

HOUSE OF ASSEMBLY

Tuesday 29 October 1991

The **SPEAKER (Hon. N.T. Peterson)** took the Chair at 2 p.m. and read prayers.

PETITIONS: PROSTITUTION

Petitions signed by 205 residents of South Australia requesting that the House urge the Government not to decriminalise prostitution were presented by Messrs De Laine and Meier.

Petitions received.

QUESTIONS

The **SPEAKER**: I direct that written answers to the following questions on the Notice Paper, as detailed in the schedule that I now table, be distributed and printed in *Hansard*: Nos 44, 110, 123 to 125, 127, 178 and 179; and I direct that the following answers to questions without notice and a question asked during the Estimates Committees be distributed and printed in *Hansard*.

RECREATION FOR THE DISABLED

(Estimates Committee A)

In reply to **Mr OSWALD (Morphett)** 26 September.

The **Hon. M.K. MAYES**: I provide the following in response to the honourable member's question:

Forty-one per cent of 1990-91 SARI grants were appropriated to social justice initiatives, which include funding of disabled sports and recreation associations. A total of \$132 636 was provided from SARI specifically to disabled sports and recreation associations in 1990-91. This represents 57 per cent of social justice grants or 24 per cent of the total grants provided from SARI budget in 1990-91. In addition, funding of \$12 500 for the Wheelchair Sports Association was provided from the SASI budget. Applications for grants for 1991-92 are being considered and no firm information of funding levels can be presented at this time.

TRANSPORTION OF LIMESTONE

In reply to **Mr ATKINSON (Spence)** 9 October.

The **Hon. FRANK BLEVINS**: The answer to the first question is 'No'. I am unable to confirm or deny that the Penrice limestone traffic will be carried by road rather than rail next year. However, it is common knowledge that in today's economic climate the majority of manufacturing and business enterprises are attempting to minimise all costs. This includes transport costs. It may be possible that consideration is being given to transporting the limestone from Penrice quarry to Osborne by road, but it is impossible to either confirm or deny that this will occur next year.

The STA does charge AN in the vicinity of \$300 000 per annum for use of its tracks to carry limestone between Gawler Central and Dry Creek and between Rosewater and Glanville under the reciprocal transit rights agreement. This is to cover the additional maintenance required due to the running of AN trains. From AN figures the total tonnage

of limestone carried between Penrice and Osborne was 478 190 tonnes. The State Government does not intend to subsidise the carriage of any traffic on the non-metropolitan rail network.

It is possible that the line from Gawler Central to Lyndoch could become part of the STA's suburban rail network in the future. However, this would be a very high cost means of catering to the public transport needs of the area. Urban rail is best suited for high density corridors when a frequent service is warranted. In lower density areas, like the Barossa Valley area, buses are a more cost-effective solution.

POLICE HEALTH FUND

In reply to **Mrs KOTZ (Newland)** 10 October.

The **Hon. J.H.C. KLUNDER**: In reply to Mrs Kotz's question asked on 10 October 1991, concerning the Police Health Fund, the Minister of Finance has provided me with the following information. For many years the Government has provided a deduction facility from Government payrolls and more recently from the pensions of retired police officers and other public servants. The purposes for which these deductions are made include contributions to health funds, life assurance companies, general insurance companies and insurance brokers. A commission of 3 per cent is charged on the majority of these deductions. A small number of organisations which include the Police Health Fund have not been charged commission. It was considered inappropriate to continue with that arrangement when deductions for other health funds were charged commission. As a result all health benefit deductions now attract 3 per cent commission.

STATE GOVERNMENT INSURANCE COMMISSION

In reply to **Mr MATTHEW (Bright)** 22 October.

The **Hon. J.C. BANNON**: The Treasurer's in-principle approval for SGIC to borrow \$45 million from SAFA and on-lend to the consortium developer of the East End Market was provided on the basis of Treasury advice. Treasury supported the proposal presented by SGIC on the basis that it was consistent with SAFA's function as a central borrowing agency for the public sector, will not impact on global limits usage and was a commercial proposition. While in-principle approval was provided, it should be noted that this transaction did not proceed.

SOUTH AUSTRALIAN GOVERNMENT FINANCING AUTHORITY

In reply to **Mr LEWIS (Murray-Mallee)** 23 October.

The **Hon. J.C. BANNON**: Before answering the specific question raised by the member for Murray-Mallee, it may be useful for me to outline certain financial aspects of the Native Vegetation Management Scheme. Under the provisions of the Native Vegetation Management Act 1985 (now repealed), in cases where land holdings become non-viable as a result of clearance, they may be purchased by the Government. Until 1988, recurrent budget allocations of the Department of Environment and Planning were used to meet the cost of land purchases. This was inappropriate as the purchases were of a capital nature and temporary.

Since 1988, the financial reporting arrangements have been improved significantly by involving SAFA. Essentially,

SAFA purchases properties made non-viable as a result of clearance applications being rejected with interest and other costs being met by the Department of Environment and Planning. Under these arrangements the Department of Environment and Planning recurrent budget allocation meets the 'true cost' of the scheme, which is the holding costs of land purchases (mainly interest on the capital during the period the land is owned by SAFA) and any capital loss of sale of the land.

The details of the arrangements are as follows:

- SAFA purchases properties on the advice of the Department of Environment and Planning.
- The Department of Environment and Planning pays interest to SAFA on the level of funds SAFA has provided to purchase the land.
- Following purchase, properties are available for resale, creating the possibility for adjoining farming landholders to purchase the land and consolidate their holdings.
- On occasions, several adjoining properties have been consolidated to form a national park with a view to protect the local fauna and flora.
- On sale of land held by SAFA, proceeds of the sale are paid to SAFA, and the department pays to SAFA any difference between the proceeds and the original purchase price from Consolidated Account recurrent budget allocations.
- The Department of Lands manages any land purchased by SAFA.

SAMIC

In reply to **Mr S.J. BAKER (Deputy Leader of the Opposition)** 22 October.

The Hon. J.C. BANNON: Mr Stephen Chapman was appointed a commissioner of SGIC on 18 September 1991, and attended his first board meeting on 25 September 1991. The board's decision to divest of the commission's shareholding in SAMIC was made on 22 August. As a consequence, there was no conflict of interest. Mr Gerschwitz is still a shareholder in SAMIC yet resigned as a director of SAMIC on 25 September 1991. Mr Gerschwitz did not take part in the discussion relating to the decision to divest of SAMIC shares.

At 30 June 1991, SAFA land holdings comprised 20 properties covering in excess of 15 000 hectares of uncleared land. The cost of properties held at 30 June 1991 was \$5.4 million. Sections 271 and 272 in the Hundred of Monarto were purchased by SAFA in August 1989 at a cost of \$355 780. The property was valued prior to purchase by the Valuer-General as is the case with all properties purchased under the scheme. The purchase price reflects the Valuer-General's assessment of the property's value if clearance approval had been given (i.e. as if the property were totally usable). The property was sold in February 1991 for \$202 000 with a heritage agreement over 130 hectares of a total area of 228 hectares or 57 per cent of the property. This reduction in usable hectares along with the current decrease in rural land values accounts for the loss incurred in the sale of the property. SAFA received reimbursement in full (\$355 780) during April 1991.

As mentioned earlier, capital losses (or gains) in relation to the operation of the scheme are incurred by the Department of Environment and Planning and funded through recurrent budget allocations from Consolidated Account. Any suggestion that SAFA has lost funds on the sale of the property is totally inaccurate. Full details of land bought and sold by SAFA under the Native Vegetation Manage-

ment Scheme will be collated and sent to the honourable member in the near future.

PAPERS TABLED

The following papers were laid on the table:

- By the Minister of Health (Hon. D.J. Hopgood)—
South Australian Health Commission—Report, 1990-91.
- By the Minister of Agriculture (Hon. Lynn Arnold)—
Meat Hygiene Authority—Report, 1990-91.
- By the Minister of Education (Hon. G.J. Crafter)—
Court Services Department—Report, 1990-91.
Commercial and Private Agents Act 1986—Regulations—Licensing Exemption.
Land Agents, Brokers and Valuers Act 1973—Regulations—Border Agent Exemption.
- By the Minister of Children's Services (Hon. G.J. Crafter)—
Children's Services Office—Report, 1990-91.
- By the Minister of Transport (Hon. Frank Blevins)—
Fees Regulation Act 1927—Regulations—Proof of Age Card.
- By the Minister of Recreation and Sport (Hon. M.K. Mayes)—
Bookmakers Licensing Board—Report, 1990-91.
Greyhound Racing Board—Report, 1990-91.
Racecourses Development Board—Report, 1990-91.
- By the Minister for Environment and Planning (Hon. S.M. Lenehan)—
Coast Protection Board—Report, 1990-91.
Environmental Protection Council—Report, 1990-91.
South Australian Urban Land Trust—Report, 1990-91.
- By the Minister of Water Resources (Hon. S.M. Lenehan)—
Engineering and Water Supply Department—Report, 1990-91.
- By the Minister of Lands (Hon. S.M. Lenehan)—
Auditor-General's Department—Report, 1990-91.
Outback Areas Community Development Trust—Report, 1990-91.
- By the Minister of Emergency Services (Hon. J.H.C. Klunder)—
Country Fire Service—Report, 1990-91.
- By the Minister of Forests (Hon. J.H.C. Klunder)—
Woods and Forests Department—Report, 1990-91.
- By the Minister of Labour (Hon. R.J. Gregory)—
Daylight Saving Act 1971—Regulations—Summer Time.
- By the Minister of Employment and Further Education (Hon. M.D. Rann)—
Corporation By-laws:
City of Mount Gambier:
By-law No. 5—Council Land.
District Council of Strathalbyn:
By-law No. 8—Liquor Consumption.

MINISTERIAL STATEMENT: CAR LPG CONVERSIONS

The Hon. R.J. GREGORY (Minister of Labour): I seek leave to make a statement.

Leave granted.

The Hon. R.J. GREGORY: In the House last week, the member for Hanson raised the issue of car gas conversions and allegations of faulty and unsafe work. In my response, I asked the honourable member to supply me with details regarding the claims to which he was referring. He has done

so and I have handed the details on to the Department of Labour.

In his question, the honourable member indicated that about 127 businesses in this State are licensed to undertake vehicle gas conversions. This is incorrect. There are no companies licensed to carry out such work. Permits to do conversions are issued to those who do the work or supervise it, not to companies or businesses. At present, there are 485 people in South Australia with Department of Labour permits to carry out LPG conversion work. Many of these relate to forklift trucks. There are 181 Class 1 permits enabling people to carry out all classes of gasfitting including car conversions. Before these permits are granted, the workers must have held a Class 2 permit and performed at least three conversions that have been inspected and approved by the Vehicle Engineering Section of the Department of Road Transport. A trade qualification or six years appropriate experience is required to secure a Class 2 permit. Experience with LPG is also required.

The member for Hanson also suggested in his question that, in some way, there was a failure to respond to the concerns about a supplier of faulty car gas conversions raised in a letter sent to me last December. In fact, the complaints made to my office last year, as well as more recent concerns, have been followed up by the Department of Labour. The Office of Fair Trading and the Vehicle Engineering Section of the Department of Road Transport have also had involvement in these issues.

These complaints and other concerns have highlighted the need for changes to the Dangerous Substances Act and its regulations, and the Government is moving to amend the law, as I indicated in my response to the House last week. First, we intend to change the Act to enable the employer or principal of a firm that carries out LPG auto-conversions to be prosecuted and penalised for unsafe conversion work. At present, our only avenue under the law is the prosecution of the worker who has carried out the conversion. Given that these workers are operating under instruction and with the equipment and tools supplied by the employer, some responsibility must rest with the person in charge.

Secondly, the Government intends to place clear responsibilities on those people in charge to ensure equipment used in connection with a dangerous substance, such as LPG, is in a safe condition. They must also ensure that any work done on that equipment is done safely and does not result in an unsafe situation. Failure to do so would be met with a substantial fine or a jail term, or both. It is hoped to introduce these amendments as soon as practicable. They will make it easier for the department to bring—and win—prosecutions against those few people responsible for sub-standard LPG conversions and to penalise them accordingly. In the meantime, the department will work closely with the Department of Road Transport and the Office of Fair Trading to ensure that safety standards are maintained.

I must stress that it is my understanding that the majority of LPG conversions in South Australia are carried out safely, but the industry's reputation has been tarnished by one or two 'sharp operators'. LPG is a safe, economical and efficient way of powering a car. It is quite popular and, given the increasing emphasis on 'value for money' motoring these days, I am sure it will prove even more popular in the future.

QUESTION TIME

TAX REFORM

Mr D.S. BAKER (Leader of the Opposition): At the Special Premiers Conference in Perth, will the Premier support tax reform that will enable the States to give up a substantial proportion of tied and general assistance grants, excluding top-up grants, in exchange for a guaranteed share of Commonwealth revenue?

In the *Advertiser* of 14 May, the Premier said he would 'like to see a fairer and more reliable distribution of revenue raised by the Federal Government through existing taxes rather than imposition of a new tax', but the *News* of 8 October reported the Premier's view that 'the difference between the money raised and money spent by State Governments had to be addressed but income tax changes were not appropriate' even if income tax revenue was shared 'through the Australian Taxation Office'. The Premier's rejection of income tax sharing begs the question what Commonwealth tax base he believes the States should share.

The Hon. J.C. BANNON: I find it very interesting that the Leader of the Opposition asks me this question. My views on this matter have been fairly clearly enunciated: I think, to a certain extent, so have his, although they have been somewhat obscured lately. I would be very interested to hear him on the record.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order!

The Hon. J.C. BANNON: That is quite relevant. At the meeting of Premiers that I convened on Sunday there was, in fact, unanimous rejection of the concept of the States' imposing State income tax. Of course, this was something that the Leader of the Opposition supported. I would like to know whether he is still of that mind; he is certainly on the record as saying that the States should have the right to do that.

Secondly, the States have certainly agreed that we should continue to look at the question of the collection and distribution of revenue in this country. We did not look, nor indeed would I have invited that meeting to look, at the question of equalisation, which is of fundamental importance to a State such as South Australia and which must be kept quite separate from the issue of what the States get from the money raised by the Commonwealth. We want to get a more certain share of that money; we want to ensure that there is at least some possibility of growth in it; and we want to avoid what has been happening recently at the crisis meeting every year on the brink of our making up our own budgets without knowing what we are likely to get.

Therefore, long-term agreements are certainly something I would favour, and some kind of guarantee in relation to what we might get in terms of revenue raised by the Commonwealth is obviously something that has to be pursued as well. But, there is no way that the States should have imposed on them an obligation to set a State income tax, and it would be ludicrous to establish two bureaucracies to raise that.

I am also concerned about differential rates in that situation. What will happen if some States decide they are going to increase taxes and others decide they are going to put them down, and some sort of competition develops? What if the States decide they are going to make extremely generous concessions in some areas to some categories and other States do not? That is not on; that will impede national development and work strongly against the State of South Australia. It is reckless to do otherwise.

On Sunday there was a meeting of Premiers that looked at this matter, and there was also a sort of Liberal love-in

in New South Wales which the Leader attended. It is very interesting his asking me what I stand for and what I will support. At that meeting the fundamental issue being discussed was the consumption tax, which the Leader of the Opposition has supported very loudly indeed. Not only is he in favour of it at the Federal level but also he wants to impose his own State GST. I refer members back to 26 August of this year when the Leader of the Opposition talked about consumption tax rates which could be set by individual States; the States, he said, as an alternative could collect their own income tax. So, we know where he stands. He wants a State income tax and he wants a State consumption tax.

It is very interesting that the Leader of the Opposition at the Federal level, Dr Hewson, had to tell his troops to shut up about this issue. I would be very interested to hear what the Leader of the Opposition in South Australia has to say. He is on the record as being a strong supporter of that general consumption tax, which would be, I think, a disgrace and an imposition on people in South Australia. He is standing up in favour of that, and he wants to extend it to the State level. If he denies that that is his position—and I note that the Leader of the Opposition was not very prominent at this weekend's event; he sort of snuck away when the cameras appeared, I guess, and I can well understand his motives in that—we ought to hear whether or not he has become—

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order!

The Hon. J.C. BANNON:—like the Leader in Victoria, who is regarded as, I think, having become squelchy, as it has been put, in relation to the consumption tax. Let us have a proper debate on this. Is the Leader of the Opposition supporting totally Dr Hewson and his GST and its application here or is he squelchy like the Leader of the Opposition in Victoria? It would be very interesting indeed. I have put my position on the record firmly and decisively; it is about time the Leader did the same.

EMERGENCY HOUSING SERVICES

Mr QUIRKE (Playford): My question is directed to the Minister of Housing and Construction. I understand that the level of demand for emergency housing services is at an all-time high and is increasing daily. Will the Minister explain how the South Australian Housing Trust and the Government are coping with this demand?

The Hon. Jennifer Cashmore: Not very well.

The Hon. M.K. MAYES: The member for Coles has answered for me—but she is wrong, as usual. It is a good message and a good story from the Emergency Housing Office. The position is that through the Emergency Housing Office over the past year we have offered 47 617 people the opportunity of assistance to obtain private tenancies. That compares with 34 000 for the previous year. In relation to the break-up of that, sole parents and sole parent guardians with dependants comprised about 68 per cent of those applications. From the Government's point of view, we have increased by 42 per cent the funding that has been put into this program over the past year. This indicates the high commitment that we have given to and the significance we have placed on assisting applicants for private tenancy throughout the community.

In February this year a decision was taken that we would integrate the Emergency Housing Office into the normal Housing Trust programs within the administration of the Housing Trust. This new community service will improve

the coordination and the service provided to those applicants. In fact, it has been a progressive integration since the end of September this year. In line with that, it is important to record that the response to the recommendations from the Domestic Violence Council report of 1987, in which domestic violence policy and program was implemented, has also been taken in line with this integration.

As from October this year, in partnership with the Department for Family and Community Services, the women's and family shelters, the South Australian Housing Trust regional offices, and all other emergency services, including services for non-English speaking and non-Aboriginal people, we have instituted those recommendations. The program aims to coordinate the provision of housing and welfare services to survivors of domestic violence, to minimise resource duplication and to fast-track access services in order to mitigate the immediate issues that the individuals concerned face, particularly in relation to providing safety, protection and prevention of any further domestic violence.

In 1991, approximately \$215 000 was provided in financial grants to families to assist them to avoid domestic violence. The trust has also committed resources to work on the project to develop a comprehensive housing information service and guide for consumers and human services agencies also in the application of their policies. I think it is a recognition of the level of demand for housing services, both for those people of non-English speaking background and also Aboriginal families, that the trust has made available a number of small dwellings for pool housing programs.

It is critical for people on low incomes that they have that access. I believe that, given our funding and our commitment to this program, the success that we are having in terms of the Emergency Housing Office will again be seen this year with the work that has been achieved in the community, particularly in relation to working with domestic violence. So, I am very pleased to say that the integration is going well and I hope that the service that is provided is in fact seen out there for those people who need that very important service.

ADELAIDE AIR TRAFFIC CONTROL

Mr S.J. BAKER (Deputy Leader of the Opposition): What representations has the Premier made to the Federal Government to ensure that Adelaide's air traffic control is not moved to Melbourne and that both air safety and Adelaide's role as a transport hub are not further compromised by the removal of search and rescue operations from South Australia? The Civil Aviation Authority Officers Association has advised that the Federal authority plans to move the Adelaide air traffic control centre to Melbourne and to control our air space by 'remote control' from Melbourne. I am also advised that moves are afoot to take the air search and rescue operations out of Adelaide, despite Adelaide's central location and proximity to the Orion fleet at Edinburgh airbase.

The Hon. J.C. BANNON: That has been a matter of great concern to the Government. In fact, our original position was that if there was to be a centralisation of such control it could appropriately be done here in Adelaide. In fact, through the Department of Industry, Trade and Technology, we mounted a major submission devoted to just that outcome. When the decision was finally taken, it was taken in favour of this Melbourne location, and the implications for Adelaide traffic control, air sea rescue and so on, were not immediately apparent. Since they have become so, we are taking up the matter through the department,

and the Minister and I would be very happy to talk to the air traffic control group about anything with which it believes we could assist.

SPECIAL DRIVERS LICENCES

Mr ATKINSON (Spence): Will the Minister of Transport advise the House whether he would consider an amendment to the Road Traffic Act to allow very restricted, employment related drivers licences for offenders who suffer disproportionate hardship when they are the subject of a mandatory drivers licence suspension for driving under the influence of alcohol? A constituent of mine was convicted of driving under the influence of alcohol and his licence was suspended for 22 months. When the offence occurred he held a sales job in a country town, and that job necessitated his driving a car. He lost that job and then came to the city, because he says he could not live in the country without driving. He says that all the sales jobs advertised in Adelaide require a drivers licence. He accepts that he deserves to be punished for his offence but feels that for him it is a much heavier burden than for the majority of offenders, whose incomes do not depend on a licence.

The Hon. FRANK BLEVINS: I do have some sympathy for the plight of the member for Spence's constituent. As the honourable member says, some penalty is appropriate for people who offend against the appropriate laws, and it is also a truism that penalties fall differently upon different people: a \$100 fine falls far more heavily, for example, on someone on unemployment benefits than it would on any of us. I am not sure how we get around that. The Attorney-General has indicated that he will consider this proposal. I know the Law Society has approached the Government on it. It does seem to me that in very rare and extreme instances a case could be made out for a provision such as this. I would like to hear the contrary argument for maintaining the *status quo* before I recommend anything to the Government one way or another. Nevertheless, I know that the Attorney-General is having discussions with the various players to determine whether such a provision is appropriate for South Australia. In passing, I advise the member for Spence and the House that I understand that every other State has such a provision.

MULTIFUNCTION POLIS

The Hon. D.C. WOTTON (Heysen): Does the Premier agree that we need the MFP to restore the economic credibility of the State and that firm Australian private sector commitments are required to reverse some of the international damage done by the State Bank disaster and poor project management? At a recent presentation to the Planning Review Resource Group, the head of the Department of Industry, Trade and Technology, Dr Peter Crawford, said that one of the many challenges associated with the establishment of the MFP was the need to restore the economic credibility of the State.

Official Department of Foreign Affairs and Trade documents leaked to the *Financial Review* on Friday indicate concern that the MFP is being managed in a shoddy, Mickey Mouse or Keystone Cops way, which could damage relations with Japan. The Managing Director of the Industrial Bank of Japan has now called for firm MFP investment commitments by Australian companies to ensure that Japanese companies take part in the project.

The Hon. J.C. BANNON: There is no question but that the MFP provides us with a magnificent opportunity to

reassert our standing and significance on the national scene with an international symbol that will have enormous power. It is interesting that the sceptical reaction to it in some quarters in South Australia is a matter of bewilderment to a number of people overseas. I know that the Leader of the Opposition has probably had some first-hand experience of that. Certainly his colleague at the Federal level, Mr McLachlan, who accompanied him on a recent visit—and I think Mr McLachlan went on to Sophia Antipolis—has certainly been impressed, as I understand it, by what he saw being done.

That has been reinforced to me again in the last two or three days when we have had members of the International Advisory Board here, very eminent people of business and finance from Europe, North America and the Asian area who are unanimously saying to us in Australia—I do not think that they need to spread their message too much to the people of South Australia who understand this concept—that it provides us with a unique opportunity in so many ways and that it is a symbol of Australia in the new age, the twenty-first century. I agree with the honourable member that any questions of credibility, of confidence in the future and of our ability to do the job are all very much bound up in the way in which we handle the project.

The honourable member went on to quote some correspondence that was reported in last Friday's *Financial Review*. I would make two comments about that. First, it is an old story. It was a dispute that I believe events have overtaken. It referred particularly to reactions from the Japanese area. Last week, the Australia/Japan Business Cooperation Council met, and the MFP was positively discussed there. Mr Tamaki, from the IBJ, who is a member of our International Advisory Board and also prominently involved in the AJBCC and the leader of the Mitti Investment Mission, which is due to come here in December, has reaffirmed the significance and value of the MFP and the interest in it. That investment mission is a unique opportunity for South Australia. I do not think it is understood that it is the largest specific purpose investment mission of its kind ever assembled in Japan. It comprises some 50 individuals representing more than 20 companies and it is coming in December.

An honourable member interjecting:

The Hon. J.C. BANNON: The honourable member says that it has not achieved anything. This is quite extraordinary. He is making a complete idiot of himself. I say that we are getting the most impressive investment delegation of its kind from Japan in December and the member says that we have not achieved anything. It is staggering, and his colleagues must be severely embarrassed by his performance. Yes, the Leader of the Opposition is severely embarrassed; his bluster indicates it. I am sure that the people to whom he has talked in business, industry and elsewhere know the value of what I am talking about. To get back to this particular item that was quoted—

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order!

The Hon. J.C. BANNON: I agree that the State's credibility is at stake, and we had better make sure that we deliver. I am sure that sensible members opposite know how they can contribute to that process.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order!

The Hon. J.C. BANNON: That interdepartmental spat, if one might call it that, is not very relevant to the mainstream of the project. It was not aimed at South Australia. It was an argument between the Department of Foreign Affairs and Trade and the Department for Industry, Tech-

nology and Commerce at the Federal level. Those matters have been sorted out. Those departments are fully participating, and I think yesterday's meeting—and the members of the board are looking today at further things involving the MFP—has strengthened that process and that association. I look forward to cooperation from the Opposition in helping us to achieve this project.

NATIONAL PARKS AND WILDLIFE SERVICE

Mr HAMILTON (Albert Park): Is the Minister for Environment and Planning aware of criticism levelled periodically against the endangered species program run by the National Parks and Wildlife Service?

The Hon. S.M. LENEHAN: Yes. I am sure that members on both sides of Parliament would be aware of the procession of articles during the past two or three years which have denigrated the National Parks and Wildlife Service and the very worthy programs which the service runs for both the breeding and the reintroduction of rare and threatened species throughout the State. The Liberal Party's own blueprint on conservation, released in May of this year, stated that national parks are not fit places for endangered species to inhabit. Certainly that is not the Government's position, and I believe it is not the position of the vast majority of South Australians. Let us look at the history of this matter.

If we look at the long history of native vegetation clearance in the agricultural areas of South Australia, the parks and reserves have often provided the only means by which threatened species could be saved, and it is to the credit of all Governments, stretching back to the turn of the century, that so many of South Australia's threatened species have been preserved. The National Parks and Wildlife Service's breeding and reintroduction programs have been crucial to the survival and re-establishment of species such as the greater stick nest rat and the bettong. Indeed the National Parks and Wildlife Service has been a major supplier of breeding stock for a number of breeding programs conducted at open range zoos such as Monarto and the Warrawong Sanctuary, as well as providing endangered species to programs in Western Australia.

It is important to put on the public record that the National Parks and Wildlife Service works very closely with some of the private people who are involved in these breeding programs. We provide some of the breeding stock to the private sanctuaries and zoos, as they provide support and information on their breeding programs to the service. I put it to the House that, rather than criticising the service, we should be supporting what it is doing because, in many cases, it has been the only saviour for these rare and endangered species.

STATE SUPPLY DEPARTMENT COURIER SERVICE

Mr INGERSON (Bragg): Will the Premier seek a report on why the State Supply Department went to the expense of using an express courier to send a pencil worth 20c to my electorate office on Friday? On Friday 25 October a package, dispatched a week earlier on 18 October, was delivered to my office by the State Supply Department based at Seaton. When I opened the package with its meticulous, elaborate wrapping, I found it contained one Copperplate 2H school pencil worth 20c, together with an invoice. Since my office had not placed an order for the pencil, I was concerned at how the Government could afford and justify the mindless extravagance of the \$10 courier service.

The Hon. J.C. BANNON: I know nothing about this matter. I will certainly seek a report. I understood that the House of Assembly was responsible for such material, not State Supply, but I will try to obtain a report on the circumstances.

DRUG AND ALCOHOL SERVICES COUNCIL REPORT

Mr McKEE (Gilles): Will the Minister of Health inform the House as to the findings of a report carried out by the Drug and Alcohol Services Council conducted both in relation to school children and the general public?

The Hon. D.J. HOPGOOD: I guess two things are highlighted in the report that I issued earlier today. The first is that it is now clear, given that we have had a number of years to experience what one might call the Cornwall on-the-spot fine legislation in relation to cannabis, that that has had no impact on the use of that drug. I think it is important that that be made clear, because at the time of the introduction of the legislation there were those who claimed that it amounted to, in effect, the decriminalisation of possession for personal use and that it would lead to massive increases in the use of this drug. It is now quite clear that that has not happened and that there have been no significant increases in the use of cannabis.

The second point that comes out of the report is that, if anything, there has been a hardening of the community's attitude against the use of cannabis. This may well relate, in part, to the effectiveness of the National Campaign Against Drug Abuse, a joint campaign of the Commonwealth and State Governments that has operated since the mid 1980s. It is quite clear now that any enthusiasm that might have existed for outright decriminalisation of the use of cannabis has very largely abated. The problems that we continue to face in the health area in relation to drug abuse relate very much to illicit drugs—smoking, alcohol and, to a degree, analgesics and other prescription drugs—and that must remain the central focus of the National Campaign Against Drug Abuse.

BUILDING ACT

Mr MATTHEW (Bright): My question is directed to the Minister of Employment and Further Education. Will the Government take action to ensure that regulation 47 of the Building Act is amended to prevent potential housebreakers from gaining copies of approved house plans from local councils? I recently received a complaint from a constituent after a person obtained a copy of her house plan without her permission or knowledge. Given the massive increase in burglaries and break-ins revealed in the Police Commissioner's report, my constituent was fearful that her chances of being a future victim were increased by this ability for strangers to gain knowledge of her house plans.

The Hon. M.D. RANN: I will seek a report from my colleague the Minister for Local Government Relations in another place.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order!

INGLE FARM SCHOOLS

Mr QUIRKE (Playford): My question is to the Minister of Education. What progress has been made on the refurbishment of Ingle Farm schools?

bishment of the vacated Ingle Farm High School site, and can I advise the community that the three amalgamated Ingle Farm primary schools can expect to be relocated to this site by the beginning of the 1992 school year? As a result of the rationalisation of Ingle Farm schools, it was decided to amalgamate the Para Vista High School and the Ingle Farm High School on the Para Vista site, and the three primary schools were to be amalgamated on a thoroughly refurbished Ingle Farm High School site by 1992.

The Hon. G.J. CRAFTER: I thank the honourable member for his interest in matters relating to my portfolio. A steering group conducted very extensive consultation with communities in the Ingle Farm and Para Vista areas during the latter part of 1989 and throughout 1990. A report was distributed, and I am pleased to say that that report, which recommends the restructuring of the seven primary schools and two secondary schools at those locations, has received wide community support. The report recommends that the Ingle Farm Primary School, the Ingle Farm Central Primary School and the Ingle Heights Primary School be closed, amalgamated and re-located on the site of the former Ingle Farm High School to form the new Ingle Farm Primary School, which will cater for approximately 460 students from reception to year 7.

As a result of that review, I can say also that the Para Vista High School and the Ingle Farm High School were amalgamated earlier this year to form the Valley View High School catering for 700 secondary students. A successful amalgamation of those two schools is under way. Approval has been granted also for approximately \$1.3 million to be expended on the former Ingle Farm High School to facilitate the amalgamation of these three primary schools, and it is anticipated that that work will be completed by the commencement of the 1992 school year.

STATE TRANSPORT AUTHORITY

The Hon. JENNIFER CASHMORE (Coles): Is the Minister of Transport aware that total overtime payments to State Transport Authority employees during the 1990-91 financial year were \$6.22 million, an increase of 14 per cent over the 1989-90 figure of \$5.46 million? Is the Minister further aware that it could be more cost effective to cover the additional 1700 hours overtime per annum through the employment of additional employees at normal rates? If so, why has he not heeded the view of the STA internal audit expressed in a 1 July 1991 memo that 'inefficient work practices continue to exist in the authority' and acted on the advice of the Auditor-General in his 1990 report that 'the greatest potential for direct real savings to the authority is through increased labour efficiency'?

The Hon. FRANK BLEVINS: The question of overtime, and balancing overtime with full-time employees, is always a vexed one. I can assure the honourable member that, if the STA can find savings through employing full-time people as opposed to paying overtime, that is the way it will do it: it does not give people overtime for the sake of their health.

The Hon. Jennifer Cashmore: It has.

The Hon. FRANK BLEVINS: You say that it has, but that does not make it right.

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

The Hon. FRANK BLEVINS: It was very rude not to respond to somebody who speaks to me, Sir. Overtime gives a great deal of flexibility. The STA has several thousand employees and, when people phone in sick and a service

has to be operated, it is quite often better to have somebody come in on overtime than to have somebody standing by just in case. These are managerial decisions that the STA and every other employer has to make every day. In every organisation which employs several thousand people and which is running an operation for at least 16 hours a day, and often longer, seven days a week, there has to be flexibility and overtime. It does not matter whether that is in the private or public sector. I can assure members that, if BHP thought it was cheaper to run the steelworks in Whyalla without paying overtime, it would, but it does not: it maintains flexibility by paying overtime, additional shifts and so on. It is an equation.

However, there is no doubt that the obligation is on any management of any organisation to ensure that any payment, whether it be overtime or for full-time employees, is kept to a minimum. I can assure you, Sir, and the member for Coles that the STA does all it can to ensure that the organisation is run as leanly as possible.

The Hon. Jennifer Cashmore interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order!

The Hon. FRANK BLEVINS: I believe that every organisation, whether public or private, has an obligation, whether to its shareholders or, in this case, to the taxpayer, to run the organisation as leanly as possible. I think that the success of the STA—

Mr D.S. Baker interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order!

The Hon. FRANK BLEVINS: —can be measured by the—

The Hon. Jennifer Cashmore interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order! The Minister is starting to become repetitive in his answer. I would ask him to draw his response to a close.

The Hon. FRANK BLEVINS: —constantly decreasing running costs. The increased costs in the STA relate mainly to the cost of the purchase of new equipment—new trains, buses and so on. Its capital costs are increasing; however, the administrative and operating costs are decreasing and have been decreasing for a number of years, and they will continue to decrease.

GLENELG SEWAGE TREATMENT WORKS

Mr FERGUSON (Henley Beach): I direct my question to the Minister of Water Resources. Does the Government have plans to upgrade the aeration equipment at the Glenelg Sewage Treatment Works to provide the required air flow for a nutrient reduction and to replace the existing outdated power generation equipment, some of which is 50 years old, with modern units which can operate on the digester gas?

The Hon. S.M. LENEHAN: I thank the honourable member for his continued interest in this matter, as indeed is the case particularly with other honourable members who represent electorates along the coastline. Indeed, the Government does have proposals to address the whole question of maintaining and upgrading our sewage treatment works.

The Hon. D.C. Wotton interjecting:

The Hon. S.M. LENEHAN: I am getting to that. If the honourable member would pay me the courtesy of allowing me to explain what the Government is proposing, and indeed allow me to finish my answer, I think he might well find that I am addressing the point to which he alludes, quite rudely by way of interjection. It is of vital importance both from an operational viewpoint and in relation to the need to meet new environmental standards that the Government undertake this work. The Government has pro-

grammed work to install four new aeration compressors and new power generation equipment at Glenelg. The total cost of this work is estimated to be some \$5.25 million. That gives an indication of the seriousness with which this Government seeks to address the issues that have been raised by the honourable member.

It is proposed that four compressors will each have a capacity of 16 000 cubic metres per hour. Three of these units will provide the desired air flow, including that which is required for nutrient reduction. The fourth unit will provide the standby capacity that is needed. The two power generation units will comprise two 650 kilowatt generator sets, able to operate on digester gas, or indeed on natural gas. These proposals will reliably and economically satisfy the aeration, electrical power and digester heating requirements at the Glenelg plant. Indeed, this work has been referred to the Public Works Standing Committee for inquiry and report.

STATE BANK

Mr BRINDAL (Hayward): My question is directed to the Treasurer. Has the Treasurer received advice from the State Bank as to the cost to the Remm project of union bans and other delays and, if so, what was that advice and when was it received?

The Hon. J.C. BANNON: I do not recall advice on that specific point. Obviously, any industrial problems on any large undertaking do cause some cost penalty. Indeed, there was a lot of concern over the course of that project and I think I recall honourable members here urging the Government to take some action to try to get it fixed up, and both myself and my colleague the Minister of Labour did in fact on occasions lend assistance to try to improve the industrial relations on that site. The matter itself is under specific investigation and discussion in the royal commission, and therefore I do not think it is appropriate that I say anything further about it.

AUSTRALIAN NATIONAL

Mrs HUTCHISON (Stuart): Will the Minister of Transport advise the House whether it would be feasible for Australian National's South Australian workshops to do any of the maintenance work on STA rolling stock not able to be handled by the STA itself? On Saturday 26 October I attended a rail conference at Broken Hill, which was also attended by Mr Russell King, Managing Director of Australian National. At that conference Mr King made the statement that AN's South Australian workshops were the most efficient in Australia, and one sector did suggest that some of the STA maintenance work could be done by those workshops.

The Hon. FRANK BLEVINS: I congratulate the member for Stuart and other organisers in the Iron Triangle for the way in which they organised and supported that particular conference.

Mr S.J. Baker: They still haven't got their train service.

The SPEAKER: Order!

The Hon. FRANK BLEVINS: It was the kind of very positive action that will assist greatly the South Australian Government's thrust for the reinstatement of our country rail services. I can understand the frustration of Australian National in some of these areas, in particular in the use of its workshops. There is no question that Australian National runs the best railway in Australia—by far the best. In his

usual childish, infantile, sarcastic way, the member for Mitcham seems to think that is amusing.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order!

The Hon. FRANK BLEVINS: The member for Mitcham, of course, would not know; he would know nothing at all about Australian National, country rail or pretty well, as far as I can make out, anything else.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order!

The Hon. FRANK BLEVINS: I can understand the frustration felt by Australian National. What it has done, particularly over the past five to 10 years, is to upgrade its workshops and practices until it runs what is an efficient and profitable rail service and, in the Australian and indeed the world context, that is something of a miracle. That is what it has done, and it appears that it is in great danger of being subsumed into a national rail corporation where all that hard work may go for nought. Australian National workshops have been a credit to the workers and management concerned. Those railway workshops in South Australia are indeed the most efficient in Australia, without a doubt.

With regard to the question of STA work going to the railway workshops, very small amounts of work could be going there, but I will have to check that out. The STA has its own, excellent workshops. If anybody has visited them, they would have seen that they are first class workshops. The STA overwhelmingly does its own maintenance and repairs. A substantial amount of work, for example the repair of a rail car that has been involved in an accident, goes out to tender; I remember that happening some time ago. I am not sure whether Australian National tendered, but a railway workshop in Victoria did, and won that work on open commercial tender. I think we would all accept that. I will have the STA look to see whether any work can be transferred to Australian National on a commercial basis and to see whether we can assist Australian National to maintain the most competitive railway workshops in Australia.

WORKCOVER

Mrs KOTZ (Newland): Will the Minister of Labour request that the Auditor-General investigate claims that WorkCover has made special secret arrangements to assist the AWU affiliated principals behind the company Occupational Rehabilitation Services to continue as rehabilitation providers, despite WorkCover's claims, following a damning audit report, that ORS was unsuitable and, if the claims are true, will he establish why this occurred?

The Hon. R.J. GREGORY: I will ask the Managing Director of WorkCover to provide me with a report in this matter. It is a decision that is taken by the manager in respect of efficiency of rehabilitation providers. I think that there have been some arrangements to ensure continuity of business so that people who were being rehabilitated were not simply dumped. However, I will get a report for this House as soon as practicable.

HIGHER EDUCATION FUNDING

The Hon. J.P. TRAINER (Walsh): Will the Minister of Employment and Further Education inform the House regarding South Australia's current and proposed share of higher education funding?

The Hon. M.D. RANN: I commend the member for Walsh for his passionate interest in higher education. Certainly, we are most concerned that the Commonwealth is treating South Australia poorly in the area of higher education, particularly in terms of new places. Federal bureaucrats have proposed that South Australia will receive in 1991 to 1993 less than half its population share of new places, or 48 per cent, and less than two-thirds of its population share of capital growth, or 61 per cent, for higher education. The Commonwealth has said that the major reason for South Australia's receiving such a low share of growth for the 1991-93 funding period is that its expected growth in year 12 enrolments and the tertiary age population are well below the national average.

However, it has been drawn to the attention of the Commonwealth by my officers that the data on year 12 enrolments that it is using are deficient. Some of the effects of the treatment that we have received in recent years are: the level of unmet demand in South Australia rose in relative terms in 1991 by more than in any other State except Queensland; for under 20 year olds our relative level of unmet demand is exceeded only by that in Queensland; and the restriction on opportunities continues to depress our rate of transfer from year 12 to higher education.

Certainly I believe that South Australia has been duded by departmental officers from DEET. I welcome the Federal Minister's recent announcement of additional places for 1994 and am concerned that we be treated significantly better in the present round of discussions than in recent years. I have met with the chief executives of the universities in recent times and have also written in the strongest terms to my friend and colleague, Mr Dawkins. In particular, as well as redressing the ill-treatment in relation to undergraduate places, I trust that the Commonwealth will take note of the significant strengths—demonstrated in open competition—of the South Australian university system when allocating higher degree places.

Let us consider some of those strengths. When we go out there in the marketplace and compete equally on the level playing field, South Australian universities perform superbly. To illustrate those strengths, in 1991 our universities have won 11.4 per cent of funding for special research centres and key centres for teaching and research (35.7 per cent above our population share); we have won 10 per cent of research fellowships (19 per cent above our population share); 10.5 per cent of research infrastructure grants (25 per cent above our population share); 11.8 per cent of Australian Research Council grants (40.5 per cent above our population share); and 12.3 per cent of National Health and Medical Research Committee grants (46.4 per cent above our population share). When we are out there competing on merit, South Australia cannot be beaten. I think we have to get the message across to these Federal bureaucrats that we are interested in partnership in higher and further education, not takeovers.

POKER MACHINES LEGISLATION

Mr SUCH (Fisher): My question is directed to the Premier in his capacity as Treasurer. Why has the introduction of poker machines legislation been delayed, when will it be introduced, and what effect will this delay have on budget revenue?

The Hon. FRANK BLEVINS: Legislation has not been delayed. No date was given for the legislation.

An honourable member interjecting:

The Hon. FRANK BLEVINS: It will be introduced when the Government puts it before the Parliament. Whether or

not it has an effect on Government revenue will depend very much on when it is introduced.

HINDMARSH STADIUM

Mr ATKINSON (Spence): Will the Minister of Recreation and Sport say how much support the State Government has given the Soccer Federation to upgrade the Hindmarsh Stadium; and will this support allow Hindmarsh Stadium to be the venue for more international soccer matches?

The Hon. M.K. MAYES: It is important that we see the Hindmarsh Stadium's upgrading not only as regards the standard of facilities for the national league but to enhance our opportunity to host international events. In particular, we are keen to see the World Youth Cup, which is programmed for March 1993, being part of the program hosted at Hindmarsh Stadium. Members will recall that I reported to the House previously that the Government had committed \$925 000 to upgrading the lighting at Hindmarsh. That has been successfully completed, and we have now embarked on the second stage, which is to upgrade all the training facilities, changerooms, VIP areas and some of the facilities connected with the stand on the western side of the ground.

The total cost of the project will be \$735 000. To date we have committed \$425 000 for the upgrading of the changerooms and media facilities. Additional funds will be allocated to upgrade the kiosk area and to provide extra seating on the eastern side of the stadium. That is expected to be completed in the first half of the next financial year. The estimated cost of that is \$400 000. We believe that this will meet FIFA standards and allow us to successfully participate in the 1993 Youth World Cup which obviously will be quite a fillip for us in terms of having the facilities with which we can promote South Australia as a host for international standard sporting events.

I am pleased to be able to report to the honourable member that things are on track. We expect the upgrading of the VIP and media facilities to be completed early next month, and that will allow work to commence on the second stage of upgrading of the stadium in the new year.

GRAND PRIX

Mr OSWALD (Morphett): My question is directed to the Premier. Will the Grand Prix be televised in Adelaide this year?

The Hon. J.C. BANNON: The final decision is never taken until fairly late in the week, until there is some idea of how bookings are going. My advice at the moment is that general admission bookings have been going very well indeed. If it was not for the reduction in—

Mr D.S. Baker interjecting:

The Hon. J.C. BANNON: The Leader of the Opposition laughs derisively as if he is suggesting that he is unhappy about that fact, or is he—

Mr D.S. Baker interjecting:

The Hon. J.C. BANNON: It seems very odd that we get derisive laughter when I say that there has been a terrific response to the Grand Prix. In fact, it is South Australia's premier tourist attraction; it is the event that gives us the highest visibility of anything around the world; it involves something like \$40 million worth of expenditure value to us. Therefore, its success is very important. To laugh derisively when it is suggested that it is successful seems an extraordinary reaction from the Leader of the Opposition, and he ought to be ashamed of it.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order!

The Hon. J.C. BANNON: Corporate support clearly is down in the current climate. Some of those companies which took major corporate platforms in past years have either gone out of business or have decided that it is not appropriate. Many of those opportunities have been repackaged and, as was the case last year, there has been a very good response to that. We will certainly try to maintain that.

Mr D.S. Baker interjecting:

The Hon. J.C. BANNON: In relation to unemployment, as the Leader of the Opposition interjects again, the fact is that the Grand Prix provides very considerable employment in this State, involving not only jobs that go on through the year but a very large component of part-time work around the event itself. That is very valuable in the present climate and, through its identity, its pulling power, its image and the way in which we stage it, it is a very marketable commodity for South Australia.

SALVATION JANE ERADICATION

The Hon. T.H. HEMMINGS (Napier): Can the Minister of Agriculture advise the House of the progress of the moth released to control salvation Jane?

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order!

The Hon. T.H. HEMMINGS: For the third consecutive year I have been approached by farmers in my electorate who are grappling with the problem of salvation Jane in their paddocks, requesting information on current programs to eliminate this wretched plant.

The Hon. LYNN ARNOLD: I thank the honourable member for this very important question. Along with many others in this House, I guess I have to declare an interest as a hay fever sufferer, so I am particularly pleased to see that we are making progress in eradicating this plant in some areas of the State. It might be felt that that progress is not quick enough—and I suppose that is a valid point—but if one looks at the spread of salvation Jane over the whole State, it will be seen that there is still a lot to get. The program only started in 1989 with two releases of the moth *Dialectica scalarisella*. In 1990 there were further releases in the South-East, the Eyre Peninsula, the Adelaide Hills, the Adelaide Plains and the Mid-North; in 1991, a further release was made in the South-East; and this year a new strain has been released at Narridy.

It appears from sighting and identification of these moths that they have become somewhat established in the Adelaide Plains and Hills areas extending to the Lower North, the Riverland and the Murray-Mallee. For reasons that are not clear, it appears that they have not become established in the South-East, on Kangaroo Island or Eyre Peninsula despite a number of releases in those areas. We will have to examine the causes, and further releases will be considered. This moth is the first of eight insects planned for release which it is believed may be able to control salvation Jane over a wide area, but at this stage the breeding of other organisms is not being proceeded with while we concentrate on the moth. One of the reasons for this is that some of the species have a particularly long breeding time, and breeding in laboratory circumstances is somewhat difficult particularly with respect to the root-boring beetle.

The moth that has been released chews away the insides of salvation Jane leaves and forms tunnels and blisters, eventually killing the plant. It is a bit early to say what its

success will be, but we are confident that there will be some reduction in salvation Jane plants in the years ahead, certainly in the moister areas of the State, such as the Adelaide Hills and Plains and farther south. Regarding insects that might be used in the drier areas, we are not yet certain which insects might successfully cope. As a hay fever sufferer, I am certainly pleased that some progress is being made. I know that some apiarists are a little concerned and may be a touch less pleased about this, but nevertheless the farmers in the honourable member's and my electorates are certainly very pleased to know that some progress is being made.

PAGET'S DISEASE

Mr S.G. EVANS (Davenport): If the Minister of Health has not already done so, will he investigate the possible link between distemper in dogs and bone disease in humans? Research carried out by a team of doctors in north-west England has found evidence that many sufferers of the common and frequently fatal Paget's bone disease have been exposed to a dog suffering from canine distemper. Bearing in mind that thousands of dogs die or are put down as a result of distemper every year in South Australia, the matter is clearly of great relevance to health authorities and also to members of the community in this State.

The Hon. D.J. HOPGOOD: I cannot throw any light on this matter immediately. I recall once being warned as a chemistry teacher that mercury poisoning had some of the symptoms of distemper in dogs. Whether or not that throws any light on the question, I do not know, but I think not. I will certainly get a report for the honourable member and the House.

EXCISE EXEMPTIONS

Mr QUIRKE (Playford): Will the Minister of Mines and Energy say whether it has been possible to gain any assurances from the Commonwealth in relation to the continued exemption of alternative fuels, mainly LPG and CNG, from excise charges? I am aware that the Minister announced in August that the Special Premiers Conference in July had agreed that road use charges would not be applied to alternative fuels at that time. However, that left unanswered the question of a possible future excise charge on their use, and this has caused concern among people considering the conversion of their vehicles to LPG use, in particular.

The Hon. J.H.C. KLUNDER: Subsequent to my announcement in August the Prime Minister wrote to the Premier confirming the Premiers Conference decision in relation to not applying road use charges to alternative fuels. However, the Prime Minister's letter actually went further than the August announcement, and he said:

No review aimed at changing the current excise exemption of alternative fuels is planned or envisaged by the Commonwealth Government.

That is the most positive and authoritative statement made on this issue since the early 1980s, and it is a very gratifying response to the submission made to the Prime Minister prior to the Premiers Conference. It is excellent news for the environment in South Australia and, indeed, everywhere in Australia.

It had become clear, prior to the Premiers Conference, that uncertainties in relation to the application of Commonwealth charges were having a detrimental effect on the number of conversions that were being undertaken in South Australia—they had dropped by very considerable percent-

ages—and the industry was coming very close to a standstill. In addition, it was felt that the possible introduction of such charges would threaten the economic advantages and environmental benefits to be gained from converting South Australia's metropolitan bus fleet to compressed natural gas. These decisions are welcomed by the South Australian Government, which continues to strongly support the greater use of LPG and CNG as transport fuels, and they will certainly be welcomed by the industry and the people of South Australia generally for both their environmental and import/export implications.

GRIEVANCE DEBATE

The SPEAKER: I pose the question that the House note grievances.

Mr D.S. BAKER (Leader of the Opposition): I asked a question of the Premier today, and it was very simple: what is he going to do at the Special Premiers Conference about tax reform, and was he going to try to look at a sensible proposition to get rid of some of the tied and untied grants to enable some general tax sharing? The Premier got up and, because he knows he is in a corner, fudged for about two minutes. Then he started to attack us. So, in the few minutes I have, I will reiterate what our stance really is. Our stance was put—

An honourable member interjecting:

Mr D.S. BAKER: Of course he walked out, because he does not understand financial matters. I do not blame his being so embarrassed about what he has done to South Australia that he should leave this Chamber. The only unfortunate thing is that he will come back tomorrow when he should be resigning. In the *Advertiser* of 20 October 1990 it was made very clear what the Liberal Party thought on the matter. In part, the article states:

In an Opposition discussion paper on Commonwealth-State financial relations released today, Mr Baker says income tax would be a key way of ensuring there was an incentive for State and Federal Governments to increase their efficiency and reduce the overall tax burden.

This is on 20 October 1990, well before the Premiers Conference that the Premier attended that year. He pooh-pooed the idea then and started talking about additional taxes and getting rid of top-up grants and all that rubbish. The proposal was not for any additional tax whatsoever; it was for a more sensible tax fixing system that would enable the States to further budget forward in relation to how they ran their economy.

Today the Premier stood up and said, 'Yes, we want to budget forward.' We asked him what he would do about it, and he keeps running away from it. On Sunday, we had the charade of the State Premiers coming to Adelaide to discuss how they were going to gang up against the Feds. The Premier has not told us what went on, but there have been a few leaks. The *Financial Review* of Monday 28 October states:

Although they were not able to agree yesterday on the form additional State revenue powers should take, they agreed unanimously that it was a crucial issue which had to be dealt with.

Now the Premier is telling us that he does not want to discuss any of that when he goes to the Premiers Conference later in the year, that he just wants to talk about jobs. I notice that the Premier of Queensland, who talked about it quite sensibly in the *Advertiser* of 28 October said:

... some form of possible access to growth revenue is very much on the agenda ... but the details are yet to be worked out.

He went on to say:

What we're looking for is not extra revenue from the States, but a trade-off whereby we give up a substantial portion of the general assistance grants in exchange for a guaranteed share of Commonwealth revenue.

That is why the Premier of South Australia is now in a corner. The majority of Premiers from around the country concede that in running their States efficiently they have to be able to tax forward in the next three or four years. The only way they will be able to do that is to have a guaranteed share of income tax that is gathered by the Federal Government so that they know what they are getting.

Two years ago we had a great charade when the Premier went cap in hand to Canberra. When he returned, he bleated to us that he had received about \$150 million less from the Federal Government but, when we dissected the figures during the parliamentary budget debate, we proved to the House that in fact he had received more. This is the sort of hypocrisy that has gone on with respect to the financial relationship between the Commonwealth and the States over many years, and it has allowed the Premier to be not accountable to the people of South Australia.

An honourable member: Misreporting to the House.

Mr D.S. BAKER: As the honourable member said, it is misreporting to the House. Sensible tax sharing, if transferred to the States, would mean that the Premier would have to come back to this State and tell us exactly what is going on. He would know how much money he would be getting and he could budget accordingly and, as a result he would be more accountable to the people of South Australia. With the nonsense that has gone on in the past he has misled not only this House but also the taxpayers of South Australia as to our true position. He has been painted into a corner. The other Premiers in Australia do not agree with him—

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

Mrs HUTCHISON (Stuart): In the few minutes that I have available I would like to speak about recent changes to payroll tax, which were part of the budget brought down by the South Australian Government, and draw some comparisons with the other States. In South Australia the changes to the payroll tax structure are estimated to provide tax relief equivalent to \$13.5 million in a full year. This means that a company with a \$1 million payroll will pay \$2 316 less tax in a full year after the changes are implemented compared with its current position, and that is a reduction in tax of about 6.5 per cent. Tax on a \$5 million payroll will fall by \$8 316, while tax on a \$10 million payroll will be down by \$15 816. If we look at that in proportionate terms, we will see that the changes are relatively more beneficial for smaller businesses. For example, the tax reduction on a \$1 million payroll is 6.5 per cent, compared with a reduction of 2.6 per cent on a payroll of \$10 million.

If we look at the New South Wales and Victorian payroll tax structures as a benchmark (and I believe that the New South Wales and Victorian payroll tax structures will be similar by the end of 1991-92), South Australia's comparative position has improved significantly for all company payroll levels greater than about \$800 000. For example, in South Australia the tax on a \$1 million payroll will be \$1 816 or 5.2 per cent lower than in both New South Wales and Victoria. For a \$2 million payroll it will be \$10 816 or 10.3 per cent lower than in New South Wales, which has always been quoted to us by members opposite. For a \$5 million payroll it will be \$37 816 or 12 per cent lower than in New South Wales and Victoria. I hope that members opposite are listening to these figures. For a \$10 million

payroll it will be \$82 816 or 12.5 per cent lower than in New South Wales and Victoria.

If we take the annual cost of an extra employee, which is assumed to be the equivalent of the most recently available June quarter figures 1991, national average total weekly earnings estimate from the Australian Bureau of Statistics, we see that this saving in payroll tax on a \$10 million payroll will allow that company to employ three extra people, compared with the same company in New South Wales or Victoria. I suggest to the House that that is something we should be aiming for because, after all, unemployment is one of the single biggest factors in this State at the moment and is causing a lot of concern to all our constituents. I am sure that applies to members opposite, but one would not think so, given their interjections.

Similarly, assuming that the average total weekly earnings represent an approximation of the average cost of employment, the estimated \$13.5 million of tax relief in this budget by the State Government equates to hundreds of extra jobs in existing businesses. This is without taking into account the increased incentive for new business to locate in Adelaide, given the lower payroll tax than in the two main eastern States. After all, we are trying to be competitive and to encourage people to locate in this State in order that we can get job creation programs going. This proves the Government's *bona fides* in the area of small business and business generally, as well as in the area of employment creation. I believe it highlights so much of the hypocrisy of members opposite when they are speaking about these matters. They could have obtained these figures as easily as I did with regard to the effect of payroll tax changes in the State Government's budget, but it appears that none of them bothered to do so.

The SPEAKER: Order! The honourable member's time has expired. Before calling the honourable member for Coles, I ask for the attention of the member for Murray-Mallee and the member for Heysen.

The Hon. JENNIFER CASHMORE (Coles): This afternoon the Minister of Transport gave what I regard as a totally unsatisfactory reply to a question I asked about excessive overtime payments by the State Transport Authority. I asked that question basing it on a memo from the Manager, Internal Audit of the State Transport Authority, dated 1 July this year and headed 'Overtime—1990-91

Financial Year', and the distribution of that memo was to the General Manager and to a number of other senior staff of the authority. The key sentence in the memo is that the total overtime payments to employees during the last financial year was \$6.22 million. This is an increase of 14 per cent on the previous year's figure of \$5.46 million. The increase in the amount of overtime payments, says the Manager, Internal Audit, is 'disappointing and may suggest that inefficient work practices continue to exist in the authority'.

The Minister of Transport said that, no, that was not the case, that administrative and operating costs within the authority were decreasing. Reference to page 473 of the Auditor-General's Report of June this year indicates that the reverse is the case. The cost of traffic operations is up, the cost of administration and general expenses is up, the cost of fuel, oil and power is up—admittedly, the STA has no control over those components—interest on leases is down, interest on borrowings is down, and the net cost of providing services before extraordinary items is marginally down, but the South Australian Government contribution towards the cost of providing services is up substantially by \$3.2 million. It is clear from a full reading of that internal memo that it is possible that that amount could have been saved had the STA and the Minister who administers it taken note of the report of the Auditor-General for the previous year, in which he said that labour practices were the most likely area in which the STA could save money.

If one looks at the addendum to the memo, one sees that some employees are earning as much as \$20 000 a year in overtime. Seven employees, all of them mechanical tradespersons, are earning more than \$10 000 in overtime—well over \$10 000. A depot supervisor—

The Hon. Ted Chapman: Are you able to incorporate the figures?

The Hon. JENNIFER CASHMORE: I could do that. A depot supervisor is earning \$13 532.22 and an electrical signals tradesperson is earning \$20 042.66—in effect, a decent wage for another person who, if not working at an overtime rate, would undoubtedly, in the case of permanent part-time work, be earning perhaps half that amount. Mr Speaker, I seek leave to have inserted in *Hansard* a table, which I assure the House is purely statistical.

Leave granted.

EMPLOYEES WITH THE HIGHEST INCIDENCE OF OVERTIME
1990-91 FINANCIAL YEAR

| | | | Hours worked | \$ |
|--------------------------|----------------|------------------------------------|-----------------|-----------|
| TRAIN OPERATIONS | | | | |
| D4342 | Slater, I. | Depot Coordinator Sub Train Driver | 240.10 | 7 950.88 |
| D4259 | Hodges, G | Depot Coordinator Sub Train Driver | 251.13 | 7 751.67 |
| BUS OPERATIONS | | | | |
| T6893 | Curnow, P. | Operator Class 7 | 293.19 | 7 000.48 |
| T1172 | Dickson, J. | Operator Class 7 | 280.24 | 6 604.90 |
| FLEET ENGINEERING | | | | |
| L/Serv | Ferguson, J. | Depot Supervisor | 436.20 | 13 532.22 |
| L/Serv | Vassallo, T. | Depot Supervisor | 292.00 | 9 428.06 |
| E5610 | Thompson, S. | Electrician Special Class | 446.27 | 8 767.43 |
| E5604 | Tyler, A. | Electrician Special Class | 363.54 | 7 563.69 |
| S1551 | Frick, R. | Depot Supervisor | 230.08 | 6 794.39 |
| WORKSHOPS, RAILCAR DEPOT | | | | |
| M7002 | Beckmann, A. | Mechanical Tradesperson | 452.11 | 10 911.27 |
| M7030 | Muth, R. | Mechanical Tradesperson | 449.26 | 10 877.60 |
| M7060 | Spicer, W. | Mechanical Tradesperson | 434.00 | 10 509.90 |
| M7024 | Metzenrath, J. | Mechanical Tradesperson | 425.03 | 10 409.01 |
| M7026 | Jones, A. | Mechanical Tradesperson | 419.40 | 10 309.21 |
| M7012 | Laube, M. | Mechanical Tradesperson | 415.52 | 10 012.52 |
| M7028 | Moore, T. | Mechanical Tradesperson | 411.11 | 10 005.28 |
| M7418 | Flaherty, T. | Fitter (Electrician Special Class) | 379.38 | 9 396.94 |
| M7402 | Fleming, D. | Fitter (Electrician Special Class) | 346.26 | 8 363.81 |
| M7414 | Heffernan, M. | Fitter (Electrician Special Class) | 335.11 | 8 285.04 |

| | | | Hours worked | \$ |
|--------------------------------|----------------|---|-----------------|-----------|
| M7401 | Bugg, M. | Fitter (Electrician Special Class) | 331.11 | 8 145.07 |
| S7308 | Dunk, M. | Shift Supervisor | 271.11 | 8 016.15 |
| M7412 | Morony, J. | Fitter (Electrician Special Class) | 321.51 | 7 999.71 |
| M7428 | Torode, M. | Fitter (Electrician Special Class) | 311.29 | 7 918.37 |
| S7310 | Mielke, S. | Shift Supervisor | 255.33 | 7 883.07 |
| M7056 | Jaensch, C. | Mechanical Tradesperson | 303.47 | 7 265.71 |
| S7304 | Benson, K. | Shift Supervisor | 234.18 | 6 940.65 |
| M7426 | Foster, H. | Fitter (Electrician Special Class) | 273.38 | 6 706.74 |
| M7014 | Hughes, R. | Mechanical Tradesperson | 271.57 | 6 685.38 |
| M7006 | Carmody | Mechanical Tradesperson | 239.42 | 6 616.49 |
| M7851 | Barnes, G. | Carriage Builder | 280.03 | 6 584.23 |
| WORKSHOPS, REGENCY PARK | | | | |
| E2500 | Ide, P. | Leading Hand Vehicle Builder/Repairer Special Class | 275.13 | 7 179.05 |
| ENGINEERING FACILITIES | | | | |
| S6830 | Thomson, N. | Environmental Officer | 212.30 | 7 123.54 |
| NETWORK MAINTENANCE | | | | |
| S6914 | Maple, M. | Costing Assistant | 376.56 | 9 644.18 |
| R6504 | Green, C. | Electrical Signals Tradesperson | 701.54 | 20 042.66 |
| S6601 | Lang, I. | Signals Supervisor Electrical | 254.36 | 9 092.25 |
| R6566 | Hatzilakis, E. | Leading Hand Cable Joiner | 440.59 | 9 053.97 |
| R6508 | Kodele, B. | Electrician Special Class | 274.22 | 8 415.37 |
| R6506 | Melis, J. | Electrical Signals Tradesperson | 246.54 | 8 271.99 |
| R6536 | Smith, B. | Electrical Signals Tradesperson | 258.36 | 8 271.91 |
| R6560 | Larcombe, T. | Electrical Signals Tradesperson | 243.18 | 7 995.85 |
| R6538 | Runeckles, P. | Electrical Signals Tradesperson | 240.54 | 7 973.10 |
| R6520 | Moyle, D. | Signals Maintenance Electrician | 264.12 | 7 969.09 |
| R6509 | Davies, W. | Electrician Special Class | 266.24 | 7 958.94 |
| R6570 | Bryant, A. | Cable Joiner | 377.54 | 7 865.73 |
| R6576 | Gouskos, D. | Cable Joiner | 397.54 | 7 784.88 |
| R6534 | Groves, K. | Electrical Signals Tradesperson | 229.12 | 7 543.62 |
| R6526 | Bockman, R. | Electrical Signals Tradesperson | 197.42 | 7 482.03 |
| R6532 | Crook, P. | Signals Maintenance Electrician | 314.51 | 7 322.33 |
| R6507 | Smith, M. | Electrician Special Class | 234.48 | 7 188.67 |
| R6500 | Robertson, W. | Leading Hand Electrical Tradesperson | 211.54 | 6 716.31 |
| R6640 | Shearing, G. | Leading Hand Signals Maintenance Fitter | 251.37 | 6 628.65 |
| S6954 | Flynn, M. | Communications Supervisor | 447.30 | 14 485.12 |
| R5810 | Srpek, S. | Electronic Tradesperson Grade 2 | 452.00 | 13 283.13 |
| R5836 | Iona, J. | Electronic Tradesperson Grade 2 | 381.30 | 10 618.59 |
| S6956 | Parasram, R. | Technical Officer | 329.30 | 9 786.05 |
| R5820 | Bugg, D. | Electronic Tradesperson Grade 2 | 335.30 | 9 222.15 |
| R5818 | Spinelli, A. | Electronic Tradesperson Grade 2 | 316.30 | 8 712.20 |
| R5822 | McDonald, P. | Electronic Tradesperson Grade 2 | 313.30 | 8 192.32 |
| R5814 | Svanborg, G. | Electronic Tradesperson Grade 2 | 298.30 | 7 955.74 |
| R5830 | Sproule, D. | Electronic Tradesperson Grade 2 | 286.00 | 7 860.12 |
| R5802 | Cullinane, A. | Leading Hand Electronic Tradesperson Grade 2 | 259.30 | 7 456.68 |
| S6612 | Laing, D. | Electrical Projects Supervisor | 475.06 | 16 074.81 |
| R4664 | Boxer, J. | Senior Trackworker Class 2 | 533.00 | 9 688.87 |
| R4814 | Frith, J. | Trackmaster Class 3 | 388.10 | 9 609.74 |
| S6409 | Burton, D. | Redeployee | 276.00 | 9 300.85 |
| R5106 | Heinen, A. | Trackmaster Class 3 | 314.15 | 9 065.51 |
| R4626 | Whitrod, L. | Trackmaster Class 3 | 343.40 | 8 838.79 |
| R4902 | Hill, D. | Machine/Plant/Vehicle Operator Class 3 | 381.59 | 8 386.92 |
| R4618 | Papai, J. | Machine/Plant/Vehicle Operator Class 3 | 393.05 | 7 478.72 |
| S6826 | Thiele, R. | Technical Officer | 272.00 | 7 306.50 |
| S6838 | Edmead, D. | Technical Officer | 221.45 | 6 989.79 |
| S6828 | Schweiger, R. | Senior Technical Officer | 201.00 | 6 952.43 |
| ENGINEERING PROJECTS | | | | |
| S6914 | Moule, R. | Building Maintenance Supervisor | 346.26 | 8 363.81 |
| SUPPLY | | | | |
| E0026 | Ball, E. | Oil Tanker Driver | 607.30 | 11 229.55 |
| PERSONNEL | | | | |
| S5156 | Barry, J. | Payroll Clerk | 331.00 | 9 239.83 |
| S5152 | Kessell, P. | Assistant Payroll Supervisor | 260.45 | 8 537.12 |
| S5151 | Lea, D. | Payroll Supervisor | 255.30 | 8 101.18 |

The Hon. JENNIFER CASHMORE: This indicates the colossal mismanagement that is currently the responsibility of the State Transport Authority in terms of work practices, which certainly should be altered. I shall give an idea of how that money could be used. I am not suggesting that the whole \$6 million could be saved, because obviously some overtime is essential and, even if permanent part-time employees were engaged to undertake some of this work more effectively, there would still be an additional cost. It may be, as I say, that \$3.2 million, which was the increase in the State Government's deficit funding last year, could be totally met by improved work practices. However, I would like to suggest that \$6 million is the price of three

Bluebird motorised railcars, two of which would re-establish a service from Adelaide to Mount Gambier—a much needed service.

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

Mr M.J. EVANS (Elizabeth): I wish to raise the issue of the glacial progress of the self-defence committee's report. The outcome of the select committee of this House some 12 months ago was a report which recommended to the Parliament that we should enact a significant reform of the common law in relation to the law of self-defence, to ensure that, where individual citizens were the victims of crime,

where they were the victims of housebreaking, where they found their person or their property under threat, they should be able to take adequate steps to defend themselves. The select committee met over a significant period of time and called for evidence from a wide range of people in the community. There was a very positive response to the work of the select committee, and quite a number of people gave some very substantial and well-informed submissions.

The committee, of course, was an all-Party committee of this House, and members of the committee worked extremely well to produce the final outcome of the report, which I think reflected well, if I can say so myself as a member of the committee, on all those concerned.

Mr Brindal interjecting:

Mr M.J. EVANS: Well, I will, because I think it is true, and I think the truth should always come out in this place, as I am sure the member for Hayward would agree. The report of the committee was then acted upon with a reasonable degree of promptness by the Government, and I congratulate the Attorney on that. It was only a matter of a few months before the Bill was before this House. In fact, of course, after some debate in this place it passed through this Chamber, in the last session of Parliament, with the support of, I believe it is correct to say, all members, although some members expressed some concerns about individual words in parts of the Bill. However, there was no doubt that there was almost total agreement in this Chamber as to the need to reform the law of self-defence.

Indeed, the matter was the subject of considerable controversy at the last election, and I think that the outcome of the select committee was a very positive one, based on that controversy. Unfortunately, that is where the good side of the story starts to grind to a halt. The Bill was introduced into another place on 10 April this year, and as might reasonably be expected it made very little progress in the short period which was left in that session.

Mr Brindal interjecting:

Mr M.J. EVANS: Yes. One might have expected that over the winter break people would have studied the legislation and, if necessary, come to some agreement about what reform might be needed of it, if any. I would take the view myself that indeed the Bill as it left this Chamber very adequately expressed the views of the committee, and I thought it was a substantial and useful reform. But I am sure that it is not above improvement and if indeed there is some way of improving the Bill I am sure that this House would be pleased to know of it and that our colleagues in another place are often well placed to put forward such amendments.

Unfortunately, very little progress has been made in that regard. The Bill has recently been read a second time but, whilst most members support the concept behind the Bill, there does appear to be very little prospect in the immediate future that it will become law, because there are agreements and disagreements about individual words in the Bill.

I would like to commend to all members of this Parliament—not only of this House but also of the other place—and, indeed, to the public that the reform of this law is now somewhat overdue. Members of Parliament placed their credibility on the line in assuring the public following the select committee's report that indeed Parliament was concerned about this topic and that it would take action on the matter. The House of Assembly has taken action and the rest of the Parliament must now give the matter urgent consideration to ensure that the public can have the reform which is so greatly required and indeed which many people in the electorates I and other members represent are now very concerned to see enacted into law. The delay has now

become significant and I believe it is most important that we all use our best offices and efforts to ensure that this Bill does receive speedy consideration. It is a very brief Bill, but it is most important and I hope that the intervening period since 10 April is enough to allow all concerned to study it. By all means, let us improve it, but let us do it soon.

The Hon. TED CHAPMAN (Alexandra): I want to raise a couple of matters in this brief grievance debate. First, I appreciate the change in Sessional Orders that has enabled six members of this Chamber to speak for five minutes after each day's Question Time. I am just a little concerned about the report that came from Randall Ashbourne last Sunday, I think, criticising yet again the procedures of this Chamber and in particular this change to Sessional Orders. I do not really think he acknowledges or understands the importance placed on a member to raise from time to time matters, admittedly parochial but of local concern to one's constituents, in the Chamber. What does concern me about the new system is the continued practice of some members to read their speeches. When I came into Parliament I was told that, other than the use of cursory notes, statistical detail or (where necessary) a quote, the reading of speeches was contrary to Standing Orders.

Whether or not that is true, as a matter of longstanding practice my colleagues of that era and I were urged not to indulge in such practices, but I have seen, even in this five minute period, some members reading from a totally prepared speech. I would think that, with all respect to your situation, Sir, some encouragement ought to be signalled to those people to abandon that practice, because it will grow on them and they will become dependent on those pieces of paper for comfort each time they get on their feet, whether it be in this place or in the public arena. It is in the interests of all members at least to try to address the Parliament on the subject of their concern without such readings.

In the short period available to me on this occasion I want to raise but one local issue. Twice last week I drew to the attention of members the fact that lightning had struck on the western sector of Kangaroo Island and that a fire was out of control in Flinders Chase. I was under the impression from reports at the time (that is, later last week) that that fire had been brought under control at great expense. I was told subsequently that that expense amounted to some \$250 000 to the Government—a ridiculous waste of money if ever there was one.

I am told today by local farmers that that fire was not put out properly after all and that, indeed, it continued to smoulder away and is ablaze in the western end of the Flinders Chase reserve. It does not concern me that large tracts of natural bushland are being burnt, particularly on Kangaroo Island today, where the temperatures are about 22 to 25 degrees centigrade. In that climate, despite the winds that are prevailing, it would not be a hot and devastating fire in that region. It would simply clear up a lot of undergrowth and rubbish and make the area generally safe for those who have to live around it and make a living from primary production in the adjacent region of that vast reserve.

The grass is green on the perimeter properties of the Flinders Chase reserve; it is an ideal opportunity at this stage in the season to allow fires to cool burn or to trickle around in those scrublands and to gobble up the accrued dry matter that is in that region, there having been no fires for a number of years. Policy on the island is that local volunteer firefighters will not go into wild fires in the scrub

on national parks unless life and/or personal property is in danger. To date, they have not been endangered and therefore our local people have declined but, again, we find the department, in its usual nervous Nellie panic, has taken people from the national park on Kangaroo Island and from the mainland in car loads, plane loads and even on the local ferry to try to put out a bushfire about which they have very little experience. Yet again, I am reporting to this House on the gross waste of public money—

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

Mr QUIRKE (Playford): I welcome the opportunity this afternoon to discuss an issue in my area that has caused much heartache and a great deal of soul-searching over the past five years. Today, during Question Time when I asked the Minister of Education a question about it, I can only say that I received a satisfactory answer from the Minister with respect to the relocation of three primary schools on a new site for a school in my area next year. Put briefly, the problem is something like this: when I was elected in 1989, a process was under way in which a rationalisation of schools in my electorate was to take place.

The Hon. Ted Chapman: Was that before you took off overseas or afterwards?

The SPEAKER: Order!

Mr QUIRKE: It started some considerable time before my election and in fact as a process it went well into 1990. After considerable consultation (and, some people would argue, far too much consultation), decisions were eventually made on the future of Ingle Farm High School and Para Vista High School to such an extent that one school would emerge that would be strong and have the confidence of the local community on the Para Vista site. This left the Ingle Farm High School site vacant for three primary schools to amalgamate and to develop the necessary curriculum policies, to integrate staff and resources and, in essence, to bring three communities together so they could share the one common site.

It is a fact that some considerable amounts of money were required to be spent on this site and, indeed, on the Valley View secondary school site, as the old Para Vista High School site has now become, and that these moneys were not automatically available where this was concerned. The community had to go through a process of working out priorities regarding the necessity for changes and, in particular, on the Ingle Farm High School site, the conversion from a secondary school to a primary school situation.

I was pleased in Question Time today that the Minister of Education announced that \$1.3 million had been approved by Cabinet so that in 1992 the three amalgamated primary schools could move onto the new site. One hopes that the strength of those three amalgamated communities will give rise to a primary school that will endure for many years. Certainly, with \$1.3 million being spent, many of the issues which are facing those communities, and which would have been facing them on the old school sites, some of which are 25 years old, will be resolved.

It is a pity in one respect that one of those school sites was very much better than the other two: one of the school sites that is closing has probably the best set of school buildings anywhere in my electorate. The problem is that it might well have had the best buildings, but it did not have the students. We hope that we have now got it right. About 450 students annually will enrol in the amalgamated primary school. I want to get the message across to the Minister—who is very much in tune with the needs of

education—that we must get this program going as quickly as possible.

It is absolutely essential that no further disturbance should take place. The past five years have been traumatic enough. Hopefully, all these schools will be ready to go on day one for the 1992 school year. That concludes my comments on this issue, although there may be other times in this House when I have to raise this and other issues relating to the schools rationalisation program. I certainly—

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

DRIED FRUITS (EXTENSION OF TERM OF OFFICE) AMENDMENT BILL

Returned from the Legislative Council without amendment.

SITTINGS AND BUSINESS

The Hon. D.J. HOPGOOD (Deputy Premier): I move:

That the time allotted for—

(a) completion of the following Bills:

Correctional Services (Drug Testing) Amendment,
Goods Securities (Highways Fund) Amendment,
Fair Trading (Miscellaneous) Amendment,
Wheat Marketing (Trust Fund) Amendment,
Director of Public Prosecutions, and
State Emergency Service (Immunity for Members)
Amendment;

(b) completion of second reading of the Fisheries (Miscellaneous) Amendment; and

(c) completion of the debate on the Report of the Select Committee on the Gulf St Vincent Prawn Fishery

be until 6 p.m. on Thursday.

Motion carried.

REPORT OF THE SELECT COMMITTEE ON THE GULF ST VINCENT PRAWN FISHERY

Mr QUIRKE (Playford): I have great pleasure in bringing up the report, together with the minutes of proceedings and the evidence of the select committee, on the Gulf St Vincent prawn fishery.

Report received.

CORRECTIONAL SERVICES (DRUG TESTING) AMENDMENT BILL

Adjourned debate on second reading.

(Continued from 8 October. Page 923.)

Mr INGERSON (Bragg): In principle, the Opposition supports the Bill, but we will move one small amendment relating to the use of 'regulation' and 'direction of the Minister' in terms of the type of drugs that should be listed and the way in which they should be looked at in this area. Many inmates in Australian gaols are imprisoned for drug related offences and are drug users. In 1988 Professor John Dwyer estimated that in Long Bay Gaol about 60 per cent of inmates use intravenous drugs once or twice a week. The availability and the general boredom in Australia's overcrowded prisons also means that some inmates acquire a drug habit when incarcerated.

In 1989 a study of a sample of prisoners in the South Australian prison system reported that 42 per cent of prisoners engaged in risk behaviour while 37 per cent were estimated to use drugs intravenously. A very high proportion (said to be more than 70 per cent) of all persons sent to prison in Australia have some civilian contact with illegal drugs. Of considerable concern are the diseases which are transmitted by drug users in prisons. This Bill is designed to reduce the contraband entering the prison system and to deter the use by prisoners of illicit drugs.

The measures include the searching of prisoners, cells, prisoners' property and visitors; the use of dogs to assist in searches; the use of prison design to maximise security and prisoner observation; and perimeter security. It is proposed that correctional officers will be responsible for the collection of specimens. Procedures will be adopted, in consultation with staff, to cover all occupational health and safety issues. Urine testing is available now to the Department of Correctional Services. The problem is that the results of a sample taken by a doctor are confidential between the prisoner and the doctor. The amendments to this legislation are designed to overcome this problem.

Urine analysis is in operation in both New South Wales and Victoria. Problems observed in the New South Wales system include the practice of swapping samples by prisoners, high levels of non-compliance by prisoners, problems with the accuracy of the test results and lack of understanding of the purpose of the program by staff. It is proposed urine analysis be introduced into South Australia in two phases. Phase one would involve testing on suspicion that a prisoner might have used an illicit drug. Phase two would involve adding random sampling and total population testing.

Clause 3 inserts the definition of 'drug' in the interpretation section. A drug is a drug of dependence or prohibited substance, as defined in the Controlled Substances Act, or a prescription drug specified in the notice published by the Minister in the *Gazette*. This is the area that the Opposition is most concerned about. We believe that if the classification of drugs is to be changed by the Minister of Health by regulation, whether a narcotic becomes a schedule 4 drug or vice versa, this sort of issue should be brought before Parliament and not decided purely and simply by the Minister. In essence, we ask the Government to reconsider that amendment.

Clause 4 amends the provision dealing with the power to search prisoners in certain circumstances. It provides that a prisoner may be searched preparatory to giving a specimen of his or her urine pursuant to the Act. The Opposition has no problems with this clause and we will support it. Clause 5 inserts a new section empowering the manager of a correctional institution to require a prisoner to provide a urine specimen if a prisoner is suspected of unlawfully using a drug or if a manager is carrying out a random check on some or all of the prisoners in the institution. This provision has caused general debate and, in Committee, we will question the Minister as to how this clause will operate.

With respect to the regulations, clause 6 regulates the collection of urine specimens from prisoners for the purpose of analysis. It also allows for the prescribing of directions that can be given to a prisoner for the purpose of collecting and authenticating a urine specimen. It also allows for the prescribing of higher maxima penalties where a prisoner breaches regulations under section 89 (2), paragraph (ea), provided that those higher maxima do not exceed by more than three times the maxima prescribed in sections 43 and 44. The penalties prescribed under this new section are

supported by the Opposition. In principle, we see this as a very important change.

In our consideration of the Bill, we have received quite a number of comments from people working within the system. A few of their comments are worth putting on the record. One person who works within the Remand Centre believes that the stopping of all contact visits would reduce the prevalence of drugs in prisons immediately and to a level that could be controlled. That person is insistent that it is the only thing to do and should be done without delay. Recently, there was some talk of giving prisoners clean syringes. The lady concerned said that, if that happened, most of the nursing staff and at least 75 per cent of correctional officers would walk off the job. That person believes that 95 per cent of all drugs that get into prisons do so through contact visits. It is believed that the assumption that correctional officers are the main culprits is not entirely true. Some of the officers probably are dealing with prisoners, but nothing like the number first anticipated.

It was also said that correctional officers should do the urine collecting and testing, and that all collections should be observed, otherwise we will end up with the same situation as prevails in New South Wales, where samples have been swapped. It was also pointed out that the medical staff quite simply do not have the time or the resources to carry out this practice. Staff at the Remand Centre are currently working 12 hour shifts, as one of the staff is on long-term sick leave. Temporary staff can be called in, but this has proved useless, because they will not work; the permanent staff has decided that it is easier to work the 12 hour shifts. These comments have come forward as a result of our sending a copy of the Bill to people directly involved in the system—as in this case, to someone directly involved with the Remand Centre—and to other interested parties.

We also sent a copy of the Bill to the Correctional Officers Legal Fund. In essence, the reply supported the directions that both we and the Government have put down, arguing that there is a need for supervision of these samples. The general comment from OARS was that it supports urine testing but does not agree with the provision that correctional officers should be responsible for the collection of specimens. OARS suggests that urine testing should be routine for all admitted to prison, not just carried out on a random basis.

We also received comments from Prisoners Advocacy. In essence, it supported the thrust of the Bill. However, it was pointed out that the issue of drugs within prisons was not purely and simply a problem within prisons: because prisons are part of the major community, it was spilling over into the community. It was pointed out that loneliness and general confinement in prison is one of the major issues with respect to drugs in prisons. With the amendment foreshadowed, the Opposition supports the Bill.

Mr OSWALD (Morpheff): I will make a very small contribution to this debate. When the debate on drugs in prisons has come before this House and the public of the State, the Government has always been very slow to move. It has a lot to say, but it is slow to move. I recall the Minister saying two years ago that he would introduce legislation. It was reported in the *Sunday Mail* of 30 July 1989 that 'compulsory urine tests of prisoners to weed out drug use in South Australian gaols looks certain to be introduced'. It is now October 1991 and we are just seeing the legislation. Whilst I support the legislation, the problem has been around for a long time, and I would have thought that the Government would move very quickly in 1989 to do something about it.

Since 1989 the use of drugs in the community has increased quite dramatically. The incidence of breaking and entering offences and crime within the community has been related more and more to drugs. It has been put to me that more than 60 per cent of crime in South Australia is drug-related. As a result of that, it is not surprising that we will see a larger drug problem in our prisons. I congratulate the Government on bringing forward this terribly important legislation. It should have been done—

Mr Becker interjecting:

Mr OSWALD:—years ago, as the member for Hanson says. It was promised two years ago. At last we are seeing a move in this place. It has been noted that the number of drug discoveries in South Australian prisons rose from 225 to 311 last year, with the number of alcoholic home brew discoveries almost doubling from 49 to 95. Last year's figure of 311 discoveries is almost one a day. As a Parliament, we must ask how good are the procedures that have been adopted in the prisons to ensure that drugs do not get in. I have no doubt in my mind that contact visits have a lot to do with it.

I do not believe that prison officers as individuals are the mechanism by which the majority of drugs get into gaols. It seems a ludicrous situation when we become involved in the public debate that we should be talking about the issuing of syringes within the gaol system to placate those in gaol who want to use drugs. The issuing of syringes serves a couple of purposes. As members would know, it stops septicæmia that results from the sharing of syringes, and it stops the spread of AIDS and other diseases. To have a situation where syringes are issued within a gaol system says something about the inadequacy of the checking system. If it means that no contact visits are allowed to ensure that we have no drugs in gaols, we must look at that, and those who run the gaols will have to contend with the impact on the morale of prisoners.

It is not acceptable to have drugs circulating in gaols, and it is not acceptable for us to start talking in terms of issuing syringes within gaols. We have enough of that in the community, let alone in our institutions. I acknowledge that the use of alcohol in prisons causes problems. However, it is probably the least of the problems in our gaols. Prisoners attempt to make their own home brew. The Minister is on record (and I do not disagree with him) as saying that alcohol has been used in the community for 2 000 years, and people who have used alcohol in the community will want to have access to it in prison.

However, when it results in prison riots and uncontrollable behaviour, it has to be curtailed. I have no doubt that this legislation, which will allow the random testing of inmates, will go a long way towards identifying those persons involved in drug use. I put again to the Government a remark that I made a few minutes ago: there must be something radically wrong with our system of screening and contact visits that allows drugs to get in. It has been put to me that drugs can be transferred through the mouth by an inmate being kissed by a female visitor, and prison officers have related other methods. This has to stop.

I know that the Government and the prison authorities are making an effort to cut out drugs, but obviously they are not succeeding. The discovery of one drug case per day in South Australian prisons is one too many, and I hope that prison administrators will do something about it. I support the Bill in principle. I think it is well overdue. The public expected this Bill to be passed two years ago. If the honourable member had decided to bring in this legislation immediately following the New South Wales legislation, I am sure it would have received bipartisan support. The

member for Bragg has listed the organisations with which the Opposition has discussed this measure. I look forward to the speedy passage of this Bill with the exception of one clause to which the member for Bragg will move amendments.

The Hon. FRANK BLEVINS (Minister of Correctional Services): I thank members for their contributions. The member for Bragg who led the Opposition speakers showed a good grasp of the Bill and its importance. I was very pleased to see a bipartisan approach—and this is not the first time—to some of the problems involved in running a correctional services system. In other States we have seen almost total opposition by the principal Parties when trying to deal with these problems. They should look at South Australia and see the bipartisan position that is very clearly emerging. The problems are not Party political; they are readily identifiable, but not so readily solvable. To some extent, the solutions suggest themselves, and both major Parties in this State attempt to assist in implementing those solutions.

The member for Bragg repeated some comments made by a prison officer from the Remand Centre. I agree with some of those comments but question the accuracy of certain others. There is no doubt that contact visits are the prime avenue for entry of drugs into a prison. I do not think it would be a satisfactory solution to stop contact visits because most visitors do not bring drugs into gaol and most prisoners do not use them; so, we would be punishing all prisoners for the offences of a few. I think a much better approach would be to try to identify the offenders, and that is precisely what this measure will assist in doing.

The officer quoted by the member for Bragg suggested, among other things, that prison officers were working 12 hour shifts and that they should conduct drug testing and not medical staff, who are too busy. I am advised that prison officers are not working 12 hour shifts at the Remand Centre, and the whole intent of this legislation is that correctional officers and not medical staff should perform drug tests. So, perhaps the officer from the Remand Centre had a few crossed wires.

The question of syringes has been raised many times in this State. This Government does not intend to introduce any kind of a needle exchange program in the prison system. We believe that at this stage the problem in this State is not large and that, in a sense, you have given up once you introduce a needle exchange program. I support strongly a needle exchange program in the community, as it is very difficult to do anything about the drug problem within a free society. Of course, a prison is not a free society, and it ought to be easier to do something about the drug problem in a prison than in the community. So, I believe the circumstances are different. It is not illogical to support a needle exchange program outside a prison and yet not support such a program inside a prison.

The member for Morphett very mildly, as is his wont, chastised me for being slow in bringing in this legislation. To some extent, he was correct—it has been two years. The member for Bragg outlined the reasons for this situation. Where this legislation has been introduced interstate, it has not worked. We have used the past couple of years to look at systems both interstate and overseas so that when we did bring in a system in South Australia it would be effective. We have taken the time to learn from other States where such systems are so ineffective that they may as well not have them. Some of the problems with those systems were outlined by the member for Bragg. We believe that waiting

until we refined a system has been worthwhile rather than implementing a system that was not effective.

As the member for Bragg and the member for Morphet stated, it is not surprising that there is a drug problem in prisons because there is a drug problem in the community. The same thing could be said of the alcohol problem. The member for Morphet suggests that if there is an alcohol problem in the community it will overflow into the prison system. Our aim is to keep that to the absolute minimum, consistent with not punishing everyone for the misdeeds of a few. I am very pleased that the Opposition has shown a high degree of cooperation and bipartisanship, and I commend the second reading to the House.

Bill read a second time.

In Committee.

Clauses 1 and 2 passed.

Clause 3—'Interpretation.'

Mr INGERSON: I move:

Page 1—

Line 23—Leave out 'Minister, by notice in the *Gazette*,' and insert 'regulations'.

Lines 25 to 32—Leave out all words in these lines.

The Opposition believes that any changes to the Act should be made by regulation so that Parliament can consider them instead of their being implemented purely and simply by ministerial decree.

The Hon. FRANK BLEVINS: I am very happy to accept the amendments.

Amendments carried; clause as amended passed.

Clause 4 passed.

Clause 5—'Drug testing of prisoners.'

Mr INGERSON: Will the Minister provide answers to the following questions: who will be the officer in charge of this testing system? What training will officers have or be expected to have? Will they be part of an independent unit? When will this unit be ready to begin work?

The Hon. FRANK BLEVINS: Officers will be selected and trained, particularly the Dog Squad officers who will assist with this process. Testing will be done in a number of ways, as outlined in the second reading explanation. A prisoner suspected of taking drugs will be urine tested. Also, we will walk into a gaol and at random choose people for testing. We will occasionally close an entire gaol and test every person so as to gain a snapshot as to who is and is not taking drugs at that time. Although it was not part of the question, I add that all these details will be published in the annual report. As we always do, we will publish every drug find. The open way we run the prisons system—we show the problem and how we are attempting to deal with it—I think has assisted enormously in getting cooperation from the community, the Opposition, media and everybody else. I think that more and more people understand that there is no easy answer.

Mr INGERSON: Will the prisoners be observed during this process? Why is it intended to introduce this process in two phases? It seems to me it could take place simultaneously.

The Hon. FRANK BLEVINS: Yes, prisoners will be observed. For the information to be of any value to us it is necessary for them to be observed. The implementation is purely a gradualist approach so that we can learn as we go along.

Mr INGERSON: What will be the frequency of the random testing, and how will this be decided? Does the Minister know what the cost of the tests is expected to be?

The Hon. FRANK BLEVINS: We have allocated about \$60 000 a year for testing costs, out of which amount chemists or pharmacists (I am not sure of the difference) will do well. Random testing will be irregular; there will be no

pattern. By its very nature, random testing has to be just that. We will learn as we go along. As I have said, we will publish in the annual report how many tests we have conducted and the results of those tests. It is very much a learning process, but we want it to be effective. If it is going to happen only once every five years, it will not be effective, and I am sure that we cannot test each prisoner once every five days. So we will find a level that has the effect of deterring and identifying without completely disrupting every prison every day.

Mr INGERSON: What method is it intended to use, to select the prisoner for random testing?

The Hon. FRANK BLEVINS: That will be done completely at random. I cannot give the honourable member a system. As I stated in reply to an earlier question, somebody suspected of being under the influence of a drug will be tested. Otherwise, it will be completely at random. I am not sure how prisoners will be picked at random—whether it will be by lottery, alphabetical order, every third person who walks past, every blonde or whatever. I really have no idea. The reason why I cannot say is that it will be at random.

Mr INGERSON: Will there be a trace-back mechanism to find the source of drugs entering the prison once they have been detected? What computerised information is in place on each prisoner, and how will that information be transferred to the prison (and this relates to the JIS as well)? How will a prison know that a prisoner may be there for a drug-related offence?

The Hon. FRANK BLEVINS: Our records system has the details of offences. As regards a trace back, when somebody is found to have drugs in their body the authorities will obviously trace that back as far as they can. If we suspect drugs have been brought in through a contact visit, we will have the right to suspend contact visits for a prisoner who tests positive after such a visit. It will be a very useful management tool. It is not only a punitive measure: it will identify prisoners who have a drug problem. The prison medical service, which runs all the medical services in the prisons, will attempt to get those prisoners into some kind of drug rehabilitation program so that we can help them. It is not only a punitive measure but also has some very positive rehabilitation aspects to it. That is the hope, anyway.

Clause passed.

Clause 6 and title passed.

Bill read a third time and passed.

GOODS SECURITIES (HIGHWAYS FUND) AMENDMENT BILL

Adjourned debate on second reading.
(Continued from 8 October. Page 923.)

The Hon. D.C. WOTTON (Heysen): The Opposition supports the Bill but will move a minor amendment in Committee. The costs of maintaining the Goods Securities Register, which was established under the Goods Securities Act 1986, and the payment of compensation are met from the Goods Securities Compensation Fund. The fund derives its income from credit providers through a fee for the registration of security interests, from motor vehicle dealers and members of the public through a charge for the production of security status certificates, and from accrued interest. I understand that to date no successful claims have been made against the Goods Securities Compensation Fund. The balance in the fund as at 30 June 1990 was \$723 000,

and for the year ended 30 June 1991 it is expected to be near \$1 million.

The Bill abolishes the Goods Securities Compensation Fund and transfers the current balance to the Highways Fund. The Bill also transfers responsibility for administering the register to the Department of Road Transport, and directs any fees paid under the Act to be paid into the Highways Fund. It would seem that the Government's rationale in putting this Bill before the House is that a separate Goods Securities Compensation Fund is no longer warranted following the merger of the Highways Department and the Motor Registration Division into the new Department of Road Transport. However, credit providers and motor vehicle dealers believe that if the funds are simply absorbed into the Highways Fund they will have little access to the funds in the future to improve the register system. In fact, they are concerned that the real motivation for the Bill is to boost funds for road works.

At present each State database stands alone and is only accessible to queries originating in different States by special arrangements between the States. The finance industry in general is keen to establish a national database of financially encumbered vehicles, a move that is supported by the major industry as a means to provide industries and consumers with much greater protection against illicit movement of motor vehicles between States. I am sure that we all support that move. Accordingly, last year Ernst and Young was appointed as an independent consultant to recommend actions needed to establish a national system. In December this year the State managers of securities registers and representatives of the finance and motor industries are to meet in Perth to assess the Ernst and Young report. If as a result of that meeting a national scheme is accepted, changes to the Goods Securities Act will be required in South Australia to accommodate the new system.

In that context, it could be argued that the Bill presently before the House is somewhat premature, even presumptuous. Also, if moneys in the Goods Securities Register are to be transferred to the Highways Fund, the Australian Finance Conference (South Australian Branch) and the Credit Union Association of South Australia want assurances from the Minister that sufficient funds will be made available as and when required to upgrade computer systems to accommodate a national database. The Motor Traders Association is concerned to ensure that sufficient money is available so that the register is open during extended shopping hours or that the database is on-line, as in New South Wales and Victoria. Currently in South Australia the register is not open on Saturday afternoons, and the Registrar has indicated that any extension of hours of operation will only be accommodated by closing the register on Thursday and/or Friday evenings. I shall be most interested in the Minister's comments on this matter.

It appears that the above matters would not be of such issue of concern if the Bill before us at present provided for an annual statement of funds held on behalf of the Vehicles Securities Register and the compensation fund. At present section 17 of the Goods Securities Act requires the Registrar to submit to the Minister an annual report on the administration of the fund on or before 31 October and for the Minister to table a copy of the report before each House of Parliament within 14 days. The Minister's second reading explanation fails to mention that this Bill deletes section 17 relating to the annual report. Whilst, as I said earlier, the Opposition supports the legislation, we believe that it is necessary to amend the Bill to provide for funds accrued under the provisions of the Goods Securities Act to be disclosed in the annual statement of accounts for the High-

ways Fund. I will be moving in that direction at the appropriate time.

There are a couple of questions I want to specifically put to the Minister. First, I am most interested to know why the funds are to be incorporated in the Highways Fund and not into general revenue. I will be interested to know why that decision was made.

The Hon. Frank Blevins interjecting:

The Hon. D.C. WOTTON: The Minister will have the opportunity to indicate to the House why that might be the case. Also, as I said earlier, I am aware that the State Registrars are meeting in December, I think in Perth, to discuss a national database, and I am looking for a commitment from the Minister that funds will be provided to ensure South Australia's participation in that procedure. Finally, will the Minister say whether he or the Government have any plans to extend the range of information on the register to include, for example, off-road vehicles, boat trailers, etc.? This question has specifically been asked by industry. I would appreciate the Minister providing information on those three matters. The Opposition has consulted with the Australian Finance Conference (South Australian Branch), the Credit Union Association, the Motor Traders Association of South Australia and the RAA. Some of the concerns that I have raised and the questions I have asked have been put forward by those authorities. The Opposition supports the second reading but we will look to amend the legislation at the appropriate time.

The Hon. FRANK BLEVINS (Minister of Transport): I thank the member for Heysen for his support on behalf of the Opposition for this measure. It is a small measure but I think a sensible one. The member for Heysen asked a number of questions which I am very happy to respond to. The question of extended shopping hours and having the register available during extended shopping hours is a matter for negotiation with the industry, and I am very happy, as always, to continue negotiations with them. I cannot say that we will always come to an agreement but, by and large, industry is very responsibly led by the industry bodies, and the Registrar is very reasonable. Where we can accommodate the industry, we always do. On the question of why these funds are going into the Highways Fund and not into general revenue, I was only joking when I said that it is because I am a very good Minister of Transport and a very poor Minister of Finance. However, these funds are raised by one means or another from motorists, and it is appropriate that they be used in this particular area rather than in any other, until such time as the funds are called on.

In relation to the national database, we have every intention of this State's being involved in that. I did not quite understand the question about whether there was any intention to expand the amount of data that was available or the range of vehicles on the register. My understanding is that all vehicles are on the register. If a vehicle can be sold and someone wants to use this provision it does not really matter whether it is a four-wheel drive or an ordinary four-wheel sedan. However, if I have not picked up the question correctly, I will talk to the member for Heysen later and expand on my answer. I thank honourable members and commend the second reading to the House.

Bill read a second time.

In Committee.

Clauses 1 to 3 passed.

Clause 4—'Application of fees and payment of compensation and administrative costs.'

The Hon. D.C. WOTTON: I move:

Page 1, after line 31—Insert subclause as follows:

(3) The Commissioner of Highways must include in each annual report under the Highways Act 1926 to the Minister responsible for the administration of that Act statements of—

- (a) the total of the amounts credited to the Highways Fund pursuant to this Act during the financial year to which the report relates;
- (b) the total of the amounts paid out of that fund during that year to meet the costs of administration of this Act;
- (c) the total of the amounts paid out of that fund during that year for the payment of compensation payable under orders of the tribunal; and
- (d) the total of the amounts credited to that fund pursuant to this Act at any time up to the end of that year less the total of the amounts paid out of that fund at any time up to the end of that year to meet the costs of administration of this Act and for the payment of compensation payable under orders of the tribunal.

As I said earlier, the credit and finance industry in particular has asked us to make representation to have this Bill amended to provide for funds accrued under the Goods Securities Act to be disclosed in the annual statement of accounts for the Highways Fund. I appreciate the dialogue that has taken place between the Minister and me (representing the Opposition at this stage), and I understand that there are some practical concerns about the amendment. However, I hope that the Minister and the Government accept the thrust of the amendment. I can only repeat again that it is something that the industry has requested, and we are happy to support it.

The Hon. FRANK BLEVINS: I support the principle of the amendment but, as the member for Heysen said, there are some technical difficulties with the wording of the amendment. It would be a very simple matter for the amendment to be redrafted and introduced in another place and, provided it is in the general terms of the amendment that is before the Committee at the moment, the Government will certainly support it. It is something that we intended doing in a different way from that which is proposed in the amendment, and we are very happy for it to be enshrined in the statute. So, I will have to oppose the amendment.

Amendment negatived; clause passed.

Clause 5 and title passed.

Bill read a third time and passed.

FAIR TRADING (MISCELLANEOUS) AMENDMENT BILL

Adjourned debate on second reading.

(Continued from 10 September. Page 673.)

Mr LEWIS (Murray-Mallee): The member for Bragg is the Opposition's lead speaker on this matter. However, my own view of the measure is that it is warranted and we will be supporting it. It was first introduced at the end of last session and was not finally dealt with at that time, so it was reintroduced. The intention is to provide that consumers can rescind contracts within six months of the date of the contract if the supplier or the dealer from whom they procure it commits an offence in the course of those negotiations or in relation to those negotiations leading to the formation of the contract or, for that matter, if the contract contains certain prohibited contractual terms. The cooling off period of the Bill is proposed to be extended in those cases where such contracts may not comply either with the form or with the other procedural requirements as set out in the present fair trading legislation.

We note that the Bill repeals section 39, which prohibits the practice of offering goods for sale on condition that

other goods are first purchased. It enables us to ensure that the Commissioner for Consumer Affairs has some jurisdiction in the matter and may give approval for such a practice if it is warranted. The Minister in the other place has pointed out publicly that, since the provision has been in operation, the Commissioner has approved all but one of those applications, and there were special circumstances relating to that instance. The Opposition agrees that no harm is done by repealing this section; it is used by retailers and manufacturers of consumer goods in various forms of promotional activities.

We believe that the administrative work involved in approving these arrangements by the Commissioner for Consumer Affairs, on each occasion in light of the history of the section, is work that could well be dispensed with and is otherwise unnecessary. We note the similarity between the principal Act and the Federal Trade Practices Act, where section 58 is somewhat similar to section 53 of the State Act, which applies duties and obligations to people, whereas the Federal Act applies the same provisions to bodies corporate other than natural persons. With that cursory cover of the legislation as I understand it, I commend the Bill to the House and leave it to my colleague, the member for Bragg, to give a clearer understanding of the Opposition's approach to the proposal.

Mr INGERSON (Bragg): The Opposition supports the Bill. We recognise that these sorts of changes are required and that they will be to the advantage of the retail industry. In fact, we have spent some time discussing the proposals with the Retail Traders Association, which has indicated that it supports the Bill because it has significant advantages for the association in removing some of the anomalies that exist. The amendments relate, first, to enabling consumers to rescind contracts within six months of the date of the contract if the supplier or dealer commits an offence in the course of or in relation to negotiations leading to the formation of that contract. This cooling off period is proposed to be extended to those cases where the contract may not comply with either form or procedure requirements set out in the principal Act.

Mr De LAINE: Madam Acting Speaker, I draw your attention to the state of the House.

A quorum having been formed:

Mr INGERSON: As I said, the first amendment widens the cooling off period, and the Opposition supports that amendment. Clause 3 repeals section 39 of the Act. This section prohibits the practice of offering goods for sale only on condition that other goods are first purchased unless the Commissioner for Consumer Affairs has given approval for such a practice. The repeal of this section has the support of the Opposition. We do not support this practice and the retail industry is glad to see the end of it.

Section 58 is in similar terms to section 53 of the Federal Trade Practices Act, although it applies duties and obligations to persons rather than to corporations. The application to corporations is achieved by the Federal Act. Section 58 provides that a person, in relation to the supply of goods or services or the promotion of the supply or use of goods or services, must not falsely represent that the goods are of a particular standard, quality, etc., or that services are of a particular standard, quality or grade. The Bill seeks to include 'value'. That is a grey area about which there is much criticism in the community. Many retailers buy goods with good intent from reputable wholesalers to be sold at a certain standard and quality, only to find at a later date that those products do not come up to standard. It seems

to me that the Government needs to show more flexibility in this area than it is doing at present.

I believe that, if a person buys a product that has a certain standard, he should be able to clear that stock unless there is an obvious break in quality or standard that may affect the safety of individuals. An example mentioned recently in this place related to certain highchairs. It was said that they do not come up to a particular standard; yet, they are sold in every other State in this nation. The standard for those highchairs is accepted in other States; yet, for some reason, in South Australia a particular standard has been placed on them.

I can quote an example of a dentist who has bought a pressure cooker for use in his surgery to sterilise needles. That pressure cooker is recognised in every other State in Australia and worldwide; yet, in South Australia, it is not accepted for the job that it is doing—sterilising dental equipment. This is an area of concern that the Government needs to look at more rationally. If it is saying that retailers must take these goods off their shelves and not sell them, we need some better mechanism than we have for saying that those goods must be removed from sale.

Section 81 provides that a trader who acts contrary to an assurance accepted by the Commissioner for Consumer Affairs is guilty of an offence, but that such an offence may not be prosecuted except by the Commissioner or a person authorised by the Commissioner. The Bill makes only minor changes to prevent proceedings from being issued except on the authorisation of the Commissioner and to allow a document, purporting to be under the hand of the Commissioner, to be evidence of such authorisation in the absence of proof to the contrary. We support that move. Hopefully, it will simplify the issuing of summonses. We hope that it will be very effective. The cooling off provision is the most substantial of the amendments. As I said at the beginning, the Opposition supports the Bill.

The Hon. G.J. CRAFTY (Minister of Education): I thank the Opposition for its indication of support for these amendments to the Fair Trading Act. This series of amendments has been waiting for some time to come before the House to amend and improve the Act and to provide the matters which have arisen in other jurisdictions and which need to be implemented here to bring our legislation into line with the national trend in legislation of this type.

With regard to the honourable member's comments regarding section 58 of the Fair Trading Act, which incorporates the provisions of section 53 of the Federal Trade Practices Act, which applies the duties and obligations therein to persons rather than to corporations, this section is intended to complement the Federal provisions. In 1988 sections 53a and 53aa of the Federal Act were amended to include the word 'value' after the word 'quality'. This effectively prohibited a corporation from falsely representing that goods and services had a particular value that they did not have. This matter is now dealt with in the legislation before us. It is now proposed to bring the Fair Trading Act into line with the Federal Trade Practices Act so that these protections may extend to consumers who are not corporations.

The honourable member raised more general policy issues with respect to the operation of the Fair Trading Act in this area, but I point out that there is a Manufacturers Warranties Act in place in this State. This is one of the few places in the world where that legislation exists. It gives the consumer a right of recourse to law if a manufacturer's goods do not meet the manufacturer's warranty and cause harm or loss to the consumer. A series of remedies is available to the consumer. The *caveat emptor* principle still applies,

of course, but it is subject to the laws which we have enacted in this State over a long period and which have been well accepted by our community and, I believe, well served by officers of the Government who administer this legislation. I commend the Bill to the House.

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

ADJOURNMENT

The Hon. G.J. CRAFTY (Minister of Education): I move:

That the House do now adjourn.

Mr VENNING (Custance): I wish to raise an issue which, to say the least, is topical. The future of the South Australian regional passenger rail network is very much the topic of the moment, particularly in relation to the weekend's railway inquiry at Broken Hill. I was unable to attend, but I am assured that it was a very interesting conference and that the right decisions were made. I was unable to attend because there were no trains running, nor was there any suitable airline service at the time for me to get there. I understand that the member for Stuart went, along with the Mayor of Port Pirie. In fact, the Premier opened the conference.

I was interested in the outcome of the inquiry, which I have read in great detail. I fully support most of its findings, as follows: to provide financial support for a six-month consultancy by the rail lobby group Rail 2000; to lobby the Federal Government to classify the services as community service obligations and fund any operating cost not covered by AN revenue; and to support an existing union campaign pushing for the continuation of the Iron Triangle, Silver City and Blue Lake services.

It is regrettable that the unions are on strike at the moment. It is a very bloody-minded exercise on behalf of the unions, particularly in relation to another issue dealing with redundancies in Port Augusta and, no doubt, Port Pirie and Peterborough, which will come into the same category. It is regrettable at this time that the rail unions are flexing their muscles. The problem with our rail system today is that it has been unable to compete, primarily because the unions have, through their work restrictions, made the service uncompetitive, particularly when compared with road transport. Most road transport operators are private operators working 24 hours. If the rail system were allowed to operate in an equal way, it would more than keep up with the road systems. I hate to see the demise of our rail systems that we are seeing at present. Will we see them completely close? Surely these systems should be privatised to some degree at least. I know that AN has gone in this direction, but I do not believe it has gone down the track to the degree that the South Australian public would have wished.

The facts reveal no surprises to anyone interested in this subject. Expenditure on the rail services compared with that on road infrastructure was \$66 million versus \$5 000 million in the same period (since 1983). The Government has an obligation to provide such a service. I do not think that is an inflammatory statement. The people in the north of the State have as much right to rail passenger services as do the people of Hallett Cove, Port Adelaide or anywhere else. Because it ran at a \$3 million loss in the last 12 months prior to its closure, the service was withdrawn. If STA were to use the same criteria, I wonder what would be the cost per line? I repeat that the Government, either State or Federal, has an obligation to provide people with a rail

alternative, particularly when there are three major regional cities in South Australia at the other end—Port Pirie, Port Augusta and Whyalla.

When we consider the service that we had, it was a standing joke. I first travelled on the rail system in 1950, when I was five years old. I last travelled on that service exactly 12 months ago, and the same rolling stock was being used 40 years on. However, we are told by members opposite that it should be scrapped. I note that the Minister of Transport has been making some very encouraging comments in recent days. He also said that I had not used the service in the past. I used the service whenever possible but, every year that went by, the service became harder to use and less friendly. The timetables were all wrong. The train would come down in the middle of the day, stay here for two hours and then return. The timetables needed to be changed so that people could arrive at the city shortly after business started and depart a short time after the close of business, with preferably two services a day.

Country people found it obnoxious to be dropped off at Mile End. The rail service was not designed to end there. Members should try to get into the city from out there. There was Dial a Bus and various ways of getting to the city, but people found it just another hassle of using that service, and decided it was not worth the hassle.

The rolling stock was designed in 1948, straight after the Second World War. It ought to be in the National Trust or given to Pichi Richi, not used as modern people movers that we should have today. One needs to go to the northern suburbs of Sydney to see how they move people—in fast, modern rail cars, built for the twentieth century. These cars are air-conditioned, air cushioned, quiet and quick. I have spoken with Mr Russell King about this and suggested that the STA's Series 2000 rail cars could be used. They are not seen as ideal as they are considered unsuitable for suburban work, because they are too heavy.

Mr Hamilton: They have no toilets.

Mr Venning: They would be extremely suitable for country work. As the member for Albert Park says, they have no toilets, but I am sure that, with a small modification, these could be fitted. I am sure it would not take much effort to convert them.

Mrs Hutchison: They have looked at them.

Mr Venning: They have looked at the train, and not the toilets, or both? In the short term, as Mr Russell King assured me six or seven months ago when I spoke with him on this very matter, if we could get over all the hurdles, this service could come on stream very quickly indeed. With cooperation from the STA, which owns the rail cars and the Adelaide Railway Station, and AN, which owns the country lines, we could use STA's cars and put in a third line from the Adelaide Gaol to the Adelaide Railway Station. That is not a big problem, and these trains could then deliver their passengers to the Adelaide Railway Station. That is a very important part of making this whole thing work. It would be an important part in the promotion of a friendly service. When it is brought back on line, promoted and sold, it will be a real goer. We have not wanted to do that. We have put everything in its way. We have not wanted to go along this track.

After the Broken Hill inquiry, I am very encouraged to hear the Minister and the Premier in this House. I think we are starting to win this argument. I would like to see the country rail services given a chance in the short term. The member for Stuart nods, and I know that the Mayor of Port Pirie agrees, as do the Mayors of Port Augusta and Whyalla. Who would disagree? Why are we hesitating? Talk about a total nonsense! We are just playing games. It is all too hard.

I plead with this House to support the reintroduction of this service. It may make a small loss when it is brought back—I would expect that—but, if properly promoted, this service to the Iron Triangle, the Silver City service and the Blue Lake service to the South-East would be successful. They should be brought back. I do not know why we are procrastinating. An arbitrator has said that the Blue Lake service should not have been stopped. The Premier and the Minister have said so. I know that Bob Brown is awaiting a report in the next two weeks from Mr Russell King. Surely, when that report lands, we will see some commonsense. I urge all members to support the reintroduction of country rail passenger services in South Australia.

Mr HAMILTON (Albert Park): I listened with a great deal of attention to what the member for Custance said about the retention of country rail services. I note the time that the honourable member has been a member of this Parliament, and I have listened to what he has said about country rail services. What I am about to say in no way reflects upon him, but some of his statements about country rail services are in stark contrast with statements made between 1979 and 1982 under the Tonkin Government. If ever I have heard a load of hypocrisy, I have heard it from some members opposite.

An honourable member interjecting:

Mr HAMILTON: Indeed, as my colleague suggested, if members would care to peruse the budget Estimates Committee responses they would see that I asked the Minister of Transport a question about the closure of country rail services and branch lines. The number of services closed under the Tonkin Government and the token opposition by that Government at that time far outweigh, in my view, what has happened under this Government. It is a sad reflection—

Mr Venning interjecting:

Mr HAMILTON: I certainly did not interject on the member for Custance, but he makes an interesting comment. Prior to and after entering this Parliament I have heard members opposite talk about efficiencies and effectiveness and value for the taxpayer's dollar. On the one hand, they say that these services must run at a profit; the taxpayer should not have to pay to prop them up. On the other hand, when it suits their electorate, they say, 'Well, we believe in community service obligations.' I have never walked away from community service obligations. My father and my three brothers relied, and now my son relies, upon the railway industry to earn their bread and butter. We recognise community service obligations.

I am not reflecting on the honourable member opposite, but the hypocrisy I have heard prior to and following my entry into this place never ceases to amaze me. Some people wanted those rail services when it suited them to use them but, when asked to prop up those systems by an injection of funds, they opposed them. I want to put on record my feelings as a person who in 1975 was involved as State President of my union in the passage of the Railway Transfer Agreement Act. I have listened intently to what has been said, but I noted that hypocrisy and I wanted to put it on record. I support the retention of country rail services for very good reasons, including their use by disadvantaged groups in the community and particularly by people who live in the country. I have always believed in and supported, together with the member for Mount Gambier and other members of this Parliament, the retention of those services.

I also want to put on record an issue that the member for Henley Beach and I have addressed in the western suburbs of Adelaide. Comments from some members oppo-

site that Labor members in the western suburbs are not particularly concerned about their electorate indicate that they are trying to do everything possible to pull the rug from underneath me, the member for Henley Beach and others.

An honourable member: That is very true.

Mr HAMILTON: I understand the nature of politics; they want to make those statements.

Mr Venning interjecting:

Mr HAMILTON: The honourable member opposite says that it is not true. I could attribute many statements to members opposite, but not to that honourable member in particular. Indeed, the only time we ever saw many members opposite was when they contested elections in the western suburbs.

One of the issues I want to place on record concerns the amount of money that has been spent on the Port Adelaide Sewage Treatment Works. Quite deliberately, I put a question on the Notice Paper about the amount of money that has been spent on the upkeep and maintenance of the Port Adelaide Sewage Treatment Works since 1979, the year in which I became a member of this Parliament. It is rather interesting to see that recurrent expenditure since 1979 on operation and maintenance of those works is \$19 178 585.

The manner in which the member for Custance reacts to that figure indicates quite clearly that he recognises that I, as the member for that area and with the very strong support of this Government, have seen a considerable amount of improvement to the Port Adelaide Sewage Treatment Works. The measures taken to control odours from that establishment have been considerable and include collection and biological treatment of foul air from covered channels carrying raw sewage and settled sewage; chlorine dosing into the raw sewage pumping mains entering the plant, to control sulphide levels in the sewage—this treatment minimises the subsequent generation of hydrogen sulphide odours through the works; oxygen dosing into the pumping mains from Ethelton and Port Adelaide pumping stations to minimise sulphide levels in raw sewage entering the plant—oxygen is used instead of chlorine on these two pumping mains as it

is a more economical dosing system; and repairs to gas leaks in the roofs of the sludge digestion tanks.

I remember when I first came to live in the Seaton area in 1968 that I was in my backyard and I smelled an awful odour. I had no idea where it was coming from, so I followed my nose and it was not long before I arrived at its source. It was pretty strong, I can assure you, Sir. I resolved that, if ever I had the opportunity, I would address this problem. I remember that the member for Chaffey, as the Minister of Water Resources at that time, expressed some dismay that the member for Albert Park had the gall to enter that plant without consulting him. I do not know what he had to hide; I was not going there to make a political statement: all I wanted to do was to have the plant upgraded.

I give credit over that time to the Government's allocating money, resources and effort to the Port Adelaide Sewage Treatment Works. Every year since 1980 other members and I have asked questions and, when a response was forthcoming from the Minister concerned, I disseminated that information to my constituents who live in and around that area. On the Labor Day weekend while delivering 1 000-odd leaflets, I spoke to a woman who said that she has in her home every letter relating to the Port Adelaide Sewage Treatment Works. I thought that was rather interesting. I wondered why someone would want to keep all those letters but, seriously, it showed the interest that is prevalent in that area. It also amazes me that approximately 70 000 trees have been planted around that plant.

The Hon. T.H. Hemmings interjecting:

Mr HAMILTON: Almost a forest, as my colleague suggests. I want to give credit and recognition to the Minister for the amount of work done not only by her but by her staff in that area to assist my constituents. Whilst it will not completely eliminate the odours from that plant, I believe it has gone a long way towards doing so.

Motion carried.

At 5.15 p.m. the House adjourned until Wednesday 30 October at 2 p.m.