

HOUSE OF ASSEMBLY

Tuesday 25 March 1986

The **SPEAKER (Hon. J.P. Trainer)** took the Chair at 2 p.m. and read prayers.

ASSENT TO BILLS

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

Acts Interpretation Act Amendment,
 Australian Formula One Grand Prix Act Amendment,
 Beverage Container Act Amendment,
 Biological Control,
 Builders Licensing,
 Business Franchise (Tobacco) Act Amendment,
 Cattle Compensation Act Amendment,
 Crimes (Confiscation of Profits),
 Dog Fence Act Amendment,
 Industrial Conciliation and Arbitration Act Amendment,
 Industrial Relations Advisory Council Act Amendment,
 Local Government Act Amendment,
 Motor Vehicles Act Amendment,
 Motor Vehicles Act Amendment (No. 2),
 Pay-roll Tax Act Amendment,
 Potato Marketing Act Amendment,
 Poultry Meat Hygiene,
 Public Works Standing Committee Act Amendment,
 Road Traffic Act Amendment,
 Second-hand Motor Vehicles Act Amendment,
 Stamp Duties Act Amendment,
 State Government Insurance Commission Act Amendment,
 State Lotteries Act Amendment,
 Statute Law Revision,
 Statutes Amendment (Victims of Crime),
 Supply (No. 1),
 Technology Park Adelaide Act Amendment,
 Travel Agents.

PETITION: LAND TAX

A petition signed by 1 667 residents of South Australia praying that the House urge the Government to abolish the metropolitan land tax levy and review current rates of land tax was presented by Mr Olsen.

Petition received.

PETITION: UNSWORN STATEMENT

A petition signed by 17 residents of South Australia praying that the House support the abolition of the unsworn statement was presented by Mr Lewis.

Petition received.

PETITION: ELECTRONIC GAMING DEVICES

A petition signed by 115 residents of South Australia praying that the House legislate to permit the use of electronic gaming devices in South Australia was presented by Mr Oswald.

Petition received.

PETITION: STIRLING PEDESTRIAN CROSSING

A petition signed by 185 residents of South Australia praying that the House urge the Government to install a pedestrian crossing in the Stirling main street was presented by the Hon. D.C. Wotton.

Petition received.

QUESTIONS

The **SPEAKER**: I direct that written answers to the following questions on the Notice Paper, as detailed in the schedule that I now table, be distributed and printed in *Hansard*: Nos 6, 7, 35, 38, 43, 45, 48, 51, 56, 59, 60, 88, 90, 91, 93, 97, 100, 101, 105, 107, 108, 109, 113, 114, 115, 121, 122, 126, 128 to 132, 135, 139, 140, 142, 147, 148, 149, 150, 155, 161, 162, 164, 165, 166 and 169 to 172; and I direct that the following answers to questions without notice be distributed and printed in *Hansard*.

STRAY AND FERAL CATS

In reply to Mr HAMILTON (19 February).

The **Hon. G.F. KENEALLY**: My colleague the Minister of Local Government is concerned at the plight of persons who suffer nuisance caused by stray and feral cats. However, cats by their very nature cannot be controlled using the same techniques applied to dogs and therefore the enactment of a 'Cat Control Act' similar to the Dog Control Act is not seen as the answer. The Minister of Local Government has asked the working party presently reviewing the law relating to the impounding of animals to consider the question of stray and feral cats in its deliberations.

RUBBISH DUMPING

In reply to Mrs APPLEBY (18 February).

The **Hon. G.F. KENEALLY**: My colleague the Minister of Local Government does not condone the practice of serving expiation notices for litter offences without the alleged offender having first been interviewed by officers of the council. The Department of Local Government has written to the mayor of the council concerned asking for an explanation of the circumstances in the case cited by the honourable member.

SWIMMING POOL FENCING REQUIREMENTS

In reply to Mrs APPLEBY (11 February).

The **Hon. G.F. KENEALLY**: My colleague the Minister of Local Government has advised that the effectiveness of the Swimming Pool Safety Act is being reviewed. The evidence is that the requirement to fence properties, on which swimming pools have been constructed, has been effective in providing a barrier to prevent drownings by small children from outside the property. Unfortunately, as the member for Hayward indicated there have been a number of drownings involving children who resided on or were visiting the property, which raises the question of whether the legislation should require the fencing of the pool itself to protect small children on the property.

Requiring the fencing of the pool itself would be a major policy change and would affect the majority of the estimated 38 000 existing pool owners in South Australia who would have to erect new fencing around the pool itself and consequently any new legislation requiring fencing of the pool

itself would have to provide a period of grace for existing pools to enable this work to be carried out. Swimming pool covers, but certainly not solar covers, are presently accepted as effective barriers if the cover meets certain criteria. The future acceptance of pool covers is being considered in the review. The Minister expects to be in a position to recommend amendments to the Swimming Pool Safety Act to the Parliament in the near future.

TEENAGE DRINKING PROBLEMS

In reply to **Hon. D.C. WOTTON** (25 February).

The Hon. G.J. CRAFTER: I have now obtained further information from the Education Department concerning the programs being carried out to help curb teenage drinking problems. These include a current health curriculum that has a unit entitled 'Use and Abuse of Drugs' in the R-10 range, and the notion of teenage drinking being a shared responsibility within the community. An emphasis on alcohol within the 'use and Abuse of Drugs' unit is started in years 6 and 7, and continues through the secondary years. The newly introduced drug education package 'Free to Choose' has three of its ten units directed toward the use of alcohol. These units are 'The Party' and 'Away from Home' for years 9 and 10 and 'Want a Lift Home' which is targeted at year 11 students.

The 'Free to Choose' pack was introduced to South Australian Schools in 1985 with funds made available from the Drug and Alcohol Services Council. The units simulate youth lifestyle and highlight social situations where young people are required to express opinions, make decisions and deal with peer group pressures. An evaluation of 'Free to Choose' conducted late last year indicated that the three alcohol type units were used very frequently by schools.

In association with the Drug and Alcohol Service Council and with additional funding from Rotary, three seminars on drugs were conducted for primary school teachers during 1985. In addition, the Drink Driving Kit, published by the S.A. Education Department, with financial assistance from the Division of Road Safety, the Health Commission and SGIC, was distributed to all secondary schools in 1985. I believe the honourable member can be assured that a responsible approach to the problem is being taken in departmental schools, although I would reiterate the comments which I made on 25 February, that the problem is not going to be solved within schools alone, but that the primary responsibility for responsible consumption of alcohol rests with the family and with the teenagers themselves.

AIDS TASK FORCE

In reply to **Mr BECKER** (6 March).

The Hon. FRANK BLEVINS: The AIDS Task Force has not asked the South Australian Government to allow condoms to be issued to prisoners as part of an experiment to reduce the risk of sexually transmitted diseases. In fact at the AIDS National Conference held in Melbourne, November 1985, any form of experimentation in prisons was rejected as being unethical. However, there was strong support given by the Conference to the practice of 'safe sex', including the use of condoms by homosexual and bisexual persons in the community. No approach has been made for South Australia to consider participation in this experiment and the Clarkson Royal Commission recommended against sexual activity in prisons. Any sexual activity between prisoners would be a breach of regulation 20 of the regulations made under the Correctional Services Act 1982.

DEBT REPAYMENT

In reply to **Hon. B.C. EASTICK** (25 February).

The Hon. FRANK BLEVINS: On 22 February 1986 the person in question was admitted to the Women's Centre to complete 10 days imprisonment ordered under an unsatisfied judgment summons. The summons had been served because of outstanding debts totalling \$770. The Touche Ross Services report on the administration of the department in 1980 recommended that institutions should gazette official hours of movement to improve security and overall efficiency. As you will be aware, the hours of business observed in institutions are laid down in regulation 53 of the regulations made under the Correctional Services Act 1982. Notwithstanding this, the managers of institutions do retain a discretion to admit and discharge prisoners outside the prescribed hours so as to cater for the exceptional cases, as above. As I have previously mentioned in reply to your question without notice, any extension of existing hours would involve additional staff with the complement of a considerable overtime bill. The person in question was able to obtain the money and was released from the centre on 23 February 1986. I should add that occasions such as this are very rare.

COFFIN BAY WATER SCHEME

In reply to **Mr S.J. BAKER** (27 February).

The Hon. FRANK BLEVINS: The Coffin Bay water scheme project was approved under the Community Employment Program (CEP) in December 1984 and comprised two separate grants. The major grant was to the Engineering and Water Supply (E&WS) Department for an amount of \$1 021 040 and a sponsor contribution of \$461 160; a total estimated project cost of \$1 482 200. The second grant was to the District Council of Lincoln for road restoration works with a grant of \$65 602 with a sponsor contribution of \$16 400 for a total estimated project cost of \$82 002. Total CEP grants were \$1 086 642 with a sponsor contribution of \$477 560 for a total estimated project cost of \$1 564 202.

In February 1985 these costings were revised by the E&WS Department and whilst the CEP grant to that Department remained the same, total estimated project costs were increased to \$1 940 000. The project commenced towards the end of April 1985 and estimated to be completed by 14 March 1986. In fact, the project will be completed under budget and ahead of schedule without the necessity for the grant to the District Council of Lincoln for road restoration being utilised. These works are currently being completed by E&WS Department within its CEP grant allocation. I now refer to the points made in the question.

1. Due to the scaling down of the construction work load of the E&WS over the past few years machinery required for the Coffin Bay project had to be obtained from wherever possible. Some machines came from the Salvage Section of the E&WS Department which were to be sold as they had been identified as surplus to departmental requirements. However, those machines were not at the end of their working life, were not considered outdated and in fact, similar machines are still in use throughout E&WS Department. Other machinery was obtained from other operating areas of the department. All departmental machinery and vehicles were thoroughly checked by the E&WS workshops at Port Lincoln before they were taken on site. The remaining machinery was hired locally.

2. As stated, in (1) above, all vehicles were thoroughly checked by the E&WS workshops at Lincoln before they were taken on site. There was a recorded case of a brake

booster failing in one of these trucks. This meant that the brakes were still operable but required more effort to stop. This was repaired as soon as it was reported. There were several complaints about the steering of one of the trucks. This was inspected by the Port Lincoln workshop foreman who agreed that the steering had more than normal free play but he considered it was not excessive or unsafe. It was not considered that any of the trucks were deficient as claimed.

3. Breakdown frequency of machines was not excessive for the type of machines used. All trench digging machines were supplied by the E&WS department and had the same suspension and cushioning as used by departmental employees. To the knowledge of the department no machines were used without guards which were normally in place. No machine or vehicle left the E&WS Department Port Lincoln workshops if it was deemed unsafe, nor were any unsafe machines operated on site.

4. All asbestos pipes were cut with approved hand operated pipe cutters. No rotating power tools likely to generate asbestos dust were used. This method of pipe cutting has been standard throughout the E&WS Department for a number of years and does not require the use of protective clothing. The unions involved are aware and accept standard departmental practice. This practice conforms with Department of Labour regulations.

5. Machine operators were employed a week before anybody else on the project. They were given detailed instructions and training by a certified E&WS machine operator trainer. The training given to those operators was the same as that given to all new departmental operators. They were not given a licence to operate the machines until the trainer was satisfied that they were competent to handle the machines. Further, the trainer was on site for the full duration of the project to ensure all standards of operation were met.

6. In all, there have been to date a total of 23 workers compensation claims on this project. Four of these were long term injuries and all were the result of sprained muscles or ligaments. In three of these instances workers compensation payments are continuing at this time. Of the remainder, many were for minor injuries resulting in one to two days absenteeism and fourteen involved time lost of no more than one working week.

7. The Ditch Witch machine used on the job was an early model which is still used extensively in the Department and it was designed for use without a seat belt. This model was also not designed for use with roll cage (the safety guards referred to). Later models which are larger machines do have a roll cage. For the model in question, regulations do not require roll over cages or seat belts.

STATE GOVERNMENT INSURANCE COMMISSION

In reply to Mr OLSEN (26 February).

The Hon. J.C. BANNON: Amendments to interstate Government Insurance Office Acts were not necessary to allow the other offices to invest in the risk management company.

PENSIONER EARNINGS

In reply to Hon. P.B. ARNOLD (12 February).

The Hon. J.C. BANNON: At this stage my Government has not made any representations to the Federal Government over this issue. It is, however, recognised that the decision by the Department of Social Security to no longer 'average' pensioners' earnings over each fiscal year may

financially affect some pensioners and possibly cause some additional demands on State emergency financial assistance funds. The Emergency Financial Assistance Advisory Committee share this view and have formally communicated their concern to the Director-General of Community Welfare.

The federal change of policy was effective from November 1985 and will be gradually phased in until all pensioner concessions end on 1 November 1986. Accordingly, it is not yet possible to accurately assess any impact on State finances. It should be noted that 'income free areas' are also being increased significantly for all pensioners, thus providing a continuing incentive for pensioners to be employed in a positively productive manner. Recent press articles indicate that the Federal Government is apparently reconsidering the policy change, reportedly due to the public protests over hardship which may be felt by some pensioners. The Minister of Community Welfare and his department will continue to monitor the situation.

PAPERS TABLED

The following papers were laid on the table:

By the Premier (Hon. J.C. Bannon)—

Pursuant to Statute—

Australian Formula One Grand Prix Board—Report, 1985.

By the Minister for the Arts (Hon. J.C. Bannon)—

Pursuant to Statute—

Eyre Peninsula Cultural Trust—Report, 1984-85.

History Trust of South Australia—Report, 1982-83. Report, 1983-84.

Northern Cultural Trust—Report, 1984-85.

Riverland Cultural Trust—Report, 1984-85.

South East Cultural Trust—Report, 1984-85.

State Opera of South Australia—Report, 1984-85.

By the Minister of Emergency Services (Hon. D.J. Hopgood)—

Pursuant to Statute—

Country Fire Services Board—Report, 1984-85.

Police Regulation Act, 1952—Regulation—Directions to the Commissioner of Police.

By the Minister of Employment and Further Education (Hon. Lynn Arnold)—

Pursuant to Statute—

South Australian Institute of Technology—Report, 1984.

By the Minister of Transport (Hon. G.F. Keneally)—

Pursuant to Statute—

Building Act 1970—Regulation—Fees.

Metropolitan Taxi-Cab Act 1956—Regulation—Drivers' Appearance and Dress.

Public Parks Act 1943—Disposal of Parklands Adjoining Yankalilla Memorial Park, Report.

District Council of Port MacDonnell—By-Law No. 25—Traffic.

By the Minister of Education (Hon. G.J. Crafter)—

Pursuant to Statute—

Accounting Standards Review Board—Report, 1984-85. Companies and Securities Law Review Committee—Report, 1984-85.

Hairdressers Registration Act 1939—Regulation—Registration Fees.

Justices Act 1921—Rules—Courts of Summary Jurisdiction Regions.

Rules of Court—Supreme Court—Supreme Court Act 1935—Discovery and Solicitors' Profit Costs.

Trade Measurements Act 1971—Regulations—Motor Fuel.

Trade Standards Act 1979—Regulation—Silos, Tanks, Furniture and Motor Fuel.

Trade Measurements Act 1971 and Motor Fuel Distribution Act 1973—Regulation—Motor Spirit Revocation.

By the Minister of Housing and Construction (Hon. T.H. Hemmings)—

Pursuant to Statute—
Architects Act 1939—By-Law No. 38 Professional Conduct.

By the Minister of Fisheries (Hon. M.K. Mayes)—

Pursuant to Statute—
Fisheries Act 1982—Regulations—
West Coast Experimental Crab Fishery.
Gulf St Vincent Prawn Fishery.
Spencer Gulf Prawn Fishery.
Northern Zone Rock Lobster Fishery—Pots.
Southern Zone Rock Lobster Fishery—Pots.

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

Pursuant to Statute—
Lottery and Gaming Act 1936—Regulation—Minor Lottery Licences.

MINISTERIAL STATEMENT: POLICE REGULATION ACT

The Hon. D.J. HOPGOOD (Deputy Premier): I seek leave to make a statement.

Leave granted.

The Hon. D.J. HOPGOOD: In tabling in this Parliament new directions promulgated by the Governor-in-Council on 24 March 1986 pursuant to the Police Regulation Act 1952, I wish to summarise the events preceding, and the reasons that lie behind them. In 1977 the Dunstan Government commissioned the (then) Mr Acting Justice White of the Supreme Court, among other things, to:

Inquire from and discuss with the Commissioner of Police, and such other officers of the Police Department as may be necessary, in relation to Special Branch Records:

- (a) the criteria used to determine what information is currently being recorded;
- (b) the rank of the officer responsible for the determination of what is recorded;
- (c) how that information is recorded;
- (d) who has access to such information.

In his letter of 21 December 1977 His Honour observed:

My report discloses that Special Branch has maintained records on political trade union and other sensitive subject matter for 23 years. Their existence was not mentioned to the Government in spite of several requests for information about them. Special Branch believed that it owed a greater loyalty to itself and its own concept of security than to the Government, because it was cast in an ambiguous role.

He concluded (on page 73 of his report) that:

In the past, Special Branch (through the Commissioner) has failed to keep the State Government fully informed about the existence of sensitive files on political and trade union matters (and on other matters). This failure was due to ambivalent loyalties within the Special Branch towards ASIO and imagined security interests, on the one hand, and to the State Government on the other. It was also due to lack of high ranking local direction of Special Branch policy and procedures.

In consequence of the White report the Government, on 18 January 1978, promulgated instructions (pursuant to the Police Regulations Act 1952) which sought to overcome the problems that had become apparent.

On 20 November 1980 the Tonkin Government replaced the 1978 instructions with a set of guidelines for the Special Branch. In December 1983 this Government prepared and published a detailed and lengthy submission to the Royal Commission on Australia's Intelligence and Security Agencies comprising Mr Justice Hope. In May 1984 the Solicitor-General of South Australia appeared before the Royal Commission to speak to that submission. The Government's submission advanced the following propositions in comparing the 1978 directions to those promulgated in 1980:

(1) The 1980 directions do not expressly establish accountability to any Minister of the Crown. This is in contrast to the 1978 directions;

(2) The emphasis in the 1980 directions is in contrast to the more clearly circumscribed and tighter wording of the 1978 directions;

(3) The 1980 directions require that they be read in conjunction with instructions issued by the Commissioner of Police which have not been made public. In other words the 1980 directions are not self-contained;

(4) In many places, the 1980 directions repose unaccountable discretions in members of the Police Force;

(5) The ambit of 'activities' to be covered by Special Branch was wider than laid down in the 1978 directions (in other words, contrast the activities listed in paragraph 2.1 with those laid down in 1978 paragraph 1 subparagraphs 1, 2 and 3);

(6) There is no regulation of the actual physical custody and security of Special Branch information or records;

(7) The procedures of culling and destruction of outdated or inaccurate records are entirely unregulated.

In June, 1984 the Attorney-General publicly announced the Government's intention to abolish Special Branch. In consequence, and shortly thereafter, the Commissioner of Police published in the *Police Gazette* a notice which had the effect of discontinuing Special Branch and constituting the Operations Planning and Intelligence Unit of the Police Department. That unit comprises two sections.

First, there is now the Operations Planning Section whose responsibilities include formulating, maintaining and updating major police emergency/contingency plans and the Operations Command Manual; providing assistance and advice to personnel preparing operation orders or undertaking operational planning tasks; forming the nucleus of an operations planning team for large scale police operations; and maintaining a central repository of all operation orders, debriefing reports and other material relevant to the planning and control of police operations. Additionally, it is responsible for operational planning liaison with external emergency services and other organisations.

There is also, now, the Operations Intelligence Section whose responsibilities (within approved guidelines) include collecting, evaluating, storing and disseminating operations information in respect of persons who may pose a threat to individuals, groups, or property (and similarly in respect of those individuals, groups or property considered at risk); and maintaining liaison with relevant police personnel, Commonwealth and State officials and other people who may be of assistance, within and without the State. It is worth noting that a very similar reorganisation has taken place in both Victoria and Western Australia, following the abolition of their respective Special Branches.

The Government firmly believes these new directions represent a substantial improvement on both the 1978 and 1980 directions. They are a clearer description of the section's functions, they delimit those functions more acceptably, and they establish and promote more appropriate lines of oversight, responsibility and accountability for the section's day to day activities and operations. These directions were prepared in full consultation with both the Commissioner of Police and the Hon. Mr D.S. Hogarth, QC, who was the inspector appointed by the 1980 guidelines which have now been superseded.

These directions (among other things):

- (i) precisely describe and delineate the section's functions in the gathering of information, the assessment and evaluation of intelligence, the recording of intelligence and the dissemination of intelligence;

- (ii) precisely delimit and define the nature and extent of the information and intelligence which can be so gathered, assessed, recorded or disseminated. This will ensure that persons who are engaged in non-violent activity or who are expressing legitimate and peaceful dissent cannot and will not be the subject of the section's operations. Such rights should not be the subject of police surveillance. To suggest otherwise would place an intolerable premium on freedom of speech and, for that matter, freedom of conscience and thought;
- (iii) establish increased responsibility in respect of the dissemination of intelligence by generally requiring prior written approval, by specifying precisely to whom intelligence may be disseminated and by laying down strict conditions for fair, complete and accurate record-keeping;
- (iv) require the complete respect of all relevant functionaries for the privacy of individuals, by completely prohibiting unauthorised access to the records held by the section;
- (v) provide for more comprehensive avenues of accountability:
 - (a) by periodic police reporting to the Minister of Emergency Services;
 - (b) by the annual comprehensive inspections of the auditor;
 - (c) by the annual report of the auditor to the Governor; and
 - (d) by increased oversight by the auditor of the record-keeping system of the section;
- (vi) contemplate a more active and substantive role for the auditor, who is to be independent of both the Public Service and the Police Force.

The Government has been scrupulous in ensuring that these new directions are consistent with the views, and philosophies, espoused by it in its submission to the Hope Royal Commission. It has sought to strike a better balance between the right and duty of the State to protect and preserve its own integrity and lawful processes, and the time honoured rights and liberties of the individual.

These directions are a clearer articulation of the considerations that allow a better balance to be struck on a day to day basis and will enable the Government to respond quickly, precisely and sensitively to any problems that may arise. They represent an endeavour to clarify the roles and responsibilities of the major functionaries—the responsible Minister, the police, the auditor—so that those functionaries are, or will be, protected from unfair or unfounded suspicion or criticism. Their activities (precisely limited and subject to continuous public scrutiny) should be above reproach. For the first time this State has directions that will most nearly ensure that such aspirations will be realised. I commend them to honourable members.

MINISTERIAL STATEMENT: PRISONER ESCORTS

The Hon. FRANK BLEVINS (Minister of Correctional Services): I seek leave to make a statement.

Leave granted.

The Hon. FRANK BLEVINS: At approximately 3.15 p.m. on Tuesday 18 March, a prisoner named Gordon Ronald Forrest escaped while leaving the Outpatients Department of the Royal Adelaide Hospital. Forrest was a high security prisoner in the escort of two Department of Correctional Services officers and was handcuffed with his hands in front of his body at the time of the escape.

This was a particularly serious incident which has raised a number of questions relating to the procedures used during prisoner escorts. Normal procedure for a prisoner of Forrest's security rating calls for the prisoner to be handcuffed to one of the officers and backup to be provided by the department's Dog Squad. Those procedures were not followed on this occasion.

Immediately after the escape I ordered a full investigation into all aspects of the incident. That investigation has been conducted over the past few days by three Government investigating officers, and I am now in a position to inform the House of their findings.

The escape of the prisoner Forrest was the result of a breakdown in security caused by apparent management failure at Yatala Labour Prison and the failure of staff to follow set procedures. It is clear from the investigation that a staff routine instruction on prisoner escorts was not followed in this case. In particular, the escort report, which lists the prisoner's security rating, outstanding charges and comments on general behaviour, was not filled in by the officer in charge of escorts nor was it signed by the escorting officers. On this occasion a leave of absence from prison form was used. However, that form did not carry the details which could have alerted the responsible officers to Forrest's security rating.

It appears, from the investigation so far, that the escort reports are not used for every escort. The Acting Executive Director of the Department of Correctional Services has informed me that he has issued orders that the escort report is to be completed for all prisoners at Yatala Labour Prison prior to their leaving the gaol on escort.

As well as that, the Acting Director has instituted an immediate review of escort procedures at all other prisons in the State. It is also clear from the investigation that information about a possible escape attempt by Forrest was passed, via the Manager, to the gaol security squad five days before the escape. There is no evidence that this information was relayed to the officer responsible for arranging an escort for prisoner Forrest.

The issue of conveying information between the security squad and the officer responsible for arranging escorts is to be immediately reviewed to ensure that a clear system is put into place to ensure that critical information is brought to the notice of officers arranging escorts. The Manager of Yatala Labour Prison has stated that he was fully aware of Forrest's escape potential when he signed the order authorising last Tuesday's escort. However, he says he signed the movement order in the mistaken belief that the escort involved another prisoner, also named Forrest but with a lower security classification.

It would appear that, if the set procedures had been followed in preparing for this escort, the Manager and the escorting officers should have been alerted to the risks posed by Forrest and a more appropriate security escort could have been provided. As a result of the investigation the Acting Executive Director of the Department of Correctional Services has informed me that he has laid charges relating to negligence against the Manager of Yatala Labour Prison and the officer who was in charge of escorts on the day of the escape. The Acting Director has also informed me that he has suspended both men pending the outcome of the charges.

There is no doubt that the escape of Forrest was a serious breach of security. However, I believe the incident must be put in perspective. This incident was the first escape from a prisoner escort since September 1979. Over the past 6½ years there have been literally thousands of escorts of prisoners in South Australia with no escapes. That is, I believe, a highly commendable record.

Coupled with that is the fact that there has not been an escape from Yatala Labour Prison since June 1984. In fact the year 1984-85 was the first 12 month period in 25 years that there was no escape from Yatala Labour Prison. This record speaks highly of the normally tight security which now surrounds Yatala Labour Prison. As I have already indicated, steps have been taken to ensure that the events which led to the breakdown in security on this occasion do not occur again.

I now turn the attention of the House to an incident which occurred last week at Adelaide Gaol involving a prisoner named McQuade. On the morning of Thursday of last week prison officers found this prisoner bleeding from injuries which he had inflicted on himself. After being examined by a prison medical officer, it was decided that McQuade should be taken to hospital for treatment. The prisoner was fully conscious at the time and the medical officer did not consider the injuries serious enough to warrant an ambulance.

This incident occurred early in the morning, at approximately 7 o'clock, which is a time of maximum movement within the prison because cells are being unlocked and the prisoners are receiving their breakfast. Because of this there were no spare staff available to drive the prisoner and his escort to the hospital. As a result the decision was made to transport the prisoner by taxi. Much has been made in recent days, in the media and by the Leader of the Opposition, Mr Olsen, about this decision. I would inform the House that taxis have been used to transport prisoners in South Australia since 1977. They are used mainly at times, as in this case, when there is no staff available.

In such cases the use of a taxi proves to be more cost effective than calling an officer into work at overtime rates. I point out that this apparently was recognised by the Leader of the Opposition, Mr Olsen, when he was Chief Secretary in the Tonkin Liberal Government. In 1982, the year that the Leader was Minister responsible for prisons, there were more than 750 taxi journeys involving the transport of prisoners from Adelaide Gaol.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order! I warn the member for Mitcham.

The Hon. FRANK BLEVINS: At least half those journeys were for hospital or court visits. The main question raised over the past few days has been in relation to the safety of the taxi driver involved in last Thursday's operation. McQuade was escorted in the taxi by two experienced prison officers and was handcuffed to one of them. As well as that, the taxi was followed by a Dog Squad officer and a dog. I would suggest that this was probably the safest fare that the taxi driver involved has ever had.

I am not aware that any complaints from taxi companies, regarding the transport of prisoners, have ever been received by the Department of Correctional Services or my office. I have since written to the two taxi companies involved to determine if they have any reservations about the continuation of the practice.

WATTLE PARK RESERVOIR

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

Wattle Park Reservoir (Flexible Membrane Liner and Floating Cover).

Ordered that report be printed.

PUBLIC ACCOUNTS COMMITTEE REPORT

Mr KLUNDER brought up the 43rd report of the Public Accounts Committee, containing the Treasurer's minutes and other comments on the 26th, 30th and 34th reports of the Public Accounts Committee.

Ordered that report be printed.

QUESTION TIME

The Hon. D.J. HOPGOOD (Deputy Premier): I move: That Question Time be extended to 3.30 p.m.

Motion carried.

HOME LOAN SUBSIDIES

Mr OLSEN: Will the Premier say whether the Government intends to extend its subsidy scheme for home buyers with building society loans? The current scheme is due to end next Monday and, as it is to be assumed, therefore, that the Government has already decided whether or not it is intended to extend the scheme, I ask the Premier to identify to the House the Government's decision. Building society home loan interest rates are now 2.25 per cent higher than they were when the scheme was introduced just a month before the election was called, and that means that an existing borrower of \$45 000 will face a monthly repayment increase of \$81 if the scheme is not extended beyond Monday next, with the possibility of further rises with pressures being maintained on interest rates.

The Hon. J.C. BANNON: I appreciate the Leader of the Opposition's interest in this scheme, which he denounced as being inequitable and one that should never have been introduced. It has been very interesting to note that since the election he has discovered that perhaps it was not such a bad thing after all and that he seems to have changed tack and now wants these schemes prolonged and extended.

Members interjecting:

The Hon. J.C. BANNON: I appreciate the change of mind, although the Leader has not admitted to that. A decision will be announced obviously before the expiry date on 31 March.

BUS SCHEDULES

Mr GREGORY: Will the Minister of Transport request the State Transport Authority to review urgently the schedules of buses on routes 544 and 505? Since the introduction of the O-Bahn service, the change in bus schedules has led to my office receiving a number of complaints: for example, several services have been removed from the morning schedules on routes 544 and 505; buses have been overcrowded; people have been left at bus stops because of overcrowding on buses; and people have experienced difficulty in boarding the correct bus at the Grenfell Street stops. On the other hand, a number of constituents who have visited my office have praised the new service for its speed.

The Hon. G.F. KENEALLY: I thank the honourable member for his question. It is true that since the installation of the O-Bahn busway there has been, to put it mildly, a

settling in period. One reason we are having some difficulty is that we programmed for an increase in patronage of 16 to 17 per cent, whereas the increase has been about 26 or 27 per cent. Those figures are not positive at this stage, because we still must determine how much of the increase in patronage is an increase in commuters and how much involves a novelty factor (which obviously there is, as people, including many visitors to South Australia, are travelling on the O-Bahn to see what the system is like). Therefore, at this stage we do not know what the increase in daily commuters will be, but it is significant and far more than we anticipated. As the STA has a responsibility to provide the best possible commuting service for the greatest number of people, the schedules needed to be changed and those changes have caused some concern to commuters whose normal bus route is changed. Some commuters are getting to Adelaide more quickly, but other commuters, because the collection trip is longer, are getting on to the O-Bahn later and consequently reaching the city later.

Another problem alluded to by the honourable member concerns Grenfell and Currie Streets. The STA has put on four additional buses to service both those areas and has also employed additional ticket sellers in Grenfell and Currie Streets to help people identify the correct bus for them and to facilitate the smooth throughput of commuters. However, I point out that the problems in Grenfell Street are not all of the STA's making: there are other traffic problems over which the STA has no control but, as always, the authority will try to ensure that its patrons have the best possible service. I do not have available to me at present a report on routes 544 and 545 about which the honourable member asked a question, but I will get a reply for him as soon as I can. I will have investigated those matters he has addressed to see whether the problems referred to him by his constituents can be alleviated in any way.

PRISONER ESCAPE

The Hon. E.R. GOLDSWORTHY: Will the Minister of Correctional Services table the report that he has received following the investigation into the escape of Gordon Ronald Forrest, and will he say whether he holds himself personally responsible to the people of South Australia for the safe custody of prisoners committed to his charge; and, if he does not, why not? The escape of Forrest has caused considerable community disquiet, and the public deserves a full explanation. I therefore ask the Minister to table the full report that he has received on this matter. In his statement this afternoon, the Minister also revealed that certain action had been taken against two prison officers, but he completely ignored the Westminster system of ministerial responsibility to this Parliament for the actions of his departmental officers and, in so doing, suggested that he accepted no personal responsibility for the escape of this dangerous criminal.

The Hon. FRANK BLEVINS: The short answers to the Deputy Leader's questions are 'No' and 'Certainly not', and if he thinks about this matter for a moment he will understand why. The report cannot be tabled, as it contains security matters which I certainly would not want to be made public. However, the full report is available to Opposition members, as indeed is anything else concerning the escape of Forrest, but I would expect Opposition members to treat such information with discretion, as security issues are involved. I hope that the Deputy Leader will consider that an acceptable substitute.

As regards the second part of the question, certainly not. We could enter into an interesting debate on the Westminster tradition of ministerial responsibility, although I

am not sure that Question Time is the time to go into it at any length. But certainly, as I see it, if, for example, I had given insufficient resources to a particular area or had not been able to win from the Government sufficient resources, I would consider myself as a Minister somewhat negligent. One cannot say that about Yatala. From research I have done, I believe that Yatala has the highest prison officer to prisoner ratio of any prison in Australia and, from what others more experienced in correctional services than I tell me, probably in the world. So, there are certainly ample resources available to the management of the institution to manage that institution properly.

The only thing which I could have done (but which I have not done and will certainly not be doing in the future) is personally to supervise every escort. As Minister, I have provided sufficient procedures of a high quality to ensure the safety of the public and sufficient staff to fully implement those procedures. Apart from going down there daily and implementing them myself, there is not a great deal more, realistically, that I can do. The inquiry is still ongoing: we are still trying to find out certain things and we are still refining certain procedures. If there is anything I can do to provide additional security for the public, I will do it. This Government has demonstrated such a commitment. It has spent a phenomenal amount on making Yatala a safe institution. The fact that there has not been an escape from Yatala in the previous 18 months—the first in living memory of anybody—shows that our commitment and what we are doing is working.

I have to smile when anyone talks to me about ministerial responsibility, because I am reminded of a previous Minister who was in charge of prisons and who was Chief Secretary when a murderer escaped from one of our institutions. Over the past three years in correctional services I have made a point of turning the other cheek, because I believe that at some stage we have to break this tit for tat from one Party to another. We have to do that, so I have always turned the other cheek. I have not come out with a long list of atrocities that occurred during the time of the previous Government, and we know how easy that would be. One only has to read the results of the Clarkson Royal Commission into prisons, when the honourable member was in charge of prisons. I cannot help telling the House of one incident that occurred when the present Leader of the Opposition was Chief Secretary. There was an escape—and I will not give the prisoner's name, because there is not much point.

Mr Olsen: It was Smith.

The Hon. FRANK BLEVINS: The Leader of the Opposition reminds me that it was a Mr Smith who escaped. Quite correctly, the then Chief Secretary engaged an Aboriginal tracker—a very good one, and so successful that he was deserving of a monetary reward of several hundred dollars. That reward was duly sent by the present Leader. The only trouble was that he sent it to the prisoner! He sent it to the murderer who escaped, rather than the servant of the Crown who assisted in the recapture.

I will not always be Minister of Correctional Services, but one lesson I have learnt is that when I am no longer Minister I will never criticise a future Minister, because I will know what is in my past, and what there is that can be brought out regarding the Minister in charge of prisons at any time.

JUBILEE POINT

Mr FERGUSON: Will the Minister for Environment and Planning inform the House whether he is aware of the

concern expressed by officers of the Henley and Grange council about the environmental impact of the proposed Jubilee Point project? I have received a 13 page submission from the Town Clerk of Henley and Grange in which many concerns are expressed about the impact of Jubilee Point on the council area of Henley and Grange. Doubts have been expressed about the advisability of reclaiming part of the sea, the reliability of the sea walls, the use of fill for reclamation, the possibility of taxpayers having to pay for future repairs, the possibility of damage to the beachfront, and many other concerns.

The Hon. D.J. HOPGOOD: I am aware that concerns have been expressed in relation to this project. All I can say to the House is that the normal procedures will be followed. The submissions on the environmental impact statement are now in (I think the closing date was 17 March) and, following this period of public exhibition, the environmental impact statement and the submissions will be assessed by my department. That assessment will itself be a public document and at the end of that time, under section 50 of the Act, a decision has to be made by the Governor in Executive Council. The Government clearly would not be prepared to recommend to His Excellency that the project proceed unless all the environmental concerns which have been expressed are properly addressed by both the statement itself and the assessment by my office. That is how we are approaching the matter.

WATER RATES

The Hon. P.B. ARNOLD: Will the Deputy Premier admit that the Government is using incorrect water rates as a form of backdoor taxation on the users of Adelaide's metropolitan water supply and say what is the anticipated profit this financial year for the Government on the operation of that water supply? Successive Governments have determined water rates and the cost of water on the basis of a break even situation on the operation of the metropolitan water supply. However, last year the Government made a profit of \$15.8 million from the metropolitan water supply, following an estimated revenue increase of 20 per cent at a time when inflation was running at only 6 per cent. Before the Minister responds by saying that the profit is to offset the losses incurred on country water supplies, I remind the House that there is already a massive cross subsidy from country to city, in the form of funding the State Transport deficit, for which country people receive no transport service whatsoever. The Government's policy on water rates should be clearly explained to residents of the metropolitan area so that they are aware of the full extent to which they are being ripped off by backdoor taxation through this Government.

The SPEAKER: Order! Before calling on the Minister to proceed I warn the member for Chaffey that debating the question in that way will lead to leave for his question being withdrawn.

The Hon. D.J. HOPGOOD: The policy which is being followed in relation to water rates is exactly that which was followed by the honourable member when he was Minister of Water Resources. For some years—

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order! I call the Deputy Leader of the Opposition to order. The Minister will proceed.

The Hon. D.J. HOPGOOD: For some years the policy of successive Governments in this State, with a view to preserving water, has been that the entitlements have reduced and, therefore, people find themselves in a position where they get into an excess water situation rather more quickly than was previously the case. That is being done on publicly

justifiable grounds. In the water rating system we have a mixture of a rate and a charge for water. There has been a very slow movement away from the rating basis of the system to a charging basis of the system as a result of a reduction in those entitlements. That has been done, as I say, in the interests of conserving water. It is as simple as that.

I reject the concept of seeing this as taxation. I make no invidious comparisons between metropolitan and country areas. I simply point out that overall the State Government loses money in the provision of water services to the State as a whole. In those circumstances I do not see that it can be categorised as taxation, either backdoor or otherwise.

HOUSING LOANS

Ms GAYLER: Will the Minister of Housing and Construction advise the House of the Government's attitude to the proposal by banks, the Housing Industry Association, the Real Estate Institute and others to have the Federal Government lift the ceiling on home loans from banks? Many of my constituents are middle income families who have mortgages with banks. Most of these families are currently protected by the 13.5 per cent interest rate ceiling. Several constituents have contacted me to say that they would find it extremely difficult to cope if their mortgage repayments went much higher. Others contemplating the purchase of new homes can do so with confidence once the federal policy on housing finance is clear. I note that in yesterday's *News* a Treasury official, Mr J.H. Cosgrove, said that the current economic situation added to easing financial conditions given favourable trends in overseas interest rates.

The Hon. T.H. HEMMINGS: All members regard this as a vital issue, and Government members and Opposition members are completely divided on it. Some people are concerned about the way in which mortgage interest rates are rising and are confused about the differing stand of the individual political Parties on whether the ceiling should be lifted or remain. I make it perfectly clear that this Government's position has been crystal clear. During the last State election campaign, when the Liberal Party and the banks tried to pressure the Hawke Government into lifting the ceiling, this Government gave its message to Canberra loud and clear.

The Liberal Party, in calling for deregulation, certainly backed a loser in that instance. Our position for the past two years has been that the ceiling must remain in place until certain conditions are met and certain assessments have been made. We have consistently said that the impact of deregulation on low to middle income groups must be analysed first. We have also said that the first step is for the banks to show some sensitivity to consumer needs and to take active steps to protect their home borrowers from severe fluctuations in repayments—that is, the bank should develop stable repayments for borrowers or, to put it quite bluntly, stop blackmailing the Federal Government and develop a social conscience.

We have also said that deregulation on home loans can occur only in a falling interest rate market. None of those requirements have been met or properly addressed by the banks or the HIA in its submission to the Federal Government. The Liberal Party, both Federal and State, has not addressed these issues, either. So, our position has been perfectly clear for the last two years. However, let us look at that of the Liberal Party. As a political Party, it is completely all at sea. It has been making conflicting statements since October last year. This has split the Liberal Party, both State and Federal, and was, I believe, a contrib-

uting factor to its losing the election both here and in Western Australia. It has certainly destroyed Mr Howard's credibility and that of the present Leader of the Opposition in this State.

It may be pertinent to go through the record of the Liberal Party in relation to interest rates and whether or not there should be deregulation. Leading up to the December State election, we had the Federal Liberal Party calling for deregulation. The present Leader of the Opposition was conspicuously quiet. We sought him out and encouraged the media to ascertain his views. They tracked him down to Ayers Rock, and he said on radio on 1 October 1985 that he did not support deregulation. Two hours later I personally congratulated him on making a stand and supporting the Bannon Government. On 2 October a spokesman for the Leader (and I do not know who it was) said that he had never said that he supported deregulation, even though 5KA played the radio broadcast in which the Leader said he supported it.

Last November Mr Howard visited Adelaide and highlighted the split between the federal and State Liberals when he said that he supported deregulation. On 10 February 1986, after the disaster of the election, the member for Hanson entered the arena and said that the 1.5 per cent increase on building society rates would precipitate a crisis in the home building industry and force hundreds of potential home buyers out of the market. On 11 February 1986, the federal Opposition Housing spokesman (Mr Beale) said that high interest rates were driving the housing industry into the ground and that the Federal Government must ease interest rates.

However, on 15 February 1986, the Leader of the Opposition in the Senate (Senator Chaney) said that interest rates were not an issue. On 14 February 1986, the Federal Opposition Treasury spokesman (Mr Carlton) said that high interest rates were causing the housing crisis. On 17 February 1986, there was a report from Canberra that the Federal Opposition would continue its policy to raise the ceiling despite widespread criticism and having lost the South Australian election. The Liberals claimed that deregulation was in the best interests of the people of Australia. Then Mr Howard did his complete—

Mr S.J. BAKER: I rise on a point of order. We went through changing the Standing Orders of this House some weeks ago, and some agreement was reached that we would have short questions and short answers so that Question Time could work more efficiently—

The SPEAKER: Order!

Mr S.J. BAKER: —but we have had to listen to this drivel by the Minister of Housing—

The SPEAKER: Order!

Mr S.J. BAKER: —and the Minister of Correctional Services for at least 20 minutes of Question Time.

The SPEAKER: Order! The member for Mitcham took an undue period of time to resume his seat after I called him to order on that occasion, and I point out to him that he has already been cautioned this afternoon. There is no point of order. However, I call on the Minister not to indulge in what could be described as prolixity and to try to wind up his reply to the question.

The Hon. T.H. HEMMINGS: Thank you, Mr Speaker. I certainly understand the value of giving short, sharp and concise answers during Question Time. However, the whole question of whether the ceiling should remain or whether it should be lifted is of prime importance to people in the community. I am highlighting the complete lack of coordination by the Liberal Party—both State and Federal—on this vital issue. People who are concerned have approached the member for Newland. I think it is my job, as Minister of Housing and Construction, to set the record straight in

relation to exactly where this Government stands and exactly where that loose alliance which calls itself an Opposition stands. If members opposite think that that is wasting time, so be it.

GRAND PRIX

Mr INGERSON: Will the Premier say what discussions he has had with the Executive Director of the Grand Prix Board, Dr Mal Hemmerling, and the Chief Engineer of the Grand Prix circuit, Mr Barnard, about their formation of a company to manage future races? Has he given the approval for this arrangement, what is the contract worth to the company, and does he consider that the contract should have been put out to tender? The *Advertiser* revealed on 12 March that Dr Hemmerling and Mr Barnard had formed their own company, Prix Motions International, to manage the Grand Prix in future. The report also said the contract was for an undisclosed sum.

In seeking further information, the Opposition makes no reflection upon Dr Hemmerling and Mr Barnard, who have won widespread and much deserved praise for their contribution to the success of the first Grand Prix, nor do we question the principle of private entrepreneurs being involved in management of the event. However, in view of these particular and unique circumstances, in which they are able to set up a private company directly as the result of experience they have gained at public expense, I ask the Premier whether, in the public interest, he will provide the information I have asked for and whether he considers competitive tendering would be a more appropriate means of determining this contract.

The Hon. J.C. BANNON: The matter of negotiation is one for the Grand Prix Board—that is its job. It is charged with staging the event, letting contracts and making arrangements for it. In relation to employment, the Act requires that matters are approved by Executive Council. When the Grand Prix Board is in a position to do so, no doubt it will report to the Government and at that stage we will consider what is proposed. I think there is a lot of innuendo and scuttlebutt around about this matter; I suppose it is part of the 'tall poppy' syndrome we have in this country, that is, if someone does something well and is receiving a lot of praise for it, we find ways and means to try and cut them down to size. I think that is a great pity. I hope the honourable member, in raising this question and making a disclaimer about it, is not actually agreeing with this attitude.

In terms of the history, I make this explanation. First, Dr Hemmerling was seconded from his substantive position as Director of the Cabinet Office to direct the Grand Prix at my specific request because he had been involved in all the detailed negotiations and, in fact, without his participation we just would not have had a Grand Prix. When the contract was signed we had something like 10 months to ensure that the event happened. There was absolutely no question of starting from scratch to assemble some sort of organisation without using the experience and background that Dr Hemmerling had developed. It would have been quite impossible for him to continue as Director of the Cabinet Office, because his position with the Grand Prix Board required his full-time attention and, as a result, he was seconded to the board. Of course, on that secondment he was no longer subject to the Public Service regulations and proceeded with the job under the direction of the board.

Mr Barnard worked for a private engineering company and, again, because of the particular needs of the Grand Prix, he was seconded from that company to work full time on the Grand Prix. That was another most appropriate

arrangement and we are very grateful for it, as without it the event would not have happened. Having come to the end of the first event, both Mr Barnard and Dr Hemmerling had to decide what sort of future they had: were they going to continue to be involved in the Grand Prix? The House will also recall that such was the success of our Grand Prix that a number of the systems, suppliers, engineering techniques and administration solutions that were applied attracted great interest overseas.

In fact, as a State, we see considerable opportunity to make some money for South Australia beyond the staging of the event itself by acting as a consultant and taking part in similar events overseas. I point out also that that expertise will be very valuable to the Government in terms of assistance with the staging of other events from time to time. So, clearly, we had a major asset, and it is the intention of the Grand Prix Board to exploit that asset. In that they have my total backing, because the whole point of the Government's being involved in the Grand Prix is to get the maximum benefit and return for this State. It has already been very considerable and it is going to be much larger in future years.

The two individuals concerned had a decision to make, and the board clearly wanted Mr Barnard and Dr Hemmerling to continue in that role. Clearly, also, the engineering company employing Mr Barnard and myself, as Premier, and the Public Service of this State, wanted to see Dr Hemmerling return to his position or decide whether or not he was going to continue with the Grand Prix. Faced with those decisions those two people have made a choice and a suitable contract is being negotiated.

I do not see anything wrong with that at all, and I can assure the honourable member that if I know anything about the Grand Prix Board, the terms are not going to be outrageous or result in creating instant millionaires or in any of the other rumours we have heard. Indeed, if that was going to be the case, Mr Barnard and Dr Hemmerling would not be wasting their time continuing to operate here in Adelaide: they would hoof it off overseas as fast as they could and join up with Mr Bernie Ecclestone of FOCA or other similar organisations. They are not on about that: they are going to stay here and give their skills and services to our Grand Prix. It will be done on a proper contractual basis which will go through all the appropriate approvals.

As I say, having a team of that kind, coupled with the expertise that our board has developed, we have a marketable commodity from this State which I hope we can exploit in future years.

WATER SUPPLY

Mrs APPLEBY: Can the Minister of Water Resources report on the circumstances that caused the water supply to be rumoured as bacteria contaminated and foul tasting and smelling over the last few days in the southern and adjacent areas? A substantial number of complaints, both domestic and business, were received at my office yesterday, some of these complaints coming from small businesses relying on the water supply for the preparation of drink and food. A number of rumours were circulating that caused concern about the health responsibility of these businesses in the circumstances.

The Hon. D.J. HOPGOOD: The short answer is that an algal bloom occurred in Myponga over the weekend. It is about this time of the year that the Myponga system is switched into the Happy Valley system and this in itself usually brings some problems, in that pipes that have not been used for some months suddenly come into commission, with some increased turbidity. Last week the depart-

ment took out advertising in the local papers to warn people in the southern suburbs that there would be reasonably high levels of turbidity in the water very early this week. What was not anticipated was that the algal bloom would coincide with it.

There was no higher than usual bacteriological level, and the chlorination process proceeded normally. It is unfortunate that a rumour spread that the unpleasant smell was associated with higher than normal bacteriological levels, but that certainly was not the case. The reservoir has been treated and the problem has largely gone away. I have requested the department to keep a close watch on the situation over the next few days, especially as it would seem that summery conditions will continue to prevail and that is the ideal recipe for further algal blooms to occur.

MOTOR VEHICLE TAX

The Hon. JENNIFER ADAMSON: Will the Premier table the Government's submission to the Federal Government on the impact on South Australia of the proposed fringe benefits tax on motor vehicles and, if not, why not? This submission, apparently leaked to the *Advertiser*, predicted job losses of up to 4 500 in South Australia this year on top of earlier State Government estimates of 2 750 job losses this year because of depressed conditions in the motor vehicle market. The *Advertiser* has reported that the Premier refuses to publicly release the submission. The submission supports concerns raised last year by the Opposition that the implementation of a fringe benefits tax on motor vehicles would have severe effect on jobs in the car industry—concerns which the Premier at the time dismissed.

At last year's tax summit the Premier in fact said that measures needed to be taken to bring fringe benefits within the tax net. He added, 'We note that the single most important untaxed benefit is probably the provision of motor vehicles.' On November 15, the Premier also said he had 'great confidence in Keating' and said that 'his economic policies are correct'. Will the Premier table the Government's full submission so the House can examine the extent to which his support for Mr Keating's tax policies will damage the South Australian economy?

The Hon. J.C. BANNON: As I explained at the time, I did not publicly release that report because, as some members would be aware (although I guess not many opposite because they are not too subtle in these matters)—

The Hon. E.R. Goldsworthy: You're so subtle you are a bit like orange flower water.

The Hon. J.C. BANNON: The Deputy Leader is giving a classic demonstration. I suppose we are getting used to it.

The Hon. E.R. Goldsworthy interjecting:

The Hon. J.C. BANNON: Give your colleague a break, Roger: she is trying to listen. The fact that it was being considered within the Federal Government meant that it was most effective to direct the submission, as I did, to the Prime Minister, to the Minister for Industry, Technology and Commerce, and to the Commonwealth Treasurer (Mr Keating), and not make a public document of it. It was better not to stomp around and carry on but to try to ensure that the arguments that I put were seen as a careful and factual analysis of the situation.

Another factor is that, while we have done an analysis on the best information that we could obtain, there are obvious assumptions that must be made that can affect the figures. Therefore, we cannot come out with a definitive statement that there will be X jobs lost or a particular effect. We can talk only about an upper and a lower limit of such effects depending on what assumptions or mixture of assumptions are used. If I brandished a document with

those assumptions, I would simply be inviting a public debate in which the Federal Treasurer or anyone else taking up the cause might be able to point to this or that assumption and claim that it was erroneous, thus discrediting the whole argument that had been built around it. So, it was important that we not only presented the submission but also went through it, discussed it with the Federal Government, got that Government's reaction, and gave it the opportunity to respond with counter arguments if its own information detected errors in this area.

Our approach in this respect was consistent with that being undertaken by the industry itself. One has not heard, except for some people not directly involved in an election contest last December, the industry carrying on about this matter. The industry has in fact taken a sensible, low key approach to get the facts and to ensure that they are listened to. The industry has not tried (and it would be wasting its time and that of the Opposition in trying) to make something political out of it. The matter is too important to play around with in that way. I said at the beginning that, if the effect of any of those provisions, both in terms of estimated revenue to be collected and in terms of revenue lost through job losses or any other factor, was not as calculated by the Federal Treasurer, he should make a review of it, and I understand that such a review is being made.

In that context I was not prepared to release the document publicly. I am not sure to what extent the *Advertiser* published or released the document referred to but, if it did publish the document and was not concerned with the way in which the matter should be approached, Parliament is entitled to the document. I will look at that for the honourable member and, if my assessment is that we may as well release the document, I will ensure that the honourable member receives a copy.

ELECTORAL PROCEDURES

Ms LENEHAN: Will the Minister of Education ask the Attorney-General to provide a report on the timetable for the proposed introduction of an optical scanner by the electoral office? Further, will the Attorney-General report on the computerisation of electoral rolls within electorate offices throughout the State? The background to my first question is that, as many members may be aware, a large number of 'please explain' letters or notices were recently sent to a huge number of enrolled electors asking for an explanation of why they had not voted at the State election that was held on 7 December. Indeed, it is common knowledge that the Electoral Commissioner received such a letter. I, too, received one and found it a little amusing.

A number of elderly constituents who contacted my office were distressed because, although they had voted, they had received a 'please explain' letter. It was not just the threat of a \$50 fine being imposed: they believe that they had broken the law and therefore were extremely distressed. I contacted the Electoral Commissioner, who explained to me that, under the present system, birth rolls are manually scanned by human beings and that many of the errors were human errors. He further assured me that, with the introduction of an optical scanner, birth rolls could be fed into the machine and that this would almost completely eliminate the kinds of errors they have made since the recent election.

The background to my second question concerns a request for a progress report on the computerisation of electoral rolls. I am reliably informed that this would not only be cost efficient and more effective but would also enable computers in members' electorate offices to easily have access to the information on electoral rolls. This would

effect an enormous saving of paper and time and would thus be an extremely effective and efficient means of having access to this information.

The Hon. G.J. CRAFTER: I thank the honourable member for her question and will refer it to the Attorney-General to obtain a report from the Electoral Commissioner on the matters that she has raised. I understand that following the December general election an exceptionally high number of people received notices requiring an explanation for their alleged failure to vote. Obviously, there are computerised methods of minimising these notices and the offence that they caused to constituents who voted validly.

With respect to computer facilities being provided to honourable members and their electorate staff, I understand that the Attorney-General is reviewing this matter in conjunction with the Electoral Commissioner. Obviously that requires very substantial additional resources to be provided to that office. I understand also that it is a matter that the State alone cannot tackle, but that it must be done in consultation with the Commonwealth Electoral Department, as the rolls are jointly prepared and, indeed, are in custody jointly of the Commonwealth and State electoral offices.

DOMESTIC VIOLENCE

The Hon. B.C. EASTICK: Will the State Government co-operate with the Federal Government by toughening laws relating to domestic violence and reducing the delay period involved in protecting victims? The Federal Government has announced amendments to the Family Law Act making it easier for police to arrest violent persons before a serious assault or even murder or murder suicide involving innocent children occurs. The Federal Attorney-General has appealed to State Governments to co-operate by toughening their laws in a national campaign against increasing domestic violence.

Delay periods before court appearances by alleged offenders are leading to considerable trauma for many victims of domestic violence in South Australia. One case brought to my attention involves a mother of three small children who was physically attacked by her ex-husband in October last year. When the ex-husband returned to her home later that month wielding a tomahawk, the woman took out a restraining order. The order is not listed for hearing until April this year, and there is no guarantee that this case will be heard even at that time due to a backlog of previously listed cases.

Since the tomahawk incident, the woman has changed her address and spent some time in a shelter. However, she was accosted in the street last week by her ex-husband, who said he would be around that night with his axe. This woman is living in terror and fears for her life and the lives of her children. The Liberal Party would welcome immediate action from the Government to provide urgent increased protection to victims who find themselves subject to such harassment as a result of lengthy court actions.

The Hon. J.C. BANNON: I do not know the precise details of what plans are under way, but certainly the State is cooperating at all levels in tackling this problem. In fact, we are not only cooperating but also have taken the lead in this area in a number of instances. As members would be aware, we recently established a Domestic Violence Council. That comes out of intensive work that has been going on under the former Minister of Community Welfare, the member for Norwood, and subsequently the current Minister, Dr Cornwall in another place. We have task forces looking at very specific areas including legal matters, health

and welfare and the general education area in relation particularly to violent abuse and sexual abuse of children.

So, it has been lifted to a very high priority. The fact that it has become a priority is evidenced by the very large increase in the number of complaints, allegations and detectable offences in this area. As with a number of these things, the increase in those figures show not that the community has suddenly lost its senses over the past two to three years and that strange things have happened but rather that under the surface these things have been going on for a very long time. Now the taboo has been broken and people are starting to talk about it. People are emboldened to come forward and not simply put up with it or with the cloak of family secrecy being put over it. The whole thing is coming more into the open, and it is a very good thing that it is.

In a sense we have opened a Pandora's box because the number of complaints and difficulties that have been shown up along with the number of delicate situations that are so revealed are creating enormous stress and work problems for those who have to deal with them. We are moving to ensure that those needs are addressed because this is one of the major problems that we will face over the next few years as the community adjusts to a new era of frankness and a desire to tackle these things that have remained hidden in the cupboard for far too long.

My Government, through all its avenues, is working very hard to ensure that this is tackled systematically—not hysterically but with compassion, understanding and dispatch. Certainly people who have been threatened with violence in domestic situations, or indeed have reached the stage where charges have been laid, should not remain in terror or at risk and, therefore, if delays are caused through problems of the law or whatever they must be addressed.

I assure honourable members that the matter is being taken seriously. We have been working hard on it over a period of two to three years and, as far as the community in South Australia is concerned, we have a real determination to ensure that something is done about it.

PAGANA'S RESTAURANT

Mr ROBERTSON: Will the Minister of Transport, representing the Minister of Health in another place, undertake to investigate allegations that a young man suffering from muscular dystrophy was refused service in an Adelaide restaurant during the Adelaide Festival of Arts on the grounds of his disability? I have been informed that during the recently completed Festival of Arts a young visitor from Britain who suffers from muscular dystrophy was refused service at a Hindley Street restaurant. The gentleman in question is 27 years of age and timed his visit to Adelaide to coincide with the festival because of his great love for the arts.

The young man is a sculptor of some note in the UK and is known internationally for his work. He also runs his own art gallery in London. After one evening performance on Monday 17 March, he went with two friends to eat at Pagana's Restaurant at 101 Hindley Street, where a table had been booked. When one of the group asked to be shown to the table, the owner of the restaurant refused to serve them and asked them to leave. The young man in question, suspecting that his disability might be the cause of the owner's action, approached the owner and asked why the group had been refused service. The owner ignored his approaches and spoke to the young man's female companion, explaining that he did not want the group in the restaurant. He said, 'We can't have that thing eating here. It will put people off their food.' I ask that the incident be investigated and that steps are taken to ensure that such

discrimination should never again be allowed to spoil the reputation which we in this State have acquired—

The SPEAKER: The honourable Minister.

The Hon. G.F. KENEALLY: I thank the member for his question, which I will certainly convey to my colleague the Minister of Health for urgent investigation. I speak on behalf of all members of this House and on behalf of all South Australians when I express my great concern that any such incident should occur anywhere that would lead to allegations of this kind. One would trust that it is an isolated incident within the restaurant industry in South Australia, which, by and large, provides extremely good service, and which, one would hope, is open to people of all backgrounds and from whatever physical disability they may from time to time suffer.

I trust that our young visitor has been informed that such behaviour is very much foreign to the nature of South Australians and that he in all other respects during his visit here had a good time and that his view of South Australia has not been coloured by this experience. The circumstances that have been outlined by the member are of regret. I think we are all saddened by it and trust that the Minister is able to get to the bottom of the allegations and ensure that such circumstances will never again occur in a restaurant or business or in South Australia generally.

The SPEAKER: Call on the business of the day.

SITTINGS AND BUSINESS

The Hon. R.K. ABBOTT (Minister of Lands): I move: That the House at its rising adjourn until Tuesday 15 April at 2 p.m.

Motion carried.

SUMMARY OFFENCES ACT AMENDMENT BILL (No. 2)

Adjourned debate on second reading.
(Continued from 25 February. Page 517.)

Mr S.J. BAKER (Mitcham): This Bill, which is one of a number of Attorney-General's Bills before us this afternoon, relates to the detention of people under the age of 18 years. There was an assumption under the previous legislation that it would have included minors and that this provision was unwarranted. However, the detention of minors is covered specifically under this Bill. Further, it allows for a person known to the offender to be present at the time of the detention. The Opposition supports these provisions.

The Hon. G.J. CRAFTER (Minister of Education): I thank the Opposition for its indication of support for this Bill which, although a small measure, nevertheless deals with some important issues for children who appear before the courts in this State. I foreshadow to the House that I will be moving an amendment of which I have given the Opposition some notice. It is a minor amendment to allow for the administration of this measure to be brought in other than under the one proclamation. This is a matter which is quite common in legislation, and it has been decided that it is appropriate for the administration of this legislation that the provision be applied with respect to the whole Bill.

Bill read a second time.

In Committee.

Clause 1 passed.
Progress reported; Committee to sit again.

STATUTES AMENDMENT (CHILDREN'S BAIL) BILL

Adjourned debate on second reading.
(Continued from 25 February. Page 517.)

Mr S.J. BAKER (Mitcham): The Opposition supports this Bill and has no difficulty with any of the provisions. The issues have been canvassed in another place. The Bill allows normal bail provisions to properly operate in respect to minors and brings it into line with legislation dealing with adults.

The Hon. G.J. CRAFTER (Minister of Education): I thank the House for its support of this measure. I foreshadow an amendment to the Bill which will allow for a degree of flexibility in the administration of this measure, that is, to allow for it to be brought into effect by other than the single act of a proclamation.

Bill read a second time.

In Committee.

Clause 1 passed.

Clause 2—'Commencement.'

The Hon. G.J. CRAFTER: I move:

Page 1, after line 14, insert new subclause as follows:

(2) The Governor may, in a proclamation fixing a day for this Act to come into operation, suspend the operation of specified provisions of this Act until a subsequent day fixed in the proclamation, or a day to be fixed by subsequent proclamation.

This new subclause provides flexibility in the administration of this measure. I understand that specified provisions can be proclaimed. I assume that that will allow certain parts of a clause to be proclaimed, rather than the whole clause.

Amendment carried; clause as amended passed.

Clause 3—'Amendment of Bail Act 1985.'

Mr S.J. BAKER: In relation to paragraph (r) will the Minister explain the extension of the detention period from 12 noon to 4 p.m.? This may parallel other legislation in relation to the bail of adults, but when I looked through the Bill I was not able to satisfy myself that—and there was certainly no explanation provided in the second reading explanation—there was justification for the extension of the detention time.

The Hon. G.J. CRAFTER: Rather than make a guess at it, I will find out the precise information. I understand that this Bill should be read in conjunction with other legislation that has previously passed the House. The essence of it is to bring the Bill into line with other legislation applying to adult offenders.

Clause passed.

Clause 4 and title passed.

Bill read a third time and passed.

CHILDREN'S PROTECTION AND YOUNG OFFENDERS ACT AMENDMENT BILL

Adjourned debate on second reading.
(Continued from 19 February. Page 407.)

Mr S.J. BAKER (Mitcham): This Bill has more substance than the two previous Bills. It tidies up the provision dealing with homicide and brings it into line with provisions relating to attempting to commit homicide and making it the

same as homicide, which is the way the law is currently interpreted. It also includes a clause making unfit guardianship a ground on which a minor can be deemed to be in need of care. When trifling matters come before a court, the Bill provides that the court has jurisdiction to allow that those matters not be brought up in any court other than the Children's Court. This means that, if a child commits an offence, it is not brought up if and when the child becomes an adult and appears in an adult court.

The Bill provides for an increase in fines for specific offences; it allows for community work orders; it allows for the appointment of deputies in the case of the board and the committee; it obviates the need to actually serve a notice on a minor should there be a fear that the serving of a notice will allow the minor to abscond; it places further limitations on the publication of reports of charges to be laid; and it allows for the movement of 18 year olds to prison under certain conditions.

All these provisions are supported by the Opposition. We see some worthwhile reform here, particularly in relation to unfit guardianship. We recognise that the Act, as it currently stands, deals with neglect by parents. As such, one could have a very undesirable person being a guardian of a minor and, until that person committed an offence, there would be no way in which the court could deem that the child was in need of care. This provision is a positive amendment.

The Opposition finds it difficult to interpret what the Government means by trifling matters. However, I will question the Minister about that during the Committee stage. For the Government to allow community work orders to operate in relation to juveniles is a positive step in the right direction. I had assumed that community work orders were available under the existing terms of the Act, but according to this Bill that is not the case. I would like to take this opportunity, however, to say that the community work orders have been the subject of a great deal of rhetoric and very little action by the Government.

The Hon. G.J. Crafter: That is not so.

Mr S.J. BAKER: I did not raise it last year but I have received reports from people in the field regarding community work orders. I take the Minister's advice that it may not be so now, but I assure the Minister that in about June last year when I did a little research on this subject that the whole matter of community work orders was in the too hard basket. No community work orders were actually being conducted because there was a problem with supervision and with the organisation of the project. In fact, it was quite a farce. If the Minister is willing to assure me that the community work order scheme is now reaching the heights that were originally intended, I would be delighted to hear that.

The appointment of deputies is up to the Government, and the second reading explanation canvasses the fact that there have been a number of sicknesses and absences by board and committee members: we see no difficulty with that provision. My colleague raised the question about reporting of court proceedings. I do not intend to reiterate what he said. There has been concern for some time that less and less information is coming out of the court system. It is becoming what is classically called a closed shop. There is now some difficulty in obtaining information which many people believe should be made available in the public interest. In this area, however, the intention is quite clear: it is even less desirable to place a report of a charge than it is to talk about proceedings, so we support the amendment. However, the shadow Attorney has put on notice that he wishes the whole area to be reviewed.

The final item deals with the movement of 18 year olds from detention centres into prisons. Only experience of those people in the field can tell whether that is worth

while. At first sight I think it is desirable to get into a somewhat more secure environment those people who are causing problems in detention centres, and the Opposition supports that amendment.

The Hon. G.J. CRAFTER (Minister of Education): I thank the honourable member for his indication of the Opposition's support for this series of measures. As he has just told the House, this Bill gathers together a package of amendments which have come to the attention of the Government from a variety of sources. It is quite appropriate with legislation of this type that it be brought under regular review. It is innovative legislation, and it has proven to be highly successful.

I think that the overwhelming majority of young people who appear before our children's courts in this State do so only on the one occasion. The honourable member referred to the provision which allows for an appearance before the court not to be recorded as such where the offence is of a trifling or minor nature, and I understand that that is to bring the powers of the court in line with the juvenile aid panel appearances of young people. A young offender who appears before a juvenile aid panel, having admitted his guilt, is dealt with by a process of administration of the law outside of the formal Children's Court structure. Where an alleged offender chooses, for one reason or another, to have the matter heard before the Children's Court rather than to appear before juvenile aid panel, it is appropriate that that court should be empowered with the same range of orders that would apply if the child had appeared before a juvenile aid panel.

I think that the concerns raised by the Hon. Mr Griffin in another place were allayed by the explanation that was given by the Attorney. I reiterate that this is the same result as section 40a of the substantive Bill, which provides that an appearance of a child before a juvenile aid panel may not be referred to in a court other than a children's court. That was the explanation given when the Hon. Mr Griffin in the other place asked whether the order was a final order which could not be reviewed. The affirmative answer was given by the Attorney-General.

Dealing with the matter of community service orders, I think I should clarify for the record that these orders were regarded as innovative when initially established in this State, and they have been very successful indeed in the juvenile offenders area. I have seen many of these programs in operation across the State, and honourable members may recall the work done by young offenders in, I think, the township of Marree about 12 months ago, when they cleaned up a lot of debris and rubbish in that town, which has an important tourist component. The young offenders camped there for some time while they undertook that work program, which is of the design that is seen throughout South Australia, where there are many innovative programs for young offenders to provide some reparation to the community for their offences.

If the member is referring to adult community service orders, I think the progress has been slower than we would have all hoped in that regard. I think it is unfortunate that there is a practice in some jurisdictions that magistrates do not exercise that option on more occasions. However, the law there may need further reform to allow for that to happen. I have a program based in my own electorate of Norwood, and I have visited those operations and a number of the homes in my district where work has been carried out.

This program has considerable merit and, indeed, great potential. I hope that confidence in that method of sentencing will be gained by all those who work in the criminal justice system as time goes on. If there are legislative bar-

riers to that option of sentencing being applied, I hope that we can clarify that as soon as it is possible. The honourable member referred to the other provisions of this Bill which, as he says, are of importance and will provide for the better administration of justice in our children's courts.

Bill read a second time.

In Committee.

Clauses 1 to 5 passed.

Clause 6—'Powers of court on finding child guilty.'

Mr S.J. BAKER: Paragraph (a) refers to offences of a trifling nature. I am sure that we can all think of trifling offences. I have a question about how the courts interpret what constitutes a trifling offence. It is relative: you might say that a so-called serious offence was trifling compared to, say, murder. Have the courts demonstrated a capacity to interpret 'trifling' in the same way as do members of the Committee? It is an area where we are not quite determinate on what we are trying to achieve here, as it is all a matter of relativity.

Can the Minister, for example, provide examples of what he perceives as being trifling? It is accepted that the children's aid panels, rather than the courts system, deal with offenders. That was introduced in the early 1970s. I believe it is a system which has worked to the positive benefit of South Australia. There is a reason for matters of contention (charges) not going through the system, that is, because children's aid panels deal with less serious charges. They are there to mediate so that parents, police officers, community workers and offenders can get together and reach an agreement about future behaviour. They have worked well because they are in that sort of environment. Of course, if an agreement is broken, the children's courts come into operation. Can the Minister clarify this matter? I find it rather interesting because I cannot find a definition of 'trifling' in other legislation where matters are dealt with before the courts.

The Hon. G.J. CRAFTER: I cannot point to other legislation for the member where the word 'trifling' is used. It is certainly a matter that is raised almost daily in the courts of this State and, indeed, throughout the common law world. There are many minor offences before the courts where counsel for an accused person would argue that, while the person was guilty of the offence, under the Offenders Probation Act the offence was so trifling that no conviction should be recorded, and that that is the most appropriate way for the court to deal with the matter. That is often the result in shoplifting offences where a person is able to adduce evidence as to mental illness, sickness, old age or some other circumstance and, even though a plea of guilty has been entered, no conviction has been recorded. In a way, this is akin to that occurrence in the adult jurisdiction.

I suppose the mind can conjure up an enormous range of matters where children are involved, where most certainly an offence has been committed: the matter has been brought before the Children's Court but it is considered to be of a trifling nature. I refer, for example, to the stealing of an apple, swearing or some other offence. It is then up to the court to determine the circumstances of the matter and bring down an appropriate penalty upon proof of the offence being committed. It may well be, in the interests of the child's well-being, its rehabilitation and future chances in life, that the order under this provision is the most appropriate for the court to bring down. It would be an anomaly if that opportunity was not available to the court as it is for young offenders who appear before juvenile aid panels.

With respect to the judicial interpretation of 'trifling' there is a series of precedents at law to determine the meaning of that word and in what circumstances it should apply. Of course, every factual situation is different. It is

open to a magistrate or judge to apply the law to the circumstances before the court. The provision is always open to interpretation, but I think it is a reasonably certain word to use in legislation of this type.

Mr S.J. BAKER: I merely make this observation because I have noted a number of examples where courts have treated serious offences in a trifling manner in the way that they have handed down sentences. I wonder what the word 'trifling' means where a person who has eight convictions for serious offences is charged with a ninth serious assault and the judge determines that he should be given another suspended sentence. I leave that matter aside because it is not as pertinent to this clause as the Minister might believe.

My final question relates to work orders. I had assumed that work orders were already provided for and had been in existence previously. However, this provision now seems to make them official. Can the Minister explain whether they were legal in the past? Under section 51 of the parent Act the court was empowered to provide for a variety of outcomes, including work orders. Can the Minister inform the Committee whether what we have been doing in the past has been illegal?

The Hon. G.J. CRAFTER: No, we have not been doing things illegally in the past. This amendment empowers the court as follows: where it convicts and sentences a child to a period of detention and then suspends that sentence upon the child entering into a recognisance on condition that the child will be of good behaviour and enter into a work project or program, the court is not permitted to include participation in a work project as a condition of a recognisance unless the period of the suspended sentence is not more than four months and the court has received an assessment panel report recommending that such a condition (that is, a work project condition) is appropriate. When the court imposes a work project condition, first, the period in hours of participation in the project is determined by multiplying the number of days of detention under the suspended sentence by two; secondly, the child is not required to work for more than eight hours on one day; and, thirdly, the recognisance expires on completion by the child of participation in the project. The amendment really provides another instance in which a court can provide the work option for a young offender.

Clause passed.

Remaining clauses (7 to 14) and title passed.

Bill read a third time and passed.

JUSTICES ACT AMENDMENT BILL

Adjourned debate on second reading.

(Continued from 26 February. Page 608.)

Mr S.J. BAKER (Mitcham): Although the Opposition supports the Bill, I have some reservations about one aspect of it. It is well known that certain people face a number of difficulties when they have been fined by a court, whatever the offence. There are often difficulties involved in paying traffic fines. The Bill seeks to amend from three months to four months the period currently allowed for the service of a summons by post. I question whether the extension will not clog up the system further along the track without addressing the fundamental problem. However, I will make further remarks about this when speaking to the Summary Offences Act Amendment Bill (No. 3), where they will be more pertinent. As I have reservations also about some of the flow-on effects of that Bill, I will address them at the appropriate time.

Bill read a second time.

In Committee.

Clauses 1 and 2 passed.

Clause 3—'Service of summons by post.'

Mr S.J. BAKER: I am not sure, based on what the Attorney has said, that this amendment will be of assistance. Therefore, I seek from the Minister an undertaking that the Government will review the operation of the extension of the period of service of a summons. The system can be just as slack over four months as it can over three months. I want the Government to review the operation of this change to see whether any real improvement results. The more we extend such periods the greater the difficulty that will arise in respect of paperwork, and the greater the likelihood that there will be some backlog in the system.

The Minister would be aware that, if a system turns itself around weekly, it is much more efficient than one that turns itself around over two weeks: the experience of those involved is closer to hand, and there is no loss of memory involved. Although the Opposition supports the amendment, it seems to be exacerbating the problem rather than solving it.

The Hon. G.J. CRAFTER: I thank the honourable member for his interest in the matter, and I will make sure that his comment is brought to the attention of the Attorney, who can then perhaps refer it to the appropriate authorities for some ongoing review of the situation. Obviously, the present situation is the result of malpractices that have developed over a period, and I believe it will be monitored from time to time. However, I will make sure that this matter is brought to the Attorney's attention.

Clause passed.

Title passed.

Bill read a third time and passed.

SUMMARY OFFENCES ACT AMENDMENT BILL (No. 3)

Adjourned debate on second reading.

(Continued from 26 February. Page 609.)

Mr S.J. BAKER (Mitcham): The Opposition supports this Bill, which deals with four basic matters. One is the extension of time to pay from 28 days to two months. The Bill clarifies the situation and makes administration somewhat simpler in the case of driving breaches which attract traffic infringement notices and which are accompanied by other driving breaches. For example, I refer to a person driving without a licence or driving in contravention of the conditions of a licence, whether it involves, for example, a learner's permit, a P plate or an ordinary licence, where both the notice and the offence are involved.

As the law stands, the situation is that if a person has expiated a notice police have to repay the expiation fee that has been paid and then take the total matter to court. That is crazy, and administratively this change will make the position easier for the police. The Bill also deals with multiple offences at the same time, and clarifies the situation of a person who has met his or her commitment in regard to the expiation fee, with the Police Commissioner proceeding with other similar offences at the same time.

I congratulate the Government on the amendment to section 76 which deals with the situation of people committing offences on private property. Previously, there was a limitation on the powers of arrest available to the person citing that offender. It is now possible for not only the principal but also the principal's employees to take the appropriate action in such circumstances.

I make the same observations as I made about the extension of time. Certainly, I am well aware that going back about 10 years Adelaide Gaol was full of people who could

not pay their fines. The situation has improved out of sight since then, but there are still the same problems: what do we do when someone says that he cannot afford to pay or refuses to pay his fine? We have not addressed properly the non-payment of fines. Community work order schemes and other instruments may well be the answer and, rather than putting people in gaol for a few days at Her Majesty's pleasure, we should be able to get them to work off their fine, just as people do who visit a restaurant but who do not have enough money to pay their bill.

The traditional means of payment was to wash a few dishes, and we might adopt a similar principle in these circumstances. The extension of this time may help a few people. Alternatively, however, human nature being what it is, some people may delay the payment of the debt because they have more time to pay. Psychologically, if a bill is due in a short while, I usually pay it on time. However, in the case of council rates three months notice is given, so I often forget until the last day that I must pay the bill. The provision may give people more time to save money to pay a fine, but a few people may default because they overlook it, and the system could become administratively worse.

Generally speaking, I commend the Government for the changes made by the Bill, especially those that make it easier for the police to collect traffic infringement fines and those concerning the powers of employees to look after the property of their employers. I suggest that the matter of extending the time for the payment of fines must receive more attention than it appears to have received, although it may well have been researched thoroughly before this legislation was introduced. However, I do not believe that that provision will solve any problems; it will simply accentuate existing problems.

The Hon. G.J. CRAFTER (Minister of Education): I thank the Opposition for its support of the measure, but I do not share the pessimism expressed by the member for Mitcham concerning it. The Bill amends the Summary Offences Act 1953 so as to achieve a more efficient method of dealing with breaches of prescribed offences under section 64 of that Act and, indeed, a better measure of justice for offenders under that section. As the honourable member said, it does that in certain ways. It is true that far too many persons are imprisoned today as a result of their inability to pay fines or in relation to other matters concerning their poverty. In a small way this Bill acknowledges that and allows for an additional period of time in which to pay such fines.

Bearing in mind that there is now a substantial number of persons who receive infringement notices of this kind each year in South Australia, this measure will be welcomed by those who are helping persons in this position and who are often helping financially in this respect. I draw to the attention of members the fact that the Attorney-General is currently considering legislation that would allow for fines to be levied according to an offender's means and his inability to pay. This situation successfully applies in some other countries. It is a matter that the House could consider in the future. In other respects, this legislation clarifies and improves the operation of this important provision.

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

RACING ACT AMENDMENT BILL

Returned from the Legislative Council without amendment.

[Sitting suspended from 4.24 to 5.7 p.m.]

STATUTES AMENDMENT (CHILDREN'S BAIL) BILL

The Legislative Council intimated that it had agreed to the House of Assembly's amendment.

ADJOURNMENT

The Hon. G.F. KENEALLY (Minister of Transport): I move:

That the House do now adjourn.

Mr LEWIS (Murray Mallee): I think it is disgusting that this motion should be put to the House at this time. We have not tried to end the debate on the Address in Reply, even though it is only 5.7 on Tuesday afternoon. I and many of my colleagues have been called here at considerable expense to the taxpayer to attend a sitting of Parliament and, in doing so, we have had to set aside a day which has been nothing more than an occasion to deal with what might be described as the rats and mice of legislation.

The staff of Parliament have been called back today, again at considerable expense to the taxpayer, to do the same thing: simply to deal with rats and mice matters for the convenience of the Government. I think that is deplorable. Not only is it an insult to the Governor that we do not complete the Address in Reply debate: it is also an insult to the taxpayers of South Australia and to the intelligence of thinking members. That the Government can use its numbers to behave in this way is disgusting. All Government members who wanted to say something either in support of or in opposition to what His Excellency said during the course of his remarks in his Address to Parliament had their say, but members of the Opposition—

Mrs Appleby: That's not true.

Mr LEWIS: If it is not true, then the solution is in the hands of the honourable member, who is the Whip. Were it not so, there is no reason whatever why we could not continue this evening and conclude the Address in Reply—no reason at all! We were given to understand that we were being recalled this week for a normal week's sitting. I realise that what little information we are given from time to time is certainly insufficient, but at least on this occasion we were told that we could expect a full day's sitting. I do not know what Government backbenchers are really doing if they allow the head prefect and the vice-captain of their outfit to run them in the fashion that the Government Whip has suggested and in the fashion that the vice-captain suggested that I should conduct myself this afternoon.

I am a member of this House, the same as every other honourable member, the whole 49 of us, and to be told by the person who is ostensibly in charge of the business of the House that agreements made can be broken at less than a minute's notice and that I should consult some other member to find out why, when I know that, in the course of that agreement being broken, no exchange has taken place between himself, the Deputy Premier, and the other member to whom I suggested I should address my inquiries is I think the height of arrogance and impudence.

Mrs Appleby interjecting:

Mr LEWIS: Certainly, and I refer to the incident at the conclusion of the speeches the Government Ministers made in the form of ministerial statements, about matters upon which they considered themselves to be sensitively exposed to public scrutiny at Question Time, prior to Question Time, when it took Government Ministers an unprecedented half an hour to get through their business before we could begin Question Time. I was appalled by that piece of behaviour.

Members may well ask why I would want to participate in the Address in Reply. Not only is it a matter of tradition that has been denied me, but it is the only opportunity I will have between 7 December and August sometime—and based on the precedent of this truncation of the Address in Reply debate it is no certainty that I will get an opportunity in August—to ostensibly or prospectively have an opportunity to say anything about the enormous problems that confront the people I represent. All those problems are a direct result of inaction of the Government of this House and this Parliament, or the Government in Canberra or, conversely, the actions taken by this Government in this Parliament or in Canberra. They are not problems which have arisen as a consequence of any natural phenomena or disaster, and they are not problems as a consequence of any incompetence of any of my constituents. They are problems directly visited upon them by the action or inaction of the Government. I think therefore that, as I said at the outset of my remarks, it is disgusting.

Let me give members some instances. We have a situation whereby farmers are faced with falling commodity prices the like of which they have never had to face before, when, at the same time as those commodity prices are falling, they are automatically locked into cost price increases that they cannot avoid in any circumstances. Those cost increases of the commodities they use in the course of their production cycle, growing or producing whatever it is they get from their farms, are the direct result of the ratchet effect on the wage fixing policies introduced and supported by this Government and this Labor Party, in South Australia and federally. They are locked in and can do nothing about it. Moreover, this Government and the Government in Canberra have now introduced this ratchet effect on taxation, taxation of so many kinds—

An honourable member: How do you spell that?

Mr LEWIS: 'R-a-t-c-h-e-t'—and there are other ways I would prefer it to be spelt and understood in the course of the remarks I am making to the House now. Let it be well understood by members opposite that it is the kind of thing that I am referring to that are causing those people to face enormous levels of stress and distress.

Only recently, and quite surreptitiously, the Deputy Premier—the man who attempted to insult me this afternoon by sending me to see the deputy head prefect, or something—in the course of his responsibilities in his own department made a decision, and endorsed the implementation of that decision, not to further process any applications for land clearance under the native vegetation clearance control legislation that we have in this State.

No further applications from anyone in my electorate will be processed by that department. No explanation was given to farmers—not at all. What is more, they are waiting to find out what their lot will be, having put in their applications to the department, before they go to see their bank managers to try to arrange the credit that they need to begin preparation of this year's crop seedbeds, and arranging their lines of credit for the seed, fertiliser and fuel that will be expended over the next three or four months, depending on when the opening rains come—if they come.

God help this country if we have a drought this coming year. We will see the kind of economic recession the like of which we have never seen since this State was first founded as a colony, and we have had some pretty horrific recessions and depressions during last century, the most recent of which in the '30s was by no means the worst. Given the kinds of economic circumstances that the Government is creating for itself by its policies, its actions and inactions to which I have referred, it is making a rod for its own back and for this country's back. We face horrific consequences if that eventuates. I want to know why the

Minister chose to decide simply to not continue with the processing of any more applications for native vegetation clearance on the farms, those few areas that still have remnant native vegetation.

As I have said before and I say again, I am not opposed to the retention of remnant native vegetation, but the Government should not by stealth require those poor unfortunate individuals who own land on which native vegetation is growing to carry the can, especially in circumstances where they do not even know whether or not their applications will be considered, let alone when they will be considered.

Also, the Government has \$1 million in the kitty to pay out as compensation under the terms of the legislation that we passed in this House late last year. However, it has only processed and paid out compensation to two people. It has neither publicised the fact that it has the money available nor advised people eligible to obtain it that it is obtainable if they apply for it. It is the most poorly publicised scheme that the Government has ever had the gall to promote. There are other problems that confront my constituents. They are those of, say, the schoolchildren, about which I would have liked to say something, and also the international markets for our commodities that I went to study specially during the post Christmas break. That is something I have not had time—

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

Mr LEWIS: —to speak about.

The SPEAKER: Order! The honourable member will cease his deliberations when he is called upon to do so by the Chair, and when his time has expired.

Mr TYLER (Fisher): I would like to take this opportunity to talk about one of the important matters affecting the people of my electorate and the people of the southern area in general. In my maiden speech I said there were four matters that I was aiming to promote to the House. The first was to achieve the best possible physical and social environment for the people of my electorate. I said that I would pay particular attention to the area of transport, where it was my aim to promote the provision of safe, convenient and economical transport. The second concerned community protection. The third concerned development in the areas of health and welfare, so as to promote physical and social wellbeing. The fourth was to promote and strive for positive economic growth.

In this 10 minute adjournment debate I would like to talk about the first of these issues; that is, the effect of transport. In doing so, I would like to strike a contrast between the positive and realistic policies which the Bannon Government put forward at the last election and which differed dramatically from the negative and opportunistic policies of the Liberal Party.

The Liberal Party went to the election with a platform of building the north-south corridor. I want to briefly explain, particularly for the benefit of the member for Bragg, who has just walked into the Chamber, that a corridor is not a road, but a parcel of land on which a road or highway is constructed. Nevertheless, I understood that the Liberal Party's proposal meant that they would build a north-south road or a north-south freeway.

The first part of their proposal, namely, to build a road from Sturt Road to Reynella, was sheer plagiarism, for the Government announced in early 1984 that it would construct that vital road link for the southern suburbs. That road will cost some \$50 million, and it is hoped that construction of the road will have begun by the year 1990. That freeway will bypass the infamous Darlington bottleneck.

All the remaining transport policy initiatives of the Liberal Party were stolen from the Government's working party report established by the then Minister of Transport in 1983.

Mrs Appleby interjecting:

Mr TYLER: As the member for Hayward has said, the Liberal Party was going to do what we had already started. Further, I point out that on 3 December 1985 *Advertiser* transport writer, Stuart Innes, referring to the Liberals' 32-page policy, stated that 'in a few instances it promised to do work already announced or, indeed, already started by the Labor Government'. The only new policy promoted by the Liberal Party was to build a road north of Sturt Road through the western suburbs and ripping the heart out of places such as Mitchell Park, Edwardstown and Ascot Park.

Mr Ingerson interjecting:

Mr TYLER: This was promoted in an airy-fairy sort of way with very vague timetables and costing details. As a result, it seemed to the people in the southern area and the western districts that the former member for Davenport, who was shadow Minister at the time, was trying to have a bob each way. He said that the road would cost some \$200 million. We know where he got his costing from, and that was from a report produced for the former Minister of Transport and member for Torrens, Michael Wilson, in 1981, in which reference was made to the road costing \$200 million to \$250 million—and that was in 1981. For the former member for Davenport to have talked about \$200 million for a road in 1985-86 was quite misleading and downright irresponsible.

Mr Ingerson interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order! The member for Fisher will be heard in silence, particularly as the Chair is extremely interested in this contribution.

Mr TYLER: Thank you, Mr Speaker. Many people have criticised the Liberal Party's proposal for a north-south arterial link, and some people, like me, have claimed that it is from the dinosaur age: a road, a freeway concept, that was developed in the 1960s for Adelaide, based on the 1950s freeway system in the United States, which will not be relevant by the turn of the century. I noticed a refreshing form of honesty from the member for Bragg quoted in the *Eastern Suburbs Messenger* of 12 February, as follows:

Mr Ingerson said his shadow transport portfolio pitted him against senior Labor Minister Gavin Keneally, who had 'been around for a long time'. Mr Keneally was the Labor Party's 'Mr Fix It' and was given the transport portfolio in 1985, he claimed. Mr Ingerson said, 'I'll enjoy keeping the Minister on his toes.'

Mr Keneally is taking the portfolio off the front page. It's up to me to put it back there'.

Mr Ingerson said he would not be a controversial shadow Minister for the sake of being controversial. He said, 'But if the Minister has to be taken to task, then obviously I'll do that.' He said he had a far greater knowledge of recreation than transport because he had written the Liberal Party's sport and recreation policy for last December's State election.

I like the honesty. Everyone in the House knows that the honourable member knows nothing about sport and recreation, so God only knows what he knows about transport. To highlight this fact he concluded by saying:

Transport issues this year would include the north-south corridor.

Obviously the member for Bragg, has not talked to his colleague the member for Hanson, whose comments were referred to in the *Westside* of 18 December 1985, as follows:

Mr Becker said he would also be calling on the Liberal Party to scrap both the privatisation policy and the north-south transport corridor plan. 'In my opinion they cost us the election', he said. The north-south corridor plan made the seat of Walsh—

and you, Mr Speaker, would be interested to know this—virtually unwinable and it didn't get the expected support from the southern seats. The Liberal Party would be foolish to follow through these policies after the result of the election.

The member for Bragg probably has not been reading the *Messenger* newspapers. In an article in the *Advertiser* of 8 January it was stated:

Mr Becker said he was frustrated by the way the Party came up with policies that were contrary to the mood of the people. 'Privatisation was just not on; you could never sell it in a million years', he said. 'The proposal for the north-south corridor cost us thousand of votes.'

Mr Ingerson interjecting:

Mr TYLER: The criticism does not stop there. For the information of the member for Bragg, I am trying to help him, Mr Speaker. He should come into this place very well briefed on transport (but that has not occurred so far) otherwise the Minister of Transport will use him as a mat. I am trying to help him. The *News* editorial of 27 February 1984, under the heading 'Traffic in words', stated:

Politicians traffic in one commodity, words, frequently to the exclusion of realities and the evidence of their eyes. State Opposition transport spokesman, Mr Brown, is waxing indignant over scrapping of the north-south freeway plan, citing a leaked report.

Even with projected population growth around Morphett Vale, the notion of such colossal expenses—\$240 million—cannot be justified. Mr Brown may be looking to future problems, but he is proposing yesterday's solutions.

One of the problems of the north-south corridor is that, although it was always seen as a pie in the sky solution for planners and, I suppose, politicians such as Mr Brown and unfortunately the member for Bragg, they could always look to—

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order!

Mr TYLER: This proposal was always seen as pie in the sky and a panacea by politicians such as Mr Brown and the member for Bragg. They could look to the corridor and say, 'We are doing something for the south. We have an option of a north-south corridor.'

We must come up with new initiatives, have an imagination, and look to the future with vision. That is where the Liberal Party has demonstrated that it is sadly lacking. This Government has decided to look to the transport needs of metropolitan Adelaide and particularly the southern suburbs. I completely agree with the Bannon Government's proposal that it is no good hanging on to the 1960s concept when looking to the twenty-first century. If we followed the MATS plan that the former member for Davenport proposed we would have seen massive disruption in the construction stage—not for just five years but for 15 years.

One of the reasons why the Liberal Party did so badly in the recent State election, as the member for Hanson has stated, is that the Party was not believed. No one believed that on the one hand a Liberal Government could cut taxes and reduce this and that, as well as having small government, and then on the other hand spend in excess of \$200 million. The Liberal Party was just not believed—and it should not have been believed.

Mr S.G. EVANS (Davenport): I take this opportunity to express my deepest regrets on the passing of Lady Playford this afternoon. Most of us in this activity would realise that the partner of any person in public life, especially the partner of a politician, carries a big load, which requires many sacrifices. There is no doubt that, over the years in which Sir Thomas Playford was a prominent politician in this State and a leader, Lady Playford carried a load, and at the same time she was a lady in the way in which she operated within the community. I believe that her passing will be of deep regret to the vast majority of South Australians, particularly those who knew her.

The other matters that I wish to raise I will leave for a moment to pick up the points the member for Fisher was making. He was going to tell us what the ALP was going to

do about southern transport. In fact, he attacked the statements of a lot of other people and did not tell us anything they were going to do. When one looks at the past record of the Labor Party, which has been in government for 15 of the past 20 years, it is quite obvious that all the problems down south that have been allowed to grow larger and stronger, to the inconvenience of the public, are the ALP's responsibility, and the ALP should take the blame.

There are still buses down there into which people are packed like sardines, and the drivers are told to pack them in like sardines. There are still inadequate bus services and inadequate public transport throughout the south. In that time the ALP have had members such as Lenehan, Tyler, Hudson, Virgo and Appleby, all supposed to be representing the south, and now they say that the public transport is inadequate. Whose fault is it? They know whose fault it is. If the Member for Fisher publishes his speech the people will see that it is a knocking speech. Nothing is stated about what they will do. There will be not one more bus; the buses are still overcrowded; the services are still inadequate; and so it will be.

On Kalyra Road, Belair, the buses are so badly underpowered that they do not make the gradient. People have to walk to the top of the hill to ring their homes. Young people coming home from high school have to ring home and say, 'Mum and Dad, we are stuck up at Belair. Come and pick us up (from Blackwood, Glenalta, Hawthorndene or wherever) because the bus did not make the gradient again.'

This has been going on week after week. They put the junk in the hills—as they do with the water—and say, 'Those people are second-rate citizens and we will not give them a decent bus service. We will not even give them a bus that can get up the hill.' That is happening day after day, particularly on hot days.

I want to pick up the point made by the member for Murray Mallee and, at the same time, mention what Sir Mark Oliphant had to say, as reported in today's *Advertiser*. How can we justify our actions in this place when we sit at the most for only 14 days in nine months—14 days in 270-odd? From early November through to August we will sit for 14 days.

Members interjecting:

Mr S.G. EVANS: That was when Parliament sat under the same philosophy as the ALP is now espousing in sitting for 14 days in 270.

Sir Mark Oliphant tells us that the public has lost faith in us. It does not matter: somebody wins, because they have no choice. He has told us that the political Party is all powerful and the individual has gone from Parliament—and that is true. An example is the Address in Reply as suggested by the member for Murray Mallee. We are not allowed to debate it. We are not allowed to get up in a new Parliament and express our views about problems in our electorate or the problems into which we see our State heading.

We are denied that opportunity by a Government that is power hungry. There is no shortage of days: there are plenty of days on which to sit. Before 6 o'clock on a Tuesday, when we normally sit on Tuesday, Wednesday and Thursday, we are going home and we will not come back until late July. That is a joke! It is an insult to those people who elect us. On top of that, I gave Parliament the opportunity to accept the challenge to give a guarantee that we would sit for 80 days a year and it was refused, yet people talk about hard working politicians! How can we bring up matters that concern our electorate if the Parliament does not sit?

Somebody will say, 'Write a letter to the Minister.' I have just got from one Minister an answer to a letter written last

October. If I had not been re-elected, I would not have got an answer. I am getting answers from Ministers to letters from the previous member for Davenport which were not answered in the previous Parliament. I have had to ring the Premier's Department to get an answer to a letter written when land tax was due in January, and it took three telephone calls before we looked like getting the answer early next week. We will not get it on Monday, because that is a public holiday.

The person concerned is an elderly man who owes a debt he cannot afford to pay. He wants it added to his estate as a debt against the property when he passes on, and he is waiting for a reply, under the threat that, if he does not pay, he has to pay a fine or go to gaol. (That is what it says on the bottom of the note). It is a great life! So, it is no good writing letters. In the main, unless you can get to the Minister personally and explain the urgency of the matter, you cannot get a response quickly enough.

Parliament is the place we should be able to come as members to express a viewpoint. We should have enough time for private members to express a viewpoint by way of introduction of a Bill or motion. The Government is not the be all and end all of what Parliament is: it was never intended that way. We should take note of what Oliphant said because, if we asked people in the street whether they think we are a mob of rabble, from what they know of Federal Parliament and from the bickering they pick up from the media, I think that is how they would see us.

I make a point about the media. No doubt the image parliamentarians carry is created largely by the media, which looks only for stirring issues and those upon which there is division. Whether they be Labor, Liberal or National Party members, if they want to express a viewpoint different from their Party overall but still vote with their Party the media will not let them do it without condemning them, saying that there is a split in the Party. That is irresponsible reporting. The press must get around to saying that it is healthy for the Parliament for an individual to express a viewpoint different from that of most of the Party whilst voting with the Party because of a consensus view. That is a responsible way for a Parliament to operate. I hope that the day comes when our Parliament is seen that way, and the condemnation which many people hold for us and which was expressed by Sir Mark Oliphant will disappear if we get that attitude across. We can never expect 24 or more men and women to agree entirely on an issue, but we can expect them in the end to vote the same way if we are to have a Government that operates.

I think we should make that point as often as we can as parliamentarians because, in the end, the message will get across. A healthy Parliament and a healthy Party is one in which individuals have some freedom. If we do not, we will have the situation of which Sir Mark Oliphant speaks. We should make ourselves well aware of that situation. No doubt the electorate is concerned that we do not sit often. No doubt it is concerned that we seem to be all powerful to ourselves, whether as individuals or as Parties. The challenge should be with us.

To suggest that we not come back to this place until August, except for one day in June, is a joke. Most of the work in the electorate offices can be handled by a capable electorate secretary. Much electorate work needs to be done by the individual, but it can also be done from within this place to a degree, although not in total. We have to accept that. Not many years ago there were no electorate offices. Fewer than 20 years ago one typist serviced five members of Parliament with typing and calls. They succeeded and represented the State well, and on average those parliamen-

tarians were held in greater regard than we are in servicing their electorates.

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

Motion carried.

At 5.38 p.m. the House adjourned until Tuesday 15 April at 2 p.m.

HOUSE OF ASSEMBLY

Tuesday 25 March 1985

QUESTIONS ON NOTICE

ELECTRICITY TARIFFS

6. **Mr BECKER** (on notice) asked the Minister of Mines and Energy: Did the Consumers' Association of South Australia Inc. meet with the Minister in June 1983 seeking a price freeze of electricity tariffs pending an independent inquiry and if so, did the Minister promise a reply to the association within two or three weeks following the deputation and, if so, what was his response and if he has not responded, why not?

The Hon. R.G. PAYNE: Yes. A formal reply was not sent to the association. However, they were advised at the meeting that a price freeze of electricity tariffs was not possible as the Government was bound by the agreement entered into by the former Liberal Government which guaranteed substantial gas price increases to the Cooper Basin producers from 1982 to 1985.

COOPER BASIN ROYALTIES

7. **Mr BECKER** (on notice) asked the Treasurer:

1. How much does it cost annually to collect royalty payments from the Cooper Basin producers?

2. How many persons are employed supervising and collecting the royalty payments and where are they located?

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

1. A precise figure cannot be given as it involves a number of senior officers on a part-time basis from both the Mines and Energy and Treasury Departments.

2. See (1.) above.

WEST TERRACE CEMETERY

35. **Mr BECKER** (on notice) asked the Minister of Transport, representing the Minister of Local Government: What

plans are there and when is it proposed to clean up and beautify the older sections of West Terrace Cemetery and, in particular, the Catholic section?

The Hon. G.F. KENEALLY: In the late 1970s, in conjunction with the West Terrace Cemetery Committee, a master plan was developed for the upgrading of the cemetery. The plan allowed for long-term redevelopment including tree planting, linking of historic grave sites with all-weather paving blocks, and the day-to-day maintenance of lawn mowing and weed control. This plan has been progressively implemented within the available funding allocations.

For the member's information, a sum of \$60 000 has been set aside in this year's budgets to continue the program of memorial restoration which has been undertaken during the past two years. Unfortunately, in October 1985 the cemetery's graves were attacked by vandals with subsequent damage to various sections, including the Catholic area. Subsequently, the security branch and the police were consulted and extra patrols and surveillance were provided. The South Australian Department of Housing and Construction will continue to implement the upgrading program, undertake day-to-day maintenance, and provide protection where necessary to all sections of this important cemetery.

GOVERNMENT HOSPITALS DRUGS

38. **Mr BECKER** (on notice) asked the Minister of Transport, representing the Minister of Health:

1. What was the individual amount and total cost of drugs purchased for each Government hospital and institution under the South Australian Health Commission or Minister's control for the year ended 30 June 1985?

2. How do these figures compare with the previous two financial years and what are the reasons for any variation?

3. Are the cost effectiveness controls implemented by hospitals and institutions satisfactory and, if not, why not?

The Hon. G.F. KENEALLY: The replies are as follows:

1.	1982-83 \$	1983-84 \$	1984-85 \$	Var %
Western Sector—				
Andamooka	2 326	2 999	3 314	42.4
Bishop Kirkby	2 184	2 848	2 909	33.2
Central Eyre Peninsula	5 561	5 601	7 255	30.5
Cleve	25 538	20 568	25 496	-0.2
Cooper Pedy	13 177	7 672	12 746	-3.3
Cowell	11 547	11 415	12 051	4.4
Cummins	10 178	8 716	10 803	6.1
Elliston	4 597	4 646	5 145	11.9
Great Northern	9 087	4 893	3 235	-64.4
Kangaroo Island	15 450	14 686	18 721	21.2
Kimba	8 846	11 810	11 474	29.7
Leigh Creek South	7 472	7 693	11 967	60.2
Maitland	13 705	14 872	16 214	18.3
Marree	4 044	6 519	5 902	45.9
Minlaton	10 562	12 978	15 109	43.1
Murat Bay	29 614	35 305	34 403	16.2
Oodnadatta	4 702	5 164	3 165	-32.7
Port Augusta	88 714	94 483	118 013	33.0
Port Broughton	11 442	10 850	14 785	29.2
Port Lincoln	67 392	72 920	97 223	44.3
The Queen Elizabeth	2 607 881	3 278 318	3 474 338	33.2
Quorn	7 768	7 887	9 264	19.3
Saint Margaret's	10 070	7 326	6 896	-31.5
Southern Yorke Peninsula	12 722	12 703	14 498	14.0
Streaky Bay	9 438	6 953	6 932	-26.6
Tarcoola	2 254	3 843	2 866	27.2

	1982-83 \$	1983-84 \$	1984-85 \$	Var %
Tumby Bay	12 142	13 078	15 676	29.1
Walleroo	23 423	29 272	27 108	15.7
Whyalla	202 625	237 284	237 067	17.0
Total	3 234 461	3 953 302	4 224 575	
Southern Sector—				
Flinders Medical Centre	2 018 723	2 251 439	2 602 286	28.9
Kalyra	24 086	24 601	27 271	13.2
Torrens House	2 226	2 364	1 651	-25.8
Barmera	31 334	34 338	31 635	0.9
Berni	29 303	31 892	30 578	4.4
Bordertown	26 296	26 213	33 113	25.9
Karoonda	4 023	4 702	4 534	12.7
Kingston	7 119	6 695	6 097	-14.4
Lameroo	8 993	3 335	7 111	-20.9
Lower Murray	15 015	14 890	16 320	8.7
Loxton	23 673	22 964	25 505	7.7
Mannum	13 287	15 390	13 750	3.5
Meningie	12 354	20 094	14 925	20.8
Millicent	23 569	20 053	20 455	-13.2
Mt Barker	15 910	8 095	11 096	-30.3
Mt Gambier	112 834	123 651	155 129	37.5
Murray Bridge	35 489	38 448	44 576	25.6
Naracoorte	43 283	45 055	57 293	32.4
Onkaparinga	8 109	9 355	10 173	25.5
Penola	3 971	5 119	5 543	39.6
Pinnaroo	6 206	5 841	11 029	77.7
Renmark	21 214	20 644	20 796	-1.9
South Coast	19 627	22 023	27 318	39.2
Southern Districts	26 934	29 260	27 061	0.5
Strathalbyn	14 174	17 072	17 559	23.9
Waikerie	20 778	19 442	24 172	16.3
Glenside	127 560	144 897	127 851	0.2
Child Adolescent & Family Health Service	1 961	153	29	-98.5
Mt Gambier Extended Care	218	n.a.	n.a.	—
Christies Beach CHC	2	n.a.	n.a.	—
Carramar Clinic	n.a.	n.a.	13 247	—
Total	2 698 270	2 970 027	3 388 104	
Central Sector—				
ACH	1 304 227	1 377 651	1 675 928	28.5
QVH	282 628	338 301	354 457	25.4
RAH	4 144 460	4 399 567	4 475 455	7.9
Hampstead Centre	61 203	57 718	98 735	61.3
Lyell McEwin	319 199	370 500	396 323	24.2
Modbury	499 477	556 339	657 395	31.6
Angaston	14 219	19 181	20 533	44.4
Balaklava	15 476	17 648	16 613	7.4
Blyth	6 852	9 375	13 319	94.4
Booleroo	6 699	8 094	8 574	28.0
Burra	16 095	16 963	17 277	7.3
Clare	17 739	21 492	24 159	36.2
Crystal Brook	9 486	9 691	9 854	3.9
Eudunda	10 796	13 505	12 658	17.3
Gumeracha	6 752	5 794	12 074	78.8
Hutchinson	35 135	48 041	49 749	41.6
Jamestown	13 297	15 344	18 961	42.6
Kapunda	14 888	13 580	14 519	-2.5
Laura	7 020	6 098	8 244	17.4
Mt Pleasant	9 580	11 173	13 517	41.0
Orroroo	11 402	8 844	11 376	-0.2
Peterborough	14 780	13 583	17 434	18.0
Pt Pirie	100 669	113 492	113 486	12.7
Riverton	10 905	11 337	15 944	46.2
Snowtown	7 263	9 614	7 855	8.2
Tanunda	5 991	6 550	6 640	10.8
Hillcrest	187 016	209 656	222 309	18.9
Strathmont and Intellectually Disabled Services Council	97 739	90 812	108 389	10.9
Hampstead Nursing Home	31 529	31 079	53 165	68.6
Ru Rua	24 215	24 272	22 628	-6.6
Magill Home	n.a.	n.a.	1 536	—
South Australian Dental Services	21 283	18 196	11 414	-46.4
Eastern Regional Geriatric and Medical Rehabilitation Service	26	n.a.	86	230.8
St Corantyn	n.a.	n.a.	3 631	—
Total	7 308 046	7 853 490	8 494 237	
State Total	13 240 777	14 776 819	16 106 916	

2. For details of variations for each hospital/health unit see response to part (1). The percentage variation is calculated using 1982/83 as the base year.

The majority of variations are due wholly or in part to the following:

- inflation increase
- hospitals with small numbers of approved beds and low occupancy rates (e.g. Andamooka)—any variation in number of admissions has a large effect on drug usage
- fluctuations in occupied bed days, admissions
- change in doctors resulting in change in preferred treatment method
- fluctuations in case mix, e.g. number of acute type patients and high dependency patients
- fluctuations in number of operations performed
- fluctuations in surgical procedures
- introduction of new services
- timing differences in the payment cycle.

3. Except where previously stated variations in the cost of drugs over the financial years in question have been maintained at an acceptable level.

ETSA BOARD

43. **Mr BECKER** (on notice) asked the Minister of Mines and Energy:

1. Why has a woman not been appointed to the ETSA board?
2. Will such an appointment be made and if so, when?
3. When will a consumer be appointed to the board?

The Hon. R.G. PAYNE:

1. Consideration is given to all persons with relevant experience, regardless of sex, for appointment to the board when a vacancy occurs.
2. See (1) above.
3. See (1) above.

ELECTRO-CONVULSIVE THERAPY

45. **Mr BECKER** (on notice) asked the Minister of Transport representing the Minister of Health: Does the Government propose to hold a public inquiry into the use of electro-convulsive therapy in psychiatric hospitals and, if so, when and, if not, why not?

The Hon. G.F. KENEALLY: A national study into the use of electro-convulsive therapy is to be conducted by Dr J. Carson of the Victorian Health Commission. South Australia has agreed to participate fully in the study. There are no major studies currently planned in South Australia on the use of electro-convulsive therapy. The use of this treatment is monitored on an on-going basis by each facility in which it is given.

MINISTER'S REPLY

48. **Mr BECKER** (on notice) asked the Minister of Community Welfare: When will the Minister reply to correspondence from the member for Hanson of 26 June and what is the reason for delay?

The Hon. J.R. CORNWALL: The member was replied to on 16 November 1985.

ENGINEERING CONFERENCES

51. **Mr BECKER** (on notice) asked the Minister of Mines and Energy: Does ETSA sponsor speakers at engineering

conferences and, if so, why and at what cost for the years ended 30 June 1983 to 1985, respectively?

The Hon. R.G. PAYNE: Occasionally, where the Institution of Engineers Australia has brought speakers of international repute to Australia, the Electricity Trust has met, or shared, the actual costs of enabling the speakers to talk with trust engineers, where their special expertise is of relevance to trust activities.

Professor W. Walker, Head of the Administrative Staff College at Mt Eliza, is to address the 1986 National Conference of the Institution of Engineers and it is expected that he will also be available to address trust officers on management matters during the course of the conference. Although he is not an overseas speaker, he is of international standing, and he will be assisted by a contribution of \$1 000.

The Electricity Trust did not sponsor any speakers from June 1983 to 1985. However, if a particular speaker who was in the State for other purposes went to a country town to address ETSA officers, travel costs and meals would have been covered for this part of their visit. It is not possible to identify these minor expenses without considerable and unwarranted effort.

MAGILL AND EAST TERRACE SUBSTATIONS

56. **Mr BECKER** (on notice) asked the Minister of Mines and Energy: What were the original estimate and final cost of completion of the 275 000 volt underground cable between Magill Substation and the new 275 000 volt substation at East Terrace, Adelaide and what was the reason for any over-run?

The Hon. R. G. PAYNE: There was no over-run. The estimated cost was \$10 182 000. The final cost was \$8 944 251.

DEPARTMENTAL VEHICLES

59. **Mr BECKER** (on notice) asked the Premier: Which Government department owns vehicle ULA 819 and why does it carry the following sticker on the rear door window 'Fertilize the bush doze in a greenie', and does the sticker reflect Government or departmental policy and attitude and, if so, why?

The Hon. J. C. BANNON: The vehicle ULA 819 is owned by the South Australian Department of Housing and Construction. The sticker observed on this vehicle was attached by an individual employee and the sticker does not reflect Government or departmental policy and attitude. The sticker has since been removed and the individual cautioned. To prevent a repeat of similar incidents, the Department of Housing and Construction has circulated a departmental memorandum advising that unauthorised stickers are not to be attached to departmental vehicles. In addition, all unauthorised stickers previously attached to vehicles will be removed.

WORKERS COMPENSATION

60. **Mr BECKER** (on notice) asked the Premier:

1. What was the cost of premiums for workers compensation for each department and agency under the Minister's control in the years ended 30 June 1984 and 1985, respectively, and by whom is the insurance cover held?

2. How many workers compensation claims were made by employees of each department and agency in the years ended 30 June 1984 and 1985, respectively, how many have

been settled and for what total amount for each department or agency?

The Hon. J. C. BANNON: The following is a consolidated reply to Questions on Notice Nos 60-72.

1. The cost of premiums for workers compensation cover for each department and agency by the Government Insurance Fund for the years ending June 1984 and 1985 is set out in the attached schedule.

2. The number of workers compensation claims and the amounts for lump sums paid for the years ending June 1984 and 1985 for each department and agency is included in the attached schedule. It is not possible to state how many of the settlements resulted from the claims made in 1984 and 1985. The attached figures represent all settlements made in those years irrespective of when the injury occurred.

Department	Year ending 30 June 1984			Year ending 30 June 1985		
	Premium	Lump Sums Paid	No. of New Clms	Premium	Lump Sums Paid	No. of New Clms
Agriculture	291 547	141 500	137	303 000	172 186	153
Arts	19 055	—	3	17 968	—	15
Attorney-General	33 319	51 888	10	60 600	—	10
Auditor-General	12 657	—	2	13 322	—	2
Amdel	84 874	10 000	19	80 000	28 408	34
Betting Control Board	2 049	—	1	2 060	—	5
Community Welfare	720 608	311 050	193	757 500	600 460	162
Corporate Affairs	9 028	—	9	11 687	—	4
Correctional Services	428 162	293 100	183	707 000	627 405	190
Courts	72 675	21 500	43	111 100	49 210	57
Education	1 894 693	1 272 364	1 167	3 030 000	1 172 887	1 297
Electoral	1 924	—	1	1 841	20 010	1
E & WS	3 927 062	1 170 491	997	3 838 000	2 241 350	1 066
Environment and Planning	259 972	30 850	154	202 000	23 650	142
Fisheries	97 067	—	8	60 600	—	29
Highways	1 696 971	619 826	543	1 717 000	884 840	508
House of Assembly	2 814	—	1	3 010	—	—
IMVS	91 736	—	59	95 106	—	63
Joint House Committee	39 870	—	3	50 500	—	3
Labour	61 373	64 757	39	85 850	52 750	74
Lands	100 435	6 210	52	107 549	40 255	71
Legislative Council	1 508	—	1	1 652	—	1
Local Government	92 681	94 500	66	151 500	196 937	90
Marine and Harbors	990 838	606 384	289	1 010 000	348 106	334
Mines and Energy	145 268	45 900	80	151 500	12 185	61
Minister of Technology	1 301	—	—	1 727	—	—
Parliamentary Library	1 252	—	3	2 020	—	—
Police	966 124	260 166	609	1 212 000	390 951	651
Premier and Cabinet	13 775	38 000	6	50 000	100	8
Housing and Construction	1 371 426	536 689	529	1 616 000	614 325	503
Public and Consumer Affairs	117 405	63 600	14	151 500	17 000	31
Public Service Board	23 410	—	6	25 082	—	9
Recreation and Sport	20 738	—	2	25 250	—	2
Services and Supply	209 685	194 500	78	232 300	82 800	148
SA Urban Land Trust	2 054	—	1	1 915	—	—
SA Teacher Housing Authority	1 008	—	—	935	—	1
State Bank	46 225	—	11	—	—	—
State Development	9 349	—	—	9 833	—	1
Tech. and Fur. Education	395 241	141 530	170	434 300	179 468	217
Tourism	18 069	—	5	11 072	—	5
Transport	129 365	257 363	87	227 250	2 000	77
Treasury	23 564	14 000	7	24 348	—	5
Woods and Forests	724 649	280 800	40	747 400	425 995	490
Totals	15 152 826	6 526 968	5 998	17 344 577	8 183 278	6 520

PETROLEUM PRODUCT LICENCES

88. **Mr M.J. EVANS** (on notice) asked the Treasurer: How many litres of petrol and diesel fuel, respectively, in each of the licensed categories (wholesale and retail) were subject to the Business Franchise (Petroleum Products) Act in the year 1984-85?

The Hon. J.C. BANNON: Licence fees for 1984-85 wholesale licences issued under the Business Franchise (Petroleum Products) Act were based on the sale of 1 468 689 801 litres of petrol and 327 131 542 litres of diesel fuel. Retail licence holders pay a flat fee of \$50 per annum and are then permitted to sell petroleum products purchased from licensed wholesalers without payment of any additional licence fee.

CIGARETTES

90. **Mr M.J. EVANS** (on notice) asked the Minister of Transport representing the Minister of Health: What is the level of tar and nicotine in each of the major brands of cigarettes available on the South Australian market and what proportion of the total market does each brand hold?

The Hon. G.F. KENEALLY: The table attached details the top major cigarette brands and their respective market share (1984) in Australia. The remaining brands each share less than 3 per cent of the market. Under specific brands, several styles of that brand are listed with their respective tar and nicotine content. These charts may not indicate all the styles available on the market. Details about the market share of particular brands in South Australia are not readily available.

TABLE 1.

Brand and Type	Market Share ¹ 1984% (Aust.)	Tar ² (mg/cig)	Nicotine ² (mg/cig)
<i>Winfield—</i>	26.2		
Virginia		13	1.2
Export		11	1.1
Menthol		10	1.0
Extra Mild		10	1.0
<i>Benson & Hedges—</i>	14.2		
Plain		14	1.6
Special Filter		13	1.2
Extra Mild		8	0.8
<i>Peter Jackson—</i>	12.5		
Peter Jackson		12	1.0
Menthol		12	1.0
Extra Mild		11	1.0
<i>Marlboro—</i>	5.1		
Gold		14	1.3
20s + 25s		14	1.2
Menthol		13	1.1
Lights*		11	1.0
Special Mild		10	1.0
Golden Lights		9	0.9
<i>Alpine—</i>	4.8		
Alpine		13	1.1
Luxury length*		10	0.9
Lights		9	0.9
<i>Escort—</i>	3.8		
Menthol		12	1.1
Virginia		10	0.9
Extra Mild		6	0.8
<i>Peter Stuyvesant—</i>	3.3		
Menthol		13	1.1
K.S.F.		13	1.2
Luxury Length 94 mm		13	1.2
Luxury Length 100 mm		12	1.3
Extra Mild		9	1.1
Luxury Length EM 94 mm		9	1.0
Luxury Length EM 100 mm		9	0.9
Ultra Mild		3	0.3

* Manufacturer's yield only—not tested by Australian Government Analytical Laboratories (AGAL).

1. Brand/type and Market Share 1984 compiled by Maxwell and cited in *World Tobacco* 1 September 1985, p. 43.

2. Reproduced from Smoke Yield Table, Department of Health, November 1984.

TOBACCO INDUSTRY SPONSORSHIP

91. Mr M.J. EVANS (on notice) asked the Minister of Transport, representing the Minister of Health: Is the South Australian Health Commission aware of any estimates of the level of financial and other sponsorship given to sports and recreation clubs or events by the tobacco industry or its representatives and, if so, what is the estimated level of sponsorship for the latest year for which figures are available?

The Hon. G.F. KENEALLY: Details are unavailable on the distribution of the money State by State that the tobacco industry claims it spends on sporting sponsorship. The usual figure quoted by the industry is \$15 million per annum. Australia's population is estimated at 15.7043 million and South Australia's population 1.3610 million, therefore, on a per capital basis, South Australia could possibly receive \$1.3 million in sponsorship from the tobacco industry. However, a simple division on per capita terms is likely to be highly misleading, given that the biggest sporting sponsorships are for national events such as cricket and golf (broadcast throughout Australia). It is likely that the bulk of the money from the tobacco industry is spent in Sydney and Melbourne where the major television networks have their headquarters.

SUPERTRAINS

93. Mr M.J. EVANS (on notice) asked the Minister of Transport:

1. What proportion of the train services on the Gawler line are operated by 'supertrains'?

2. When is it anticipated that all train services on the line will be operated by the 'supertrains'?

The Hon. G.F. KENEALLY: The replies are as follows:

1. There are 32.5 per cent of train services worked by 'supertrains' each week on the Gawler line.

2. It is not possible to operate all services on the Gawler line using 'supertrains' as there are only 30 of these railcars available and they have to be used throughout to best suit passenger requirements. Generally, they are used on fast limited stop services on major routes handling large numbers of passengers.

THIRD PARTY INSURANCE

97. Mr M.J. EVANS (on notice) asked the Minister of Transport: What was the total value of compulsory third party insurance premiums paid in the year 1984-85 itemised by premium class?

The Hon. G.F. KENEALLY: The information requested on compulsory third party insurance premiums is set out below. It should be noted that whilst the total premiums disbursed to the State Government Insurance Commission during the financial year 1984-85 was \$121 546 230, the only breakdown into premium groupings available is that provided by computer processing which covers a period July 1984 to July 1985. Therefore the breakdown does not balance to the total premiums disbursed.

Premium Class	Amount \$
1	76 872 460.30
2	8 005 540.00
3	2 457 693.00
4	304 506.00
5	657 132.00
6	286 162.00
7	6 954.00
8	94 514.00
9	152 074.00
10	23 132.00
11	1 259 715.00
12	324.00
13	143 865.00
14	22 656.00
15	976 801.00
16	795 113.00
17	2 182.00
18	153.00
19	71.00
20	0.50
29	395 138.00
51	19 285 367.00
52	3 345 723.00
53	945 202.00
54	1 240 946.00
55	36 943.00
56	29 110.00
57	1 745.00
58	28 897.00
59	70 350.00
60	5 895.00
61	822 772.00
62	235.00
63	42 105.00
64	11 657.00
65	394 925.00

Premium Class	Amount \$
66	935 043.50
67	18 125.00
68	1.00
69	96.00
70	
79	164 480.00
	<hr/> \$119 835 803.30

PUBLIC SERVICE BOARD APPEALS TRIBUNAL

100. **Mr BECKER** (on notice) asked the Premier:

1. How many appeals were heard by the Public Service Board Appeals Tribunal in each of the past three financial years?

2. What is the estimated cost per appeal and how much did the appeals cost in each of the past three financial years?

The Hon. J.C. BANNON: It is not clear whether the question is directed at the Appointments Appeal Committee which hears appeals against nominations for appointment, or whether it refers to the various appeal jurisdictions of the Public Service Board or the Appeals Tribunal constituted under Section 67 of the Public Service Act (which hears appeals against disciplinary decisions of the Public Service Board).

(1) However, set out below are details of the number of appeals in each jurisdiction over the last three financial years:

	1982/83	1983/84	1984/85
Appointments Appeal Committee	118	86	114
Public Service Board (Classification Appeals)	104	182	57
Public Service Board (Grievance Appeals)	8	8	6
Public Service Board (Admonition Appeals)	1	1	—
Disciplinary Appeals Tribunal	—	2	—

(2) With the exception of the Chairman, Appointments Appeal Committee, members of these part-time appeal bodies are full-time public servants who receive no remuneration apart from their normal salaries. Consequently in respect of them no additional costs arise. Irrespective of that point it is not practicable to provide a meaningful estimate of cost per hearing for the following reasons:

- Membership (and therefore salary level) varies from appeal to appeal.
- The duration of appeals is extremely variable and in any case this specific information is not kept.

In relation to the Chairman, Appointments Appeal Committee, the incumbent has over the last three years received an annual fee of \$5 500. Based on that fee the cost per promotion appeal over the last three years averages out at approximately \$52. However, as indicated previously this does not include provision for the salary of the other two members (which would have been payable in any event).

PUBLIC SERVICE EXECUTIVE OFFICERS

101. **Mr BECKER** (on notice) asked the Premier:

1. What is the ratio of women to men in Public Service positions of EO1 upwards?

2. How many women have been appointed to EO1 positions or above since July 1984?

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

1. The Board collects and publishes staffing statistics on an annual basis, the premise of which is the financial year, namely July to June. For the financial year 1984 to 1985

the ratio of women to men in Public Service positions classified in the Executive Officer (EO) range as at 30 June 1985 was 9 to 230.

2. During the same financial year two women and seven men were appointed to Executive Officer positions in the Public Service.

MS. D. GAYLER

105. **Mr BECKER** (on notice) asked the Deputy Premier: Did Ms D. Gayler receive any payment in lieu of notice when she terminated her service as Ministerial Adviser following her election as the member for Newland and, if so, what was the amount of the payment?

The Hon. D.J. HOPGOOD: No, and in this context the member's attention is drawn to page 307 of Legislative Council *Hansard* dated 15 March 1983, when, in answering a question from the Hon. I. Gilfillan, the Attorney-General revealed that severance payments totalling \$162 465.80 were paid to 26 former Ministerial Officers to the Tonkin Government. Of these people, the most nearly comparable to the member for Newland was the Hon. D. Laidlaw elected to the Legislative Council at the 1982 election. Her severance pay was \$6 974.40.

MR P. TYLER

107. **Mr BECKER** (on notice) asked the Minister of Transport: Did Mr P. Tyler receive any payment in lieu of notice when he terminated his service as Ministerial Adviser following his election as the member for Fisher and, if so, what was the amount of the payment?

The Hon. G.F. KENEALLY: Mr Tyler received no payment in lieu of notice when he terminated his service as Ministerial Adviser. His only terminal payment was 5½ days *pro rata* recreation leave, including leave loading, which amounted to \$899.37.

S.A. HOUSING TRUST

108. **Mr BECKER** (on notice) asked the Minister of Housing and Construction:

1. What criteria are used in engaging contractors to undertake property maintenance work for the South Australian Housing Trust?

2. What system is adopted to check costings of each job to ensure value for money and standard of workmanship?

3. How often are contracts reviewed and recalled?

4. What maintenance work is carried out by Trust employees?

The Hon. T. H. HEMMINGS: The replies are as follows:

1. Contractors are engaged on the basis of the following criteria:

&

2.—

Tradesmen must demonstrate that they hold qualifications, certificates and/or licences relevant to the work to be carried out;

Contractors must have a proven capacity in terms of labour and other resources to complete contracts;

Contractors must be of proven reliability on the basis of either work carried out for the Trust or of reference from other employers; and

Contractors must accept the Trust's schedule of conditions (attached).

There are currently four bases on which contractors may be engaged:

Schedule item contractors are engaged on a long term basis having proven their capacity to carry out Trust maintenance work at a consistent standard. Work is carried out by these contractors subject to a schedule of conditions for works and prices. Standard items of work are carried out at a scheduled price which is indexed according to national wage determinations and movements in material prices.

Negotiated rate contractors carry out work on the same basis as schedule item contractors; however, these are generally works which either are not standard works for which there is an agreed price or works which cannot be carried out economically at the agreed price because of location or some other factor. Work is carried out under the same schedule of conditions for works and prices as applies for schedule item contractors. It should be noted contractors who have successfully carried out special works on a negotiated basis have frequently been accepted as schedule item contractors.

Sundry contractors carry out 'one-off' works such as the installation of new flooring, insulation, windows and so on. These contractors are selected from reliable firms who are invited to submit prices for specific works. Once again the standard schedule of conditions for works and prices applies.

External painting contractors have, since 1981, been selected on the basis of public tender and contracts entered into apply only for the duration of the individual tendered works.

Currently the Housing Trust is considering a pilot program of tendering a wider range of maintenance works in metropolitan Adelaide involving tenders of two types:

Public tenders called for major and 'single operation' works including roof renewals, glazing, salt damp repairs, termite treatment and concrete paving.

Tenders invited from existing maintenance contractors for a range of scheduled tasks including carpentry and general repairs, gas fitting, plumbing, electrical work and interior painting, etc. with tender prices being quoted as a percentage above or below the scheduled or 'par' price for a range of tasks in respect of a certain number of tenancies within a given area or areas.

The Housing Trust is currently discussing means to implement this pilot scheme with the trade unions concerned and contractors currently carrying out work on a schedule contract basis.

As noted above, much of the maintenance work carried out on Trust rental properties is contracted on the basis of agreed schedules and prices. A sample of at least 10 per cent of jobs carried out on this basis are inspected by Trust Maintenance Inspectors who are engaged on the basis of trade qualifications. All scheduled jobs are clerically checked to ensure that the invoices submitted by contractors correspond with the orders raised by the Trust.

All non scheduled items and all work carried out by contractors who are not regularly engaged by the Trust is inspected by Maintenance Inspectors.

3. Contracts are reviewed annually to ensure that building licences are current, insurance cover is current and agreements with the Trust are being complied with. If these basic conditions are met and the standard of work and services are acceptable, schedule item contracts are essentially continuous. Other contracts, i.e. negotiated contracts and sundry contracts, are reviewed for individual works. As noted above, external painting works are tendered and contracts are for specific tasks which must be carried out within a specific period.

4. All maintenance work is carried out by contractors which the very minor exceptions of emergency work such as stopping water leakages resulting from broken pipes or

drains and very minor work which is an immediate irritant to the tenant—such as changing a washer or a fuse—which may be carried out by Maintenance Inspectors pending any subsequent work which would be carried out by contractors.

WALLAROO LAND

109. **Mr BECKER** (on notice) asked the Minister of Housing and Construction: Why did the South Australian Housing Trust purchase four blocks of land at a new subdivision approximately 1½ miles from Wallaroo at an average price of \$17 437—on Saturday 18 January when similar blocks within the township were available at prices between \$2 000 and \$3 000?

The Hon. T.H. HEMMINGS: The General Manager of the South Australian Housing Trust has advised that the Trust's agent has been experiencing difficulty in locating or acquiring any land in Wallaroo suitable for Trust rental housing.

To provide some allotments to meet the ongoing demand for housing the Trust recently purchased, in line with the valuation advice of the Valuer-General, four allotments at an average price of \$17 437.

The Trust has been unable to locate any suitable land in the price range indicated by Mr Becker. The Trust is always seeking appropriately priced allotments, and would be pleased to receive Mr Becker's information on cheaper priced allotments.

CHLOROPICRIN SPRAY

113. **Mr BECKER** (on notice) asked the Minister of Transport, representing the Minister of Local Government: Have representations been made to the Minister to have the use of chloropicrin spray banned in or adjacent to residential areas and if not, will the Minister consider such a request?

The Hon. G.F. KENEALLY: No. This matter is the responsibility of my colleague the Minister of Health, and the member is directed to his answer to Question on Notice No. 114.

114. **Mr BECKER** (on notice) asked the Minister of Transport, representing the Minister of Health:

1. Have tests been undertaken to determine whether chloropicrin spray is safe to use by market gardeners in residential areas and if not, why not?

2. How many accidents involving chloropicrin spray have been reported to the South Australian Health Commission in each of the past three years, what action was taken against the users in each case and what assurances were received that a repetition will not occur?

The Hon. G.F. KENEALLY: The replies are as follows:

1. Tests have not been undertaken by the South Australian Health Commission staff. Chloropicrin is safe for use in market gardens in residential areas when fumigation is carried out by licensed fumigators in accordance with the Health Regulations.

2. No accidents involving chloropicrin fumigation have been reported to the Commission in the past three years.

S.A. SPECTACLES SCHEME

115. **Mr BECKER** (on notice) asked the Minister of Transport, representing the Minister of Health:

1. Since November 1982, how many persons have benefited from the introduction of the South Australian spec-

tacles scheme, what was the cost each year and what is the estimated cost for this financial year?

2. When will a reprint of the brochure publicising the scheme with up to date information be available and what are the reasons for the delay?

The Hon. G.F. KENEALLY: The replies are as follows:

1.

Number of Persons Benefiting from and costs of SA Spectacle Scheme

	Total Cost (\$)	Persons Benefiting (approx.)
1982-83	1 149 591	39 000
1983-84	1 680 969	55 000
1984-85	1 561 752	59 000
1985-86 (est.)	1 880 000	62 000

2. The most recent amendment to the SA Spectacle Scheme (increased cardholder contribution rates) was approved by Cabinet on 10 February 1986. The Health Commission's Media Liaison Unit provided a new format brochure approximately two weeks ago and consideration is being given to producing the brochure in a limited number of foreign languages. The English brochures should be ready for printing by approximately mid April.

STATE BANK POLICIES

121. **Mr BECKER** (on notice) asked the Premier:

1. Why is it the State Bank of South Australia's practice to not make housing loans to persons who arrive from interstate at rates of interest and on similar terms and conditions to residents of South Australia?

2. What is the bank's housing loan policy in respect of each category of customer as to amount and interest rate?

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

1. The State Bank does not differentiate between persons who arrive from interstate and residents of South Australia in respect of housing loan terms, conditions and rates of interest.

2. Two categories of State Bank owner/occupier housing loans are available:

(1) Home Savers Loans (available to customers who qualify by saving with the State Bank or an interstate bank with which reciprocal arrangements exist. Applications lodged by new arrivals from a State where there is no bank with reciprocal arrangements are considered on their merits.)

The maximum loan available is four times the average balance of acceptable savings with the bank for the 12 months preceding acceptance of the application, provided that:

For loans of up to \$50 000, a minimum monthly balance of at least \$3 000 has been maintained for the 12 months preceding application;

For loans of \$50 000 and over, a minimum monthly balance of at least \$4 000 has been maintained for the 12 months preceding application.

An interest rate of 13.50 per cent p.a. applies to all loans in this category up to \$100 000.

(2) Market Rate Home Loans (available to all other persons who have not maintained sufficient funds with the bank to qualify for a Home Savers Loan, but who are able to meet the bank's normal income and equity requirements and demonstrate loan servicing ability.)

There are no savings qualifying criteria for this type of loan, for which funds are gathered from the open market as opposed to traditional sources of customer savings. The following rates of interest are currently applicable to Market Rate Home Loans for owner/occupier borrowers:

Existing Loans

14.50 per cent p.a. for loans up to \$30 000

14.75 per cent p.a. for loans up to \$40 000

15.00 per cent p.a. for loans up to \$50 000

15.50 per cent p.a. for loans up to \$100 000

New Loans from 10 March 1986

16.00 per cent p.a. for loans up to \$30 000

16.25 per cent p.a. for loans up to \$40 000

16.50 per cent p.a. for loans up to \$50 000

17.00 per cent p.a. for loans up to \$100 000

STA EMPLOYEES

122. **Mr BECKER** (on notice) asked the Minister of Transport:

1. What is the STA policy on re-employing former employees?

2. Will STA reconsider its re-employment policy by considering applicants on their merit and the circumstances of terminating previous employment and, if not, why not?

The Hon. G. F. KENEALLY: The replies are as follows:

1. The STA will consider re-employment of former employees using the following guidelines:

(a) Daily paid positions: persons who have been twice previously employed on separate occasions will not normally be considered for re-employment a third time.

(b) All other applications for re-employment are evaluated on the basis of individual merit, subject to availability of vacancies.

(c) In determining suitability, officers are required to consider previous records if available, and where appropriate, cases are referred to former supervisors or relevant branch officers to assist in formulating a decision.

2. Cases for re-employment are evaluated on the basis of merit as described above. All circumstances related to previous employment are included in the analysis. The STA believes that its current re-employment policy is satisfactory.

COMMUNITY DEVELOPMENT BOARDS

126. **Mr BLACKER** (on notice) asked the Minister of Transport, representing the Minister of Local Government:

1. How many community development boards have been or are in the process of being formed?

2. What Government funds have been made available to councils with community development boards?

3. Is additional money available to councils which have community development boards?

The Hon. G. F. KENEALLY: The replies are as follows:

1. Forty community development boards have been formed.

2. No funds are specifically allocated to those councils which sponsor community development boards. However, both councils and boards may make application under the department's Local Government Assistance Fund to sponsor appropriate community projects.

3. No additional money is made available to councils which sponsor boards. However, the department does meet expenses for State-wide board meetings (every six months) and for training courses for board members.

SMALL BUSINESS ADVISORY UNIT

128. **Mr BLACKER** (on notice) asked the Minister of Labour: Does the Government intend to send the Small Business Advisory Unit to various parts of the State on a regular basis to help small-business proprietors in non-metropolitan areas and, if so:

- (a) to which towns will the Unit be sent;
- (b) by what criterion will they be selected;
- (c) how often will the Unit visit them;
- (d) when will the service begin,

and, if not, why not?

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

- (a) Since the establishment of the Small Business Corporation in March 1985 it has actively promoted its service to small business owners throughout South Australia. The Small Business Corporation visits any town where a need is identified. An 008 telephone number is being installed to help with country inquiries.
- (b) The criterion for specific visits is the identification of a need for training, counselling or consultancy.
- (c) The corporation staff or pathfinder consultants will pay timely visits as needs are identified.
- (d) The services began in September 1985, soon after the corporation was established.

PORTER BAY SEWERAGE PROPOSAL

129. **Mr BLACKER** (on notice) asked the Minister of Water Resources: When is it expected that work will commence on the Porter Bay sewerage proposal, when is it expected to be completed, and what is the estimated cost?

The Hon. D.J. HOPGOOD: The member for Flinders brought a deputation to see the Minister of Water Resources and the matter is under consideration.

BEVERAGE CONTAINER ACT

130. **Mr BLACKER** (on notice) asked the Minister for Environment and Planning:

1. Is the Department of Environment and Planning considering a review of the Beverage Container Act, 1975 and, if so, when and on what grounds?

2. Is the department aware of claims that the aluminium beer can is disadvantaged compared with the glass stubbie and, if so, what action, if any, is proposed and what are the reasons for such action?

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

1. A public announcement that there would be a review of the Beverage Container Act was made in November 1985. The review will take place during the term of this Government. The terms of reference will be announced at an appropriate time prior to the review.

2. Yes. However, that claim is not correct. The aluminium can competes on the same terms as the non-refillable stubbie with a 5 cents deposit. The only difference between the two types of container is that cans are returned to a collection depot and the stubbie to the point of sale.

VEGETATION CLEARANCE

131. **Mr BLACKER** (on notice) asked the Minister for Environment and Planning: How many applications were received by the Native Vegetation Management Authority for vegetation clearance permits to 31 January 1986, how

many have been processed and how many have been approved, partly approved or rejected, respectively, and in the case of those rejected, what is the anticipated cost of compensation?

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

1. Between the date of operation of the Native Vegetation Management Act (21 November 1985) and 31 January 1986, 37 applications to clear were received. Of the 37 applications, nine have been processed. Other applications have also been considered by the Authority from the backlog.

2. Of the nine applications processed, six have been finalised. Two applicants were exempt, one was withdrawn, two were refused and one was approved.

3. No overall estimate of compensation payment is available because not all applications have applied for an estimate and not all estimates applied for are completed.

NEIGHBOURHOOD WATCH

132. **Mr S.G. EVANS** (on notice) asked the Minister of Emergency Services: When will Neighbourhood Watch programs similar to that in Flinders Park be established in other metropolitan areas and in particular in the Mitcham Hills area?

The Hon. D.J. HOPGOOD: Expansion of the Neighbourhood Watch Program in the Adelaide metropolitan area is being planned for implementation over the next two or three months. This will depend largely on negotiations currently under way for sponsorship. Selection of suitable suburban areas within which to establish Neighbourhood Watch Programs is based principally on the following criteria:

Suburbs having a higher incidence of house-breaking and other residentially based crime.

Suburbs where the residents are able to demonstrate a readiness and capacity to undertake the program.

Expansion of the program is thus dependent upon properly determined requirements and, amongst other things, the availability of local police and community resources. There is no specific intention to establish Neighbourhood Watch in the Mitcham Hills district at present. However, it will receive equal consideration based on the above criteria as the program develops.

GLENELG SEWAGE WORKS

135. **Mr BECKER** (on notice) asked the Minister of Water Resources: What is the economic life of the Glenelg North Sewage Treatment Works and will the works or part of it be phased out in the near future and, if so, what sections and when?

The Hon. D.J. HOPGOOD: The Glenelg Sewage Treatment Works was first commissioned in 1931 and has since been progressively extended in stages in 1942, 1960 and 1969 to cater for increases in contributing population. In view of the staged construction it would be very difficult, and of little potential value, to attempt to define the so called 'economic life' for the plant as a whole—particularly since there exists within each stage a diversity of structural elements (both steel and reinforced concrete), and mechanical and electrical equipment, all of which possess widely varying physical life expectancies. The Engineering and Water Supply Department has no plans currently to phase out the operations of the Glenelg Sewage Treatment Works, either in the short or the long term, and will continue to upgrade the plant as required.

MINNIPA POLICE STATION

139. **Mr BLACKER** (on notice) asked the Minister of Emergency Services: When is construction expected to commence on the Minnipa police station complex, what is the expected completion date and what is the anticipated cost?

The Hon. D.J. HOPGOOD: Construction of a new integrated police station and residence at Minnipa will commence during the 1986-87 financial year, subject to approval of funding. The anticipated cost of the complex is \$220 000.

STATE GOVERNMENT INSURANCE COMMISSION

140. **Mr M.J. EVANS** (on notice) asked the Treasurer:

1. In respect of the year 1984-85, which private law firms acted on behalf of the SGIC in the following matters:

- (a) workers compensation;
- (b) compulsory third party insurance; and
- (c) all other matters;

how many cases in each category were referred to each firm and what was the total value of the fees paid to each firm in each category?

2. How are the firms selected and how often are the appointments reviewed?

3. How many legally qualified persons are directly employed by SGIC to undertake duties for which a legal qualification is essential?

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

1. (a), (b) and (c) In terms of section 12 (1) (b) of the State Government Insurance Commission Act, the Commission transacts business according to the manner in which other insurance offices conduct their business. SGIC's competitors do not disclose information of the type sought. The Commission regards the information requested as confidential and believes that its disclosure could be prejudicial to it and the parties concerned. However, it has indicated that:

Five legal firms act for the Commission in South Australia and a further 10 interstate. In addition, various members of the independent bar are briefed from time to time.

Approximately \$5.5 million was paid in legal fees for the year ended 30.6.85 of which \$4.5 million related to compulsory third party insurance.

2. Firms are selected on the basis of expertise and on their ability to handle matters both expeditiously and capably. The performance of these firms is continuously under review.

3. Two.

PINNAROO AREA SCHOOL

142. **Mr LEWIS** (on notice) asked the Minister of Education: When does the Government propose to proceed with the stage II redevelopment at Pinnaroo Area School?

The Hon. G.J. CRAFTER: The need for the upgrading of Pinnaroo Area School has been recognised and stage I of the project was completed in late 1984. Sketch plans have been prepared for stage 2 and the project was considered for admission to the education buildings program. Unfortunately, the demand for funds for new pupil places in particular was such that the project could not be funded in 1985-86. Further, I am unable to give a firm commitment on when the project will commence.

However, the administration at the school will be upgraded under the 1985-86 minor works program and the former St Joseph's Primary School buildings—the school closed at the end of 1984—are being leased by the department to supplement the Pinnaroo Area School facilities.

ASER PROJECT

147. **Mr OLSEN** (on notice) asked the Premier: What are the latest estimates of the annual rental and the annual return to the Government, respectively, for the first year of its sublease of each of the convention centre, the car park and the public areas within the ASER project?

The Hon. J.C. BANNON: The annual rental and the annual return to the Government for the convention centre, car park and public areas within the ASER project are estimated as follows:

Convention Centre and associated common areas (including plaza)	
	1987-88
	\$
Lease Rental	1 925 000
Operating Deficit	55 000
Total Deficit	\$1 980 000
Car park and associated common areas	
	1987-88
	\$
Lease Rental	975 000
Operation Surplus	1 697 000
Total Surplus	\$722 000
Estimated overall cost to the Government	\$1 258 000

148. **Mr OLSEN** (on notice) asked the Premier: What has been the cost to the Government so far of providing access roads, water, power, gas, sewer and other service connections and all necessary infrastructure provided for under clause 2 (j) of the principles of agreement for the ASER project and what is the latest estimate of their total cost?

The Hon. J. C. BANNON: The only cost to the Government so far has been for providing service connections as follows: sewer connection, \$803; water services connection, \$1 085.

JUBILEE 150

149. **Mr LEWIS** (on notice) asked the Premier:

1. What moneys have been allocated to city and metropolitan councils for Jubilee 150 celebrations?

2. Which country district councils and/or corporations received grants and what were the respective amounts?

The Hon. J.C. BANNON: The Jubilee 150 board devoted considerable time to designing and establishing its organisational structure to ensure an effective operation and to serve the interests of the community. The board established a Local Government Executive Committee to consider projects emanating from councils in South Australia. The committee comprises 13 members; six members represent country councils.

Metropolitan councils have been allocated Jubilee 150 funding totalling \$60 000 within the program of the Local Government Executive Committee. The following country councils have been allocated Jubilee funding within the program of the Local Government Jubilee Committee:

		\$
Port Pirie Council	Rotunda restoration	5 000
Barossa Council	Development of Fiebig Square, Lyndoch	5 000
Beachport Council	Beachport lagoon project	5 000
Le Hunte Council	Central Eyre Peninsula emergency services complex	30 000
Riverton Council	Development of new parkland	2 000
Millicent Council	Redevelopment of park	5 000
Tanunda Council	Renovations of cutting garden	5 000
Port Augusta Council	Construction of nursing home and day centre	5 000

Meningie Council	Redevelopment of old Tailem Bend wharf	\$ 5 000
Mount Gambier City Council	Establishment of garden for the blind	750
		<u>\$67 750</u>
Other Jubilee 150 executive committees have allocated funding to country councils as indicated below:		
Burra Council	Conservation	\$ 270 000
Victor Harbor Council	Re-establishment of horse train	50 000
Riverton Council	Erection of balcony	8 000
Millicent Council	Local history collection	4 000
Mount Gambier Council	Lady Nelson Jubilee Park	100 000
Penola Council	Heritage Park improve- ments	8 000
Kingscote Council	Reeves Point conserva- tion	10 000
Lameroo Council	Restoration of old cottage	1 500
Total		<u>\$451 500</u>

ADELAIDE GAOL

150. **Mr BECKER** (on notice) asked the Minister of Correctional Services:

1. Are toilet buckets from cells at Adelaide Gaol dumped in an open sewer each morning and, if so, why and does the sewer overflow and, if so, how frequently?
2. How many cases of hepatitis have been reported at the gaol in the past 12 months and how many were attributed to the above practice?

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

1.—

- (a) Each morning the prisoners empty the toilet buckets from their cells into the troughs which are connected to the sewerage system.
- (b) Due to the nature of the building, that is, its early construction, cost factors, and the fact that it has been designated an historical building as well as the decision to vacate the institution, no cells at Adelaide Gaol are sewered.
- (c) As a result of the Department of Housing and Construction providing special troughs which are covered except at the opening into which waste is poured, there has been no overflow of waste for approximately six to seven months.

2. There have been nine cases of hepatitis diagnosed at Adelaide Gaol during the period 1 January 1985 to 1 March 1986. There is nothing to indicate that any of the cases of hepatitis may be traced to the disposal trough.

GLENELG NORTH SEWAGE TREATMENT WORKS

155. **Mr BECKER** (on notice) asked the Minister of Water Resources: what was the reason for the construction of a pond and water fountain at the Glenelg North Sewage Treatment Works, how much did the project cost, why is the fountain not working and does the pond leak?

The Hon. D.J. HOPGOOD: The site of the pond was originally occupied by a departmental house which was demolished in November 1983 because of its dilapidated state. The demolition of the house left a substantial depression in the ground and, as a result, the opportunity was taken to enhance the overall aesthetic appeal of the area, which is visible to both nearby residents in Anderson Avenue and the general public using Military Road, by constructing a pond approximately 15m x 15m in size and incorporating a fountain. The depression would otherwise have needed to have been filled in and some other form of landscaping such as tree planting, carried out.

The total cost of the project was approximately \$5 300. However, the estimated cost of filling and reinstating the whole area was \$5 100, making the net cost of the pond and fountain only \$200. The fountain is not yet working, as installation of a pump has not been completed. The pond was designed so that any leakage would be minimal. Heavy duty plastic was used to line the entire surface, over which was placed a thick layer of clay to provide a further barrier against leakage. Although some leakage was evident when the pond was initially filled, this has since decreased to negligible amounts as the clay lining has subsequently become saturated and impermeable to seepage. Most of the water loss from the pond occurs through evaporation, requiring it to be periodically topped up with treated effluent in order to maintain a reasonably constant level.

DAILY PAID WORKERS

161. **Mr BECKER** (on notice) asked the Premier: How many daily paid workers are presently employed by the departments and statutory authorities under each Minister's control and what are their classifications, are they employed in the city or country and how many were there as at 30 June 1985?

The Hon. J.C. BANNON: The number of daily paid workers employed in each Government department under each Minister's control as at 30 June 1985 is shown hereunder.

To produce this information for statutory authorities and the further details requested as to their classifications and location would require considerable work by the agencies and departments, the expense of which is not considered to be justified.

Weekly Paid Employees in Departments as at June 1985 (Excludes C.E.P. employees).

Minister	Department	F.T.E.	Persons
Premier, Treasurer, Minister for the Arts	Premier and Cabinet Public Service Board Treasury	2.0	2
Deputy Premier, Minister for Environment and Planning, Chief Secretary, Minister of Emergency Services	Arts Env. and Planning Auditor-General Police E. & W.S.	45.0 213.5 77.0	45 234 77
Attorney-General, Minister of Consumer Affairs, Minister of Corporate Affairs, Minister of Ethnic Affairs	Attorney-General Courts Pub. and Cons. Affairs Corporate Affairs Electoral	3 218.0 11.0 4.0	3 218 11 4

Weekly Paid Employees in Departments as at June 1985 (Excludes C.E.P. employees).

Minister	Department	F.T.E.	Persons
Minister of Lands, Minister of Marine, Minister of Forests, Minister of Recreation	Lands	27.5	28
	Woods and Forests	1 223.2	1 227
	Marine and Harbors	513.0	513
Minister of Health, Minister of Community Welfare	Community Welfare	57.4	73
Minister of State Development, Minister of Employment and Further Education, Minister for Technology	State Development	0.6	2
	Tech. and Further Education	442.8	445
	Minister of Technology		
Minister of Transport	Transport	5.8	6
	Highways	1 776.0	1 776
	Services and Supply	199.7	204
Minister of Mines and Energy	Mines and Energy	116.0	119
Minister of Education and Children's Services, Minister of Aboriginal Affairs	Education	469.4	1 061
Minister of Housing and Construction, Minister of Public Works	Housing and Construction	1 280.0	1 280
Minister of Labour, Minister of Correctional Services, Minister Assisting the Treasurer	Labour	3.4	4
	Correctional Services	9.3	10
Minister of Tourism, Minister of Local Government, Minister of Youth Affairs, Minister Assisting the Minister for the Arts	Tourism	2.0	2
Minister of Recreation and Sport, Minister of Agriculture and Fisheries	Local Government	71.0	71
	Agriculture	255.7	332
	Fisheries	1.0	1
	Recreation and Sport	2.0	2
Total		10 026.3	10 747

EXCISE DUTY

162. Mr BECKER (on notice) asked the Treasurer: What action is being taken to prevent the impact of State taxation on projected increases in beer, petrol and cigarettes following increases in CPI figures?

The Hon. J. C. BANNON: It is assumed that the honourable member is referring to the automatic indexing of rates of Commonwealth excise duty to CPI movements and the effects of these changes on the prices used for the purposes of levying State taxation. With respect to the petroleum franchise levy, movements in market prices do not affect the revenue collected by the State since the levy is based on a gazetted price which is well below market levels.

With respect to liquor licence fees and the tobacco franchise levy, it has never been the practice of the State Government to differentiate between price movements caused by changes in Commonwealth excise duty and those caused by other factors. Rather, it has been the practice to make periodic broad judgments about the amounts of revenue derived from the range of taxes available to the Government and to adjust the rates of those taxes so that the overall balance of the State taxation system reflects the Government's priorities. The tax concession package introduced prior to the 1985-86 budget was an example of this process in action.

PUBLIC SERVICE CLASSIFICATIONS

164. Mr PETERSON (on notice) asked the Premier:

1. How many persons are employed in the Public Service in a classification for which the salary is equal to or greater than AO4, what are the classifications and what are the current salary ranges applicable to each?

2. What other benefits, if any, are applicable to officers holding these classifications including home telephone allowances, discretionary use of motor vehicles, expense allowances, etc.?

3. How many employees of statutory authorities are employed at salaries equal to or greater than AO4?

4. What other benefits, if any, are applicable to these employees including telephone allowances, discretionary use of motor vehicles, expense allowances, etc.?

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

1. (a) The number of persons employed in the Public Service in a classification for which the salary is equal to or greater than AO-4 is 887.9 FTE's as at the end of December 1985.

(b) The classifications which are included in this group and the current salary ranges which are applicable are as follows, appendix I.

2. Officers classified AO-4 and above in the Public Service include Permanent Heads. Permanent Heads are paid an 'expense of office allowance' which is as follows:

EO-6—\$2 500 p.a.

EO-5—\$2 000 p.a.

below EO-5—\$1 500 p.a.

The use of motor vehicles is regulated by Public Service Board Memorandum.

The payment of private telephone is also regulated.

All officers are entitled to the reimbursement of expenses incurred in the course of their duties. These expenses vary widely as many are precisely defined in industrial awards.

3. and 4. To produce this information for statutory authorities and the other detailed information sought would require considerable work by departments and agencies, the expense of which is not considered to be justified.

Classifications Equal to or Greater than AO4 and Current Salary Ranges Applicable

Classification	\$ From	\$ To	Classification	\$ From	\$ To
AO4	37 877	39 034	HP1	40 251	41 573
AO5	41 094	42 621	HP2	41 573	42 902
APH1	68 762		HP3	42 239	44 231
AR4	39 172		HP4	44 942	45 654
AR5	44 840		LE4	43 290	47 654
AR6	46 093		LE5	52 383	54 566
CU5	39 172	40 562	LEC4	43 290	47 654
ED2	38 628	40 975	LEC5	52 383	54 566
ED3	43 228	45 776	LEC6	57 043	
ED4	50 161		LEC7	62 705	
ED5	54 465		MO2	42 208	46 109
EN4	39 172	42 064	MO5	46 109	51 962
EN5	43 786	46 093	MO7	54 889	58 792
EO1	48 011		MO9	65 624	
EO2	52 313		NA1	39 172	42 064
EO3	56 617		PLA	46 093	
EO4	62 049		QS4	43 786	
EO4Z	65 024		RO3	38 628	40 975
EO5	67 477		SO4	39 172	40 562
EO5Z	72 774		SO5	42 064	43 786
EO6	74 297		SO6	44 840	46 093

Classifications Equal to or Greater than AO4 and Current Salary
Ranges Applicable

Classification	\$ From	\$ To	Classification	\$ From	\$ To
EP2	38 425	40 665	SU4	39 172	40 562
FB3	39 172	42 924	SU5	42 064	43 786
FB4	42 064	45 466	SU6	44 840	46 093
FO4	39 172	42 064	SV3	39 172	42 064
FO5	40 562	43 786	SV4	43 786	46 093
FO6	43 786	44 840	VL5	40 190	
FO7	46 093		VO4	42 064	43 786
GE4	39 172	40 562	VO5	46 093	
GE5	44 840	46 093	VP2	39 172	40 562
GO4	38 628	40 975	VP3	42 064	46 093
GO5	41 808		VP4	48 407	

PAINT: HOUSING TRUST ACCOMMODATION

165. **Mr BECKER** (on notice) asked the Minister of Housing and Construction: How many South Australian Housing Trust tenants were provided with some of the 48 200 litres of paint issued during the year ended 30 June 1985 and what was the total cost of supplying the paint?

The Hon. T.H. HEMMINGS: During the 1984-85 financial year, 48 200 litres of paint to the value of \$120 500 was supplied to nearly 1 100 trust tenants.

This is based on approximately 45 litres per house with some tenants requesting smaller amounts, depending on their need and ability to paint. Some tenants choose to paint their house over a two or three year period and request paint accordingly. Also, a small number of issues were for one or two rooms or perhaps the woodwork only in some rooms.

Each region issues this paint on the basis of the complete house being supplied every eight years. This is administered with complete flexibility of timing according to the circumstances of each tenant.

REROOFING

166. **Mr BECKER** (on notice) asked the Minister of Housing and Construction:

1. How many South Australian Housing Trust properties were re-roofed, and at what locations, during the year ended 30 June 1985 and in the current year to date?

2. What is the average cost of re-roofing and what materials are preferred?

3. What specific problems, if any, have occurred with the re-roofing program?

The Hon. T.H. HEMMINGS: The replies are as follows:

1. 1 184 trust properties were re-roofed during the 1984-85 financial year with 1 046 completed in this financial year to date.

A break down of regional activities is as follows:

Region	Completed 1984-85	1985-86 To Date
Metro South	247	131
Metro North	226	288
Central	153	253
Northern	8	34
Eyre	168	63
Southern and Riverland	3	3
South Eastern	98	40
Inner Metro	76	32
North East	205	202
Total	1 184	1 046

2. The average cost of re-roofing a trust property is currently approximately \$2 000, taking into account such differences in types and sizes of dwellings and the higher costs incurred in some country centres. Generally, zincalume cor-

rugated sheeting is used to replace the old corrugated iron roofs, but a small mix of coloured sheeting and coloured pressed metal tiles are used to vary the aesthetics of the trust's estates.

3. Very few problems have occurred in the trusts' re-roofing program to date; However, a recent contract was not completed due to the insolvency of a roofing contractor. This did result in delays in completing the work and some inconvenience to the tenants concerned.

TENANT VACANCIES

169. **Mr BECKER** (on notice) asked the Minister of Housing and Construction: What was the turnover ratio of tenant vacancies caused by termination of rental by existing tenants to rental stock held in the past 12 months and what are the major reasons for such turnover?

The Hon. T.H. HEMMINGS: In the 1984-85 financial year, the trust reallocated a total of 5 453 vacancies following termination by existing tenants. This represented 10.23 per cent of the rental stock (53 281 dwellings) at 30 June 1985. Although the trust does not keep detailed records on why tenants vacate, past surveys have shown that, in the main, vacancies occur for the following reasons:

- death of the tenant
- vacate to purchase
- change in household size or marital status
- medical problems or advancing age
- change in employment
- moving interstate or overseas
- transfers

The trust believes that the majority of vacancies would still occur for these reasons. It should be noted however, that large numbers of tenants do not state their reason for vacating, as it is not essential or mandatory that they do so.

FALIE

170. **Mr BLACKER** (on notice) asked the Minister of Marine: What have been and what will be the Marine and Harbors charges for port berthing and associated services for the Jubilee 150 vessel *Falie* at each of the ports visited on the grain trade re-enactment?

The Hon. R.K. ABBOTT: The *Falie* and its cargo have been exempted from all normal port and wharfage charges during that vessel's grain trade re-enactment voyage.

171. **Mr BLACKER** (on notice) asked the Minister of Transport representing the Minister of Local Government:

1. What were the circumstances that prevented the *Falie* from visiting Arno Bay on Monday 24 February?

2. Was every endeavour made to have the vessel enter Arno Bay?

3. Was an offer made by local people to tow the vessel into Arno Bay and, if so, why was this offer not accepted?

4. Was an offer made to have a diesel mechanic ferried to the vessel and, if so, why was this offer not accepted?

5. Will the *Falie* be re-scheduled to visit Arno Bay and, if so, when?

The Hon. G.F. KENEALLY: The honourable member has asked a series of questions regarding the *Falie* and Arno Bay. At least one of the honourable member's questions has been overtaken by events. To answer his last question first, the *Falie* itinerary was re-scheduled to allow the vessel to visit Arno Bay on Monday, March 10, between 9 a.m. and 1.30 p.m. While the shore-based activities, which coincided with the ship's visit were nowhere near as extensive as those originally planned for February 24, the occasion was quite

successful. The vessel arrived under sail and after anchoring about 100 metres off the jetty the Chairman of *Falie* Project Ltd and others on board visited the shore and spoke to local people. Bags of grain from the district were loaded on board and several hundred people were able to inspect the vessel.

- (i) On arrival off Arno Bay on the morning of 24 February, after crossing Spencer Gulf under sail, a major problem was found in the governor of the ship's auxiliary engine when that engine was started. A broken worm gear prevented the governor from operating normally. *Falie* was approximately 5 miles off Arno Bay when the breakdown occurred. The vessel hove to but, with the water too deep to anchor and on-shore winds, began to drift towards the shore at approximately one nautical mile an hour. After two hours of unsuccessful attempts to repair the problem, the Master decided to hoist the sails to take the vessel well out to sea and out of danger.
- (ii) Yes. The efforts of *Falie's* engineers to repair the governor are evidence of that. However, with freshening on-shore winds forecast, it was unsafe to enter Arno Bay without auxiliary power. That would not have been in the best interests of the ship and its crew.
- (iii) Such an offer was not received by those on board *Falie* until it reached Port Lincoln. While the offer was appreciated, it would not have been possible for small pleasure craft to have towed a 200 tonne vessel under such circumstances.

- (iv) The Manager of *Falie* Project, who was on the vessel, reports that he was not aware of such an offer but did know that the engine problem required spare parts held in Adelaide. None were available locally because he had purchased them himself from Hawker Siddeley in Melbourne. Moreover, with two fully qualified engineers on board, one of whom was on the vessel when it visited Arno Bay for the town's centenary in 1983, a diesel mechanic from Arno Bay would not have been able to assist.

GAY GAMES PARTY

172. Mr S.G. EVANS (on notice) asked the Minister of Employment and Further Education:

- 1. What is the estimated cost of advertising and promoting the Gay Games Party?
- 2. Will food and drink be provided at the party and, if so, who will meet the cost?
- 3. Will the Minister provide a written answer to the original questions asked by the then Member for Fisher in the letter of 21 August 1985 and, if so, when?

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

- 1. As there is no CITY project called the 'Gay Games Party', the only cost incurred is \$7.98 to place a small advertisement in the newspaper.
- 2. As there is no project, no food and drink will be provided.
- 3. The letter referred to is, in fact, the letter of 21 February 1986 and a written reply has been provided.