HOUSE OF ASSEMBLY

Wednesday 12 April 1989

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

PETITION: MARINELAND

A petition signed by 248 residents of South Australia praying that the House urge the Government to reconsider the closure of Marineland was presented by Mr Becker.

Petition received.

PETITION: FLINDERS RANGES NATIONAL PARK

A petition signed by 66 residents of South Australia praying that the House urge the Government to modify the scale and nature of the proposed resort development in the Flinders Ranges National Park was presented by Ms Cashmore.

Petition received.

PETITION: NATIONAL PARKS

A petition signed by 290 residents of South Australia praying that the House take action to ensure that national parks and recreation reserves remain free of foreign control was presented by Mr S.G. Evans.

Petition received.

PETITION: FISCAL POLICY

A petition signed by 294 residents of South Australia praying that the House take action to persuade the Federal Government to reduce interest rates and urge the State Government to reduce taxes and charges was presented by Mr S.G. Evans.

Petition received.

PETITION: BICYCLE HELMETS

A petition signed by 45 residents of South Australia praying that the House urge the Government to make the wearing of bicycle helmets compulsory was presented by Ms Gayler.

Petition received.

PETITION: COORONG BEACH

A petition signed by 380 residents of South Australia praying that the House urge the Government to review proposals for restricting the use of the Coorong Beach for recreation purposes was presented by Mr Lewis.

Petition received.

PETITIONS: INTEREST RATES

Petitions signed by 59 residents of South Australia praying that the House take action to persuade the Federal Government to amend economic policy to reduce housing and rural interest rates were presented by Mr Lewis.

Petitions received.

QUESTION

The SPEAKER: I direct that the following answer to a question without notice be distributed and printed in *Hansard.*

BANKCARD

In reply to **Hon. B.C. EASTICK (Light)** 14 March.

The Hon. J.C. BANNON: The Government sees no reason at present for upfront fees, or any other additional fees on Bankcard or other credit cards. The issue of upfront fees has arisen in the course of consultations about new uniform credit legislation by the Standing Committee of Consumer Affairs Ministers (SCOCAM). South Australia is actively involved in the development of this proposed legislation. Ministers resolved that the issue should be carefully examined and therefore directed the SCOCAM working party to examine proposals by financial institutions to introduce upfront fees for their credit card services in conjunction with interest rate falls. The working party is aiming to present a draft uniform Credit Bill and a report on its inquiry into credit card pricing for consideration by SCOCAM Ministers at their meeting, scheduled for July 1989.

QUESTION TIME

Mr TERRY CAMERON

Mr OLSEN (Leader of the Opposition): I direct my question to the Premier. In relation to the investigation of Mr Cameron by the Department of Public and Consumer Affairs, will the Government appoint an independent legal practitioner to conduct an inquiry with the following terms of reference:

To identify what files, reports and other documents were opened by the Department of Consumer Affairs and the Builders Licensing Board in relation to Mr Cameron and his associates and associated companies during the time they were respectively active in the building industry.

To identify whether all those files, reports and other documents were still held by the Department of Consumer Affairs on 15 February 1989, when a further investigation of Mr Cameron's activities was ordered and, if they were not, which files, reports and other documents had been removed, when, by whom and for what reasons.

To identify which files, reports and other documents relating to Mr Cameron, his associates and associated companies were examined by the departmental investigators whose reports were tabled on 4 April by the Premier and, if all available files, reports and other documents were not examined, the reasons for not doing so.

To identify which files, reports and other documents relating to Mr Cameron and his associates and associated companies remained in the department at the completion of this investigation.

And as a result of establishing the above facts, to report those facts and on whether or not there has been a full and proper investigation of Mr Cameron's activities in the building industry or whether the two reports tabled on 4 April by the Premier were deficient in material respects.

The Hon. J.C. BANNON: That was a very long and complex question—

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order!

The Hon. J.C BANNON: It has just stopped short of asking that the Government hold a royal commission into this matter that has been beaten up by the Opposition.

Members interjecting:

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

The Hon. J.C. BANNON: That will be the next thing the Opposition demands on these events that were alleged to have taken place between 1976 and 1979, I think, on the material that the Leader was quoting yesterday. I will refer his question to my colleague, the Minister of Consumer Affairs, and bring back a considered reply.

PET FOOD

Mr GROOM (Hartley): Will the Minister of Education ask the Minister of Consumer Affairs to review the adequacy of consumer laws relating to the sale of pet food? This matter was brought to my attention by a constituent who purchased a tin of pet food from a supermarket. By sheer chance, and before she had given the food to her pet, she discovered in the pet food a significantly sized fish hook with a very sharp arrow head.

As a consequence of that discovery, she rang the Consumer Affairs Department, the local board of health, the city council health department and a number of other consumer organisations and found that no prosecution or action could be taken because the item was not for human consumption. Consequently, there is a gap in the legislation. As there are no laws covering the sale of pet food, will the Minister of Consumer Affairs investigate whether any change is warranted?

The Hon. G.J. CRAFTER: I thank the honourable member for raising this most interesting dilemma that was faced by his constituent. It may be that there is a recourse under the manufacturer's warranty legislation that was passed by this Parliament in the early 1970s that may give a remedy in this situation. That would need to be explored. I will be pleased to refer this matter to the Minister of Consumer Affairs for his attention.

Mr TERRY CAMERON

Mr S.J. BAKER (Mitcham): Before yesterday's debate in this House, did the Premier have any personal knowledge of the following:

1. That Mr Cameron had been found by the Builders Licensing Board not to be a proper person to be a director of a building company.

2. That Mr Cameron had been associated with a company which had failed to comply with orders of the Builders Licensing Board.

3. If so, why did the Premier say last week that Mr Cameron had been completely exonerated of any wrongdoing in the building industry? If not, did the Premier not consider he had a duty after questions were first asked in this House a year ago, to ensure that Mr Cameron gave the Government a full account of all his activities in the building industry?

The Hon. J.C. BANNON: First, Mr Cameron is not accountable to the Government. He is not a member of my Cabinet nor a member of this Parliament. Secondly, the information that I had was based on the reports that had been tabled. Where I referred to Mr Cameron being exonerated, I was referring to that specific reference by the Commissioner for Consumer Affairs in the letter of transmission of his report. I will read it again. It is as follows:

> You have asked me to conduct an investigation into the activities of Terry Gordon Cameron in the building industry. The investigation is now complete. In addition, allegations made in Parliament in relation to Mr Cameron's activities on a number of days, and allegations made to my investigating officers in the course of their inquiries . . .

And we now know that not all the members of the Opposition, including the Leader, who claimed to have information helped in those inquiries. They were shunted off to Mr Yeeles—

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order!

The Hon. J.C. BANNON: —of the Leader's office—the Leader did not want to have his hands dirtied by this, or be called to account—and the member for Mitcham. The Commissioner continues, as follows:

> . . . have all been investigated, and the conclusion was . . .

And this is why I said Mr Cameron had been exonerated:

> In any event I have concluded, based on the advice I have received from the senior legal officer of the Department of Public and Consumer Affairs, and the report made by the officer of the department in charge of the investigation, that it has not been established Mr Cameron at any stage contravened the Act.

There it is stated quite plainly. That was the information I had. That was the information Parliament had.

Members interjecting:

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

The Hon. J.C. BANNON: It is not wrong, because the matters referred to have been alluded to in the report. Any member who has read those reports will understand them. Mr Cameron has been exonerated of those charges made by the Opposition. Incidentally, I point out that these events occurred well out of time for anyone to be liable to prosecution. We also tabled the findings of the Crown Solicitor, who double-checked this matter.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order!

The Hon. J.C. BANNON: His report not only corroborated the findings but went on to say that there may be some other people who could have committed offences. The question is why, then, they are not being prosecuted and the answer is, 'Because it is out of time.' Having said that, that is the information that Parliament received and it is on that information I base my statements. The Government in no way interfered with, instructed, intimidated or directed any member of the Public Service, the Commissioner or his officers in how they carried out their duties. The Leader of the Opposition disgracefully libels those public servants in what he has been saying outside this place.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order!

Mr Olsen: Prove it.

The SPEAKER: Order! Regardless of the strong feelings members may have on any matter, there are still certain requirements for decorum and good manners in the Parliament.

NUCLEAR POWER

Mr RANN (Briggs): My question is to the Minister of Mines and Energy. Has the State Government been urged by the authors of a high level report to adopt nuclear power as the electricity source for South Australia? A headline on the front page of Monday's *Advertiser* claims that a report prepared for the State Government 'urges nuclear power for South Australia'. A number of my constituents are con-

cerned whether or not this newspaper account is an accurate reflection of the report and its recommendations.

The Hon. J.H.C. KLUNDER: I thank the honourable member for his question, and the blunt answer is 'No'. Not only does the report not urge nuclear power for South Australia, but it devotes only 61 words to the subject in a 26 page report. The report is not about nuclear power. It is entitled 'Greenhouse Effect and Energy Policy in South Australia'. It was prepared at my request by the Energy Planning Executive following discussions at the November meeting of the Australian Minerals and Energy Council, which resolved to establish a working party to review the energy policy implications of the greenhouse effect.

The report is structured to provide a background on the greenhouse effect and the energy implications it may have for this State. It canvasses a range of possible options and strategies for combating the effects of the greenhouse phenomenon. It is a discussion document—not a policy paper or high level report—and I will be using it in our continuing work with the Commonwealth on the implications of the greenhouse issue.

Let me make it quite clear that this Government is not considering any change in its present policy of opposing the use of nuclear power for electricity generation in this State. However, I am not in the business of stifling debate on this question, nor do I instruct officers of my departments to turn a blind eye to the nuclear option or any other option when they are asked to prepare a discussion document on the implications of the greenhouse effect.

However, unlike the Opposition Leader—who responded to the *Advertiser* article with his usual uncritical endorsement of the use of nuclear power in this State—I am prepared to look at a much wider range of options and strategies and to reject the Opposition's quick-fix mentality. That is precisely what the Energy Planning Executive's discussion document does. It discusses all the issues it is able to identify which may have relevance to the greenhouse effect. Let me quickly summarise some of the many suggestions in the report:

it recommends the continuation and extension of the range of programs already operating in the State which assist in combating the greenhouse effect;

it says the Office of Energy Planning should continue to liaise with Commonwealth and State working groups on developing common information data bases, coordination of research, development and demonstration of technologies which improve energy efficiency and reduce greenhouse gas emissions, and the development of longer-term strategies to combat the greenhouse effect;

the State should push for a review of the National Energy Management Program with the aim of revitalising that program with clear objectives and with adequate resources to achieve those objectives. A primary objective of such a revitalised program could be a 20 per cent improvement in energy efficiency by the year 2000 with a focus on the motor vehicle industry and industry in general where a national approach will be essential;

the State should support the development of an energy demand management strategy to be agreed upon during 1989 with specific programs defined;

the State should support the review of a range of alternative technologies for supply and end-use based on their potential for reduction in the emission of greenhouse gases;

the State should encourage utilities to take account of greenhouse considerations and to specifically address these in all development proposals which are made to the Government;

the State should take account of the impact on greenhouse gas emissions in determining policies for technology research and development, and future fuel mix; and

the State should consider the implications of possible future international agreements resulting from the greenhouse effect on the State's energy supply system and develop least damage/most benefit strategies within the scope of such potential constraints.

Mr TERRY CAMERON

The Hon. E.R. GOLDSWORTHY (Deputy Leader of the Opposition): My question is to the Premier. In view of the information given to the House yesterday, does he still believe that Mr Cameron did not break the law and that he should be exonerated of any wrongdoing in the building industry?

The Hon. J.C. BANNON: All of this was covered yesterday in the debate. I stand by what I have said. The report and the material we have before us support the position that I have taken.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order! The honourable member for Albert Park.

PUBLIC AND CONSUMER AFFAIRS OFFICE

Mr HAMILTON (Albert Park): My question is directed to the Minister of Education, representing the Minister of Consumer Affairs in another place.

An honourable member interjecting:

Mr HAMILTON: Will you belt up!

The SPEAKER: Order! I caution the honourable member for Albert Park. It is the duty of the Chair to try to maintain decorum.

Mr HAMILTON: He's hopeless!

The SPEAKER: Order! The honourable member will resume his seat. The Chair is making every endeavour to remind members of their good manners. It is most unfortunate that some members forgot theirs when the member for Albert Park rose to his feet. The honourable member for Albert Park.

Mr HAMILTON: Thank you for your protection, Sir. My question is directed to the Minister of Education, representing the Minister of Consumer Affairs in another place. Will the Minister assist residents of the western suburbs of Adelaide by investigating the feasibility of installing an office of the Department of Public and Consumer Affairs in that area? Many constituents have complained that they must journey to the city should they wish to lodge a complaint with the Department of Public and Consumer Affairs. My constituents have suggested that a site, either at Woodville, West Lakes or Port Adelaide, would assist them greatly. I am supported in this request by the members for Price and Henley Beach.

The Hon. G.J. CRAFTER: I thank the honourable member for raising this issue. I shall be pleased to refer the matter to my colleague in another place. I am aware of the concern that has been expressed by a number of members in relation to access to these important services in our community, particularly by those people who are aged or disadvantaged in some way and who have to travel into the city to obtain services.

WOMEN'S SHELTERS

The Hon. JENNIFER CASHMORE (Coles): My question is to the Minister of Community Welfare. Following the statement by the Chairwoman of the review committee into women's shelters, Ms Judith Roberts, that it was the Government's decision to make public unsubstantiated allegations against the Christies Beach Women's Shelter and the unanimous decision of the select committee of another place to condemn the use of those allegations in the strongest possible terms, does the Government accept full respon-

sibility for the serious damage that this action has done to the reputations of all those associated with the shelter? Is it the Government's intention to offer them compensation and to support any application by former employees for reinstatement as shelter workers? Will the Minister review the procedures of the Department for Community Welfare for dealing with women's shelters, in view of the committee's findings that these procedures need to be improved?

The Hon. S.M. LENEHAN: I thank the honourable member for the question. I think it goes without saying that I have long been a supporter of the women's shelter movement and of the services and facilities that women's shelters provide in this State. Can I also say—

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order!

The Hon. S.M. LENEHAN: Can I also say that a number of points are contained in the honourable member's question and I am not sure that I got all those points down. First, I want to address a number of issues that have been—

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order! The Minister is replying to a question, and it is not possible for anyone to do so when they are being harassed by the heckling that is coming from some members.

The Hon. S.M. LENEHAN: Thank you, Mr Speaker. I do take this as being a very important question, and I would like to answer it in the best way that I can.

Mr Lewis interjecting:

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

The Hon. S.M. LENEHAN: With respect to the first part of the question, if I recall it correctly, the honourable member suggested that the chairperson had said that the decision to include in the report the unsubstantiated allegations was at the request of the Government. I would like to remind the House that at the time I was neither Minister nor a member of Cabinet. It was something undertaken by my predecessor, the Minister in another place, as I understand the situation, that the unsubstantiated allegations were included in the report *Shelters in the Storm.* That report was subsequently tabled by the then Minister of Community Welfare.

I have no knowledge of whether it was a Government decision in terms of a Cabinet decision or an individual decision taken by the honourable Minister, and I think it is quite inappropriate for me to comment on that point. If I recall correctly, the second part of the question dealt with what I am going to do in view of the unsubstantiated allegations being referred to in the first of the recommendations of the select committee's report. First, quite clearly, my reading of the select committee report indicates that there has been no recommendation regarding any form of compensation. The select committee did not suggest that.

From my understanding of the report, the select committee found that, irrespective of the unsubstantiated allegations, the persistent overrunning of budget, etc., was 'sufficient in itself to warrant defunding'. With respect to the honourable member's question about reinstatement, I remind the honourable member that as Minister of Community Welfare I fund over 400 different bodies and organisations in South Australia, all of which must be incorporated bodies and therefore are independent from ministerial decision in terms of the appointment, retrenchment or reinstatement of staff.

It is not within the ambit of my responsibility to reinstate any member of any one of those 400 organisations which I fund. The funding is given to those organisations in terms—

An honourable member: It is public funding.

The Hon. S.M. LENEHAN: It is public funding, and I am very happy with that interjection, because I would like to talk about that. Grants to non-government organisations are discretionary payments, with no legal obligation for any Government of any persuasion to continue funding to any group. Therefore, the honourable member's question is really not relevant to my responsibilities. The honourable member has not referred to the remaining 10 recommendations of the select committee report, but I am happy to pick up those recommendations.

I share with the House the fact that I am implementing a number of the recommendations in terms of the necessity for financial accountability of any organisation receiving public funding, and in the areas of my portfolio I have, very early in my ministerial career, put this on the agenda. I thank the honourable member for his interjection, because it has highlighted the fact that 10 of the 11 recommendations dealt specifically with the need for any organisation receiving public funding to be very clearly accountable for the way in which it spends the money of the public of South Australia. I am quite pleased to receive those recommendations, and can assure this Parliament that I will be moving to implement them.

WEST BEACH REDEVELOPMENT

Mr D.S. BAKER (Victoria): Will the Minister of State Development advise whether an officer of his department effectively blackmailed the investor in the West Beach redevelopment, Zhen Yun, by telling the investor that the Government would not support the construction of a hotel on the Marineland site unless the plans to include a marineland complex in the redevelopment were scrapped on 14 February? The Minister told the House that the decision not to include a marineland complex in the West Beach redevelopment was taken by Zhen Yun on the grounds of its viability.

However, the Opposition has been provided with information that the Government put immense pressure on the investor to make this decision because of the continued opposition to the Marineland redevelopment by sections of the Labor Party. There is in fact evidence going back to August last year that the Government wanted to scrap the Marineland redevelopment with its threat to withdraw a guarantee of funds to the Tribond company which had been appointed by the West Beach Trust to redevelop Marineland. This pressure continued to the point at which Zhen Yun was informed by a departmental officer early this year that the Government would not support its plan for a hotel at West Beach if Zhen Yun wanted to include a marineland complex in the total redevelopment. This is further evidence that South Australia is going to lose one of its most popular tourist attractions at Marineland—

The SPEAKER: Order! The honourable member is beginning to debate the question in making postulations.

Mr D.S. BAKER: —because of union and political opposition rather than on the grounds of its viability.

The SPEAKER: Order! The honourable member's leave is withdrawn. The honourable Minister.

The Hon. LYNN ARNOLD: The Government did not blackmail Zhen Yun nor did the Government put pressure on Zhen Yun to change its plan to delete an oceanarium from its proposal.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order! The honourable member for Hayward.

OAKLANDS LEVEL CROSSING

Mrs APPLEBY (Hayward): Will the Minister of Transport ensure that every priority is given to relieving the delays experienced by road traffic at Oaklands level crossing? The remedial maintenance work undertaken following the Minister's inspection on site on 24 November 1988 has improved the smoothness of the crossing but there remains the same delay factor. With the commissioning of the express/stopping train discrimination system, 25 per cent of the delay will be discounted. Recent examination of the crossing on a weekday between 4.46 p.m. and 6.29 p.m.—some 104 minutes—indicated that the estimated road closure time was 24 minutes. Given the present situation, the additional facilities to serve the community—such as the Westfield office tower, Marion Civic Centre and development on the previous Oaklands education site—are being argued as reasons for additional pressure on the Oaklands crossing and feeder roads, which generate an intolerable situation for commuters.

The SPEAKER: Order! The honourable member is debating the situation. The honourable Minister.

The Hon. G.F. KENEALLY: I thank the honourable member for her question. I expect that she would like some assurance, before my retirement as Minister, that that level crossing remains a high on Government priority. The honourable member was correct in drawing to the attention of the House that it has a considerable traffic build-up in this area, causing severe inconvenience to commuters. I suppose members who are familiar with the area know that the complex of streets near Diagonal Road, Morphett Road down to Dunrobin Road, combined with the level crossing, creates inevitable problems for commuters. In fact, the long-term resolution has always been grade separation. Before talking about grade separation I will refer to some of the developments taking place within the new signalling system capacity available to the State Transport Authority.

Mr LEWIS: On a point of order, Mr Speaker.

The SPEAKER: The honourable member for Murray-Mallee.

Mr LEWIS: Mr Speaker, what relevance does the Minister's offer of information about the new signalling system for South Australia have to the question that has been asked by the member for Hayward about a specific level crossing?

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order! Because of the Leader of the Opposition, the Chair could not hear the last few words of the honourable member's point of order. I heard the words 'What do signalling systems have to do with—' but I did not hear any words from that point.

Mr LEWIS: Mr Speaker, the honourable member for Hayward asked a question about a specific level crossing and the Minister now says that he will give the House information about the signalling system of the STA and its general application. What relevance has that to the honourable member's question?

The SPEAKER: Order! I appreciate the honourable member's point. However, only the Minister knows in his own mind how he will link signalling in general with signalling and other safety devices at a specific crossing. The honourable Minister.

An honourable member interjecting:

The Hon. G.F. KENEALLY: Yes, and I am getting better at it day by day. I forgive the member for Murray-Mallee because he lives out in the country and does not understand how signalling equipment and the STA operate at level crossings. With stage 3 of the signalling equipment, the management information system will be able to distinguish between express trains going through the Oaklands Railway Station and the level crossing and those that stop at the level crossing. So, there will be a more efficient use of the level crossing and a reduction in the time delays there. I hope that that satisfies the member for Murray-Mallee.

I have asked the STA to conduct a study into whether or not an overpass, an underpass, a rail over road, road over rail (or a mixture of the last two) should be undertaken at this crossing. The results of that study are with the Highways Department and the Department of Transport, and they will determine the priorities that we should accept. The cheapest of those options is clearly rail over road, but whether that is the most efficient option in terms of serving both the rail traveller and the road user is yet to be determined.

In any event, this is a costly exercise and it will need to be placed into the forward works program. I assure the honourable member that grade separation is the preferred option to satisfy all the competing needs of that complex of roads and the level crossing. The Government and the Highways Department see this as a matter of high priority. In fact, it is equal now to any other level crossing in Adelaide in terms of its adverse effect on road traffic, and the Government will consider placing that in our construction timetable. I hope that, when the new Minister of Transport is announced within the next few weeks, he or she will be able to make a statement about this matter at a time not too many weeks or months ahead.

MARINELAND

Mr BECKER (Hanson): Will the Minister for Environment and Planning exercise his powers under the Planning Act to allow the public to make submissions on proposals to relocate the Marineland dolphins to the Granite Island marine enclosure? I understand that an environmental impact statement for the Granite Island development was published in March last year. At that stage, there was no plan to locate dolphins within this development. However, since the Government's decision to scrap the Marineland development, it has been proposed that the dolphins should be relocated to the Granite Island marine enclosure when it is established. This has required major modifications to the original Granite Island plans.

Section 49 of the Planning Act allows the Minister to invite further public submissions where the substance of an environmental impact statement has been significantly affected by subsequent changes to development plans. This has occurred in this case and an exercise of the Minister's powers would allow all those who have a view about whether or not it is appropriate to relocate the dolphins to Granite Island to make official submissions.

The Hon. D.J. HOPGOOD: It is my melancholy duty to inform the member for Hanson that his premise is wrong and that that which he desires is currently taking place. The Granite Island development requires two things: first, consideration of a planning application which is now before the relevant authorities; and, secondly, consideration of an animal management plan which is also currently before the relevant authorities.

Both of these two applications will go on public exhibition, if they have not already gone on public exhibition, and a week or so ago I was told it was about a week off (that is the reason for my degree of vagueness). If they are on public exhibition now, the only reason for putting them on public exhibition is so that the public can make submissions. If they are not yet on public exhibition and they

go on tomorrow or the next day, that will also be so that public exhibition can take place. Although I regret to have to tell the honourable member that he is wrong, I am delighted to tell him that that which he desires will take place.

Mr Becker: Will it be advertised?

The Hon. D.J. HOPGOOD: Yes, that is what public exhibition means.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order! I remind honourable members that they are on public exhibition, too.

ENERGY EFFICIENT HOUSES

Mr ROBERTSON (Bright): Will the Minister of Mines and Energy keep under review a research project currently being undertaken at the University of Adelaide to assess the cost effectiveness and thermal efficiency of purpose built and retrofitted low energy housing? On page 3 of the Adelaide University magazine *Lumin*, volume 18, No. 3, published recently, an article poses the question whether low energy houses work. As one who in 1973 puttied up ventilation holes, put loose fill in the ceiling, installed foam around doors to stop air leaks and blocked off chimneys to stop Father Christmas, I have a vested interest in hearing the answer.

The Hon. J.H.C. KLUNDER: I thank the honourable member for his question. I am pleased to advise him that the project which is partially funded by a South Australian Government SENRAC grant is planned to run over a two year period and will assess the performance of existing energy efficient housing in comparison with a control group of existing standard houses. The criteria for control will include user experiences and attitudes, thermal comfort and amenity, energy consumption and environmental conditions. Where possible, these criteria will be related to the five star design rating guidelines previously established by the Glass Mass Insulation Council with financial support from the Government to the tune of $48 000.

The South Australian portion of the study will be undertaken by Ms Susan Coldicutt and Mr Terry Williamson, both senior lecturers in the Department of Architecture at the University of Adelaide. These two people have had extensive experience in this type of study and, indeed, have pioneered, with assistance of this Government, a number of the evaluation techniques. The data collected on each household will be recorded on a sealed comfort vote logger developed by these researchers under a $31 000 SENRAC grant in 1983.

The Government regards the provision of energy efficient housing as an important part both of its energy and its social justice policies. The results of this project will benefit both the community and the housing industry through the identification of practices which are cost effective and endorsed by users. This study will be a timely review of practices in the design of energy efficient dwellings, and will allow the best ideas to be identified and publicised. It is an important part of the Government's programs to reduce energy costs and encourage domestic use efficiency. Indeed, it is not difficult to see a linkage between this research project and the answer that I gave earlier regarding the discussion paper on the greenhouse effect.

PORT LINCOLN SEWAGE TREATMENT WORKS

Mr BLACKER (Flinders): Will the Minister of Water Resources explain to the House when it is expected that a sewage treatment works will be built at Port Lincoln? A 1973 E&WS Department report into Spencer Gulf water pollution identified that the area to the east of Billy Light's Point near Port Lincoln was the most polluted area in Spencer Gulf.

Since then there has been extensive development in the Lincoln Cove area, as well as a move by the Port Lincoln Yacht Club to relocate to Lincoln Cove. When winds blow in a south-easterly direction the pollution in the sea is visible from both Kirton Point and Lincoln Cove. Most sections of the community are expressing increasing concern about the pollution problem, and residents are anxious to know when the project is expected to commence.

The Hon. S.M. LENEHAN: I thank the honourable member for his question. He is always concerned to represent his constituents in this place in any way he can. I am aware of the concern of the residents as to what is seen by them to be a problem. I have personally visited the area. Perhaps I was fortunate to fly over the outfall area on a good day, because there was nothing obvious or evident to me, despite the fact that we circled a number of times over the area where the pipe actually discharges into the sea.

At present the proposed Port Lincoln sewerage treatment plant is not part of the immediate budget proposals, and therefore I cannot give a definite time frame with respect to the building of a sewage treatment works.

HOMELESS YOUTH

Mr DUIGAN (Adelaide): Will the Minister of Community Welfare advise what progress has been made by the joint Government/Adelaide City Council working party on the plight of homeless street kids in Adelaide, and on the ways in which the Government and the council can work cooperatively and with other inner city youth agencies to deal with this distressing feature of our city, in order to determine the most effective utilisation of the public and private financial resources that the people and Government are prepared to direct to this problem.

The Hon. S.M. LENEHAN: I thank the honourable member for his question. I am very pleased to be able to provide him with a progress report on the way in which the Government is working with the Adelaide City Council in addressing what is considered to be a very serious problem, and I certainly consider that that is the case. I remind the honourable member that the Minister of Housing and Construction, the Lord Mayor (Mr Steve Condous) and I established a task force in March this year, because we wanted to develop proposals to respond to the needs of homeless young people in the inner city area.

The task force had a number of terms of reference, and I think that it is appropriate to share them with this House. First, the task force was asked to gain an overview of existing emergency accommodation, welfare, health and street worker services that are available to the young homeless in the inner city area. Secondly, it was asked to determine different service needs for young homeless people. Thirdly, it was asked to identify possible gaps in such services. Fourthly, we asked it to consider long-term accommodation options for such young people. Fifthly, it was asked to develop options for more detailed considerations by the relevant Government departments and the Adelaide City Council. Finally, we asked the task force to report to the Minister of Community Welfare, the Minister of Housing and Construction and the Adelaide City Council.

The task force is chaired by Mr Peter Bicknell, who is the Manager of the non-government welfare unit. It consists

of a very good cross-representation of people from the community and various Government departments as follows: two representatives of the Inner City Emergency Accommodation Coordinating Committee; two representatives of the Inner City Youth Worker's Network; a representative of the Youth Bureau; the Adelaide City Council Community Services Manager; a representative of the Adolescent Support Team (my department); the Director of The Second Story; a representative of the South Australian Health Commission; a representative of the Drug and Alcohol Services Council; and a Youth Supported Accommodation Program project officer, who will provide the executive services.

The task force has a three member executive which comprises the chair, the City Planner from the Adelaide City Council, and a nominee of the Minister of Housing. This executive will report to the Lord Mayor, the Minister of Housing and Construction, and me on the recommendations of the task force by 1 June this year. If further work is required after that time, it will be required to report by 1 September this year.

It is necessary to consider this area of working together, because it is important to take into account the considerable knowledge, experience and documentation that already exists in the honourable member's electorate and, therefore, that main service providers are included on the task force. A half-time project officer has been appointed to work exclusively on this task. The executive, which has already met, has called for submissions from interested parties, especially with respect to the most appropriate ways of responding to the needs of young people.

I understand that, as part of that consultation process, the executive, if it has not already contacted the honourable member who is the local member, will certainly be doing so to get his input and contribution to this very important issue. It is important to consider responses which might lead to many young people returning to their families and their homes or to being supported outside the inner city area along with the provision of new facilities.

I think it appropriate to share with the House that, on a national perspective, the March Social Welfare Ministers' conference in Tasmania established a short-term national working party to prepare a report on the Burdekin Report on homeless children in Australia, and Mr Peter Bicknell from the Department of Community Welfare is the State's representative on this national committee, which will report to a special National Social Welfare Ministers' conference, which I will be attending, to be called in June. Finally, it is essential that the co-operation that has now been established is maintained, and continues to address what has been highlighted by the honourable member as a very serious problem and one that we must address as quickly as possible.

AIDS TRANSMISSION IN PRISON

The Hon. B.C. EASTICK (Light): Can the Minister of Correctional Services say whether the Government is considering the introduction of conjugal visits to reduce the risk of AIDS transmission in prisons, and what further action will the Government take to reduce drug-related activity by prisoners in view of the fact that almost one in five prisoners is now receiving drug treatment?

There are now 11 prisoners in South Australian gaols identified as being infected by HIV—the AIDS virus. This has increased from three cases two years ago. The Opposition also has received information that almost 28 per cent of prisoners in South Australian gaols are receiving treatment from the prison drug unit.

In the first six months of 1988-89, the prison drug unit dealt with 498 individual clients, representing 18.9 per cent of the monthly prison figures. In a letter providing this information, the Minister has also referred to the South Australian AIDS strategy in indicating action the Government could consider to deal with AIDS in prisons. In a section on AIDS in prisons that strategy states:

> Reducing the incidence of institutional sexual activity would help reduce the risk of AIDS transmission. It may therefore be desirable that more temporary leave or extended family and conjugal visits be available to prisoners.

In relation to the problem of drugs in prisons, the figures I have quoted show further action is needed to stop drugs getting into prisons and being used by prisoners. In this respect, the Minister told the House on 16 February this year that random urine testing was being seriously considered by the Government.

The Hon. FRANK BLEVINS: There is no intention to introduce conjugal rights into the sytem. It is something that is available to prisoners in other systems in Australia. The closest prison that provides this facility for prisoners is at Ararat in Victoria. The rationale is quite clear: all prisoners are coming out of prison at some time. I will put this as delicately as possible. If we want to avoid institutional sex, one way of doing that is to see that sex, although it is available within the institution, is also available within a more stable relationship. How was that! Did you like that?

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order!

The Hon. FRANK BLEVINS: Well, the member for Hanson—

The SPEAKER: Order! This is not Lords or the MCG, and the Minister does not make appeals of that nature!

The Hon. FRANK BLEVINS: The member for Hanson in his atavistic way suggests that we reintroduce bromide. I do not know whether bromide was ever as effective as people said but, as I say, it certainly has not been considered. On the question of HIV positive prisoners in the prison system, there were 11 as at the date the letter was sent. I point out that there are no prisoners in South Australia who have full blown AIDS. They are all HIV positive only, which is serious enough.

The number of prisoners in the system with drug problems is not surprising, having regard to my advice from the police that probably the single largest identifiable cause of crime in Australia is drug related. About two-thirds of all crimes committed are in some way or other related to drugs—whether it be financing drugs, drug dealing, or drug addiction. I am delighted to say that the prison drug unit contacts individually those prisoners who may have a drug problem. A drug problem, of course, may not, and quite often does not, necessarily involve hard drugs. There is an alcohol problem amongst prisoners, as well as a problem with other drugs, substance abuse, and prescription drug abuse, and prisoners come into our system with all these problems. I believe that the prison drug unit does a first class job in contacting prisoners, and also in assisting those prisoners who refer themselves to the unit for assistance. That is a program of which we are particularly proud.

As regards keeping drugs out of prisons, I have said before in this House that, unfortunately, I do not have the answer to that. I do not know that anyone, certainly in the Western world, has found an answer. The general consensus is that most drugs come into the prison system through contact visits. No-one in this place in their right mind would suggest that contact visits ought to be abolished. The benefits of contact visits far outweigh the problem of them being used as an avenue for drugs being taken into the prison system.

We have very regular searches of prisons and individuals. After every contact visits mandatory strip searches are undertaken in our high security institutions. From time to time, we insist on visitors being strip searched by our officers if they wish to come into the gaols. Of course, they are free to refuse the strip search, but by the same token we are free to refuse visitors entry into the gaols.

We believe that we take it just about as far as we can. We are presently undertaking a review of the dog squad. I hope that that review will indicate methods by which we can use the dog squad more effectively and more frequently within the prisons. At present a great deal of time of the dogs is spent on escorts, and I believe, without pre-empting the report, that the dogs could probably be used much more effectively and efficiently on further drug detection within the prison system. There was one other question that the member for Light asked—

Mr Becker: Condoms.

The Hon. FRANK BLEVINS: I thank the member for Hanson; again, he comes to my aid. While I am on my feet, I would like to welcome back the member for Hanson. We have missed him. I personally have missed his interjections. The two interjections we have had today have been very sensible and worthwhile. The question of condoms is a very interesting one. Every health authority in the nation would wish condoms to be issued within all the prison systems. It is something with which I do not agree and to which I will not agree. I do not believe it is appropriate.

All our efforts in relation to the prison system ought to deal with reducing the amount of institutional sex that occurs within the system. What we are doing is, predominantly, having single cell accommodation. More than anything else that will cut down the incidence of institutional sex. I thank the member for Light: it was a very interesting question—

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order! I warn the House, in view of the Minister's tendency to prolixity, not to encourage that problem with the Minister by continually prompting him by way of interjection. The honourable Minister has concluded his remarks, I hope?

The Hon. FRANK BLEVINS: Thank you very much, Sir. I was on the point of thanking the member for Light for his question. It raises some very interesting issues, and I would be very happy to debate those issues with him or with the House at some more appropriate time. Not wanting to take up too much of Question Time, I will leave it at that for now.

FINANCIAL MANAGEMENT IN SCHOOL CURRICULA

Mr De LAINE (Price): Will the Minister of Education give consideration to the introduction of household financial management and budgeting into school curricula? There are ever-increasing campaigns by lending institutions to encourage people (and in particular, young people) to use credit. Many people (and, once again, particularly young people) are getting into difficulty by essentially not understanding the system.

This is an area of concern to me as well as to my colleague the member for Albert Park. It has been suggested to us that to learn something about budgeting and how the credit system works would be of immense value to young people.

The Hon. G.J. CRAFTER: I am sure all members are concerned that during their education young people in our community receive some understanding of their roles, responsibilities, and rights as consumers and are able to manage effectively those resources which come into their hands, and give an example to others who are somewhat less fortunate. Unfortunately, there is a spirit of materialism amongst many young people who tend to believe that the acquisition of certain items brings about a sense of well-being and happiness, and that can lead young people into many difficult situations.

I am pleased to inform members that the Education Department has a very active curriculum interest in both our primary and secondary schools in matters relating to financial management in both the home economics and business education aspects of curriculum. Home economics is one area that deals with personal and household financial management, and is offered as part of the secondary school curriculum for years 8 to 12 for both boys and girls.

Part of this course involves the investigation of financial, material, personal, and community resources available to assist families. It also includes such skills as planning a week's food budget, evaluating domestic appliances, and developing strategies for decision-making, which includes clarifying needs and budgeting. In the field of business education, a major component of the year 12 accounting course is the area of personal financial management. This covers budgetary planning and control for the financial affairs of a household. The Business Education Task Group is currently developing a business awareness course that will address the area of financial management and budgeting at junior secondary level.

The project officer in business education is currently working cooperatively with the Australian Bankers Association, the Finance Conference of Australia and the Department of Public and Consumer Affairs. This cooperation between the Education Department and the finance industry will produce resource materials for our schools to help students develop skills in budgeting, use of credit and management of financial matters. I hasten to advise members that this is the Year of School and Industry, and this relationship is being cemented right across the education system. I will be pleased to have the question referred to the Director-General of Education, who is responsible for curriculum content in our schools.

WEST COAST FARMERS

Mr GUNN (Eyre): In view of the Premier's refusal to declare Eyre Peninsula a drought-affected area, will he make immediate representations to the Prime Minister following a further lift in interest rates being charged by the Commonwealth Bank to drought-affected farmers on Eyre Peninsula? When I raised this matter last week with the Minister of Agriculture, the Commonwealth Bank was charging 19.25 per cent interest for loans to farmers on Eyre Peninsula to finance a crop for the forthcoming year. The Minister described the bank's interest rate as disappointing. The situation now is even worse.

I have received representations from some farmers who have received advice from the bank that they will be charged 19.75 per cent—a half per cent rise in just over a week. Further, I have been advised that another bank has sent out at least 40 letters to farmers advising them that they are now unviable and it is unlikely that they will receive carry-on finance to enable them to sow a crop this year. If rises like this continue, more farmers on Eyre Peninsula will be crippled financially. The farmers are looking to the Premier to take up the matter immediately with the Prime Minister, the Chairman of the Commonwealth Bank and other banking institutions to relieve their drastic situation.

The Hon. J.C. BANNON: First, let me correct the honourable member: we have not refused to declare it a drought area. That has been gone through 100 times in explaining the basis of the financing package and the best way of assisting those farmers. I do not wish to canvass that, and nor would the honourable member wish me to.

The interest rates situation is desperate and difficult indeed. That was conceded by my colleague last week, and I am certainly happy to take up the matter. I might add that, as the honourable member knows, we have had a number of meetings with banks to discuss financing packages, and there have been appeals by the Government for the banks to find the best approach. The problem with the Commonwealth Bank was the one put to us in relation to the Government package to which they would not accede. It claims that under the legislation as drafted it is not able to respond to those sorts of requests and is prohibited by statute from so doing. I undertake to take up the matter yet again.

PUBLIC ACCOUNTS COMMITTEE REPORT

Mr HAMILTON (Albert Park) brought up the fifty-ninth report of the Public Accounts Committee on the management of the Justice Information System.

Ordered that report be printed.

PERSONAL EXPLANATION: Mr TERRY CAMERON

Mr OLSEN (Leader of the Opposition): I seek leave to make a personal explanation.

Leave granted.

Mr OLSEN: I claim that in this morning's *Advertiser* Mr Cameron has misrepresented information I put before Parliament yesterday relating to his activities in the building industry. For example, and in particular, he has claimed that the Builders Licensing Board had found only 'minor faults' on two or three houses he had arranged to have built, and that these faults had been rectified immediately. It can be proved from reference to official documents that Mr Cameron's statements are untrue and that everything I said yesterday about these matters was correct.

The SPEAKER: Order! I caution the honourable member. He cannot debate the matter—he can only give a very brief refutation of his having been personally misrepresented. The honourable Leader.

Mr OLSEN: Mr Speaker, with respect, that is exactly what I am doing in terms of the information tabled.

The Hon. J.C. Bannon interjecting:

The Hon. E.R. Goldsworthy: Mr Cameron misrepresented what the Leader said, and you know it.

The SPEAKER: Order! Will the Leader resume his seat. The Deputy Leader is completely out of order.

Mr Olsen: As is the Premier.

The SPEAKER: Order! I wish to seek advice on this matter. The honourable Leader cannot canvass whether or not a person who is not a member of this Parliament has or has not done certain things in the past. The honourable Leader can only, in a very specific way, refute allegations that he, the honourable Leader, has or has not done certain things. The honourable Leader.

Mr OLSEN: Mr Speaker, it is in relation to Mr Cameron's claim about the veracity of the statements in the documents tabled in this Parliament yesterday, and it is on that point that I want to indicate clearly to the House the facts of the matter. They are that—

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order! The honourable Leader has the call.

Mr OLSEN: It is in relation to that matter that I wish to indicate clearly that the information that I put to the House yesterday was accurate and not as has been portrayed by Mr Cameron in the *Advertiser* today. To that extent I have been misrepresented and I seek leave of the House—

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order! The last few words of the honourable Leader were completely lost. In any event, the Chair indicates that the House gives to members who have been misrepresented the special opportunity to merely clarify a situation where they have been misrepresented, not to debate other matters. The honourable Leader.

Mr OLSEN: Mr Speaker, I wish not to debate other matters but to clarify and ensure that the statements that I put to the House yesterday are put before the House again today. I wish to clearly put in context Mr Cameron's statement in the *Advertiser* this morning.

The SPEAKER: Order! Leave is withdrawn.

Mr OLSEN: Well, Mr Speaker, we will do it in grievance if you block us now.

The SPEAKER: Order! I demand that the honourable Leader retract that reflection on the Chair. It clearly implies that the Chair is not endeavouring to maintain the Standing Orders of the House but is deliberately trying to prevent the honourable Leader from making a contribution. The Chair is not deliberately trying to prevent the honourable Leader from doing anything of that nature. The Chair merely seeks to ensure that the honourable Leader abides by the Standing Orders. The honourable Leader.

Mr OLSEN: Mr Speaker, if you wish me to withdraw, I will certainly withdraw, and I will take up grievance to put the matters before the House.

The SPEAKER: Order! The honourable member for Murray-Mallee.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order! That was an erroneous call for the honourable member for Murray-Mallee, because it was the honourable member for Mitcham who earlier approached the Chair to indicate that he wished to seek leave. The honourable member for Mitcham.

Mr S.J. BAKER (Mitcham): I seek leave to make a personal explanation.

Leave granted.

Mr S.J. BAKER: On the front page of this morning's *Advertiser*, Mr T.G. Cameron accused me of having put false information before this House yesterday.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order! Will the honourable member for Mitcham resume his seat. I ask the honourable Premier to assist the Speaker in his efforts to maintain decorum in the Chamber and not to continue interjecting on members opposite, and I ask the honourable Deputy Leader of the Opposition to do likewise. The honourable member for Mitcham.

Mr S.J. BAKER: In particular, Mr Cameron said that his wife—

The SPEAKER: Order! The honourable Deputy Leader is clearly trying to entice the Premier into coming into conflict with the Chair.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order! I ask all members to cease any gesticulations that would encourage disorderly behaviour. The honourable member for Mitcham.

Mr S.J. BAKER: Thank you, Sir. In particular, Mr Cameron said that his wife was convicted on only four of seven charges and that these had occurred only because of a clerical error.

The SPEAKER: Order! The honourable member for Newland has a point of order.

Ms GAYLER: Yes, Mr Speaker.

The SPEAKER: Order! The Chair has already called the honourable member for Mitcham to order. If the point of order of the honourable member for Newland is the same as the matter that the Chair is about to put before the House, I will then call on the honourable member. It appears that the honourable member for Mitcham is falling into the same error as the honourable Leader inasmuch as both members are trying to introduce into the Chamber material by way of debate as part of their personal explanations. The honourable member—

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order! Notwithstanding the fact that we are in an election year and members are engaging in attempts at political point scoring, the Chair will endeavour to maintain the decorum of the House. The honourable member for Mitcham may continue with his personal explanation only so far as it relates to his defending himself by way of correcting an error that he believes may have been made about him.

Mr S.J. BAKER: On a point of order, Mr Speaker, I had only got to that part of my personal explanation repeating what was stated in the *Advertiser*, so the House was totally and utterly clear about what I was refuting, and I will present some facts relating to the detail that was supplied in the *Advertiser* which directly reflected upon me. I will point to the proof of the seven charges included in the document of 22 August 1983. This is a letter from the warrants clerk of the Adelaide Magistrates Court.

The SPEAKER: Order! The member for Mitcham will resume his seat. If it will help the honourable member and other members in this situation, the easiest way to proceed legitimately with a personal explanation is to simply state as concisely as possible, and with as few words as possible, what error has taken place, what statement has been attributed to the honourable member, or in whatever way the member has been misrepresented to show that there is an error. The member for Mitcham.

Mr S.J. BAKER: I may need further guidance, Mr Speaker, but I thought I was clearly saying that Mr Cameron told untruths in the *Advertiser* this morning about the information that had been presented to Parliament, and in the process—

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order! I caution the honourable member. The honourable member may say that a particular person has said X, which is incorrect, and then prove where it is incorrect, but he cannot just simply cast general aspersions on someone who is not a member of this place. The honourable member for Mitcham.

Mr S.J. BAKER: He misrepresented me by saying that the seven charges were in fact only four charges. He misrepresented me by those facts that he put in the *Advertiser* today. I point out to the House that clear evidence was provided yesterday to show that that person—

The Hon. J.C. Bannon interjecting:

Mr S.J. BAKER: By me. There was evidence that those convictions had actually taken place.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order!

An honourable member: Shut up!

The SPEAKER: Order! I ask the member for Murray-Mallee not to make the Chair's position far more difficult than it is already. The honourable member for Mitcham should continue and try to avoid debating the issue. The honourable member for Mitcham.

Mr S.J. BAKER: I will do so, Sir. I point out that fines of $445 were imposed on Mrs Cameron for seven breaches of the Residential Tenancies Act. That is fact; that is where I have been misrepresented. Mr Cameron said that there were only four.

The Hon. J.C. Bannon interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order! The Premier is out of order in interjecting. The honourable member for Mitcham.

Mr S.J. BAKER: He also said that he had fixed up these problems immediately. Again, I point back to the facts—

The SPEAKER: The honourable member will resume his seat. This is the danger we always run into with personal explanations. Rather than simply explaining where a member has been misrepresented, a member will start to go off on a tangent introducing other material for other reasons. The honourable member for Mitcham.

Mr S.J. BAKER: I will read what was stated in the *Advertiser*, as follows:

> I am disgusted that the Liberal Party has used parliamentary privilege to attack my wife for overlooking lodging a bond from some seven years ago.

It was not overlooking it: I was trying to show this House clearly the facts that were presented yesterday.

The SPEAKER: Order! The honourable member seems to have sufficiently explained himself and leave is now withdrawn by the Chair. I call on the business of the day.

TAXATION (RECIPROCAL POWERS) BILL

Adjourned debate on second reading.

(Continued from 6 April. Page 2770.)

Mr OLSEN (Leader of the Opposition): The Opposition supports this measure before the House. The Bill introduced last Thursday seeks to amend a number of State taxation Acts and allow for reciprocal powers of investigation beyond State borders to prevent tax evasion and avoidance. The origins of the Bill go back almost seven years to 1982. In September of that year, Commonwealth, State and Northern Territory Treasurers and officials met to discuss how to maximise combined efforts to overcome tax evasion and avoidance. The meeting agreed that each Government had a responsibility to bring to the attention of other Governments information about abuse of other Governments' revenue laws.

Following the meeting, a working party was established to formulate appropriate legislation. The proposals of the working party have led to the Bill currently before us today. As the Bill is designed to deter tax crime, the Liberal Party is naturally supportive, although I think it is unfortunate that it has taken until now for this Government to bring in the necessary legislation. Legislation has now been enacted at Federal level, as well as in New South Wales, Victoria, Queensland and the Northern Territory. I understand that a Bill was introduced in Western Australia last year.

Although the major portion of evasion and avoidance of State taxation occurs within the relevant State, there has been some inclination in recent years to avoid taxes by operating in another State or Territory. Such practice makes detection difficult, and incurs a loss to the respective State's revenue base. To be completely effective, therefore, recip-

rocal legislation is required in all States. I understand that the provisions of the Bill have been discussed with an *ad hoc* committee comprising representatives of the Government, the Taxation Institute, the Law Society, the Institute of Chartered Accountants and the Australian Society of Accountants.

Submissions have been made by all these groups as separate entities and the final make-up of the legislation has resulted (in part) from this work. The provisions of the Bill are essentially the same as the laws passed by the other State Parliaments. However, it is a pity that we seem to be the last State to enact this legislation. As I indicated earlier, some of the other States passed their legislation in, I think, 1987. Because it is reciprocal legislation, the lack of appropriate law has prevented in some instances officers of this Government from investigating tax evasion and avoidance elsewhere and it has also prevented officers in other States and Territories and at Commonwealth level from investigating perhaps some abuses here. The Liberal Party supports the Bill and will facilitate its passage through the Parliament.

The Hon. J.C. BANNON (Premier and Treasurer): I appreciate the remarks made by the Leader of the Opposition and the indicated support for the measure. It is a sensible one. It is one that reflects what has been done or will be done in other States. The Leader referred to the fact that some legislation in some States has been in force since 1987 and it is only now that we are introducing our legislation.

The chief reason is that we ensured that there would be full consultation with all the professional bodies. Members of the Opposition may recall another measure in relation to which this was discussed and it is certainly our intention, where these machinery matters and matters involving taxation powers are to be introduced, to have discussions with the appropriate professional bodies. That has been done comprehensively. As the Leader said, in part, the legislation reflects the outcome of those discussions. I say 'in part' only because obviously we have not adopted holus-bolus each submission that was made to us. If the consultation results in better legislation, the time is worth it and I appreciate the support given to this measure.

Bill read a second time.

In Committee.

Clauses 1 to 4 passed.

Clause 5—'Investigatory powers in relation to records.'

Mr OLSEN: This clause provides that significant investigatory powers be vested in the South Australian Commissioner. Subclauses (1) *(b)*, *(c)*, *(d)*, and *(e)* all imply significant costs to business. While it is fine that such businesses incur these costs if they are found to be evading or avoiding tax, is it the view of the Government that these costs be absorbed by a business if the charge is not proven? In other words, should there be compensation in relation to costs for producing and copying records, when the investigation exonerates the business (or individual) concerned?

The Hon. J.C. BANNON: While, in some instances, provision is made for compensation, this is not the case in relation to this clause; and it is not the usual thing to do. The provision of records and things of that nature are regarded as a responsibility. If we introduce the matter of compensation we would be doing something that nobody else has done in their legislation, as I understand it.

Clause passed.

Clause 6—'Investigatory powers in relation to goods.'

Mr OLSEN: What is the definition of 'reasonable time'? Is this time to be during business hours or does it include weekends? What are we talking about?

The Hon. J.C. BANNON: Normally it is confined to business hours. If there has to be some sort of consent or agreement that certain things can be done outside business hours, then that is included in the definition of 'reasonable time'.

Mr OLSEN: Subclause (1) *(b)* requires that any person on the premises can be directed to produce goods for information. I wish some clarification on this subclause. If someone—a relative, friend or spouse—is minding the shop (so to speak), surely this provision should not apply. The definition should apply to people who have a direct relationship to the running of the business, not someone who has been co-opted or is taking over control of the business on some casual or short-term basis.

The Hon. J.C. BANNON: Apparently, this provision is inserted in relation to tobacco products. A person may be required to produce goods, etc., for inspection, and that could be inclusive on the premises. Obviously, if they are not able to so comply, then that would be established. It is a mandatory requirement in order to prevent avoidance of it by having other persons on the premises who could argue that they are in no position of authority.

Mr OLSEN: Subclause (2) provides that if a corresponding law imposes a tax with respect to petroleum or tobacco products, the goods must be returned after inspection. Obviously, any such goods are likely to be important to the ongoing activity of that business. Should there not be a time frame in which those goods must be returned, rather than it being within a 'reasonable time'?

The Hon. J.C. BANNON: It is termed in that way in order to allow for contingencies that might arise. It would complicate the matter if it means that the goods are retained beyond a certain period that is laid down in the Act. Of course, it cuts both ways. The Act may lay down a term of three months, or something like that; and it may well be reasonable for goods to be returned in a shorter time frame. Of course, that can be tested by the person seeking to have those goods returned. If they believe it is unreasonable then they can apply to have that matter tested. There is that safeguard, but it is better to leave flexibility if, for some reason, a time longer than that stipulated, which would necessarily be arbitrary, was required.

The CHAIRMAN: The Leader has now asked three questions as allowed under Standing Orders.

The Hon. E.R. GOLDSWORTHY: What is the process of compensation as a result of inaccurate investigations?

The Hon. J.C. BANNON: The court may direct that those goods be returned, and obviously they would have to be returned in good condition. But, there is no provision for compensation within the Act itself. Action may be taken by separate proceedings if that is warranted, but I am told that there have been no situations where this has arisen.

Clause passed.

Clause 7 passed.

Clause 8—'General investigatory powers.'

Mr OLSEN: I once again come back to the question of investigation, the subsequent appearance before the commissioner and the requirement to produce documents and records before that commissioner, and the cost, in some instances, that that will incur on businesses. I am not concerned about the instance where a business has been found guilty of evading or avoiding taxation, but the instance where a business has been clearly determined not to be evading or avoiding taxation, and where the costs in relation to such a determination are not budgeted for. Witness fees in the local court, for example, are not commensurate with the hourly rate that most professional groups charge, and the costs that would be applied to a business by accountants

acting as witnesses and providing information will have to be met by the business operator who is required to furnish the details and pay various people to appear.

I have no doubt that the various professional interest groups in the community will have taken this matter up with the Government when the Bill was considered and discussed. If investigations prove to be unfounded, will the Premier in those circumstances indicate whether any compensation will be considered so that businesses are not out of pocket for participating fully and appropriately with requests for information and the production of documents?

The Hon. J.C. BANNON: This legislation is reciprocal. It lines up with the position in other States and reflects Commonwealth taxation law in this respect. The requirements of providing information and so on are not necessarily onerous ones. The compensation provided in terms of a witness fee, while it is conceded that that is set at a particular level which might not take account of professional time, is really one of the costs of complying with the law. It has never been the practice to provide specific compensation. There may well be people with reasons to conceal or not cooperate, or whatever. Once one imposes particular compensatory proceedings, then it becomes much more difficult to administer the Act. It is not common or general, and it is not proposed to introduce any more than that under subclause (3).

Clause passed.

Remaining clauses (9 to 16) and title passed.

Bill read a third time and passed.

LIBRARIES ACT AMENDMENT BILL

Received from the Legislative Council and read a first time.

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

That this Bill be now read a second time.

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

Leave granted.

Explanation of Bill

The proposed amendments to the Libraries Act 1982 are designed to achieve five main aims. First, to increase the size of the Libraries Board from eight to nine members to include an additional member nominated by the Local Government Association of South Australia. In this way, note is taken of greater commitment now being made by Local Government to the provision of public libraries with 98 per cent of the State's population now served by local public library services. The additional member is to be a public librarian or community information officer to note the broader role libraries and information now play in local government. Secondly, to remove references to institutes and their governing bodies now that all institutes have been dissolved, or will be dissolved, in favour of public libraries by 30 June 1989.

Thirdly, to note the change of name from the South Australian Archives to the Public Record Office of South Australia. Fourthly, to increase the legal deposit provisions for the Parliamentary Library and the State Library of South Australia to include non-book materials. This is in line with legislation enacted in Queensland and Tasmania, and is being considered by the other States. And finally, at the request of the Astronomical Society of South Australia, to remove its affiliation with the Libraries Board of South Australia. The society no longer meets or has its collection in the State Library of South Australia. I commend the Bill to all members.

Clause 1 is formal. Clause 2 provides for the operation of the Act to be by proclamation. Clause 3 amends section 3, an arrangement provision, of the principal Act. References to the divisions dealing with the Institutes Standing Committee, the Institutes Association of South Australia, and the regulation of institutes have been struck out. Clause 4 amends section 3 of the principal Act, which is an interpretation section. The definitions of 'the Association', 'institute' and 'the Standing Committee' have been struck out.

Clause 5 amends section 9 of the principal Act and substitutes new subsections (1) and (2). Section 9 deals with the membership of the Libraries Board. New subsection (1) increases the membership of the board from eight to nine members, appointed by the Governor. Two members must be members or officers of councils, nominated by the Local Government Association of South Australia, one of whom must be a librarian employed in a public library or a community information officer employed by a council. One member must have experience in local government, nominated by the Local Government Association of South Australia. The remaining six members must be nominated by the Minister, one of whom must have experience in local government. New subsection (2) provides for the appointment by the Governor of one member of the board to be the presiding member, and another member to be the deputy presiding member.

Clause 6 amends section 10 of the principal Act. This deals with the terms and conditions of membership of the board. New subsection (1) provides for staggered terms of membership, of up to a maximum term of four years. New subsection 3 *(d)* removes a cross-reference. Clause 7 amends section 11 of the principal Act, dealing with proceedings of the board. References to the 'Chairman' and 'Deputy Chairman' of the board have been substituted by 'presiding member' and 'deputy presiding member' respectively.

Clause 8 amends section 14 of the principal Act, which sets out the functions of the board. A reference to 'the Archives' has been substituted by a reference to 'the Public Record Office of South Australia'. Functions related to the Institutes Association of South Australia and the institutes have been struck out. Clause 9 amends section 21 of the principal Act, which deals with the payment of subsidies to public libraries and public library services. References to the institutes have been struck out. The scope of section 21 has been widened to permit the payment of subsidies, or other assistance, for the establishment, maintenance or extension of community information services.

Clause 10 repeals sections 23 to 30 (inclusive) of the principal Act. These sections deal with the Institutes Standing Committee and the Institutes Association of South Australia. Clause 11 amends section 35 of the principal Act. This deals with the lodgment of copies of material published in South Australia with the board and the Parliamentary Librarian. New subsection (5) *(e)* widens the scope of section 35, to include material produced in the form of a record, cassette, film, video or audio tape, disc or other item made available to the public, designed to reproduce visual images, sound, or information. However, subsection (5) has been amended to allow prescribed material or material of a prescribed class to be excluded from the lodgment requirements of section 35.

Clause 12 amends section 36 of the principal Act, which deals with societies affiliated with the board. The Astronomical Society of South Australia is disafiliated by this

provision. Clause 13 amends section 37 of the principal Act. This deals with the vesting of certain gifts or bequests in the board. Future gifts or bequests to the Institutes Association of South Australia or to the institutes will continue to be deemed to be gifts or bequests to the board. Clause 14 repeals the schedule to the principal Act, which lists the names of the institutes.

Schedule 1 contains a transitional provision providing for the termination of office of existing members of the board, on the commencement of the Act. Such members remain eligible for reappointment. Schedule 2 provides for the expression of existing penalties in the principal Act in the new form of divisional penalties.

The Hon. B.C. EASTICK (Light): The Opposition supports this measure. It has already had scrutiny in another place and has been available for discussion by the Opposition over several days. We have had the opportunity to consult with people who are so affected—more particularly the Local Government Association, which is delighted to know it has additional membership on the board. That reflects the fact that it is now required to provide rather more financial input than was previously the case. This matter has five aspects quite apart from the increases in penalties which have become a feature of measures before the House.

The increase in membership of the board from eight to nine is questionable in the sense that there has been a tendency over the years to reduce the number of board members. A person can be nominated to a board to advance the cause of a particular area, but usually at the expense of another area's representation. I accept the situation put by the Government on this occasion to increase the membership, but it would be most unwise for the Government at a later stage to ask for an increase to 10, 11 or 12. It is now as large as it ever ought to be.

Reference to institutes is removed from the Libraries Act, and this is a deliberate action taken by this Parliament on earlier occasions. Most recently we dealt with measures in that regard and there has been a phasing out of institutes, and it is expected that those remaining will have gone out of existence by 30 June this year. That being the case, there is no purpose in a reference to institutes.

The Public Record Office has taken over from what was originally the South Australian Archives. It has now been in existence for some time and the officer in charge of the Public Record Department has appeared before the Estimates Committee on the past two occasions. A number of members have had discussions relative to public records as to how they are to be kept and, in essence, some members have been prevailed upon to make their papers available for posterity so that documents relating to their period of office in this place are available. It may well be that the honourable Minister is about to unload several boxes of his records at the Public Record Office for the purpose of the ongoing historical significance of South Australia.

My colleague in another place raised the matter of videos and materials other than books which will be held in the libraries. I do not know that an adequate answer has been given as yet to his concerns. In fact, there is no indication that the Minister even responded to the second reading debate. My colleague drew attention to the fact that videos and other materials need to be re-recorded at least once every seven years. Thus a cost factor is involved and local government and/or the libraries board, through the funding it receives from the Government, may have to accommodate this recurrent cost in future. That matter ought be placed on the record and recognised, but its significance or extent is an unknown quantity. However, it may be that in the Government's financial programming, it will need to give recognition to this extended cost in about five to seven years from now.

Finally, the Astronomical Society of South Australia has requested that its affiliation with the Libraries Board of South Australia be removed. This is because the society no longer meets in the facilities provided by the Libraries Board, and the Opposition has no difficulty in acceding to that request. The Libraries Board has a very major part to play in community education and in the availability of books for the community at large. There have been some rather unfortunate experiences of recent times where councils were prevailed upon to build libraries but have not yet been funded as promised.

Next Tuesday I will be taking a group from the Angaston District Council to meet the Minister in relation to a promise made for funds for the Nuriootpa library made by my colleague who is presently at the front bench. It was a deliberate action taken by the council with the concurrence of the Minister to proceed to borrow for the purpose of building a library, and would then stand in line for an allocation of $130 000 in due course. Regrettably, that funding has not yet been made available.

The council finds that it is paying a very heavy cost for bridging finance it undertook and it has indicated to the community at large, with a predicted response from the community, that it may be necessary to close down or seriously limit the availability of the facility which was built and which has proven very successful for the extended Barossa Valley community. I trust that the information we are able to gain from the Minister on Tuesday next is favourable, and that the predicament which has been well exposed in the local press does not flow through and that the community of the Barossa Valley will have the service for many years to come in the very effective way in which it has been delivered thus far. I support the Bill.

The Hon. G.F. KENEALLY (Minister of Transport): I thank the member for Light and the Opposition for their support for this Bill. The honourable member made some observations and raised matters to which I do not have the answers at this time. I recognise that these matters will not affect the Opposition's support for the Bill but, nevertheless, it would appreciate a response to them. I will raise these matters with my colleague, the Minister of Local Government, to see that the member for Light is provided with the necessary information. Once again I thank the Opposition for its support for the measure.

Bill read a second time.

In Committee.

Clauses 1 to 8 passed.

Clause 9—'Subsidies, etc.'

The Hon. B.C. EASTICK: I just draw the attention of the Minister to the fact that the matter of subsidisation as the payment of a promise comes under this provision. I note that section 21 (1) of the parent Act is to be reworded. I see no change in the nature of the responsibility; this involves simply a drafting change, and I am quite happy to support it. I hope it is productive.

Clause passed.

Remaining clauses (10 to 14), schedules and title passed.

Bill read a third time and passed.

MARINE ACT AMENDMENT BILL

Returned from the Legislative Council without amendment.

ROAD TRAFFIC ACT AMENDMENT BILL 1989

Returned from the Legislative Council without amendment.

METROPOLITAN TAXI-CAB ACT AMENDMENT BILL

Received from the Legislative Council and read a first time.

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

That this Bill be now read a second time.

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

Leave granted.

Explanation of Bill

The purpose of this Bill is to amend the Metropolitan Taxi-Cab Act 1956, to give the Government more choice with respect to the method of issuing new taxi-cab licences and the use to which the funds generated from the issue of new licences can be put.

Over recent years various reports have drawn attention to the need to issue new taxi-cab licences to keep the number of taxi-cabs broadly in line with demand and population growth. In 1985, the Select Committee of the Legislative Council on the Taxi-Cab Industry in South Australia recommended that any new taxi-cab licences issued by the Metropolitan Taxi-Cab Board in the future should carry a market value and that the revenue raised from the sale of licences should be used to set up a taxi industry development fund. The select committee proposed that this fund be devoted to the development and promotion of the industry and driver training.

The review of regulation of the taxi-cab industry in 1986 undertaken by Mr Shlachter recommended that new licences should be made available under a leasing arrangement and the proceeds from leases should be used for the benefit of the industry.

The Metropolitan Taxi-Cab Board as part of its response to a report by Travers Morgan in 1988 has proposed that more taxi-cab licences are needed, that issue should be by public tender, and that the money obtained from the issue of new licences should be placed in an industry development fund.

Under current legislation, taxi-cab and hire car licences are issued for a prescribed fee recommended by the Metropolitan Taxi-Cab Board. Given the current market value of around $90 000 for taxi-cab licences, windfall profits would accrue to any successful applicant for a licence.

The Crown Solicitor has advised that the Act should be amended to clarify licencing processes, particularly with respect to auctioning or tendering and leasing. This Bill clarifies these processes by empowering the board after consultation with the Minister, to issue licences in a manner determined by it from time to time. This could include sale at a fixed price, auction or tender and lease.

The Bill also amends the Act to set up a fund to ensure that the money generated by the issue of new licences is applied for the industry as recommended by the select committee, Mr Shlachter's review and the Board. The amendment clearly spells out the safeguards which exist to ensure that the fund is used for the benefit of the taxi-cab industry and demonstrates that it is not the Government's intention to use funds generated by taxi-cab licences for other purposes.

As mentioned, the Bill will allow for a variety of methods for issuing new licences. It will also empower the board to determine the maximum number of licences to be issued. I would like to foreshadow the Government's intention to lease up to 20 taxi-cab licences during 1989 at a annual leasing fee yet to be determined. Experience with the leasing option and close monitoring of levels of services provided by the new licence holders will assist in determining suitable long term approaches to enable Government to balance the industry's requirements for a stable and predictable business environment, and the public's need for a high quality and reliable taxi-cab service in South Australia. I commend the Bill to members.

Clause 1 is formal.

Clause 2 provides for commencement of the measure on a day to be fixed by proclamation.

Clause 3 amends section 2 of the principal Act by inserting a definition of 'the Fund'.

Clause 4 repeals section 17 of the principal Act and substitutes a new provision. This section requires the board to receive and recover all fees and other amounts payable under the Act and to pay out of that money the costs of administering the Act. The new section provides for amounts received in respect of taxi-cab licences issued according to a special licence allocation procedure specified in the regulations to be paid by the board to the Minister for the credit of the Fund.

Clause 5 inserts new section 24a into the principal Act. Subsection (1) establishes the Metropolitan Taxi-Cab Industry Research and Development Fund.

Subsection (2) makes the Minister responsible for the administration of the Fund in consultation with the board. Subsection (3) provides for the Fund to consist of amounts paid in respect of taxi-cab licences issued according to a special licence allocation procedure and income paid to the Fund from investment of the Fund.

Subsection (4) requires the Fund to be kept in a separate account at the Treasury. Subsection (5) authorises the application of the Fund by the Minister for the purposes of research into and promotion of the metropolitan taxi-cab industry and any other purpose beneficial to the industry.

Subsection (6) authorises the Treasurer to invest any money standing to the credit of the Fund that is not for the time being required for the purposes referred to in subsection (5). Subsection (7) provides that income from investment of the Fund must, at the direction of the Treasurer, be paid into the Fund.

Clause 6 repeals section 30 of the principal Act and substitutes new sections 30 and 30a. New section 30 deals with the taxi-cab licences.

Subsection (1) empowers the board to issue a taxi-cab licence in accordance with the regulations to any fit and proper person who complies with the prescribed conditions.

Subsection (2) authorises the holder of a taxi-cab licence to use a taxi-cab for the purpose of carrying passengers for hire or reward in the metropolitan area. Subsection (3) provides that a taxi-cab licence is subject to such conditions as are prescribed and remains in force for such term as is prescribed or determined by the board.

Subsection (4) provides that the board may, from time to time, after consultation with the Minister determine the maximum number of taxi-cab licences to be issued by the board in any given period and that particular taxi-cab licences will be issued according to a special licence allocation procedure specified in the regulations.

Subsection (5) provides that the board may, as required for the issue of particular taxi-cab licences according to a special licence allocation procedure, determine the term of licences and any amount or amounts to be paid in respect of the licences. New section 30a reproduces the existing provisions of section 30 relating to the issue of taxi-cab driver's licences.

Clause 7 amends section 35 of the principal Act to expand the regulation-making power to provide for the prescription of special licence allocation procedures which may be used for the issuing of taxi-cab licences and for the recovery by the board of any amount payable in respect of a taxi-cab licence issued pursuant to a special licence allocation procedure.

Mr INGERSON secured the adjournment of the debate.

BARLEY MARKETING ACT AMENDMENT BILL

Adjourned debate on second reading.

(Continued from 5 April. Page 2670.)

Mr GUNN (Eyre): The Opposition supports the Bill. This proposal is the result of representations from the barley industry through the United Farmers and Stockowners. The operation of the Australian Barley Board has been most successful from the inception of that organisation. It operates basically in South Australia and Victoria. South Australia has been the leading barley producer in Australia, producing a high quality product which is widely sought after. The Opposition is pleased to support any proposal that will allow for improvements in the legislation.

This measure allows for a better system of permits for growers. I sincerely hope that when the legislation is enacted the Australian Barley Board will be in a position to determine the terms and conditions under which those permits are issued. In view of the importance of the barley industry to South Australia, I am sure that all members wish the barley industry every success in the forthcoming year. I am very pleased to indicate my support for the Bill.

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

OCCUPATIONAL HEALTH, SAFETY AND WELFARE ACT AMENDMENT BILL

Consideration in Committee of the Legislative Council's amendments:

No. 1. Page 1, line 19 (clause 3)—Leave out "12" and substitute "13".

No. 2. Page 1 (clause 3)—After line 33 insert new paragraph as follows:

(ea) one will be the General Manager of the Workers Rehabilitation and Compensation Corporation or a person nominated by the General Manager of the Workers Rehabilitation and Compensation Corporation with the concurrence of the Minister;

No. 3. Page 3, line 5 (clause 8)—After "(3)" insert "and substituting the following subsection:

(2) One member of the staff of the Commission may be appointed as Deputy Chief Executive Officer of the Commission.

No. 4. Page 3—After line 5 insert new clauses 8a, 8b and 8c as follow:

"Insertion of s.67a

8a. The following section is inserted after section 67 of the principal Act:

Registration of employers

67a. (1) Subject to subsection (2), a person who is required to be registered as an employer under the Workers Rehabilitation and Compensation Act 1986, is also required to be registered under this Act.

(2) A person is not required to be registered if the person is exempt from the obligation to be registered by the regulations.

(3) The Workers Rehabilitation and Compensation Corporation will undertake registrations under this section in conjunction with the registration of employers under the Workers Rehabilitation and Compensation Act 1986.

(4) A periodical fee is payable in relation to a registration under this section.

(5) The fee referred to in subsection (4) will be—

(a) calculated in the prescribed manner; and

(b) payable to the Workers Rehabilitation and Compensation Corporation in accordance with the regulations.

(6) If a person fails to pay a fee, or the full amount of a fee, in accordance with the regulations, the Workers Rehabilitation and Compensation Corporation may recover the unpaid amount as if it were unpaid levy under Part V of the Workers Rehabilitation and Compensation Act 1986.

(7) Subject to subsection (8), the Workers Rehabilitation and Compensation Corporation will, in accordance with guidelines established by the Treasurer, pay the fees collected under this section to the Department of Labour.

(8) The Workers Rehabilitation and Compensation Corporation may deduct from any amount payable under subsection (7) any costs reasonably incurred by it in undertaking registrations and collecting fees under this section.

(9) The Department of Labour and the Commission are entitled to information provided to the Workers Rehabilitation and Compensation Corporation for the purposes of this section (and section 112 of the Workers Rehabilitation and Compensation Act 1986 does not apply in relation to the disclosure of that information to the department or to the commission).

(10) A person who fails to comply with this section is guilty of an offence.

Penalty: Division 6 fine.

(11) A person who was, immediately before the commencement of this section, the occupier of a workplace registered under the Occupational Health, Safety and Welfare (Registration of Workplaces) Regulations 1987, is, on written application to the director of the Department of labour, entitled to a refund of a portion of the registration fee paid under those regulations, the portion being so much of the fee that, immediately before the commencement of this section, represented the unexpired term of registration.

Regulations

8b. Section 69 of the principal Act is amended by inserting after subsection (8) the following subsections:

(8a) A regulation made under this Act in relation to the notification of work-related injuries may provide that notice of prescribed classes of injury may be given to the Workers Rehabilitation and Compensation Corporation in conjunction with the provision of information relating to claims for compensation under the Workers Rehabilitation and Compensation Act 1986.

(8b) The Department of Labour and the Commission are entitled to information relating to work-related injuries obtained by the Workers Rehabilitation and Compensation Corporation under subsection (8a) (and section 112 of the Workers Rehabilitation and Compensation Act 1986 does not apply in relation to the disclosure of that information to the Department to the Commission).

(8c) The Workers Rehabilitation and Compensation Corporation is entitled to charge a fee, set by the Workers Rehabilitation and Compensation Corporation after consultation with the Treasurer, for the provision of information under subsection (8b).

First schedule

8c. The first schedule to the principal Act is amended by inserting after item 3 the following items:

3a. The procedures to be followed in respect of the registration of any person under this Act.

3b. The information to be provided by persons who are required to be registered under this Act.

No. 5. Page 3, line 18 (clause 9)—Leave out "as deputy to the" and substitute "to the office of deputy".

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

That the Legislative Council's amendments be agreed to.

Mr S.J. BAKER: I want to make two observations before referring to the amendments. First, I am a little upset that we are being asked to debate these amendments when we do not actually have a copy of the Bill as it stands at present. The Bill that was passed by the House of Assembly was changed quite dramatically when it reached the other place. The Minister saw fit to make further amendments to the Bill, which change dramatically its content. I do not believe that it is competent or proper that the Government should put this schedule of amendments before the Committee while we do not have a copy of the Bill as amended from the other place. If we are to debate these amendments properly, it is important for us to have all the information available. I am looking at the Bill that is on the Bill file at the moment and it bears no relationship to the amendments that we are being asked to consider.

The CHAIRMAN: Can I interrupt the honourable member here and say that this place, in all of its deliberations for the past over 100 years, has never had a clean copy of the Bill. The Bill that we receive is the Bill that went to the Legislative Council plus the amendments.

Mr S.J. BAKER: The Bill that left this place dealt with only one thing, and that was the content of the commission. The amendments that the Committee has been asked to agree with extend the scope of that quite significantly and as such it is very difficult to consider such broad-ranging amendments without having a copy of the Bill that was presented to the other place.

The CHAIRMAN: I must say that for the honourable member to be presented with a clean Bill would involve changing over 100 years of tradition. Although it might be difficult, over the past history of the House all the honourable member's predecessors have been able to accomplish their deliberations by getting hold of the schedule of amendments and the original Bill. The honourable member for Mitcham.

Mr S.J. BAKER: I suggest that it is incumbent on the Government to supply it to the members of the place. However, I will address myself to the amendments before us. I bitterly oppose the further extension of the commission as proposed here. We started off with 10 members and, because that was unworkable, the Minister said that we should have 12. That was to fix up some difficulties which had been experienced by the commission and to fix up its balance of power. As the Minister would well remember, that received very lukewarm support. Now we have an amendment put up by the 'wobbly legs' in another place whereby the membership of the commission is extended to 13.

If it was the desire of all parties concerned to have the General Manager or his representative from the Workers Rehabilitation and Compensation Corporation on the commission, I am sure we could have deleted one of the other positions, particularly the occupational health and safety expert. With respect to the third amendment, I am not sure of the need for us to state that one member of the staff of the commission may be appointed as Deputy Chief Executive Officer of the commission. I would have thought that the normal Public Service procedures adopted by the commission would come into play in this situation and we would not need to put in something about the deputy's position. So, I am flabbergasted to see that amendment.

In principle, the fourth amendment has my support, as the Minister would be well aware. The proposition contained in that amendment, which was never considered by this place, allows joint registration in respect of occupational safety and workers compensation. It also allows for one fee to be extracted from employers by the Workers Rehabilitation and Compensation Corporation. The Minister would be well aware that for some time I have been saying that it is ludicrous in this State that we have to get employers to fill out forms until their hair goes grey when they are actually providing the same information that is in the bowels of another Government organisation. In this case we have registration under the occupational health, safety and welfare (registration of workplaces) provision and there is also employer registrations under the Workers Rehabilitation and Compensation Act.

I am concerned about the wording of the amendments, and I do not believe that we have had sufficient time to consider them. We do not know, for example, what the periodical fee will be. The original proposition was for the imposition of a percentage levy on employers. Naturally, I would oppose that proposition from two points of view: first, because it becomes a milking cow for the Government; and, secondly, it means a lot of paper work for very few cents when the payroll is not very large. So, one could send out bills or have extra bills supplied for very small sums. The same principle applies to my opposition to the original proposition. The new proposition is fairer but, again, the Committee has no information as to what the prescribed fee will be. The amendments are worded very strangely. Proposed new section 67a provides:

(1) Subject to subsection (2) a person who is required to be registered as an employer under the Workers Rehabilitation and Compensation Act 1986 is also required to be registered under this Act.

(2) A person is not required to be registered if the person is exempt from the obligation to be registered by the regulations.

First, I believe that that is a very clumsy way of attacking the registration, because there are exempt employers under the Workers Rehabilitation and Compensation Act. Looking through the amendments I am not sure whether that exemption is adequately covered under the proposals contained herein.

Secondly, as I understand it, for this to be effective the Workers Rehabilitation and Compensation Act will have to be amended. So the Minister should have brought in amendments to the Workers Rehabilitation and Compensation Act requiring the corporation to do certain things.

This legislation cannot require the corporation to do anything. It is the Workers Rehabilitation and Compensation Corporation that will be actually collecting the money in respect of workplace registration. This legislation cannot give power to the corporation. It must be covered under the corporations legislation, as I understand the way the law works. So, we have from the other place what I believe are a number of incompetent amendments. I raise these concerns and oppose the motion. I do not intend, for a whole range of reasons, to call for a division. Of course, in the main I do not have the numbers, but would expect that the amendments would fit in more with accepted practice. These amendments do not seem to do that.

It may well be that they are competent amendments, but I do not believe they are. I believe that in practice they will be found wanting, requiring further amendment of the legislation. If the Minister intended to change the legislation in this way—and I am pleased he has actually thought about it, because it is something that I have been talking about for a long time—I would have hoped that it would be done properly. I believe that it has not been done properly, therefore I oppose all the amendments listed in the schedule.

Motion carried.

CREDIT UNIONS BILL

Adjourned debate on second reading.
(Continued from 6 April. Page 2810.)

The Hon. JENNIFER CASHMORE (Coles): The Opposition supports this Bill which has been examined and debated in an extremely thorough fashion in another place. Even prior to that examination the Opposition supported the Bill, which is the result of the 1985 credit unions review committee report. The credit unions themselves, of which there are 18 in this State with total assets of more than $679 million, are keen to see the passage of the Bill which adapts and amends their statutory regulation in the light of the deregulation of the financial market which has occurred in Australia, creating a very much changed environment in which all financial institutions are competing for funds.

Principally, the Bill is geared towards member and creditor protection by tightening prudential standards and controls. The provisions upon which the Opposition sought to question the Government related to the voting rights of minors, the requirement of certain officers of credit unions to provide reasonable public notice of disclosure statements prior to a credit union issuing securities to its members, and the provision that a loan made to a director of a credit union need not be disclosed to any general meeting, although the rules of the credit union might have provided for such disclosure.

Those issues, together with the clarification of the definition of 'commercial loan', the question of whether or not any security should be required to provide a guarantee to members and the question of whether a shareholder or director of a proprietory company which is a trading trust may be the vehicle through which an officer deals with a credit union, are all issues which have been considered and answered satisfactorily in another place. It is interesting to read that debate and appreciate yet again the meticulous manner in which the Hon. K.T. Griffin addresses these matters of corporate and consumer affairs. I must acknowledge the cooperative way in which the Government and the Minister, the Hon. Chris Sumner, is inclined to accept amendments based on merit, the result of which is invariably improved legislation. The Opposition supports the Bill, which is essentially a Committee Bill, and hopes that its proclamation will be welcomed by the credit unions and of benefit to depositors and creditors.

The Hon. G.J. CRAFTER (Minister of Education): I thank the Opposition for its indication of support for this measure. It comes before the House having been the subject of considerable debate and considerable amendment in another place. It is obviously the better for that. As the member for Coles has indicated, it comes before us as a result of a considerable amount of work by the officers of the Government and the credit unions and their representatives, so that it is a modern piece of legislation which meets the needs of credit unions as they find themselves today in a very competitive area of activity amongst other financial institutions in our community. They have, over a long time, etched out a very important role.

The close association of credit unions with their subscribers and supporters is important and is, indeed, their strength. That is seen as being of vital importance to the ability of our community to provide credit to people where otherwise credit may not be available, and in those circumstances there is certainly a very positive role, particularly in the workplace where fellow workers are encouraged to save and give support. For all those reasons, credit unions have a very fine history of service to the community and, indeed, a very stable history here in South Australia. They are very much dependent upon the goodwill of their members and those who, in the main, volunteer to provide management at board level.

So, it is an important piece of legislation welcomed by credit unions as being appropriate to provide those safeguards that the community now requires of Government where bodies of this type hold substantial sums of money in the form of the savings of their subscribers. The honourable member has outlined the important role that credit unions play in terms of the capital invested in them and indeed the new products being marketed by credit unions as they move into other fields of investment. Some of those areas have not been covered previously in legislation and are now required to be covered and supervised by the statutory bodies created under the legislation before us. As this matter has been thoroughly scrutinised in another place where the Minister and shadow Minister reside, I recommend the measure to all members.

Bill read a second time.

In Committee.

Clauses 1 to 113 passed.

Clause 114—'Power of the Board to borrow.'

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

To insert clause 114.

This is a money clause appearing in erased type in the Bill. As honourable members are aware, a money clause cannot originate in the other place where the Bill was introduced; nevertheless, it was the subject of scrutiny. It is merely a formality that it is brought before us in this form, and I urge members to support it.

The Hon. JENNIFER CASHMORE: At whose behest was the clause inserted in the Bill? Was it at the suggestion of the Government or the credit unions? If the former, what did the Government have in mind in making such a suggestion?

The Hon. G.J. CRAFTER: I understand that the provision exists in the Act and has been there since time immemorial. Obviously, it is there because it is of mutual benefit to both the Government and credit unions, particularly the Credit Unions Stabilisation Fund. Those powers exist and need not be the subject of separate legislation should they have to be acted upon. It is an historic clause and is in the existing Act.

Clause inserted.

Remaining clauses (115 to 152), schedule and title passed.

Bill read a third time and passed.

ROAD TRAFFIC ACT AMENDMENT BILL (No. 2)

Adjourned debate on second reading.
(Continued from 6 April. Page 2811.)

Mr INGERSON (Bragg): Although Opposition members support the Bill, we are concerned about some difficulties that may arise in the general policing, a matter to which I will refer later. We understand that this Bill has been introduced principally as a result of requests from certain local councils to change their district management plans in relation to speed on their roads. In my district, the Burnside council is considering 30 km/h and 40 km/h speed zones in some parts of the district. I understand that council authorities have told the Minister of Transport that they would like to carry out a pilot study on the use of speed humps, road plateaux, and roundabouts, and to reduce speed limits in certain areas. Like many other councils, the Burn-

side council recognises that this cannot be done unless it is done in an organised way and unless such a procedure is supervised and controlled by the State Government.

The Bill provides that a management plan cannot be implemented unless the Minister of the day has approved it. Opposition members have no problem with that concept because, if that provision was not in the Bill, a haphazard situation could develop throughout the metropolitan area. Opposition members also support the provision that reduced speed limits may be imposed in industrial and recreational areas.

Policing will be the most difficult part of any traffic management scheme. I am sure that local councils in particular would not want to take further responsibility for the policing of any reduced speed limit. Tremendous extra pressure would be placed on the Police Force in policing reduced speed limits under a traffic management plan. So, Opposition members would like to hear what the Minister has to say about the policing of these traffic management schemes.

The Hon. G.F. KENEALLY (Minister of Transport): I thank the member for Bragg for his indication of Opposition support for the Bill. The matters that he has raised are of concern both to the Government and to local councils, as well as to the Opposition. In fairness, I should say that, although the Bill may have had its genesis in requests from certain local councils, nevertheless it will enable a trial to be made of the concept of a speed zone in which the Government would be happy to be involved.

Under existing legislation, the Government can declare a speed zone only along a length of road, whereas under this Bill a speed zone may be declared over a whole area. Any Minister would approve the trial of a speed zone only after he was convinced that full consultation had been held with the local community and that there was every indication of the trial being successful. At present, speed in local streets is controlled by road humps, plateaux and roundabouts, to which the honourable member has referred. The Government has hitherto been reluctant to agree to the introduction of sign posted legal speed limits of 40 km/h, or whatever speed is judged to be appropriate by the local council, for two reasons. First, motorists do not always see the environmental speed limit as the legal speed limit; and secondly, if we approved a general speed limit of 40 km/h on local streets throughout the metropolitan area, we would need almost double the police force to police road activity.

Therefore, the Government, and certainly this Minister, will be cautious in approving an application for a general speed zone to be declared. We would like a local council to trial this system and we would consider closely the capacity to police such a system. If the mere signposting of an area in a council district proved ineffective, I am sure that another application would be unlikely to be approved. Further, if it proved impossible to police such a trial speed zone, the Government would have to consider carefully whether or not it approved another trial. I understand that in both Melbourne and Sydney similar trials are now taking place.

For all the reasons given by the member for Bragg, the Government will remain cautious about the appropriateness of this measure, although I believe that this concept is entitled to a trial. However, we should be careful lest speed zones proliferate throughout the metropolitan area. Therefore, the Minister will have the responsibility of ensuring that there is as much uniformity as possible within the metropolitan area because, when driving from one council area to another where the speed environment is the same but the speed limits differ, a motorist is unlikely to respond to that different speed limit. Therefore, the Government and the Minister should maintain that authority.

Policing will be a matter of trial and error. If a local council wishes to trial a speed zone, the Government will be happy to facilitate that and to check closely with the Police Department and the local council as to the capacity to police such a speed zone. If it is impossible to do so, or if the speed zone is not effective in reducing speeds, we will have to fall back on traditional methods of reducing speed such as road humps, plateaux and roundabouts, as well as the general provision of slow points. However, as I said earlier, I believe that the speed zone concept is entitled to a trial and the Government, with Opposition support, is willing to allow that to happen. What happens after that will depend on the success of this measure.

Bill read a second time.

In Committee.

Clauses 1 and 2 passed.

Clause 3—'Interpretation.'

Mr S.J. BAKER: I am sorry that I did not have the opportunity to take part in the second reading debate. Clause 3 defines 'speed zone'. I am seriously concerned about how this legislation will operate. The number of my constituents who are talking about closing off their streets and introducing restrictive speed measures is growing almost daily.

If a week does not pass when I have not received a complaint about someone speeding down a street, it is a good week. Importantly, one of the complaints made is that the police are never there when someone is speeding. In practical terms, I realise that many times I have to water down constituents in some way and explain that the realities of life are this and that; that there are priorities other than speed humps; and that we do not have enough police to officiate at every corner in the metropolitan area, particularly in the District of Mitcham.

I have some severe concerns about this. Whilst the measure will be wholeheartedly supported by the constituency, with about 95 per cent of people saying that we should phase the concept in as it is a good idea, the problem that I see is that the number of complaints to my office will increase astronomically. Every person will demand that there be a speed restriction in their zone, reducing the speed to 40 km/h.

As the member for Mitchell knows, I wrote a newsletter on this subject, suggesting that people should be travelling at speeds below 60 km/h, and most non-arterial roads in Adelaide are in this situation. Clearly, 80 per cent of roads are not main roads and it is inappropriate for drivers to be travelling at 60 km/h because of parked cars, pedestrians, cats, dogs, and every other obstruction that one could think of.

Intrinsically, the idea has much appeal, but in practical terms the demand for policing of this measure will grow astronomically. I have already encountered demands for people to sit on street corners and watch drivers speeding, and it makes my life more difficult. The most positive aspect of the measure is that it is educational. When people see the 40 km/h sign which was previously a 60 km/h zone, in time they may take a little more notice and, instead of travelling at 80 km/h, they will slow to 60 km/h.

Further, we will bring a visual blight to Adelaide. We will have a proliferation of signs on all the roads around Adelaide, and I do not necessarily believe that that will enhance Adelaide's beauty. I have some sympathy for the measure, but it would be useful if we did the trial test on one area under normal conditions, without extra police being provided, because I would like to see how well the idea works. I have severe reservations about these matters.

The Hon. G.F. KENEALLY: There is little with which I would disagree about what the member for Mitcham has said. The Government also has reservations about the success of the trial that we would be willing to allow. It would be the Government's intention that one discreet area—not a whole local government area—would be trialled. There would not be a proliferation of signs in each street. At the moment we would have to signpost each street. The intention is to sign the major access points to the discreet zone. The honourable member is correct in saying that we ought to try originally with the signs and without heavy police presence to see whether the signs themselves reduce the speed.

The honourable member is correct that people will not take great heed of speed signs if the speed environment encourages them to go faster than the legal speed limit. That is why in local streets we have constituents approaching their local member agitated about the dangers on local roads from speeding motorists. All of the concerns expressed by the honourable member are shared by the Government. However, I still believe that there is demand by a number of local authorities to trial a speed zone, rather than a proliferation of slow points—many communities do not like speed humps, speed plateaux, and round-abouts as they believe that signposting the speed would result in better control.

That is certainly not the experience of the Department of Transport, the Division of Road Transport, the Highways Department or whatever. However, the community is entitled to see a trial given to what many constituents and some local government authorities believe is a good concept and something that they believe would work. It may work. If it does, the Government would be encouraged to trial it somewhere else, but the Government would look at it very seriously indeed. Certainly, I will draw the honourable member's remarks to the attention of the Division of Road Safety and the Highways Department, which will have the responsibility for ensuring that, if an application is received from a local government authority, the system is given a fair but appropriate trial.

Clause passed.

Clause 4 and title passed.

Bill read a third time and passed.

Ms GAYLER: Mr Deputy Speaker, I draw your attention to the state of the House.

A quorum having been formed:

ADJOURNMENT

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

That the House do now adjourn.

Mr S.J. BAKER (Mitcham): In the 10 minutes available I want to canvass the thing I call 'quality of life'. For some time it has been my observation that people now are no longer receiving the services that they want. Part of that results from a change in attitude, but also I have seen on behalf of the Government changes which are not to my liking and which have depreciated the precious thing called 'quality of life'. In particular, I refer to the situation in my district concerning Government services.

Until recently Mitcham has been very well endowed with Government services, and most of them have serviced parts of my district well. However, I have noted that changes are taking place that I do not believe have been in the best interests of people in my area.

Of course, these changes are also occurring in other electorates. The three changes I refer to in the Mitcham electorate are: the stationmaster position at the Mitcham railway station which has been lost; the Motor Registration Division office that will be moved from the Mitcham Shopping Centre; and the social security office which has been moved to Parkside. Like many members, I have an ageing electorate. Mitcham probably has the highest nursing home population of any electorate in South Australia.

Mr Ferguson: You will be going to beat mine.

Mr S.J. BAKER: In terms of the Julia Farr Centre, I have the largest nursing home accommodation in Australia. As well as having two large Resthavens, I have about 14 nursing homes in my electorate. My ageing electorate requires more servicing in relation to certain areas than it does in other areas. Older people need access to facilities. That is probably their greatest need, after personal safety. Many of my constituents are housebound because of their fear of being attacked or being burglarised if they leave their houses, although I do not wish to canvass that matter tonight.

I wish to talk about the provision of facilities in my electorate. It can be argued that when money is short—and all Governments are short of money; they never have enough—there has to be a little give and take in the system. I agree with that. However, after having analysed the changes that have taken place in my electorate, I believe that some wrong decisions have been made.

I think that the Mitcham railway station has had a stationmaster for 70 or 100 years. That person sold the tickets (the weeklies and the dailies)—but he did much more. He supported the elderly citizens. When the train pulled in he was there to assist them off the train. If anyone needed guidance as to the form of transport they should catch after leaving the train, the stationmaster would provide that detail.

Stationmasters at Mitcham have enjoyed a very high reputation over the years. All of them have been excellent people. They have been willing to help and have become somewhat of an institution in their own time because of the way in which they have assisted people who travel by train. Now, that assistance has disappeared. I know that the number of train commuters has dropped, but this drop has not been significant because, in many cases, we are only talking about one or two trips per week by the people to which I refer. Some of these people now no longer take the train, because they have no personal help when the train is pulling into and out of the station. They fear that the train will suddenly start before they board or not stop when they think it should, and that this will be a threat to their physical well-being. The loss of the stationmaster, I believe, took away from the quality of life that Mitcham residents enjoyed.

I have some grave reservations about the ability of Government decision makers to analyse the true economics of the facilities and services that the Motor Registration Division office at Mitcham provides. On my calculation the Government would be better to leave that office where it is. But, the Minister of Transport has been under great pressure to rationalise—and it does not matter at what cost, the rationalisation will occur.

On my calculation, it would be cheaper to maintain the Mitcham registration office with fewer staff, because it has on-line facilities. Then, the Marion office would require fewer facilities than it will require because of the amalgamation of the two offices. Indeed, the Motor Vehicles Department has got into difficulty because if it moves from Mitcham it will have to work out how it will get into this high rent district of Marion without paying high rents. This indicates that someone has not done their homework.

There is no doubt in my mind that the Mitcham office could have been adapted to the needs of the Motor Registration Division. It had an on-line system, so the demand on employees would have decreased; there was to be less paper work and more automation. While the facility a year ago was inadequate, in today's terms it is more than adequate. Yet, it is now committed into going into larger and better offices.

Who has told the Minister the bottom line, that the rents will triple (and it may even be more) because of this move? Mitcham has one of the lowest and probably most effective rents per square metre of space in the metropolitan area. It is not a low profile office as 105 000 people use it every year; despite the fact that it is in the basement of a shopping centre, it is well used.

The number of people who came to my office complaining about the taking away of the ticket selling facility was enormous. That facility was supposed to be placed at the post office, but the union placed a ban on that and no-one can buy tickets at Mitcham. The people who are making these decisions in the Government departments lack competence. If basic economic principles were employed they would find that Mitcham is a viable office.

The Department of Social Security office performed a valiant service for quite a few people. It was accessible whether people travelled by train or bus. It was moved to Parkside because it needed larger accommodation, but the number of people which previously used it now do not use it because they cannot get there. The Government is not interested in the level of service or economics, because the cost of accommodation is higher. Some bureaucrat has made the decision. I said to the people concerned that if they had come to me earlier, if they had problems with planning or the owner would not play ball, we could have fixed it up. But, they would not have any of that. It was decided to move to Parkside where few people could get to it.

However, I did receive one phone call from a Parkside constitutent who told me to shut up about it because it was the first time they were getting good service. Overall, 30 per cent of people are better off and 70 per cent are worse off.

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

Mr FERGUSON (Henley Beach): During this debate I will refer to a problem which is becoming increasingly important in my electorate, that is, the rapidly increasing value of properties that is occurring on the seafront in the Henley and Grange area. In this morning's *Advertiser*, members would have noticed a scale which gave the information that valuations in Henley and Grange had increased by 9 per cent during the past 12 months. However, that gave a lopsided view because recent sales of property along the Esplanade have brought prices of up to $500 000 for very old homes. Other prices have reached as high as $400 000. It would be impossible to buy either a block of land or an old home on the Esplanade for under $200 000.

The Henley and Grange council has recently announced a proposed redevelopment scheme on the Esplanade, and I believe this has heightened interest in homes along the Esplanade, and speculators and even companies are now seeking homes in this area. On the prices that have already been received, within the next 12 to 18 months we will see valuations of properties increasing quite spectacularly in this area. Not only will this mean an increase in council rates, but also it will mean an increase in water rates and, where it applies, increases in land tax. The problem often relates to residents who first commenced purchasing their home 30, 40 or more years ago and are in retirement, intending to remain in their own home until they die. The problem is the increase in valuations will so increase council rates and other rates that they will not be able to continue living in their own home.

The valuation question, of course, is a vexed one, and it is not for me to argue the case on valuations in this forum, except to say that increases in property values on the Esplanade, which will soon work their way through the system, will very shortly be reflected in increasing valuations in other areas. For example, properties across the road, although increasing in value, are not increasing at the same rate, and these will also have an upward effect on things like council rates for properties that are two streets away.

The problem is not a new one as this has also been occurring in the larger cities. In order to discover what other local government institutions have done in other areas, I contacted the Local Government Association in New South Wales to discuss with its Assistant Secretary what its problems were and, if it had similar problems, how it was going to tackle them.

The situation in New South Wales has been exacerbated by the fact that there has been a freeze on valuations, and the State Government, in order to try to assist people like those I have been talking about, in fact froze the valuation of properties at the 1974 level and councils were only allowed to base their rates on those levels. The problem is that sooner or later the embargo has to be lifted, and this happened in Sydney last year. As a result there has been some spectacular increases in Sydney council rates while the rates found their appropriate level. I do not advocate the freezing of valuations as being an answer to the particular problem, because sooner or later that embargo has to be lifted, with a consequential huge increase in the accounts being sent out from local government to the ratepayers.

One of the points which was made to me by the Assistant Secretary of the New South Wales Local Government Association was that rebates are allowed to pensioners, and that a rebate up to a maximum of $275 may be made by a council. Fifty per cent of the rebate is provided by the State Government and 50 per cent is provided by Local Government. Up until now this has been a way that the councils in New South Wales have been able to overcome the problem of very rapidly increasing valuations. However, they are now confronted with a new set of problems because houses on harbour sites are being sold for figures ranging from $14 m to $20 m per house and, of course, this in itself will extend considerably the increase in valuations.

The way that local government predicts that councils will be able to overcome this problem is by differential values of individual streets. An approach is being made to the New South Wales Government to allow for differential rates to apply, and it is my understanding that this is being looked at very favourably by the Government to try to overcome the problem, especially that of the pensioner who has already paid for his house, has no intentions of leaving, has had his house for 30 or 40 years and just merely wants to stay there for all time. In South Australia, differential rates are allowed, but not on an individual street basis.

My understanding is that differential rates refer to only a zoned area, so that differential rates may be applied to the whole of the zoned area, but may not be narrowed down to the extent that one can pick out, as in the case of New South Wales, harbourside houses or, in the case of South Australia, esplanade type houses, both of them with a view of the sea. That fact is pushing up prices expediently.

I understand that this is not actually confined to my area at Henley Beach. My information from the Department of

Local Government is that it also applies to, for example, Osmond Terrace at Kensington and Norwood where the same sort of acceleration in prices has occurred. It is speeding through the system and affecting rates and taxes in the immediate and surrounding areas. The only course of action available at the moment for local government is a rebate system. The rebate system which was made available to local government in the latest round of amendments to the Local Government Act is open ended. There is no limitation on what rebates may be made, and this is the short term answer to the problem.

Generally speaking, I understand that councils are not keen on providing rebate. The only rebate system of any substantial nature is a 50c in the dollar rebate made by the City of Adelaide to its residents. The argument put forward by the Adelaide City Council is quite reputable. The central commercial district pushes up the valuations in a fairly unrealistic way, and therefore one can justify giving a rebate of 50 per cent to those people who are actually living in the inner city area. I must hasten to add that even with the rebate system, rates and taxes in the Adelaide City Council compare with rates and taxes being paid by other councils in other areas.

It is my view that the rebate system on its own will not solve the problem I have alluded to, and that other more innovative and realistic solutions must be found. At the moment I can only see the need for differential valuation on a selective basis being allowed to councils, but there may be other answers to the problem that I have not been able to come up with. In any event, there is a real problem with the sudden increase in valuations in certain council areas, and there needs to be a further and better look at ways of solving the problem.

Mr OLSEN (Leader of the Opposition): I want to refer to a subject that was reported in this morning's *Advertiser*, namely, comments of Mr Cameron. As I indicated to the House earlier, I want to put before it the fact that I believe Mr Cameron misrepresented the information that was put before Parliament yesterday relating to his activities in the building industry. In particular, he has claimed that the Builders Licensing Board had found only minor faults on two or three houses he arranged to have built and that these faults had been rectified immediately. It can be proven from reference to official documents that Mr Cameron's statements are untrue and that everything I said yesterday about these matters was correct. I refer first to—

Mr TYLER: On a point of order, Mr Speaker, I draw your attention to Standing Order 147 which provides:

> No member shall allude to any debate of the same session, upon a question or Bill not being then under discussion, except by the indulgence of the House for personal explanations.

I would need your ruling to determine whether the Leader is referring to what was the subject of a debate in this House and voted on yesterday.

Mr Oswald: He's just trying to be smart.

The SPEAKER: Order! The degree of relevance to a particular Bill or motion before the House falls into a grey area. If the Chair was to apply too strict an interpretation of what is relevant and related and what is not, there probably would not be any grievance debates in the House as part of the adjournment debate. I do not uphold the point of order at this stage. The honourable Leader.

First, I want to refer to the number of houses that were involved: there were three. The faults in their construction were reported to the Builders Licensing Board by a departmental inspector. His report was dated 27 September 1978—only two months after Mr Cameron's company, Tarca Investments Pty Limited, had received a general builder's licence. The addresses of these houses were: lot 830 Reed Street, Aldinga, lot 674 Jobson Street, Aldinga and lot 399 Stirling Crescent, Aldinga. In relation to lot 830 Reed Street, 19 specific complaints of faulty workmanship were listed, and included insecure roof fastenings, roof water discharging onto a wall, cracked arches and brickwork, unprotected electric cables and window central supports not built in. In relation to lot 674 Jobson Street, Aldinga, 16 specific complaints were listed, and included insecure roof fastening, the hot water unit cantilevered over the passage, ceiling joists not properly supported and unprotected electrical wiring. In relation to lot 399 Stirling Crescent, Aldinga, there were 11 specific faults, covering the roof construction, the brickwork, electrical wiring, windows and the doorframes.

The Builders Licensing Board made findings on these complaints on 27 October 1978. In each case the board found that:

> The building work has not been carried out in a proper and workmanlike manner.

It also found:

> The board is of the opinion that the three houses complained of reflect lack of supervision to a significant degree. Admitted areas concern trusses, door frames and supervision of carpenters. The board is also concerned that other buildings constructed for associates of the builder have in the past, through another builder, namely, Mr Addison, exhibited lack of supervision. The board admonishes the builder for lack of supervision and points out to it the consequences of section 19 (3) *(c)* and *(e)* of the Builders Licensing Act.

Those provisions related to disciplinary action being taken against the holder of a builders licence for negligence, incompetence, or failure to properly supervise building work.

In February 1979, the Builders Licensing Board did initiate disciplinary action against Tarca Investments after it had failed to carry out the remedial work that it had been ordered by the board to undertake. Accordingly, Mr Cameron is again not telling the truth when he says that that work was carried out immediately. In fact, a senior inspector of the board, Mr D.J. Dunstone, reported on 30 January 1979 that most of the faults ordered to be corrected had not been attended to.

Accordingly, on 2 February 1979 the Builders Licensing Board directed that the files relating to these properties be referred to the Crown Solicitor so that disciplinary action could be taken against Mr Cameron's company. I have all the documents—which are Government departmental files—relating to these matters. They demonstrate quite clearly that Mr Cameron is continuing to lie about his activities in the building industry and that the Premier has continued to defend Mr Cameron against the indefensible.

The SPEAKER: I am looking for a member on the alternate side of the House who wishes to speak: there not being one, I now call the honourable member for Davenport.

Mr S.G. EVANS (Davenport): I want to raise a matter of some importance to the area that I represent and to other areas nearby. Last year the Local Government Advisory Commission was asked to consider an application from a group of people who had submitted a petition to the Minister of Local Government in relation to creating a new council in the Blackwood and surrounding areas. The petition did not meet the criteria for the commission to come together in relation to it. The Minister of Local Government chose to ask the commission to consider the proposition. This resulted in the Happy Valley council seeing its opportunity to make a submission to have Blackwood, Belair, Bellevue Heights, Eden Hills and other nearby suburbs attached to the Happy Valley council.

The Coromandel Valley group in the Happy Valley area put in a later claim, through the Mitcham council, to be

attached to Mitcham. A report was to be brought down in November. I was told that when I gave evidence. It was then to be December, and then February or March. However, that report has still not been made public or, it appears, been presented to the Minister.

A letter from Mayor Starr of the Happy Valley council, sent out in the past fortnight, indicating that he will contest the position of Mayor again, gives a clear inference that he is satisfied that the Bellevue Heights, Eden Hills, Blackwood, Belair and surrounding areas—sometimes referred to as Mitcham Hills—would be attached to Happy Valley. Comments that are coming from quite senior people in the Happy Valley council indicate that that will take place, and that that recommendation will be in the report. Also, that there will not be nine wards but only eight, that the recommended name will be 'Flinders', as suggested by the Happy Valley council previously; and that the attitude will then move towards having a Happy Valley ward, which will satisfy those people of Happy Valley who have been fighting to retain the name 'Happy Valley' regardless of what happened.

Many people in the community are very upset and disturbed at not having had the opportunity to respond to a poll in relation to deciding what happens—and this relates to the Happy Valley people and to those in Blackwood, Belair, Eden Hills, Bellevue Heights and surrounding areas.

I believe that, if the report recommends that the area should be attached to Happy Valley council, that there should be only eight wards, that it be called 'Flinders' and that there should be a Happy Valley ward, that will indicate that there is a scandal attached to the operation of the commission—because someone has leaked the information. No senior person in the Mitcham council has had any indication of anything like that taking place. They cannot even find out (and they have not tried to go behind doors to do it) what the result will be. But they are deeply concerned—and in fact annoyed—first of all at the Minister's action and, more particularly, at this delay of the release of the report until the Parliament gets up. Whether that is the fault of the commission being unable to complete the report, I do not know.

These people are finding that their rights are being eroded. Matters that should have remained confidential to the commission have not remained so. There are even statements being made that press releases have already been prepared by the people involved to say to the people of Happy Valley that this is a great idea, that they should get behind it and back it 100 per cent. If that is the case, one has the right to ask the Government to set up a royal commission to have a look at whether some sort of skullduggery has gone on behind the scenes in this instance. I do that now. I raise the matter now to make sure that people do not say that I am squealing after the event.

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

Motion carried.

At 4.59 p.m. the House adjourned until Thursday 13 April at 11 a.m.