricity delivered, but councils might have a very firm idea as how it should be delivered, where it should be delivered and whether the lines should be underground or overhead. Again, I have been contacted on this matter.

It is important that the responsibilities remain—that ETSA or Southern Power be required not only to say, 'Within 7 days, we are going to be in your area,' but before that happens we must have agreement in principle that the wiring and power lines that will be installed are in keeping with the desires of council, with the local environment and with those landholders affected—and the council is well aware of whose rights will be affected. It is a matter of balance; it is important that people's rights be protected. This is one of the original protections. I might add that it had stood the test of time since 1897, and if it were irrelevant I assume it would have been deleted long ago in the various amendments to the Act. This is one of the reasons that the 1897 Act has survived.

I believe that perhaps only two relevant provisions are left in the Act that have stood the test of time, and this happens to be one of them—for very good reasons. It is not a silly provision: it really is a very sound provision. It says to Southern and Power Water, or whatever the name of the entity shall be, 'You're required to get the approval of council.' That is very healthy. Under normal circumstances, I would have moved an amendment but, as the matter is going to a select committee, I ask the Minister to consider whether that change should take place.

The Hon. J.H.C. KLUNDER: I hear what the honourable member is saying, but I do want to make some comments on that. The argument that things that have stood the test of time should never be deleted because they have stood the test of time is an interesting one, and I wonder how it could have been used in relation to the witchcraft legislation, for instance, which also stood the test of time, for several hundreds of years. To argue that, because it has been around for a long time you cannot change it because it has stood the test of time, is a rather interesting argument. However, let us deal with this matter. The Electricity Trust of South Australia Act, section 37(2), provides:

> If it is reasonable and economic to do so, the trust will, on the application of any person, and the payment of the appropriate fees and charges fixed by the trust, provide a supply of electricity to any land or premises occupied by that person.

So, there is clearly a need to put poles and lines in place. I understand that the honourable member does not have difficulty with that, and that is fair enough.

I cannot imagine that either ETSA, in its past history, or Southern Power and Water, in the future, would ever be dictatorial enough to say to a council, 'We do not care what you think; we are going to put these things there and that is that.' That does not happen. There is always consultation.

If there is a problem, clearly that problem would be brought by the council to the attention of the media, but certainly to the attention of the Minister. As I have said before the Minister, under both the Electricity Trust of South Australia Act and the Southern Power and Water Act, when it comes into place, will have the power to direct and control. And so the power, which the honourable member believes ought to be exercised by the Minister—and I think he is going to spend a lot of time later on saying that there ought to be powers exercised by the Minister—is a power clearly exercised by the Minister if there happens to be a dispute between a council and Southern Power and Water.

I am not as concerned as the honourable member is with the effect of this provision, because it is an area where, if there is a conflict because people have been unable to resolve differences, it will clearly immediately come to the Minister to use his powers of direction and control.

Mr S.J. BAKER: I simply say that I reject the suggestion by the Minister that the Electricity Trust or Southern Power and Water are all knowing and all caring. They would normally do what they believe is the most effective and efficient way of delivering a system without due regard to the impacts. There are many examples where Government imposes its will and in this instance it is the Government in the form of the corporation. The most classic example in recent times is the ASER development. The Government imposed its will; it took away the rights of the Adelaide City Council. That might well have been appropriate under the circumstances.

I am just saying that, if Government or a corporation wants to do something, this allows them to do it irrespective of the feelings of other people. I believe there has to be balance and so I merely bring that issue to the attention of the House. It may well be that councils do not have a right to say, 'No, no, no', but we may need some mechanism to sort out problems if there is a dispute. I believe that the local people have a right to be heard. The corporation should not say to the local council or to the local residents, 'We are going to be there in seven days. We do not care what you say; we are going to put the power line here and you are irrelevant', because that is exactly what the new provision does. New section 37 provides:

> The corporation may, with the approval of the Minister, provide a loan or subsidy to another supplier of electricity in the State.

Do any loans or subsidies exist at the moment?

The Hon. J.H.C. KLUNDER: The answer is 'No.' This provision replaces a provision of the Electricity Supplies (Country Areas) Act. Under the provisions of this Act, no loans are currently being made, and this clause is merely to maintain the capacity to provide such loans or subsidies, should it be necessary.

Mr S.J. BAKER: I refer to new section 38. This involves a change to the duties of the corporation in relation the electricity supply. New section 38(3) charges the corporation with the responsibility of supplying power. New subsection (3) provides that, if it is reasonable and economic to do so, the corporation must, on the application of any person and payment of the appropriate fees and charges fixed by the corporation, provide a supply of electricity to any land or premises occupied by that person. It appears to have a rider that does not exist at the moment. I would appreciate the Minister's clarification of that matter.

The historical position has been that Governments have made decisions about the supply of electricity. We know that there are a number of country or outlying centres which have their own generation plants because it is not economically appropriate to send powerlines hundreds of kilometres to supply very small communities, so they are catered for in

different ways. However, we have this rider to which I cannot find a parallel and which may in fact stop the corporation from supplying electricity in areas where we believe it is appropriate to do so, even if it is not economically appropriate to do so.

Historically in South Australia, if we dealt purely in economic terms, most of our country centres would not have power or water because of the costs involved. However, we believed at an early stage that it was important that everybody receive some equity—social justice is the common terminology—and it would appear that, if this provision is interpreted in the way I think it can be interpreted, it would restrict Southern Power and Water from servicing those communities. I shall be interested in the Minister's interpretation.

The Hon. J.H.C. KLUNDER: I point out to the honourable member that this clause is exactly the same as the provision that currently exists in the Electricity Trust Act, with the change that, whereas in the Electricity Trust Act there are references to the trust, in this Bill the references are to the authority. So, the capacity which the trust had in the past to extend services and under which it did extend services is exactly the same power that the authority will have under the current clause. There has been no change except to change the name from 'trust 'to 'authority'.

Mr S.J. BAKER: I would be interested in an update on the power situation. New section 38(4) provides that the corporation may cut off the supply of electricity to any region, area or premises. That again is taken directly from the existing Act. I would appreciate the Minister's providing the Committee with details of our current generating capacity here in South Australia, the actual capacity of the grid (not the nominal capacity) and the estimated peak consumption.

The Hon. J.H.C. KLUNDER: The provision to which the honourable member referred, namely, new section 38(4), is in fact very similar to the existing provision, except for subsection (b), which is due to the fact that now there will be some powers and regulations, and that makes reference to that. With regard to the peak consumption, we do not have those figures at the moment, but I thought we topped 2 000 megawatts last summer. That is a figure off the top of my head, and I would not like to be held to that.

Mr S.J. BAKER: I raise this question under this clause because it is mostly a direct take from the existing provisions, but it is important to understand that new subsection (4)(a)(ii) says 'to prevent damage to any part of the distribution system through overloading'. We did have an example in recent times, as the Minister would recognise, where we did not get extra power from Victoria and we had consecutively to cut out suburbs in Adelaide because there was an overload during the very warm weather.

I am interested in where we are in relation to how much capacity we would have within the system and, obviously, if Victoria and South Australia are overloaded at the same time we will not be able to draw on the grid for that extra electricity. Some concern has been expressed by businesses that this could be a sign of the future: that, rather than increase our own capacity, we will look to the grid to provide greater top up and that, when we are both in a stress situation, South Australia will be the major loser.

So I would appreciate the Minister's update on the actual generating and grid capacities, as well as on the peak consumption that has been registered, because I believe that there are some problems that could be right on our doorstep. As far as I am aware, there is no intention at this stage to increase our own generating capacity; we are going to live with what we have. However, if we have an incapacity to draw on other supplies, we will have more and more disruption as a result of power failure. So, I would appreciate that information when the Minister has it available.

The Hon. J.H.C. KLUNDER: As I have indicated, I cannot give the honourable member an exact figure on the peak demand situation, or indeed the anticipated peak demand situation, in the next year. I can, however, off the top of my head, provide him with some other figures. The peak capacity in the State is of the order of 2 400 megawatts, and we have reached a point where our demand and our supply are in line with world's best practice. Most States, as the honourable member would have appreciated, in the 1980s spent a lot of time and a lot of money increasing their peak capacity to far exceed the figures in terms of what they actually needed during the 1980s and the 1990s.

South Australia, partly because of ETSA's good commonsense and partly because of the work that was done in the Public Accounts Committee in the mid-1980s which questioned whether or not ETSA should be committing ourselves to producing extra power stations, has not fallen for that trap, and we have about the right amount of capacity for the demand, whereas in other States they have fallen into the trap of providing far more than necessary.

The honourable member also wanted to know what our capacity is for taking from the interconnection between Victoria and ourselves, and there the incoming capacity is 500 megawatts and the outgoing capacity is 250 megawatts. So we can import 500 megawatts and we can export 250 megawatts.

I also need to take issue with the honourable member on his definition of overloading, because it is incorrect. Overloading is usually due to excessive demands for a short circuit. In other words, all of a sudden there is zero resistance in the line and an enormous amount of current goes through because of the voltage that is supplied and it blows out, if one is lucky, the fuses or the circuit breakers or, if one is unlucky, it actually causes damage in households, as happens from time to time. It is not due to a high demand by consumers.

The transmission and distribution system is capable of taking care of the highest demands that consumers can normally place on those lines. I refer to the brownouts and blackouts that occur from time to time. As the honourable member indicated, that occurred at a time when Victoria was under an arrangement with us—which was accepted by that State—which required it to supply us with electricity. It had a problem of its own and could not supply itself. It tried to continue to supply us and had to indicate that it could not do it.

Those brownouts and blackouts are not due to excessive demand: they are due do a lack of supply. I hope that when the honourable member reads the information in *Hansard* he will accept that the definition of overloading that he has put forward in this place is not correct.

The figures that I have been given are not 2 400 megawatts of installed capacity but 2 300 megawatts. Obviously, we have been retiring some capacity. The persistent peak on 2 February 1993 was 2 090 megawatts. So, we have the capacity to deal with all of our own requirements.

The honourable member also mentioned that we were not going to install any further capacity ourselves. That is true for base-load capacity, where we have no plans for the time being, but there is some planning to install some additional peak capacity.

Mr S.J. BAKER: I will now deal with proposed new section 38B. It has changed something. Again, I was trying to find the parallel reference and I certainly have found it in relation to vegetation clearance. We will deal with that later because we have some difficulty with the proposal that the Department of Environment and Land Management should determine what trees should be cut down and what regulations should be put in place—although obviously we do believe in cooperation between departments.

However, in relation to powers of entry, can the Minister point to the existing provision? I have found it in relation to vegetation clearance, and that requires 60 days notice, of course. But no 60 days notice is included in this particular provision.

The Hon. J.H.C. KLUNDER: In terms of the honourable member's reference to the powers of the Department of Environment and Planning in relation to the cutting of trees, it is an exiting power. So, that has merely been translated directly from the existing legislation to the Southern Power and Water Bill. With regard to proposed new section 38B, the honourable member wanted to know where the provisions are currently. They are in the conditions of supply, which, of course, are individual agreements between the authority and the consumer. They are also in section 15 of the Electricity Act.

Mr S.J. BAKER: There are no checks and balances in this provision; it allows Southern Power and Water to do anything it likes without redress, and the Minister would well know what the Gunn amendment does to some of these provisions. I do not have all the relevant information available, so I am seeking an assurance that the details are exactly the same as exist today. If not, I would like to know what variations exist.

The Hon. J.H.C. KLUNDER: I have been assured that, whilst the words may be different, the intent is the same.

Mr S.J. BAKER: I have heard that before. I understand that there are three gas turbines at Snuggery generating power for the local area. With the grid in place I understand there is a capacity to draw power from it. Does that make the gas turbines at Snuggery redundant or do they still have a future?

The Hon. J.H.C. KLUNDER: The turbines at Snuggery are not for local use; they are turbines for peak supply. It is machinery that can be switched on very rapidly as distinct from base load machinery, which takes a lot of time to warm up and get up to speed. They are used as part of the response to peaks in demand, such as the high summer peak when air-conditioners are switched on, and so on, because they are almost instantaneous. They are connected to the main grid to enable a quick response to an increase in demand, but I understand that they are not being used very heavily or frequently at all.

Mr S.J. BAKER: We can assume that they have a limited lifetime. My next question relates to making the observation that the 5 per cent surcharge on electricity is still in place, and it just changes the requirement of the Electricity Trust to pay the 5 per cent to the corporation to pay the Government. As we can now dispense with clause 12, my next question will be on clause 21.

The CHAIRMAN: I must thank the Deputy Leader for his cooperation in letting the Chair know what is going on.

Clause passed.

Clauses 13 to 20 passed.

Clause 21—'Repeal of part IVA.'

Mr S.J. BAKER: I simply ask the Minister: why is part IVA of the Act being repealed? That part deals with coal mining at Leigh Creek. I would appreciate some explanation. I believe that there is a need to recognise Leigh Creek as a separate participating body in the Southern Power and Water Corporation and that it is appropriate to have it remain in the Act. But the Minister might be able to give me one good reason why it should go.

The Hon. J.H.C. KLUNDER: I think I can do that. The provision for Leigh Creek was necessary in 1946 because ETSA was formed and took over the operation of the coalfield. An interesting comment, a sort of sidelight to history, is that it took over the operation of the coalfield from the E&WS, which shows that there are times when you can go around in circles over a long time. One can argue that the authorities have had something in common for a very long time. Consequently, the Leigh Creek Coal Act was repealed in 1946 by the ETSA Act. At the time it was apparently very necessary to be quite specific about what the new authority was intended to do, and it was of course one of the main reasons for establishing ETSA, namely, to develop and use indigenous fuels rather than imported ones. We currently have clause 13(1)(a)(ii) of the new Southern Power and Water Bill:

> . . . to carry out research and works to develop, secure and utilise energy sources suitable for the generation of electricity.

That clearly is a capacity to continue with the Leigh Creek situation.

Clause passed.

Clause 22 passed.

Clause 23—'Repeal of part V.'

Mr S.J. BAKER: I draw the Minister's attention to the drafting of new section 44(3). I think there could be a better drafting of that particular instruction. There is a simpler way of expressing what form of proof is necessary. Further, under new section 45, can the Minister inform the Committee whether fax is now a legitimate form of communication, in the circumstances?

The Hon. J.H.C. KLUNDER: No, I cannot.

Mr S.J. BAKER: I thought there may well be an omission and it is a very quick and simple form of communication. In relation to new section 46, my understanding is that currently for summary offences, and particularly relating to this area, we can only prosecute within 12 months. This seems to extend the prosecution period for another two years. Can the Minister satisfy my inquiry on this matter?

The Hon. J.H.C. KLUNDER: It is an interesting comment because I am not aware of that. What the Water Resources Act has, for instance, is a period of five years and we thought that three years would be more than adequate and consequently did not bother to bring that out from the Water Resources Act. So, we are in a situation where I cannot answer the honourable member's question because that is a point of law that I would have to refer in any case to my colleague the Attorney-General.

Mr S.J. BAKER: I understand that that is the case. We are really talking about two significantly different items. Here we are talking about people who attach a piece of wire to the system and try to take some power. We are talking fairly minor offences. It is not actually taking electricity. They are summary offences. I understand that the one year provision is appropriate for more serious offences. For example, if a person is causing extreme problems to our water supply due to negligence or direct action, then I would say it is absolutely appropriate to have a long time frame for prosecutions. In the circumstances, we are dealing with summary offences. I

believe there is a code in place. I believe it does relate to one year.

Therefore, I also believe it is inappropriate to extend it to three years. That is another matter that can be taken up by the legal powers. With respect to new section 47(3), vegetation clearance, the Minister said that the trust has to have the approval of the EPA or Minister of Environment and Land Management in relation to the regulations for vegetation clearance. I have read the Act and I cannot find such a reference. Can the Minister please enlighten me as to where I have missed this reference?

The Hon. J.H.C. KLUNDER: Subsection (3) of section 47 says that regulations dealing with the clearance of vegetation can only be made with the concurrence of the Minister of Environment and Land Management. It is the regulations, not the individual clearance.

Mr S.J. BAKER: The Minister said that that is an existing requirement. I cannot find that existing requirement, but I may have missed it. This piece of legislation has taken a lot of work, and I may well have missed it. If the Minister can point to where it is provided in the Act, I will sit down and say that it is not an issue.

The Hon. J.H.C. KLUNDER: It is to be found in section 44(3) of the Electricity Trust of South Australia Act 1946 (page 25 of the Act).

Mr S.J. BAKER: New section 47(4) deals with regulations under this Act. There are other powers that we have dealt with under the Southern Power and Water Bill relating to regulations. Can the Minister tell the Committee how long after the proclamation that the regulations will be in place? Was it intended that all the regulations would be directly transposed into the new corporation and then sorted out, or was it intended that there would be a cleansing of the regulations to update them prior to the proclamation of the Act?

The Hon. J.H.C. KLUNDER: My advice is that, as the ETSA Act is not being deleted but merely modified, the regulations under the ETSA Act will remain in place. As the Southern Power and Water Act will be a new Act, new regulations will have to be drafted, and there will be some minor modifications in respect of the Electricity Act.

Clause passed.

Clause 24—'Substitution of schedule.'

Mr S.J. BAKER: This deals with the transitional provisions in relation to the debt outstanding under the name of ETSA. What is the quantum of that and the period over which that will have to be worked out?

The Hon. J.H.C. KLUNDER: The figures regarding that matter are not available at the moment, but they can obviously be made available to the Deputy Leader.

Mr S.J. BAKER: What is the legal position in respect of a person who owns stock in ETSA? I am not sure that the law allows for the automatic transfer of stock from the trust to the corporation without the owner being given the right to quit that stock. How will that be organised?

The Hon. J.H.C. KLUNDER: Again, I think we will have to provide that information to the honourable member, because that is not available at this stage.

Mr S.J. BAKER: My last question on clause 24, which deals with the schedule, relates to statutory easements. I must admit that, when I saw the statutory easements deleted, I thought we had lost them for good, but I found them in the schedule. Clause 5(1)(b) provides:

> That part of the distribution system was as at 1 November 1988 on, above or under the land and the land did not then belong to the trust.

I would like some explanation of the reference to 1 November 1988.

The Hon. J.H.C. KLUNDER: I am not entirely sure that I understand what the honourable member is asking here. We may have to continue the discussion on it. My understanding is that sections 40 and 41 of the Electricity Trust of South Australia Act came into being on 1 November 1988, so this is a continuation of that.

Clause passed.

Clause 25 passed.

Clause 26—'Amendments contained in schedule.'

Mr S.J. BAKER: Clause 26 deals with the schedule, and pages 18 to 26 of the Bill deal with the Sewerage Act. I do not have a large number of questions on this part, because basically the drafting is such that where 'the Minister' appears the corporation's name is inserted. I will deal with issues related to that change shortly. The acquisition of land was previously provided for under section 5 and was under the control of the Minister, but that is now dealt with under the Land Acquisition Act. Will the Minister now have no part to play in land acquisition, and will the corporation be governed by the general rules that prevail under the Land Acquisition Act?

The Hon. J.H.C. KLUNDER: The second part of the honourable member's question is correct, but of course the Minister still has the overriding power. It is intended that these matters will be dealt with under the Land Acquisition Act.

Mr S.J. BAKER: Part II of the Sewerage Act deals with the principle of keeping separate accounts. Under sections 6 to 9, a number of areas of responsibility have been deleted because they are now the corporation's responsibility. Under the Sewerage Act the Minister was required to keep proper accounts for sewerage, but what guarantee do we have—and there appears to be no guarantee under the new Act—that the corporation will still be required to keep separate accounts for sewerage? Under the Sewerage Act, the Minister had direct responsibility for keeping proper records of sewerage and every ancillary activity. As this section has been deleted and not replaced by another, will the Minister explain how this matter will be dealt with?

The Hon. J.H.C. KLUNDER: This is part of the Minister's power to direct the authority either after the event if he is not happy but certainly in terms of the charter in the first instance to indicate in which way the corporation will discharge its duties.

Mr S.J. BAKER: I am worried by the Minister's response. As the Minister knows, during the second reading debate I spent some time talking about cross-subsidisation and the need to account fully for every service that is supplied and, if the service is supplied on a user-pays basis, to ensure that the accounts are kept strictly so that we know the cost that is involved including depreciation of assets plus the full cost of all ancillary services. So, I make the point that in the Southern Power and Water Bill there should be reference to this matter. I alluded to this earlier, and I re-emphasise the point.

The Hon. J.H.C. KLUNDER: Part of the requirement of any organisation that works for a Minister would be its ability to provide him with clear accounting of the discharge of its functions. If the Minister did not require that, the Auditor-General most certainly would. So, I am not as

concerned about this item as the honourable member appears to be.

Mr S.J. BAKER: I will deal with the next matter *en bloc* as it concerns the transposition of the powers of the Minister to the corporation. I did suggest that the drafting had been sloppy as there had been no discrimination in any area about the powers that should be retained by the Minister, although we understand that the Minister has the ultimate right of intervention. I refer the Minister to section 22 concerning the construction of dams, section 50 concerning the demolition of buildings, section 52 concerning encroachment, section 54 concerning discharge of pollutants, section 65 concerning remittance of rights, section 78a concerning charges for sewer installation and sections 85a, 85b, 85c and 85d dealing with leasing. That also requires approval of the Governor, and section 94 deals with the sale of property when the user is in arrears. I refer to section 94 first, because it is a matter that relates to most people.

The Minister had certain rights under the Act so that, if a first person fell behind in their payments, certain consequences could flow. Section 94 sets out a hierarchy of actions that can be taken. The actions that can be taken under the Sewerage Act are different from those that can be taken when a person falls behind under the water rates legislation. The Act enables the Minister to sell the land. The Water Works Act contains a quicker path than the Sewerage Act. It is an area where, if people are in impecunious circumstances, that is, broke, whilst the Minister exercises that responsibility and is responsible to the people of South Australia, there is a certain check and balance so that every step along the way a person's rights are taken into consideration. If they are behind in their rates, every effort will be made to ensure that they are not placed in a situation where they could lose their house and home. Under the Sewerage Act—and I also refer to the Water Works Act—the corporation has power to exercise the ultimate disposition of a person's land if that person falls behind.

I am using that section as an example, because everyone can relate to it, but there are certain powers that the Minister is responsible for that will now be transferred to the corporation. This is one of them. They are quite draconian in nature, with the ultimate test being that the public can say, 'We believe the Minister is acting unconscionably.' In each of those areas there is no balance in the system. All the powers are transferred *en bloc* to the corporation. I do not believe anyone has really thought about it, but I put to the Minister that there are certain of those areas such as the one about the ultimate sale of land and another one about encroachment—and there are other matters relating to destruction of buildings—where I believe it is important that the corporation does not have the sole right to do these things. Section 50 provides:

> If any person builds, rebuilds or constructs any house, privy, cesspit or drain, in contravention of the last preceding section, the Minister may pull down or demolish the same. . .

That gives the Minister the ultimate right to do so, and it is quite appropriate, because Ministers and the Government are subject to the electorate saying whether it wants them back in power. This section is saying to the corporation, 'You have a right, if you find someone has transgressed, to bulldoze their building.' There is no natural right of appeal written into this Act or into the amendments. I have listed a number of sections where I believe the new Act should provide a check and balance on the system and the capacity for appeal so that the corporation of its own volition cannot do those things which are transferred to it by right.

The Hon. J.H.C. KLUNDER: I note what the honourable member is saying, but it seems to me he is arguing that we should have done more than just transfer the existing powers into the Southern Power and Water legislation: he suggests we should also have taken a sweep through and made a number of amendments to provide a better Act. My argument is that if the Government had done so, it probably would have confused the two issues, that is, the merger of the organisation as distinct from all the changes we might want to make in the process. That is why I said in the second reading explanation that these are interim arrangements to allow the merger to proceed as quickly as possible. The Government has determined that a full review should be undertaken on a priority basis to better integrate and rationalise the legislative framework governing the activities of the corporation. The things that the honourable member has mentioned have been considered by the Government and taken on board. There will be a working through of the legislation to improve it. The merger legislation is the first step which will then lead to further steps.

The argument that the honourable member raises with regard to the various sections he has mentioned is that at the moment the Minister has the final untrammelled power to make these decisions. The honourable member is concerned that those powers should be given to a statutory authority. In a sense, ETSA already has those kinds of powers, because under the ETSA Act it is not the Minister but ETSA that has those powers. The honourable member is concerned that the same kind of powers should be given to the statutory authority for the E&WS component that is being translated and merged into the new organisation.

Mr S.J. Baker interjecting:

The Hon. J.H.C. KLUNDER: If I have misjudged the honourable member—

Mr S.J. Baker interjecting:

The Hon. J.H.C. KLUNDER: The power is there, whether the Minister has the power under an Act or whether a corporation has the power under an Act. If the honourable member is arguing that the power should not be there, then there would need to be an amendment. No doubt that will be discussed when we go through the legislation after the merger has been completed. There is still an overriding power by the Minister, and in 1985 when we introduced that power under section 5(1)(a) of the ETSA Act, which gave the Minister power of direction and control, it was indicated that this would be a reserve power rarely used.

I do not see that as being a problem under the Public Corporation Act. If one puts things of this nature into a statutory authority, the Minister does need to have a somewhat more hands-on approach and, indeed, that hands-on approach is indicated under the charter and the various powers of the Public Corporation Act.

The general point is that if a statutory authority is created to do the work, it is appropriate that it should have the power to do it; and it is also appropriate that there should be control and direction powers so that the Minister can step in when necessary. I take the point made by the honourable member, but I reject it on the basis that had we tried to get all the powers changed at the same time as the merger this would have become an impossibly difficult task. The Government has indicated that a full review will be undertaken on the legislative framework of the new authority.

Mr S.J. BAKER: If the Bill were not going to a select committee, I would make a very strong political point. As it is, I shall not waste the time of the Committee. I am sure that people would be appalled if they believed that the corporation could get in the bulldozer and plough through their houses or whatever they had built.

The Hon. J.H.C. Klunder interjecting:

Mr S.J. BAKER: I have looked through the Electricity Act, and I am not sure that it gives them the same rights. The corporation has been given certain powers which I believe have to be tempered and referred back to the Minister. The only two powers that are referred back to the Minister in these changes relate to the setting of water and sewerage rates and water allowances. The only direct responsibility that is installed for the Minister is when we are into money; the rest of the time it does not matter what the corporation does. The only referral back to the Minister in the legislation is concerned with money. In principle, I have difficulty with that.

I understand what the Minister is saying. As I said, if it were not going to a select committee, I would be putting out press releases about the terrible things that the Minister would be doing to people's houses and properties, selling them out from underneath them, and so on, because that is what the Bill does, irrespective of what the Minister says. I ask the Minister to have a good look at these sections to see whether we can get some balance in them if ultimately they are to succeed as part of Southern Power and Water. That comment applies to a number of clauses, but there might be others that offend people. These are the ones that I quickly browsed through. I said that these were appropriate to go to the corporation and others needed some tempering—perhaps by being referred back to the Minister, tribunal, or independent body—before being allowed to be exercised. I have made the point, and the Minister has said that he will look at it.

In terms of rate setting—I refer to new section 73(1)—will the Minister explain how the process is meant to work?

The Hon. J.H.C. KLUNDER: I shall have to get advice on the last part of the honourable member's question. However, I need to pick up the point that he is concerned that the only power that the Minister has directly as distinct from his control of the corporation relates to pricing. I remind the honourable member that SAGASCO, which is a private company, is caught in the same situation. The Minister has powers directly with regard to SAGASCO, and they include the power to set prices. It is not unusual in that situation, and I understand that the honourable member accepts that.

The second point is that if we put into the legislation, as we are doing, that the corporation has the power instead of the Minister, there is a clear line of responsibility and everybody knows what the situation is. If we do not do that, the Minister has the power to delegate those powers at various times and in various ways and the Parliament will not know at that stage which power has or has not been delegated. Then the situation of the Parliament being informed is more cloudy than if it is all lined out.

The third point again, of course, is that if you are going to have a statutory authority, you must have statutory authority powers. You cannot give it powers that are no more powerful than the powers that a Government department has and call it a statutory authority, because it will not work.

Mr S.J. BAKER: I am delighted the Minister used SAGASCO as the example. How can the Gas Company, without a court order, go and mow down people's houses? He will not find it, and that is exactly my point. I would appreciate the Minister's answer to the question involving rate fixing.

The Hon. J.H.C. KLUNDER: With regard to determining rates, I will refer to the Sewerage Act 1929, section 73, which provides:

> The Minister may, by notice published in the *Gazette*, fix the scale or scales upon which sewerage rates. . .

The new situation is that, 'The corporation may, with the approval of the Minister. . . ', so there is that very direct power for the Minister to do that.

Mr S.J. Baker interjecting:

The Hon. J.H.C. KLUNDER: Which I should imagine will be exercised very frequently.

Mr S.J. BAKER: I already knew that; that really did not assist the cause. I wanted to know what the Minister envisaged as the process. I come back to the point about cross-subsidisation, hiding costs within various parts of the corporation in order to change the price. How is the process meant to work? Is the head of the corporation supposed to sit in the Minister's chair and say, 'Minister, this is the real cost of producing; this is what we have in revenue for the last year. If we wish to keep the same profit margin or same surplus, this is where we have to go. Now, if you want to play politics and reduce the price, this is where we can go, or if we want to make a supernormal profit to offset one of our losses, this is where we should go.' That is the normal process that Ministers pursue. Is it up to the head or chairman of the corporation? Whose responsibility is it to bring the information and the argument to the Minister?

The Hon. J.H.C. KLUNDER: Of course, the situation is that in the same way as the Electricity Trust has a board, the new corporation will have a board, and the board will be in charge of the day-to-day activities. There will no doubt be a discussion regarding the setting of prices of the various items that come under that control and, as I have already indicated, the Minister retains the right to set those prices. But the board's push will be towards greater efficiency and effectiveness at all times and the board will no doubt, at a stage during the year, put forward its next year's budget to the Minister. The Minister then has the power to talk to the board and to discuss what should be in those budgetary requirements and so on. That is part of the work under the Public Corporations Act where goals are clearly set. So I do not think that is any different from the way in which the Electricity Trust has operated to great effect over the past number of years.

Mr S.J. BAKER: I merely make the point that when the Electricity Trust is an electricity producer alone the considerations are far less complex than when you are dealing through three major functional areas, or three delivery areas, which are being charged to the consumer. Electricity has certain complexities in terms of whether you are a commercial or industrial user, or whether you live in a residential area or some other part of the State. Adding water and sewer on to that creates further complexities, and there will be further trade-offs. It is absolutely vital that each of the services are costed properly.

I merely raise the point. I expect that we will be in Government making decisions on that. I do not expect this Bill to survive but I was merely surmising as to how the process might have worked.

The Hon. J.H.C. KLUNDER: Mr Chairman, clearly a Minister in charge of this corporation will want to know the effectiveness of each and every cost centre in the

organisation. At the moment there are a number of subsidies and cross-subsidies that occur within the electricity situation and within the E&WS. By and large these are the cross-subsidies from the city to the country, where city sewerage and water is very profitable and where country sewerage and water is a loss maker and there is a cross-subsidy from one to the other. Exactly the same applies to electricity.

Clause passed.

Clause 27—'Interpretation.'

Mr S.J. BAKER: This is the area I alluded to in my second reading contribution, as did a number of other members, relating to the balance that will be achieved with the responsibilities vested in the Minister, but the assets and the research staff vested in the corporation. Minimal changes have been made to the Water Resources Act. Section 12 of the Act provides:

> The South Australian Water Resources Council is established.

Of course it will involve, as clause 12 provides:

> the Chief Executive Officers for the time being of the following departments:
>
> the Engineering and Water Supply Department;

We know that disappeared and many other changes have taken place. Perhaps the Statutes Interpretation Act handles that particular contingency, although with the new 'super' department I would say there needs to be some redrafting. I looked at the Act in terms of its currency and there are a number of other alterations that had to be made to the Act at the same time. We are dealing with a minimalist position in changing as little as possible and I understand that, even though the references may be out of date.

When we are dealing with the Water Resources Act the requirement on water quality is pre-eminent in most peoples' minds. As I said, the Minister has the responsibility, which can be delegated—and we dealt with that matter earlier, as the Minister would remember—but all the resources are with the corporation. My first question is: which powers would the Minister wish to delegate from the Water Resources Act?

The Hon. J.H.C. KLUNDER: Basically, the honourable member has asked two questions. The first is about the assets that pass to the corporation, and I understand those are related to the Water Works and Sewerage Acts. The second question was the extent to which under the Water Resources Act I intended to delegate my powers to the corporation. At the moment I delegate quite extensively to people in the E&WS under the Water Resources Act, and those delegations will continue in place to allow the same people to continue the work they are doing.

Mr S.J. BAKER: That is what I expected the answer to be, and that does concern me. Can the Minister provide me with a copy of the current delegations? This raises the question that I dealt with previously, namely, the extent to which the Minister is responsible, either directly or by delegation within the existing framework, to the extent that those responsibilities are shifted off to the corporation. I would like to make a very strong point about this, because we have a corporation which has been charged with particular responsibilities. If I am dealing with an organisation that is required to produce a good (we will say it is water), I can see that you can use the supply system and make it more efficient, reduce the number of employees in certain areas and increase response times just by doing things better, so a corporation can easily grapple with the need to make the organisation more efficient and effective.

However, when we come to water supplies, we are dealing with some decisions which have to be made, which do not have anything to do with the efficiency of distribution, and which may have more to do with where the water supply will be in 10 or 20 years. Some obvious conflicts will arise and will ultimately be reflected in the pricing process. So, I have some problems with that. This is the one area of difficulty I have, in terms of Ministerial responsibility. The other difficulty is whether we should have very large units which encompass electricity, water and sewerage; I have a great difference of opinion on that item. How does Ministerial responsibility impose itself on the corporation which has some efficiency responsibilities in delivering the best service at the right price? We are dealing with what I think are some real conflicts, and how they are resolved is of great interest to me.

The Hon. J.H.C. KLUNDER: The points made by the Deputy Leader are perfectly reasonable in that we need to be flexible in our response to water quality issues, because of the changing external conditions that will apply. That is why the Water Resources Act remains committed to me instead of the corporation. That is why the powers under the Water Resources Act are delegated and revocable at will, because that maintains the maximum degree of flexibility for the Minister.

Mr S.J. BAKER: I would like to draw a parallel and make a point very strongly. When the Highways Fund revenue was dedicated so that petrol tax was dedicated to that fund, there was a commitment by the Government to maintain the asset. We may not agree with hypothecation, and most of us do not; in fact, in America hypothecation is seen as being one of the worst things that can possibly happen in a Government administration—it is just so inflexible. However, there was a commitment. Because of the changing inputs from the Federal sphere, if we had maintained the Highways Fund as it was dedicated originally, we would have a much better asset than we have today. The Minister would admit that, because we are talking about millions of dollars a year—$50 million or $60 million a year perhaps—difference in the amount of money that could be supplied.

So, there is no doubt that a commitment to the quality of the asset has been diminished by the change that the Government made in relation to the Highways Fund. In the same way, it is easy for Government to say, 'We'll fix up the problem today and not worry about the long-term future; it is all the responsibility of the corporation and, as long as the water comes out of the tap and it looks reasonable, somehow that is going to be sufficient; and if it all goes wrong you can always blame the corporation.' I do not expect an answer, but I believe they are the sorts of issues where there has to be an overriding pact, if you like, or an overriding agreement, on these matters, which I do not think have been sorted out. They may have been, in some people's minds, but in terms of the responsibilities and the extent to which they impinge on the efficiency demands of the corporation, there are some real conflicts that have to be dealt with, and they are not met if we just have a simple shift of power without a clear delineation of where the ultimate responsibility lies; and, just as importantly, a clear indication as to how the costs of meeting the long-term demands for water quality will be met within the new framework

The Hon. J.H.C. KLUNDER: I must admit, I am delighted to hear the honourable member's view on hypothecation, because I too have seen some of the United States excesses in this regard and the disasters that occur as a result.

Certainly, by the same token, in deference to a ruling that you are about to make, Mr Chairman, I will not enter into a large debate on the Highways Fund and on the quality of the highway assets, although I understand that interstate people are very jealous of the quality of our highway assets. Indeed, you can notice it when you come into South Australia: the roads improve considerably.

Again, the basic point is that the Water Resources Act remains committed to me in order to maintain that superior flexibility and to indicate the Government's high priority on the quality of water, especially when we know that there are a number of pressures on the State in terms of water quality that basically do not exist in other States. I would have thought that our past record on water quality—the spending of some $220 million just on water filtration, for instance, over the past 15 years or so—would be an indication that this Government has not sat back and just ignored that aspect of it.

Indeed, I do not know that one would argue that it is just this Government; I think that any Government in this State would always have to place a very high degree of importance on the quality of water because of the extraneous situations that apply. I was somewhat amused at the honourable member's view that one could blame the corporation if things went wrong. I did not notice that in SATCO when things went wrong there; I do not remember SATCO being blamed. The blame was sheeted home, of course, immediately to the Minister. No Minister will ever be able to stand aside and say, 'It's the corporation that did it', or 'It's the State Bank that did it': the Opposition of the day will always try very hard to sheet the blame home to the Minister, as I am quite sure the Deputy Leader will recall from recent debates in this Parliament. So the Minister retains the overall responsibility and must ensure, particularly with regard to water quality, that the very best possible situation applies.

Mr S.J. BAKER: I do not need to pursue the matter any further except to point to a recent example involving television licensing. It was a member of a Federal Minister's own staff who was responsible in terms of allocating blame.

An honourable member interjecting:

Mr S.J. BAKER: I was just pointing out to the Minister that, when one of the Federal Ministers got into strife on a TV licensing issue, the first thing he mentioned was that it was a staff member who was responsible.

The CHAIRMAN: It is a good point, but get back to the issue.

Mr S.J. BAKER: I am saying that Ministers will always look for a scapegoat and hope that people are fooled in the process. The Minister was probably quite right: probably the ministerial advice he received was wrong under the circumstances. Having that further step in the chain of ministerial advice from the corporation to someone in the department to the Minister rather than the existing arrangement just increases the distance we have from the actual decision making. I have no more questions on clauses 27, 28 and 29, except to reiterate my request for a copy of those powers that are currently delegated by the Minister.

Clause passed.

Clauses 28 and 29 passed.

Clause 30—'Amendments contained in schedule.'

Mr S.J. BAKER: We are dealing with the schedule to the Waterworks Act. I have made some observations—and I hope I have made them strongly—in relation to certain sections in the Sewerage Act and the same observations apply in relation to the Waterworks Act. I am not happy that the following provisions should be passed on to the corporation as of right: clause 12, dealing with the overriding power for works; clause 20, dealing with incursion; clause 33, dealing with reduction of supply; clause 58, dealing with pollution; clause 67, dealing with rates imposition, even when the value is wrong; clause 88, dealing with remittance of rates; clause 98, dealing with sale of land; clauses 106 to 109, dealing with leasing of land; and, of course, the same areas dealing with the non-payment of rates, clauses 87 and 93 to 97.

All I am saying is that, whilst the corporation has to have some responsibility in these areas for obvious reasons, there needs to be a check and a balance. We could have an argument about some of these issues. Some I do not feel very strongly about, as the Minister would understand, but there are others where I believe people's property is at risk or where action can be taken that normally would not be conscionable by an outside organisation or, indeed, an outside corporation. That is what we are dealing with: a body that will be subject to the Public Corporations Act. That Act provides that this body must act like any other privately listed organisation. A whole lot of rules apply that do not allow those companies to do certain things, and most of those things come within the sections I have mentioned.

Whilst we should mention those matters in the Acts, because they are important to sustain the water and sewerage systems and the electricity supply, there has to be a check and a balance in the system if we are to live with the general design and ideological framework around which the Public Corporations Act has been constructed.

The Hon. J.H.C. KLUNDER: I think we can probably cut this answer reasonably short and indicate that since the honourable member has stated that he has the same kind of observations to make then the same kind of responses also apply.

I have already indicated that there will be a review of the legislative framework so that a number of those things can be taken into account. But there is an oddity in all this: it will be interesting to know where the honourable member stands. Is he saying that some of the so-called draconian powers to which he has referred are okay for a Minister to wield but not for a corporation under the control of a Minister to wield? If that is his view, that can be taken into consideration as we look at a further review of this.

Mr S.J. BAKER: The Minister got it in one, Sir.

Clause passed.

Clause 31—'Acts repealed.'

Mr S.J. BAKER: I have a number of questions relating to the repeal of the Acts and I will deal with them as quickly as possible. There are two matters in relation to the 1897 Act. We have already dealt with one of those: the need for Southern Power and Water to have the approval of the council area in which it wishes to construct its works. The second matter concerns the right of consumers to be treated equally, as one of the original tenets of the Act. That means that you can discriminate between a residential and a commercial consumer but not between Fred and Freda if they are living next door to each other. That has been deleted with the repeal of that Act, and I should like to know what similar provision will be put in place.

The Hon. J.H.C. KLUNDER: Whilst we do not have in the Act a condition similar to that of the 1897 Act, a standard set of conditions of supply will be gazetted. They will make clear that people will be treated equally. We are talking here about equality of price of electricity rather than equality of cost of supply, because they will be very different, and indeed

country people rely on that being subsidised. In any case, there is also in the Act—but I could not dig it out immediately—a provision to enable the establishment of terms and conditions, with the Minister's agreement, which will be the condition that will be used to treat, say, large industrial consumers, and so on.

Mr S.J. BAKER: Obviously the Electrical Workers and Contractors Licensing Act is no longer of significant import in this debate. There are two Acts that are linked: the Electricity (Country Areas) Subsidy Act 1962—which gives people the rights—and the Electricity Supplies (Country Areas) Act 1950. So it is the subsidy Act which requires the Treasurer to make payment to cover the shortfalls. Can the Minister tell us anything in relation to why those two Acts are being repealed? Are they now totally irrelevant or are there some sections that should be reconstituted in the new corporation?

The Hon. J.H.C. KLUNDER: The so-called subsidy Acts are indeed the Electricity Supplies (Country Areas) Act 1950, the Local Electricity Undertakings (Securities for Loans) Act 1950 and the Electricity (Country Areas) Subsidy Act 1962. The first two do not actually serve any purpose for ETSA with regard to its customers and indeed the Local Government Act and the Local Government Financing Authority are better vehicles for dealing with the purposes of those Acts should the need arise. The question of subsidy arrangement for off-grid electricity undertakings has been under review, as the honourable member would know, for some three years, and it makes sense that the responsibility for those subsidies should be with the infrastructure experts who better understand the technology and the basis of the subsidy. Discussions have therefore occurred between the Outback Areas Community Development Trust, ETSA and Treasury and new arrangements are reasonably close to being agreed on. There is a whole range of issues being resolved between State Government and local government and this is one of them. I can give an assurance that none of those three Acts will be repealed until the Government is satisfied that satisfactory arrangements are in place that will ensure that efficient electricity supplies can be continued to be provided to country areas.

Mr S.J. BAKER: Again, if this Bill was not being taken to a select committee I would have made a very strong point about repealing something that exists as of right in legislation and the Minister saying, 'Trust me.' I would make the point strongly about people in country areas, and the Minister well knows the feeling on this side of the Chamber about people in country areas and the need for them to get a decent quality of service. That should be encased in legislation as far as we are concerned. The repeal of these Acts does not actually guarantee it. It does allow for it to happen but it does not guarantee it. We make the point strongly. I accept what the Minister is saying—that there is a need to put certain arrangements in place to ensure that, before these Acts are repealed, the current arrangements are still maintained so that nobody is disadvantaged. I accept that that is the responsible way to operate. I do, however, believe that that should still be encased in specific legislation of the nature we have seen here. At this stage I will not go on with that, but I would have done had the Bill not been going to a select committee. Can the Minister tell me why ETSA Torrens Island Power Station survives the repealings?

The Hon. J.H.C. KLUNDER: The Act vests the land in ETSA.

Mr S.J. BAKER: Why is that Act not repealed and the land vested in Southern Power and Water? Have I missed something in the process? We seem to have cleaned up all the other areas, but we have this strange reference whereby a piece of legislation vests that land in ETSA, and ETSA is being vested in Southern Power and Water. I would have thought for consistency we would vest that piece of land directly in Southern Power and Water. I may well be missing something, but I am sure the Minister can clear it up.

The Hon. J.H.C. KLUNDER: It is obviously one of those things which we could, if we wanted, transfer to Southern Power and Water, but there is no need to do so because of schedule 2 of the Southern Power and Water Bill. Clause 1(2) provides:

> Subject to subclause (3) a reference in an Act or instrument to the Trust is, where the context admits, a reference to the Corporation.

So, it has been picked up in that fashion. To include another Act in this area would be excessive, and therefore it was not done.

Mr S.J. BAKER: I accept the Minister's explanation. The only thing is anybody looking through the Acts of Parliament would say, 'Why does this still exist?' There is a very simple explanation. I will not labour the point. Extreme concern has been expressed by the Cowell Electricity Supply, which is one of the major country producers. It appears to be a very efficient and effective organisation. Given the way these Acts are being repealed and the formation of the new corporation, it appears that its future may be under a cloud. Can the Minister give some assurances to the people responsible that this will in no way affect their future operations, because they do have plans for future expansion which I believe are consistent with the State's best interests?

The Hon. J.H.C. KLUNDER: Clearly, discussions are going on there, but the legislative movement from two organisations into the merged organisation will not affect them.

Mr S.J. BAKER: Can the Minister give the Committee an undertaking that the rights and the future of the Cowell Electricity Company will be in no way impeded by the legislative changes envisaged here?

The Hon. J.H.C. KLUNDER: The indication I gave that the rights and powers of the Cowell Electricity Supply group would not be affected by the legislation is correct. The upshot of any discussions that take place will be no different if it is ETSA talking to Cowell or SPW talking to Cowell. While those discussions are occurring I would rather not bring them up here, because that would put an extra oar into the water at possibly the wrong time. The change in legislation will not affect organisations like Cowell Electricity Supply.

Clause passed.

Schedule passed.

Title.

The Hon. J.H.C. KLUNDER: I move:

> Page 1—Leave out 'Builders Licensing Act 1986'.

Amendment carried; title as amended passed.

The Hon. J.H.C. KLUNDER (Minister of Public Infrastructure): I move:

> *That this Bill be now read a third time.*

The House divided on the third reading:

AYES (20)

Arnold, L. M. F.	Bannon, J. C.
Crafter, G. J.	De Laine, M. R.
Evans, M. J.	Ferguson, D. M.
Gregory, R. J.	Groom, T. R.

AYES (Cont.)

Hamilton, K. C.	Heron, V. S.
Holloway, P.	Hopgood, D. J.
Hutchison, C. F.	Klunder, J. H. C. (teller)
Lenehan, S. M.	Mayes, M. K.
McKee, C. D. T.	Quirke, J. A.
Rann, M. D.	Trainer, J. P.

NOES (20)

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

PAIRS

Atkinson, M. J.	Allison, H.
Blevins, F. T.	Brown, D. C.
Hemmings, T. H.	Evans, S. G.

The SPEAKER: As there are 20 Ayes and 20 Noes and as I understand that this Bill will be the subject of a full select committee investigation in the other place, I cast my vote for the Ayes.

Third reading thus carried.

ELECTRICIANS, PLUMBERS AND GAS FITTERS LICENSING BILL

Adjourned debate on second reading.

(Continued from 12 August. Page 261.)

Mr INGERSON (Bragg): When I was asked to look at this Bill on behalf of the Party, I thought that on the surface it was very innocuous; it seemed to change the licensing system in a minor way. However, I decided, as with all the things I do, that I should consult the parties concerned, and then the holocaust began. Some of the words regarding the thoughts of the Minister and the staff concerned cannot be repeated in this place.

The Minister ought to be aware, as he has had almost daily meetings with the unions as well as fairly regular meetings in the past few days with the trade associations involved, that there is widespread concern about two issues. It is absolutely staggering to realise that it is a Labor Government legislating on trade qualifications and there is a lack of consultation and a lack of drive to sit down and discuss a new licensing process with the tradespeople concerned.

As you would be aware, Mr Speaker, the plumbing and electrical tradespeople have a strong connection with the Labor Party and, as I said, it surprised me how concerned ('concerned' is a mild word) or aggravated they were about the Government's handling of this licensing issue. To put the matter in its context, I need to talk about the two divisions, the electricians as one group and the plumbers as a separate group. Coming from a professional background, it has been most interesting for me to sit down with the plumbers and electricians and learn a bit of the history about how this whole process began and developed, who are the players and how ETSA appears in this case to be wanting to get rid of a service that it has been carrying out for many years on behalf of the electrical trades because of an underlying $2 million cost and, indeed, it seeks to transfer that $2 million cost to the community.

In other words, there is a deliberate push by the trust away from what has been a traditional community service in regard to the licensing process and pushing that service into a user-pays system as it relates to the electrical side of the Bill. It appears to me that almost since its establishment the trust has managed the whole registration process. ETSA has managed and set most of the rules; it has carried out the inspection process on behalf of the community. It has done this for two reasons. First, it is often said that electricity mishandled is silent death. A major reason for having the trust involved in licensing has been the safety issue and the need to make sure that electricity and its supply, the transformation and use of electricity in homes and industry has a strong safety basis, and so the trust carried out that role successfully. It was supported strongly in that role.

The second issue, which is as important and which is also partly related to safety, is the need to have quality workmanship carried out by the contractors and the workers and employees and the connection within the trust system itself.

I understand that in December 1991 the Electrical Contractors Association of South Australia, as it was then called, replied at extreme length to an ETSA position paper. Association representatives argued that the removal of the inspection function of ETSA, probably more effectively and accurately called the safety audit, would not improve quality. They argued at length in that paper that they saw a very strong, important need for this inspection role to be maintained by the supplying authority. They believed that that was a very important issue. They were also concerned, and put down clearly in that paper back in 1991, that they believed that custom and practice, where there was an inspection interface between the inspectors and the contractors (with not only an inspection being done in terms of safety but also an educative role being played to help clearly this supportive safety quality function or custom and practice, as the contractors had called it), should be properly carried out. It was an important part of the standards required in the connection between the power that the contractor or contracted employees carried out and the supply of the ETSA service itself.

They also argued that by removing policing standards there would be a need to mount intensive education programs over a prolonged period in order to maintain present standards. They were arguing that ETSA's community service role of inspection, looking after safety and quality, is an irreplaceable factor in the safety and quality delivery of electricity services in our State.

In that paper they supported a tripartite body of workers, employers, Government and the supply authority and they said:

> The present licensing system in South Australia is the result of careful and considered evolution since 1967 that has adequately met the demands of both technological change and industry demand since that time.

That comment was made in reply to a paper that went to ETSA in December 1991, and that position has not changed today. The Electrical Contractors Association (whilst they have changed their name to a national body) recognises that that situation applies today. They commented further in that paper that, in relation to new installations, the supply authority (I keep on referring to ETSA, but in reality if this Act passes it will be the new Southern Power Supply Authority) should be involved because it gives a mantle of

safety and authority. That is an argument which they believe and support very strongly. It is interesting as well in the paper that they talk about some national trends, because the national trend is to self-inspection by electrical workers and contractors, and that is, in fact, an opposite view to the argument put very strongly by the South Australian association. They say:

> To ensure standards are maintained you need to provide an independent inspector or certifying authority with legislative backing to ensure compliance.

They are clearly arguing that in South Australia, in any case, you need to have this authority or body involved.

It is important to note that, whilst this was in 1991, since then an important national paper has been put forward and, as part of mutual recognition and the need to have national standards, there has been a move towards national licensing. One of the major issues put to me by the Electrical Contractors Association was that, although in 1991 the Government agreed that we should have national standards and that it knew full well that discussions were going on relating to national standards and involving national licensing, it has rushed in as part of the Southern Power and Water Authority development a licensing system which does not need to have the same urgency. The reason is that there is no connection between the licensing that we have and what is proposed in the Bill with the supply authority. If the national licensing concept were allowed to develop—I understand that it is not very far off recognition in a national system—we would not need to go through this process.

A couple of days ago the Government argued that we needed mutual recognition and standards throughout Australia, yet this Bill seems to be moving against the trend towards national licensing. I cannot understand it and, more importantly, the electricians and plumbers think it is nonsense. I cannot understand why this has to be rushed through now, because it has no connection, other than in a funding sense, with the Southern Power and Water Authority in terms of inspection.

Another argument brought up by the Electrical Contractors Association was that $2 million is currently paid by ETSA in servicing and administering the inspection and licensing process. That is the figure that I have taken from one of the reports. I cannot recall which report it was, but I think the Minister would agree that it is of that order. This sum will now be transferred to the community. Therefore, the community, as part of the new licensing exercise, particularly in relation to electricians because previously there had been no payment for licensing in this area, will bear the burden of $2 million. It has been estimated that the licence fee will be $80 to $100 for electricians, plumbers and gas fitters.

This is a fascinating exercise, because I understand that this afternoon the Government will be talking about there being no increases in taxes and charges, but here is a nice whack of $2 million that the community will have to pick up purely and simply because the licensing system is to be changed. That is a bit of a double standard, and hopefully the Minister will explain it.

As I said earlier, there was a national discussion paper on licensing by the Electrical Contractors Association. It was set up by the Regulatory Authority Licensing Committee; the report was made in April 1991, and it is continuing. I understand that the Minister knows all about it, but he seems to have ignored it. I will take up this issue with regard to the plumbers when I have an opportunity to continue my presentation. I seek leave to continue my remarks later.

Leave granted; debate adjourned.

[Sitting suspended from 1 to 2 p.m.]

BAROSSA VALLEY

A petition signed by 258 residents of South Australia requesting that the House urge the Government to reconsider the building restrictions upon title holders in the Barossa Valley Region Supplementary Development Plan was presented by the Hon. B.C. Eastick.

Petition received.

MOUSE PLAGUE

The Hon. T.R. GROOM (Minister of Primary Industries): I seek leave to make a ministerial statement.

Leave granted.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order! The Minister has been given leave to make a ministerial statement.

The Hon. T.R. GROOM: Today Cabinet approved a special one-month 50 per cent strychnine subsidy scheme for farmers who have already baited crops so that they can bait again. The subsidy scheme will commence immediately. This step has been taken because nature has not worked with us in August, failing to give mice the knock-out blow needed. The Government's mouse control campaign itself has been highly successful. Where bait has been applied there has been in excess of an 85 per cent reduction in mice and most areas have reported a 90 to 99 per cent reduction in mouse numbers.

However, the warm weather we have experienced in the past fortnight is now providing perfect conditions for remaining mice to breed up again. This next month will be critical because warm conditions have caused early flowering of weed species, providing an alternative source of feed for mice. Any build up in mice numbers will have the potential to do further damage to maturing crops in spring and I have sought to immediately reduce this risk.

The scheme has been set up to provide bait at the reduced rate of $1.50 per kilogram (previously $3 per kilogram) for farmers who have already baited, so that they can bait again to ensure a worthwhile harvest and help prevent residual mice populations surviving until next year.

There is no doubt that the strychnine baiting program has been a huge success in controlling devastating mouse numbers at the peak of the plague. As at 20 August 1993, 640 kilograms of strychnine has been used in treating 212 000 hectares of crop in 1 900 individual lots, at a cost of $634 000. There have been 73 State Government employees involved in various aspects of the campaign, as well as 45 employees of the Animal and Plant Control Commission Boards.

Altogether the cost of the campaign to date is in the vicinity of $1 million. Additionally, the State Government will outlay between $100 000 and $150 000 in monitoring and testing grain following harvest. The establishment of this special one month subsidy will go a long way towards making control measures more affordable for farmers who have already invested in protecting their crops.

LEGISLATIVE REVIEW COMMITTEE

Mr McKEE (Gilles): I bring up the fifth report of the

Legislative Review Committee and move:

That the report be received.

Motion carried.

QUESTION TIME

PUBLIC SECTOR REFORM

The Hon. DEAN BROWN (Leader of the Opposition): My question is directed to the Premier. Why has he allowed the handling of public sector reform to cause distress and outrage at senior levels of the Public Service? A number of very senior public servants have contacted the Liberal Party to reveal that there is deep anger within the Public Service—

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order!

The Hon. DEAN BROWN: —over the manner in which the Government has implemented public sector reform. This anger came to a head yesterday when the new Commissioner of Public Employment, Ms Sue Vardon, rather than the Premier or the Minister for Public Sector Reform, advised chief executives and other senior officers affected about the latest round of departmental changes. They felt that the Premier's priorities had been distorted by his obsession to prepare for that widely publicised TV spectacular. Because of the TV spectacular he was not able to inform the public servants of how the deck chairs were being rearranged, and he reneged on his commitment to open the Royal Show's new $250 000 dairy.

The Hon. LYNN ARNOLD: Question Time is always a slow one on budget day, as the Opposition tries to think up some sort of questions that might have a little bit of a run. They always fail and they fail again this year. The effort by the Leader in this case is a pathetic effort indeed. He is suggesting that, any time there is any change in the public sector, the Premier should personally take responsibility for informing people what is to happen all the way down the line, and that is quite ludicrous. All the Premier would ever be doing is having appointments to speak to people about what changes might take place.

We actually do have a system in place that allows for other people to pass on that information. We have a situation that provides for people to be informed, without having to fill up the Premier's appointments schedule (which, if that happened, would be quite a ludicrous idea). The question was asked: why was the statement made yesterday? The reason for that is that it is important in terms of this year's budget how the funds are arrayed in the documents members will see later today. There is always the chance that it could have been announced today but, quite frankly, this is budget day, and it was appropriate that that announcement be made yesterday. The Leader is really clutching at straws to suggest that the announcement should not have been made. I made a commitment that we would phase in the changes to the public sector between last April and June next year, and we are doing precisely that.

Some people may not be happy with some of the changes that have taken place. It is inevitable that, whenever there is change in any organisation, some people will like the change, some will not have any opinion about the change and some will not like the change; indeed, some people may very much dislike the change. I am sorry about that, but the fact is that some changes needed to be made, and they are changes that will enable us to meet the needs and expectations of South Australians from their Public Service much more efficiently than was previously the case. In fact, the budget today, which will address many of these issues so well, fundamentally relies upon many of these changes that have taken place in the public sector.

I note also that when questioned yesterday the Leader himself said that if he were to be elected he would not fundamentally alter the changes I announced yesterday. So, he automatically takes away the rationale behind his own question today and clearly reduces it to nothing more than pathetic nit-picking while he cannot think of anything else to ask on budget day.

EDUCATION AND TRAINING

Mr FERGUSON (Henley Beach): Can the Minister of Education, Employment and Training inform the House whether the creation of the Department of Employment, Education and Training SA will result in benefits for the delivery of programs in children's services, institutes of vocational education and our schools?

The Hon. S.M. LENEHAN: I am delighted to inform the honourable member that, indeed, that certainly will be the outcome of the creation of this new department, which will enable the provision of more diverse and higher quality services not only to the very young children in South Australia but also right through to the clients of the new department, including those in adulthood who are accessing the programs through that section of the department which is TAFE. As well as improving the quality and diversity of the course offerings within this new department, it will mean that we can do so in a more efficient and effective way and increase productivity. One of the principles underlying the new department is the delivery of service, which recognises the decentralised nature of the work of this department. The first priorities are to put in place this new management structure, which we are already doing, and to combine the corporate services and corporate support services.

I believe very strongly that efficiencies will flow from both these areas and that savings will be redirected to the delivery of programs at the areas in which they are most needed. We will be looking at providing better access to quality care, education training, and vocational education and training right across the continuum of learning and education within this new department of DEET SA.

POLICE COMMISSIONER

Mr MATTHEW (Bright): My question is directed to the Minister of Emergency Services. Will the powers and responsibilities of the Police Commissioner be reduced when the Government's new departmental structure is implemented next month? The Police Commissioner is a statutory office holder with wide ranging powers. As head of the Police Department he has controlled the police budget and has had responsibility for his civilian staff. The new arrangements announced yesterday raise the question of whether the Police Commissioner will retain all of his powers and responsibilities or whether some of them will now be transferred to the Chief Executive Officer of the Department of Emergency Services. It has been put to me that, if powers and responsibilities are to be split up between the Commissioner and the departmental head, the ability of the Police Force to operate efficiently will be affected if the Commissioner now becomes

responsible to a civilian Chief Executive Officer for some aspects of the operations of the Police Force.

The Hon. M.K. MAYES: The honourable member has answered the question himself: the statutory powers will remain as they are. The Commissioner will retain the powers, functions and responsibilities that he has had in the past. That is as it should be. It is appropriate. Only this morning I spoke with the Commissioner about his function and role and the role of the new CEO for the department. The best parallel I can draw for members opposite is to compare it with how the Department of Defence operates with the department's operational arms such as the Army, the Navy and the Air Force. That is the closest parallel I can draw with respect to how it will operate. The Commissioner will retain all those statutory powers and be responsible to the Minister, this Parliament and the people for administering those powers.

The Hon. Dean Brown interjecting:

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

The Hon. M.K. MAYES: The Police Commissioner will continue effectively in that role, and the application of resources for all of those divisions, now within the Emergency Services Department, will be the responsibility of the new CEO, Mr Andrew Strickland.

CHEMICALS

Mr HOLLOWAY (Mitchell): Will the Minister of Labour Relations and Occupational Health and Safety inform the House what progress has been made towards introducing regulations to control workplace hazardous substances? Following a number of accidents involving the use of hazardous chemicals in the Edwardstown industrial area in my electorate over the past few years, residents are concerned about the pace of moves towards achieving a national system of controlling hazardous substances.

The Hon. R.J. GREGORY: I thank the member for Mitchell for his question. This matter has been of concern to all occupational health and safety authorities in Australia for some time. Over the past four years the WorkSafe organisation, comprising employer representatives, unions and the Government, has been considering model regulations for the control of hazardous substances. There has been general agreement with respect to the regulations, and they have been subject to an enormous amount of discussion publicly and revision after being put out for public comment.

At the moment they are awaiting an evaluation of their economic impact on industry. There is concern in industry that these regulations, if implemented, will impose a cost burden on industry. We need to take into account what has happened in the past. When we first introduced an upgraded dangerous substances code in South Australia, a large number of manufacturers were exempt from immediate application of that code. They submitted plans to the Department of Labour about how they would introduce and upgrade safety standards within their factories. On a number of occasions I visited factories where they were implementing simple improvements such as putting an appropriate bund around a tank of sulphuric acid. At one time a tank of sulphuric acid would stand in a factory and, if it ruptured, was knocked or leaked the fluid would just run into a drain.

Now, they are totally bunded. We had an experience in Edwardstown where a cyanide based salt solution of 1 500 litres ran out of a factory into the street and down the drain. Only prompt action by emergency services and the Engineering and Water Supply Department stopped that from becoming a dangerous situation.

It is very important that this code is in place. Given the rate at which new chemicals are introduced into the world each year, there must be a method of control to ensure that the people who work in industry and those who live around it are not placed in danger. I hope that by the end of this calendar year this State will have published in regulations a new standard which operates throughout the whole of Australia.

STATE GOVERNMENT INSURANCE COMMISSION

Mr S.J. BAKER (Deputy Leader of the Opposition): My question is directed to the Treasurer. Does SGIC face further large payouts as a result of the damage caused by the recent severe floods in the Mid West of the United States? Earlier this year, it was revealed that writing of overseas risk business had forced SGIC to set aside $26 million for possible claims arising from Hurricane Andrew in the United States last August and that it faced further large payouts as a result of damage caused by severe storms over America in March this year. I have been informed that the commission now faces further exposures from overseas reinsurance as a result of the floods in the Mid West last month.

The Hon. FRANK BLEVINS: My information, from memory, is no.

STALKING

The Hon. J.P. TRAINER (Walsh): My question is directed to the Minister of Emergency Services. What action is the Government taking to prevent the harassment of individuals that is referred to as 'stalking'? Members would be aware of many situations, sometimes in their own electorates, of continuing harassment and endangering of people, mainly women, by persons with either an obsessive or vengeful intent. Members would also be aware of a tragic incident this week in New South Wales in which a woman was murdered following a period of harassment. Community opinion is clearly of the view that there is a need to provide greater protection to women who are exposed to this sort of threat and danger.

The Hon. M.K. MAYES: I thank the member for Walsh for his question because this is a very important issue, and it is just now that we are beginning to realise the extent of the problem within the community. As a result of the awful incident that occurred in Sydney in the past few days, which has been covered extensively in the media, I think it is quite appropriate for the honourable member to raise this question with me. The Commissioner of Police has raised this matter with me as well, and earlier today we had a discussion as to what steps we should take to address this serious situation and to provide proper safety for our community, particularly women. Much of it is related to domestic situations, and I believe we must be very conscious and sensitive to that aspect.

As a consequence of our discussions today, the Commissioner and I agreed that I should recommend to my colleague the acting Attorney-General that we amend the legislation to allow the police to properly prevent stalking taking place within our community. I presume we would amend—and I will leave this to the Attorney-General to address—the Summary Offences Act to provide for the prevention of

stalking, an insidious, covert action which threatens many people in the community. We are now discovering, as it becomes exposed through the media, that it is occurring more often.

The Police Department is very concerned about this. The Commissioner has assured me that there is a practical situation that can be policed, and he is confident his officers can undertake this with complete confidence and efficiency. So, I will be recommending to my colleague the acting Attorney-General that we take steps to amend the legislation so that we can eliminate this practice from our community.

DEPARTMENTAL MERGER

Mr D.S. BAKER (Victoria): My question is directed to the Premier. Will the Government review its proposal to merge ETSA and the Engineering and Water Supply Department in view of the recommendations of the Hilmer report? The Hilmer report, released yesterday, on policies to improve national competition, has very important implications for the States. The report identifies the need to improve the efficiency of major public utilities, including power and water, through what it calls 'full vertical structural separation' of their different business components. However, the proposed ETSA/E&WS Department merger takes exactly the opposite direction.

The Hon. LYNN ARNOLD: The matter of the vertical separation question and ETSA is something on which the Government has for some time made some cautionary views known in national fora. We have said that we would agree to an accounting separation of the generation aspect of ETSA from its power transmission aspect but that there were good reasons why there should not be a total separation of those two entities from each other. It is one of the reasons why, whilst agreeing with the principle of the national grid formation, we have expressed caution about the speed at which that comes into place until some of the issues of interstate competition are more effectively addressed.

There could be a danger that electricity dumped in South Australia at marginal production cost by power generating authorities interstate could cause a problem for us in this State. It is not something that we think we should rush into and, whilst I accept the fact that this may not be acceptable to the member for Victoria, in terms of caring about the best interests of South Australia it is something I am not ashamed to say is the view that I have expressed.

Clearly, separation of functions will still take place within the merged ETSA/E&WS Department organisation. That separation of functions will still happen. There will still be separate operational units within the amalgamated entity, and the Hilmer recommendations do not in any way stop that kind of efficiency by bringing those operational units together for administrative and other efficiencies, while still having separate operational work to do. So, what members of the Opposition really should do is to work out what they believe is in the best interests of South Australians. It is quite clear they have some very confused views on this matter (the member for Victoria not the least of them).

This Government knows what it wants for the best interests of South Australians. The merger of the E&WS Department and ETSA is about providing that. It will provide significant savings to the budget over many years. That will be of benefit to other areas of Government expenditure and, therefore, of benefit to South Australians. At the same time, on this question of the separation of units, we stand by the position I have already expressed at the Council on Australian Government on a number of occasions.

GARBAGE RECYCLING TRANSFER CENTRE

Mr HAMILTON (Albert Park): Will the Minister of Housing, Urban Development and Local Government Relations instruct officers of his department to obtain an urgent report as to whether any council or councils in the western suburbs of Adelaide and/or councils elsewhere in the metropolitan area have made a commitment to the proponents of the Royal Park waste recycling depot that that council or councils will recycle their waste at this proposed waste recycling and transfer plant? If this has occurred, will the Minister advise which council or councils are involved and when this agreement or these agreements were entered into?

At a well attended public meeting at Hendon and Royal Park on Saturday last, approximately 200 angry residents expressed their overwhelming opposition to this proposal. Those residents have requested that I raise this matter in this Parliament. The residents emphasise, as I do, that this proposal must be environmentally acceptable to their community.

The Hon. G.J. CRAFTER: I acknowledge the honourable member's concern on behalf of his constituents, and I will be pleased to obtain advice from my officers about the relationship between the proposed recycling depot to which he refers and local government. I might say, for the honourable member's interest and for that of the House, that I appreciate the work that local government is doing in order to tackle the great issues that surround the disposal of refuse and, indeed, the opportunities that that provides for recycling of waste products in our community. This is a vexed question and it leads to conflict with local communities; thus, recycling plants need to be properly sited and environmentally sound within their own operations, especially since we are asking the community to be more environmentally conscious. I will be pleased to take up the honourable member's representations, which have been very loud and clear to this Parliament and within the community, and obtain the information for him.

DEPARTMENTAL MERGER

Mr GUNN (Eyre): I direct my question to the Premier. Will the Government now freeze all physical moves to merge the Electricity Trust and E&WS Departments and staff until the parliamentary select committee has had the opportunity to examine all aspects of the merger and report its findings to Parliament?

The Hon. LYNN ARNOLD: This matter has gone through the Parliament; the Bill was read a third time. I know it is going to another place, where decisions may be made on this matter, but it is really quite presumptuous of me or any member of this House to anticipate what decisions another place may make. I really think that there are other things that Question Time could be used for than asking me to anticipate what may or may not happen in another place.

KESTERS ROAD INTERSECTION

Mr QUIRKE (Playford): Will the Minister representing the Minister of Transport Development seek a report from his department about proposals to make the Kesters Road/Main North Road intersection safer for vehicular and pedestrian

traffic? Many of my constituents in Para Hills West have raised legitimate concerns about this intersection, which has been the scene of many accidents in recent times.

The Hon. M.D. RANN: I am very pleased that the honourable member should raise this issue because I also have constituents in and around that area who have also complained to me about the number of accidents. Of course, Main North Road is a major thoroughfare north and recently many millions of dollars worth of works has been undertaken to widen it. I guess it is very important, because of some of the confusion resulting in those changes, that we take every step possible to ensure that it is safer for residents in the area. I am aware of the problems relating to the Kesters/Main North Road intersection and I will certainly raise this matter as a matter of urgency with the Minister of Transport Development and obtain a report for the honourable member.

HOUSING TRUST RENTS

Mr OSWALD (Morphett): I address my question to the Minister of Housing, Urban Development and Local Government Relations. What is the commencement date when Housing Trust rents will cease to be charged at the flat rate and will instead be increased by varying amounts to reflect market rents in the suburbs in which houses are situated? I have received telephone calls over the last week informing me that this new system of charging differential rents will begin soon as part of an organisational review of the trust, which will see corporate services and policy areas of the trust transferred to the Department of Housing and Urban Development, with the trust retaining only its landlord and management functions.

The Hon. G.J. CRAFTER: I think the honourable member has received what is commonly known as a 'bum steer' with respect to some of the information that he has received. A telephone call to me would have allayed some of his fears and those of the people who have contacted him. With respect to rental policies and any changes that might have occurred, I will obtain the accurate information for the honourable member in that regard but, with the other, I think he should perhaps put rumour in its appropriate category.

SPEED CAMERAS

Mr De LAINE (Price): Can the Minister of Emergency Services inform the House about the level of public support for speed cameras in South Australia? I am informed that a detailed survey of public attitudes to the operation of speed cameras in South Australia has recently been completed by McGregor Marketing and that this survey indicates a strong level of public support for the cameras as a road safety measure.

The Hon. M.K. MAYES: I am pleased to respond to the member for Price on this matter. The Police Department, as part of the ongoing process, commissioned McGregors to undertake an omnibus survey in August 1993 on the use of speed cameras and public reaction. I am very pleased to inform the House that the figures show that seven out of every 10 South Australians agree with and support the operation of speed cameras in South Australia. Some 69 per cent strongly support it.

It is interesting to look at the breakdown of the figures from February 1991 to August 1993. The survey showed that in February 1991 some 64.3 per cent of South Australians supported the operation and use of speed cameras; in August 1991 the figure was 71.6 per cent and in August 1993 it is 69 per cent. Those are interesting figures.

Looking at the subgroups within that figure, we see that there tends to be an increase in age acceptance of speed cameras and their operation: in the 18 to 30-year-old group 32 per cent supported it; in the 65-plus age group, it was 53 per cent, and it is interesting to note how the age bracket support for speed cameras increases. Rather more females than males strongly agree: 48.8 per cent to 34.2 per cent. The results were least favourable among the 18 to 30-year-old male blue collar workers. However, overall majorities agree, 54.9 per cent and 54.5 per cent, although only one quarter strongly agree; that is, 23.5 per cent in the former and 27.3 per cent in the latter category.

Overall, while there has been much criticism, people accept that speed cameras are providing a safety net on our roads; they are slowing motorists down and making them more conscious of the relationship between speed and accidents. Of course, these figures confirm my feelings: that there is majority support in South Australia for the operation of speed cameras on our roads.

WINE TAX

The Hon. P.B. ARNOLD (Chaffey): My question is directed to the Premier. While Mr Keating is in Adelaide for the submarine launch, will the Premier invite the Prime Minister to extend his stay so that he can discuss with wine industry leaders the savage consequences that his 55 per cent increase in wine tax will have on our grape growers and wine producers?

The Hon. LYNN ARNOLD: I met the wine industry earlier this week and reported to the House on those meetings. I am working closely with them on the best approach to argue the case for the wine industry with the Federal Government. We have committed significant sums of money to make sure that we properly research all the information required for a submission to the Prime Minister.

Members interjecting:

The Hon. LYNN ARNOLD: On this issue, I shall be guided by the wine industry itself.

Members interjecting:

The Hon. LYNN ARNOLD: It is very easy—

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order!

The Hon. LYNN ARNOLD: It is very easy just simply to go off without a properly argued case. I intend to go with the wine industry with a properly argued case, and we are putting resources behind that. As the Leader and the member for Chaffey know full well, we have already expressed our views on this matter to the Federal Government, and they are in no doubt whatsoever about this Government's view on the matter. We shall be using every opportunity to pursue that, and at the earliest time that we have all these facts together and the industry is ready to come with me to see the Prime Minister we will go to see him. I am sure that the member for Chaffey wants some realistic representations on this matter. We will take every opportunity realistically to propose it. I hope that the member for Chaffey is willing to support that and will indicate that same support to the wine industry in this State. We have set in place—

Members interjecting:

The Hon. LYNN ARNOLD: Obviously more than the Opposition has done. We have set in place an agreed

framework with the wine industry. They are happy with the directions that we are following—

Members interjecting:

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

The Hon. LYNN ARNOLD: —and they are happy with the work that we are doing on this matter.

Members interjecting:

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

The Hon. LYNN ARNOLD: I should have thought that the wine industry people were the ones to listen to on this matter, rather than the kind of cheap political mongering by the member for Chaffey.

Mr Meier interjecting:

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

The Hon. LYNN ARNOLD: If, as I say, the wine industry believes something is needed in addition to what we are already doing, they know that my door is open and I will listen to them on that matter. The view of the wine industry expressed so far is that they are fully satisfied with what we are doing, how we are doing it, and the way we are working with them.

MOUSE PLAGUE

Mrs HUTCHISON (Stuart): I direct my question to the Minister of Primary Industries. In the light of the Minister's statement today what assistance will be given to those farmers who have not previously baited for mice and will be doing so for the first time rather than as a follow up to the previous baiting?

The Hon. T.R. GROOM: I appreciate the question from the honourable member because it is a most important clarification to make for the benefit of the rural community so that they know where they stand.

The cost of bait at $3 a hectare actually represents about 3 per cent of the cost of growing the average crop. This is all within the normal spectrum of protective costs for crops which the rural community undertake. The Government's intention is to ensure that there is an equitable and fair system with regard to the subsidy program.

Many farmers have in actual fact paid for the cost of strychnine. Of the $640 000, something like 60 per cent of farmers have actually paid. For those farmers who have been in difficulty, have previously baited but are not able to pay, as Minister I have instructed that they can have an extended time of payment which would be until February next year and which will coincide with harvest.

All primary producers, as the honourable member knows, are eligible to apply for rural assistance at any time. Of course, as I have previously indicated to the House, the target amount for rural assistance from various components is something like $70 million per annum, which is a very significant amount. But, during the next month, for those farmers who had not previously baited and will have to bait for the first time, obviously they will have to bear the costs, as everybody else has done with regard to first baiting, at the $3 per hectare level. But if they bait—

An honourable member interjecting:

The Hon. T.R. GROOM: I am referring to what they will be able to do if they are baiting for the first time during the next month. If they have not applied for assistance or anything else and are in difficulties as a result of having to bait for the first time, they can get extended payment to February of next year. The member for Goyder can laugh but the fact of the matter is—

Mr Meier interjecting:

The Hon. T.R. GROOM: The honourable member wants to understand that the use of poisons in this way or of any other protective measures necessary for crop protection is an ordinary cost that the rural community bears. Previously with insecticides or pesticides it was something like $10 a hectare. So, the strychnine program has actually been a great benefit to the rural community because the cost has been reduced to $3 a hectare for ground baiting. I stress for the benefit of the member for Goyder that-

Mr Meier interjecting:

The Hon. T.R. GROOM: The fact of the matter is that for those farmers who bait for the first time during the next month, if they are in difficulties, they can either apply for rural assistance in the ordinary way or specifically in relation to the strychnine costs. They will be able to apply to defer payment to February next year to coincide with harvest, as will every other farmer who has baited. But for those farmers who have already baited and are forced to bait again, due to circumstances completely beyond their control, then the subsidy program will apply. And any farmer, who during the next month baits for the first time and then finds during the course of that month that he needs to bait for the second time, will be eligible for the subsidy.

MAGISTRATES COURT

Mr MEIER (Goyder): Would the Minister of Public Infrastructure explain why it is necessary to change the name plaque on the new Magistrates Court building at Elizabeth at a total cost of at least $44 000? I have been informed by a source within the Magistrates Department that a large hand polished steel sign carrying the words 'Elizabeth Magistrates Court' is to be erected on the new court building, which is nearing completion, at a cost of $22 000.

I understand that the member for Elizabeth has now played a part in arranging to have another hand polished steel plaque made carrying the words 'Para Districts Magistrates Court', which is to be erected instead. It has been pointed out to me that the cost of this new sign could be more than the original $22 000.

The Hon. J.H.C. KLUNDER: I assume that in cases like this it is the client who orders signs and SACON provides them but I will check the details out for the honourable member.

BOLIVAR OPEN DAY

The Hon. D.J. HOPGOOD (Baudin): My question is directed to the Minister of Public Infrastructure. Was there an open day at the Bolivar State Water Laboratory and the associated Australian Centre for Water Quality Research on 25 July? What was the purpose of this open day, and was it achieved?

The Hon. J.H.C. KLUNDER: I have been advised by the Manager of the State Water Laboratory that the public open day held on that day was a brilliant success. In the process I must thank the people in my own electorate for their assistance in this matter, because it was actually raised by a group of people in my electorate who remembered attending an open day at Bolivar and realising that there had not been one for some considerable time.

On one of my consequent visits to the State Water Laboratory I asked if they were thinking of putting on another one and I was delighted with the response. They immediately organised one and the staff did their usual brilliant job of taking through a total of 1 400 people in one day.

I visited the complex the day before it was open to the public. I spent half a day there and I barely scratched the surface. As I may have indicated in a different context in this House, there is one single laboratory, in a single room, where they carry out 450 000 tests on water each year, to ensure that Adelaide's water supplies and indeed the State's water supplies are constantly checked for bacteriological qualities and various other things.

The amount of work that is done is really quite outstanding. Indeed, I think any observer would be very impressed with the amount of scientific research and the amount of work generally that takes place there. The work at this facility has a high reputation both nationally and internationally.

During my visit I took the opportunity to announce that an expanded research partnership and programs are expected to be finalised shortly by the Australian Centre for Water Quality Research. That has a very interesting history because the centre made an unsuccessful bid for funding last year under the Commonwealth Cooperative Research Centres program. It got to the interview stage but got no further.

However, the research and industry partners involved in the proposal believed that the proposal was too important to drop. They have been negotiating for several months with the centre to proceed with a more modest expansion than would have been otherwise sought. I understand that the interim board is in the process of considering a draft business plan and that negotiations will be finalised very quickly.

In addition to the E&WS, the partners in that expanding proposal are the Universities of Adelaide and South Australia and the CSIRO Division of Water Resources. Other organisations involved are the Urban Water Research Association, ICI Watercare, the Australian Water Services, the Sydney Water Board, the Melbourne Water Corporation and the MFP.

EAST END MARKET

The Hon. D.C. WOTTON (Heysen): My question is directed to the Minister of Housing, Urban Development and Local Government Relations. What time scale has been determined for work on the East End Market site? Does the erection of scaffolding on East Terrace, which I am informed was put up in great haste, mean that the facade only is to be tarted up and the actual development to be delayed even further, and will the Minister give an assurance that the scaffolding and a very large sign, yet to be erected, is not just another election gimmick or a superficial shop window for our Grand Prix visitors?

The Hon. G.J. CRAFTER: I can confirm that it is none of those things the honourable member alleges. As I have said publicly on many occasions, very protracted but complex and important negotiations are proceeding with a number of developers with respect to the development of that important site.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order!

The Hon. G.J. CRAFTER: The Government is committed to the preservation of the historic perimeter of the East End Market site and will ensure that those historic facades are protected and that the unique character of that important part of the Adelaide city square is preserved. In the near future I anticipate being able to advise all members and the community of the arrangements that the Government is putting in place to see that very important site appropriately developed.

CROWS MATCHES

The Hon. J.P. TRAINER (Walsh): I direct my question to the Minister of Recreation and Sport. In view of the traffic congestion and parking problems that are invariably associated with capacity crowds at Football Park, will the Minister advise the House what arrangements have been made to encourage Crows patrons to use public transport to get to the sold-out home game against Collingwood this Sunday? What steps have been taken by the STA to publicise those arrangements in the mass media, and could the STA inquire, in consultation with the Adelaide Football Club, whether special season tickets for the Crows next year could incorporate a public transport component in the price to encourage the use of public transport?

The Hon. G.J. CRAFTER: I thank the honourable member for his interest in this matter and for his interest in football, which we all know is very keen. I can advise the House that from Sunday 27 June this year the STA has been providing additional special football buses to Football Park for Crows matches. Whilst buses have always been provided from Currie Street, Adelaide, additional buses now travel from Marion Shopping Centre, Seacliff and Modbury Interchange via the busway and city to Football Park. Standard fares apply through the STA, although the STA recommends day trip tickets as the best option for football followers. Patronage is varied on these different services but has generally been pleasing. It is intended to operate the special services for the reminder of this season.

With respect to SANFL matches, the STA provides special football buses from Currie Street in the city to Football Park via Port Road and Grange Road. Arrangements have been made for Port Road buses to stop each way for football fans attending games at Woodville Oval. Special buses will also be provided to ovals included in the finals series of matches, and details of this are being finalised by the STA in conjunction with the South Australian National Football League. With respect to publicity, notices have been placed in buses advising passengers of the special buses to Crows matches, and match information is regularly updated. Earlier in the season, STA employees handed out leaflets at Football Park, and updated leaflets have been available prior to each game through depots and information offices.

A short message to football fans advising them of the special buses was made over the public address system at Football Park earlier this season. Bus arrangements for the finals series of matches will appear in the STA's information column entitled 'Your guide to ride' on page 6 of the *Advertiser* on Saturday. With respect to the honourable member's suggestion of including bus travel in a season ticket for Crows games, that is worthy of further consideration. I will make sure that it is considered by the appropriate authorities.

Dr Armitage interjecting:

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

FORESTS

The Hon. H. ALLISON (Mount Gambier): Can the Minister of Primary Industries advise the House whether any progress has been made towards the disposal of the South-East scrimber project or towards a cooperative venture, or whether any of the claimed expressions of interest (and I say 'claimed' because the director in previous years and the previous Minister have claimed on a number of occasions that there have been several expressions of interest) are liable to prove successful? If not, is the $60 million plus investment on behalf of the taxpayers of South Australia now a total loss?

The Hon. T.R. GROOM: I cannot provide the House with any information at this time, but I undertake to obtain a report on the specific matter—

Members interjecting:

The Hon. T.R. GROOM: I undertake to the honourable member that I will obtain an up-to-date report from the officers and I will let the honourable member know.

ECO-TOURISM

Mrs HUTCHISON (Stuart): Can the Minister of Tourism advise the House what progress has been made in developing South Australia as an eco-tourism destination? Last March the Minister announced a major eco-tourism project. This has created considerable interest in my electorate, leading to requests for further information.

The Hon. M.D. RANN: I certainly thank the member for Stuart for her continued interest in promoting tourism in the outback and in her region and also her interest in eco-tourism. Certainly, a great deal is happening in the area of eco-tourism. Last week on Thursday and Friday we convened a major South Australian eco-tourism forum, which was a vital step in bringing together all the key players to begin future planning. More than 200 people attended a two day forum, which included international conservation leader Dr Ian Player, who is perhaps known to the member for Bragg as Gary Player's brother but known to us as the saviour of the white rhino in Africa. He is one of the world's top experts on eco-tourism. The forum was also attended by an international travel consultant from the US, Mara Della Priscoli, tour operators, representatives of Aboriginal communities, land managers, developers, State and Federal Government officials and people from throughout the tourism industry in South Australia.

It is true, as the member for Stuart mentioned, that earlier this year the South Australian Government announced a four stage project to assess the State's potential to become Australia's leading eco-tourism destination. This included a rigorous assessment of current operators, destinations and the infrastructure available, the results of which were presented to the forum. I have already spoken in this House about the 'Dream Green' campaign we are mounting in the United States. In developing the State's eco-tourism industry, the issues of economic development and protection of fragile wilderness areas must be addressed together.

Eco-tourism is the fastest growing segment of the tourism industry world-wide, but its central focus is and must be on low impact travel, conservation, better education of travellers about wilderness areas and indigenous cultures. However, there is currently no system of accreditation for eco-tourism operators in Australia. I believe this State could be a role model for others, which would increase the credibility of the industry as a whole.

A system of accreditation standards for tour operators specialising in eco-tourism needs, to be jointly developed between the tourism industry, Governments and the conservation community, obviously has to be a priority. I will shortly be writing to operators in the eco-tourism area seeking their response to the immediate establishment of a code of ethics and accreditation standards for this eco-tourism industry that will be a key note for South Australia's tourism future.

RESERVES ADVISORY COMMITTEE

Mr VENNING (Custance): Can the Minister of Environment and Land Management confirm that a farming sector representative on the Reserves Advisory Committee has been removed from the committee and that the vacant position on the committee has been filled by a person with close links to the wilderness movement? If this is so, will the Minister explain the reason for this apparent shift in the committee's representation? The Reserves Advisory Committee is established to advise the Minister on a range of matters concerning reserves and wildlife conservation. The five members of the committee are appointed by the Governor.

The Hon. M.K. MAYES: I will be pleased to obtain a full report for the honourable member, and I will be happy to speak to him personally about it and any other concerns he has. I am sure we can find a very good basis for discussion in regard to the reserves committee. The honourable member is aware of its function and role. The committee fulfils a very important role, and I know from previous Ministers that that has been the case in the past. I am sure the interests of the farming community, which I gather is the honourable member's purpose in asking the question, will be well represented on the committee.

ABORIGINAL AIDES

Mr De LAINE (Price): My question is directed to the Minister of Emergency Services. In view of the success of the Aboriginal Aides program, will the Minister investigate strategies to allow the Police Department to recruit more Aboriginal people as general police officers?

The Hon. M.K. MAYES: I am delighted the member for Price has asked this question, because I think it is very significant. I know from the point of view of the department that there is a very strong commitment to have more Aboriginal people serving in the South Australian Police Department. A training needs analysis was undertaken by the department with the University of South Australia. That report presented a number of options for the department in terms of recruit training programs and also initiatives that we could take as a Government and as a department to encourage more Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander people to become members of the Police Force. As a consequence of that survey and the analysis provided, information sessions were set up throughout the State to identify Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islanders who could be interested in recruitment to the South Australian Police Department. Those sessions were jointly conducted by the CES and the Police Department.

From the information sessions a number of Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islanders were tested and processed by the recruiting section of the South Australian Police Department. Five applicants were selected to undertake a bridging course

at the Aboriginal Community College at Port Adelaide in order to develop skills for selection into the Police Department and to then attend the academy. Four persons completed the course as a consequence of that program and commenced at the Police Academy in June this year.

The initiative has to continue and, as a consequence, the department has undertaken with the Aboriginal Research Institute of the University of South Australia research to develop and document an employment strategy aimed at increasing access by Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islanders to employment within the South Australian Police Department and to research, develop and document a career development strategy aimed at Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islanders who are or may be entering employment with the Police Department. I am pleased that we are taking this initiative. We are ahead of the rest of Australia in this area, and I hope that continues.

GAMING MACHINES

The Hon. B.C. EASTICK (Light): My question is directed to the Minister of State Services. Is he aware that amendments to the poker machine legislation introduced by the Government have precluded a South Australian company from obtaining an important contract to service poker machines? Last year the Government amended the poker machine legislation to give the State Supply Board a role in assessing and determining certain tenders. I have received correspondence from a reputable Adelaide company, Applied Data Control, based at Fullarton, which shows that as a result of those changes it has effectively been precluded from winning the gaming machine service agent's tender and thereby expanding employment in South Australia. The company has received a letter from the State Supply Board, which states:

> . . . in the case of ADC, there was an additional factor which had a major impact. Because of the prescriptive nature of the Gaming Machines Act, which exposed the State Supply Board to risks not normally experienced, the Crown Solicitor found it necessary to place a complete indemnity clause in the service contract.

The letter further claims that ADC would be unable to fulfil the requirements of the indemnity, a claim which is disputed by the company because it carries indemnity insurance, has substantial capital reserves and owns several commercial and other properties. I have been informed that instead of supporting local industry this tender has been awarded to an overseas company that incurred significant losses last year.

The Hon. M.D. RANN: I want to point out right from the start that I have very strong confidence in the State Supply Board, as I hope all members of Parliament have. It applies the most rigorous standards in tender arrangements—

Members interjecting:

The Hon. M.D. RANN: I hope that members opposite are not suggesting that tender processes should be rorted for political ends. If that is what you are suggesting, you are not fit to govern.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order!

The Hon. M.D. RANN: I will say—

The SPEAKER: Order! The Minister will come to order.

The Hon. H. ALLISON: Mr Speaker, I rise—

The SPEAKER: Order! I am calling order. The honourable member will resume his seat.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order! The Minister will not direct his remarks across the Chamber: he will direct all remarks through the Chair.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Interjections are out of order from anyone in the Chamber. The Minister will direct his remarks through the Chair.

The Hon. H. ALLISON: Mr Speaker, I rise on a point of order. The Minister is attributing improper motives to all members of the House and I, for one, take great exception to his comments.

The SPEAKER: The Minister will continue with his reply.

The Hon. M.D. RANN: Thank you, Sir. I would never attribute improper motives to all members opposite because I have great admiration for the member for Flinders. However, I will seek a report from the State Supply Board. I want to find out whether members opposite are really dinkum in their support for the tender process. It will be done properly—it must be done properly. I shall be pleased to obtain a report on what will undoubtedly be my last question as Minister of State Services. I will ask my successor, the Minister of Labour, to arrange an appropriate briefing for the member for Light.

Members interjecting:

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

WEST LAKES WATERWAY

Mr HAMILTON (Albert Park): My question is directed to the Minister of Public Infrastructure. Further to my question asked of the Minister of Local Government Relations, will the Minister direct officers of his department to carry out an urgent investigation into whether contaminants from the proposed Royal Park recycling plant will pollute the West Lakes waterway? I am advised that the Department of Marine and Harbors has responsibility for monitoring the water quality of the West Lakes waterway, which is the water body into which the drain adjacent to this proposed new facility will discharge its waste.

I am further advised that the issue of the quality of the stormwater which discharges into the drain and hence into the lake is not addressed directly by the Tonkin report issued by the consultants. Moreover, my constituents have sought an assurance that the quality of the stormwater discharging from the site will not adversely affect the quality of the water going into that lake. Finally, I am advised that the site for this proposal has been used for industrial purposes, including brick blasting and painting. My constituents are concerned that, when the various pits in the new works are excavated, the ground water pumped into the drain may have become contaminated as a result of these former activities. They have asked whether any testing of the ground water has been carried out and, if not, what tests can be undertaken to ensure that any pollutants are not pumped into the drain and hence into the West Lakes waterway.

The SPEAKER: I remind the honourable member that he has access to the grievance debate.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order!

The Hon. J.H.C. KLUNDER: I appreciate the honourable member's concern both for his constituents and the environment. I will make sure that I seek an urgent report on the matter.

PORT LINCOLN APPLIED LEARNING CENTRE

Mr BLACKER (Flinders): Can the Minister of Education, Employment and Training advise the House when it is expected that the proposed Applied Learning Centre will be commissioned in Port Lincoln, and what are the expected benefits for students and education institutions in Port Lincoln? The House would be aware of the difficulties experienced at a number of schools in Port Lincoln earlier this year. It was identified that a number of students would benefit from an individualised education program. I understand that the program has the cooperation of a number of Government agencies.

The Hon. S.M. LENEHAN: I thank the honourable member for his question. As some members of the House would be aware, the member for Flinders has been working closely with me as Minister and with Government agencies to ensure that some of the problems experienced at Port Lincoln High School are resolved. In the resolution of those problems it has been decided to establish an applied learning centre in Port Lincoln to provide students with individualised education programs aimed at redressing both educational and social factors contributing to their lack of success within a conventional school structure and environment.

The centre will be located in Oxford Terrace, sharing a building complex with the Investigator Clinic and the Aboriginal Health Department. A management committee for the centre will be established and will have representatives from the Port Lincoln Aboriginal Organisation, the City of Port Lincoln, the Eyre district education office, the Family and Community Services Department and the Port Lincoln High School. Students at the Applied Learning Centre will be able to go into this as a result of counselling and in consultation with students, parents and the Applied Learning Centre staff. This will be done in accordance with the Port Lincoln High School student behaviour management.

I want to emphasise that the centre is not an alternative to school but is a specialised part of the ongoing education program. The centre has the support of teachers at Port Lincoln High School; they will be kept informed of and involved in those programs to ensure a continuity of educational experience for students who need to attend the centre. Parents and the community will also be involved in design of programs and their implementation. The school Principal will be the overall person responsible for the centre and that will come within the operation of the Port Lincoln High School.

I want to thank the member for Flinders for the way in which he has worked with his own community to solve what has been a very sensitive and delicate problem, and I want to congratulate my colleague the Minister of Health, Family and Community Services, because he has put a lot of resources into working with my officers through the Education Department. I think it is one of those success stories: a problem can be resolved by people working constructively and cooperatively.

PUBLIC EMPLOYMENT COMMISSIONER

The Hon. G.J. CRAFTER (Minister of Housing, Urban Development and Local Government Relations): I seek leave to make a brief ministerial statement.

Leave granted.

The Hon. G.J. CRAFTER: It was alleged in Parliament yesterday by the Leader of the Opposition that Ms Sue Vardon, the Commissioner for Public Employment, had been freely backgrounding journalists and others over the past weeks that there were 12 000 surplus public servants in South Australia. It was said that this was the secret agenda of the Premier. Ms Vardon rejects these allegations outright.

Mr Brindal interjecting:

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

The Hon. G.J. CRAFTER: Ms Vardon has briefed journalists and public servants extensively in the past months, with the permission of her Minister. Briefings with journalists have been made in the company of Ms Philippa Schroder, Senior Consultant Public Affairs with the Office of Public Sector Reform. These briefings have detailed the Government's public sector reform agenda, leading from the Minister of Public Sector Reform's statement in May 1993. At no stage has she made any statements concerning a Government policy to reduce the numbers of public servants over and above what—

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order!

The Hon. G.J. CRAFTER:—has already been announced.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order! The leader is out of order. The Deputy Leader is out of order. The Minister was given leave to make a statement.

The Hon. Dean Brown interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order! I warn the Leader.

The Hon. G.J. CRAFTER: Ms Vardon has emphasised that the reduction of public servants to date will not lead to a loss of services and that there is great potential to improve the quality and extent of services which now exist with the present level of Public Service numbers.

GRIEVANCE DEBATE

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

Mr OSWALD (Morphett): This afternoon I would like to bring to the attention of the House two issues. The first one relates to the surveys being conducted by the Australian Bureau of Statistics. As members know, these are compulsory surveys; when the surveyor goes to the selected household, that person must take part in the survey. A labour force survey is currently being conducted in my district and a questionnaire which is currently being taken around was brought to my attention by one lady who had been asked to contribute. I think it should be borne in mind that it is a labour force survey and this lady, who lives in Somerton Park, is 83 years of age. This 83 year old woman was approached and told she had to take part in the survey; she was told that every month they would come back and ask various questions again.

Some of the questions put to that lady were: 'Did you last week do any work or take part in a job?'; 'At any time during the past four weeks have you been looking for full-time work?'; and 'At any time in the past four weeks have you been involved or looking for any part-time work?' They are just some of the questions that were put to that lady. She told the surveyor, 'At 83 years of age, I am hardly likely to be out

there looking for work. In fact, I am not looking for work and I would rather not take part in the survey.' The surveyor then said, 'I'm sorry; your name is on the list. I cannot take it off. I will have to come around every four weeks and ask you the questions'. Once again the lady said, 'This is ludicrous. I am 83, I am not involved in work and I am not looking for work. I retired many years ago. The system is ludicrous.'

This discussion rolled on for some time and the surveyor went back to the office. Eventually my office became involved. The conclusion was—and it shows how intransigent that Commonwealth department is—that on a monthly basis this woman will be telephoned and all she has to say is, 'There is no change in my situation.' The system is so intransigent that the department could not take her off the survey, even though she was an 83 year old. They must leave her on the survey and they will contact her every month, when she will have to say, 'There is no change in my situation.' If ever there was an example of Government intransigence and the ludicrous situation of bureaucracy that cannot control itself, we have heard it this afternoon.

I do not blame the person who knocks on the door. The survey instruction sheets are specific; the surveyor must attend and ask the questions. There must be some flexibility somewhere regarding these surveys so that, if an 83 year old woman wants to withdraw or not become involved, all she must do is say so. The department must respect the fact that an 83 year old will not actively be looking for work.

I now raise another quite unrelated issue. A constituent of mine at Glenelg North received a traffic infringement notice. In fact, he failed to pay within 60 days a fine for having gone through a red light. The lad was having some difficulty in raising the money and eventually he did raise it and took it to the police station; because he was 10 days late, they would not take it. I believe that, if a person who has difficulty in raising the money can get it together, it should be accepted. Perhaps there is a need for a late fee, say of 10 per cent, but in this case—

Members interjecting:

Mr OSWALD: The member for Albert Park is acknowledging that the proposition is of some value and that the Government should be looking at it, and I am glad that he agrees. In this case, the lad could have paid a compulsory additional 10 per cent, but in fact he will be dragged up through the courts at enormous cost to himself and the Government, at the end of the day, will get its money. The money is there now; I know it is there now as I have spoken to the family. I would have thought—and the family agrees with me—that a small matter of a 10 per cent surcharge or perhaps even 5 per cent could avoid the court process. I would like to see the Government take up this matter, and I think that the member for Albert Park is intimating that people should take it up with the Government. I believe it is a matter of concern to many people.

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

Mr HERON (Peake): In this grievance debate I want to refer to the Federal election that was held last March, particularly to the bleats that have continued to come from the Opposition that the Labor Party used scare tactics in that campaign. I fully agree; it was a scary campaign and, boy, were the people of Australia scared. They were scared of the Liberals—they were really scared of them. The amazing thing about that election is that to this day the Opposition still cannot work out where it went wrong. As I said, the only excuse it can come up with is that there was a scare campaign. The truth is the Opposition goofed, and goofed badly, as the result showed. In my opinion it goofed in three main areas: health, the GST and, the doozey one, the industrial relations policy.

Today I will elaborate on the Liberal Party's so-called industrial relations policies. The Liberal Premiers in Victoria, New South Wales, Tasmania and now Western Australia all strongly denied in their election campaigns that they would cut wages and conditions and the rights of workers. All those States have now done a complete back flip, and the same thing would happen in South Australia if—and I say if—the Liberals were to win the next election. In Western Australia right now, the Liberal Government is about to amend its industrial laws, and I want to point out to the House some of those laws that are about to change. These are horrendous, and their effect includes the following:

· transfers contractual arrangements from the specialist industrial relations system to the common law courts;

· removes access to conciliation and arbitration for the resolution of disputes;

· does not provide a test for the contract to determine whether it is unfair, harsh or unconscionable, nor does it contain a 'no disadvantage' test.

Mr Hamilton: Take it or leave it!

Mr HERON: As the member for Albert Park says, take it or leave it. Other effects include:

· allows employers to sack employees in dispute, even during contract negotiations when limited immunity from common law action is provided;

· provides for individual contracts to override collective contracts, and both to override awards;

· weakens current provisions relating to enforcement of commission orders for reinstatement in unfair dismissal cases;

· requires the agreement of the employer before a union can be signatory to a contract;

· increases the range of actions for which the unions can become liable for penalty;

· removes the issue of payroll deductions as an industrial matter;

· provides the Minister with powers relating to the suspension of unions' rights to coverage, either when a Federal award exists or if they seek to move some, part or all of their awards or agreements to the Federal jurisdiction;

· prevents unions from pointing out to workers that provisions of a contract are oppressive, and allows employers to maintain any misrepresentation as to the effect of the agreement, without anyone being able to challenge the misrepresentation;

· provides for the Minister to determine the minimum rates of pay—what about that one; we all remember the $3.50;

. entrenches secrecy in workplaces as to the conditions of employment of workers;

. is not about agreement but is about ensuring that the employer is able to force his or her contract on the employees.

The only thing left out is that the Government over there will not supply the employers with whips, because this legislation being put through now is 1893 stuff, not 1993. All I can say is that, if the Liberal Party somehow happened to fluke this next election, heaven help the workers here in South Australia, because they will follow along exactly the same lines as those other States.

Mr GUNN (Eyre): I wish to raise this afternoon a matter that has been brought to my attention by the Dieri Association Incorporated of Marree. That association held a meeting on 20 August, which unanimously voted on the following resolutions:

1. To write to the Minister of Aboriginal Affairs and the Premier of South Australia advising that Finniss Springs is land for which the Dieri people have primary responsibility within Aboriginal tradition and that the Government should not transfer Finniss Springs to the Aboriginal Land Trust until they determine who within Aboriginal tradition are the primary custodians and traditional owners of the land.

2. To write to all relevant State and Commonwealth bodies and advise them of Dieri within Aboriginal tradition and of their traditional lands, together with supporting materials and to seek their recognition, support and funding.

3. To write to the Minister of Aboriginal Affairs and the Premier of South Australia concerning the Dieri rights within Aboriginal tradition to the mission land in Marree.

4. To ask Western Mining Corporation to seek recognition from the Government to their agreement with the Dieri.

5. To ask Neva Wilson to construct a genealogy of the Dieri.

6. To write to the South Australian Museum and request it to provide a bibliography of documents about the Dieri and to assist the association with research.

7. To remind Government of its acceptance of Mr Clifford Warren as the person nominated by the traditional elders (at a meeting of Government) to be the contact person for matters relating to the Arabanna.

This was signed by Graham Warren, Clifford Warren and Raelene Warren, and the meeting was attended by many people. I bring this to the attention of the House this afternoon because there has been a considerable amount of controversy and public discussion in relation to this matter, and it ought to be a matter exercising the mind of all members to ensure that the right decision is made. I am of the view that the previous Minister of Environment and Land Management acted in a hasty manner when the land was acquired, without the consent of all those who were associated with it.

The second matter I want to bring to the attention of the House is the proposed amalgamation of the Country Fire Service and the State Emergency Service, a matter that has caused a great deal of public controversy in my electorate in relation to those organisations. Today I received a letter from the Coober Pedy Mine Rescue/SES organisation, addressed to me, which states:

Dear sir,

I am writing to you regarding the proposed changes to the emergency services. Our only information comes from an article in the *Advertiser*. Our main point of concern comes from the suggestion that in some country areas the CFS and the SES will be amalgamated. The Coober Pedy Mine Rescue/SES was formed initially as a mine rescue squad only. The majority of our members are miners and consider mine rescue to be their primary role. Our members have developed a fair amount of expertise in mine rescue work and take pride in being in the squad.

We are only a small group and in the event of an accident have to work quickly and harmoniously together. We feel that any amalgamation would adversely affect the team spirit and efficiency of our squad. We would like to know if there are any plans to amalgamate the emergency services in Coober Pedy and how or if the changes will affect us. Copies of this letter have been sent to the Minister of Emergency Services, the Director of the SES. . .

It is signed 'Don Nottle, Secretary, Coober Pedy Mine Rescue/SES'. This is very similar to a number of letters I have had from concerned representatives of both the SES and the CFS in my district, and from councils. I am of the view that forced amalgamations will achieve nothing. You cannot force people to work together. Big is not beautiful. People must be allowed to operate as they think best, and from my knowledge of the Mine Rescue/SES operations at Coober Pedy, they have worked very well together.

They have provided an invaluable community service and should be encouraged and assisted, not hindered or interfered with, nor should their task be in any way made more difficult. The Country Fire Service itself has a very important role to play but in many cases, particularly in this case, it is somewhat different. I believe that both services can work harmoniously together without being forced to amalgamate, and I am just wondering where this concept has come from. It is obvious that the Government believes that big is beautiful. I have never been of that view. They believe that—

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

Mr HAMILTON (Albert Park): Following the Premiers Conference, our Premier indicated that the Government may have to cut a further 600 public sector positions. When I heard that, I made representations to the Premier, expressing my strong opposition to such a proposal. So, yesterday's announcement by the Premier that that was not to occur was particularly pleasing. The reason why it is particularly pleasing is that I, in the Caucus and the Party, indicated in very strong terms that I was opposed to those cuts, for the reasons that were enunciated later.

It was pleasing subsequently to receive the support of my backbench colleagues. It was not a revolt: it was strong representations that turned around that indicated intention of the Premier. I received very strong support from the member for Henley Beach, the member for Price, the member for Walsh and the member for Peake (particularly the western suburbs members) and many other backbench colleagues in relation to this proposal. It shows that the Premier does listen to his backbench. It shows that the Premier will take on board the views of my constituents and all those of my colleagues who represented their constituents in a very strong and forceful way.

It is pleasing that we have a Premier who will listen to the wishes of the back bench and will take into account our feelings. We were concerned about a whole range of areas. We all understand that there are constraints out there in the community, and I was particularly concerned about the health area, as I believe I have indicated in this House over many years, from statements I have made.

I was equally concerned about education and cuts that could occur there. My colleagues and I were not prepared to accept those cuts without a fight. Family and community services is an equally important and critical area in the community, particularly in the western suburbs and north of the metropolitan area. Those are issues of critical importance.

It was rather pleasing to see that other areas such as motor registration, police, ETSA, the E&WS, etc., were not impacted upon. We have heard a great deal from the Opposition about the cuts and what this Government may do. We on this side will not forget that the Leader of the Opposition said that their could be cuts of between 15 and 25 per cent in the public sector; nor will the community forget, especially those disadvantaged people in the community. We all know that conservative Governments will shaft the workers with every opportunity they get, and I refer to the illustration given by my colleague the member for Peake in connection with what is happening in Western Australia which indicates the contempt of conservative Governments and the untruths that they have perpetrated on the community at large. I refer to the

following editorial in the *West Australian* dated 20 August 1993 and headed 'Barriers go up at the House':

> The contempt which the Court Government showed for State Parliament in ramming through its industrial relations reform legislation in the early hours of yesterday morning sets an alarming precedent for the rest of its four-year term. . . it had no authority for the bulldozing tactics it used to push the legislation through. It was ridiculous for the Government to expect members of Parliament to absorb the differing implications of more than 40 amendments and debate them rationally when they were put to a vote in one block. That conduct flies in the face of the WA royal commission's well argued suggestions for restoring Parliament to its pre-eminent position and freeing it from under the Executive's thumb.

What did we see happen there? Stakes were put in concrete in front of Parliament House and barbed wire was erected to deny workers the right to express their opinion. Never before in this country have we seen workers denied the opportunity to make representations and be present on the steps of Parliament House, but Western Australia was a classic illustration: 10 000 workers were lied to, and that is outrageous. In my view, we can expect the same thing from this Opposition, which is not prepared to spell out to the workers in this State what its views are.

Mr LEWIS (Murray-Mallee): The first matter I wish to draw to the House's attention involves an outfit calling itself a political Party: the Australian Democrats, particularly in so far as it operates in this State. With the disgraceful way its members carry on, they are real political wimps. I am sure it would not be lost on you, Mr Speaker, that the two members of the other Chamber propose to resign their seats at the next election and contest House of Assembly seats. What might be lost on most members of the general public is the consequence of that. Whilst the Hon. Mike Elliott's term will have expired, the Hon. Ian Gilfillan's term will not have expired. The Democrats will be able to renominate a member of their Party to fill the vacancy created by his resignation once the election is over and they have both lost their House of Assembly seats. Mr Gilfillan has no desire to continue in Parliament, so what they will do is quite simply nominate Mr Elliott after he has lost the election in Davenport, in consequence of which he will returned to the Upper House and continue his parliamentary career there.

I warned at the time that it was made possible, through an alteration to the Constitution, for political Parties to use the Upper House to train their fillies and colts, but I never expected that the Party that says that it is there 'to keep the bastards honest' would be the first to abuse it in that way.

The other thing that I should like to draw to the attention of the House is that the same man, the Hon. Michael Elliott, was on radio today claiming that farmers in my electorate who attended a protest rally at a farm where a farmer was evicted yesterday were neo-Nazis. I have made some telephone calls to ascertain who did attend from the Rural Action Group and, of the names that were given to me, I know none who are either Nazis or neo-Nazis, and I have known most of them for 10 years. I would like the Hon. Mr Elliott to name the people whom he believes to be neo-Nazis and not hide behind such pejorative terms, criticising and scoring cheap political points in the metropolitan area among people who do not understand and do not know.

An honourable member interjecting:

Mr LEWIS: Yes, he ought to come clean. If he knows, he ought to provide that information to the police so that an investigation can be made as to whether sedition is being undertaken in an organised way in this country. I suggest that it is not and that he is merely taking the opportunity to make cheap political points at the expense of the people whom I represent in their hour of misfortune whilst they band together to indicate their feelings about what has happened to them.

The third point to which I draw attention is the plight of a shearing contractor who has had his WorkCover rate lifted to such an extent that he will have to charge an extra 7.5c a sheep because one of the people who recently joined his shearing contracting group, an older man, found that his back gave out. He had not been injured, nothing fell on him, he did not fall over; he simply wore out. That happens to shearers, as I well know—many of them are my friends—having been a shearer myself a good many years ago. The point is that he should not be penalised for the consequences of a lifetime of hard work by that shearer. The contractor ought not to have his WorkCover rate raised to such an outrageous level that it prices him out of the market. It was a quirk of fate that the shearer in question was working for that contractor at the time when his back gave out.

Medical evidence has been provided to WorkCover and to the Minister, and still there has been no response. There has been no consideration whatever for the plight of that contractor or the other shearers who work for him and who now cannot get work because he is unable to give a competitive quote on any shed while this threat hangs over him like the sword of Damacles, with an imposition of 7.5c per sheep resulting from an increase in his WorkCover rate.

Finally, Mr Apsey, a member of senior management in the Department of Correctional Services, ought to take a close look at himself over the way that he has set out to vilify and persecute Mr James Wilfred Ward. The evidence before me suggests that it is a case of pure victimisation.

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

Mr McKEE (Gilles): Yesterday the member for Hayward, the Freddie Mercury of the Liberal Party, made a few remarks which I wish to address. It is no great secret that, when the Liberal Party wants to do a snotty job on somebody, it wheels out the member for Hayward; it is no great secret that when the Liberal Party wants to kick a man when he is ill it calls out the member for Hayward.

The member for Hayward lives in a glass house. This is the man about whom the Mayor of Marion had to seek a special meeting with the then Leader of the Opposition, the member for Victoria, to complain officially about his behaviour; this is the man who would deny the right of a woman to choose to have an abortion; this is the man who has had an harassment complaint laid against him by a woman in his previous employment; this is the man who has been suspended and thrown out of this House by the Parliament—a day, Mr Speaker, I am sure you will never forget.

After the last redistribution, the member for Hayward found that he had lost his seat, but, rather than put himself forward for a new seat, he abandoned those voters who supported him in 1989 and hawked himself across the other side of town to present himself for preselection in the seat of Hartley, only to be knocked off by Mr Scalzi, himself a losing candidate in 1989.

Members interjecting:

Mr McKEE: In other words, the Liberal electoral college in Hartley would rather choose a losing candidate than have the sitting member for Hayward represent them in the election. Then he hawked himself across to the seat of Unley, and at last he had some success. But I know several longstanding financial members of the Liberal Party in Unley, and they have never been more disappointed, devastated and frustrated

since the member for Hayward became the Liberal candidate in Unley. Those Liberal members confided in me that the only reason why the member for Hayward got the nod—

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order!

Mr McKEE:—was that they could not bring themselves to vote for the Labor turncoat, a fellow by the name of John Cummins. Having won preselection, the member for Hayward wanted to appear normal to the people of Unley, so he made two announcements. In the *Advertiser* of 18 June 1992 the member for Hayward said (1) that he would move into the electorate and (2) that he would be getting married before the end of 1992. Mr Speaker, you can guess which one is which. He has got only one out of two. I understand the member for Hayward has moved into Goodwood. There goes the neighbourhood! I also know that there is no basis to the rumour that there is a complaint of breach of promise against the member for Hayward.

I want to say only one more thing to the member for Hayward and other members opposite. I have never started a brawl in my life, but I have finished a few of them. I am going to give some advice to the members for Hayward and Mount Gambier: if they want to dump on me, I will dump on them from a much greater height.

Members interjecting:

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

The Hon. H. Allison interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order! The member for Mount Gambier must understand that the grievance debate has finished and he was not on the list.

PAPERS TABLED

The following papers were laid on the table:

By the Premier (Hon. L.M.F. Arnold)—

Meeting the Challenge—Progress Report

By the Treasurer (Hon. F.T. Blevins)—

Financial Statement, 1993-94
Estimates of Payments and Receipts, 1993-94
Economic Conditions and the Budget, 1993-94
Capital Works Program, 1993-94
The Budget and the Social Justice Strategy, 1993-94
The Budget and Its Impact on Women, 1993-94
The Treasury of South Australia—Report, 1992-93
State Government Insurance Commission—Report, 1992-93
South Australian Superannuation Board—Report, 1992-93
Lotteries Commission of South Australia—Report, 1993
South Australian Government Financing Authority—Report, 1992-93
South Australian Superannuation Fund Investment Trust—Report, 1992-93
Group Asset Management—Review, 1992-93
Public Sector Employees Superannuation Scheme Board—Report, 1992-93
Enterprise Investments Limited—Financial Statements, 1992-93
Enterprise Investments Trust—Financial Statements, 1992-93
Enterprise Securities Limited—Financial Statements, 1992-93
State Bank of South Australia—Annual Results—Key Indicators

By the Minister of Tourism (Hon. M.D. Rann)—

Formula One Grand Prix Board—Report, 1992

APPROPRIATION BILL

The Hon. FRANK BLEVINS (Treasurer) obtained leave and introduced a Bill for an Act for the appropriation of moneys from the Consolidated Account for the financial year ending 30 June 1994, and for other purposes. Read a first time.

The Hon. FRANK BLEVINS: I move:

That this Bill be now read a second time.

In doing so I present the budget for 1993-94. The Government's plan to contain and then begin to reduce the level of the State's debt was set out in the Economic and Financial Statements delivered on 22 April 1993. This budget represents a major step by the Government in implementing that plan.

The Government will proceed at a rate that ensures that it does not harm the essential community services demanded by the people of South Australia. The Government is concerned, in particular, to minimise any unfair burden on vulnerable and disadvantaged members of the community and has chosen therefore to implement its strategy over a three year period.To have done otherwise would have placed an unfair burden on individuals and families in the community already suffering from the effects of a prolonged recession and the process of economic and industry restructuring.

Equally, delaying the adjustment process would have acted to further damage State finances and community and business confidence in the State's outlook and ultimately would have meant a harsher and more painful adjustment process.

The South Australian economy is undergoing a fundamental transformation that must include the public sector. The changes required of the public sector in this State in terms of workplace reform, productivity growth, increased efficiency and reduced costs of operation are in large measure the same as those that face the private sector in South Australia. The Government is determined to make those changes to bring stability to the State's public finances as an essential element in the adjustment process in this State.

The national fiscal outlook was considered by Commonwealth, State and Territory Governments at the Premiers' Conference on 5 July 1993. In prospect at that time was a combined deficit in the general government sector of the Commonwealth, States and Territories of more than $20 billion in 1993-94.

While growth in the economy will assist in reining in that deficit figure it is clear that policy change by governments will also be required, particularly at the State and Territory level, if substantial progress is to be made. It was also acknowledged by all governments, however, that in the short term fiscal policy needed to reflect the subdued state of the economy.

It was recognised that 1993-94 is not the year to cut dramatically into budget deficits. It was also recognised, however, that governments needed to set in train or consolidate strategies to achieve budgetary repair in the medium term.

The three year debt management strategy already announced and implemented in this budget is consistent with this approach.

ECONOMIC OUTLOOK

The South Australian economy continues to move through the process of adjustment to the changing national and international economic environment. Economic conditions remain difficult. It is clear, however, that the South

Australian economy is recovering and that the recovery should continue at a moderate pace in 1993-94.

The State's economy is closely linked to and to a substantial extent is driven by developments in the national and international economy. The national outlook is for stronger economic growth than in 1992-93 which should accelerate in the second half of 1993-94 though the pace of change will be constrained by weakness in the world economy.

Consistent with the national economy, business investment in South Australia has been slow to recover despite low interest rates and low inflation. Employment will increase in 1993-94 but not quickly enough to reduce unemployment significantly.

In summary Mr Speaker, the economic outlook for 1993-94 is one of continuing but modest recovery in the State's economy. Beyond the short term the State faces continuing economic adjustment. The Economic Statement signalled the Government's intention to assist the process of adjustment to secure a basis for long term growth in the economy.

The budget confirms the Government's commitment to that process of change.

THE DEBT MANAGEMENT STRATEGY

The fundamental features of the 1993-94 budget were established by the Government in the April Statements in formulating the debt management strategy. The budget is a further step in the achievement of the State's targets set in the strategy; namely:

- the reduction of net State outlays by 1 per cent in real terms in each of the next three years;
- the elimination of the recurrent budget deficit by 1995-96;
- a reduction in net State debt as a proportion of Gross State Product; and
- a real reduction in the level of the State's net debt.

Since the time of the April Statements there have been four significant developments that necessitated adjustments to the Government's budget plan for 1993-94.

First, the Government made what it regards as an economically sound decision for businesses in South Australia to reduce ETSA tariffs substantially in real terms for 1993-94.

Second, the Government has had to absorb the negative budgetary effects for South Australia of the results of the 5 July 1993 Premiers' Conference.

Third, on the basis of emerging statistical data on the state of the economy, it has been necessary to revise downwards the revenue estimates for 1993-94. On the other hand reduced interest rates have provided scope to reduce the estimates of interest costs to the budget in 1993-94.

The fourth adjustment required since the Statements has been in the area of the projected financial relationship of the State Bank with the budget in 1993-94. This has had the effect of offsetting the emerging pressures I have just referred to. The 1993-94 budget reflects a significant improvement in the financial performance of the State Bank and therefore of its capacity to begin to repay the community for the assistance injected in the last three budgets while observing prudent limits in doing so.

I shall return to the Bank's performance.

The net result, after these changes, is that in response to the targets the Government set for itself in the debt management strategy I can announce to the House that the 1993-94 budget will see:

- net State outlays reduced by 2.8 per cent in real terms;
- an estimated recurrent deficit of $24 million in 1993-94—a substantial reduction of $145 million on the recurrent deficit of $169 million in 1992-93 and significant progress towards the stated target of eliminating the recurrent deficit by 1995-96;
- net State debt of an estimated $8.1 billion by 30 June 1994—a reduction in real terms when compared with the figure at 30 June 1993; and
- net State debt representing an estimated 25.1 per cent of Gross State Product by 30 June 1994—a reduction compared with the figure of 25.7 per cent at 30 June 1993 and the beginning of a significant reduction by 30 June 1996.

There will be a budget surplus of $120 million in 1993-94 which builds on the improved 1992-93 budget result I have already announced.

Mr Speaker, this year's budget is a solid start to the Government's planned program to restore the State's public finances to a position that is sustainable for the long term. It represents a platform for growth in the State's economy and in the capacity of the public sector to provide the high standard of services now expected by the South Australian community.

The budget reflects the range of measures included in the April Economic and Financial Statements. The budget also includes revenue and expenditure measures that are additional to those decided on so far.

REVENUE MEASURES

The April Statements underlined an essential point about the Government's approach to dealing with the State's financial difficulties—the answer does not lie in simply increasing taxes and charges. The overall effect of the decisions already announced in the Statements will be to reduce the impact of government revenue raising on the community, particularly the business sector.

The effect of the additional revenue measures included in the budget will be to provide further reductions in the real level of taxes and of charges for major government services.

Taxes

In the area of taxes, the only new measure is to provide relief from Financial Institutions Duty for exporters. The Government has responded to the arguments put to it in recent years regarding the perceptions of the business sector that State taxes, particularly FID, affect the competitiveness of this State's exporters.

In 1993-94 rebates of FID will be paid to those firms that are able to establish that the tax will be paid on receipts generated from export activity. The cost to the budget of doing so is put at around $1 million in 1993-94 and $2 million in a full year.

The Government's existing policy with respect to land tax is to limit the growth each year in receipts to no more than the estimated rate of inflation based on the Consumer Price Index for Adelaide. The level of land tax receipts will be affected this year because of the inclusion in the land tax base for the first time of land owned by the Commonwealth Bank and the Commonwealth Bank Officers Superannuation Corporation.

With this exception, consistent with the existing policy, land tax receipts are estimated to increase in 1993-94 by less than the estimated rate of inflation. The Government's policy provides restraint and greater certainty for taxpayers, smoothing as it does the annual fluctuations in land tax receipts and the Government has decided that the policy will continue for a further three years beyond 1993-94.

Charges

The budget contains two measures with respect to charges that provide substantial real reductions to consumers, particularly in the business sector. In 1993-94 electricity tariffs have been reduced in real terms for all consumers.

On average they have been reduced by 2¼ per cent in nominal terms, with reductions to industrial and commercial customers ranging from 2 per cent to 12 per cent and obviously much more in real terms. These follow real reductions of between 16 per cent and 33 per cent in industrial and commercial tariffs over the previous 7 years. This provides a further significant reduction in the competitive gap between business sector tariffs in South Australia and those in the eastern States and represents a reduction in costs to industrial and commercial customers of around $25 million in 1993-94.

Residential water charges have been set for 1993-94 at the same nominal level as for last year. Non-residential water charges have been set on the basis that estimated revenue collections in 1993-94 will be the same in nominal terms as they were in 1992-93. The result will be real reductions in average charges for water in 1993-94.

OUTLAYS

The Government has committed itself to a three year program of reductions in the level of budget outlays, particularly recurrent outlays.

The savings required are substantial and they must be sustainable in the long term. It will require major changes in the way the public sector functions.

Wages policy, employment policy and the public sector reform program will provide the framework and the means to do so.

Public Sector Reform

The public sector reform program includes major organisational changes. In the April Statements the Premier announced the Government's intention to continue the process of rationalising and reducing the number of Departments. The Government has now decided on a new configuration of agencies and this will be implemented during the financial year. In addition to the opportunities this will provide for more effective public administration, these changes will make it possible to secure further substantial savings in public sector running costs.

The advantages of these major changes in terms of operational effectiveness and efficiency and in terms of reduced costs of operations were spelled out in detail in the April Statements and the Ministerial Statement made by the Minister of Public Sector Reform to the Parliament on 4 May 1993.

The Government has a broad ranging public sector reform agenda. Competitive practice, financial management reform and customer services are all areas in which improvements in performance are being pursued. These changes will assist in achieving the outlays reduction targets included in the budget.

Public Sector Wages Policy—Enterprise Bargaining

The Government has begun the process of applying its policy on enterprise bargaining to the public sector. The essential feature of the policy is that it links the wage determination process to the public sector reform program and the Government's budgetary strategy. There can be no wage increases without the means to meet the costs of any such increases being derived from improvements in the way the public sector operates—not from reductions in the level of services provided. The Government has indicated to the public sector unions its willingness to negotiate at enterprise level a wage increase during 1993-94 based on this principle. There is no allowance for prospective wage increases included in agency budget allocations.

Public Sector Employment Policy

In this budget the Government has implemented measures that will see the State funded public sector workforce reduced in overall size in order that the target reduction in recurrent budget outlays can be met. The budget also includes measures, however, that will provide new opportunities for young people to obtain training and work experience in the public sector. I shall return to this matter.

In the Economic Statement the Government announced that a target figure of 3 000 had been set for further public sector workforce reductions by 30 June 1994. To cope with the additional budget pressures resulting from the Premiers' Conference the Government considered and rejected a further reduction of 600 jobs in 1993-94.

The target figure of 3 000 was part of a planned approach over three years and the Government considered that as the debt management strategy was on track it was not necessary therefore to go beyond the target for 1993-94. More than 1 000 staff have already accepted an offer of voluntary separation at a total cost of $68 million to the Government's Targeted Separation Package scheme. The scheme will continue to operate through 1993-94 to facilitate further voluntary workforce reductions and the Government has now made changes to the scheme that will see it operate in a much more flexible fashion than has been the case to date.

The total public sector workforce will be reduced by an estimated 1 800 full time equivalent positions by the end of this financial year. The Government's approach is one of removing from the public sector on a voluntary basis only those positions that are not required to provide the essential services demanded by the community.

The most pressing problem facing the South Australian community at present is the level of unemployment. This budget provides funding for the continuation of a range of employment and training programs that are directed at supporting and assisting those people in the community who are unemployed. It also provides for two programs designed to directly assist in increasing the availability of employment opportunities.

First, the Government has decided to extend the Payroll Tax Rebate scheme for another year as an incentive for private sector employers to maintain or add to their workforce during 1993-94. The budget includes $5 million in rebates of payroll tax to eligible employers that met the criteria of the scheme and maintained or increased the level of their workforce in 1992-93. Further rebates will be made in 1994-95 based on private sector employers demonstrating stability or growth in the level of their workforce through 1993-94.

Second, the Government has also decided to offer up to 1 000 places for young people aged between 17 and 24 to undertake training and work experience in the public sector. They will be employed with Commonwealth assistance under the Jobskills and Career Start programs. They will be in addition to the 400 young people engaged under the same program during 1992-93 of whom it is estimated that nearly half have found ongoing employment in the public sector and other successful participants are likely to secure private sector employment. A total of $12 million has been allocated for this purpose in 1993-94.

The budget also reflects decisions about more specific reductions in both recurrent and capital outlays. In total,

forward estimate budget outlays have been reduced by $225 million of which $165 million was related to recurrent purposes.

Economic Development

An efficient and effective public sector is essential to growth in the State's economy.

The Government accepts the need to look for ongoing efficiency gains, if the public sector is to meet the demand for its services without adding further to the State's debt or increasing taxes and charges.

Beyond reducing the level of taxes and charges that affect the cost structure of businesses in the State, the Government believes it to be appropriate to provide direct support to the private sector through expenditure programs designed to stimulate the changes required in the State's economic base for long term growth.

In 1993-94 the Government has committed a further $40 million to the Economic Development Program with $30 million to be spent this year and $10 million in 1994-95. In total, $52 million will be spent in 1993-94 on a range of programs including two new export development schemes—the Strategic Export Development Scheme and the New Exporters Challenge Scheme.

This will bring to $80 million the Government's commitment over the two years of the Program.

The budget includes $34 million for expenditure on the Multi Function Polis and marks the beginning of the substantive phase of development following the appointment of the Board and senior staff of the organisation.

Public Trading Enterprises

The Government has already achieved much in reforming the State's public trading enterprises but will now require a significant and sustained lift in performance, beginning in 1993-94.

The Public Corporations legislation will require increased accountability and improved performance, the benefits of which will flow to all consumers but particularly the business sector. The creation of Southern Power and Water alone provides scope for significant annual savings. Estimates now available confirm annual savings of about $50 million as a consequence of the merger. The benefits of that improvement will flow both to consumers and to the community at large, the owners of the assets.

Social Development

South Australia has enjoyed for a long time now a reputation for leading the nation in meeting the needs of the community in the important areas of social policy. In the context of this budget I suggest it would be helpful to remind ourselves of that fact.

The assessments of the Commonwealth Grants Commission suggest that the State continues to spend much more—about $185 million in 1991-92—than required to provide the same level of community and social services provided by all the States and Territories. Clearly, while restraint has been exercised in recent budgets and this will continue in 1993-94 these figures cannot be construed to indicate radical reductions in service standards in South Australia.

The Government's strategy for the next three years is aimed at streamlining the provision of public sector services but preserving present standards of service and improving them where possible.

The budget provides additional funding in 1993-94 for the following important areas of social policy:

- total health spending will increase by an estimated $79 million with increased assistance of $22 million under the Medicare Agreement;
- the schools maintenance program will continue in 1993-94 with an additional $12 million to be spent on essential works in schools across the State;
- extensions to the Art Gallery will begin in 1993-94 and a total of $16 million will be spent completing stages I and III together over the next three years;
- an additional $500 000 will be spent on Aboriginal advancement programs including increased support for land care management by Aboriginal landholding authorities and for the employment of field officers;
- funding of $24-million will be provided under the Commonwealth sponsored Rural Assistance Program which provides interest rate subsidies and household support for rural families;
- an additional $6 million will be spent on providing services for people with a disability;
- a major new initiative will begin at a cost of $750 000 to combat child sexual abuse and domestic violence;
- an additional $7 million will be spent on the provision of additional child care places with 890 new long day care places being provided by 1996 and 600 outside school hours care and vacation care places and 171 Family Day care places being provided in 1993-94 under the national child care strategy;
- the South Australian Housing Trust is expected to house 6 000 new tenants in 1993-94 and to provide a net addition of 110 dwellings to the public housing stock, 200 additional houses under the Cooperative program and 100 additional houses under the Housing Associations program.
- an additional 30 000 South Australians will be eligible for a range of concessions including water, power, transport and health at an estimated cost of $11 million in 1993-94 following extensions in eligibility for Pensioner Health Benefit cards; and
- an additional $240 000 will be spent on a range of multicultural and ethnic affairs programs.

The 1993-94 budget continues the emphasis of recent budgets on the Government's social justice policy. In large measure this has been achieved by reallocating resources to meet the needs of the disadvantaged members of our community.

In total an additional $58 million will be spent in areas of high priority in social justice terms despite the significant restraint required in agency budgets this year. In 1993-94 total budget sector spending on capital works will be an estimated $957 million or $113 million more than last year.

Spending levels in 1992-93 were well below the budget estimates in part due to revised timing on major projects such as the MFP and the Waite Institute research project and in part to delays in property sales by several agencies, particularly the Education Department, with a consequence that capital works were deferred to avoid exceeding budget spending limits.

In present economic conditions the Government decided to continue with spending levels consistent with those planned, rather than those occurring, in 1992-93.

State-Local Government Reform

The Government remains committed to the reform program and this is reflected in the budget. For 1993-94 an estimated $45 million will be raised from the petrol levy for local government purposes introduced in last year's budget.

These monies will be paid into a special fund to meet the costs of programs administered by the State Government that are on the reform agenda. Discussions between the two levels of government on possible reforms to present arrangements will continue and the funds may be used to facilitate any changes to those arrangements agreed upon.

THE STATE BANK OF SOUTH AUSTRALIA

Mr Speaker, we are as a community all too well aware of the harm done to the State's public finances by the State Bank losses. Much effort and money has been expended in investigating how this came about and those investigations continue in some specific respects. It is indeed important that these past events be fully understood, the lessons learned and action taken against those responsible to the extent which the law permits. But it is no less important that we look at the present and to the future. The news in that regard is unreservedly favourable.

The decisive action taken by the Government in the early months of 1991 and subsequently ensured that confidence in, and the stability of, the Bank was maintained at all times. This was itself no mean achievement. But the achievements now go well beyond that.

The Bank we now have is the same in legal terms as that which existed up to 1991. But there the comparison ends. For all intents and purposes we have a new Bank—a new relationship with the Government, a new Board, new senior executives, new philosophies and new operational methods. As a result of the actions jointly conceived and taken by the Government, the Board and management, we now own a highly successful and profitable Bank.

The Bank is today reporting a profit before tax of $108 million for 1992-93. This budget includes receipts totalling $297 million from the State Bank, made up of:

- $55 million as income tax equivalent for 1992-93;
- $52 million as dividend for 1992-93;
- $160 million as a return of capital in the form of a special dividend; and
- $30 million as estimated guarantee fees in respect of 1993-94 as provided for in the Bank's statute.

This amount of $297 million has not come about by accident. It has come about as a result of well conceived policies and hard work by all concerned. I pay tribute to the hundreds of thousands of South Australians who have stood by the Bank as loyal and valued customers. I pay tribute also to the three thousand or so Bank employees, at all levels, who have worked so hard, often under great difficulty, to keep the Bank alive and, we can now say, well.

The $297 million included in this year's budget represents the first return which will be received by the South Australian community from the efforts which we have all had to make. It is not in any sense an undue return, nor will it be the last.

GAMD

Mr Speaker, the Government assumed full control of the Group Asset Management Division from 1 July 1992 under arrangements which provide that GAMD is to be managed by its own Board and that the Government is to meet any losses.

Today GAMD has announced a loss of $287 million for 1992-93 which includes an amount of $85 million for a reduction in the value of the Myer Centre property. This is not a new loss requiring further funds. It is covered by the $3 150 million provision previously made by the Government. The Government has already paid $200 million of this loss for 1992-93 in June 1993 to GAMD as part settlement with the balance, $87 million, planned to be paid during 1993-94.

Within that provision the Government to date has provided or committed support to the State Bank and GAMD totalling $3 037 million including the loss announced by GAMD.

In the short term GAMD will continue to record losses. However as assets under GAMD control and management are sold or rehabilitated, GAMD's losses will fall significantly from the 1992-93 level with the prospect in the medium term of GAMD reporting profits. Estimates available to the Government indicate that the level of actual support expected to be provided to GAMD over coming years will peak at close to the $3 150 million provision made by the Government. While these estimates are subject to some uncertainty, the conclusion can be drawn that no further support beyond that amount will be required from the Government.

SGIC

Mr Speaker, the State Government Insurance Commission has been significantly reformed during the last year with a new board, Chairman and managing director. Under its new board and management the SGIC is adopting a lower risk profile and is focussing on its traditional core South Australian insurance business.

The Commission today reported a loss before tax of $42 million reducing to $23 million after tax. This loss was greatly affected by expenses of $54 million being required for provisions for claims from overseas inwards reinsurance and financial risk insurance. The SGIC has withdrawn from these areas of business, with the exception of domestic mortgage insurance in South Australia.

The profit achieved by the SGIC in the second half of the year demonstrates that its strategy of returning to its core business is producing real improvement.

The positive actions of the Government, Board and management have laid the foundations for the future of the SGIC. In the coming year the SGIC is expected to return to profitability, with its future assured.

SAFA

The South Australian Government Financing Authority has had another stable and successful year with significant achievements in its most important function of minimising interest costs on the State's borrowings.

In 1992-93 the SAFA operating surplus after abnormal items was $414 million. In terms of the Government Financing Authority Act, $410 million of the surplus was paid to the budget.

In 1993-94, the SAFA surplus is estimated at $345 million all of which is planned to be paid to the budget. After taking account of revised arrangements for the collection of guarantee fees on public sector borrowings, the $345 million is equivalent to the nominal amount paid to the budget in 1992-93. This estimate takes no account of gains which will arise through the disposal of the Government's shareholding in SAGASCO.

ASSET SALES

The April Statements included a limited program of asset sales in the Government's debt management strategy.

The Government has begun the process of selling the State Bank and is considering options for the sale of its SAGASCO shareholding.

In the Government's view a sound financial or social case has not been made for the sale of other major assets.

Work continues on the business cases for the possible sale of the small number of minor assets included in the April Statements.

For this budget an amount of $15 million has been included as the estimated contribution from the South Australian Urban Land Trust during 1993-94.

THE ESTIMATED 1993-94 BUDGET RESULT

Mr Speaker, as I have announced already, for 1993-94 it is estimated that there will be an overall surplus of $120 million in the Consolidated Account. This will be by any measure a remarkable result.

It will have been achieved in part through some measures with a major impact only in the short term.

It is obvious that such measures are not a solution in themselves. They merely afford the Government the flexibility to move in a planned fashion to a sustainable position in the State's finances over the medium term without wreaking havoc on the public sector and the services required of it by the South Australian community.

The Government must make the hard decisions required for long term stability and the 1993-94 budget shows that it is willing to do so. The Government has decided that the funds generated as a result of the budget surplus will be utilised to reduce the level of debt which has to be supported by the budget.

CONCLUDING COMMENTS

With this budget the Government has made further significant progress in meeting the budgetary and financial targets it set for itself in the April Economic and Financial Statements. The financial difficulties facing the State required resolute action and with this budget the Government has taken that action.

The Government has done more than begin the task of restoring the public finances. In this budget it has introduced measures that will further assist the private sector of the State's economy in the continuing process of adjustment for long term stability and growth.

The Government has at the same time maintained and in some areas extended the provision of essential social and community services and it has done so on a basis that directs assistance to those members of the community that need it most.

Mr Speaker, the form of the Appropriation Bill differs in some important respects from last year. The format of the schedule to the Bill has also been altered.

These changes have been necessary to reflect the Government's approach to the restructuring of agencies— a process that will be completed during 1993-94.

Finally, Mr Speaker I would like to acknowledge the work of the Under Treasurer and his officers in preparing the budget papers. I commend the budget to the House. I seek leave to have the explanation of the clauses inserted in *Hansard* without my reading it.

Leave granted.

Clause 1 is formal.

Clause 2 provides for the Bill to operate retrospectively to July 1993. Until the Bill is passed, expenditure is financed from appropriation authority provided by the Supply Acts.

Clause 3 provides relevant definitions.

Clause 4 provides for the issue and application of the sums shown in the schedule to the Bill. Subsection (2) makes it clear that appropriation authority provided by Supply Act is superseded by this Bill.

Clause 5 is a new clause designed to ensure that where Parliament has appropriated funds to an agency to enable it to carry out particular functions or duties and those functions or duties become the responsibility of another agency the funds may be used by the responsible agency in accordance with Parliament's original intentions without further appropriation.

Clause 6 provides authority for the Treasurer to issue and apply money from the Hospitals Fund for the provision of facilities in public hospitals.

Clause 7 makes it clear that appropriation authority provided by this Bill is additional to authority provided in other Acts of Parliament (except, of course, in Supply Acts).

Clause 8 sets a limit of $50 million on the amount which the Government may borrow by way of overdraft in 1993-94.

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

LAND TAX (RATES) AMENDMENT BILL

The Hon. FRANK BLEVINS (Treasurer) obtained leave and introduced a Bill for an Act to amend the Land Tax Act 1936. Read a first time.

The Hon. FRANK BLEVINS: 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.

In the 1991-92 budget, the Government announced that it would limit growth in aggregate land tax receipts to zero in 1991-92 and to no more than estimated CPI growth in each of 1992-93 and 1993-94. In practice, land tax receipts have fallen in absolute terms in each of the last two years from $76.0 million in 1990-91 to $75.8 million in 1991-92 and $75.4 million in 1992-93.

This policy of limiting growth in land tax receipts to no more than estimated inflation was introduced in response to representations over successive years from industry and small business groups for the Government to smooth annual fluctuations in land tax. The Government has decided to extend this policy for a further three years beyond 1993-94.

Consistent with the policy, the land tax scale will require adjustment in 1993-94. For land ownerships where the site value is in excess of $1 million, the marginal rate on the excess above $1 million will increase from 2.8 per cent to 3.7 per cent. Two per cent of land taxpayers will be affected by this change.

Tax rates will not alter on site values up to $1 million, where South Australia currently has the lowest level of land tax of all the States apart from Victoria. This relative position will be maintained.

The adjusted tax scale is estimated to result in land tax receipts increasing in 1993-94 by less than estimated inflation before taking into account the inclusion in the tax base, for the first time in 1993-94, of the Commonwealth Bank and the Commonwealth Bank Officers Superannuation Corporation. Following the repeal of section 119(1) of the Commonwealth Banks Act, 1959 which had previously provided an exemption from State and Local Government taxes those bodies will now be liable for land tax. In total, land tax receipts are estimated to yield $78.3 million in 1993-94 compared to $75.4 million in 1992-93.

Clause 1: Short title

This clause is formal.

Clause 2: Commencement

This clause provides that the measure will be taken to have come into operation at midnight on 30 June 1993, being the time at which land tax for the 1993-1994 financial year is calculated (see section 10(3) of the Act).

Clause 3: Amendment of s. 12—Scale of land tax

This clause alters the top marginal rate of tax (relating to land with a taxable value exceeding $1 000 000) from 2.8 per cent to 3.7 per cent.

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

TOBACCO PRODUCTS CONTROL (MISCELLANEOUS) BILL

Returned from the Legislative Council without amendment.

STATUTES REPEAL AND AMENDMENT (PLACES OF PUBLIC ENTERTAINMENT) BILL

Second Reading.

The Hon. M.K. MAYES (Minister of Environment and Land Management): I move:

That this Bill be now read a second time.

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

Leave granted.

This is a Bill to repeal the Places of Public Entertainment Act 1913 and to make provision in other legislation for a limited number of sections in the repealed Act which it has been thought necessary to continue.

In mid-1992 the Places of Public Entertainment Act 1913 was reviewed by a Working Party consisting of representatives from the Department of Public and Consumer Affairs and the Office of Business Regulation Review.

The Working Party advertised widely for submissions and contacted certain interest groups specifically affected. Some thirty-nine (39) submissions were received, and subsequently a Green Paper was produced and circulated for further public comment. A further fifteen (15) submissions were received for the Green Paper.

As a result of the review, it was determined to repeal the legislation, but it was also recognised that some of its safety provisions should be placed in other, more modern and appropriate pieces of legislation.

The Places of Public Entertainment Act was first introduced to protect the public from injury through fire in picture theatres. As such, it established a licensing regime for theatre firemen and for projectionists who were, at that time, handling flammable nitrate film. It is proposed that this regulation will cease as modern technology has made such controls redundant. Also to be deregulated are controls over patrons in drive-in theatres and the regulation of operating hours on Sunday, Christmas Day and Good Friday with the exception of operating hours for the Adelaide Show Grounds, where regulations will be set under relevant legislation prohibiting trading on Sunday before 10.00 a.m.

It is proposed that safety controls for temporary structures such as circus tents and fire safety provisions for fixed seating in cinemas will be controlled under the new Building Code of Australia and the regulation of amusement devices will become the responsibility of the Occupational Health and Safety Commission.

Smoking in auditoriums, which was prohibited in the Places of Public Entertainment Act will be subject to the authority of the Minister of Health through the Tobacco Products Control Act.

There will be consequential amendments to the Liquor Licensing Act 1985, the Classification of Theatrical Performances Act 1978, the Noise Control Act 1977 and the Summary Offences Act 1953 to delete references to the Places of Public Entertainment Act 1913 while maintaining the effect of those provisions in those Acts.

Finally, a public order power previously vested in the Minister of Consumer Affairs will be placed under the jurisdiction of the Police Commissioner pursuant to existing provisions in the Summary Offences Act.

The Bill has much to recommend it as an example of sensible and considered deregulation and the removal of outmoded legislation which at the same time continues to ensure that the public remain properly protected.

Clauses 1: Short Title

Clause 2: Commencement

Clauses 1 and 2 are formal.

Clause 3: Interpretation

Clause 3 is a standard clause for Statute Amendment Bills.

PART 2

REPEAL OF PLACES OF PUBLIC ENTERTAINMENT ACT 1913

Clause 4: Repeal of Places of Public Entertainment Act 1913

Clause 4 repeals the Places of Public Entertainment Act.

PART 3

AMENDMENT OF ADELAIDE SHOW GROUNDS (BY-LAWS) ACT 1929

Clause 5: Amendment of long title

Clause 5 amends the long title of the Adelaide Show Grounds (By-laws) Act 1929 to include the regulation-making power of the Governor.

Clause 6: Substitution of s. 1

Clause 6 changes the short title of the Adelaide Show Grounds (By-laws) Act 1929 to Adelaide Show Grounds (Regulations and By-laws) Act 1929.

Clause 7: Insertion of s. 2a

Clause 7 inserts section 2a into the Adelaide Showgrounds (Regulations and By-laws) Act. The proposed section provides that the show grounds must be closed to members of the public at the times prescribed by regulations made by the Governor. However, the Society may, with the written approval of the Minister, open the showgrounds at times when they are required to be closed by the regulations provided the Minister's approval is published in the *Gazette* at least 14 days before the showgrounds are opened.

PART 4

AMENDMENT OF CLASSIFICATION OF THEATRICAL PERFORMANCES ACT 1978

Clause 8: Amendment of s. 17—Places where restricted theatrical performances may take place

Clause 8 is a consequential amendment to remove the reference to the Places of Public Entertainment Act 1913.

PART 5

AMENDMENT OF LIQUOR LICENSING ACT 1985

Clause 9: Amendment of s. 4—Interpretation

Clause 9 strikes out the definition of 'place of public entertainment' as it is obsolete.

Clause 10: Amendment of s. 83—Rights of intervention

Clause 10 amends section 83 by repealing subsection (3) as it is obsolete.

Clause 11: Amendment of s. 113—Entertainment on licensed premises

Clause 11 is a consequential amendment to remove the reference to the Places of Public Entertainment Act 1913.

PART 6

AMENDMENT OF NOISE CONTROL ACT 1977

Clause 12: Amendment of s. 6—Interpretation

Clause 12 replaces paragraph (e) of the definition of 'non-domestic premises'. The substituted paragraph defines a place of public entertainment rather than referring to a place licensed under the Places of Public Entertainment Act 1913.

PART 7

AMENDMENT OF SUMMARY OFFENCES ACT 1953

Clause 13: Amendment of s. 4—Interpretation

Clause 13 replaces the definition of 'place of public entertainment' to remove the reference to the Places of Public Entertainment Act 1913.

PART 8

AMENDMENT OF TOBACCO PRODUCTS CONTROL ACT 1986

Clause 14: Amendment of s. 3—Interpretation

Clause 14 amends the Interpretation section of the Tobacco Products Control Act 1986 by inserting definitions of 'entertainment' and 'place of public entertainment'. Entertainment is defined as meaning (1) all kinds of live entertainment, including a lecture, talk or debate, and (2) the screening of a film.

Place of public entertainment is defined as being a building, tent or other structure in which entertainment is provided for the benefit of the public and in which the audience is seated in rows.

Clause 15: Insertion of s. 13a

Clause 15 inserts section 13a into the Tobacco Products Control Act. The proposed section provides that a person attending a place of public entertainment must not smoke a tobacco product in the auditorium of the place of public entertainment at any time before the entertainment commences, during the entertainment or after it has concluded.

Mr INGERSON secured the adjournment of the debate.

ELECTRICIANS, PLUMBERS AND GAS FITTERS LICENSING BILL

Adjourned debate on second reading (resumed on motion).

(Continued from page 529.)

Mr INGERSON (Bragg): There are some 16 000 licensed electricians in our State and it is interesting that, as I said previously, the unions and the employer's association are angry with the Minister. It is interesting that this Government has again not bothered to consult with a very important industry and with members of a very important trade. It has been suggested that to raise the $2 million, which is the current cost to ETSA for servicing this area, will involve licences costing somewhere between $80 and $100 for electricians, contractors and their workers.

It is interesting to note the Premier's comment that the budget was to contain no increase in charges, when some $2 million will come from the industry to pay for this new licensing exercise. This Bill changes portfolio responsibility to the Consumer Affairs Minister and administration as the licensing authority to the Commercial Tribunal. It also sets up an electrical advisory committee. One of the association's major concerns involves the number of people who will be required to manage this new system and the cost of that to the industry and consequently to the consumer. The National Electrical Contractors Association (formally the Electrical Contractors of South Australia) wrote to me making the following comments confirming their earlier comments to me in private:

> ...we believe this legislation is being pushed through in unseemly haste to accommodate the Southern Power and Water merger process. It should also be stated that at no time has the Government sought to consult the statutory boards and committees that have on a voluntary basis since 1966 provided technical and professional advice and assistance on installation standards and...as importantly safety of the end users, the consumer. The industry is greatly disturbed at the proposed dismantling of the licensing/examining committees and boards that have been instrumental in setting up and maintaining a service to the community in South Australia to the envy of all other States. Further, there appears to be no reference in the copy of the report or the Bill—

which, interestingly enough, was supplied by courtesy of the Opposition—

> to any proposed regulations. We reject the simplistic proposition of a 'one stop shop' concept of licensing and the utter naivety that the Consumer Affairs Department act as an appellant body, a policing authority, the licensing authority and the disciplinary authority.

It is interesting that they make the comment: how could that possibly not involve some conflict covering those different areas? It continues:

> In short since 1991 representative employer bodies and unions have made numerous submissions to ETSA working parties that were set up to effectively transfer the cost and function of electrical licensing administration, inspections of electrical installations, electrical installation compliance and investigations away from ETSA and under the Commercial Tribunal. Notwithstanding these submissions our organisation continues to have grave reservations about the appropriateness of the Office of Fair Trading or indeed the Minister of Consumer Affairs for such a portfolio.

It goes on to say:

> We fully support the white paper of the previous Minister of Water Resources that identified the industry concerns about using the Commercial Tribunal as a licensing authority.

I will come back to that in a minute, because it raises a very significant conflict between the previous Minister and the new Minister, who seems to rush through and cloud over everything. It continues:

> There is no doubt that Minister—

that is, the Minister of Water Resources—

> had been better briefed and was fully aware of the potential problems to the consumers. The Minister also made it clear the Government's position was that it was inappropriate to bring the industry under the Commercial Tribunal umbrella.

Here we have a white paper, issued and signed by the then Minister of Water Resources (Hon. Susan Lenehan) saying, in essence, that it was inappropriate to use the Commercial Tribunal. The white paper clearly stated that it was not intended to use the Commercial Tribunal as a registration authority despite the attraction of a 'one stop shop' building related licensing facility. That was the comment from the electricians.

I turn now to the plumbers. We have a similar critique, but in most instances more vehement than the criticism levelled by the electricians. It states:

> For some time preceding 1990 a green paper was circulated which broadly proposed various options for the application of licensing and the infrastructure required to oversee its implementation. The consultative process culminated in the publication of a white paper which documented the agreed position as between all industry parties and the Government. This was evidenced by an advice circulated at the time by the then Minister of Water Resources, the Hon. Susan Lenehan, specifically,'These policies are detailed in this plumbing and drainage white paper...'. Legislation to effect the agreed changes was never enacted and further consultation since that time (December 1990) has not occurred. Recently it came to our attention that a new Act was to be introduced to Parliament...which seeks alterations in the plumbing licensing/regulatory area, some aspects of which were contrary to the agreed industry position reflected in the white paper.

I should like to make some comments on the white paper and note the people who were involved. They were the Minister of Water Resources, TAFE, the Plumbers Association, the unions, PGEW, E&WS, SAGASCO and the Gas Employees Union. This white paper talks about several issues. It refers to the need to have public health as a prime objective of the sewerage system. It refers to the fact that diminished plumbing standards will compromise the objectives of the public system and it also refers to competence and the need for further competence with respect to plumbers. It also talks about the education needed in this licensing process. It states:

> Off-the-job training is conducted by the Department of Employment and Further Education under the supervision of the Sanitary Plumbers Examining Board. This will continue with some slight modification...

It then refers to the importance of a linkage between education and the process of plumbing. Referring to licensing, it states:

> The impact of third party effects of incompetent plumbing on public health and the objectives of a reticulated sewerage system is sufficient to warrant the licensing of competent plumbers.

Nobody disputes that. It then states:

> The concern expressed about using the Commercial Tribunal as the licensing authority is recognised.

We should remember that the Minister of Water Resources wrote and signed this document. It continues:

> Given that there is a Federal Government study of the building industry currently being undertaken, it is inappropriate to bring the plumbing industry under that umbrella. It is not intended to use the Commercial Tribunal as the registration authority despite the attraction of one-stop-shop building related licensing.

This white paper, a very significant document, being discussed by all parties in the industry, including the Minister, clearly says, 'The Commercial Tribunal is nonsense; it is not the way to go. Let us sit down and work out a better way.' It goes on to say:

> An independent Plumbers and Gas Fitters Licensing and Advisory Board constituted under the authority of the Minister administering the Water Works Act and Sewerage Act...is considered to be the most appropriate model.

We now have the Southern Power and Water Bill before the House, but that Bill has no relevance at all to the licensing of plumbers. Yet this Government is tying them together for some spurious reason. There is no connection between the two. The licensing board and licensing authority can run independently of that authority.

Mr Ferguson interjecting:

Mr INGERSON: I will tell you in a minute. That authority can run independently of the new authority that produces power and water. It is also recommended strongly by the previous Minister. Interestingly enough, the previous Minister had the courtesy to talk to the industry about these changes. I know, and the Minister knows, that in the last couple of days he has had some very heated discussions with the unions in particular—his mates, in fact. His mates have told him clearly what he ought to do with this piece of paper, and that is not to bring it into this House. He has been told to do that because nobody in the industry supports the action, particularly the Minister, who I believe actually knew what she was doing. Now, as we have Klunder's blunder again, we know that this Minister again has not bothered to sit down with the plumbers or the electricians, his mates, and get a whack around the ear. He has brought forward a new licensing system which is backward and has no hope of creating a decent system for our community.

This Bill will put in another layer or cost to the community. As has been said in correspondence with the Government, this is going to be a user pays system. In a user pays system, the consumer pays. The member for Henley Beach knows—if he does not, he should talk to some of his union mates—that they are disgusted at the way in which this simple, progressive licensing system has been handled. It could have been done simply in cooperation with the unions and the employers associations and fixed up very quickly.

The industry has concerns about many parts of this Bill and I will mention them. I will refer first to the concerns in relation to the plumbing side of the industry. Under the heading of 'Advisory Board Representation' the document states:

> The Government has been advised there will be one additional member of the Plumbing and Gas Fitting Advisory Board. A nominee from the United Trades and Labour Council other than from the unions presently involved in the industry.

I wonder why the hell we need two union members on this particular advisory committee, and yet we do not have the same relative numbers of members from the Employers Association. Obviously we need the UTLC down there for some reason. Perhaps some of their mates are frightened that they are going to lose some positions when there is a change of Government in the future. Why do we need a UTLC representative on this particular advisory committee? It is not even a voting committee. It is an incredible decision: that we need another representative from the UTLC. The proposal is contrary to the board representation agreed in the white paper—in fact, you should go down and ask the Minister what she agreed to—and adds unnecessarily to the number of representatives who do not have the industry expertise, background or specific knowledge. Probably we will have Mr Lesses in the meeting. I wonder if he will turn up if he comes on it. What other UTLC representatives could we possibly nominate?

The next heading is 'Ministerial Responsibility', under which the document states:

> It was agreed in the white paper it was not intended to use the Commercial Tribunal as the registration authority and consequently it would not be placed under the direction of the Minister of Consumer Affairs and utilise the 'one-stop shop' concept for building and related industry licensing. Consideration for public health and safety aspects of plumbing industry work dictate it should have an independent status consistent with current industry direction toward increased self regulation.

The next heading is 'Consultation' and it states:

> Whilst there was a significant level of agreement in regard to licensing reform evidenced by the White Paper and agreed to by the Government Minister of the day—

and I might say that was Minister Lenehan, who is a very good Minister and who is quite different, of course, from this particular Minister who does not listen to anybody—

> ...there has been no consultation with the industry in regard to these latest reforms. The action is seen by the contracting sector of the industry as contravening previous commitments and reneging upon established consultative processes.

I hear every day when I talk to the union movement about how we must have consultative processes, and I know that this Minister understands that very well. I know he had a very important consultative process yesterday. The only difference was that the consultation from the ETUU was not quite the sort of consultation that the Minister would normally enjoy.

This whole exercise of consultation, when you make significant changes to the industry, is a very important issue. The intent of the Government's action is not reform in the interests of improving licenses but cosmetic alterations prompted by the political expediency to achieve a merged authority to provide the delivery of electricity, water and sewerage.

Mr Ferguson interjecting:

Mr INGERSON: The member for Henley Beach asked where I got this from. I got this from the plumber's contractor. They were so cross with this exercise that they thought they would like to get it written down so I could read it in the House. It further states:

> The Government has declared its intention to minimise the changes to the licensing system in anticipation of the finalisation of national uniform standards, to which it would be bound to comply.

That, again, is a very important issue. The electricians brought it up. The plumbers have now brought it up, in saying that there is a national standards exercise going on now. Everyone knows that; yet this Minister—unlike the previous Minister who understood, because she said it in her white paper—does not understand that it is in the best interests of everyone to have national standards to which everyone in the industry right around Australia agrees. The submission further states:

> The Government's advice that it intends to conduct the broader view based on the white paper makes a nonsense of their current intention. Their *bona fides* are also questionable due to their reluctance to table regulations relating to the Act although assurances have been given industry consultation will occur prior to finalisation.

When you read this Bill firsthand, and not knowing anything about these issues, as I said when I started my presentation, you would see it as an innocuous Bill. But all of a sudden you find that really it is an enabling piece of legislation and the things that make it work—the regulations—are just not there. You have to ask yourself: why are they not there? Is the Minister going to assure not only me in this House, but also the industry, which is more important, that before there is any future debate on this particular Bill the regulations are tabled, or if not tabled in this House made clearly available for all concerned so that they can have a look at them?

Perhaps if the regulations come through and they find that, instead of being $100 per licence as suspected, it is only $50 there may be some feeling about it. If suddenly they find that all the issues they are concerned about are spelt out and they are able to look at them and be part of the consultation process, when it gets to the other House there may not be such opposition. All the industry is saying is that, if you want support and if you want to make change, you ought to get off

your bottom and talk to it: you ought to tell it what the regulations are all about, and don't just ram down its neck some changes about which it knows nothing.

As the association said in its reply to me, if I had not sent it a copy of the Bill—as I assumed all Ministers would normally do in consultation with an industry—it would not even have known that it was coming into the House; and that is a disgrace. Finally, the issue about which it has most concern is that, for the first time, expiation fees have been introduced into the penalties area regarding a breach, whether it relates to an electrician or a plumber. Members opposite have heard me say many times in this House what I think about expiation fees.

The Hon. J.H.C. Klunder interjecting:

Mr INGERSON: It does not matter what the Liberal Party thinks, this is what I think about expiation fees. I think it is immoral that a person who breaches a regulation is not at any stage given a reason in writing with respect to why that breach has occurred and an opportunity to at least argue the case through the courts. The opportunity exists after the expiation fee is paid. You end up with a group of gorillas running around with some notices in their back pocket, and whenever the Government runs short of a few dollars they whip them out. That is the history of expiation notices. If one looks at the growth in payment through the expiation system, one could imagine a very significant amount of: 'Out of the hip pocket and let's get a few more; we have to have our quota done today.' I believe that is a disgrace and, interestingly enough, so does the association. It was not consulted and it was not told about it because the Minister wanted to slip the thing in via the back door.

As I said earlier, in terms of licensing, 16 000 electricians are involved, about 3 000 plumbers and about 2 000 gas fitters; that is, 21 000 licences at $80 a pop—about $1.68 million, a very interesting piece of revenue for the Government. Perhaps the Minister will deny that and say that the licence will be free. I hope he does because the industry would rejoice.

Another issue in the plumbing area that is of concern is the fact that significant funds are held by the plumbing registering authority. Like everyone else, that body would like to know where the money will go. Will it go back to the industry that has paid for it, will it go into Government coffers or will it go to the Commercial Tribunal to create positions for all these extra people who will be required to do the licensing, because 21 000 licences will have to be issued every two or three years? There is no mention in this Bill of the exact period of the licence. That was the letter from the plumbers association.

I also received from the Australian Plumbing and Mechanical Contractors Association a copy of a letter dated 16 August addressed to the Hon. John Klunder. This is an important letter from the Australian body which sets out its views and points out again its concern about the lack of national consultation on standards. It refers to its need to be part of a national program and makes strong criticism of the lack of consultation and the use of commercial tribunals.

Usually, when the Opposition goes out to the industry to talk about a Bill, somebody out there supports it. In this case it has not found anybody, which is also unusual. In other words, everybody out there is opposed to this change. So, I have to ask the Minister: what is it all about? Why the urgency? Why can you not sit down with the industry and talk about how a licensing system can be introduced in which all parties are happy? Why does it have to go to the Minister of Consumer Affairs and the Commercial Tribunal? How much will it cost and how many extra staff will the Commercial Tribunal need to cope with this new licensing procedure? When we get into Committee we have a lot of questions to which we require detailed responses, but I hope in the Minister's second reading reply we will get some reasonable answers as to why it has been so difficult for him, representing the Government, to consult with the industry.

The Hon. J.H.C. KLUNDER (Minister of Public Infrastructure): That was an interesting contribution from the member for Bragg, and some of it was so horrifyingly wrong that I really do suggest that the honourable member either check his notes more carefully or not believe everything he hears. For instance, one of the great plays he made early in his contribution was that the electrical area was not consulted about this arrangement. Let me put that concern to rest. In 1988 ETSA first commenced a review of the methods and practices of its electrical licensing and inspection, and the following organisations were contacted—

Members interjecting:

The Hon. J.H.C. KLUNDER: Just relax and we will get there. The Electrical Trades Union, as it was then known, was advised by letter on 31 August 1988; the Municipal Officers Association, as it was then known, was first advised by letter on 31 August 1988; the Electrical Contractors Association, by visit on 1 September 1988; the Insurance Council of Australia, by letter of 26 October 1988; and the Institute of Electrical Inspectors by letter of 2 September 1988. In 1990, the Tregellis report, which was prepared for DOLAC, reviewed electrical licensing in Australia and argued against the supplying authority also being the licensing authority, on the basis of conflict of interest and natural justice.

Given that in each of the situations the agency sets the rules, licenses the workers—the electricians or plumbers—inspects the work, prosecutes (in the case of alleged breaches) and then sets the penalties, that is not in the interests of natural justice, and it is reasonable to split up those functions, that is, put them in the same authority. When one adds to that the fact that the number of plumbers employed by E&WS is roughly 1 per cent of the plumbers in this State, we have an even stranger situation, where an organisation that employs 1 per cent of a trade is setting all the rules and doing all the rest of it. So, it was necessary to consider whether or not this should go to an independent body, and that was the next step.

In November 1991 ETSA published a position paper for consultation with interested parties, advertised in the press on 8 November 1991 and wrote to all licence holders—15 000 of them—advising them of the proposals. And what was in those proposals? I have a copy here. On page 12, under No. 5, 'Administration of licensing' on the question of who should administer licensing, three alternatives were given—the Commercial Tribunal and two others—and the Commercial Tribunal was the preferred option. So, I find it difficult to accept the claim that people were not consulted, especially given that since 1992 there was a series of meetings with various bodies, and earlier this year I spoke to both the unions to let them know what the intention was.

The interesting situation of course is that this Bill only does several things. It is a fairly minimalist approach, really. One of them is to make it into a one-stop shop, which is Government policy, and I will not be at all surprised if, when the Liberal Party gets its policies organised, we will find it is also Liberal Party policy, because it is sensible to have all these trades that are involved in the building industry centred

in the same place. The second thing that this Bill does is to remove the prosecutor/judge/jury/executioner syndrome, which almost everybody would agree was appropriate. The third thing that it does is add one person from outside the trade to the advisory board for that trade.

An honourable member interjecting:

The DEPUTY SPEAKER: Order!

The Hon. J.H.C. KLUNDER: There is, indeed, a very good reason for that and, if the honourable member will be patient for a moment, I will tell him what the reason is. Last year sometime, I had a delegation from employers and unions together. They came to me and they said that they had some problems. There had been a drive towards multi-skilling throughout Australia, towards the removal of demarcation disputes and towards a capacity for people to do some work in some restricted form in other people's areas. That got rid of the demarcation disputes that have plagued industry generally for years in Australia, and it has been part of the drive throughout the 1980s and early 1990s to try to reduce that. What these particular employers and unions were telling me was that, when the electrical and the plumbing unions wanted their members to work outside those trade areas, they were in favour of there being fairly minimal competency-based requirements.

So, their members then worked outside their own specialities and did work so that other people would not have to be brought in. However, when it went the other way, when people from other trades wanted to work in the particular areas by these two unions, then the requirements were considerably higher. In one case, that of the Plumbers Union, it actually wanted people who had been working in a particular set of jobs for over 10 years and who, at the end of this so-called training, were going to be doing exactly the same job as they had been doing for the previous 10 years, to go through an adult apprenticeship in order to do that work—to do exactly the same work as they had been doing for 10 years. That I found unreasonable. It was against multi-skilling, competency-based training and the removal of demarcation disputes, and I assume the honourable member is fully in favour of those.

In order to move one small step towards removing all those obstacles and allowing people to do work with appropriate amounts of training in areas that were not their own specialty, I indicated to both unions that I was going to place on the advisory board a person from the trade union movement as a whole who was not a person of that particular union. So, there would be somebody from another union who had an interest in that area, who had an interest in making sure that multi-skilling and competency-based training were at appropriate levels, who would in each case be on each of the advisory boards. If the honourable member wants to say to me that that is an inappropriate and wrong thing to do, then I hope he will stand up and tell me so, because it was an appropriate way of having an input from somebody who was in a skilled trade, from a trade union background, who was in another trade on that advisory board, so that the advisory board could be aware, when it tried to set standards for entry into the profession or for doing some work inside the profession with a particular form of competency-based training, of the views of people outside that union.

I still believe that that is an appropriate way to go and it is certainly something from which I do not resile. The honourable member also went and played games with numbers and with dollars. Apparently the fact that at the moment there are licensing functions that are being carried out and that there is an advisory board that has a particular amount of competence in dealing with problems means that at the moment all these functions are fulfilled for free and no-one actually pays for them.

That is not the case. At the moment those functions are being paid for by water and electricity consumers, who are subsidising tradespeople. Given that the Liberal Party has been pushing for user-pays for a long time and strongly believes in it, then I am somewhat surprised that, first, the honourable member is unable to see that money is involved and, secondly, that the money has to come from somewhere. In my view the money ought to come from the people who actually benefit from getting a licence from the State in order to carry on a trade. That sort of licence is a valuable piece of paper, and I see no reason why the people who benefit from that licence should not be willing to pay for it.

They pay for it in every other Australian State and in most other trades where such licensing applies. I see no reason why the cost should not be carried by the people who benefit from holding the licence. They are the users and they should pay.

Mr Ingerson: How much will—

The Hon. J.H.C. KLUNDER: The amount will be determined by regulation.

Mr Ingerson interjecting:

The Hon. J.H.C. KLUNDER: Because we have a situation where an electrician's licence is for five years.

Mr Ingerson: That would be—

The DEPUTY SPEAKER: Order! The member for Bragg had unlimited time.

The Hon. J.H.C. KLUNDER: The member for Bragg insists on using my unlimited time as well as his own. It is the Liberal way of dealing with things: grab what you can. The situation is that—

Mr Ingerson: At least I'm not arrogant.

The Hon. J.H.C. KLUNDER: There are several views about that. Electricians' licences are for five years—

Mr Ingerson: That is a cost of $500.

The Hon. J.H.C. KLUNDER: The honourable member will just not shut up. He has no manners.

The DEPUTY SPEAKER: Yes, he will.

The Hon. J.H.C. KLUNDER: The honourable member must be aware that when only one-fifth of the licence holders will come before the tribunal at any one time it will be necessary to start at a fairly low level so that the subsidy by ETSA, in particular, will continue for some time and be gradually moved down. That is what I have been trying to get out, but the honourable member has been far too interested in interrupting to let me get that out.

I find it absolutely fascinating that the member for Bragg now espouses the cause of unions. I refer to his incredible attempts in the past to blame the unions for everything that goes wrong in this country and for everything that does not. Unions have always been at the worst end of it, yet suddenly the member for Bragg is saying how wonderful the unions are and how terrible it is that something fairly minor is being done. Let me also make clear that this Bill does not cut across the common national approach.

The common national approach has been coming in six months for almost the last three years and the last time I heard, it was still six months away. When we talk to people unofficially, they say that 12 or 18 months sounds more like it. So there was no point in holding off on these sorts of changes; they do not cut across a national approach. We will, of course, look with some interest at and help to formulate a national approach, because that will be in the interests of

people everywhere. I hope that when we do have a national approach members opposite will have an attitude towards it different from that which they had towards the common standards approach, because they opposed that originally until they had to be told by their friends in private enterprise to back off and do a quick back-flip.

We are in a situation where the Bill says only that this ought no longer be a situation where ETSA and the E&WS fulfil all the functions and that the tribunal appears to be a logical place for those functions to be carried out. The advisory boards will advise the tribunal, and to that extent all that they have had is a change of boss: instead of reporting to me as Minister they report to the tribunal. That is not a major change if we can get out of the situation where at the moment we have that denial of natural justice for people.

It also adds, as I said, one person from outside a particular trade but from an allied trade onto the advisory boards in order to make it clear to the advisory boards that there ought to be reasonable competency based training and not particularly high hurdles put in place for people. Finally, it produces the idea of a one-stop shop which, as I said, is the policy of virtually everybody in this Parliament.

Bill read a second time.

In Committee.

Clause 1—'Short title.'

Mr INGERSON: I have a reference from the Electrical Contractors Association basically on mutual recognition in which it has asked me to ask the Minister whether this title recognises the mutual recognition undertakings by State and Federal Ministers and what steps are being taken in this area to make sure that that is occurring?

The Hon. J.H.C. KLUNDER: There is not yet a national approach in these matters, so I fail to see the import of the honourable member's question.

Mr INGERSON: As I mentioned earlier, I have received letters from the Australian Plumbing and Mechanical Contractors Association and the Electrical Contractors Association which clearly state that a Federal Government Department of Labour advisory committee—called the DOLAC committee—is reviewing occupational licensing arrangements in Australia through a process that I understand is recognised by all State and Territory Governments, including the South Australian Government, as part of uniform mutual recognition legislation initiatives. As we in this place have recently passed a Bill on that issue which importantly recognises standards, does this Bill fit in with that Mutual Recognition Bill and any other processes taking place within the Federal area?

The Hon. J.H.C. KLUNDER: This is fascinating. The honourable member wants me to assure him that we will fit into something that has not yet been decided. I have to admit, that is a change from retrospectivity to prospectivity of quite amazing proportions. As the honourable member himself said, that particular DOLAC committee is still reviewing the situation. My understanding is that it will continue to review it for some time. We are having an input into that review and, clearly, if it is possible to achieve a national standard for these things, we would be delighted. I do not think that this Bill cuts across that in any way whatsoever.

Mr INGERSON: I think that is the point. The point that has been made by all the associations is that, if we are to have mutual recognition and national licensing, we ought, as States, at least be recognising the trends that are occurring and following the review processes of the other States. I am advised that the use of commercial tribunals and consumer affairs type legislation in the area of trade licensing is different in all other States and we are going down a different path in principle than in regard to any other areas. That is really the point that both the associations are making. They recognise that there must be some changes to the licensing system because of Government decisions, but their concern is the haste with which this is done when they know that this whole Federal process is taking place. I asked that question in relation to the short title because there is an opinion that this whole process is out of kilter with what is happening nationally.

The Hon. J.H.C. KLUNDER: My understanding is very clearly that the DOLAC committee will take some time yet to report. I am not at all convinced, as the honourable member appears to be, that it is heading in a particular direction and that that direction is contrary to where we want to go. Clearly, every State in Australia, when there is an agreement on national licensing, will need to look at its own Acts in order to bring those Acts into line with the national licensing situation. We would have to do the same, and we would do the same no matter which base we were operating from at the time. That is why I am saying that what we are doing here does not, in the slightest way, cut across any later national situation, because largely nobody knows what the national directions will be, and each State, at a time when it agrees to a national licensing situation, will have to amend its Acts. Different States will have to amend different sections of their Acts, but they will have to all bring their Acts into their own Parliaments and amend them.

Clause passed.

Clause 2—'Commencement.'

Mr INGERSON: Can the Minister guarantee that the regulations will be available to the respective bodies prior to the proclamation of this legislation? This is enabling legislation and the major elements that drive enabling legislation are the regulations. If the industry—including the employers and the employees—at the end of the day is to be happy with an in-principle piece of legislation, at least they ought to know how this legislation is to be driven. They say to me that they smell a rat. It is unfortunate if that is the case, but that is the issue because they do not believe that there has been enough consultation. So will the Minister provide the regulations to the industry as soon as practicable so that industry can at least view them before the Bill is debated in the other place and before the legislation is proclaimed?

The Hon. J.H.C. KLUNDER: On the one hand, I am getting criticism from the honourable member for not having consulted even though, as I have shown, there are areas where that is totally untrue and there is no area where it is completely true: on the other hand he wants me to set up the regulations and then send them out to industry. I would much rather do it the other way around and consult with industry very widely on the regulations. I think that there is a feeling about the place that the Bill does far more than it actually does.

That is something that I have picked up because in the past week or so when I have talked to people they have said, 'Oh well, if that is all there is then we don't need to worry.' So that is the situation that applies; there are only fairly minor things in this Bill, apart from taking it from the advisory board's responsibilities to the Minister to the commercial tribunal. However, I am perfectly happy to consult widely with industry and with the unions regarding the regulations, and in that case it will take some time.

Mr INGERSON: That is a greatest lot of gobbledegook I have ever heard in this place. I ask the Minister a very

simple question: will he supply the regulations to the industry within the time frame of the Bill's leaving this House and being debated in the other place, in probably a month's time?

The Hon. J.H.C. KLUNDER: The existing regulations are available, and if the honourable member is asking whether I will make those available the answer is: yes, they are available, that is not a problem. If he is asking me whether I will draft a new set of regulations and say, 'These are the regulations,' and then send them out to industry, then the answer is: no, I will not do that. I will talk to the industry first and ask what its input is on the regulations, since in the existing regulations it has a basis on which to frame its criticisms. But we will consult with them in order to get the regulations to the point where they are reasonable.

Mr INGERSON: It has never happened in the history of this place that regulations are drafted after consultation. The regulations are always drafted and put out to consultation; it is not done the other way around. If the Minister is fair dinkum in saying that there are very few problems with this particular piece of legislation and if he is saying that there are not many concerns, why will he not make a commitment to put the regulations out in a very simple form that even he and I can understand? Surely it is not an unreasonable request of the industry to say, 'Show us what they are all about and then we will believe you that there are not very many hidden parts to this Bill.'

The Hon. J.H.C. KLUNDER: If the honourable member had started with the term 'draft regulations' in the first place we might have got somewhere. But he wanted to know whether I was going to put the regulations out. Yes, draft regulations can be put together. I do not know what the time frame for that is, but normally that sort of work can be done in, say, six weeks. So we will go and consult widely with industry, on the basis of draft regulations, if that is what the honourable member is after.

Clause passed.

Clause 3—'Interpretation.'

Mr INGERSON: In relation to the definition of 'contractor', the comment from the association is that it had the view that 'a contractor' should mean a person who carries out work for hire or reward. The association would like to know what is the Government's position if licensed or registered persons wish to perform unpaid work for a charitable institution or some community service. Must that person pass all the requirements and pay annual fees as a contractor to be able to do this? In other words, is a 'contractor' in that case covered by this definition within the interpretation? Further, the philosophy of licensing a contractor and registering a prescribed worker seems to be the reverse of similar legislation in other States. Can the Minister also advise the Committee what the reasoning is for this amazing difference?

The Hon. J.H.C. KLUNDER: In response to the honourable member's first question, if you perform electrical work there are health and safety aspects. Consequently, whether you perform them for no charge or whether you charge for them you still must be appropriately licensed. Will the honourable member repeat the second part of the question?

Mr INGERSON: The philosophy of licensing a contractor and registration of a prescribed worker is the reverse of similar legislation in other States. What is the reason for this difference?

The Hon. J.H.C. KLUNDER: It is apparently consistent with the approach taken in the Builders Licensing Act, so that there are parallel provisions.

Mr INGERSON: In relation to gas fitting, it appears as if 'maintenance' has been left out of the definition. Is there any particular reason why gas fitting does not also cover maintenance?

The Hon. J.H.C. KLUNDER: I think the honourable member has found out something which is reasonable and which I think could well be picked up in another place, because I have no objection to 'maintenance' being included there.

Mr INGERSON: Under the definition of 'plumbing', installation and commission have also been left out. Is there any reason why that has been done?

The Hon. J.H.C. KLUNDER: Again, it is one of those things we will look upon kindly if it is picked up in another place.

Clause passed.

Clause 4—'Exemption.'

Mr INGERSON: Is it the intention of this legislation to exempt Government business enterprises that are in direct competition with small business? This whole area of exemption is by regulation and, because we do not have the regulations, we have no idea who may be exempt and in which particular area. The two groupings in particular would like to know where Government business enterprises stand in relation to exemptions.

The Hon. J.H.C. KLUNDER: The intent of the clause certainly is not to do that; it is to give exemptions under certain circumstances to people such as apprentices, and so on, so that they can perform work. It is not the intention to exempt the Crown and, as the honourable member would know, the Crown is specifically bound unless there is a clause in an Act that specifically says 'The Crown shall not be bound'. It is not the intention to do that by an underhand method.

Clause passed.

Clauses 5 and 6 passed.

Clause 7—'Categories of licences.'

Mr INGERSON: I would like to take up the issue of national licensing. Will the Minister give some assurance to the Committee as to what direction he sees this new body taking in relation to the national licensing reviews and what input he sees the Minister of Consumer Affairs taking in hurrying up that whole process of national licensing?

The Hon. J.H.C. KLUNDER: National licensing is one of these processes that will take a long time to come to fruition, because there are a number of independent Governments involved in it. Whilst one would wish for that to be done as quickly as possible, one can also try to ensure that one's own interests are not dealt with unduly harshly in such a process. I cannot give an indication that that will come to fruition within a given time or that we will move other people towards a speedier conclusion of the process. That will depend on each independent jurisdiction. When the national licensing arrangements are agreed to, we will need to bring this Bill back into the House to make sure it fits in with the national provisions.

Mr INGERSON: What is to occur regarding the licensing or registration, as currently occurs, of migrant workers or unqualified people studying to qualify after coming in from other areas?

The Hon. J.H.C. KLUNDER: I see that as being part of the work that will need to be done under the regulations, so that can be dealt with in consultation with the industry.

Mr INGERSON: In this area of contractors licences, there seems to be a philosophy that has been taken directly from the builders licensing legislation that the restriction on the scope of work that can be undertaken must be on the ability of the employee to competently perform that class of work and not on the employer, unless he or she is the self-employed person. Is it mandatory that the contractor must disclose such restrictions to any client or any consumer? Obviously that relates to any contractor employing someone who has restrictions that are listed under this category of licence. If he or she has to do it, how should that be done?

The Hon. J.H.C. KLUNDER: I would have thought there was an obligation under law that, if you were employing people who were working under a restricted licence and they were asked to perform unrestricted work, you would be breaking the law. Any contractor who did not tell prospective clients that he would be using people who were not qualified for the job would be in awful trouble. I cannot imagine anyone doing that sort of thing.

Clause passed.

Clause 8—'Obligation to be licensed.'

Mr INGERSON: At present the plumbing contractors must submit a certificate of intention, and then a certificate of compliance on completion. Is this to continue and, if so, who is responsible for the lodgment of these certificates? If these notices are to continue, who will be signing the certificates in the event of the death of a licensee?

The Hon. J.H.C. KLUNDER: I am advised that this has nothing to do with this Act whatsoever, but one assumes therefore that the existing situation will continue to apply.

Clause passed.

Clause 9—'Applications for licences.'

Mr INGERSON: What is the intention of the Government regarding the suspension of the licence of contractors or workers who perform faulty or unsafe work? In this area, where you have applications for licence, they obviously have previously been referred to the advisory committee, and the advisory committee may or may not have given advice. What is the intention of the Government regarding that?

The Hon. J.H.C. KLUNDER: It is as set out in part IV which deals with that very topic.

Mr INGERSON: In relation to applications for licences, it is obvious that there is some fee structure. In the discussion that the Minister has already promised he will have with the industry in relation to regulations, is it the intention of the Minister to clearly set out the fee structure, and is there an intention to have them on a *pro rata* basis given that, as the Minister said earlier, he may be introducing a five year rolling licence?

The Hon. J.H.C. KLUNDER: Certainly I would expect that we would have discussions with the industry about fee structures. I cannot imagine how one would talk to them without discussing those matters, so it will come up during that time.

Clause passed.

Clause 10—'Duration of licences.'

Mr INGERSON: During the Minister's second reading reply he said there would be a rolling five year licence for electricians. Do you see a rolling five year licence system for electricians, plumbers and gas fitters, or do you see an independent licensing system for each?

The Hon. J.H.C. KLUNDER: I am not sure whether the honourable member has read the legislation correctly. Clause 10 provides that a licence remains in force until various things happen.

An honourable member interjecting:

The Hon. J.H.C. KLUNDER: I do not know that it runs out. I think the intent is that somebody will have a licence provided they occasionally pay a fee for it, that they put in an annual return on it, or until the licence is suspended or whatever.

Mr INGERSON: It was my understanding that the Minister said that there would be a five year licence for electricians. He also said that there would be a rolling licence. In other words, not every person would be licensed in the same year, which is very similar to what we have in respect of motor vehicles. The question is: is that system intended to be introduced for electricians, plumbers and gas fitters? In other words, are we going to have a fifth of them in the first year, two-fifths in the second, and so on? I cannot find anywhere in this system where it says that. If there is a position, perhaps the Minister can advise the Committee.

The Hon. J.H.C. KLUNDER: I think the honourable member may be confused. I said that the licences would be picked up on a yearly basis, because the current licences for electricians are five yearly. Therefore, it will be five years before people come under the new system all together. The plumbers and gas fitters will come under clause 10.

Clause passed.

Clauses 11 and 12 passed.

Clause 13—'Obligation to be registered.'

Mr INGERSON: The Bill does not appear to mention examinations. What is to occur regarding examinations and qualifications in relation to licensing? Who is responsible for the standard of competency, for which the original was responsible?

The Hon. J.H.C. KLUNDER: It is difficult to put everything into the legislation, and this will again come under the regulations.

Mr INGERSON: Fascinating, Minister. As we are getting down the line these very simple regulations are starting to become quite complex. When I say 'complex', I mean complex in respect of the number of issues that will have to be covered by these regulations. Currently a plumbing contractor requires a builder's licence to perform plumbing work. Will a contractor now be required to hold two or more licences on application to the Commissioner?

The Hon. J.H.C. KLUNDER: We are currently in the situation where these people require two licences. They will continue for the time being to require two licences. Of course, since the two licences are now going to come from the same place, there is always going to be an option in the future of being able to consolidate those into a single licence, but they have to take out two licences now.

Mr INGERSON: Does the Government plan to exempt Government employees from holding the required licences, registrations, qualifications and experience when working on Government properties.

The Hon. J.H.C. KLUNDER: No.

Clause passed.

Clause 14—'Applications for registration.'

Mr INGERSON: We have a situation with a plumbing contractor who owns a plumbing business. He applies to the Commissioner for Consumer Affairs for a business licence in writing on the prescribed form. The application fee is paid and he provides any other information required to the

Commissioner. The Commissioner grants the licence based on the relevant advice of the advisory board: the age, whether he or she is a fit and proper person, qualifications, experience, prescribed sufficient business knowledge, and payment of the fee. What are the qualifications and experience prescribed and to which regulations are the Commissioner's decisions subject? Must the Commissioner act in accordance with the recommendations of the advisory board, or does he take merely token notice of the board's recommendation.

The Hon. J.H.C. KLUNDER: The Minister was never required to take the advice of the advisory committee. He usually did, however, because they had the technical expertise. In the same way, the Commissioner is not required to take the advice of the advisory committee, but my guess is that he or she usually will on the basis that they are the people with the expertise—or the brokers if you like—who will advise on what they know of the situation.

Mr INGERSON: Again on this area of application, where is the information required by the Commissioner in the annual return prescribed? It says that the Commissioner must make an annual return. Where will he get this information from in making that annual return? Where is it prescribed and how will he do it?

The Hon. J.H.C. KLUNDER: Can the honourable member can point us to a particular section, because at the moment we are not quite sure to which aspect of this he is referring?

Mr INGERSON: As a supplementary explanation, in the general area of requirement for return, the Commissioner has to put together the return which, in essence, comes to the Parliament. Is this information collected from applications of registration? How is this information collected in terms of the Commissioner's making his return? How much detail will have to be supplied in these applications for registration before the Commissioner will make the return to the Parliament within this prescribed period, which I think is towards the end of October?

The Hon. J.H.C. KLUNDER: If I understood the honourable member's question correctly, the Commissioner will report on the activities of the Commercial Tribunal and will no doubt in future have to provide some information about the operations of each of these advisory boards. I presume that, in order to describe the operations of the advisory boards, he would have to get information from them if it was not given to him at normal stages throughout the year.

Mr INGERSON: If we combine the existing master plumber's qualification with the experience requirement under the building licence provisions for running a business, will that be a requirement in terms of the application form? Will they require any extra special qualifications other than those of a master plumber? Finally, must the plumbing contractor also hold a plumbing worker's registration before he can work as a one-man business? In other words, what issues will be required for him to make his application?

The Hon. J.H.C. KLUNDER: The honourable member has asked several questions and we are trying to sort them out. It may take a little time. In answer to his first question, I understand the requirements would be substantially the same as they are now. A plumbing contractor requires a licence, but, if he is already qualified, he does not need to be registered as well.

Clause passed.

Clause 15—'Duration of registration.'

Mr INGERSON: Is the Minister aware of the industrial implications of a worker failing to renew a registration as a registered worker and being terminated by the employer on the ground that he may not legally employ such a person? How does the Minister intend to overcome such problems?

The Hon. J.H.C. KLUNDER: I am advised that that situation is no different from what it is now.

Clause passed.

Remaining clauses (16 to 41), schedule and title passed.

The Hon. J.H.C. KLUNDER (Minister of Public Infrastructure): I move:

That this Bill be now read a third time.

Mr INGERSON (Bragg): Before the Bill passes, I should like to make some general comments. We are generally concerned that the Minister should take up the issue of consultation. As we now have a fairly long period before the Bill reaches the other place, will the Minister take the opportunity to consult the industry and make sure that some goodwill is exercised to ensure that what could be an excellent licensing system is taken up and improved?

The Hon. J.H.C. KLUNDER (Minister of Public Infrastructure): I have already indicated that I would consult widely, so I am quite happy to give that undertaking.

The House divided on the third reading:

AYES (21)

Arnold, L. M. F.	Atkinson, M. J.
Bannon, J. C.	Blevins, F. T.
Crafter, G. J.	De Laine, M. R.
Evans, M. J.	Ferguson, D. M.
Gregory, R. J.	Groom, T. R.
Hamilton, K. C.	Heron, V. S.
Holloway, P.	Hopgood, D. J.
Hutchison, C. F.	Klunder, J. H. C. (teller)
Lenehan, S. M.	Mayes, M. K.
Quirke, J. A.	Rann, M. D.
Trainer, J. P.	

NOES (20)

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

PAIRS

Hemmings, T. H.	Brown, D. C.
McKee, C. D. T.	Blacker, P. D.

Majority of 1 for the Ayes.

Third reading thus carried.

SUPPLY BILL (No.2)

Returned from the Legislative Council without amendment.

ADJOURNMENT

At 5.44 p.m. the House adjourned until Tuesday 7 September at 2 p.m.

HOUSE OF ASSEMBLY

Tuesday 24 August

QUESTIONS ON NOTICE

CHRISTMAS PAGEANT

15. **Mr BECKER:** Will the State Bank continue to co-sponsor the John Martin's Christmas Pageant and, if so, what is the estimated cost for 1993 and what was the cost in 1991 and 1992?

The Hon. FRANK BLEVINS: I have been advised that the State Bank will continue to sponsor the John Martin's Christmas Pageant for 1993. As a matter of policy the Bank has advised that they do not release details about the amount of individual sponsorships.

STATE BANK

18. **Mr BECKER:**

1. Why was KPMG Peat Marwick reappointed as Auditor for the State Bank of South Australia and Beneficial Finance?

2. What is the annual remuneration for the audit of each company?

3. Does the appointment cover off balance sheet companies as well and, if not, why not?

4. How many auditors applied for the position of auditor and was the lowest tender accepted?

5. Did the Auditor-General apply and, if so, why was he not successful and, if he did not apply, why not?

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

1. The audit of the State Bank Group was put to tender. Those tenders received were evaluated on a number of criteria. KPMG Peat Marwick achieved the highest score in the evaluation process indicating the best tender, and were therefore awarded the contracts.

2. The successful tenderer quoted a single fee to cover the audit for the Group, it was not split by entity.

3. The audit covers all entities which the bank controls under the AAS 24 definition of control.

4. There were six auditors who applied for the audit of the State Bank Group. The decision on which tender was accepted was based on several factors, one of which was price, and the lowest price tender was accepted.

5. The Auditor-General was consulted verbally about the bank's intention to ask for tenders and the Auditor-General advised verbally that they would not tender at this stage.

BENEFICIAL FINANCE

19. **Mr BECKER:** Did the wives of the executives of Beneficial Finance Corporation accompany their husbands on any overseas trips in each of the past three financial years and, if so, were they employed as secretaries or paid clothing or other allowances and airfares and, if so, why, how much was paid to each wife on each trip and was any fringe benefits tax incurred and, if so, how much?

The Hon. FRANK BLEVINS: The following schedule details travel undertaken in the past three financial years by wives of Beneficial Finance Corporation Ltd executives accompanying their husbands on overseas trips:

Name	Location	Airfares paid by Beneficial Finance $
1988-89		
Mrs P Chakravarti	Round World	5,245.18
Mrs V Horwood	Europe	-
Mrs K Yelland	Europe	6,497.78
Mrs V Horwood	United States	-
1989-90		
Mrs K Yelland	Singapore	-
Mrs N Malouf	Europe	-
Mrs P Chakravarti	New Zealand	1,006.08
Mrs V Horwood	New Zealand	1,006.08
Mrs F O'Brien	New Zealand	1,006.08
Mrs N Malouf	New Zealand	1,006.08
Mrs A Martin	New Zealand	1,006.08
Mrs K Sexton	New Zealand	1,006.08
Mrs M Reichert	New Zealand	1,006.08
Mrs A Hamilton	New Zealand	1,006.08
1990-91		
Mrs S Freeman	United States	-
Mrs K Yelland	Singapore	3,698.47

All expenses were treated as non-deductible items for tax purposes and as such, were not subject to fringe benefits tax.

Only the Managing Director, Mr John Baker employed travel secretaries during this time, one of whom he married. In each of the remuneration letters given to Mr John Baker by the Chairman of the Board of Beneficial Finance Corporation Ltd, there was approval for a portion of his package to be utilised to pay a travel secretary. From this, two travel secretaries were employed over the period in question. PAYE tax was deducted as for any other employee.

Beneficial's records do not indicate that any clothing allowance was paid.

No formal documentation exists as to why wives accompanied their husbands on overseas trips. I understand, however, that each time this occurred it had the approval of the then Managing Director, Mr Baker. In February 1990, an Executive Committee meeting was held in New Zealand and the wives accompanied their husbands on the invitation of Mr Baker. This had the full knowledge of the then Group Managing Director of the State Bank, Mr Marcus Clark and the Beneficial Finance Corporation Ltd Board.

STATE BANK

22. **Mr BECKER:** Did the Government and/or the State Bank settle out of court with the Bank of New Zealand in relation to a dispute between that bank and the Remm Group for $70 million in or about March 1990 and, if so, why?

The Hon. FRANK BLEVINS: Neither the Government nor the State Bank had any involvement in the negotiations between the Bank of New Zealand and the Remm Group, or in the settlement of the dispute between the two parties.

As an adjunct to these negotiations, however, the State Bank was requested by Remm to release charges it held over the shares in certain Remm companies. These shareholdings were considered worthless and had never been ascribed any value in the assessment of the bank's security position.

In exchange for the release of these charges, the BNZ agreed to release guarantees held from Remm Group companies associated with the Myer Centre, Adelaide. Such releases were considered advantageous to the completion and leasing of the Myer Centre.

In addition, the State Bank contemplated, but did not proceed with, lending an amount of $1.5 million needed to facilitate the settlement.

24. **Mr BECKER:** What was the average interest earned on all categories of loans made by the State Bank for the years ended 30 June 1990 and 1991 and the half year ended 31 December 1991?

The Hon. FRANK BLEVINS: The average interest earned in the bank on all relevant assets at the respective balance dates was 10.0%, 12.3% and 9.4% for the 12 months ended June 1990, June 1991 and the annualised six months ended December 1991 respectively.

GOVERNMENT VEHICLES

27. **Mr BECKER:**

1. What Government business was the driver of the vehicle registered VQH-951 attending to on Monday 7 September 1992 at 8.45 a.m. at Grant Avenue, Rose Park (directly opposite Rose Park Primary School)?

2. To which Government department or agency is this vehicle attached?

3. Were the terms of Government Management Board Circular 90/30 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:

1. The driver of vehicle registered VQH-951 was on direct route to work on Monday 7 September 1992 when he briefly stopped outside the Rose Park Primary School to allow a child to alight from the vehicle.

2. The vehicle was on long term hire from State Fleet and assigned to the General Manager, Advanced Industry—Department of Industry, Trade and Technology.

3. The driver was complying with the terms of circular No. 30 Government Management Board, and an authorised approval from the Chief Executive Officer is recorded on file.

30. **Mr BECKER:**

1. What Government business was the driver of the vehicle registered VQH-848 attending to when it was seen to enter the Ingle Farm Shopping Centre between 10.30 and 10.45 a.m. on Saturday 19 December 1992 and who were the two female passengers in the car?

2. To which Government department or agency is this vehicle attached?

3. Were the terms of Government Management Board Circular 90/30 being observed by the driver of this vehicle and, if not, what action does the Government propose to take?

The Hon. M.D. RANN: The replies are as follows:

1. The driver and passengers in vehicle VQH-848 were all Legal Services Commission employees, based at the Commission's Whyalla office. All three employees were returning to Whyalla following their attendance at the Adelaide office on 18 December 1992.

2. The vehicle VQH-848 is owned by the Legal Services Commission.

3. Yes.

31. **Mr BECKER:**

1. What Government business was the driver of the vehicle registered VQE-898 attending to in Grenfell Street, Adelaide (near Harris Scarfes) at 3.50 p.m. on Saturday 19 December 1992 and who were the female passenger and two children in the car?

2. To which Government department or agency is this vehicle attached?

3. Were the terms of Government Management Board Circular 90/30 being observed by the driver of this vehicle and, if not, what action does the Government propose to take?

The Hon. M.D. RANN: The CFS has confirmed that the vehicle VQE-898 was in service on the particular day in question and the driver was rostered for on-call duties. CFS Regional Officers rostered on call are provided with a pager and radio equipped vehicle so as to respond to any emergency situation within acceptable response times.

Duty Officers are rostered on-call for 24 hours a day over a seven day period. In order that their private lives are not unduly disrupted, they are not restricted to their home and are authorised to carry families in their allocated vehicle with the proviso that they remain in reasonable proximity to CFS Headquarters.

MINING EXPLORATION

77. **Mr GUNN:** Which companies currently hold exploration licences in the Barton area of South Australia and have there been any positive results in this area?

The Hon. FRANK BLEVINS: Currently there are three exploration licences and nine applications in the general Barton area. Two exploration licences are held by National Mineral Sands (SA) NL (a subsidiary of Peko-Wallsend Limited) and Swan Reach NL (Perth based explorer), and the other is held by Dominion Gold Operations P/L, a Perth based miner and explorer.

Peko has been exploring in the area since 1989 and discovered heavy mineral sands, a geological success, but not an economic success. Peko had intended to relinquish the area, but following the South Australian Exploration Initiative, has applied for exploration licences in adjacent areas and intends to explore the underlying basement for base and precious metal minerals in both the new and previously held areas.

Dominion, another Perth based miner and explorer, took up exploration licences in the area as a result of the government drilling project carried out in the area last year. The company has not reported any significant discoveries so far.

New applications for exploration licences in the area include those from Peko, BHP Minerals Limited, and Ashton Mining Limited (Melbourne based diamond explorers) are being assessed.

GRAIN LOADING

79. **Mr GUNN:** What stage have negotiations reached with the South Australian Co-operative Bulk Handling Company in relation to purchase of the grain loading facilities at various ports and what guarantees have been given to current employees of the Department of Marine who operate these facilities about their future employment?

The Hon. M.D. RANN: The Government is currently considering the financial assessment made by the Department of Marine and Harbors in relation to the proposed sale of the DMH Bulk Loading Plants.

The South Australian Co-operative Bulk Handling Company is one of a number of interested parties who have registered an interest in the proposed sale of these facilities.

In relation to the Department of Marine and Harbors employees, their interest will be fully canvassed with any proposed new owner.