HOUSE OF ASSEMBLY

Thursday 24 October 1991

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

RURAL COMMUNITY

Adjourned debate on motion of Mr Gunn:

That a select committee be established—

(a) to inquire into the reasons why many farmers and small businesses in rural South Australia are having difficulties in raising adequate finance to maintain their operations;

(b) to examine the operations of and funds available to the Rural Industries Assistance Branch of the Department of Agriculture to see if they are being directed toward those who have the best possibility of long-term viability;

(c) to examine the need for the Government to give protection to those facing foreclosure; and

(d) to give those people who believe they have been harshly treated by the financial institutions the ability to advise the select committee of the difficulties they are facing.

(Continued from 23 October. Page 1377.)

Mr GUNN (Eyre): Last night I explained to the House why it is essential that Parliament inquires into the difficulties that many rural producers and people in small business in South Australia have suffered as a result of the unfortunate economic policies foisted on the community. If the Parliament fails to take positive action, those people will rightly conclude that the Parliament has not given its attention to the most significant economic sector in South Australia, that is, the rural sector which, with the mining sector, are the only two industries that in the short and relatively long term have the ability to maintain a reasonable standard of living in this State.

People in the country have suffered long enough under a high interest regime and what is required immediately is protection for people who, through no fault of their own, have been placed in a difficult situation. I suggest an immediate sensible reduction in interest rates of 2 or 3 per cent, and a further reduction in the future, and a drastic reduction in the value of the Australian dollar, so that our exporters can again become competitive. There should be recognition that people in rural areas face charges and difficulties that the rest of the community do not have to bear. We need a more understanding role in relation to the Commonwealth bureaucracies and government to ensure that adequate assistance is provided so that those communities can give both secondary and tertiary education to their families. There is a need to recognise that agriculture has a high capital input and that it is necessary to maintain incomes in those areas so that small and medium size rural communities will not be decimated.

I look forward to the Minister's response, I hope that he will treat this motion on its merits and give those people, and the organisations that represent them, the opportunity to come before this Parliament in a considered manner and examine closely the difficulties they have faced. Many people in the rural and small business sectors in this State feel that they have been discriminated against and that they have been victims of banking deregulation, which has done nothing for the average Australian. In fact, it has been detrimental to them. That decision was made without properly thinking through all the disadvantages that have flowed to the nation. Many people believe that the average Australian—especially the small business person—is paying for the faults and follies of the banking system and the friends of the Labor Party, those who borrowed thousands of millions of dollars that have now been lost, yet taxpayers and members of the small business community are being forced to pick it up. Therefore, I commend the motion to the House as I believe this proposal would be of long-term benefit.

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

Mrs HUTCHISON secured the adjourned of the debate.

HIRE AND DRIVE VEHICLES

Mr MEIER (Goyder): I move:

That regulations under the Boating Act 1974 relating to Hire and Drive, made on 26 September and laid on the Table of this House on 8 October 1991, be disallowed.

These regulations are some of the most regressive regulations that this House has had before it during the years that I have been a member. They are regressive in the sense that it is a real kick in the mouth for our tourist yacht charter operators in South Australia, coming at a time when this State wants all the help that it can get from the Government and from all people concerned to get it back on its feet. Instead, the Government introduces regulations which will force some of these businesses out of the State and may lead some to close. Certainly they will ensure that the yachts operated by these businesses will not be allowed to continue to operate. That is a regressive situation that we could well do without.

This is an attack on tourism at a time when we have heard the Minister of Tourism say that we need incentives for tourism and that tourism needs all the help that it can get. Yet her own Government says that that is not to be the case; it is happy to see tourism flounder and, if necessary, go under in some of our regional centres. That will be a disaster for this State. So another potential boom industry looks as though it may wither and die unless this House decides to disallow these regulations. It is for this reason that I am speaking to this motion and I ask members on both sides of the House to take account of the facts as they relate to these regulations and to disallow them. Members will be aware that these regulations are proposed to come into effect from 1 January next year, so there is still time for the Government to reconsider its bad move and for us to look at new regulations that will help rather than hinder tourism and yachting operators in this State.

By and large, these regulations treat one boat differently from another. There are to be two, or more, sets of rules. I should have thought that a boat is a boat and a life is a life. If we are to allow people to go out in boats, then rules and regulations should apply no matter what the situation with their boats or their lives. If it is their own private boat, so be it; if they are hiring someone else's boat, so be it.

In this State and country, if one hires a motor car from, say, Avis, Rentacar, Hertz or any other group, that to all intents and purposes will be the same as any other car of that equivalent make and model on the road. One will not find that the car from Avis or Hertz has a lot of extra equipment on it to ensure that one is doubly protected or that one will require extra qualifications or anything like that. The car one hires will be virtually the same as if it were one's personal car, and that is the way it should be. However, these regulations are changing the situation. People who wish to hire boats will have to ensure that there is more equipment on board on the pretext of safety, according to the Minister. But the pretext of safety is a sham. In fact,

the regulations make boat usage for boat hirers less safe than they are now.

That is something that must be exposed, and we must ensure that the Minister is aware that, as from 1 January, he will be reducing the safety level in this State. In fact, the new regulations and the code to which the Minister refers is the USL (Uniform Shipping Law) code, which was principally designed for large commercial shipping, from oil tankers to smaller vessels such as tug boats. The code was not designed for yachts or pleasure boats, and the first area in which the Minister has made a mistake is in choosing the wrong set of laws to try to regulate these boat operators.

Let us look at the reduction in safety. As from 1 January yachts will no longer have to carry storm coverings on every window, yet the Australian Yachting Federation knows that, if a window is washed away, a storm covering is needed to replace it. No longer will yachts have to carry pins or similar items to repair a drain pipe, sea-cock or anything else that could be broken off, knocked or bumped, thereby allowing water to enter. At present, a wooden plug is available to make sure that no water gets in. Under the new regulations that will no longer be necessary. No longer will yachting crews have to wear a safety harness on board. Currently, that is part of the rules and regulations, but the new USL code says, 'No, that will not be necessary.' Yet a yachting harness has perhaps been the lifeblood—and I use that term literally—to ensure that yachtspeople are not swept off their boats, and that they are able to operate in complete safety.

The new regulations bring in the use of a certain type of safety jacket, which has been described as one of the most cumbersome types of things you could wear in that it restricts movement and makes small children virtually immobile. Perhaps that is the Minister's idea—that he does not want little kids running around on board yachts, but I doubt it. We want to see safety jackets that are appropriate to wear on yachts and that allow maximum flexibility for any yacht operator—not jackets that are so restrictive that a person cannot carry out the tasks that are demanded of them. We hear the Minister say, 'Yes, but you must carry a life raft', and he also referred to a lifebuoy. However, most yachts that go into deep waters already either carry a life raft or tow a dinghy. If the Minister thinks that the addition of a life raft or dinghy makes a boat safe, he shows his ignorance. If we consider the well-known Fastnet disaster, where some lives were lost, various boats got into difficulty, and the people on board sought to abandon their vessels either by getting into a life raft or by being winched up into a helicopter.

It might sound easy to jump from a yacht into a life raft, but we well know that, ordinarily, when a vessel is being abandoned the seas are extremely rough. Anyone who has tried to get off a boat and into a life raft in calm water (and I dare say that you, Mr Speaker, would have done that) would appreciate how difficult that is. If there are massive waves and a lot of movement, the chance of stepping onto a life raft is almost nil. In the Fastnet disaster many people missed the life raft and were swept into the sea to find that they were many metres away from both the yacht and the life raft. Within only a short time those people succumbed to the elements of the sea and, unfortunately, lost their lives.

In fact, it was shown in the Fastnet disaster that all but one of the boats remained afloat, so the yachtspeople should have stayed on board in their appropriate harnesses to ensure that they were not swept away. Yet, the Minister is saying, 'No, yacths people must be able to escape into a life raft.' That approach would simply lead to more problems than currently occur. There are many items that are not mentioned in the USL code—many other safety items that one would think would be absolutely necessary. I refer to the need for a second anchor, a comprehensive first-aid book and first aid equipment, two compasses, emergency navigation lights, more than one halyard up the mast—

The Hon. P.B. Arnold: All essential.

Mr MEIER: As the member for Chaffey says, they are all essential. There is also the need for spare sails, tool kits on the boat, a sharp knife in the cockpit and so on. Yet, under the USL code that will not be necessary. I mentioned earlier that under the new regulations a yacht is supposed to carry a lifebuoy. However, it has been pointed out to me that a lifebuoy is a rather cumbersome object; that it would actually get in the way. It is a hard piece of equipment that cannot be stowed anywhere; it becomes a real nuisance. In fact, recreational yachts should use—and therefore this is recommended—a danbuoy, which is a horseshoe-shaped soft buoy on a pole with a clip and a flap. It is able to provide exactly the same type of service as a lifebuoy, but it is fitted to the particular boat.

There is no doubt that the USL code is not the appropriate code. The Australian Yachting Federal code has been with us for a long time. It is quite logical and sensible that that code, together with our own Boating Act, should form the basis for new regulations. It has been put to me that new regulations could be devised and implemented within a matter of a few weeks if the Minister were prepared to withdraw the current regulations. I hope that the Minister sees commonsense and withdraws the regulations, because the many yachts we see on our tourist brochures or pamphlets—yachts that we see in other countries and perhaps in other States—and the industry that we want to promote are currently being driven out of this State. In addition, under the new regulations yacht operators will have their costs increased by thousands of dollars. In fact, under the new regulations it could cost yachting operators up to $10 000 per yacht extra to set up in South Australia. Is that the type of impost we want to place on businesses coming to South Australia? I would say, 'No, absolutely not.'

As I said earlier, these are some of the most regressive regulations that South Australia has seen, particularly for the South Australian yachting industry. They will cause enormous problems, and the Department of Marine and Harbors should be aware that they are the wrong way to go. However, more importantly, it is certainly something that the Minister should have recognised as being the wrong way to go, and he must turn back to a commonsense approach.

In conclusion, I point out one great anomaly. Under the new regulations, one yachting operator, if he wants to sail from Lincoln Cove Marina to the Sir Joseph Banks group, will not be able to do so unless he has his sail area cut down. In other words, he has to have his sails modified. What a stupid regulation for this House to be considering. We want to ensure that boats which comply with international standards and which have international certificates are able to sail in South Australian waters as they are able to sail anywhere else in the world. Those organisations, and those certificates are what we require.

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

Mr FERGUSON (Henley Beach): I believe that the member for Goyder is tackling this proposition in the wrong way. If one wanted to change regulations, it should be done by way of logic and sense and by providing arguments that could be accepted by the Minister and by the department, rather than by being a carping critic. In relation to these

regulations, the member for Goyder has proved to be a carping critic, which does nothing more than stiffen opposition from departmental heads and from the Minister to any change in the regulations.

The argument put by the member for Goyder is one that most people in any area would reject. To put up an argument that regulations aimed at saving lives should be rejected on the ground of cost, which is the argument the member for Goyder was putting to this House—

An honourable member interjecting:

Mr FERGUSON: I am very sorry, Sir, but I have only nine minutes and do not have time to answer all the interjections. The proposition being put by the member for Goyder not only in this debate but in previous debates, including during the Estimates Committee that, merely because the safety regulations will increase the amount of capital that must be spent on a boat, they should not be introduced, is an argument that cannot hold water. We cannot put a price on someone's life, and if these propositions were—

The Hon. P.B. Arnold: That is what we are arguing for.

Mr FERGUSON: The interjection from the other side of the House was that this is what we are arguing for. If that were the argument, and if that argument had been put to this House properly, we would be discussing this sensibly around a table, and I am sure that the departmental heads would be only too pleased to discuss this from time to time. I have only to refer to previous copies of *Hansard*, particularly to that of the Estimates Committee, where the member for Goyder opposed the proposition for the introduction of these standards because of the cost.

What the member for Goyder said was that the cost would be so great that the charter operator to whom he was referring would be driven out of business if he had to comply with those regulations. That is not an argument that should be put to this House. If safety regulations are the right regulations, and if they involve money, no matter whether the operator is driven out of the State or not, the Parliament should pass these regulations.

Mr MEIER: On a point of order, Mr Speaker, I draw your attention to Standing Order No. 127, which provides that a member may not impute improper motives to any other member or make personal reflections on any other member.

The SPEAKER: Order! The point of order is that the honourable member has imputed proper motives. I do not believe that that is so. The statement was that the case being put was one of cost rather than safety. I do not have the *Hansard* to check what was actually said. If it was stated that cost was a factor, I do not see that there is a point of order.

Mr MEIER: On a further point of order, you, Sir, would have noted that almost half my speech earlier today was on the safety aspect of these regulations, which the honourable member—

The SPEAKER: Order! There is no further point of order. If the honourable member has used the issue of costs in debating the matter, it is quite legitimate for the member for Henley Beach to refer to it.

Mr FERGUSON: Indeed, the member for Goyder has raised the issue of costs in his argument. I refer members to the Estimates Committee volume; the member for Goyder said:

> I cite an example of how costs would go up under the Minister's proposals. Let us consider a fleet of 10 charter vessels—which has been put to me is a number that any large scale operator would be looking at for an economical charter operation—where the cost to be imposed by the Minister's USL code would be as follows:

He then enumerated the costs and got up to about $160 000. He used that as an argument and as the reason why the propositions ought not to be introduced. I am simply saying to the member for Goyder that, if he wants to win this argument, that is not the way to go. An argument that lives have a cost and that we should jeopardise somebody's life merely because of the cost should not hold water in this place. The honourable member should be more logical in the way he presents his argument.

It may well be that, when the Subordinate Legislation Committee has finished taking evidence on this matter, there may be a change of heart; the witnesses now appearing before that committee may be able, if a conference follows with the heads of the Hon. Mr Gregory's department, to come to some compromise. But, for goodness sake, let us hear some logical argument. The fact that one should be arguing against the introduction of a life raft or whether or not we should have a danbuoy or a lifebuoy is not a proposition that this House should be able to agree to. I believe that the Minister has had the best and right motives in introducing the new safety regulations for hire and drive boats. Who could argue with the fact that the regulations will require vessels which are fitted with overnight accommodation and where hired out to meet the uniform shipping laws code. The uniform shipping laws code is what it says; it should apply to every hire and drive vessel throughout the whole of Australia. It is logical that we should have a uniform code.

Hirers of those vessels must keep in radio contact with the owner. It will require boatowners to give instruction to all hirers on vehicle safety issues. What could be wrong with that? I know that the matter is subject to further negotiation, and I will not come down totally on the side of the department at this stage. The matter must be adjudicated by the Subordinate Legislation Committee and will be subject to further negotiation following what the witnesses have said to that committee. Therefore, there may well be room for compromise so far as these regulations are concerned. To put an argument before this House that the regulations should not be introduced because of the costs that would flow on to the owners of these vehicles is not one that this Parliament should be prepared to accept. I look forward to further debate on this issue.

The Hon. P.B. ARNOLD secured the adjournment of the debate.

SELECT COMMITTEE ON THE LAW AND PRACTICE RELATING TO DEATH AND DYING

The Hon. M.D. RANN (Minister of Employment and Further Education): I move:

That the time for bringing up the report of the select committee be extended until Thursday 31 October 1991.

Motion carried.

CAMDEN PRIMARY SCHOOL COUNCIL

Mr BECKER (Hanson): I move:

That this House commends the Camden Primary School Council on its proposals submitted to the Adelaide Area Directorate relating to the change for the West Torrens cluster as part of the primary schools review, western suburbs, and calls on the Minister of Education to reject any decision to amalgamate, transfer or close Camden Primary School.

In moving this motion I am quite aware that I have made several speeches about this school during the budget and Address in Reply debates. However, this school is unique: it is one of the most successful schools as far as community involvement and the standard of the quality of education provided by its staff are concerned. The Hon. Hugh Hudson, when he made it possible for the old Camden Primary School (which was built in 1916) to be relocated on the current site in 1976 by using Demac construction, gave the community a challenge to accept and adopt this school, which cost about $700 000. That is exactly what the community did, and it did it with pride.

At the time of transferring the school to its new site, the school council had a bank balance of $400; today, it has a bank balance well in excess of $105 000. It is ironic to find that, when one attends school council meetings, what is being discussed is the best short-term money market rate that can be obtained to invest its funds. But that money is not sitting there idly: it has been raised by the very proud parents of this school to provide additional staff and facilities for the school.

That is why I make this urgent appeal to the Minister. I know that it is generally not his role to interfere in the administration of the department and the consideration of these issues, but there comes a time when not only the community but also the children must be considered. What must be considered are the children in the community, the children who attend that school and the opportunities that we can give them for the best possible education that taxpayers in this country can afford—and that is being provided. The staff at that school have had problems, as the school is located alongside a very noisy industrial complex. That problem has now been overcome: the worst offending company has spent $140 000 on the construction of a huge concrete wall to block out the noise from its operations. So, the noise problem has been reduced.

That is an indication of the level of involvement within the community to which people are prepared to go to help this school. In the Messenger Press *Westside* of Wednesday 24 July, the school council arranged a two-page feature highlighting the services provided by the school. The important part of this feature is the number of advertisements from various community organisations, one of which, New Horizons Educational Computer Services, advertises itself as 'Proud suppliers to Camden Primary of software needs'.

Another advertisement read 'Boosting skills in the developing years: an exciting new concept in activities for children', regarding the Tri-Skills Centre at Penong Avenue, Camden Park. That is the organisation that used the Camden Primary School multipurpose hall. Rawsons Electrical put an advertisement in this feature, as did AppleCentre Adelaide Random Access, as follows:

> AppleCentre Adelaide Random Access is proud of its continuing association with Camden Primary School.

Vision-On stated in an advertisement that it is proud to support Camden Primary School's audio-visual and computer systems with sales, service and hire. Clarks Shoes, a local shoe manufacturer, stated in an advertisement, 'We put feet first.' We know that that company supports the school. Then, there is an advertisement from the Novar Gardens pharmacy and the Plympton pharmacy supporting this special feature. So, it is unique that community organisations and companies are prepared to spend considerable sums of money to help with a feature in the local paper, supporting the local school. That is a demonstration of the pride that people have in this school, and that is why I appeal to the Minister, I appeal to the Premier and I appeal to the Government to reconsider any decision to close or relocate the Camden Primary School.

It has been an integral part of the community of Camden Park since 1916, when it was established. After all, if it were an old building, built back then, it would be heritage listed and we would have all the greenies down there, and everybody would be protesting that we could not touch this building. But, as an institution, it seems that we can relocate it, pull down the buildings and close the school. That is the tragedy, because nobody seems to consider the educational benefits that are provided for the young people and, in fact, have been provided for the hundreds of thousands of people who have gone through that school in those 75 years.

I want to read into the record a few of the extracts from the submission, dated 2 August 1991, that the primary school council put to the Adelaide Area Directorate. The following statement was made concerning the school community and its activities:

> All school subcommittees of the school council, all student representative bodies and the public meeting are united, [in supporting the retention of the school]. The council subcommittees include the Wednesday club or Education Committee, the Education Forum Committee, the Policy Committee, the Sports Committee, the Building and Maintenance Committee and the Executive Finance Committee. The student bodies include class and school representatives.

It is interesting to note that some 21 sports have been catered for at Camden Primary School since 1976. Those sports have been organised and vigorously supported by the parents. On the previous site of the Camden Primary School there was no oval—no lawn facility—for the students to take part in any sporting activities so, by relocating the school to the current site, the Education Department provided for a very urgent and most important need of the students. That challenge was taken up by the parents and the school council, to ensure that the cost and the equipment that was necessary in providing support for those various sports was met. It did not cost the Government very much; in fact, it did not cost the Government anything at all, because the parents were so proud and pleased to have the opportunity that they assisted with the funds.

The school has an outstanding music program. The school owns two pianos, five electronic keyboards, six clarinets, four trumpets, two trombones, two saxophones, two cellos, two violas, ten violins, eight flutes, drums, percussion instruments, and ang-klung (Indonesian) instruments. Not every primary school would have that number of instruments; not every primary school would look after those instruments and keep them in first-class condition; and not every school has its own music teacher, paid for by school council funds. The Education Department does not pay for the music teacher at the Camden Primary School. In fact, the department reneged on the agreement to provide the funding for that person. So, is it any wonder the parents at that school are most upset at the threat of the closing of their school?

The school owns 15 Macintosh and five IIGS Apple computers for specialist use, and 10 IIEs or IIGS Apple computers for classroom use, plus the software. The total cost of this was $80 000, which was again raised by the school community. It should also be noted that the school community provided $180 000 cash for the erection of a magnificent hall some seven years ago. Nothing comparable exists at Plympton High School, which is being suggested as the alternative site to relocate the school. Nothing exists in the area at all that would compare with this multipurpose hall. When you look at the cost of that building, what it cost the Government, the service it supplies to the community and the opportunities through the tri-Skills program

for students of various ages, you will see that that hall is of immense value to the Camden community.

The grounds occupy almost 2.5 hectares. They are beautifully maintained and kept, again with pride by the school and school council. Eighty-eight per cent of the students live within one kilometre of the school and, if the school is relocated, as has been suggested, to the Plympton High School, the students will have to walk or obtain transport for a further six-tenths of a kilometre or more to attend that new school. In today's conditions it is not on to force smaller children to traverse some of our suburban roads, not forgetting the associated problems of supervising them. It is better to have a neighbourhood school in comfortable walking distance for students so that their parents can supervise them, as this presents the opportunity to teach these students, at this young age, some independence, although parents still need to be there to supervise them and protect them from some of the people in our community.

I was interested to note the determination of the school council and the parents; they have not shirked their responsibility to carry the message of their concern anywhere in the metropolitan area. Public meetings at the Camden Primary School have generally been attended by at least 300 people; they have been very enthusastic meetings of parents who were prepared to question and demand to know the answers. They would not take just anybody's word for anything, and that is a good and healthy sign in the community. In the *Westside* Messenger of 10 July it was reported that about 30 Camden parents had attended the Port Adelaide Girls High School, which staged a protest meeting about the future of that school, and that they let the Premier know in no uncertain terms what they felt about the Camden Primary School. To quote the Chairman of the Camden Action Group:

> We were there to show the Government the effect they are having on local communities.

What I am pointing out is that the school council and the parents will take every opportunity to demonstrate to anybody that theirs is one of the better primary schools in the metropolitan area. The parents have had to work extremely hard to make sure that that school can provide the education their children need. I put the challenge to the Premier, to the Minister of Education again and to any other Government Minister to go to the Camden Primary School, whenever they like—they need not worry about the local member of Parliament—to see for themselves what those parents are doing. At the same time, they could look at one of the community programs being undertaken, that is, collecting books for children in Africa. Not only are the parents helping one another but also they are spreading their concern for other communities by helping under-privileged children throughout the world. It is a worthwhile program. The challenge is there for the Premier and for his Government to reconsider this school, the children and the people of that community. I commend the motion to the House.

The Hon. M.D. RANN secured the adjournment of the debate.

ECONOMY

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

> That this House condemns the Government for its disregard of the misery caused by its economic policies and financial negligence and demands that it give prime consideration to the future of South Australian business in order to provide jobs.

We on this side of the House cannot understand how any member on the other side could possibly get up in the morning and look at themselves in the mirror and say that they are doing a worthwhile job and assisting the South Australian community. I do not know what they have for a conscience. However, if the number of representations made to my office is any guide, their offices must be inundated by people complaining, questioning and asking for some assistance in the current economic circumstances.

The other night at about 10.30 I received a phone call. The caller said, 'I came to this country to find a good life for myself and my family. I have raised eight children here; four of them are now of working age. Mr Baker, how do they get a job?' That question is being asked by parents right across the length and breadth of South Australia: how do children get a job? How many members on the other side of the House have had similar representations? What do they say to them? What do you say to your constituents when they come to you and say—

The Hon. J.P. TRAINER: I rise on a point of order, Mr Speaker. I ask the honourable member to direct his remarks through you, Sir, and not refer to members on this side of the house as 'you'.

The SPEAKER: I support the point of order. The honourable member will direct his remarks through the Chair.

Mr S.J. BAKER: What do members say to their constituents when they telephone them or when they go to their office and say, 'My children can't get a job. How can you help? What have you done to the job prospects of my children?' How do you answer that question?

Mr FERGUSON: On a point of order, Mr Speaker, the honourable gentleman is not addressing you, Sir: he is referring to members on this side of the House as 'you'.

The SPEAKER: The honourable member will resume his seat. I have mentioned frivolous points of order previously and, in the opinion of the Chair, this point of order comes close to it. However, I direct the Deputy Leader to direct his remarks to the Chair.

Mr S.J. BAKER: The telephone call I received was just one of a number of approaches that have been made to me, principally by parents who are worried about the future job prospects of their children. However, the matter does not stop there. How many people within our circle of friends and aquaintances—and some of them may be in their 40s and 50s—have seen their job prospects disappear. How many of us can look around and say, 'I don't know anyone who hasn't been touched by the current economic shambles'? How many members can say that they do not have a friend or know of someone in middle management who no longer had a car provided, who was then asked to work a shorter time and who finally was given notice because that person was no longer required? How many people do we know who have been given early retirement packages by companies which can no longer support them because they are making losses?

How many members have been told of people having to move their families interstate in order to get a job? That is the situation in South Australia, but it does not just stop at jobs: it goes further than that. Members know that people's hearts are being torn and that their dignity has suffered seriously because they no longer have a job. What about the children of unemployed people and young people in their late teens who do not have a job prospect? We know that some of those people resort to other forms of anti-social activity. This all revolves around our capacity to provide economic and social independence for our population.

The Bannon Government has a great deal to answer for in this regard. We were all once proud South Australians,

but we can no longer claim that South Australia is performing in the way we would all wish and hope for concerning the future of our children and our friends. Although the statistics are bland, they tell a compelling story. Labour force statistics published in the *Australian Bureau of Statistics Bulletin* disclose that in South Australia 22 100 fewer people were employed in August this year than in August last year; 17 000 full-time and 5 200 part-time jobs have disappeared. If we look further, we find the people most affected are the supporters of the ALP, people from the ALP's traditional heart land. Of those 22 100 jobs, a large proportion—9 000—come from the unskilled and labouring areas which the ALP has prided itself on representing, yet its policies are destroying those people and giving them no chance for a future.

It is the policies of Labor Governments—both Federal and State—that have caused such social dislocation and economic problems for those people. It is the unskilled and the people who have not had a good solid education—and certainly not been able to obtain a tertiary education—who suffer. Perhaps they have always had the opportunity to provide for themselves because a job was always available in some form or another, yet they are the first and the most diabolically affected.

As to the industries bearing the brunt of it, agriculture and manufacturing employ many of the people we are talking about, and we find 6 500 jobs lost in agriculture and 6 300 jobs lost in manufacturing—two of the largest areas affected.

We all know that the unemployment rate has risen to 10.5 per cent, highlighted by the latest statistics available, and we know that the median duration of unemployment has increased from 21 to 26 weeks. We also know that the number of average hours worked in a week has decreased, so it is not only those who have lost their jobs but people still employed who are paying a price for the policies pursued by State and Federal Labor Governments.

Each day there is a new development which clearly shows the real problems that are enveloping this State. This week the Berri Coop was called to account by the State Bank and told to get its house in order because there is a $10 million debt overhang on the five cooperatives in the Riverland. The ANZ Bank has announced that it will reduce its work force by between 1 000 and 2 000. Australian National has talked about downsizing or reducing numbers in Port Augusta and in our northern towns. Not once in the past six months have I seen a headline to the effect that an employer in this State is making enough profit to employ more people.

Whilst the Government and its supporters may blame the economic circumstances that have prevailed in the international sphere or those created by the Federal Government, much of the blame rests fairly and squarely with the Bannon Labor Government. I will outline some of the areas which have been directly under the control of the Bannon Government and which have not been addressed or have been addressed inadequately over the past eight years.

We expect proper management by a Government. If we had had proper management of our banks and financial institutions, we would not have a debt of $2.2 billion as a result of the State Bank disaster. That would not have occurred if the Premier and Treasurer had taken his job seriously. That does not assist, particularly as the bill of $220 million a year has to be paid to cover the interest on that debt year after year without any productive result.

The list is long. What has the Government done about things that could have improved our performance? What has the Government done about the wharves? How often have I complained about our lack of capacity to get ships in and out of Adelaide? How often have I complained about the operations and activities of the painters and dockers? Labor Governments, both Federal and State, have a view on these matters. They presume that eventually they will all clear up. In the process, the volume of goods that have been handled at Port Adelaide and Outer Harbor has diminished by at least 50 per cent.

We now push most of our goods through the Port of Melbourne; we no longer ship them out of Port Adelaide. Yet, if we had taken a decision eight years ago to clean up the wharves, to produce quick turnarounds and to show that this State, of all States, is the most efficient distributor of products, we would have had people coming to South Australia to get goods into Australia. They would have used Adelaide as their main port of call to get their goods into a number of States. But we did not take that decision and, of course, our prospects have diminished as a result. That was within the province of the State Labor Government. Nothing was done and we are paying the price, because we have to get down on our hands and knees and ask for special consideration to get a ship into this State to get our products out. It is a totally untenable situation.

How often have we complained about and questioned the role of the unions in the building industry? If we had taken one tough stance, if Premier Bannon had stood against the building unions, we may have seen a result far different from the one facing us today—total decimation of the building industry, not only due to over production and increased effort at a time of turnaround but because the unions have destroyed the industry. They have made the cost of construction in this State far too high.

What have we seen from Premier Bannon on the issue of interest rates? He has supported the Keating line and now the Kerin line on the high interest rate policy. At a time when we needed the Premier of this State to stand up to the Hawke Government on the issue of interest rates, he supported the policies of then Treasurer Keating and Prime Minister Hawke. Of course, what happened was that in the process he destroyed so many of our rural producers, who are going through some incredible problems due to bad seasons and bad product prices overseas. The accumulation of those problems was added to, because the farmers were paying 22 per cent to 27 per cent on the money that they had borrowed. They had no hope of repaying those amounts. That was the policy supported by the Premier and Treasurer of this State. Had the Premier stood up on the some of these issues we may have seen some relief.

What have we seen on the issue of rural relief? We had an opportunity to show that we support our rural communities but, again, the Bannon Government has walked away from it, and I think approximately $5 million has been provided for that purpose. We have other opportunities to minimise the burden on employers in this State, to allow people to be employed, and to reduce costs of employment. However, we have not seen any initiatives. In fact, the initiatives have gone in the opposite direction, whether they be in the areas of payroll tax, land tax or FID tax—and we can go through the whole long and sad list. Time and time again the Bannon Government has contributed to the demise and the real problems that we have today. If the Premier was showing any responsibility he would hand in his resignation. The Government should resign because of the problems and the misery it has caused. I believe that this State needs a change of leadership and a change of direction, and I demand it.

The Hon. T.H. HEMMINGS (Napier): Obviously, I oppose this motion. It is another speech direct from the

H.R. Nicholls Society, once more convincing me that the Deputy Leader of the Opposition is a member of that society. I have referred to this recently in a speech that I made to the House. Again, it is another direct lift-out of 'In search of the magic pudding' and, again, I have explored that particular—

Mr S.J. BAKER: On a point of order, Mr Speaker, can I suggest that the honourable member stick to the truth. I am not a member of the H.R. Nicholls Society.

The SPEAKER: Order! I do not believe that is a point of order.

An honourable member interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order! It is not the concern of the House whether or not the honourable member is a member of the H.R. Nicholls Society. I do not believe that there is a point of order. The member for Napier must be careful in how he uses the term; but he is not against the Standing Orders at the moment.

Mr S.J. BAKER: On a further point, Sir, should the member for Napier, in fact, reflect on the motives and the character of the member, would that then be an adequate point of order?

The SPEAKER: Order! The honourable member will resume his seat. No member may use any device at all to reflect upon any other member.

Dr ARMITAGE: On a point of order, Mr Speaker, the member for Napier stated a fact, so-called, quite clearly. The Deputy Leader has quite clearly indicated that that fact is incorrect. Is not the member for Napier misleading the House?

The SPEAKER: I did not actually hear the honourable member state positively that the Deputy Leader was—

The Hon. T.H. HEMMINGS: Sir, I said that I have always suspected.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order! I will check *Hansard*, make sure what was said, and if there was a reflection I will call on the honourable member to withdraw.

The Hon. T.H. HEMMINGS: Sir, I think *Hansard* will bear me out in that what I said was that I always suspected—but if by chance what I have said about the Deputy Leader being a member of the H.R. Nicholls Society causes him some degree of discomfort and grief I will be only too pleased to withdraw, and I will make no further reference to the membership of that society in relation to the member for Mitcham.

May I say that I know many men and women who are members of the H.R. Nicholls Society and I am only too pleased to call them my friends. I disagree with their politics, just as I disagree with the politics of members opposite, but it does not mean to say that I hate them. In fact, I am quite friendly with most members opposite. I think that clears that up.

Let us look at the speech. We had a 15-minute contribution from the Deputy Leader, the economic spokesman for the Liberal Party, and what was it? Those people who will read that speech tomorrow and those of us who heard it today will come to the same conclusion as I did: it was 90 per cent rhetoric and 10 per cent rubbish. How are we, in effect, to respond to a speech like that? In a democracy—and I am a great believer in democracy—one expects criticism. One always expects criticism from opposing political Parties. That is why democracy is so strong and vibrant in the Western world. However, if criticism is levelled, in this case at the Government, one expects to hear an alternative. Did we hear an alternative? We did not. There was some widespread scattergun attack on the trade union movement, the Federal Government and so on. It was a typical Deputy Leader speech.

One thing the Deputy Leader did say is that he is no longer proud to be a South Australian. That is a very damning remark. In effect, it is raising the white flag; it is the surrender document; it is taking the white feather; it is putting down the shutters on this State. I will not be party to that, as I am sure is the case with most members, on both sides of the House.

Mr Ferguson: Run up the white flag!

The Hon. T.H. HEMMINGS: As my colleague the member for Henley Beach says, that is what the Deputy Leader always does. Sure, things are tough out there in the community. They are just as tough for the people whom the Deputy Leader represents as they are for the people whom I represent. However, I do not have people coming into my office and saying that they are no longer proud to be South Australians. They tell me that they are prepared to battle this one through and to hope that circumstances change. In fact, I have had, for example, lowly-paid process workers come to my electorate office and put forward a better argument about how things should be changed than the Deputy Leader. Yet, he drives around in a big, white car, representing Her Majesty's loyal Opposition—and what does he give us? Bugger all! I find that a bit hard.

The SPEAKER: Order! I ask the honourable member to withdraw.

The Hon. T.H. HEMMINGS: I am sorry, Sir, I got carried away. I withdraw that remark. This motion is completely lacking in any form of substance. Apart from the words 'That this House'—the only sensible words—this motion is a load of rhetoric that has been put together on the spur of the moment. This kind of motion could be moved in any State Parliament or the Federal Parliament, or indeed in any Western Parliament that operates under our kind of system. Why? Because things are tough throughout the world. If the member for Mitcham thinks that this State can be isolated from all of the so-called problems that he has outlined to the House, he has rocks in his head, and he knows it. It shows scant regard not only for the intelligence of the people in this House but also for those gentle readers of *Hansard* who, when they get their copy, will say, 'Oh blimey, here he goes again!'

That is the problem. That is where the Deputy Leader completely misjudges the community. Some of the problems we have, especially in the rural community, were outlined very well by the member for Eyre in a speech he made yesterday. He said that there is no longer a level playing field. His criticism was of the Federal Government, and I accept that kind of criticism, because there is no longer a level playing field in regard to the rural community. This is because so-called friendly Governments are screwing us to the wall without any compunction whatsoever, and that will continue. It is no use the Deputy Leader saying that we want more rural assistance.

The kind of rural assistance that we would need to offset those so-called friendly Governments who are pouring billions of dollars into helping their own farmers would bankrupt not only this State and the Federal Government but also the gnomes of Zurich, who are also screwing us to the wall. But the Deputy Leader either does not know it—and that would be a tragedy—or he knows it and is trying to cloud the whole issue. The Deputy Leader talks about the trade union movement as if the trade union movement, along with the Treasurer, is our real problem. Let me tell the Deputy Leader that, whether he likes it or not, the building industry—

Mr Ferguson: Has shown great wage restraint.

The Hon. T.H. HEMMINGS: —has shown great restraint, as my colleague the member for Henley Beach said, as far as wages are concerned. Its attitude to employers such as the Master Builders Association and the Australian Federation of Construction Contractors is recognised by those people as being the best in this country. There are no problems in the residential building area, because the employers and the trade unions sit down and quietly sort out their differences.

When the big deregulation conflict occurred in New South Wales and Victoria, what was the Builders Labourers Federation doing here in this State? It was working. The Deputy Leader shakes his head, because he has never liked the truth. Ron Owens made sure that the pours that were due to take place on major building projects did take place without any problem whatsoever. If that is not cooperation between the trade union movement and the employers, I will eat my hat. The Deputy Leader knows that, but he is quite happy just to sow those seeds of mischief in this House and to hope that we will accept them.

What has the Deputy Leader offered as an alternative? Not a sausage! Not one suggestion has he put to this House—and this Government is quite happy to take constructive advice—in an attempt to actually make things better in the short term. Not a sausage! Should I expect anything other than that, when one looks at the past record of members opposite on projects that could only stimulate employment, make things better in this State and, perhaps more importantly, put this State on the map? Let us look at the past record of members opposite. They completely obstructed the Grand Prix legislation.

Mr S.G. EVANS: Mr Speaker, I draw your attention to the state of the House.

A quorum having been formed:

The Hon. T.H. HEMMINGS: Members opposite obstructed the introduction of the Grand Prix legislation. In effect the Liberal Party also tried to sabotage the Entertainment Centre—a shining example of what this State can produce. Even on the Public Works Standing Committee the Liberal Party opposed the Entertainment Centre. It attacks at every opportunity the multifunction polis. But, when it is up and running members opposite will be there at the grand opening getting their kudos as they did at the Entertainment Centre and at the Grand Prix. They will be swanning around with their glass of chardonnay in their hand. But, in this place, instead of giving us any assistance members opposite carp, whinge and do all the knocking for which they are renowned. The development of the Flinders Ranges is another example. I could go on and on about what the Opposition tries to do against pulling up this State by its boot straps and making it the shining jewel in the crown of our great Australian country. It will never happen as long as we have people like the member for Mitcham who sits in this place in his moment of glory as Deputy Leader. It is fairly obvious from the Notices of Motions coming through—

Dr Armitage interjecting:

The Hon. T.H. HEMMINGS: The member for Adelaide, who interjects in his very medical manner, does not have the guts. He is not the 'kick in the groin' type like the member for Mitcham, so he will never be in that position. It is a tragedy that the great Liberal Party—the Liberal Party that spawned people like Tom Playford and Steele Hall (God bless him)—has now degenerated to the point where people like the member for Mitcham is second in command. It is a bad day for this State.

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

Mr S.G. EVANS secured the adjournment of the debate.

REMEMBRANCE DAY

Mrs KOTZ (Newland): I move:

That this House urges the Government to support and encourage the observance of Remembrance Day ceremonies and the one minute silent commemoration at the 11th hour of the 11th day of the 11th month and to initiate support through the Education Department to encourage staff and students of all schools throughout the State to participate by acknowledging a minute's silence on Remembrance Day.

More than 60 000 Australian men and boys lost their lives during the First World War from 1914 to 1918. More than 60 000 of the 330 000 Australians who went to war as volunteers died on the other side of the world. This enormous loss of human life caused immense suffering and hardship to the women, children and other family members at home on Australian shores. The suffering caused to Australian families during those days by the death of loved ones was cruelly exacerbated by the inability of those families to claim their dead. The bodies of our Australian men folk remained on foreign soil for all time; many of them were younger than our year 12 students in today's education system.

It is almost unthinkable to contemplate that, of the 60 000 killed in battle, more than 18 000 Australian soldiers who died in France and Belgium were unidentified and, therefore, had no known graves. A monument to Australians killed in France was unveiled at Villers-Bretonneux, near Amiens on 22 July 1938 by King George V in the company of the President of France, three Ministers of the Commonwealth Government (Sir Earle Page, The Hon. R.G. Menzies and Lieutenant Colonel Thomas White), the High Commissioner in London (S.M. Bruce) and a guard of honour of 400 old soldiers and eight nurses from Australia. The inscription on the monument recorded that 1 200 Australians had died to capture this town in April 1918. About 11 000 names were listed, and for each missing man stood a stone inscribed 'A soldier of the Great War—An Australian regiment—Known unto God.' Throughout Australia, flags were flown at half mast.

The war dead have been remembered over the years at 11 a.m., the hour of the Armistice, on the eleventh day of the eleventh month to mark with poppies and silence the end of the war in 1918. The poppies, emblems in red cloth, imitated the poppies that grew in Flanders fields and were sold to raise money for children of soldiers, the war orphans. I would like to include in *Hansard* an excerpt from H. Septimus Power's 'Bringing up the Guns', which epitomises the last stages of World War I, as follows:

The Australians took part in the initial attacks on the Hindenburg Line but were withdrawn in October. Their war was over. The final tally was horrifying. Out of 330 000 men sent into battle, 59 342 died and another 152 171 were wounded. The cost could be measured in ways other than human tragedy, too. For example, the Victorian Education Department suffered a manpower crisis after the war because one out of five young teachers who volunteered failed to return.

On Armistice Day, 11 November 1918, Australia had 270 000 men overseas. Seventeen months elapsed before the last of them could be brought home. A Department of Repatriation had been established to care for the permanently crippled, organise work training for some, and find work for others. A returned servicemen's association—later the powerful RSL—was formed. The countryside was recovering from the effects of a severe drought and there was considerable industrial unrest. A the dawn of the Gay Twenties some 14 000 returned men had not found work. In the villages, towns and cities the war memorials were erected.

The first lines were etched on the face of the youthful nation not yet 20 years old.

These events took place in the 14th and 18th year of Australia's nationhood. It is unlikely that any one Australian was not affected by the sacrifice of life at that time. As Australia's nationhood is recorded and remembered publicly in our history for all time, so should the events that shaped and strengthened this nation be recorded. It is of great concern to me and to many of my constituents that schools within this State have neither recognised the historic significance of these past events nor supported a minute's silence over recent years. There is a resurgence of interest in the total sphere of our historical background, and I believe this is healthy for our nation and right for future generations, who need to know both what we were and what we are in order to forge what we will be. In the words of Emerson, the measured shadow of a man is history. I ask sincerely for the support of this House for this motion.

The Hon. J.P. TRAINER (Walsh): I move:

After '11th Month' insert 'in both the public sector and the private sector'.

The members of the Government will be supporting this motion, with the addition of a minor amendment which has been circulated in my name and which is intended to make clear that the Government should not only circularise Government departments to encourage the commemoration of the 11 November ceremony but also provide encouragement to the private sector to do likewise. The events of 11 a.m., 11 November are just a small part of the one day of the year in Australia when we remember all who died in the scourge of humanity that we know as war—in the two world wars, in Korea and Vietnam, and in all other theatres of war.

The date 11 November in recent years has been better known for other reasons, such as the anniversary of the execution of Ned Kelly and the dismissal of an elected Government in 1975. However, in 1918, 11 November was a very special, joyous day. If we want visible evidence of that in this building, I draw members' attention to the photograph which is located immediately outside the members' lounge and which shows the tremendous crowd that was gathered in North Terrace outside Parliament House on Armistice Day, 1918, to celebrate the abdication of Kaiser Wilhelm II and the guns falling silent at 11 a.m. that day, after the Armistice had been signed at 5 a.m. on 11 November 1918.

As well as being a day of great joy, it is also a day of great sadness for those of our ancestors who endured the Great War—the war that was called the war to end all wars. They knew the futility of war. Many of them knew the tragedy of personal loss; all around the world, nations realised the tragedy of that personal loss on an almost immeasurable scale. One just has to travel around the countryside in South Australia to see that every small country town has its memorial to that part of an entire generation of that village or town whose lives were taken or whose bodies were all but destroyed in the cataclysm of the First World War.

Historians may argue about what caused the war and what its nature was in historical terms: whether it was an imperialist war to preserve colonial empires; whether it was simply a family squabble between the royal heads of Europe; or whether it was a justifiable response to German expansionism. Certainly, the people of the post-war period knew of its effects. Today, with historical research, perhaps we know even more, because some of it was shielded from people at the time: it was only after the war that many people asked those who came back what it was really like, and discovered what was behind the rather blase communiques that had appeared in the press during the war. They learned from their surviving loved ones about their memories of corpses churned into the mud of Flanders, the stony ground of Gallipoli or the marshes of Tannenberg; they learned what it was like to be one of a group of men who were fed into the mincing machine of war, to be mere cannon fodder.

One example of the tremendous destruction of human life is the Battle of the Somme. On one day, 1 July 1916, the British suffered 60 000 casualties, of whom 20 000 were killed. In one day, more people than the capacity crowd of Football Park were strewn around as the dead, the dying and the wounded in the mud of the Somme. By the time that battle had ended, the British had suffered 420 000 casualties, the French 200 000 and the German defenders 450 000, and all that loss of men for nothing more than a very small shift in the line of five miles here or there. In effect, there was no gain at all from that tremendous slaughter. 'Idealism perished on the Somme', writes A.J.P. Taylor in his history of the First World War. He went on to write:

The enthusiastic volunteers were enthusiastic no longer. They had lost faith in their cause, in their leaders, in everything except loyalty to their fighting comrades. The war ceased to have a purpose. It went on for its own sake, as a contest in endurance.

He also stated:

The front churned into mud. There was a last attack on 13 November, then the battle, if such it can be called, came to its dismal end. There had been no breakthrough; the front had advanced here and there about five miles. Many years later, the editor of the British official history performed a conjuring trick on the German figures—

which I quoted earlier—

and blew them up to 650 000, thus making out against all experience that the attackers had suffered less than the defence.

Those British officers who led their men into the slaughter of the First World War had not learnt the lesson of what happened to the waves of attacking forces moving on well-defended opponents in trenches, but it would have been clear to them had they bothered to look at the Russian/Japanese War of 1905 or the American Civil War. Instead, the British soldiers were criminally led to the slaughter. Brave as they were, they went like lambs to the slaughter and were described as 'lions led by donkeys', obeying as the irresistible pencil of the general headquarters staff traced its way across maps, not hesitating for barbed wire, mud or shrapnel.

My father, John Patrick Trainer, Senior, was one of those who, in the First World War, was caught up in the wave of patriotism, lied about his age and fought with the British Expeditionary Force in Flanders. Like many others, for years later, he was still extracting shrapnel from his body well into his seventies. In my youth I remember meeting so many old men among his comrades who had been blinded, had had their lungs destroyed by gas or who had been wounded and, like my father, were still carrying their scars.

My father was an RSL stalwart. He was one of those who was responsible, along with others such as Senator Arnold Drury, for establishing the Field of Remembrance on North Terrace. I have indelible childhood memories of attending there on North Terrace where the small white crosses were placed on the green lawn underneath the trees. I remember the annual ceremony of Armistice Day, which was often called Poppy Day because of the sale of small paper poppies, which were pinned on in badge day fashion, for fundraising purposes for the orphans, widows and other casualties of war. The poppy was chosen as an appropriate emblem because it was believed that in those years of 1915, 1916 and 1917 the poppies grew particularly luxuriantly on the

landscape of Flanders because the soil had been so enriched by the corpses of those who had been cannon fodder.

So great was the slaughter of that First World War that it even had its impact (and members are probably not aware of this) in one of our customs each day—that of opening Parliament with the Lord's Prayer. That custom was instituted in the closing months of the First World War not so much as a prayer directed as it is now for the guidance of the Parliament, but as a prayer dedicated in the hope that it would bring an end to the slaughter of the First World War. All of us value peace. All of us can eagerly support this motion. We must continue to encourage the community to value 11 November as a symbolic reminder of the futility of war, the waste of human life and, in so many cases, the decimation in wars of the very best generations of young men of each particular epoch. I have great pleasure in supporting the motion and commend to the mover and the House the amendment that appears in my name.

Mrs KOTZ (Newland): I appreciate the support of the member for Walsh and accept his amendment.

Amendment carried; motion as amended passed.

TRAIN DISPUTE

Mr MATTHEW (Bright): I move:

That this House condemns the Government for its mishandling of the recent train dispute, in particular, its failure to intervene and negotiate a satisfactory resolution in a short period of time and further condemns the Government for removing basic commuter services thus discouraging patronage and leading to possible closures.

It is unfortunate that a considerable period of time has elapsed since I first gave notice of this motion in the first day of this session. However, I believe it is still important that a number of things about the train dispute that occurred earlier this year are placed on the record. As you, Mr Speaker, would be aware because you have a train line running through your electorate, Adelaide was without trains for a total of 27 days from 10 June to 6 July 1991. It is important that we look at the events that transpired just before and then during that strike. An article in the *Advertiser* of 6 June, which was entitled 'Shutdown threat as rail chaos looms' stated:

Adelaide's metropolitan train services will be closed down unless they are better patronised by the public, the Transport Minister, Mr Blevins, has warned.

Mr Blevins told about 100 pro-public transport demonstrators outside Parliament House yesterday State Transport Authority changes, including some railway station closures, were 'necessary for the survival of trains into the 1990s and beyond'.

That really gave the public an insight into what was to follow. Just before the strike was to start, the Minister said quite categorically that some closures were necessary for rail to continue. The strike started on 10 June. I was particularly horrified to read an article in the *News* of Friday 21 June entitled 'Rail may be axed'. In part, the article stated:

'South Australia's train system could be axed if train guards did not return to work immediately', Premier John Bannon said today.

Mr Bannon told the *News* today the system was facing a permanent loss of passengers which would force it to close.

On seeing that article, I felt it was time to call for some definite, positive action, so I made a statement to the media that the Transport Minister should resign and the Premier should intervene as a matter of priority. It was quite obvious that that had to happen. That is what some of the commuters were calling for. My office had been inundated by hundreds of complaints by commuters who had been stranded through the strike. It was interesting to see what happened afterwards.

Mr Holloway interjecting:

Mr MATTHEW: I am surprised that the member for Mitchell is interjecting. He should be very concerned about this issue, because people in his electorate have some dependence on the train, too. Is he truly going to suggest that that strike could not have been avoided? Is he going to sit there and suggest that the events that transpired should actually have occurred? I am sure that the honourable member would not dare suggest that because he knows that that is not what his electors would like to see.

The Minister's response was interesting. There was not a direct response to my call for his resignation, other than his departing South Australia for the ALP conference in Tasmania. Both the Minister of Transport and the Premier sat in Tasmania, completely oblivious to the plight of South Australia's rail commuters. The Transport Minister should never have left this State in the midst of a train dispute that lasted 27 days, turning his back on the whole problem: he should have allowed a proxy delegate to go in his place so that he could devote his full, undivided attention to resolving this dispute. Indeed, the Minister had no interest in resolving the dispute: he wanted it to drag on for as long as possible.

In the meantime, school students and workers were stranded and they had their public safety threatened. The Minister brought about this dispute quite deliberately to attempt to wind down part of our train system; then he turned his back on the problem and walked away from it. The Premier, too, is far from blameless. He should never have let the situation continue to the extent that it did without intervening. I was appalled to hear the Premier, in a radio interview during the train strike, confess from the ALP conference in Hobart that he was out of touch with the progress of the issue due to conference commitments. That is the sort of priority that this Government placed on the rail dispute. The commuters did not matter a damn.

Mr Holloway interjecting:

Mr MATTHEW: The member for Mitchell still continues to interject. I should have thought that the honourable member would sit down and keep quiet about this matter. If the honourable member wants to say something, let him get up and speak to the motion; let him put his views firmly on the record so that his constituents can see what he thought about it.

The other worrying aspect of the strike was the sort of effect that it had on school students. Indeed, I was particularly concerned about the plight of some of the students from Mawson High School, which is in my electorate. I was made aware that some students were having to leave home at 5.30 a.m., getting up at 4.30 a.m., in order to arrive at school for an 8.10 a.m. class commitment. These students were travelling from areas such as McLaren Vale, Willunga and McLaren Flat.

I was also concerned to hear that one female year 11 student arrived home at 8.30 p.m. after departing school at 3.30 p.m. Some students were unable to get to school at all during the dispute. Some parents claimed that they would have to enrol their children at another school if the threat of train disruption continued. Some of the students were nearing their trial exam period, but none of that seemed to matter to the Government. The Minister and the Premier turned their back on the plight of those commuters and went to the ALP convention in Hobart. It seems that ALP backroom negotiations and deals were more important than the plight of South Australians.

The fury of commuters, and particularly school students, came to a head through an article that appeared on the front page of the *News* on Thursday 27 June. Entitled 'Schools fury on rail chaos' the article stated, in part:

Anger is mounting among parents and schools as Adelaide's crippling rail strike continues into its 17th day. Some parents have expressed fears for the safety of their children because they have been forced to travel after dark to home from school.

There is no doubt that the problem should have been addressed, but it was ignored by the Government at the end of the day for a simple reason: the STA rail system loses about $48 million a year and transports just over 1 per cent of the South Australian population. It is fair to say that 93.7 per cent of the Adelaidians who drive, walk or cycle probably were not greatly affected by the train dispute. At the end of the day the Government was really saying, 'The train system carries a minority of South Australians and loses money. We do not care if it is closed down. We do not care if it is not operational, because it is not costing money.'

Such logic is absolutely scandalous, and the Government is indeed fortunate that no commuter was injured, assaulted or robbed as a result of having to use alternative means of travelling to or from school, work or any other location during that dispute because, if they were, the Government would have been responsible for their plight.

Before closing, I would like to read briefly, in part, a letter sent to me as a result of this rail dispute. Dated 25 June 1991 the original letter was sent to the Premier and a copy sent to the Minister of Transport. In part, the letter states:

Dear Mr Bannon, As a rail commuter from Brighton I am deeply dismayed that it seems that your department is planning to close down the current suburban rail system. While it is obvious that some problems exist for the Government, surely it is not necessary for such far-reaching and environmentally damaging consequences to occur. There must be other solutions possible.

The letter further states:

It is obvious that the Government has engaged and prolonged this strike because of its own hidden agenda to rid itself of the train system. This follows on from the new ticket sales system which is designed to make life more difficult for train travellers, especially those who are casual train users.

The letter closes:

Finally, I regret that at the last election I gave the Labor Government my support because I was foolish enough to believe that it was doing a good job.

That constituent is one of many who regret the way they voted and, even though this Government obtained office with the minority of the vote, it would seem it has turned that minority further and further away from it through ridiculous shams like the rail strike that should never have occurred. There is no doubt that, if we are to consider train travel as a realistic option, we must start selling the advantages of travelling by train to commuters, potential commuters, and all South Australians, instead of running the system down. We might then find that more people use the system and that it is not such a cost burden.

Mr Holloway interjecting:

Mr MATTHEW: The member for Mitchell is rabbiting on again. I am sure that he is aware that he will have time afterwards to reply to this debate. I do not believe that there is any need for me to say more. This strike is a sham that should never have occurred. I commend the motion to the House.

Mr HOLLOWAY secured the adjournment of the debate.

TICKET SELLING FACILITIES

Adjourned debate on motion of Mr Matthew:

That this House calls on the Government as a matter of priority to introduce selling facilities onto train platforms and/or trains to enable commuters to once again conveniently purchase train tickets and to restore public confidence in the metropolitan train system.

(Continued from 12 September. Page 820.)

Mr MATTHEW (Bright): On 12 September, when I moved this motion, I covered briefly the ridiculous situation surrounding the $500 fine that can be levied on people going on to a train platform and the crazy situation that prevails in my electorate where, despite the fact that it has eight railway stations, only one is even close to a ticket selling outlet. I wish to read a letter that I received from a constituent regarding the present situation:

Dear Sir,

I wish to draw to your attention the inconvenience that can be caused by not having tickets available at stations or on trains. Circumstances deemed it necessary for my daughter and I to go to town on Saturday to keep an appointment by train unexpectedly. At 11 a.m. we were aware of this and the train left Brighton at 11.14 a.m. We did not pass any delicatessens en route that sold tickets and the post office was not open. Thankfully that day tickets were available on the train, because the ticket office at Brighton was closed, too. It would have been most inconvenient for us if this new law was in. I had tried to buy a multitrip for $12.70 at the local newsagent earlier in the week, but they had sold out.

That letter was obviously received before the tickets were taken off trains, and that person was relieved that at that stage she was able to buy a ticket. The events that followed were rather alarming. What concerned me particularly was the Government's shameful treatment of small businesses through the STA when it introduced the ticket selling system. Without warning, the ticket selling facilities were withdrawn from trains, and delicatessens which were already selling tickets were not given any indication that this would happen. They had their normal supplies that might last for a month or so and, all of a sudden, on the first Monday they were absolutely inundated with people wanting to buy tickets. Not surprisingly, they very quickly ran out of tickets and then they were subjected to abuse by customers because they did not have the tickets. People were stranded because they could not get a ticket to get on the train. My office was flooded with calls, and I am sure that the offices of other members, who have trains running through their electorates, were flooded as well.

For all of this, the retail premises owners receive only 1½ to 2 per cent commission on the sale of the tickets. For that 1½ to 2 per cent commission they have to order the tickets from a post office, collect those tickets, have information available in their place of business for commuters to know when they can catch the train and, at the end of the day, they make a loss.

The Minister has wrongly been saying in this House that delicatessen and newsagent owners, or whoever, would attract additional business to their premises. That has proven not to be the case. So much so, that one business in my electorate opposite a railway station, which had a ticket selling facility before the withdrawal of tickets from trains, has said, 'We are not selling them any more. There is no point. We are making a loss. People come in here to grab a ticket when our normal customers are buying their paper and bread. They only want a ticket; they do not want anything else.' It was affecting their business, so they no longer sell the tickets from that venue.

If the Minister seriously believes that business owners are generating more business through selling tickets, I suggest

that he should get out there and talk to people, because we do not see enough of that from this Government. It does not talk to people: it makes its policies around desks behind closed doors or in the ALP conference room and does not get out there and talk to people to find out what is really happening.

Mr McKee interjecting:

Mr MATTHEW: I am pleased to see that one honourable member has finally sparked into some activity at last, but the fact remains that the ALP Government does not get out and talk to people, and that is why its members are living in *Alice in Wonderland* at the moment with their present direction.Something must be done. I have received a string of letters complaining about this system, and I could read at length from many of them. Members opposite seem to want more, so I will briefly quote from another letter that was sent to me. My constituent wrote, in part:

On Wednesday 5 June my wife and mother-in-law had planned to travel to town by train. This in itself would seem a fairly straightforward exercise. However, due to the recent publicity regarding the phasing out of ticket vending services on trains and the new associated (!) $500 fines for not having a ticket on one's person, I thought it prudent to drive to the Hallett Cove shopping mall to purchase the required tickets. After all, this inconvenience seemed rather small in relation to the imposition of a $500 fine by a transit security officer, baton-equipped or not.

He finishes the letter by advising me that he was unable to buy the ticket, as the premises he visited had run out of them, but he goes on to state:

Irony 1: We live literally around the corner from the Hallett Cove beach railway station.

Irony 2: For $6.60 my wife could have driven her car to town (yes, a car was available at the time!), parked for a couple of hours and then returned to Hallett Cove, taking no longer for travelling time than the train at that time of day and not having to wait around for the ride to arrive.

Irony 3: We were all able-bodied people with private vehicles available and, whilst of modest income compared to certain State Government public servants, we do not have to worry about where the money for the next tank-full of petrol is to come from—how the hell do the 'other half' live!?

He goes on further to state:

Is it my imagination, or is the STA, in conjunction with our supposedly environmentally aware Government, actually trying to reduce the patronage by the public of our metropolitan train system?

There is one more letter to which I would like to refer in this debate. This letter appeared in the *Advertiser* only three days ago, and my constituent from Marino sent me a copy. I would like to read the letter in full, because it is important. It states:

Dear Sir,

The STA management has much to answer for. A system which had been developed into a safe and friendly means of transport in the 1960s and 1970s is now in serious decline. In overcoming their largely self-imposed problems of graffiti and vandalism resulting from reduced supervision levels and free student travel, they have now produced a system which is even more unprofitable and user unfriendly. On Wednesday 10 October 1991 my teenage son was caught short when his ride home was not available and he decided to catch a train. He is a high school student but was working in his holidays for some pocket money and experience. He arrived at Lonsdale station a little before 6 p.m. and just missed a train. He waited for the next one, which came just after 6 p.m. and boarded. At this stage his troubles began. The transit officer refused his offered money for a ticket and commenced to cross-examine him while writing out a fine for 'avoiding fare'. It seems that if you have no ticket and cannot purchase one prior to boarding (there was no nearby sales outlet) you are not welcome on the train. The result was a $25 on the spot fine. The transit officer's final comment was, 'Look on the bright side, sonny. At least you don't have to buy a ticket!' What a sad state the once proud rail system has sunk to. The alternatives at that locality become to pay a $25 fine or hitch a ride—not nice alternatives for a teenager caught out by circumstances.

Mr Brindal: They also pick on grandmothers.

Mr MATTHEW: Yes, as my colleague the member for Hayward interjects, they also pick on grandmothers.

The SPEAKER: Order! I would point out to the member for Hayward that interjections are out of order.

Mr MATTHEW: My constituent goes on further to state:

I don't think this is an isolated example and I also wonder what the elderly visitors to this State think of the uncaring attitude of our local bureaucrats. I wonder why we pay our taxes to prop up a system as defunct as this. By choice I would not, and by choice we will now all avoid using the rail system which serves us so poorly.

That is indicative of a lot of the correspondence that I now receive in my office. This Government is encouraging people to no longer use our train system. We are just about to enter Grand Prix week—a week that this Government continues to tout as one of its proud achievements. What will happen when people visiting our city are hit with a $25 fine on our trains as a memento? Is that what members want? Do they want all visitors to this State who try to catch the train system to leave with a $25 ticket? Is this a new way by which the Government plans to raise revenue—to rip off the interstate tourists by hitting them with a fine on the train system? If that is not the case, I look forward to an announcement in this Parliament by the Minister of Transport of, first, as an interim measure, something being done in Grand Prix week so that this does not occur and, secondly, the return to ticket sales on trains and/or platforms.

The wording of this motion is deliberately broad in order to allow the Government a full range of options. It allows the option of vending machines to be installed, retailers to be established on platforms to sell train tickets and, perhaps, other produce, or guards or transit officers to sell tickets on trains; or, indeed, a combination of all of these things. At the end of the day, something else is needed; something else must happen because the current situation cannot continue.

Early this morning, a train arriving in Adelaide from Brighton had its fifth carriage with three inoperative ticket machines to receive and stamp tickets. The STA officer was made aware of that and, because there was a whole carriage full of standing people who would probably have taken him on, the transit guard in his wisdom decided not to slap fines on all of those people. Many people are now getting free train rides into town as well because that equipment is not being checked in the way it previously could be by guards. In this instance, there was no-one with a portable machine who would have fed those tickets through. It was one more carriage of passengers who had not paid because there was no way of stamping their ticket.

The Government's whole handling of this situation has been an absolute disgrace. A number of Government members have trains running through their electorate and I urge them to support this motion. I urge people like the members for Mitchell and Albert Park, and indeed, the Speaker and the member for Elizabeth to support this motion. It is important that the train system survive and also to ensure that people can conveniently buy tickets. I know my colleague the member for Hayward is very concerned about this issue and I look forward to his contribution later. I commend the motion to the House.

Mr HOLLOWAY secured the adjournment of the debate.

ELIZABETH/MUNNO PARA PROJECT

Adjourned debate on motion of Hon. T.H. Hemmings:

That this House notes the positive impact the Elizaeth/Munno Para Project is having on the community in that area.

(Continued from 10 October. Page 1072.)

Mr S.G. EVANS (Davenport): In speaking to this motion I will be reasonably brief. I suppose the comment from the vast majority of members of this House in response to the member for Napier's motion would be 'Sure, for them it's a great project, but what about the rest of metropolitan Adelaide?' The honourable member said that for this particular budget—1990-91—$1.4 million had been made available.

I believe that $800 000 of that was the first stage of a $20 million upgrading of the court and police station complex. In my area, we cannot even retain the police stations that we have. We cannot even get them to operate. The police station at Burnside has been closed and sold and, most probably, the Government got $800 000 for it and used it at Munno Para, if the truth be known. That is where the money went: my electorate did not get it. The police station at Blackwood operates very infrequently, and I am not enthused by a person who belongs to a Party that has been in Government for most of the past 20 years standing up here and saying that this is great because money is being spent in the area he happens to represent, along with some of his colleagues, when other parts of the metropolitan area have been totally neglected.

People around the Mitcham Hills area cannot even get a police force with enough personnel to carry out the work it should carry out in protecting people and property. Houses have been broken into repeatedly. One shop has been broken into 12 times and then burned—within 200 metres of where the police station should be operating 24 hours a day. Yet the member for Napier enthusiastically states that his Government has made available $800 000 for the first stage of a $20 million project. One aspect of that is that, if only $800 000 a year is being spent on the project, it will be the political Party to which I belong that will need to complete the project, because the Government will certainly not be completing it if that is all it is putting towards building the complex each year. In this State, we face a very serious situation.

In my area, we have a school that is 25 years old, yet that school has had a complete repaint only once. Public buildings and school buildings throughout this State are in a serious state of disrepair. We are short of jobs and do not have work for many young people. Painting is not a difficult trade to pick up. Surely, if we are going to find money, this is one area we should be looking at in which we can create jobs and give some training to young people, and start to bring some of our buildings and public property into a reasonable state of repair.

I attended a school council meeting in my electorate the other night, and when the principal was asked to give an idea of what it would cost to bring the school up to scratch, because this particular school was having a fund-raiser to carry out some work in the school yard, he said that he believed it would cost about $100 000 to bring the asphalt up to scratch, and that the rest could be as high as $300 000 to bring into a reasonable state of repair. I admit that this is his rough estimate, but if you are talking about many cases in this State, at $400 000 a time, what is this $1.4 million at Munno Para?

I am pleased that they have it there, in a way, but it is not social justice to be talking about building a police station. It might be trying to help with law and order, but the vast bulk of the effort is not going into social justice at all, although that is what the honourable member was speaking of. We as a Parliament should all be conscious of the number of young people who are unemployed, of the amount of painting that could be undertaken throughout the State, and at least make an attempt to restore parts of the public buildings and facilities and spend more money in those areas.

It can be let to private contract: it does not need to be done through SACON. In many cases, people would gain work experience because some of the school committees would undertake a volunteer effort, with some professional painters, and ask young people to come along and gain experience. It would not, therefore, be a total cost burden on the State, as long as the State found the paint and the other materials needed to bring properties to a condition where they can be painted.

I am not enthused by the honourable member's motion, although I am sure he is, because it gave him an opportunity to speak about his own area. As far as I am concerned, it is simply a case of saying, 'I'm all right Jack, how are the rest of you going?'

Mr De LAINE secured the adjournment of the debate.

AUSTRALIAN TAXATION OFFICE

Adjourned debate on the motion of Mr Matthew:

That this House conveys its disappointment to the Commonwealth Government over the failure of that Government to locate at least one of the proposed new Australian Taxation Office buildings in the vicinity of Noarlunga Centre or Westfield Marion Shopping Centre in preference to central Adelaide.

(Continued from 17 October. Page 1220.)

The Hon. T.H. HEMMINGS (Napier): Whilst I oppose the motion, I confess that I have a certain sympathy for what the member for Bright is saying in moving his motion. However, really it is part of a wish list. I have no problem with the member for Bright having a wish list: we all want things done in our respective districts and, if the member for Bright can get some sort of publicity in his local paper, all well and good. In fact, I could stand up and move an identical motion in relation to the City of Elizabeth in my electorate. In effect, what the member for Bright is talking about in relation to the City of Noarlunga in the south, I could talk about in relation to the City of Elizabeth in the north.

Over the years an equal amount of pressure has been put on Governments, both State and Federal, to locate certain Government functions in the City of Elizabeth, part of which I am very proud to represent, as has been the case with the City of Noarlunga. At the moment, if one wants to talk about runs on the board or some sort of score card, the people of Elizabeth—due to the admirable representation of both the member for Elizabeth and myself—are slightly in front. That is not because of the politics that we represent but because there has been, from the very beginning, a programmed strategy to get the required results. I suggest that that is the job that the member for Bright should be doing.

I suggest that the member for Bright, in putting future motions before this place, should investigate things, just as I investigate them, before I eventually have the temerity to stand up in this place and move a motion. I understand that before the member for Bright came into this House he was a systems analyst and a very good one at that: I say that quite sincerely. When he was carrying out his previous job in that field he would not have dreamt of willy-nilly putting something forward for the benefit of local consumption and the newspapers. Whilst I understand his reasons for putting this motion before the House, that is, for

publicity, in his former job he would have gone through an issue point by point so that, in the end, other agencies—or, in this case, the Government—could make a decision based on the advice that he had given. That is all very correct and proper. But did the member for Bright do that in this instance? He nods his head in the affirmative. He may have done some work on it, but not the amount deemed to be necessary before putting a motion before this House.

I am very pleased that you, Sir, are in the Chair because I wish to refer to the case of Elizabeth. You and I, for our sins, one could say, attended a presentation by the City of Elizabeth with the Federal member, Dr Neal Blewett. The presentation looked at the long-term input by the City of Elizabeth towards promoting the growth of the city centre. You will remember, Sir, that as part of that evening we viewed the City of Elizabeth's regional centre study, which looked at the long-term growth of that city in relation to residential accommodation, retailing and the attraction of a business hub to that centre. As I recall, the study was funded by the City of Elizabeth, Coles-Myer (the organisation that covers the bulk of retailing in Elizabeth) and the South Australian Housing Trust as part of its long-term strategy to provide accommodation in that area.

I think that is the correct way to go, because if a city the size of Elizabeth wants to get part of the action in regard to Government activity, whether it be State or Federal, it has to provide some of the information that is so necessary not only to push the case but to be able to refute accusations that may be made against a particular area. I sincerely hope that the regional centre study when it is completed will entice Government offices into the city that you, Sir, and I so diligently represent.

I have sympathy for the member for Bright, because we would all like to see increased activity in the regional hubs, but I say to him—and this is not a reflection on the City of Noarlunga—that perhaps he should talk to that council along the lines of what is happening at the Elizabeth City Centre. I am sure that the Corporation of the City of Elizabeth would be only too pleased to give a few pointers in that direction. What did we get from the member for Bright? He referred to traffic movement on South Road. With respect, and being most generous, I could not see the impact of that. He also produced an Australian Taxation Office survey of its employees who live south of Anzac Highway. I checked out that survey. I am not saying that what the member for Bright said was incorrect, but that was not the information that I received. As a result of the survey carried out by the Australian Taxation Office, the staff's preference was for a central location, and ease of access was quoted as the main reason. So, we have two conflicting versions in respect of the information received by the member for Bright as opposed to the information that I received.

Because the Federal member for Kingston (the Hon. Gordon Bilney) had supported the location in the City of Noarlunga, the member for Bright said that it was right. With all due respect to my Federal colleague, who represents the same side of politics as I do, he has it just as wrong as the member for Bright—and I am only too pleased to say so. One can say these things when one has only two years to go, by the way. There was a response by Mayor Gilbert, whom I have known for many years. In fact, I have known him for longer than the member for Bright has known him. Of course, the mayor and the council have to present a case for their local government area, but in this instance the case was not well presented. I say that as a result of what has happened in the area that you, Sir, and I represent.

Let us examine why the decision was made in October 1988 to locate both of these offices in Adelaide. At that time, I was the Minister responsible for the Housing Trust, and when we moved to Riverside we tried to sell the site in Angas Street as a preferred location for one of the taxation offices that was to be built. There is a high cost associated with servicing decentralised offices. The member for Bright would be well aware that the cost of providing services such as those provided by Telecom to large specialised offices in decentralised locations can be large, due to the lack of adequate existing infrastructure. Then there is client preference. The majority of face-to-face users of the tax office are proprietors of small businesses and companies. These people tend to be located in, or it is convenient for them to travel to, the central business district. Only approximately 40 of the 1 500 to 1 600 staff in either of the offices in Adelaide deal face to face with the public; most of the inquiries come over the telephone. I have a certain amount of sympathy for this motion, but I would advise the member for Bright that his arguments may not be good enough to win the day. In future he should do a little more research.

Mr BRINDAL secured the adjournment of the debate.

FLINDERS MEDICAL CENTRE EMERGENCY SERVICES

Adjourned debate on motion of Mr Brindal:

That this House calls on the Minister of Health to immediately instruct the South Australian Health Commission to provide the money needed for upgrading emergency services at the Flinders Medical Centre.

(Continued from 17 October. Page 1224.)

Mr BRINDAL (Hayward): When I previously spoke on this motion, which calls on the Government to upgrade the accident and emergency department at Flinders Medical Centre immediately, I highlighted two particular concerns in connection with that department. One was the problem experienced by people waiting in corridors for treatment—in fact, an overcrowding problem—and the other was that geriatric and psychiatric patients receive no special treatment or consideration and cause trauma to other patients waiting for accident and emergency services. The Flinders Medical Centre draft feasibility study to upgrade the accident and emergency department, released in May 1991, states on page 8:

> The design solution arrived at by the planning team requires 872 m² of additional area to be added to the existing accident and emergency department and the staged development of the existing facility to be carried out following construction of the new buildings. As the new area is at level 3 of the existing facilities, it is necessary to build a substructure to allow for future expansion and fit-out of areas below the accident and emergency department.

It was a responsible document and it was costed at a minimum rather than a maximum. Again, I quote from page 8 as follows:

> Furniture and equipment from the existing accident and emergency department will be reused, however additional equipment is required to fit-out the increased number of cubicles.

So, we have the ongoing spectre of Flinders Medical Centre caring for the needs of the southern suburbs by partaking in in-depth discussions with the Health Commission, only to be told yet again that, for reasons that are totally beyond the control of either the Health Commission or the Flinders Medical Centre, the project will be shelved once more. The project was to be funded in this financial year but, according to *Guardian* Messenger newspapers of Wednesday 16 Octo-

ber, the Minister is now saying that the project could—not will, not would, but could—be funded in 1993-94. So, again, the people in the southern suburbs get shoddy treatment at the hands of this Government; treatment which I believe no Government member opposite can justify or vote in favour of.

An honourable member interjecting:

Mr BRINDAL: The member for Napier says that that sort of remark is churlish. The member for Napier is a proud representative of a northern suburbs electorate that has been much better treated in terms of hospital beds than all those in the southern area. I for one, Sir, object to the member for Napier coming into this place and accusing me of being churlish for something I would expect him to demand of the Government if the service was lacking in his area. I quote a Messenger Press *Guardian* article of 16 October which refers to Mr John Blandford, the Administrator of the Flinders Medical Centre. It states:

> ... the State Government's refusal was 'very disappointing news and a matter of real concern. We are very worried about the scale of capital development,' Mr Blandford said. 'They are spending an awful lot of money in the inner metropolitan area at the RAH and the ACH but nothing is coming down to the south.'

More than 57 000 patients last year attended the accident and emergency department of the Flinders Medical Centre, exactly the same number of patients who attended that department at the Royal Adelaide Hospital and 12 000 more than the number of patients who were seen by the QEH casualty section. I repeat: last year the Flinders Medical Centre saw as many people in its accident and emergency department as the Royal Adelaide Hospital and 12 000 more people than were seen by the Queen Elizabeth Hospital. The article continues:

> 'Yet despite the number of people we see, FMC has only 17 treatment cubicles, compared to 25 at the RAH and 24 at the QEH,' Mr Blandford said.

If it is deemed that the Royal Adelaide Hospital and the Queen Elizabeth Hospital are not over-supplied, by the very facts presented here the Flinders Medical Centre is poorly under-supplied. I quote Dr Chris Baggoley who is in charge of the Flinders Medical Centre emergency department. As is well documented, he said:

> [Patients] were often affixed with drips, given blood transfusions and physically examined in full view of other patients, staff and visitors to the department.

It is obvious that in terms of capital requirements this Government is treating the Flinders Medical Centre shoddily. Another thing that bears close analysis is the catchment area of the Flinders Medical Centre. The Flinders Medical Centre catchment area and the southern population are growing rapidly, but the hospital's capacity has not changed since it was opened. This Government has announced the expansion of Seaford. It is well aware that virtually from the escarpment all the way down through Noarlunga to Seaford new housing is going up and that it is an area of large expansion. It is probably one of the most rapidly growing areas of Adelaide. Yet, the hospital facilities that service that area have basically not changed since the area was very much smaller.

The Government will probably say that the introduction of the Noarlunga Medical Centre has had an impact, but I remind members opposite that the Noarlunga Medical Centre is a different concept and that most of the patients who have serious medical conditions are taken straight from the Noarlunga Medical Centre to the Flinders Medical Centre. To me, that again is a strong argument to upgrade the accident and emergency facilities at the Flinders Medical Centre.

In 1966 the population of the southern areas was approximately 174 000 people, in 1986 it had grown to 280 000 people and by 1996 it is expected to reach 324 000 people. In addition, the population is ageing, with some 12.25 per cent being 65 years of age and over. The ageing population in the southern areas is slightly higher as a percentage of the population than in the rest of the Adelaide area. On these figures, the southern suburbs simply do not have enough hospital beds to meet the demands of the population. On the basis of current population and hospital activity data, the area has a shortfall, clearly demonstrable, of some 200 beds. On projected data, this shortfall will increase to more than 300 beds by the year 2001.

All we have from this Government is silence, excuses and apologies. It does not seek to justify itself, other than to say, 'Well, we are just not going to do it', because there is no justification. Once again, people of the south are being let down. What I find most abysmal is that the members for Walsh and Mitchell, the Minister for Environment and Planning and the Deputy Premier all have seats which clearly and heavily rely on the facilities provided at the Flinders Medical Centre. The Opposition's job is to expose failings in Government and to point out areas in which it can do better, and I am doing just that. Members on the Government benches have the privilege of being in Caucus—and, indeed, two of the members involved have the privilege of being members of Cabinet—yet they have done little or nothing to help the people of their electorate and the people who use the facilities of the Flinders Medical Centre.

Most people in the south—I think all the people I know—have nothing but praise for that facility, for its staff and for its paramedical team. I would like to put on record my appreciation for the fine work that facility does in difficult circumstances. However, I call on all members of this House—especially members on the Government benches opposite who purport to represent electors in that area—to support this motion and to put pressure on this Government to do something concrete with its money instead of throwing dollar after dollar into projects such as Scrimber, the State Bank and Beneficial Finance; it should be more fiscally responsible and spend money on a facility that is the province of Government. I think the Minister is having a fit on the bench opposite, Mr Deputy Speaker. Do you think we ought to get him medical attention?

The SPEAKER: Order! The member for Hayward.

Mr BRINDAL: Therefore, I call on all members of this House to support the motion.

Mr McKEE secured the adjournment of the debate.

[*Sitting suspended from 12.59 to 2 p.m.*]

PETITION: POLICE NIGHT PATROLS

A petition signed by 218 residents of South Australia requesting that the House urge the Government to increase the number and effectiveness of police night patrols was presented by the Hon. B.C. Eastick.

Petition received.

QUESTION TIME

STATE BANK

Mr D.S. BAKER (Leader of the Opposition): My question is directed to the Treasurer. Will he confirm that as a result

of the difficult financial situation facing the State, mainly as a result of the State Bank losses, the Government has decided to cut real funding for education, health, welfare, as well as other agencies, not only this year but for the next two years?

The Hon. J.C. BANNON: No, I will not. The way in which the Government is planning the finances of the State has been debated in this place at considerable length. It has been subject to examination by the Estimates Committees under each portfolio heading. Surely, that was the time when the questions or allegations should have been raised. In fact, we made it very clear that despite the financial difficulties facing the State we are in the middle of a recession, which is having a very direct impact on our revenue, as it is having on that of every other Government in Australia.

Despite the fact that we have to cope with servicing of the State Bank indemnity, which we have been able to do because of the good state of our finances and because we had the best services, among the lowest tax rates and the second lowest debt in this country, we were in a shape to handle this situation, and our strategy is to ensure that our front-line services in health, education, law and order and other areas were maintained. We will ensure that that is done. This was a very strange question, coming after weeks of debate and Estimates Committees examination.

STORMWATER SCOPING STUDY

Mr FERGUSON (Henley Beach): Can the Minister of Water Resources outline to the Parliament how it is proposed to progress the issue of improving the management and reuse of stormwater in the metropolitan area? I understand that the Minister and the President of the Local Government Association have just made a joint release of a study of options for the management of stormwater in metropolitan Adelaide. The report highlights the need for new practices and outlines the opportunity for a new partnership between State and local government authorities to tackle this issue.

The Hon. S.M. LENEHAN: I am delighted to explain to the honourable member and to other members of the House that I have today with the President of the Local Government Association (Alderman David Plumridge) made a joint announcement and released a discussion paper, which I certainly will be sending to all members of Parliament and to which we will ask the community and the local government authorities to respond. There will be a six-month period of consultation, because this scoping paper, which is a large document, was commissioned by the Engineering and Water Supply Department and was put together by independent consultants. The report identifies five options for the future administration of stormwater in metropolitan Adelaide. These options range from exclusive responsibility being consolidated in local government to the establishment of a new partnership between State and local government.

I am also delighted to say that we are starting to turn around the historical belief that stormwater in this State is a problem. We can now treat it as a very precious resource, and that is the thrust of this scoping study. It canvasses a number of very exciting options. We can now look at the use of stormwater, which currently is put into the marine environment, causing destruction of the seagrasses and a potentially destructive effect on the fishing industry.

We can now look at using that resource through the use of ponding basins and putting it back into the underground aquifers as a potential water supply for Adelaide into the next century. We can also look at working with local government collectively and in partnership to provide a lot of that water for local government uses in the watering of parks and gardens and for other uses where we now currently use mains water.

I commend this discussion paper to all members of the House. I think they will find it challenging and interesting. It certainly is only a discussion paper: neither the Local Government Association nor the State Government has made any commitments in terms of the range of options canvassed, but we do believe that it is vitally important for all members of the community to have some input into providing solutions to what could be seen to be one of the most exciting initiatives in South Australia for some time.

HEALTH BUDGET

Dr ARMITAGE (Adelaide): My question is directed to the Premier as Treasurer. How does he intend to honour his Government's election promise to provide increased funds to reduce hospital waiting lists if the health budget is to be cut for three successive years? The Premier told the *News* on Tuesday that 'the Government was not putting increased pressure on funding to essential services like the health system'. However, I have a copy of a recent Health Commission document which states that the Government will cut funding for health, education and welfare in real terms this financial year, 'and this trend will continue through 1992-93 and 1993-94'. It also states that health budget 'wage increases must be met from within health units' net funding allocation', and that, if increased charges and outstanding accounts are not collected, further 'offsetting savings must be made'. But the Government has admitted that $2.5 million of Adelaide's hospitals' outstanding accounts are owed by SGIC and $1.2 million by WorkCover.

The Hon. J.C. BANNON: In fact, we are honouring our commitment. There has been a major hospital enhancement program, which is factored into—

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order!

The Hon. J.C. BANNON: I think some courtesy, Mr Speaker, should be shown to the member for Adelaide who asked the question, instead of his colleagues trying to interrupt the answer being given. At least he has demonstrated that he has some interest in the matter, but members opposite clearly do not have a clue of what they are talking about. Again, this was a matter that was subjected to questioning during the Estimates Committee debates, and we have a 3 per cent recurrent increase factored into hospital and health funding.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order!

The Hon. J.C. BANNON: The way in which we intend to do it, and the way in which every Government must intend to do it is that, unless we are going to raise taxes (and perhaps the honourable member is suggesting that as a course of action; if he is, he is totally at odds with his Party), the way in which one can meet those targets of, in fact, improving services and making them more available is by efficiencies in the system, and that is exactly what we are on about. We will ensure that our services are lean, well delivered and efficient, so that there on the front line South Australians will continue to enjoy, as they do now, the best hospital and health services in the country.

HOUSING SECTOR

Mr De LAINE (Price): Will the Minister of Housing and Construction inform the House of South Australia's per-

formance in house sales for September and comment on the general state of the housing sector in South Australia?

The Hon. M.K. MAYES: This is a very timely question. South Australia posted a small rise in house sales for the month of September, despite what has been a very poor performance nationally, where there has been a fall. The national figure for house sales fell by 9 per cent for the month of September, although States such as New South Wales had an 18 per cent fall and Victoria a 12 per cent fall. Again, we have gone against the trend in this State in house sales, and I emphasise this for the sake of the community and the media. When they publish stories, they often bury in the text the fact that the housing sector in South Australia is performing exceptionally well.

I repeat that from 1989-90, when there was an enormous collapse in the residential housing market interstate, our State maintained a steady growth and showed consistency in the housing sector. It is fair to say that the community can be pleased with this stability, as we are able to maintain our trade skills, our skilled people and those people who back that up, such as the sales and financial staff, and the community can be pleased with the performance over the past few years overall, given what has happened interstate.

The stability also means stability of house prices in South Australia and, from the community's point of view, that is very important. I believe that part of this comes back to the HomeStart program initiated by this Government. HomeStart continues to be a very significant contributor to the maintenance of our housing market, along with the other programs we run to assist South Australians with their dream of buying their own home. Home ownership is a fundamental dream of Australians and, particularly in this State, they are able to achieve that.

In terms of planning, recently the Deputy Prime Minister, while delivering the Sir Albert Jennings speech, commented about the planning process that this State has put in place, and said:

> The importance of strategic planning has long been a hallmark of this State [South Australia].

Again, that is reinforced by the figures for the month of September. I am delighted that our housing sector continues to keep a stable portfolio profile. It augurs well for our programs and our community as a whole, in terms of what we are seeking to achieve with housing in South Australia.

SAMIC

Mr S.J. BAKER (Deputy Leader of the Opposition): How does the Treasurer justify telling the House on Tuesday that since its inception SAMIC 'was not and at no stage has it been' a Government-owned or sponsored company? And when does he intend to answer my question about possible illegalities, improprieties and conflicts of interest concerning SAMIC share dealings? In his budget speech of 29 August 1985 the Treasurer said:

> ... the Government has given particular attention over the past year or so to the development of the range of financial institutions which it owns or has sponsored in various ways. These institutions include SAFA, the State Bank, Beneficial Finance—

surprise, surprise—

> SAMIC and Enterprise Investments Limited.

The Hon. J.C. BANNON: I will explain it in exactly the same way I did on Tuesday in my answer to the question. The Deputy Leader's question was about the Government and its financial involvement in SAMIC, and I explained the background of the MIC program and the role that we played in relation to it. SAMIC was a privately sponsored exercise. The Government's exercise was Enterprise Investments Limited. I also explained to the House on Tuesday, when the question was asked, that in the second round of MIC licences, SAMIC having failed to gain one in the first round, we actively supported its application for doing so.

We did that in the interests of South Australia, because it seemed to us absolutely unreasonable that these licences were being made available for enterprise and high technology companies and we did not have access to that source of finance in South Australia. It was quite discriminatory. I made very strong representations to the MIC board and to the Federal Government about that point. Is the honourable member suggesting that I should not have done that or that there is something untoward in that? It is a long way away from being responsible for SAMIC's financing and operations, which we were not.

THINK AHEAD WEEK

The Hon. T.H HEMMINGS (Napier): Will the Minister of Employment and Further Education inform the House of initiatives being taken in higher education and research to assist the brain injured members of our community?

Mr Lewis interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order! The member for Napier.

The Hon. T.H. HEMMINGS: The House will know that this is South Australia's second head injury awareness week entitled 'Think ahead week', which has, I understand, the theme of moving forward with dignity, purpose and pride of place. I would appreciate any information from the Minister on initiatives that may complement the theme of head injury awareness week.

The Hon. M.D. RANN: I am pleased to inform the House that tonight I will formally announce and launch Australia's first Chair of Neurosurgery. The Chair has been established at the University of Adelaide in association with the Royal Adelaide Hospital. I know that the Deputy Premier is a strong supporter of this intitiative, of which all South Australians can justifiably be proud. South Australia has an enviable reputation in the field of medical research, and the establishment of Australia's first Chair of Neurosurgery will enhance this reputation. It is interesting to note that, compared with the rest of Australia and relative to population size, South Australia won 52 per cent more research funding from the National Health and Medical Research Council. That should not come as a surprise to any member of this House.

Indeed, we recently looked at university research funding and found that every time our universities go out and compete on the open market for research funds we win hands down—far beyond our population share. It is only when we are forced to accept the deliberations of Canberra bureaucrats that we are dudded in favour of other States. However, I was quite frankly appalled that, when the member for Napier introduced this question on a very serious issue affecting tens of thousands of Australians, members opposite laughed and joked about the brain injured. I am quite happy to ask the University of Adelaide and the Flinders University—

Mr BECKER: On a point of order, Sir, I ask that the Minister's remark be withdrawn: I was not laughing and neither were any of my colleagues.

The SPEAKER: Order! I ask the Minister not to be provocative in his responses in Question Time as it is well known what will happen. If offence has been taken, I ask that the Minister withdraw.

The Hon. M.D. RANN: I withdraw any offence to any innocent member of the Opposition, but the member for

Murray-Mallee made reference to brain injured people on this side of the House.

Mr BRINDAL: On a point of order, Sir, I ask that the remark be withdrawn without qualification.

The SPEAKER: Order! I uphold the point of order and ask the Minister for a straight withdrawal.

The Hon. M.D. RANN: I withdraw the comment, Mr Speaker, but would invite any member of this Parliament to come along to the meeting to meet some of the people, as I believe that all of us would gain greatly from that experience. The intiative would, of course, have a significant long-term impact on our State's research base, which is particularly important in the context of proposals to develop medical research and new medical technology as a focus for the multifunction polis. The key purpose of the establishment of the Chair was to improve our understanding of the needs of the brain injured and those who suffer brain damage. It is an appalling indictment on our society that as many as 4 000 to 5 000 Australians—mostly young, mostly male and mostly as a result of road accidents—suffer permanent brain damage each year.

Put baldly like that, those statistics sound horrific enough, but it is only when we start to look at the long-term effects of brain injury not only on the sufferers but also their families and their carers that the real picture starts to emerge. While the financial loss to this country amounts to many millions of dollars, it is only the tip of the iceberg when considering the cost in human terms, which is inestimable. I give my thanks and congratulations to the Neurosurgical Research Foundation for its efforts in raising the $1.5 million to establish the Chair.

The position will be advertised nationally in coming weeks. Specific funding for the Chair has also come from the State Government Insurance Commission, the Mitchell Foundation for Medical Research at the University of Adelaide and the Royal Adelaide Hospital. I will be pleased to invite the parents of brain injured children to meet with members of this Parliament to explain their needs.

TRADE UNION MEMBERSHIP

Mr INGERSON (Bragg): Does the Minister of Labour support actions by trade union officials to force union membership by intimidating employees and by introducing a secondary boycott on employers? Two days ago, two officials from the Timber Workers Union arrived at the sawmill of Tarmac Timbersales Pty Ltd at Kincaid Avenue, Plympton North to look at staff records. After looking at staff records, they requested time with employees to discuss union matters.

After the union officials left, the manager was advised that all the employees had joined the union. I might say that he was surprised and, on consulting his employees, was told that the union officials had threatened them with 'bullying victimisation', closure of the business by picketing and forcing them to lose their jobs if they did not join the union. He advised the staff of his support for voluntary membership and said that he would call the union officials to object to their standover tactics. I have been informed that, on calling the union, he was abused, threatened and told that a picket line would be set up that afternoon and that the union would ring suppliers to stop the supplying of materials. He was further told that the union would ring Government departments to have him closed for ever. Today the pickets are in place and the union thugs have rung suppliers and stopped supply.

The Hon. R.J. GREGORY: I thank the member for Bragg for his question. I welcome the assistance of the members for Victoria, Goyder and Adelaide in helping the member for Bragg to frame that question. I wonder whether they will vote for him at their next election to elect a Leader of their Party.

An honourable member interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order!

The Hon. R.J. GREGORY: I am not aware of this situation or of the allegations that have been made. All I am aware of is that when the member for Bragg raises allegations in this place they need careful checking, because they are not always quite right—and I will do that. However, one has to expect in a very competitive climate that unions will attempt to recruit people to join a union when they are employed—

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order!

The Hon. R.J. GREGORY: They will recruit people who are eligible to be members of their union to ensure they receive the appropriate wages, working conditions, superannuation and a number of other things. I am not privy to what happened in that place: all I know is that, in this sort of activity of claim and counterclaim, there is an enormous amount of exaggeration.

SOUTHERN BLUE FIN TUNA

Mr McKEE (Gilles): Will the Minister of Fisheries inform the House of the progress being made through a program to sell farmed southern blue fin tuna to Japan? It has been reported that South Australian tuna was sold in the world famous Japanese fish markets last week for a much greater price than prices received for tuna caught in the wild.

The Hon. LYNN ARNOLD: I thank the honourable member for his question, which I know will be of considerable interest to the member for Flinders, unlike some members opposite who do not seem to want to hear the information. Reference was made to a report in this morning's newspaper that canvassed a little bit of the information but not all of it, and I had hoped that members would like to know about it. There is more to know and it is good news. I understand that is something that may not be of interest to the Opposition, but I intend to convey the information to this House in answer to the honourable member's question and, as I have said, I know that the member for Flinders will be pleased to hear it.

Last week, I advised that 40 tuna were to be taken from the floating marine cages at the fish farm off Port Lincoln and sent to the Tokyo market. We estimated at that time that between $33 and $45 per kilogram would be received. I am now in a position to advise what happened to that first shipment. In fact, 40 fish were taken to the Japanese market and sold in in six different markets that supply a number of different areas of Japan.

The fish averaged $37 a kilogram spread over all those markets. The highest price was $58 a kilogram for a 14.5 kilogram southern blue fin tuna that was marketed in Nagoya. That indicates a very handsome gain on price over what otherwise would have been the case for those fish. Those fish, had they not gone into the floating cages but had simply been caught and then canned, would have returned about $1.30 a kilogram each as opposed, as I say, to the average price of $37 a kilogram. Even had they been marketed as fresh tuna or as sashimi tuna in the Australian market, the return to the fishers would have been only about $8 a kilogram.

This joint venture between the Tuna Boat Owners Association of Australia, the Overseas Fisheries Cooperation

Foundation of Japan and the South Australian Government has undoubtedly been a major success. I congratulate especially Brian Jeffries and other members of the Tuna Boat Owners Association for their initiative and the work they have done in this very successful project.

I can also advise that it is anticipated that from now until the end of January 1992, 40 fish will be marketed per week. The program will see the retention of some 200 fish for further development, plus the bringing into the floating cages of up to 1 000 new fish. This project is well and truly on the way. It will bring a major value-adding contribution to the Port Lincoln and the South Australian economies. This is a very effective program for bringing extra returns for a fishery which has been under stress, which has had to see reduced catches from the wild yet which is able to return, in real dollar terms, much more than it returned years ago when the bulk of its product went into cans.

BETTER CITIES PROGRAM

The Hon. D.C. WOTTON (Heysen): I direct my question to the Premier. What criteria are being used to determine which projects are put forward from South Australia to attract funding through the Federal Government's Better Cities Program? Which Government agency in South Australia is coordinating that program? Will the benefits to the State from this program outweigh the burden of the new Medicare charges that are funding it?

The Hon. J.C. BANNON: The Deputy Premier is our ministerial representative in the process, and he will relate to the Deputy Prime Minister in looking at the South Australian projects. We formed an interdepartmental group, which is operating from the Premier's Department but which involves a number of agencies, to identify appropriate projects. In fact, we have looked at a series of areas and projects that we believe are worthy of consideration under the Better Cities Program. Obviously, local government will be very interested in this exercise as well. That process is reasonably well advanced, but at this stage we are not in a position to announce what is formally going forward. That will be determined fairly shortly. Then it will be a matter for the Deputy Prime Minister and the Deputy Premier to determine and finalise the approvals in the context of the national program.

TEACHER NUMBERS

The Hon. J.P. TRAINER (Walsh): Can the Minister of Education provide the House with any information on the average age of the South Australian Education Department's teaching force and say how this figure compares with the average age of the teaching force in previous years? Can he advise of any problems that may arise as a consequence of that age structure?

The Hon. G.J. CRAFTER: The teaching force in this State is ageing, partly as a result of the enormous enrolment decline that has occurred in our schools in the past 15 years. Due to a decline of some 53 000 fewer students in our schools, we have not had to recruit new teachers to any great extent during those years, apart from replacing teachers who leave due to attrition.

The average age this year of our classroom teachers is 40 years, whereas in 1980 it was 32 years. The largest group—the 36 to 40 years group—consists of some 4 500 teachers (or 32 per cent of the teaching force). The next largest group is those aged from 41 to 45 years, consisting of some 3 500 teachers (or another 25 per cent of the teaching service). Therefore, over 8 000 teachers are in the 36 to 45 years range, which is nearly 60 per cent of the teaching force. Of course, this does have implications for future planning and management of our existing teaching service. More than half the teachers in our schools have been out of college and university for between 15 and 25 years.

There is a very low attrition rate of teachers leaving the service: it is about 2.5 to 3 per cent at present, whereas 10 years ago it was 5 per cent, and 20 years ago it was approaching 13 per cent. The profile of the department is also affected by the immobility of teachers within the teaching service because of the commitments that follow that age range, for example, when a teacher's own children are approaching secondary education, and so on. Naturally, there is a resistance to relocate or transfer even from one side of the metropolitan area to another.

I think we all recognise the need for a broad mix of age profiles and experience within staffrooms, and that is limited by the current circumstances. At the end of this decade, and in the early part of the next decade, the present bulge of 36 to 45-year olds will begin to reach retirement age, that is, over half the present teaching force will retire during the first few years of the next decade, starting between 2002 and 2005, when the first of today's 45-year-olds, for example, reach an approximate retirement age. Clearly, there is an urgent need to change this profile so that more young teachers can take advantage of an opportunity to learn from the knowledge and skills of the older group of teachers while they are developing their own skills and so that we also have a pool of competent teachers to replace the older ones when they start to leave the service in a few years time. I thank the honourable member for his most interesting question.

'HAZ CHEM' SIGNAGE

Mr SUCH (Fisher): Will the Minister of Labour explain why South Australia has not followed the lead of other States in requiring adequate 'Haz Chem' signage and stricter storage precautions wherever dangerous chemicals are used and stored? Other States have insisted on 'Haz Chem' signage for years and are toughening legislation in the wake of serious chemical incidents and explosions. Today's chemical spill at Islington underlines the need for the Government to meet its safety responsibility in this field.

The Hon. R.J. GREGORY: I am not aware of the particulars of the spill at Islington but, if it is in the Islington railway yards, unfortunately South Australian laws would not apply. One of the problems associated with the application of South Australia's very good occupational health and safety regulations and codes of practice is that they do not apply where the Commonwealth owns the land. Some disputation has occurred with the Commonwealth about this matter, and it has introduced its own occupational health and safety legislation. It has ignored pleas from State representatives that the whole of the safety applying within a particular State should be under the appropriate State laws.

Our State, in the application of codes of practice and regulations, applies more Australian standards and work safe standards than do all the other States. We are moving to a hazard-specific code of practice in regulation, which means that in the case of hazard the code of practice and regulations would apply to that hazard and not to the industry where it might occur. For instance, when the earth leakage circuit breaker, which some people call a residual

current device, was introduced into the construction industry, it had to be a construction site before it could apply. Once the hazard-specific regulations are implemented, it will apply wherever hand-held electrical appliances are used. With regard to hazardous substances and chemicals, extensive work is taking place within the Occupational Health, Safety and Welfare Commission to bring together standards that will apply in this State.

Like everybody else in this State, I am anxious for that work to be completed. However, there are some delays in achieving that, because it involves extensive consultation with the people who use and work with it. Draft documents are prepared and circulated for consultation and, after a certain period, the responses are considered, the tripartite organisation examines them and prepares recommendations, and eventually Cabinet recommends to Executive Council that these standards become gazetted and apply as law. Like everybody in this House, I would welcome that happening.

RAILWAYS

Mr HAMILTON (Albert Park): Does the Minister of Transport support the proposed major shake-up of Australia's railways as proposed by the Industry Commission? An article on page 3 of yesterday's *Advertiser* states:

> Railway fares for urban passengers during peak periods could double as part of a major shake-up of Australia's railways proposed by the Industry Commission.

The article further states:

> The report proposes peak-time urban rail fares could be doubled to bring them into line with overseas fares and lower charges could apply for off-peak periods. But welfare concessions would also only apply for off-peak times.

The Hon. FRANK BLEVINS: The answer is 'No', I do not agree with that report. In all fairness to the report, I have not seen a copy of it, so I cannot comment on it in detail. Certainly, what I have read in the press makes me think that it is a typical report written by people who have little or no knowledge of ordinary people attempting to go about their business. If South Australia was foolish enough to go down this particular road, which is the so-called economic rationalist road of members opposite who bow to the god of the market, rail fares in Adelaide would be increased by 306 per cent. So, a 10 trip multi-trip would cost somewhere in the order of $60—about $6 a trip.

An honourable member interjecting:

The Hon. FRANK BLEVINS: According to some text books that may be a sensible thing to do, but I can assure the travellers of Adelaide that, according to this Government, that would be a very foolish and silly thing to do, because it would guarantee one thing: that we would increase the fares to $60 for a 10 trip multi-trip one day, and we would close down the railways the next day because, clearly, nobody could afford to use them.

As I say, I am only going by newspaper reports, but I think the proposition is nonsense. What always annoys me in these kinds of arguments is the way people calculate their costing, making absolutely no allowance for anything other than the figures that they choose to put on paper. Where do you put the environment, for example, in the equation? Where in the equation do you put the costs of building additional roads? None of these things ever get into these particular models that these extremely right-wing characters choose to construct and, therefore, the answers they get out are utterly useless.

I can assure anybody in Adelaide who thought that the South Australian Government might give this particular report any credence that, based on the newspaper reports, it will not do so. As regards price, rail will continue to be a service in Adelaide available to everyone, and we deliberately keep the price low, much lower than in other States, to encourage people who have cars to leave them at home, to encourage mobility for those people who do not have private transport and, generally, to use our natural—and diminishing—resources efficiently.

OPERATION HYGIENE

Mrs KOTZ (Newland): My question is directed to the Minister of Emergency Services. Following the charging today of three more police officers as a result of Operation Hygiene, which brings the total now to 23, will the Minister advise the House of any further pending charges; and can he yet define institutionalised crime?

The Hon. J.H.C. KLUNDER: It is one of the oddities that the honourable member keeps asking me for information that is easily accessible elsewhere. I am not entirely sure what her motives are in this, and do not want to speculate. I have indicated from the word go that I do not intend to comment on Operation Hygiene, because that is an operational matter going on here and now, and to give the honourable member any information as to whether further charges are pending may hinder the police in the execution of their duties. So, I will not give the answers that the honourable member requires.

The SPEAKER: Order! Before calling on the next question, I might draw the attention of the House to the Standing Order on repetitive questions. I ask members to refer to previous questions when putting a similar one.

NORTH INGLE PRIMARY SCHOOL

Mr QUIRKE (Playford): Will the Minister of Education tell the House what plans there are to repair the damage done to the North Ingle Primary School in the recent fire? Will he also advise whether the administration block, the building damaged in that fire, will be rebuilt or relocated? No doubt members heard some detail in respect of this tragic fire earlier this week. At present, students from North Ingle Primary School are being educated at the Ingle Heights Primary School site until next year, but this school site is itself to close in December. Many constituents are concerned about this senseless act and, in particular, its unfortunate timing during the rationalisation of Ingle Farm schools.

The Hon. G.J. CRAFTER: I thank the honourable member for his interest in the school during one of the most traumatic times a school can possibly experience. The fire was very serious and required the students to be relocated to a nearby school, as the honourable member stated. The school will be repaired. It is in an important location for the provision of education services and will remain as a primary school site. I hope that the repairs needed to re-establish the school will be carried out as quickly as possible. At the moment, architects and engineers are surveying the damaged building to see whether it can be restored and used for similar purposes to that which applied in the past. If not, the building will need to be rebuilt entirely.

Whilst those repairs, in whatever form they take, are being made, the students will be able to continue their schooling, and I thank the parents, staff, students and the local community at Ingle Heights Primary School for their cooperation in accommodating the North Ingle primary students

while that work is being carried out. Obviously, there is a great reservoir of goodwill in our community, and it is great to see the cooperation between the various Government agencies and the community and, of course, the officers of the Education Department, in meeting the enormous pressures put on school communities in these tragic circumstances.

PENALTIES FOR GRAFFITI

Mr OSWALD (Morphett): Will the Minister of Family and Community Services report to the House as to the numbers of juveniles who have received detention orders over the past three years for multiple graffiti offences when the offence has not been linked with other serious crimes? In reply to my question on Tuesday, the Minister stated that graffiti offenders are placed under detention. However, it has been put to me by senior court sources that detentions are used only in conjunction with penalties for other serious offences such as illegal use, breaking and entering etc, and that detentions are not normally ordered and enforced because of FACS policies other than when a youth may be held overnight on remand. I have also been informed by court sources of the case of a youth who vandalised 72 buses with graffiti. The magistrate imposed a detention order, FACS appealed and the youth was immediately let out on a bond, which confirms the thrust of my question on Tuesday last, that senior executives of FACS have a policy that no youth is ever to be held for graffiti offences, regardless of the seriousness of the case.

The Hon. D.J. HOPGOOD: Well, it does no such thing. What has been recounted to the House has made perfectly clear that the Department for Family and Community Services can determine nothing in these matters. The matter is up to the judgment of the court. If, from time to time, there is an appeal against a court decision, to what is that appeal made? Name me a court!

Members interjecting:

The Hon. D.J. HOPGOOD: I think that I am correct in my grammar, despite the interjection. I am happy to get the information for the honourable member. The story is changing a little. It was Mr Teo the other day, and now it is apparently any senior official of the department. Does that not matter? I will get the information for the honourable member but I will maintain my position, which the honourable member cannot deny. We had this out during the budget Estimates Committees also, when I stated that the final decision is always with the judge. The Department for Family and Community Services is not a judicial body—it is an administrative arm of Government and has certain responsibilities. One of those responsibilities is not to determine penalty.

PORT AUGUSTA TAFE COLLEGE

Mrs HUTCHISON (Stuart): Will the Minister of Employment and Further Education advise the House of the latest developments at the Port Augusta College of TAFE, Coober Pedy campus? Members would be aware that for four years I was president of the council of the Port Augusta College of TAFE, which has several campuses including Leigh Creek, Roxby Downs and Coober Pedy and delivers TAFE training to people at those outreach areas. Much of this area includes a substantial Aboriginal population. The existing campus at Coober Pedy is widely regarded as inadequate. I have been made aware of considerable interest and concern about whether this development will proceed and, if so, the timetable for construction.

The Hon. M.D. RANN: It is certainly very true that the member for Stuart led the charge in terms of gaining better facilities in Coober Pedy as part of her role as president of the Port Augusta TAFE, which includes the Coober Pedy campus in terms of its administration and delivery of services. When I first became Minister of Employment and Further Education the honourable member made submissions to me on this matter, so I am very pleased to inform her and this Parliament that Cabinet this week gave approval for the expenditure of almost $3 million for the redevelopment of the Coober Pedy campus. The campus will provide a focus for education and training in this remote area of South Australia. The funding, of course, was provided by the Commonwealth Department of Employment, Education and Training because of the special provisions made within the campus for the education and training of Aborigines.

The Coober Pedy project represents an extension of the large Aboriginal education program offered at the Port Augusta College of TAFE, with 103 full-time students and increasing and also providing education and training programs for the general population of Coober Pedy. As the member for Stuart has pointed out, a need exists for Aboriginal education and training, in the area of opal mining and in terms of tourism, areas in which Coober Pedy has been growing rapidly.

Studies carried out by the Port Augusta College of TAFE have identified needs for training in mining, including plant and equipment skills, opal cutting, polishing, jewellery, tourism and business studies. Local industries see a potential for the employment of Aborigines in the opal and tourist industries. The running of TAFE Aboriginal programs within TAFE colleges (Statewide) has proved to be successful. The Coober Pedy project would see an extension of this by offering training and education to some 500 plus Aborigines in the local region. The proposed new Coober Pedy campus includes, as well as offices and classrooms, a multi-purpose workshop, a learning assistance centre, a library, a computing and commercial studies area, a lapidary workshop and shop and a visiting lecturer's flat. Plans also allow for future use of video conferencing facilities.

I can certainly inform the House that I hope to extend TAFE Channel, the video conferencing network, which is leading this nation, to both Port Lincoln and Coober Pedy next year. The plans are the result of wide-ranging consultations with employers in the local area and with the local Aboriginal community to establish training requirements. It is anticipated that work on this project will begin in November this year and will be completed in September 1992. I have asked my Federal colleague Mr Dawkins to join me at the opening ceremony.

IRON TRIANGLE AND SILVER CITY RAIL SERVICES

The Hon. H. ALLISON (Mount Gambier): On what basis does the Minister of Transport continue to raise the hopes and expectations of the former and would-be passengers of the Silver City and Iron Triangle passenger rail lines, which of course were closed by AN in January 1991? During the Estimates Committees the Minister acknowledged that neither the South Australian nor the Federal rail transfer agreements carried a compulsory requirement for Arbitrator Newton's decision to reinstate the Blue Lake passenger line to be adhered to. While the reinstatement of that and the

other two lines would be very acceptable, the Minister does not appear to have explained to the people in those three districts whether the reinstatement is likely or whether alternative arrangements might be possible, given the Blue Lake passenger line situation at Mount Gambier.

The Hon. FRANK BLEVINS: I am not quite sure what I have done or failed to do.

The Hon. H. Allison interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order!

The Hon. FRANK BLEVINS: I have now managed to understand the somewhat convoluted question which, of course, is based on a false premise. I have not given those people any hope at all. I have said very clearly—

The Hon. H. Allison interjecting:

The Hon. FRANK BLEVINS: It is very hard to understand these Poms!

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: It is very hard for the Chair to hear. Order!

The Hon. FRANK BLEVINS: They are very difficult to understand. However, the position is that under the rail transfer agreement we have some legal rights as regards the Blue Lake service—and we exercise those rights. The arbitrator came down on the side of the State Government and made it perfectly clear that the Federal Government had not established a case but that the State Government had established its case more than sufficiently. The arbitrator also made 10 recommendations. Those recommendations were not binding as was the arbitrator's decision, but I think there is a moral obligation on the part of the Federal Government to advise Australian National to take into account those recommendations.

The case for the Silver City and Iron Triangle services is, I believe, equally strong if not stronger than the case for the Blue Lake service, based on comparative costs. Losses on the Iron Triangle and Silver City services were not as great as the losses on the Blue Lake service. If the argument of the Federal Government was based on the losses being incurred by these lines, it seems to me that, if the arbitrator said that the case in respect of the Blue Lake service had not been proved, I would have thought that it would follow that a case could not be made out for the closure of the Iron Triangle or the Silver City service. However, the position is that we have no legal rights in those areas: it is entirely up to the Commonwealth Government what it does.

As soon as the arbitrator's decision came down, I went to Canberra to talk to the Federal Land Transport Minister (Bob Brown), who gave me an undertaking that he would have Australian National cost the possible introduction of a proper service to Mount Gambier, the Iron Triangle and Broken Hill. I say here and now that there is no point in reinstating at least the Iron Triangle service in its previous form—it would be pointless. The reason that service lost so much money is very simple: no-one used it, and the reason no-one used it is that it was a lousy service. It was as simple as that. We cannot ask people to use a service that leaves at 5 o'clock in the morning, takes half a day to get to Adelaide, turns around and comes back at 2 o'clock in the afternoon. Of course people are not going to use it, and they did not: they stayed away in droves.

What I have asked for—and at any time I expect a result to that request—is a properly costed service, running at times that are attractive, using rolling stock that is attractive and marketing it properly. Then, I believe, these railways would have a chance. But if the Federal Government is not prepared to do that, it is certainly a waste of time its reinstating those services in the present form. That would just be pouring taxpayers' money down the drain and not giving any kind of a service to the people in those regions.

I think it is grossly unfair that people in regional South Australia do not have a decent rail service; that is an enormous pity. This weekend the Premier will go to Broken Hill to have discussions with people from the various regional cities in the area to see whether an even more unified campaign can take place. I hope that that will be the case and that it will be successful. But, it will be successful only if it is an upgraded service.

ENVIRONMENT PROTECTION AUTHORITY

Mr De LAINE (Price): Will the Minister for Environment and Planning inform the House of the number of submissions that were received as a result of the release of the South Australian Environment Protection Authority discussion paper and provide information about the level of interest shown by the community?

The Hon. S.M. LENEHAN: I can best describe the South Australian EPA discussion paper as a best seller, and I think that that is fairly topical in this House at the moment: 1 000 copies have already been distributed after the initial release and, due to unexpected public demand, the department has had a further 600 copies printed. I think that indicates that there is a great deal of interest in the proposed Environment Protection Authority in South Australia.

As a result of the demand for the paper and the request to extend the closing date for submissions by organisations such as the National Environmental Law Association and the Conservation Council, I am pleased to inform the House that I have extended the date for the receipt of submissions by one calendar month to 21 November this year. To date the department has received 43 submissions from various organisations and individuals and has had consultations, which are continuing, with various interest groups. In addition, a series of nine working groups have been established under the umbrella of the department's EPA steering committee to work on specific aspects of the proposed legislation.

AREA HEALTH PLANS

Mr BLACKER (Flinders): First, can the Minister of Health advise the House of the percentage of the State health budget that could be expected to be saved by the proposed regionalisation of health services through area health plans? Secondly, can the Minister advise of any other perceived benefits of such changes?

The Hon. D.J. HOPGOOD: I will obtain that information. At this stage it would have to be predicated upon the green paper in its entirety. Once one starts to modify the proposals in the green paper, the savings may be less or more, depending on the nature of the modification.

HANSARD PROOFS AND VOLUMES

The Hon. J.P. TRAINER (Walsh): I direct my question to you, Mr Speaker. Will you inquire into the reason for delays in the delivery of the daily *Hansard* proofs and weekly volumes? The major function of State Print when it was first established as the Government Printer was to provide speedy and accurate printing of parliamentary papers and of the *Hansard* reports of parliamentary debates. In past years, prior to the introduction of modern technology,

the daily *Hansard* proofs were delivered back to the House of Assembly well before the commencement of the next day's debate. The weekly corrected *Hansard* volumes were available before the House sat on the Tuesday of the following week.

However, delivery has not been quite that prompt in recent years. Last week's corrected *Hansard* did not arrive until late today, and the daily proofs of a Wednesday are very rarely ready before the House meets on a Thursday, a problem which may be exacerbated now that the House of Assembly meets at 10.30 a.m. on a Thursday morning. I am also curious as to why the Legislative Council daily *Hansard* proofs are supplied before those of the House of Assembly, given that this House normally commences its sittings on Tuesday and Wednesdays 15 minutes earlier than the other place, and on Thursdays nearly four hours earlier.

The SPEAKER: I will have to refer the question to *Hansard* to obtain the detail. However, *Hansard* is under a considerable load, given the committee workload at the moment. The problem may lie at either the *Hansard* end or the printing end; I do not know. The House must remember, however, that, due to the increased committee workload that may emanate from this House, *Hansard* and the other resources that service this House may be stretched even further. As the matter is a JPSC responsibility, I will take it up at the next meeting of that committee.

PERSONAL EXPLANATION: MINISTER OF EMPLOYMENT AND FURTHER EDUCATION

Mr BECKER (Hanson): I seek leave to make a personal explanation.

Leave granted.

Mr BECKER: This afternoon, in reply to a question from the member for Napier, the Minister of Employment and Further Education challenged Opposition members to attend the opening of Think Ahead week. I wish to advise that this evening I will be representing the Leader of the Opposition and the shadow Minister of Health at that function where the Minister will announce the Chair of Neurosurgery. My wife, my family and I work very hard in support of the respective organisations. We have lobbied hard for a Chair of Neurosurgery. I would also like to advise the Minister, as he reflected on me and members of the Opposition, that I will be the guest speaker at the ecumenical service at the Salvation Army Hall on Sunday at 2.30 p.m. I hope that he will come along and be further educated.

The SPEAKER: Order! Before calling on the business of the day, I will clarify a statement that I made to the House. *Hansard* is not directly a responsibility of the JPSC: it is the responsibility of the House, but it is administered by the JPSC. I will take up the matter.

The SPEAKER: The question is that the House note grievances.

Mr HAMILTON (Albert Park): One thing I have learnt in my life is that, when a person makes a mistake, they must have the intestinal fortitude to stand up and apologise. Today in Question Time a puerile comment was made about a very serious matter—the brain injured. The Minister, in responding to a question from my colleague the member for Napier, was subjected to one of the most puerile comments I have heard in this place in excess of 12 years. The member for Napier asked a question in relation to the brain injured. He asked, 'Can the Minister inform the House of initiatives being taken in higher education and research to assist the brain injured members of our community?' That was a very good question, one that deserved the decorum of this Parliament and, indeed, the response being heard in silence. However, it received an inane interjection from the member for Murray-Mallee directed to the member for Napier. He said, 'They could start with you.' I thought that was absolutely outrageous, insensitive—

Mr LEWIS: On a point of order, Mr Speaker, I said no such thing. That is outrageous. That impugns my reputation. I ask that you, Mr Speaker, direct the honourable member to withdraw it.

The SPEAKER: Order! It certainly is against Standing Orders to reflect upon or impugn the motives of another member. Obviously, I did not hear the interjection, or I would have ruled the honourable member out of order if his remarks were out of order. We can look at the *Hansard* record to see whether the remark was recorded and whether it was said. I am not in a position to say whether it was or was not. I ask the honourable member to withdraw until we can confirm that.

Mr HAMILTON: Sir, I respect your position in the Chair, and I respect the difficulty that you have in this place, but my recollection is a vivid one. I have a vivid recollection of what took place. And my anger, Sir, as you would recall as the Speaker in this Parliament whose job it is to impose decorum—

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order!

Members interjecting:

Mr HAMILTON: I am not!

The SPEAKER: Order! The honourable member is coming very close to defying the Chair.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order! A point is being raised by an honourable member who has been offended by a statement that was made, and I ask the honourable member to withdraw.

Mr HAMILTON: On your instructions, Sir, and because of my respect for you and your position in the House. I withdraw. But let me continue on this matter. There are members in this Parliament who know what transpired. I have a deep commitment to those people who are less advantaged—

An honourable member interjecting:

Mr HAMILTON: Go and herd your sheep!

The SPEAKER: Order!

Mr HAMILTON: I have a deep commitment to those people in the community who are less advantaged than I, and there are many here, on both sides whom I respect, and the member for Hanson is one of those. There has been no reflection or intended reflection, and I have stood in this place over the years and expressed my admiration for the work that he does. But, I must say that in my view others are below contempt after what I have heard here today. Some people in my electorate have these disabilities, and I have ably sought to assist them through Estcourt House. and, indeed, though a house just down the road from mine. We should not knock in any way people who have those disabilities.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order!

Mr MATTHEW: On a point of order, Mr Speaker, Standing Order 127 provides that a member may not make personal reflections on any other member.

The SPEAKER: Order! I understand the point the honourable member is making. The member for Albert Park made a very broad statement. I have no way of identifying whom he meant.

Mr Matthew: He is saying 'the rest of us' now.

The SPEAKER: Order! I do not support the point of order. The member for Albert Park.

Mr HAMILTON: I always know when I am getting close to the bone; there have been two examples today where points of order have been taken.

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

Mr INGERSON (Bragg): Today I brought to the attention of the House what I think was—

Members interjecting:

Mr INGERSON: Why don't you be quiet and give someone else—

The SPEAKER: Order! The honourable member will resume his seat. Interjections are definitely out of order, and the next person will be dealt with fairly severely.

Mr INGERSON: I brought to the attention of the House today a serious issue, which was treated in a very flippant way by the Minister. I find it absolutely incredible that a Minister can stand up in this House and say that, because of the normal negotiating processes between employers and employees, he can condone the sorts of actions that have taken place in the sawmill at Plympton this week.

Two union members, Paul Martinella and Eric Cathro, went to the site two days ago and abused their privileges by threatening individual workers, convincing them that they should join the union by holding over their head the threat, 'If you don't join, I'll break a few bones, and I might even fix your skull up too.' They then went on to say, 'Well, if you don't join the union, what we'll do is we'll make sure that your boss doesn't survive, because we'll cut off all his supplies.'

Today, when I went down to see Adrian Resotto, the manager of the place, I had to pass a picket to find that the same union thugs had rung every supplier of timber material in town and advised them that, if they supplied this particular sawmill, they would also be black banned. I thought that this sort of thuggery had gone out of the union movement years ago. I understand the need and the right of the union movement to go on site in order to obtain new members, but that is a totally different issue from that of union officials going on a site and 'heavying' innocent people, and going so far as to 'heavy' the boss and to say to him, 'You, as well, will suffer because of this.'

As I said earlier, the pickets and the secondary boycotts are now in place. I hope that some sense will come out of this whole exercise and that the Minister might go down to Kincaid Avenue and actually sort out this issue, because the two gentlemen I have mentioned—

The Hon. Ted Chapman: Do you think he's game to intervene?

The SPEAKER: Order!

Mr INGERSON: I think that he ought to be given a chance to go down. These two gentlemen went two weeks ago to another sawmill in this city and attempted to do the same thing, but those proprietors went to their solicitors and had a 45d issued and, within 24 hours, the unions ran for cover. But two weeks later these same two thugs—and that is all you can call them—attempted to do the same thing and to implement it the day after.

In a democracy, in which unions have the right to play their role, a role they should be encouraged to play, no-one on either side of this House should condone this sort of ridiculous action. Many people are being affected by this issue today, including the suppliers of material (who can no longer legitimately carry out their role of supplying material to this sawmill), and the individual orders, the lack of income and the individual workers are also being affected.

This fiasco came about because these two thugs went on the site complaining that the ratio of casual to full-time employees was below the award limit. I understand that there is no such provision in the award. It just happens that the union movement is paranoid about having full-time employment over the right of individuals to work when they like and to have casual employment whether or not they like. Every single employee of that sawmill is paid above the award. There are five employees there—

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

Mr QUIRKE (Playford): This afternoon I wish to address my remarks to the events of earlier this week in my electorate, in relation to the Ingle Farm North Primary School. Members will recall that I asked a question here today about the future of that school and sought an assurance from the Minister of Education as to an effective rebuilding program that will see the school community have replaced the assets it so tragically lost the other day, and at the earliest possible time.

In particular, I sought reassurance that, on day one of the first term of 1992, the facilities at that school—which were excellent until last week, in terms of the classroom and the administration block, given the age of the school and given the fact that it has had a continuous existence for some years now—will be replaced on time, so that the 1992 school year will not be interrupted as this one so tragically was. In fact, the Minister gave us the undertaking that the administration block damaged by fire the other day will be rebuilt or relocated on the same site without loss to any other of the school facilities.

That is very important because in the Ingle Farm area we have, for the past five years, struggled with a very difficult question. I am sure that members in this place know that in many areas of South Australia considerably smaller student populations exist than was once the case. Ingle Farm is a classic example of that problem. In my electorate there are something like nine schools with sufficient student numbers for approximately four or five schools. After much consultation the Education Department has achieved community consensus on a rationalisation of these school sites such that three primary schools will amalgamate onto what was the old Ingle Farm High School site. I understand that Cabinet has determined or soon will determine a program of expenditure to ensure that that school will be ready to meet its very important role on the first day of term one next year.

I have had discussions with the Principal of that amalgamated primary school and he believes, as indeed do other personnel there, that everything at this stage is moving on target. It is a close schedule, but it will need to be kept to because, if it is not ready by early next year, the disruption will be great. It will come on top of a five year program for school rationalisation, done at some considerable expense to the community. The tragic events at Ingle Farm school are such that $1 million or thereabouts of damage was done. That $1 million was a terrible waste. I will visit that school in the very near future to look at some other facilities in need of replacement and refurbishment. I have visited a number of primary schools in my electorate lately and most of them are in desperate need of painting. They need new furniture and a number of other things. Above all else they need more resources.

Mr S.G. Evans: Hear, hear!

Mr QUIRKE: I am pleased that the member for Davenport gave me a 'Hear, hear!' for that because I heard his speech this morning and some of the points he raised were indeed very valid. That $1 million would have done a great deal for the high schools and primary schools in my electorate. In fact, that money, which is necessary as a result of a mindless, senseless act that took place earlier this week, will probably have an impact in the sense that—

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

The Hon. TED CHAPMAN (Alexandra): On Tuesday of this week I drew the attention of the House to reports I had received from my constituents about a bushfire at the western end of Kangaroo Island. I have subsequently learnt that there were two fires—one that commenced as a result of a lightning strike within the Flinders Chase Reserve, which I understood went across the Playford Highway to land on the north side on private land. I have since found that indeed there were two separate fires, both as a result of lightning strikes. Be that as it may, the subject of controlled burning was the nub of the issue, and the lack of it both in national parks and on Kangaroo Island has caused me on a number of occasions to raise the issue.

My remarks were picked up again yesterday by the member for Eyre when he asked the Minister a direct and simple question about whether she would take immediate action to allow controlled burning or, in his case, consider a request for selective grazing as well in national parks to reduce potential fire hazards. In reply the Minister told the House:

> It is not a simple matter of whether I will make a decision as to whether we will have controlled burning or indeed controlled grazing in national parks.

I put to the House in the few minutes available to me that it is indeed a simple matter of the Minister's deciding whether or not she will allow controlled burning, because there will be burning of national parks: it is a matter of whether that burning will be controlled or uncontrolled. When fires start naturally as a result of lightning in the heavily wooded and naturally vegetated areas of the State, those areas will catch alight. Sometimes accompanying such lightning strikes are heavy downpours of rain, in which case the fires are put out naturally but, where there are dry thunderstorms and lightning strikes, the fire starts and stays alight, and naturally the parks will burn.

To head off any disasters resulting from such natural outbreaks, we have the option which can be pursued by the Minister, an option that the private sector pursues as a matter of practice, namely, strategically planned burning off as a tool of management of the land. That really is the nub of the question and one which I plead with the Minister to take up with her department. The people concerned should be positively instructed as to what action should be taken in order to properly manage the vast areas of land owned by the State and vested in the care and control of the respective Ministers.

I understand the Minister's current dilemma and difficulty: she happens to have a department full of nervous nellies who do not understand the subject. The guy at the top—the Director of Environment and Planning in South Australia, Mr Bruce Lever, I understand, is to have meetings with the Minister, the member for Eyre and others for the purpose of trying to sort out the subject. On this day the Minister has indicated to me that I am welcome to have a meeting with Mr Lever about the subject. The principle of discussion in that context is a very good idea. However, the problem is that I have already had a meeting with that officer and, as effective and efficient as he may be in a whole range of other administrative areas within the department, he is scared stiff of fires and has made his position patently clear.

He does not believe that strategic burning should occur within the parks. He does not want any fires in the parks because he has had experience in New South Wales, for goodness sake, where he was previously employed as a public officer. Having burnt his fingers there—or others having had their fingers burnt—he is now too scared stiff to discuss the issue rationally. So, not only do we have someone at the top of the department directing his officers and urging them in this way: we have a Minister who cannot get past that sort of fear, and it is a very real problem.

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

The Hon. T.H. HEMMINGS (Napier): Earlier this afternoon in answer to a question I put to the Minister of Employment and Further Education, the Minister stated, in part:

> I am pleased to inform the House that tonight I will be announcing Australia's first Chair of Neurosurgery.

The Minister went on to say that the key purpose of establishing the Chair was to improve our understanding of the needs of the brain injured and those who suffer brain damage. The member for Albert Park has already outlined to the House what the question was, and I am sure that most members would agree that it was a straightforward question. One would have thought that we would have a normal response from the Minister. Why were there interjections and a general hubbub of laughter following the question? Whilst you, Sir, were not in the Chair at the time, you will recall that I had to repeat the explanation for the benefit of the Minister and the House.

The DEPUTY SPEAKER: Order! The Speaker has already referred to this matter and directed the House in relation to this issue. I hope that the member for Napier is not about to transgress the Speaker's formal ruling on the matter. The member for Napier.

The Hon. T.H. HEMMINGS: No, Sir, I certainly will not. I have accepted the Speaker's ruling and the fact that the member for Albert Park has withdrawn and that there was a personal explanation from the other side to the effect that that statement was not made, and I make that perfectly clear. Sadly, I have come to the conclusion that I am not the most popular politician in this House as far as members opposite are concerned. I accept the fact that time and again when I am on my feet efforts are made to stifle anything I have to say. That does not faze me at all.

I am perfectly happy if members opposite dislike me and if my style of speaking in this House does not meet with their approval—that is no problem for me. Members opposite can call me whatever they like, as long as it is within the bounds of Standing Orders. I know, Sir, that you will always be there to protect me. However, on behalf of the 4 000 or 5 000 people whom it was intended that question should assist—and an answer was given—I object. Members opposite treated the injuries of these people as a matter for mirth just because I asked the question of the Minister. I am sure that the House and you, Sir, would back me up on that point. I again remind the House of the Minister's reply. He said that they are mostly young, mostly male and mostly the result of horrendous road accidents.

That is what this is all about: a simple, straightforward question that dealt with the brain injuries of so many of our young Australians which, because I asked it, was treated as a matter for mirth. I am now on dangerous ground, and I accept that. What the member for Albert Park supposedly heard—that they should start with me—has been denied. I

accept that that might not have been said, but why did my simple question create so much mirth? You, Sir, had only one ruling to give, and that was the correct one. The member for Albert Park had only one course open to him, and that was to withdraw. I give credit to the member for Albert Park and, with all due respect, to you, Sir, for making that ruling.

Members on this side know what was said and who said it. I sincerely hope that those members on the other side who were close enough to hear what was said will give the matter a few seconds thought. Again, like the member for Albert Park, I have the utmost respect for the member for Hanson who very quietly goes about his job in that certain area for his very own reasons, which I will not go into, and he does it well. This is not a reflection on the member for Hanson, and that was never intended, but I know that, if my colleague the member for Henley Beach had asked the question, there would have been no reaction from members opposite.

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

Mr MEIER (Goyder): Last week, I received a package from the Manager of Rural Finance, Mr Graham Broughton, entitled 'Financing Rural South Australia'. The package contains information sheets from the Rural Finance and Development Division highlighting what the Rural Assistance Branch is currently providing to farmers in this State. It deals with special farm build-up loans; rural adjustment scheme interest rate subsidies; re-establishment grants; debt reconstruction; farm build-up; farm improvement; household support; commercial rural loans; and soil conservation loans.

It is perhaps timely that this new package should come out, because we are once again being reminded that the rural sector is the sector that this State relies on so heavily. Things on the home front in many areas of South Australia show promise in terms of grain and crops, and today's *Stock Journal* indicates that wool prices have shown a slight increase but, at the same time, at the beginning of this week a headline in the local newspaper read 'Guerilla warfare in wheat fields of woe'. That article highlights the fact that in our neighbouring State of Western Australia the farmers are in a desperate situation to maintain their living and to stay on the land.

The article refers to two groups: the rural action movement (RAM) and the rural strike force. RAM has declared war on banks and finance companies to stop them from selling up debt crippled farms, whereas the second group, the rural strike force, is seen as a more extreme force, which has begun, according to the article, to use terrorist acts. In fact, earlier this month it cut up railway lines to support its demand for a moratorium on farm debt.

It is interesting that on the next day the saboteurs were warmly congratulated by most callers to a Western Australian country talk-back program. That shows the desperation of the farmers of Western Australia and how they are totally frustrated and fed up with what they have seen coming from Labor Governments, both State and Federal. In fact, they blame their money problems on the Labor Government which either has or has not undertaken action in economic matters that would have stemmed the high level of interest rates and the high value of the dollar that we are currently experiencing, and could have provided real relief to this sector, which is so important to this State.

It is also interesting to note in that same newspaper that some 20 action groups have been formed in South Australia. I have met with representatives from some action groups in this State. The UF&S President, Mr Tim Scholz, indicated that we must be aware that the general situation is that farm debt will increase dramatically despite the good year that we appear to be having. For that reason, I say to the Minister of Agriculture that I hope he continues to meet with the various groups that are so important; certainly with the UF&S but also with these action groups of which South Australian Rural Action (SARA) is perhaps the key group.

The Government must not ignore the signs that are still there. The rural sector needs assistance. If we think that the problems are suddenly going to solve themselves, we are wrong, and South Australia—not only the rural sector but also the whole regional community and the metropolitan area—will suffer more. The rural sector can make or break this State. It is unfortunate that the Government has not recognised its importance.

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

ENFORCEMENT OF JUDGMENTS BILL

Received from the Legislative Council and read a first time.

The Hon. G.J. CRAFTER (Minister of Education): 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

In 1978, Parliament enacted a package of Bills dealing with the repayment of debts and the enforcement of judgments. These Acts were the Debts Repayment Act, the Enforcement of Judgments Act, the Sheriff's Act, the Local and District Criminal Courts Act Amendment Act and the Supreme Court Act Amendment Act. None of these Acts have been brought into operation. A committee of review completed a review of the Acts in 1986 and recommended several amendments to the Enforcement of Judgments Act 1978. The amendments recommended were mainly of an administrative or machinery nature.

This Bill, rather than amending the Act, is a completely new draft done in today's style. The substance of the Bill is similar to the 1978 Act, but its provisions are somewhat less prescriptive, leaving the detail to be regulated by rules of court. This Bill, as does the 1978 Act, does away with the unsatisfied judgment summons and all the unsatisfactory features of those proceedings. A judgment debtor's financial position will be investigated by the court, which for these purposes is a judicial officer (not a justice of the peace) or a registrar of a court.

There is no longer any power for the court to make an order for imprisonment for failing to attend a hearing or failing to pay a judgment debt as ordered. It is however recognised that there must be some sanction against those who can afford to pay judgment debts but simply refuse to. Where a court is satisfied that a judgment debtor has wilfully and without proper excuse failed to comply with the order of the court, the court may commit the judgment debtor to prison for up to 40 days. This is similar to section 29 in the 1978 Act.

The Bill provides for garnishee orders, as did the 1978 Act. A garnishee order cannot be made in respect of salary

or wages unless the judgment debtor consents to the making of the order. The other methods of enforcing judgments are: sale of property; charging orders; appointment of receiver; warrant of possession; and proceedings in contempt.

Clause 1 is formal.

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

Clause 3 contains definitions of the following terms which are used in the measure:

- business debt
- court (defined to mean the Supreme Court, the District Court or the Magistrates Court)
- judgment
- judgment creditor
- judgment debtor
- land (defined to include any premises, including residential premises)
- monetary judgment
- sale.

Clause 4 provides for the examination of judgment debtors by a court. Subclause (1) provides that the court may, on application by the judgment creditor, investigate the judgment debtor's means of satisfying a monetary judgment.

Subclause (2) requires the court, on application by the judgment creditor, to issue a summons to require the judgment creditor or any other person who may be able to assist with the investigation to appear for examination or to produce documents relevant to the investigation. Subclause (3) requires such a summons to be served by personally. Subclause (4) provides that if a person fails to appear as required by the summons, the court may issue a warrant to have the person arrested and brought before the court.

Clause 5 deals with the making of orders for the payment of instalments of judgment debts. Subclause (1) empowers the court, on application by a judgment creditor, to order the judgment debtor to pay the judgment debt immediately (or within a specified period) or to pay such instalments towards satisfaction of the debt as the court specifies in the order. Subclause (2) provides that such an order can only be made against a natural person if the court has conducted an investigation into the person's means of satisfying the judgment or if the court is satisfied that there are, in the circumstances of the case, proper reasons for dispensing with such an investigation. Subclause (3) provides that the court should, in making such an order against a natural person, have due regard to evidence placed before the court as to the person's means of satisfying the judgment debt, the necessary living expenses of the person and his or her dependants and the person's other liabilities.

Subclause (4) empowers the court, on application by a judgment creditor or judgment debtor, to rescind, suspend or vary an order under subclause (1). Subclause (5) provides that if a judgment debtor fails to comply with an order, the court will, on the application by the judgment debtor, issue a summons to require the debtor to appear for examination before the court and that the court may issue a warrant of arrest if the debtor fails to appear. Subclause (6) provides that if, after examining the judgment debtor, the court is satisfied that the judgment debtor, has, without proper excuse, failed to comply with an order under subclause (1), the court may commit him or her to prison for not more than 40 days (but if the order is for payment by instalments, an order for imprisonment cannot be made unless two or more instalments are in arrears). Subclause (7) provides that if payment of the judgment debt or instalments is made, the judgment debtor must be discharged from custody even though the period of imprisonment has not expired.

Clause 6 deals with the making of garnishee orders. Subclause (1) empowers the court, on application by a judgment creditor, to order that money owing or accruing to the judgment debtor from a third person or money of the judgment debtor in the hands of a third person (including money in a bank account) be attached to answer the judgment and be paid to the judgment creditor. Subclause (2) provides that such an order cannot be made in respect of salary or wages unless the judgment debtor consents but, once consent is given, the extent to which the salary or wages are attached is in the discretion of the court. Subclause (3) provides that if an order is made under this clause on an application without notice to the judgment debtor or the garnishee (or both), then—

- the order operates to restrain the garnishee from dealing with money to which the order relates until both the judgment debtor and the garnishee have had an opportunity to be heard;
- the court must adjourn the proceedings to give the judgment debtor and the garnishee the opportunity to be heard;
- at the adjourned hearing the court must allow the judgment creditor and the garnishee to give evidence or make representations (or both); and
- after consideration of the evidence and any representations, the court must confirm, vary or revoke the order.

Subclause (4) provides that in deciding whether to make, vary or confirm an order under this clause affecting money of a natural person, the court should have due regard to any evidence placed before it as to the judgment debtor's means of satisfying the judgment, the necessary living expenses of the judgment debtor and his or her dependants and the judgment debtor's other liabilities. Subclause (5) provides that an order under this clause may authorise the garnishee to retain, from the money subject to attachment, a reasonable sum (fixed in the order) as compensation for his or her expenses in complying with the order. Subclause (6) provides that if a garnishee does not comply with an order under this clause, the garnishee commits a contempt of the court by which the order was made and becomes personally liable for payment to the judgment creditor of the amount subject to attachment. Subclause (7) makes it an offence for an employer to dismiss or prejudice an employee because a garnishee order has been made.

Clause 7 deals with the sale of property of a judgment debtor. Subclause (1) empowers the court, on application by a judgment creditor, to issue a warrant of sale authorising the seizure and sale of a judgment debtor's real or personal property (or both) to satisfy a monetary judgment. Subclause (2) provides that the seizure and sale of personal property that could not be taken in bankruptcy proceedings against the judgment debtor cannot be authorised. Subclause (3) empowers the sheriff, in pursuance of such a warrant—

- to enter the land (using such force as may be necessary for the purpose) on which property to which the warrant relates, or documents evidencing title to such property are situated;
- to seize and remove any such property or documents
- to place and keep such property or documents in safe custody until completion of the sale; and
- to sell any property to which the warrant relates (whether or not the sheriff has first taken steps to obtain possession of the property).

Subclause (4) empowers the sheriff, in appropriate cases, to leave a judgment debtor in possession of property until it is sold in pursuance of a warrant. Subclause (5) provides that, subject to any contrary direction by the court, the sale

of real property or tangible personal property will be by public auction (unless the sheriff considers there is no acceptable bid, in which case the sheriff can proceed to sell by private treaty for a price not less than the highest bid) and if there is a reasonable possibility of satisfying the judgment debt out of personal property, the sheriff should sell such property before proceeding to sell real property. Subclause (6) provides that where any part of the judgment debtor's property consists of intangible property, the sheriff may sign any transfer or do anything else necessary to convert the property into money.

Clause 8 deals with the making of charging orders. Subclause (1) empowers a court to charge property of a judgment debtor with a judgment debt or part of such a debt. Subclause (2) empowers a court that makes an order under subclause (1) to make ancillary or consequential orders requiring registration of the charge, prohibiting or restricting dealings with the property subject to the charge, providing for the sale of the property and the application of the proceeds and relating to any other incidental or consequential matters.

Clause 9 deals with the appointment of receivers. Subclause (1) empowers the court to appoint a receiver for the purpose of enforcing a judgment. Subclause (2) provides that a receiver may be appointed even though no other proceedings for enforcement of the judgment have been taken.

Subclause (3) provides that the court may confer on a receiver powers:

- to take charge of property of the judgment debtor, to dispose of such property;
- to divert income (other than from employment or a pension) towards satisfaction of the debt;
- to take charge of and carry on a business of the judgment debtor and apply the proceeds towards satisfaction of the debt; and
- to do anything reasonably necessary for, incidental to or consequential on, the exercise of these powers.

The court can also make orders providing for accounts to be rendered by the receiver, providing for his or her remuneration and relating to any other incidental or consequential matter. Subclause (4) provides that a receiver's powers operate to the exclusion of the judgment debtor's powers.

Clause 10 provides that where a court gives a monetary judgment against a vessel or object, the court may authorise its seizure and sale.

Clause 11 deals with the possession of property by the sheriff. Subclause (1) empowers the court, on the application of a person in whose favour a judgment for recovery or delivery up of possession of property has been given, to issue a warrant of possession authorising the sheriff to take possession of the property and deliver it into the applicant's possession. Subclause (2) provides that where such a warrant has been issued, the sheriff may, if the warrant relates to land, eject from the land any person who is not lawfully entitled to be on the land and if the warrant relates to personal property, enter land and seize and take possession of the property, using appropriate means and such force as may be reasonably necessary in the circumstances. Subclause (3) provides that a person who remains in possession of land or other property that is taken from them under this clause commits a contempt of the court by which the warrant was granted.

Clause 12 deals with the enforcement of judgments by proceedings for contempt of court. Subclause (1) provides that where a party is, by judgment of a court, ordered to do an act or to refrain from doing an act and the party contravenes or fails to comply with the judgment, the court may, on application by the party entitled to the benefit of the judgment, issue a warrant to have the person arrested and brought before the court to be dealt with for a contempt of the court. Subclause (2) provides that a person cannot be dealt with under this clause for failure to pay a monetary sum.

Clause 13 provides for the execution of instruments by court order. Subclause (1) provides that if the execution or endorsement of a document by a party to an action is necessary to give effect to a judgment, the court may order the party to execute or endorse the document or authorise an officer of the court to do so on behalf of that party. Subclause (2) provides that a document executed or endorsed by an officer of the court has effect as if executed or endorsed by the party.

Clause 14 provides for the issue by the court of a summons to appear or warrant of arrest in respect of a debtor where there are grounds to believe that the debtor is about to leave the State and that the debtor's absence would seriously prejudice the creditor's prospects of recovering the judgment debt.

Clause 15 provides that where a monetary judgment is against a partnership or unincorporated association, the judgment may be enforced against the partnership property or the common property of the association or against the property of any person who is liable for the debts of the partnership or association.

Clause 16 deals with the rights of purchasers of property sold in execution. Subclause (1) provides that the purchaser of property sold by authority of a court acquires good title subject only to registered interests and interest of which public notice has been given pursuant to statute. Subclause (2) provides that if, before the date of sale of property, a person claims to have an unregistered interest in the property and gives notice of the claim in accordance with the rules of court, the sheriff must, if the claim is not disputed or the court orders the sheriff to recognise the validity of the claim, pay the claimant out of the proceeds of the sale of the property, a sum sufficient to satisfy the claim, or, where appropriate to do so, withdraw the property from sale and give possession of it to the person.

Clause 17 empowers the court, if satisfied that there is proper cause for granting a stay, grant a stay of execution in relation to a judgment.

Clause 18 empowers a court to delegate, by its rules, any of the court's powers under this measure to officers of a class designated in the delegation. The clause also provides that a person dissatisfied with a decision made by an officer acting in pursuance of such a delegation may, subject to the rules of court, apply to the appropriate court for a review of the decision, and on such a review, the court may confirm, vary or reverse the decision.

Clause 19 provides for the making of rules of court pursuant to the Supreme Court Act 1935, the District Court Act 1991 and the Magistrates Court Act 1991 on subjects contemplated by, or necessary or expedient for, the purposes of this measure.

Mr MEIER secured the adjournment of the debate.

JUSTICES OF THE PEACE BILL

Received from the Legislative Council and read a first time.

The Hon. G.J. CRAFTER (Minister of Education): 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

It is consequential on the amendments to the Justices Act 1921 and the change of that Act's name to the Summary Procedure Act by the amendments in the Justices Act Amendment Bill 1991. The former Justices Act 1921 now regulates the procedure of the Magistrates Court and it is no longer appropriate for the provisions relating to the appointment of justices of the peace to be contained in that Act. The provisions of this Bill provide for the appointment of justices (and special justices), the grounds for removing a justice from office and the keeping of the Roll of Justices by the Attorney-General.

Clauses 1 and 2 are formal.

Clause 3 is an interpretation provision. It provides that 'justice' means a justice of the peace for South Austalia and includes a special justice.

Clause 4 provides for the appointment of justices by the Governor and requires justices to take the oaths required under the Oaths Act 1936.

Clause 5 provides for the appointment by the Governor of a justice as a special justice. Appointments are to be made on the recommendation of the Attorney-General.

Clause 6 provides that the Governor may remove a justice from office if the justice—

(a) is mentally or physically incapable of carrying out official functions satisfactorily;

(b) is convicted of an offence that, in the opinion of the Governor, shows the convicted person to be unfit to hold office as a justice;

(c) is bankrupt, or applies to take the benefit of a law for the relief of bankrupt or insolvent debtors;

or

(d) should, in the Governor's opinion, be removed from office for any other reason.

Clause 7 provides that the Attorney-General will keep a roll of justices.

Clause 8 provides that the letters 'JP' appearing after a signature will be taken to signify that the signatory is a justice.

Clause 9 makes it an offence for a person who is not a justice to hold himself or herself out as a justice or to use the letters JP afer his or her signature.

Mr MEIER secured the adjournment of the debate.

STRATA TITLES (RESOLUTION OF DISPUTES) AMENDMENT BILL

Second reading.

The Hon. G.J. CRAFTER (Minister of Education): 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 principal object of this Bill is to give members of strata corporations access to an efficient method of resolving disputes in a cost effective manner. The Strata Titles Act sets up a scheme wherein persons are able to purchase title to a unit and on doing so become members of the strata corporation for that particular group of units. The main functions of the strata corporation are to administer and maintain common property and to enforce the articles of the corporation.

A problem which concerns many strata title unit holders is the difficulty of resolving disputes which occur between the strata corporation and its members or between individual members of the corporation. At present civil proceedings may be taken in the Supreme Court to enforce rights and obligations under the articles of the strata corporation. This type of action is very expensive and out of proportion to the rights that often need to be enforced (for example, a unit holder may be parking a vehicle in the wrong place or keeping an animal contrary to the provisions of the articles). In addition summary proceedings for breaches of certain provisions of the Strata Titles Act can only be commenced with the approval of the Attorney-General. As many members will be aware disputes in strata units often end up in electorate offices with disputants lamenting the lack of an affordable avenue to resolve the dispute.

In all, a simpler method of resolution of disputes is called for. In 1987 a discussion paper was circulated which canvassed a proposal to establish a Strata Title Commissioner to resolve strata title disputes. It was suggested then that the Commissioner be funded by a levy on new strata developments and on the transfer of titles. While the need for an appropriate dispute resolution mechanism was acknowledged and recognised by most commentators, the proposed method of funding was not supported and so further options have been explored.

The States of Western Australia, New South Wales and Queensland each have a Strata Title Commissioner to deal with strata title disputes while in Victoria body corporate disputes under the subdivision Act are determined by the Magistrates Court. This Bill proposes that disputes in strata schemes in this State be determined by the small claims court. For this purpose the small claims court is vested with wide jurisdiction to resolve disputes. The court is empowered to attempt to achieve settlement of proceedings by agreement between the parties, require a party to provide reports or other information for the purpose of proceedings, order parties to take action or refrain from taking action to remedy or resolve the dispute, order alteration of the articles, variation or reversal of decisions, give judgment on any monetary claim and make orders as to costs and incidental or ancillary orders. It is considered that this jurisdiction will be sufficient to allow the small claims court to make an appropriate order to resolve most disputes.

It should be noted that the small claims court is a jurisdiction in which parties generally represent themselves. No legal representation is allowed unless all parties agree and the court is satisfied that a party who is not represented will not be unfairly disadvantaged. In certain circumstances the court may allow a party to be assisted in the presentation of his/her case. The cost of instituting proceedings in the small claims court is currently $33.

The small claims court is also given the power to make interim orders to preserve the position of any person prior to a final determination of the dispute. The Supreme Court and the Planning Appeal Tribunal will continue to have jurisdiction over matters in Part I of the Act—Division of Land by Strata Plan, to appoint an administrator of a strata corporation's affairs under section 37 and to grant relief when a unanimous resolution is required under section 46.

While it is expected that the bulk of strata title disputes will be suitable for resolution by the small claims court,

provision is made for a person to commence an action in the District Court (with leave of that court) or to apply to have proceedings transferred to the District Court. The District Court must consider that the complexity or significance of the matter warrants it dealing with the matter.

In addition a court (either the small claims court or the District Court) may of its own initiative or on application by a party to proceedings transfer the matter to the Supreme Court on the ground that the application raises a matter of general importance or may state a case for the opinion of the Supreme Court.

There are several provisions in the Strata Titles Act which create offences. A corporation is guilty of an offence if an office of the corporation remains vacant for more than six months, if it makes a payment to its members, if it fails to produce, for inspection by a unit holder, a current insurance policy, if it fails to hold an annual meeting, if it refuses to supply specified information to specified persons and if it fails to keep a letter box on the site. A person who alters the structure of a unit is guilty of an offence, as is a person who has possession of any property of the corporation and refuses to deliver it to the corporation. A unit holder who enters into a dealing with a part of a unit is also guilty of an offence. Finally, the original proprietor is guilty of an offence if he or she does not convene the first general meeting within a specified time and at that meeting place in the possession of the corporation the documentation relating to the development.

These offences basically deal with matters internal to the strata development and it is considered if an accessible means of resolving disputes is put in place there is no need for these offences. A civil action in the small claims court should suffice to ensure compliance. A penalty of $2 000 or six months imprisonment (a Division 7 fine) is provided for failure to comply with an order of a court. The opportunity has also been taken to make some other minor amendments to the Strata Titles Act.

Section 5 (7) is amended to make clear that a strata plan may on occasion specify that a wall between a unit and a unit subsidiary is in fact part of a unit and not part of common property. This is consistent with the existing wording in section 5 (5). The provisions relating to service of documents are amended by making provision for a corporation to keep a post office box. For strata schemes in some country areas a post office box is often the only method of postal delivery and strata schemes in such areas have previously been unable to comply with the Act. The new section 49 (2) addresses this problem.

Clause 1 is formal.

Clause 2 provides for the commencement of the measure.

Clause 3 makes a minor amendment to section 5 (7) of the Act to ensure consistency with section 5 (5) and to ensure that a strata plan can determine that a wall or fence between a unit and a unit subsidiary is not part of common property.

Clause 4 removes section 20 (3) of the Act in view of proposed new Part IIIA dealing with 'disputes'.

Clauses 5, 6, 7, 8 and 9 all provide for the removal of penalty provisions from the Act.

Clause 10 inserts a new Part IIIA relating to the resolution of disputes within a strata corporation. An application would usually be made to the local court and dealt with by that court within its small clalms jurisdiction. (The Bill will permit an application that involves a complex or significant issue to be dealt with by the District Court. If an application raises a matter of general importance, or if a question of law is raised for determination, the application may be transferred to the Supreme Court.) It is proposed that an application be dealt with according to equity, good conscience and the substantial merits of the case, and with the minimum of formality. Parties before the local court would usually not be represented by legal counsel. A strata corporation would be entitled to appoint a member to represent it in the proceedings. The court will be empowered to act to achieve settlement of the proceedings by agreement between the parties. Other powers to resolve the dispute are also prescribed, including the power to alter articles of the corporation or to vary or reverse any decision of the corporation or management committee. The new provision will not limit or derogate from any civil remedy at law or in equity.

Clause 11 amends section 49. This section presently requires that a strata corporation must keep a letter box at the site. The amendment will allow the use of a post office box where there is no postal delivery to the site.

The Hon. D.C. WOTTON secured the adjournment of the debate.

SHERIFF'S ACT AMENDMENT BILL

Second reading.

The Hon. G.J. CRAFTER (Minister of Education): 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 Sheriff's Act was enacted in 1978 consequential on the new scheme for enforcement of judgments also enacted in that year. The Act has never been brought into operation. This Bill makes minor amendments to the Sheriff's Act 1978. The 1978 Act does not recognise that the sheriff is an officer of the Supreme Court. This is corrected by the amendments and, as with other officers of the court, it is provided that the sheriff may not be appointed as sheriff or dismissed or reduced in status after appointment, except on the recommendation, or with the concurrence, of the Chief Justice.

Under the scheme of the Enforcement of Judgments Bill execution of judgments is the responsibility of the sheriff. For the time being the sheriff may have to delegate his authority to bailiffs in the District Court and the Magistrates Court. This is provided for in the amendments. Other amendments are consequential on the enactment of the District Court Act and Magistrates Court Act.

Clauses 1 and 2 are formal.

Clause 3 strikes out section 3 (2) as a statute law revision exercise.

Clause 4 amends the interpretation provision, section 4. The definition of 'court' is substituted, altering the references to local court and district criminal court to the District Court and Magistrates Court in light of the District Court Bill and the Magistrates Court Bill. The definition of 'judge' is also substituted as a consequential amendment.

Clause 5 substitutes sections 5 and 6 which deal with the appointment of a sheriff and sheriff's officers. The new section 5 provides that there will be a sheriff who will be a public servant. Appointments to the office of sheriff and removals from that office are subject to the decision of the Chief Justice of the Supreme Court. The new section 6 provides that there will be such deputy sheriffs and sheriff's

officers as necessary. These officers are also public servants. In addition, the sheriff may appoint deputy sheriffs or sheriff's officers on a temporary basis. These officers are not public servants and are entitled to the fees set out in the regulations. A deputy sheriff has the powers and duties of the sheriff but is subject to the direction of the sheriff. Appointment to the offices of deputy sheriff and sheriff's officer and removals from these offices are subject to the decision of the sheriff. The new provisions clarify the nature of the appointment of officers by the sheriff and the role of deputy sheriffs and bring the Act into line with the Government Management and Employment Act 1985.

Clause 6 amends section 8 which sets out the duties of the sheriff. Amendments of a statute law revision nature are made to paragraph *(b)*.

Clause 7 substitutes section 10 which sets out how arrested persons are to be dealt with. The new section 10 provides that any person arrested by the sheriff, a deputy sheriff or any sheriff's officer must be brought before a court as soon as reasonably practicable and must in the meantime be kept in safe custody. The current provision requires that the person must be brought before the court out of which the process under which the person was arrested was issued.

Clause 8 amends section 12 to clearly provide that a deputy sheriff is immune from civil liability to the same extent as the sheriff and sheriff's officers.

Mr MEIER secured the adjournment of the debate.

WRONGS AMENDMENT BILL

Consideration in Committee of the Legislative Council's amendments:

No. 1. Page 1 (clause 2)—After line 20 insert 'or'.

No. 2. Page 1, lines 22 and 23 (clause 2)—Leave out all words in these lines.

The Hon. FRANK BLEVINS: I move:

That the Legislative Council's amendments be agreed to.

Motion carried.

EVIDENCE AMENDMENT BILL

Bill read a third time and passed.

PETROLEUM (MISCELLANEOUS) AMENDMENT BILL

Adjourned debate on second reading.

(Continued from 9 October. Page 1002.)

Mr LEWIS (Murray-Mallee): The Opposition acknowledges the desire of the Government to amend the legislation as it stands to provide for appropriate legislation to allow the carriage of hydrocarbons within, through, from and to South Australia. We note that at present there is some ambiguity about the way in which a pipeline licence cannot be transferred without the approval of the Minister, and that that is now clarified. Quite appropriately, a licence should not be transferred without the approval of the Minister, and that is at the nub of the anxiety we have about another provision of this legislation.

The Opposition notes that waste materials which result from exploration and production have caused concern to some elements within and outside the industry in recent times, and this legislation provides that the Minister will be able to give approval for the appropriate disposal of that waste. The Government, ever looking for revenue, makes the excuse that, since fees, penalties or other charges that are set out in the Act have not been reviewed since 1984, that should now occur, and the Bill sets out the means by which the Government will be able to make those increases in line with inflation since that time. The Minister also uses the argument to justify that action that this will bring the charges into line with those that apply interstate.

The Opposition has no difficulty with that, other than that no evidence was given that the costs of providing any of those services for which charges are made have increased. We do not dispute that there needs to be an increase in penalties as a deterrent, but we do not necessarily accept *carte blanche* that just because time has passed and costs in other parts of the economy have escalated the cost in this instance has escalated and, if it has escalated, to the same degree as the CPI. We acknowledge that the Government has kept its promise that the increase it is seeking in each of the fees and charges will not be beyond the CPI, but the Government should not presume that the Opposition will agree to fees and charges being increased to the level of the CPI unless in future the Government is prepared to provide evidence that there has been an increase in the cost of providing such services and an indication of the measure of that increase.

The substance of the Opposition's concern arises in relation to ministerial powers or their delegation. The Minister has said that no provision exists in the law that allows him to delegate ministerial powers, but then in an offhand way the second reading explanation states that provision to delegate those powers will speed up the administrative process for matters of a relatively minor nature. The second reading explanation claims that these changes already exist in the law that governs offshore petroleum exploration and development.

However, the most important aspect of our concern about this is that not only does it provide for the Minister to delegate powers in order to speed up an administrative process for relatively minor matters but also it provides *carte blanche* for the Minister to delegate all powers, and not just those that the Minister claimed in his second reading explanation were relevant to minor administrative matters—all powers can now be delegated. It ill behoves the Minister to try to mislead the House in that respect.

The Minister ought to take more care to understand the legislation he brings into this place and/or having taken such care, not attempt to mislead the House in the course of his second reading remarks. It is up to each member in this place, as I well recognise—and other members do too, I am sure—to examine legislation and determine for themselves the effect of that legislation were it to find its way into law from the form in which we receive it as a Bill. That is true but, at the same time, it ill behoves the Minister to tell us he is doing one thing when he is doing a good deal more than that. Apart from that, the Opposition has no argument with the Bill. We support it.

The Hon. J.H.C. KLUNDER (Minister of Mines and Energy): I thank the member for Murray-Mallee and the Opposition for their support of this measure. In his speech, the member for Murray-Mallee mentioned several things which I ought to refer to to try to clarify the situation. With regard to the changes that are made for the various services to be provided by the department, even under the new charges, increased, as the honourable member says, by some considerable amount in some cases, the service that will be provided will still be far more costly than the amount that

is recouped by way of charges. In that sense, the taxpayer of this State is still subsidising the explorer and the Government. While we cannot exactly be happy about that, we accept it on the basis that the results of exploration often bring large benefits to this State. I guess in a very real sense the State is having its small flutter, whereas the explorers have flutters with much larger sums of money.

The honourable member indicated that he believed that no charges would rise more than the CPI increase. It is my understanding that some of them will, and I do not want to go past this point without making it clear that that is the situation. There are some cases where the average of charges in other States is so high that we really have a ridiculously low figure here. For example, we charge $40 for one particular service, but that same service costs $2 000 or $3 000 interstate. So, that amount has been increased to a figure that is more in line with that in other States. Again, I stress: even that $2 000 or so that we will be charging will go nowhere near getting back the amount of money we will need to expend to provide that service to the industry.

It is reasonable that the honourable member should refer to the delegation of powers, because Parliamentary Counsel has translated my wish to get rid of some of the functions by delegation to people—I certainly intended that only repetitive and minor delegations be involved. However, Parliamentary Counsel has translated that in the widest possible sense so that there is the maximum amount of flexibility to do that later by regulation and, of course, each of those regulations will need to be brought before this House. I can say quite clearly that I intend that only functions of a very minor nature be delegated.

The best example refers not so much to the Petroleum Act as to the Mining Act. However, there are cases where someone is charged $40; in relation to that $40, the docket must turn up on my desk on three separate occasions. If the docket turns up on my desk just once, and if I read through the file and sign it, that is probably more than $40 worth of time. However, because it must turn up three times, there is an ineffective use of a Minister's time, and that should not happen unless things are contained in that docket that warrant its being brought up on more than one occasion. In that regard, I give notice that I intend to introduce similar provisions with regard to the Mining Act under which things should be brought to the Minister's attention for decision only once if the matter is plain sailing: however, if that is not the case, it would come back to the Minister as a matter of course.

Bill read a second time.

In Committee.

Clauses 1 to 3 passed.

Clause 4—'Delegation.'

Mr LEWIS: This clause is a straight out *carte blanche* delegation of power from the Minister to anyone the Minister chooses to nominate. That was not the case previously. The extent to which the Minister could delegate power, albeit too severely restricted, is now not in the least bit restricted. A number of matters for which we believe the Minister should be responsible can now be delegated to someone else. There is plenty of evidence, especially from this Minister, of a Minister, once having been allowed in law to delegate authority, choosing to refuse to accept that authority when something goes wrong in the exercise of it, and not within the purview of this portfolio but within that of forests is a classic example.

It is not appropriate for the Minister to expect and for the House to accept that the Minister can simply delegate all authority and then apportion all blame. In our system the Minister should be ultimately, utterly and totally responsible, regardless of who has been involved. This Government does not accept that, nor does this Minister. Given that that is the case, we place on record our concern about this aspect of the legislation. We believe the day will come when the Minister will choose to say, 'Not my fault: someone else did it.'

The Hon. J.H.C. KLUNDER: I am somewhat disappointed in the honourable member. For him to argue that responsibility stops when power is delegated is absolutely incorrect and, indeed, for him to draw attention to the fact that, in the forestry area things have gone wrong—for which I have accepted full responsibility, including all of the flak that has come from the Opposition, a lot of it very unkind, a lot of it very inaccurate and a lot of it utterly and totally incorrect—is rather unreasonable. I am disappointed that the honourable member has chosen to try to bring it in here.

I have in front of me a preliminary schedule of the kind of delegations that I would want to give, including things such as extending the time for executing the licence by the applicant. If that actually has to come back to the Minister when an applicant is trying to get a licence organised and has some difficulty in doing that, it seems to me it is perfectly reasonable that they would have to go only to the director of the oil and gas division or to the head of the department and not to the Minister and say, 'I am going to have some difficulties. Could I have an extra week to get this in order?' If that has to be a ministerial decision, I am very surprised and, to give the honourable member his dues, I do not think he believes that that should be a ministerial decision either.

Mr Lewis: That is correct.

The Hon. J.H.C. KLUNDER: I have here a list, which I am perfectly happy to table, if the honourable member would like. I would not like the Crown, a future Minister or me, for that matter, to be bound by that list. From time to time there will be other things which we may or may not want to delegate, but this list will at least give the honourable member an indication as to the importance of the kinds of functions that I intend to delegate, and this is indeed the preliminary list that I have asked my officers to draw up for the moment. I table the document.

I hope that that overcomes the honourable member's concern, but I must say that I made an error in my second reading speech when I referred to regulations because, as the honourable member has clearly pointed out, it was possible to do this by straight out publishing in the *Gazette* and, in fact, I was thinking, having talked about the Mining Act, about that regulation situation. The honourable member is right: it will be possible for the Minister to delegate any of the powers or functions by publishing an instrument in the *Gazette*, but I think the honourable member will find that these are only fairly minor items, and that action is taken to make the Minister a more efficient instrument of the Crown, if you like, in that it will be possible for the Minister to spend a great deal more time thinking about what needs to be done as distinct from dealing with what are really quite minor matters.

Mr LEWIS: From the outset let me say that the remarks I wish to make in this instance are in two parts: in the first instance to you, Madam Acting Chair. I take it that the Minister's generous offer to provide that information in the fashion he did, by tabling it, means that it will be incorporated into the record, and I take it that your nodding is an indication to me that the impression I have is correct.

The ACTING CHAIRPERSON (Mrs Hutchison): Yes.

Mr LEWIS: Thank you. And the second part of my inquiry—

The ACTING CHAIRPERSON: I would clarify that: it is tabled, but it will not be inserted in *Hansard.*

Mr LEWIS: May I therefore ask whether the Minister would mind seeking leave, which the Opposition will provide, to have that list inserted as part of the explanation of the clause?

The ACTING CHAIRPERSON: Is it statistical?

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

The ACTING CHAIRPERSON: That can be done only if the list is purely statistical, and it is not.

Mr LEWIS: Thank you for your direction in that regard, Madam Acting Chair. I crave the indulgence of the Minister to simply read it after I sit down, if he would not mind, so that we can then know that he did, indeed, provide a list that indicates the kinds of measures that he would seek to delegate to others in his department. Indeed, I agree with him and have already said that the Opposition has no difficulty with the notion of delegation of those tasks and duties to which he referred in his second reading speech. To quote him precisely, he said:

> The Bill amends the Act to include this provision with the view to speeding the administrative process for matters of a relatively minor nature.

We have no difficulty with that at all. We were merely concerned about the fact that the powers were wider than that, and we are now reassured that the powers, even though the Bill provides for them to be wider, will be exercised not on that widest of possible interpretations of this clause, as it appears in the Bill, but in keeping with the tenor of the examples which the Minister indicates he will be kind enough to read into the record for us.

The Hon. J.H.C. KLUNDER: I am perfectly happy to do that, and I apologise to the House that this will take a little time. I intend to give the information in terms of the section and then the purpose so that the honourable member can marry it quite easily to the Act when he looks at it. I have already mentioned section 10, which extends the time for executing the licence by the applicant. The examples are:

Section 18ab: Approval for operations within a petroleum exploration licence (PEL).

Section 18b (1): Power to request additional information in respect to discovery of petroleum.

Section 18b (2): Approval for disposal of petroleum produced from a PEL.

Section 18d: Power to request statements of accounts relating to exploration expenditure.

Section 35 (4): Power to request statements regarding quantity of petroleum recovered and sold.

Section 35a: Approval and amendment of development plans.

Section 36 (Except 36 (4)): Approval of programs for operations in a petroleum production licence (PPL).

Section 37: Power to request information in respect of PPL.

Section 38: Approval for surrender of a licence.

Section 48: Approval of exploration or production operations under a road or street.

Section 52: Approval of manner of enclosing a site of operations.

Section 55 (1): Requirement of timing of supply of records required by regulations.

Section 59: Permission to drill within 100 metres of the licence boundary.

Section 65: Permission to withdraw casing or reinforcing structure from any well which is proposed to be abandoned.

Section 71: Publication in *Gazette* of the cancellation of a licence.

Section 73: Approval of joint drilling of wells.

Section 80d (2): Approval to carry out survey for proposed route of a pipeline licence (PL).

Section 80e: Requirements to supply further information in respect of PL application.

Section 80f: Power to require PL applicant to provide notice of PL application to other persons.

Section 80m: Approval for extensions or modifications to pipeline.

Section 80p: Power to request additional information in respect to construction or operation of a pipeline.

Section 88: Power to extend time to comply with provisions of the Act.

As the honourable member can see, these are things which the Minister had to do or approve personally in the past. They are all of a relatively minor nature, and I cannot see any reason why that cannot be done within the department at whatever level I decide is appropriate.

The DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: Now that the Minister has read the document into *Hansard*, there is now no need for it to be laid on the table.

Mr LEWIS: Now that I understand those matters, I would like an assurance from the Minister that the fees charged under sections 18a, 18b and 18c are to be imposed not under the statute but by regulation. They will be prescribed from now on. My final question on this matter seeks to ensure that no increases will occur in excess of the CPI at any time since the previous occasion; otherwise, will the Minister say so at the time, rather than simply bringing it in? We note from the schedule, for instance, that section 18c provides that an annual licence fee calculated in accordance with the prescribed scale will be the means by which the fees are determined in the future. I want to be absolutely sure that there is no intention to go beyond the CPI since these were last fixed by statute.

The Hon. J.H.C. KLUNDER: I am not entirely sure whether the honourable member is asking me specifically with reference to section 18 to give an indication that I will not be increasing above the CPI or whether he is asking me to give an indication in general.

Mr Lewis: In general.

The Hon. J.H.C. KLUNDER: To a certain extent, I already covered that in my second reading explanation when, after having listened to the honourable member say that he believed no fees would rise above the CPI, I indicated that some would. The example I gave then was from $40 to $2 000, which should have been from $400 to $2 000, so I am pleased that the honourable member asked the question, so that I can correct that.

There will be some rises above the CPI, and the reason I gave for that during my second reading explanation was that in a number of cases the fees interstate are so very much out of kilter with what we charge here that people come here and wonder why we are charging such low fees. Even with increasing this fee I am talking about from $400 to $2 000, the cost will be well in excess of $2 000 to process that application. We are, in fact, still subsidising the industry.

Clause passed.

Clause 5—'Substitution of section 42.'

New section 42—'Consent to dealing with licence.'

The CHAIRMAN: The Minister has an amendment to new section 43, so I will take the two new sections separately. The question is that new section 42 be agreed to.

Mr LEWIS: We note that, with this substantial change, the Minister now takes unto himself in new section 42 (1) the power to provide consent under much more stringent controls than was the case previously. Section 41 (2), of course, outlines the circumstances in which a licence or an interest in that licence can be mortgaged or otherwise charged without the Minister's approval, and states the conditions. New section 42 (1) provides for the Minister to take control absolutely and agree to allow or to disallow any transfers or other arrangements. The Opposition is curious to understand what has motivated the Minister to provide himself with such powers.

The Hon. J.H.C. KLUNDER: I take it that the honourable member is referring to lines 17 and 18: '... but, once approved it may, if it so provides, take effect from a day antecedent to the date of approval'. I agree that that is an

unusual provision. It is due to the fact that things move fairly rapidly in the petroleum industry and there are windows of opportunity when a petroleum rig happens to be free, and so on. What does not seem to happen quite so rapidly is the lawyers giving legal language to a deal struck between two groups.

So, we reach the situation in which two organisations must very rapidly do something, finish doing whatever it is—one may drill a well for the other, etc.—and their lawyers then take a month to put that into writing to send to the Minister. If they cannot do that until such time as the lawyers' language comes to the Minister, a number of opportunities will pass this State by. I agree with the honourable member. I have somewhat reluctantly indicated that I am prepared to say 'Yea' or 'Nay' and, if I am saying 'Yea', that approval may be given some retrospectivity. I am doing this very much at the request of the industry.

New section 42 agreed to.

New section 43—'Joint operating agreements.'

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

Page 3—

Line 7—After 'does not apply to' insert—

—

(a).

After line 8—Insert new paragraph as follows:

or

(b) a joint operating agreement of which a copy had been lodged with the Director before the commencement of this section.

Mr LEWIS: This change catches me unawares, and I want to examine it precisely. Given that this amendment was distributed earlier, will the Minister explain in some detail exactly what this change to the Bill does, so that all members of the Committee understand why the Minister seeks to change the Bill as he has brought it into the Chamber, albeit on this very day, without there being any opportunity for the Opposition to have considered the change prior to this point? I take it on my own head to judge the veracity of the explanation.

The Hon. J.H.C. KLUNDER: The amendment ensures that agreements currently lodged on the petroleum register do not need to be resubmitted; that is all it is. We were asked to do that by the industry, when its members looked at the Bill. They picked this as a minor point. I accepted that, and we brought it in on that basis.

Amendment carried; new section as amended agreed to.

Clause passed.

Remaining clauses (6 to 13) and title passed.

The Hon. J.H.C. KLUNDER (Minister of Emergency Services): I move:

That this Bill be now read a third time.

Mr LEWIS (Murray-Mallee): The Opposition is reassured by the explanation that the Minister has given us, but let me place on record that I do not appreciate being caught, as I have been, in having thrust upon me a requirement to accept an amendment to a Bill without prior notice of that amendment and without opportunity to clearly understand exactly what effect the amendment will have on the Bill. In this instance it is not too big a deal, but I certainly want the Minister and the Government to understand that it is hardly fair game to do that sort of thing to me or to any other member of the Chamber and expect that we will simply acquiesce. I commend the Bill to the House.

The Hon. J.H.C. KLUNDER (Minister of Mines and Energy): I take the honourable member's point. I could just as easily have indicated that this amendment could be moved by the Government in another place, but it was of such a minor nature that I appreciate the honourable member's indulgence. It does stop the Bill's having to come back to this place.

Bill read a third time and passed.

ADJOURNMENT

At 4.17 p.m. the House adjourned until Tuesday 30 October at 2 p.m.