SOUTH AUSTRALIA

PARLIAMENTARY DEBATES

(HANSARD)

Third Session of the Forty-Ninth Parliament
(1999)

Parliament, which adjourned on 5 August, was prorogued by proclamation dated 26 August. By proclamation dated 26 August it was summoned to meet on Tuesday 28 September, and the Third Session began on that date.

LEGISLATIVE COUNCIL

Tuesday 28 September 1999

The PRESIDENT (Hon. J.C. Irwin) took the Chair at 12 noon.

OPENING OF PARLIAMENT

The Clerk (Mrs J.M. Davis) read the proclamation by His Excellency the Governor (Sir Eric Neal) summoning Parliament.

GOVERNOR'S SPEECH

His Excellency the Governor, having been announced by Black Rod, was received by the President at the Bar of the Council Chamber and by him conducted to the Chair. The Speaker and members of the House of Assembly having entered the Chamber in obedience to his summons, His Excellency read his opening speech as follows:

Honourable Members of the Legislative Council and members of the House of Assembly:

Today we enter the third parliamentary year of my Government's second term.

Since my Government was re-elected in 1997, its priority has been to deliver, on behalf of all South Australians, an economic and social balance through policy direction and legislation.

Within this policy balance, it is imperative that quality of life receives the same level of priority as economic growth and debt reduction.

To achieve this balance, means ensuring that all South Australians wherever they live, whatever their situation in life, share the burdens as well as the benefits, of service delivery and economic development.

As we enter a new millennium it is important to reflect upon the history and development of South Australia as we move forward into a new century.

It is not an easy task—but we go into the next century against an economic backdrop which will create the foundation for change.

Over the last year South Australia has had the second highest level of growth of all the State's and Territories.

Our mining, agriculture, forestry and fishery industries have each grown at a rate of 20 per cent over the same 1997-98 period.

In the area of jobs—my Government's highest priority—we have had 14 consecutive months of increasing trend employment levels in South Australia.

Exports have increased by 6.5 per cent, whilst nationally they have fallen.

Net migration loss has been at its lowest in 5 years whilst our population growth rate has also been its highest in the same period.

In the building industry, housing starts increased 5% in the last year – the highest in four years—whereas they fell 6% nationally.

The value of production of the State's food industry has grown from $5.8 billion to $7 billion in the past two years.

This has supported a very good economic performance in some regional areas – the Riverland has maintained economic growth of 30% per annum for the past four years.

According to the most recent survey the level of confidence in the State's small business sector is currently higher than in any other State or Territory.

Independent economic forecasting suggests that the State's excellent recent economic performance will continue.

Econtech in its latest forecast last month said:

- That South Australia will have the highest employment growth of any State or Territory in 1999-2000
- That business investment growth in the State in 1999/2000 will be well above the national average
- That our GSP growth will similarly be above the national average, in each of the next two years
- And that our interstate migration loss will continue to slow.

My Government will continue to build on this economic backdrop to enable social stability and greater levels of community services to be achieved in future years.

My Government's goal is that our State move forward into a new century as a far fairer society.

For my Government it means maintaining a just approach, regardless of criticism, so that the young and old, the affluent and those with special needs, the healthy and those unfortunate enough not to be so, can all feel they are listened to, and that their priorities are being, or will be, addressed.

My Government makes the point, that this is why securing a Tasting Australia, Tour Down Under and a Le Mans style major event for our State, are investment decisions just as important for a positive future for South Australians as securing the Telstra investment announced today, and equally as important as the additional funding for our volunteer organisations, as has occurred in the past few weeks.

My Government's determination that we have fairness in society, is also reflected in its continuing policy of providing filtered mains water to homes in as many parts of the country and regional parts of the State as is practicable.

It's a decision made with the determination that the positive effects of improved service delivery should be shared by as many South Australians as is possible—as they are expected to be through the leasing of our electricity companies.

It is why my Government has a program to have rural arterial roads sealed by 2004, and why my Government has a strong commitment to State-wide tourism infrastructure.

Both these policies deliver economic benefits across the State, and a level of infrastructure for local residents which seeks to minimise any difference between city and country service delivery.

As an example of how much South Australia is committed to fairness and equity, our State was the first State to say sorry to the stolen generation.

And my Government's commitment to sensible and caring outcomes has also led to South Australia managing and moving forward with native title in a spirit of cooperation, understanding and trust.

This effort is set to continue.

In conjunction with delivering a fairer society as we move into the new millennium, my Government is managing a State in transition.

With this Parliament's approval of the leasing of our electricity companies, my Government believes our State will be in a more secure financial situation, and through that, on a firmer economic footing.

Without the burden of heavy interest payments on debt, and minus the risks of the national electricity market which are at this point in time creating problems for the Governments of two other States, my Government is ensuring that South Australia has, once again, a positive financial future before it.

And that it can best discharge this responsibility, by encouraging and supporting the establishment and growth of industry sectors throughout South Australia which can withstand for the long-term, the pace and demands of the global economy.

These sectors include defence industries, food and wine, telecommunications, and the burgeoning regional back-office sector.

My Government asserts that this also means continuing to support and nurture our more traditional State economic resources such as agriculture and manufacturing as they manage change so that they continue to compete successfully in Global export markets.

Insisting on a considered approach to achieving solid and long-term economic growth has also led my Government to casting a wide net for trading partners rather than concentrate on Asia. This has had the result of South Australia being little affected by the Asian crisis of the past 18 months.

My Government's forward legislative and policy program reflects all of the above priorities and demands.

Its breadth and emphasis can be seen to embrace the ideology of its commitment to a fairer society in South Australia.

In the third year of my Government's second term, its legislative program seeks to build on the foundations of the past six years;

- to make the operations of Government parallel the requirements of private sector business operations;
- and to refine existing legislation so that the changing social needs of the community are addressed.

This third year also introduces legislation which is a consequence of Federal decisions and initiatives.

Importantly, my Government will re-introduce amendments to the Native Title Act in response to amendments made to the commonwealth native title scheme in 1998.

Those amendments will reflect the outcomes of intensive negotiations with all interested parties since the introduction of the Bill in December 1998.

In the area of WorkCover, it is my Government's intention to propose changes to the Workers Rehabilitation and Compensation legislation.

This will include changes which provide for national consistency of worker coverage, where workers are temporarily working interstate; and a range of amendments that will focus on promoting worker safety within a commercial approach.

In information economy, my Government will introduce legislation that will facilitate the growth of electronic commerce in South Australia.

The *Electronic Commerce Transaction Bill* will remove the legal impediments to conducting business electronically, both between private citizens, and private citizens and the Government. This legislation will form part of a national framework for electronic commerce.

As my Government is committed to the National Competition Policy Principles Agreement which requires the review of existing legislation which restricts competition, legislation will be brought forward to repeal the *Carriers Act,* make changes to the *Prices Act*, and bring forward amendments to the various occupational licensing Acts.

The *Government Business Enterprises(Competition) (Miscellaneous) Bill 1999* will be introduced. This Bill is designed to provide additional clarification of the application of competitive neutrality to significant Government business activities; and refine the complaints mechanism and process.

The *Statutes Amendment (Universities) Bill* will amend the three university Acts to remove an outdated provision for the Governor to have a dispute resolution role within our universities. The Bill will also amend the *Ombudsman Act* to allow the Ombudsman to fulfil this role at the universities as required.

Legislation will be introduced to amend the *Guardianship and Administration Act.*

This follows reviews of the legislation and is designed to enhance its operations and assist those people coming into contact with the guardianship system.

Legislation will be introduced to amend the *State Disaster Act* to reflect recent changes to the State's emergency management arrangements.

Legislation will be introduced to establish Forestry SA as a public corporation under the provisions of the *Public Corporations Act 1993*. The new corporation will have greater flexibility in pursuing commercial opportunities, and facilitating regional economic development.

A number of legislative amendments will be made to assist the further development of the petroleum, mining and energy industries, and a provision will be made under the *Petroleum Act* to allow for development of geothermal energy in the future.

And a significant amendment will be made to the *Land Tax Act* to ensure that all agistment arrangements in the intensive cattle, pig and poultry farming industries receive the benefit of the primary production exemption.

A Bill will be introduced which will resolve outstanding issues relating to the Hindmarsh Island Bridge.

The *Highways Act* is to be amended to extend the powers of the Commissioner of Highways, as required, to embrace traffic management, and legislation will be introduced to suspend registration of operators of heavy vehicles whose vehicles repeatedly speed.

The *Legal Practitioners Act* is to be amended to make it clear that a practitioner who has been suspended from practice, or struck off the roll of practitioners, will not be permitted to work in a legal practice as a law clerk, or in any like capacity, except with the permission of the Legal Practitioners Disciplinary Tribunal.

Amendments to the *Summary Offences Act* will be made to establish procedures for carrying out a body search on a person brought into lawful custody. The object of the Bill is to provide protection for both the police and those searched.

And legislation will be introduced to amend the *Cremation Act* to remove barriers to industry entry and competition within the industry, following the competition review of the Act. In particular it is intended that licence requirements rendered obsolete by the Development Act be removed, and the process of obtaining health approval become more transparent.

A Bill for the purpose of allowing Proprietary Racing licences to be issued in South Australia is to be introduced. It will provide for appropriate checks and balances on applicants for a licence and the on-going probity of their operation.

And special legislation is to be introduced to provide for the establishment of the Qualco-Sunlands Groundwater Control Scheme. This scheme will ameliorate water logging of existing plantings, provide for new irrigation development in the district and reduce impacts on the River Murray in an integrated and collaborative way.

With major progress continuing in boundary and legislative reform relating to Local Government, this session of Parliament will see introduction of legislation intended to secure a smooth transition to the new *Local Government Act*; as well as increased emphasis on the third phase of the Government's Local Government reform program—that of functional and related financial reform.

Meanwhile my Government has established an independent review of the *Valuation of Land Act 1971*. This will address growing concerns about the equity of property valuations particularly in peri-urban areas, and the consequent effects of such valuations on State and Local Government charges and levies.

This decision is in line with my Government's commitment to ensuring that rural areas are treated fairly in terms of the application of property based charges.

The Stamp Duties Act 1923 will be amended to ensure that instruments that operate to disclaim, transfer or assign interests in real or personal property under a Will or intestacy are chargeable with *ad valorem* duty.

The need for this legislation has arisen as a result of a judgement of the South Australian Supreme Court which found that a Disclaimer was invalid on the basis that probate had not yet been granted in relation to the deceased estate and therefore the beneficiaries under the Will had not yet become entitled to any interest under the Will.

The Act will also be amended to extend the exemption provided for a transfer of mortgage to include the conveyance of the underlying debt.

The 1996 High Court decision in *Allders International Pty Ltd v Commissioner of State Revenue (Victoria)* held that stamp duty on a lease covering part of commonwealth land was constitutionally invalid. Consequently the validity of other State taxes was brought into question.

A Bill will therefore be introduced in respect of essential safety-net legislation to complement arrangements agreed between my Government and the Commonwealth Government for the administration and collection of South Australian taxation legislation that are applied as commonwealth laws in commonwealth places situated in South Australia.

From a practical perspective, taxpayers will not be aware of any significant change in approach because of the 'seamless' integration of both the commonwealth legislation and the proposed State mirror taxation legislation.

The States will collect the commonwealth taxes on behalf of the commonwealth, which will return the taxes collected to the States through a standing appropriation.

The legislative program for this year responds to needs and requirements across the spectrum of the South Australian community.

As we enter this extremely important and historic session of Parliament—the last for this millennium, I encourage all elected members to be mindful of the significant responsibility they have to continue to work both towards the common good of their local communities and the state as a whole.

It is also appropriate to remember, as we enter a new century, the contribution of those past members of parliament who have passed away in the last year.

They include former Premier Don Dunstan, and former Member for Goyder, Keith Russack.

The President again took the Chair and read prayers.

[Sitting suspended from 12.37 p.m. to 2.30 p.m.]

STANDING ORDERS

The PRESIDENT: I have to inform the Council that I have received a memorandum from his Excellency the Governor, with a copy of amendments to the standing orders of the Legislative Council adopted by this Council on 5 August 1999 and approved by Executive Council on 9 September 1999.

MEMBERS, TRAVEL

The PRESIDENT laid on the table members' travel expenditure 1998-1999 pursuant to the Members of Parliament Travel Entitlement Rules 1983.

STATUTORY AUTHORITIES REVIEW COMMITTEE

The Hon. L.H. DAVIS: I lay on the table the report of the committee on its inquiry into boards, statutory authorities, remuneration levels, selection processes, gender and ethnic composition and move:

That the report be printed.

Motion carried.

The Hon. L.H. DAVIS: I lay on the table the annual report 1998-99 of the committee and move:

That the report be printed.

Motion carried.

PAPERS TABLED

The following papers were laid on the table:

By the President—

Members' Travel Expenditure, 1998-99, pursuant to Members of Parliament Travel Entitlement Rules, 1983
Register of Members' Interests—June 1999—Registrar's Statement. Ordered—That the Statement be printed (Paper No. 134)

By the Treasurer (Hon. R.I. Lucas)—

Department of Education, Training and Employment—Report, 1998
Regulations under the following Acts—
Electricity Corporations (Restructuring and Disposal) Act 1999—Amendment
Financial Institutions Duty Act 1983—Variation
Land Tax Act 1936—General
Mutual Recognition (South Australia) Act 1993—Temporary Exemptions
Petroleum Products Regulations Act 1995—Fees
Stamp Duties Act 1923—Authorised Deposit Institutions Variation
Technical and Further Education Act 1975—General
Trans-Tasman Mutual Recognition (South Australia) Act 1999—Temporary Exemptions
Adelaide Entertainments Corporation—Charter for 1999-2000
Government Boards and Committees Information—Boards and Committees (by Portfolio), 30 June 1999—Volumes 1 and 2
Public Corporations Act 1993—ETSA Corporation—Ministerial Directions
Public Corporations Act 1993—SA Generation Corporation—Ministerial Directions
Public Corporations (Distribution Lessor Corporation) Regulations 1999—Charter
Public Corporations (Generation Lessor Corporation) Regulations 1999—Charter
South Australian Superannuation Scheme—Actuarial Report, 1998

By the Attorney-General (Hon. K.T. Griffin)—

Report, 1998-99—
Ports Corp South Australia
The Phylloxera and Grape Industry Board of SA
Regulations under the following Acts—
Legal Practitioners Act 1981—Interstate Practitioners
Occupational Health, Safety and Welfare Act 1986—Transport of Dangerous Goods
Subordinate Legislation Act 1978—Regulations Expiry Dates
Supreme Court Act 1935—Authorised Deposit Institutions
Worker's Liens Act 1893—Fees
Evidence Act 1929—Report relating to Suppression Orders, 1999
Remuneration Tribunal—Determination and Report

By the Minister for Justice (Hon. K.T. Griffin)—

Regulations under the following Act—
Police Act 1998—General

By the Minister for Consumer Affairs (Hon. K.T. Griffin)—

Regulations under the following Act—
Fair Trading Act 1987—General
Liquor Licensing Act 1997—Dry Areas—
Clare
Kadina

By the Minister for Transport and Urban Planning (Hon. Diana Laidlaw)—

Regulations under the following Acts—
Harbors and Navigation Act 1993—
Certificate of Competency
Licences
Highways Act 1926—Hindmarsh Island Ferry
Historic Shipwrecks Act 1981—General
Local Government Act 1934—Local Government Superannuation Board
Medical Practitioners Act 1983—
Practitioners' Fees
Registration
Motor Vehicles Act 1959—Miscellaneous
Road Traffic Act 1961
Declared Hospitals
Driver Hours
Vehicle Identification Plate
South Australian Health Commission Act 1976—
Audit
Benefit Entitlement Card
Perinatal Statistics
Water Resources Act 1997—Bolivar Watercourse
District Council By-laws—
Adelaide Hills—Bird Scarers
City of Norwood, Payneham and St. Peters, Kensington and Norwood (City), Local Heritage Places (Built Heritage) Plan Amendment Report—Report
City of Port Augusta—Industry (Port Augusta Power Stations) Plan Amendment Report—Report
Murray-Darling Basin Agreement 1992—Interstate Transfer of Water Allocations
Railways Agreement 1997—First Amending Agreement

By the Minister for the Arts (Hon. Diana Laidlaw)—

Regulations under the following Act—
Carrick Hill Trust Act 1985—Parking.

CHINESE DEVELOPERS

The Hon. R.I. LUCAS (Treasurer): I seek leave to table a copy of a ministerial statement made in another place today by the Premier on the subject of questions about chief executives and investments.

Leave granted.

QUESTION TIME

EMERGENCY SERVICES LEVY

The Hon. CAROLYN PICKLES: I seek leave to make a brief explanation before asking the Attorney-General, representing the Minister for Police, a question about the emergency services levy.

Leave granted.

The Hon. CAROLYN PICKLES: If we believe the government's rhetoric about listening to the people, how did it manage to selectively ignore a very significant group of people like motorists who already contribute heavily to the state's revenue through increased fees and charges on vehicles, and will the Attorney reveal the formula originally used by the government in determining that motorists will contribute 25 per cent of the total $141 million? The government's new found largess means that motorists will be contributing nearly 30 per cent of the total emergency services tax revenue.

The Hon. K.T. GRIFFIN (Attorney-General): I will refer the question to my colleague and bring back a reply. My recollection is that the 25 per cent figure was identified in the

report that was tabled last year relating to the new proposed system. That was calculated quite simply on the basis of the amount of time, energy, effort and resources that went into dealing with emergencies involving vehicles. That is my understanding. I may need to correct that when I get a more detailed response. It is really quite a simple matter. That is approximately the figure of the effort which goes into emergency services and the resources applicable to motor vehicle related emergencies.

The Hon. P. HOLLOWAY: I seek leave to make a brief explanation before asking the Treasurer a question about the emergency services tax and ETSA privatisation.

Leave granted.

The Hon. P. HOLLOWAY: A media report today states that the change to the emergency services tax is to be financed by 'a better than expected response to the lease of ETSA'. Under the government's proposal, the emergency services tax will now raise $20 million less than previously proposed. In his 1998 report, the Auditor-General was able to find a net gain to the state public sector from the ETSA privatisation of the order of only $35 million to $65 million, and this was based on figures provided by the government which the Auditor was not able to independently verify. Despite this, the Olsen government has persisted in the claim that there is a $100 million annual net benefit to the budget from the privatisation. Now an additional $20 million of annual financial benefit has been discovered. The 1999-2000 budget contains a 5.2 per cent increase in outlays in real terms and a claimed $1 million surplus following a $65 million deficit in 1998-99. In light of those facts, my questions are:

1. How much does the government now believe it can receive from the privatisation of the electricity assets?

2. By when does the government anticipate having the full privatisation proceeds?

3. Given that these proceeds will not be available in full during the current financial year, by how much will the 1999-2000 budget be in deficit as a result of the decision on the emergency services tax; that is, by how much will this decision increase state debt?

The Hon. R.I. LUCAS (Treasurer): The transcript of the Premier's press conference yesterday indicated that the government had decided that it would bring forward some of the benefit to be received by the taxpayers—

The Hon. T. Crothers interjecting:

The Hon. R.I. LUCAS: The Hon. Mr Crothers—

Members interjecting:

The PRESIDENT: Order!

The Hon. R.I. LUCAS: The Hon. Mr Crothers rightly, I think, might be a touch miffed at how his proposal was treated by the Hon. Mr Holloway and some Independents.

Members interjecting:

The PRESIDENT: Order! It is time for the Treasurer to continue with his answer.

The Hon. A.J. Redford interjecting:

The PRESIDENT: Order!

The Hon. L.H. Davis interjecting:

The PRESIDENT: Order! I have called for order three times.

Members interjecting:

The PRESIDENT: Order!

The Hon. R.I. LUCAS: The transcript of the Premier's press conference yesterday says, 'Firstly, we are going to bring forward—'

The Hon. R.R. Roberts: That was a media release.

The PRESIDENT: Order!

The Hon. R.I. LUCAS: That's a sensational interjection from the Hon. Mr Roberts—a sensational interjection! It says:

> Firstly, we are going to bring forward part of the dividend, if you like, from the sale or lease of our power utilities.

Later it says:

> So we now have the surety of five good bids sitting on the table as it relates to the process.

The Hon. R.R. Roberts interjecting:

The Hon. R.I. LUCAS: Well, we are all indebted—

The Hon. R.R. Roberts interjecting:

The PRESIDENT: Order! The question has been asked by the Opposition and it ought to cease interjecting.

The Hon. R.R. Roberts interjecting:

The PRESIDENT: Order, the Hon. Mr Roberts!

The Hon. R.I. LUCAS: We are all indebted to the community concerns which are reflected by our members such as the Hon. Mr Stefani, who has been most assiduous in reflecting community concerns in questions, and by a number of other members of Parliament in not only this chamber but in another chamber. As the Premier indicated yesterday, this government, and he as Premier, are listening to the concerns expressed by the South Australian community. The Premier indicated yesterday that as Premier—

The Hon. R.R. Roberts interjecting:

The Hon. R.I. LUCAS: The Premier does not have to pretend to be anything other than what he is. He has indicated not only in his decisions announced yesterday but in a number of other areas a willingness to listen to the concerns that have been expressed by the South Australian community and, where possible, to respond to them. I am surprised that the Hon. Mr Holloway is critical of the Premier for being prepared to listen to the message. It is not a slogan with this Government as it is with Mr Rann and the Labor Party with their 'Labor Listens' rhetoric: this is a government and a Premier who listen and who have acted. It is not a question of talking but of listening and then responding where that is possible.

The Premier, as he indicated at his press conference yesterday, right from May when he first raised this issue with his colleagues, as he indicated, and then again in June, prior to any Victorian election campaign or election result, spoke publicly and was reported in the *Advertiser* as having expressed some concern and willingness to review and reconsider aspects of the emergency services levy. It is to his credit that he and the government have listened to the concerns of the community and, as I said, they acknowledge that members in this chamber and another chamber have raised those community concerns.

In relation to some of the specific questions raised by the Hon. Mr Holloway, I have indicated previously that the immediate guesstimate of the decision in relation to not proceeding with the Rann power bill increase was that the government might see a deficit of up to $100 million in this particular financial year. Again, the government could have adopted a position that, because the leasing process had been delayed, we would continue with the Rann power bill increase for six or 12 months. Again, we took the decision that we did not believe that that was fair on the South Australian community. We decided openly, and announced so, that there would be an one-off impact on the budget for this particular financial year. As I said, that will be, at that

time, an estimate of up to $100 million. It was the government's wish to try to minimise the extent of that deficit and the degree that we could bring forward lease proceeds within this financial year would obviously assist.

In relation to the questions about timing of lease proceeds, the government's estimates announced during the last session remain broadly on track; that is, we would hope to have financial close of our first lease contract for ETSA Utilities and ETSA Power in January of next year, and the government would hope to have concluded the lease contracts for all of the business by no later than the middle of next year or the third quarter of next year. We think we might have been able to conclude lease contracts for the three generation companies and Terra Gas Trader before the end of the financial year, although not much before the end of the financial year, and Electranet would not be concluded until perhaps the third quarter of next year. So, the government's timetable remains broadly on track.

There is one significant proviso. We need to work our way through a process with the ACCC, which the government is well and truly into and we remain hopeful that the work we undertake with the ACCC can be concluded within a timeframe which will enable us to meet the deadlines that we have outlined. There are a number of questions. I think I have responded to all of the questions. If there is one that I have omitted to respond to it is not my deliberate intent. I will check, and if there is anything further I will add to my response by way of further information to the honourable member.

The Hon. P. HOLLOWAY: As a supplementary question, Mr President, given that the Treasurer indicated that he expected earlier this year a budget deficit for $100 million, does the decision on the emergency service tax now indicate that the expected deficit will be $120 million this year?

The Hon. R.I. LUCAS: No, Mr President. The government hopes that we can arrive at a deficit which is less than $100 million. That will be the government's objective, in terms of a 1999-2000 result. It is certainly not a decision we took yesterday that we are looking at a $120 million deficit. We are looking as an objective to try to have a deficit which is less than $100 million for this financial year.

Again, I hasten to say that this is a one-off issue, because, if we have concluded all of the lease contracts by the middle of next year, then the government's estimation is a broad based benefit ongoing of about $100 million, which is the estimate that we gave at the start of this particular process. We are obviously hoping that that will be at least matched and possibly, although there is still some time to go yet before we see final bids, improved. So, the government is looking to have a deficit which is lower than the $100 million, not $120 million.

The Premier indicated in his press statement yesterday that the government has seen some benefit from a recent actuary's report on the public sector superannuation schemes. There will be a benefit to the budget of some millions of dollars. I will be in a position in the not too distant future to indicate the detail of that, but that is an unexpected benefit to the budget this year. As the Premier indicated yesterday, part of the $20 million for this financial year will be funded through that mechanism.

ABORIGINES, YOUTH

The Hon. T.G. ROBERTS: I seek leave to make a brief explanation before asking the Minister representing the Minister for Aboriginal Affairs a question about Aboriginal youth funding programs.

Leave granted.

The Hon. T.G. ROBERTS: During the break I had the opportunity of moving around the state (including the north and the Northern Territory) visiting health, housing and, particularly, youth services programs being run for Aboriginal people. Aboriginal health, housing and youth programs cannot be viewed in isolation (by state) because of the way in which the commonwealth presents its funding programs and Aboriginal people move throughout the states.

I found that the commonwealth government had consistently cut funding to community youth budgets and that it was more than likely that the states had to pick up the deficit created by the federal government or create funding programs of their own to fill budget holes. In many cases, I found that ATSIC funding which had been allocated to many of these programs had been cut and ATSIC allocations were not being picked up either locally or at a state level. So, there were huge holes in their budgets.

Upon talking to Aboriginal people when I returned to Adelaide regarding programs in this state, I found that the same problem has arisen and that many of the programs for preventing young Aboriginal people from being incarcerated in prisons are not being carried out. So, we are spending money on youth Aboriginal services in the prison system but we are not presenting young Aboriginal people with opportunities to participate in funding programs to service youth in the areas of education, health, recreation, etc.

It appears to me that a false economy is being created by the deficit in federal funding for Aboriginal youth services. I have some sympathy for the states and particularly this state for the position in which it finds itself in trying to service youth programs which previously were funded by the federal government and ATSIC. I understand that many people are drifting into the Adelaide service area from Wilcannia, Port Augusta, Ceduna and regional Victoria, and that that is presenting new problems for government services. As government funding for previous programs has been cut, there is now an overlying funding crisis in relation to the transfer of problems of other communities to the metropolitan area of Adelaide.

Aboriginal people are trying to cope through voluntary means as best they can, but in areas of paid crisis care they are struggling to maintain a constant service. I pay tribute to the people who work in those areas because many of them are tired, worn out and certainly stretched to the limit. My questions are:

1. Will the government conduct a mid-year financial review of its spending programs to allow for increased allocations for Aboriginal youth support programs and projects in South Australia to overcome some of the new problems that now exist?

2. If no further state funds are available for increased services in this area, will the state government pressure the federal government into reallocating funds to this important area of prevention and cure which is also under funded?

The Hon. DIANA LAIDLAW (Minister for Transport and Urban Planning): I will refer those questions to my colleague in another place and bring back a reply.

EMERGENCY SERVICES LEVY

The Hon. J.F. STEFANI: I seek leave to make a brief explanation before asking the Attorney-General, representing

the Minister for Emergency Services, a question about the emergency services levy?

Leave granted.

The Hon. J.F. STEFANI: Yesterday, the government announced a reduction in the emergency services levy for all residential property owners in the cities and towns throughout South Australia, rural property owners, retired and aged facilities, charitable organisations, recreational facilities and private schools. I have sought clarification of the definition of the description of all residential property owners and have been advised that the new levy formula will be applied to all residential properties that are either owner occupied or used and occupied by residential tenants.

Since 1 July 1999, thousands of residential properties have been sold and the new owners have had to pay the emergency services levy which was applied using the old formula. This effectively means that they have paid much more than the amounts now being proposed by the government. My questions are:

1. Will the minister confirm that the new levy rate will apply to all residential properties, whether owner occupied or rented?

2. Will the minister advise when the government will process the cheques to refund the overpayments made by the thousands of new residential property owners throughout South Australia?

3. Will the minister ensure that the appropriate interest rate of 4.8 per cent, as stipulated in the regulations, is also refunded at the same time to the new residential property owners who have acquired properties and who have paid the higher levies since 1 July 1999?

The Hon. K.T. GRIFFIN (Attorney-General): My understanding is that the issue is being addressed and that there will be refunds. Ultimately, the adjustment between vendors and purchasers will have to be made as between them rather than by the government to both of them, but the government refund, as I understand it, will be addressed appropriately. In terms of interest, I am not aware of what will happen. I will double-check the answer that I have just given and keep open the possibility that I am wrong—I do not think I am—and I will bring back a reply.

GOVERNMENT RADIO NETWORK

The Hon. IAN GILFILLAN: I seek leave to ask the Minister for Administrative Services a question about the government radio network.

The PRESIDENT: The honourable member can ask a question without seeking leave but I understand that he is seeking leave to make an explanation.

The Hon. IAN GILFILLAN: I am, indeed.

Leave granted.

The Hon. IAN GILFILLAN: In the Estimates Committee of 30 June this year, the Minister for Administrative Services told the committee:

> The facts ultimately with the government radio network contract are that it went to tender; there were two tenderers—Telstra and AAPT; the tenders were assessed appropriately; and the process was fully accountable and met all prudential requirements.

On Thursday 16 September, in a letter to the Editor of the *Advertiser*, the Minister for Police, Correctional Services and Emergency Services said in response to an earlier inquiry by a reader:

> The GRN contract [government radio network contract] was certainly the subject of a competitive tendering process, which was won by Telstra.

I contrast these two government statements with a report published in April this year by the Public Works Committee on the government radio network. Reproducing a letter from the minister, the report describes how in April 1994, just five months after being elected, the Liberal cabinet nominated the Motorola Astro Smartzone with Omnilink as the preferred technology for the government radio network. Within five months (according to this letter from the minister) a request for proposal (RFP) had been drawn up and issued, expressions of interest received and a decision made.

I quote from the letter dated 19 March to Mr Peter Lewis MP, Presiding Member, as follows:

> In April 1994 cabinet determined that Motorola Astro Smartzone technology was preferred. The technology was proposed to the government by Telecom in response to the state's request for proposal (RFP).

Two and a half years later, in 1997, the government issued a request for proposal seeking proposals from the marketplace to design, construct, operate and manage a system using only Motorola technology on which the government had already decided. Page 10 of the same report of the Public Works Committee quotes Rod Dowling, Engineer Manager, Wireless, DAIS, which is the minister's own department, who identified no fewer than six other types of technology that might have been chosen. However, none of these other six were said to meet the government's requirements.

From experience, I know that, to get a certain answer to a question, members have to take great care to frame the questions properly. The crucial aspect of this issue is how and when the government came up with these requirements—its 'must-have' list—on the basis of which all possibilities other than Motorola were excluded. My questions to the minister are:

1. When did the government draw up its requirements for a new system?

2. Were the requirements drawn up before or after April 1994 when cabinet designated Motorola as the preferred supplier for the new government radio network?

3. When and how were the government's requirements made clear to the developers of other technologies?

4. What, if any, opportunity was given to the developers of other technologies to modify their systems so as to meet the government's requirements before they were effectively excluded from consideration only five months after the government took office?

5. Given that the choice of technology for the GRN was made in such great haste, and we are told as a result of an RFP but not a competitive tender, why is the government continuing to mislead the public by repeating what is at best a half truth that the final awarding of the contract was the result of a full and open process?

The Hon. R.D. LAWSON (Minister for Administrative Services): I begin by saying that the government is not misleading the public in relation to the information which has been provided to the parliament and to the Public Works Committee regarding the background to the awarding of the contract for the government radio network. The decision to proceed with the technology that was ultimately adopted was not made in great haste.

In the light of the honourable member's question and also his media release today, it is worth going through some of the history. The decision was made by the Labor Government in

1992 to proceed with a single integrated network because the existing conventional non-integrated radio networks did not meet the state's needs. That decision was made in 1992, albeit some nine years after the Ash Wednesday bushfires when the State Coroner recommended that an integrated network should be adopted.

Following that decision by the Labor Government, independent technology experts Amos Aked and Swift made a report in April 1993 nominating Motorola Smartzone and Ericsson/GE EDACS as two technologies that would meet the requirements of public safety organisations. When the election occurred later in 1993, no final decision had been taken on the matter, so the position was that independent experts had advised that there were two possible technologies which might meet the state's requirements.

A request for preliminary proposals document was issued in 1994. It described the state's requirements in outcome terms, that is, the requirements we needed to establish our integrated network. That request for preliminary proposals did not prescribe any specific technical solution. So, when this government came to office and sought requests for proposals, it did not seek or specify a specific technical solution. Requests for preliminary proposals were issued to Telecom, as it then was, Optus, Vodaphone, Pacific Star and British Telecom. So, five companies were capable of delivering these particular services. In the event, only two bids were received, and they were from Telecom and Optus. They were detailed, specific proposals and they were evaluated.

The Telecom bid incorporated Motorola Smartzone technology—not at any request from the government but that was Telecom's own selection. The Optus bid incorporated GSM, or mobile telephone technology, but the independent experts Amos, Aked and Swift—and I remind the chamber that they were the independent experts retained by the previous government—did not identify GSM, the mobile telephone technology, as suitable. It did not meet the user requirements.

Members will be aware that mobile telephony is extremely good on a one-to-one basis but it is not good in the radio network situation where one has one-to-many transmissions made. I should say that earlier, in January 1994, Amos, Aked and Swift had reported that the Ericsson technology was unsuitable as it was limited to 32 sites or fewer, and the government radio network, covering as it does the whole of the state of South Australia, would have transmitter sites totalling a vast number more than 32. Further, it could not support encrypted voice, which is important, for example, in relation to the police network, where it is inappropriate that people with scanners can listen into police voice transmissions. And it was also confined to the 800 megahertz frequency band. Those constraints precluded the Ericsson/GE EDACS solution from consideration in the view of the independent experts who had been retained by the Government and by the previous government as well.

In April 1994, Cabinet determined that Motorola Smartzone technology was preferred, as proposed by Telecom. Based upon the evidence that was then available, that was an entirely appropriate decision. The government's requirement was that we have technology which was proven and which would be capable of operating in emergency situations; which had been demonstrated in other comparable situations to actually work and be useable; which was entirely flexible; which would cover both digital and analog transmission; and which would include not only a voice network but also data transmission as well as paging.

An evaluation panel, consisting of representatives of the office of information technology and the Information Technology Task Force, was appointed, and it indicated that the evaluation process would cast no doubt on earlier advice that there was any realistic alternative to Motorola for the mobile radio voice component of the contract. Another firm of international experts, Gibson Quai & Associates, reported in 1996 confirming the suitability of the Motorola Smartzone technology. Once again, at a later stage, in January 1999, shortly before the awarding of the contract to Telstra, that firm confirmed the suitability of the Motorola Smartzone technology.

The honourable member seeks to create the inference that, when the Liberal government came into office at the end of 1993 and just five months after it was elected, it had decided upon Motorola as a preferred supplier. The suggestion that he seeks to make is that that was a very short time in which any government could come up with such a decision. However, the fact is, as I have indicated, experts had already been appointed. The previous government had set about a course of analysing the appropriate technology to meet the needs of an integrated radio network. It was not a hasty decision, and it was not a decision that was taken ill-advisedly. It was a decision that was taken after at least nine years of delay by the previous government in coming to grips with a recommendation that was designed to meet the emergency services requirements of this state. The previous government simply had not grasped the nettle, and the present government is to be congratulated for doing so.

Suggestions have been made that the Ericsson technology would have been more appropriate. I indicated a little earlier that the Ericsson technology was identified in an earlier report. However, I can say—

Members interjecting:

The PRESIDENT: Order!

The Hon. R.D. LAWSON: —that the Ericsson technology which had been earlier suggested was selected by the Tasmanian Hydroelectric Corporation, but a number of significant delays occurred as a result of a number of factors, including coverage problems due to rugged terrain—the sorts of problems we might well expect in South Australia. As a result of that, the contract between the Tasmanian government and Ericsson has been renegotiated to reduce the coverage of that state, and that record indicates that we were lucky not to have gone down the Ericsson route.

Similarly, in New Zealand, the New Zealand police awarded a contract to a consortium consisting of New Zealand based Tate Electronics and United Kingdom based Simco International to supply a Tetra digital radio communication system in Auckland in time for the September APEC conference and the America's Cup in October. That system, which has a number of advocates in South Australia, is possibly behind the honourable member's question, because unsuccessful tenderers are inclined to suggest that their solution was a better solution and that any other selection is achieved by nefarious means. That system was not delivered in time for the APEC conference and delays have occurred.

There is currently no Tetra approved equipment in Australia, and no common radio frequency is available. I trust that the information that I have provided to the Council has answered the substance of the allegations made in the honourable member's questions. The Public Works Committee—

Members interjecting:

The PRESIDENT: Order!

The Hon. R.D. LAWSON: —was satisfied with the process. If there is anything else in the honourable member's question that remains unanswered, I will be happy to bring back further information.

Members interjecting:

The PRESIDENT: Order!

The Hon. IAN GILFILLAN: I have a supplementary question. I assume that the Minister is aware of the statement given—

The PRESIDENT: Order! The honourable member must ask a question.

The Hon. IAN GILFILLAN: I refer to my question about this matter. I refer to the statement by Mr Rod Dowling, Engineer Manager—

The PRESIDENT: Order! I will sit the honourable member down if he does not ask a question.

The Hon. IAN GILFILLAN: My question is: is the Minister aware of the statement made by the Engineer Manager, Wireless, of his own department to the Public Works Committee, whose final report was handed down in April 1999, in which he outlined at least six other technologies that would have been appropriate or available for consideration for this process? What opportunities were given to developers of other technologies to qualify their systems to meet the government's requirements if, indeed, in 1994, after five months of office, the government found that some of them had some modifications that could have been made?

The Hon. R.D. LAWSON: I believe that I have answered the honourable member's question by indicating that, when the government went to market on this proposal, it did not specify a particular technical solution; no solution was excluded in the proposal of the government. It is a fact that Telstra, which was one of the two companies to bid, did adopt the Motorola Smartzone technology. That was its decision, not ours.

The Hon. A.J. REDFORD: As a supplementary question, is the Minister aware of a recent meeting on the radio network in Mount Gambier, as reported in the *Border Watch*? If so, does the Minister have any response to the matters raised at that meeting, as reported in the *Border Watch*?

The Hon. R.D. LAWSON: I am not aware of the report in the *Border Watch* to which the honourable member refers. I was aware that a meeting was held at which the executive director of the government radio network project team, Mr Peter Fowler, was present and answered a number of questions asked by local residents.

The Hon. M.J. Elliott interjecting:

The Hon. R.D. LAWSON: Some of those questions were raised legitimately by people who are members of emergency services organisations in the South-East; others were raised by amateur radio operators who seemed to be expressing an interest in scanning into the government radio network.

The Hon. A.J. Redford: Voyeurs.

The Hon. R.D. LAWSON: The honourable member says 'Voyeurs'—indeed, radio voyeurs whose concern was to ascertain—

Members interjecting:

The PRESIDENT: Order!

The Hon. R.D. LAWSON: —what sort of scanning devices would be appropriate so they could listen in to the new government radio network. This radio network is not being developed for the benefit of private radio enthusiasts: it is a government radio network that is being devised for the emergency services—for the police, fire and other services—and it is being devised specifically for their needs. I am advised that in the South-East it is not possible for police in Mount Gambier to contact police in Naracoorte or Millicent by radio: they actually have to transmit their radio messages through Adelaide.

Members interjecting:

The PRESIDENT: Order!

The Hon. R.D. LAWSON: This government radio network will answer those concerns that have been legitimately raised by emergency services workers and police in the South-East. If there is additional information that ought to be provided to those people who were present at the meeting to which the honourable member refers, I will obtain that information and refer it to the honourable member.

POLICE OPERATIONS INTELLIGENCE DIVISION

The Hon. CAROLINE SCHAEFER: I seek leave to make a brief explanation before asking the Attorney-General a question about the police Operations Intelligence Division.

Leave granted.

The Hon. CAROLINE SCHAEFER: An article in last Sunday's *Sunday Mail* raised a number of issues in relation to the police Operations Intelligence Division and suggested something sinister about that division and its work. In fact, the article made it sound like some sort of secret service. The implication, as I read it, was that there was a lack of accountability, to say the least. Can the Attorney identify the real position with the Operations Intelligence Division? Who set it up and, in particular, what protections are there against the keeping of material that is not authorised by law?

The Hon. K.T. GRIFFIN (Attorney-General): I was amazed to open the *Sunday Mail* and find this story splashed across a couple of pages on Sunday. I must confess that I cannot understand where it originated because if the facts had been checked it would have been seen that a significant part of the article was in fact wrong, and that is in respect of the position now with the police Operations Intelligence Division.

So I could not understand the motivation for it, nor could I understand the origins of the article. In respect to the motivation I could not understand whether the journalist was actually promoting that there ought to be something done to modify the Operations Intelligence Division or that some other action should be taken, or was merely raising the issue for the purpose of floating something which might create suspicion. But it is important to try to put the Operations Intelligence Division into a factual context.

Those who have been around for a long time will remember that when the Labor Government was in office and Premier Dunstan was the premier there was the furore over Special Branch files and that led ultimately to the dismissal of then Commissioner Mr Harold Salisbury. Immediately all that had occurred the Bannon Labor Government enacted some directions through the Governor to change quite significantly Special Branch, and that was in January 1978. In November 1980 some modifications were made to the terms of reference for Special Branch, set out in the Governor's Directions.

Special Branch was discontinued in July 1984. It was replaced with the Operations Planning and Intelligence Unit and there were some Governor's Directions in relation to that in 1986, 1987 and 1989. In December 1993 the Operations

Planning and Intelligence Unit was discontinued and replaced with the Operations Intelligence Division. In March 1998 there were some modified Governor's Directions in line with the restructuring of SA Police under the Focus 21 initiative, and in July of this year some new directions were given, this time Ministerial Directions under the provisions of the new Police Act.

All of the amendments to the directions invariably have reflected organisational change, administrative and functional process and the move to computerisation. The specific directions relating to the gathering, storage, dissemination and destruction of records have remained largely unchanged. If I could just take a moment or two to go back to the Special Branch directions given on 18 January 1978 for the purpose of looking at the objectives within which the Special Branch had to operate. They provide:

1. No records, or other material, shall be kept in Special Branch or elsewhere in relation to security matters by the Commissioner, or any person under his control as Commissioner, with respect to any experience unless—
   (1) That record or material, either alone or with other existing records or material, contains matters which give rise to a reasonable suspicion that the person, or some other person, has committed an offence relevant to matters of security, or
   (2) That record or material, either alone or with other existing records or material, contains matters which formed the whole or part of the facts with respect to which that person has been charged with an offence relevant to matters of security in respect of which proceedings have not been dismissed or withdrawn, or
   (3) That record or material, either alone or with other existing records or material, contains matters which give rise to a reasonable suspicion that that person, either alone or with other persons, may do any act or thing which would overthrow, or tend to overthrow, by force or violence, the constitutionally established Government of South Australia or of the Commonwealth of Australia, or may commit or incite the commission of acts of violence against any person or persons.

That was the origin of the amended Special Branch directions. At that time the culling and destruction of records or material was to be conducted under those Governor's Directions, under the direct supervision of the Honourable Mr Acting Justice White. From that point on there has always been an auditor who has been charged with the responsibility of vetting the records which have been kept to determine whether or not they conform with the Governor's Directions or, more recently, the Ministerial Directions.

In 1986, more comprehensive Governor's Directions were given in relation to what was then the Operations Planning and Intelligence Unit. Those can be found in the *Government Gazette* of 24 March 1986. The objectives of that unit were much the same although expanded a little, but they all focused on violence or threats of violence or activities directories against dignitaries or governments. Those objectives were reflected again in the Ministerial Directions earlier this year in almost, if not identical, terms to those which appeared in March 1986.

It must be remembered that the 1978 directions were given under a Labor government. The 1986 directions were given under a Labor government when the Hon. Mr Sumner was Attorney-General, and what has been done by the present government is consistent with each of those directions which were given under a Labor administration. That is an important point to note: there is a need for an operations intelligence division of some description, it is important that it be properly constrained by the directions which are given lawfully under the legislation under which it is established and that there be proper scrutiny.

After Acting Justice White had undertaken his task of culling the records, I remind members that in 1980 the Hon. David Hogarth QC, a former judge of the Supreme Court, was appointed as auditor. He retired due to ill health in 1987. In 1987, Judge Roy Grubb was appointed as the auditor. He died suddenly on 18 March 1991. In June 1991, Mr Kevin Canny was appointed, and he held office for quite some time. The present auditor is the Hon. Christopher Legoe, a former judge of the Supreme Court, and he was appointed in September 1995.

So, the articles in the *Sunday Mail* have no substance in terms of creating a sinister suspicion that something is awry in relation to the Operations Intelligence Division. The public can be assured that proper and lawful directions govern the operations of that division and that its activities are properly audited by former Justice Legoe who I think would have been offended by the article which tended to suggest a need for greater accountability.

The Hon. T.G. CAMERON: By way of a supplementary question, will the Attorney-General advise the Council whether there are any members of parliament on this list and whether the police have used phone tapping in the compilation of any information in relation to the list?

The Hon. K.T. GRIFFIN: I have no idea. It is not normal for the police commissioner to identify the information which might be kept in those records—and for obvious reasons. If ministers were informed about the information that was kept, then there might well, and perhaps justifiably—

The Hon. T.G. Cameron interjecting:

The Hon. K.T. GRIFFIN: I have no idea, and I doubt whether it would be appropriate for me or the Minister for Police, Correctional Services and Emergency Services to be informed.

The Hon. T.G. Cameron: Isn't it appropriate that this Council be advised if its members are on the list?

Members interjecting:

The PRESIDENT: Order!

The Hon. K.T. GRIFFIN: The moment you ask that question it necessarily leads to questions about who may or may not be identified on those records. I do not believe that the Hon. Chris Sumner would have been informed of who may or may not have been on it. He, too, would have regarded that as improper because of the purpose for which the information might have been perceived, at least from the outside, to have been used.

In terms of how police gather their intelligence, obviously, if there is a lawful basis for a telephone interception warrant, that may well be used, but you must look at the commonwealth Telecommunications (Interception) Act, which identifies quite clearly the basis upon which interception warrants may be granted. They are granted only in relation to a serious offence which is under investigation or which may be committed. So, I suppose that it is possible, although I have no direct or even indirect knowledge that that is the way in which information is gathered by the Operations Intelligence Division.

The Hon. T.G. Cameron: We could have been on the list and they could have been tapping our telephones—you just don't know.

The Hon. K.T. GRIFFIN: Unless any member has committed a serious offence or there is evidence that a member may commit or be planning an offence, I do not

believe that would be the case. If anyone wants to point the bone or the finger, let them do so, but I do not believe—

The Hon. T. Crothers interjecting:

The Hon. K.T. GRIFFIN: I come back to the point that telephone interception can be done only in accordance with the law. The law requires a warrant to be issued. A warrant can be issued only upon certain grounds which are specified within the law relating to the commission of an offence or a reasonable suspicion that an offence is about to be committed—and they are serious offences.

I will take the honourable member's question on notice and give further consideration to the issue and refer it to my colleague in another place. However, in the context to which I have referred I would be surprised if a proper conclusion was reached that it was appropriate to inquire of the commissioner for that sort of information. However, let me take the question on notice because it is a serious issue to which I want to respond fairly and reasonably.

The Hon. T. CROTHERS: I ask a supplementary question. Has this state intelligence gathering agency had connections with other state or federal government intelligence agencies such as ASIO in respect of the manner in which it compiles its files? I ask the Attorney that question because phone tapping—

The PRESIDENT: Order! The honourable member can only ask a question. The Hon. Mr Gilfillan stretched it a bit, but I will not allow the honourable member to stretch it any further.

The Hon. K.T. GRIFFIN: There are provisions in both the Governor's Directions previously and now the Ministerial Directions which seek to deal strictly with the exchange of information between police agencies and other law enforcement bodies across Australia.

The Hon. T. Crothers: ASIO could be authorising phone taps in South Australia.

The Hon. K.T. GRIFFIN: I do not know about ASIO, but the National Crime Authority—

The Hon. T. Crothers interjecting:

The Hon. K.T. GRIFFIN: If the honourable member is interested, he can look at the South Australian *Government Gazette* dated 8 July 1999, pages 174 and following. At that reference he will find the most up-to-date directions which outline both the terms of reference of the Operations Intelligence Division and also the way in which information may be exchanged with other agencies. In terms of telephone interception, telephone communications interception legislation is commonwealth legislation. That legislation sets out a very clear framework within which warrants can be obtained from a member—

The Hon. M.J. Elliott: Does that constrain ASIO?

The Hon. K.T. GRIFFIN: I have excluded ASIO because I am not sure what applies in relation to ASIO. I have no responsibility for it, but ASIO—

Members interjecting:

The Hon. K.T. GRIFFIN: All right. The issue having been raised, I will take it on notice—

Members interjecting:

The PRESIDENT: Order!

The Hon. K.T. GRIFFIN: There are very strict provisions under the Federal Telecommunications Interception Act about who may have access to information that comes from a telephone interception warrant. Even the person who transcribes it must be identified in the report on the warrant, the purposes for which the warrant was used as well as the information gathered from that warrant, that is, for the purpose of a particular series of prosecutions. There are, as I say, strict rules in relation to the exchange of information that might be gathered from telephone interception. It is not, as I understand it, the Operations Intelligence Division that does that, anyway, but I will take the question on notice and bring back a reply.

The Hon. M.J. ELLIOTT: As a supplementary question: while the minister is seeking further advice, will he also investigate the restraints upon ASIO and, if there is less restraint on ASIO, whether or not it can delegate authority to the South Australian police which might effectively negate the controls that we have directly?

The Hon. K.T. GRIFFIN: I will do that. I must confess that I do not know. Because I do not have any responsibility for ASIO I do not know what the relationship might be, but I will make some inquiries and endeavour to bring back a reply.

PORT RIVER

The Hon. DIANA LAIDLAW (Minister for Transport and Urban Planning): I seek leave to table a ministerial statement from the Minister for Environment and Heritage and the Minister for Aboriginal Affairs in the other place on the Port River environment.

Leave granted.

HILLS FACE ZONE

In reply to **Hon. CARMEL ZOLLO** (5 August) and answered by letter on 21 September.

The Hon. DIANA LAIDLAW (Minister for Transport and Urban Planning): I provide the following information in relation to the possible development (subdivision) of 75 hectares of land next to the Morialta Conservation Park in the Hills Face Zone.

1. In terms of the possible purchase of the land to ensure the protection of the Hills Face Zone, this is considered unnecessary as the current policies in the Development Plan are quite stringent in relation to land division. The creation of additional allotments in the Hills Face Zone is a 'non-complying' kind of development and the Development Assessment Commission (DAC) as the relevant planning authority, has in the past taken a strong line regarding such applications. The Development Act enables an application to be refused without the need for an assessment. Indeed, DAC recently refused a land division within the Hills Face Zone at Flagstaff Hill.

2. The process of application for land division in the Hills Face Zone is as follows—

Lodgement

Where the application relates to a proposed development that involves the division of land, the application must be lodged with DAC. DAC will forward a copy of the application to the relevant Council where the development is situated.

Relevant Authority

DAC is the relevant authority in respect of any development of a class specified in Schedule 10 of the Development Regulations 1993. That Schedule lists a number of matters in the Hills Face Zone as being the responsibility of DAC, including any land division which increases the number of allotments.

Kind of Development

Land Division forms a non-complying kind of development in the Hills Face Zone (except where the number of allotments resulting from the division is equal to, or less than the number of allotments already divided).

Process

Where a person applies for consent in respect of a Development Plan for a non-complying development, the applicant must provide a brief statement in support of the application.

A relevant authority (DAC in this instance) may after receipt of an application which relates to a non-complying kind of development—

(a) refuse the application pursuant to Section 39(4)(d) of the Act, and notify the applicant accordingly; or

(b) resolve to proceed with an assessment of the application.

If DAC resolves to proceed with an assessment of the application, before undertaking public notification, it must obtain from the applicant a Statement of Effect. This Statement must include—

(a) a description of the nature of the development and the nature of its locality;
(b) a statement as to the provisions of the Development Plan which are relevant to the assessment of the proposed development;
(c) an assessment of the extent to which the proposed development complies with those provisions;
(d) an assessment of the expected social, economic and environmental effects of the development on its locality; and
(e) any other information specified by the authority.

The application will undergo Category 3 public notification. This includes notice of the application to owners or occupiers of each piece of adjacent land, or according to DAC, those owners or occupiers who would be directly affected to a significant degree by the development, and the public generally by way of an advertisement placed in The Advertiser. (This does not apply to Crown Development).

Should DAC determine to grant provisional development plan consent it must seek the concurrence of the Minister and the relevant Council before granting consent.

No appeal lies against a refusal of consent or concurrence of a condition attached to a consent to approval. Appeal rights apply to any written representation arising out of public notification and received within the designated and advertised timeframe. Appeals are directed to the Environment, Resources and Development Court.

HINDMARSH SOCCER STADIUM

In reply to **Hon. J.F. STEFANI** (10 June) and answered by letter on 16 September.

The Hon. DIANA LAIDLAW (Minister for Transport and Urban Planning): The Minister for Recreation, Sport and Racing has provided the following information.

1. The establishment of a management committee as required by the Deed was the subject of a number of items of correspondence between the Office for Recreation and Sport and the Federation.

In particular, the Federation was asked to advise on the formation of the committee in letters written on the following dates—4 September 1997, 19 December 1997, 7 July 1998 and 3 September 1998.

2. The chairperson of the management committee is the Chairman of the SA Soccer Federation, Mr Les Avory. Other members are Mr Robert Fletcher from the Office for Recreation and Sport and Mr Basil Scarsella.

In addition, each of the two National Soccer League Clubs is entitled to send a representative. The Minister for Recreation, Sport and Racing has been advised that this latter representation varies from meeting to meeting.

The committee has met on the following dates—20 January 1999, 29 March 1999, 5 May 1999, 2 June 1999 and 30 June 1999.

3. No.

The Executive Director of the Office for Recreation and Sport advises that there has been a continuing stream of discussion and correspondence in an attempt to secure better compliance with its obligations by the Federation. The dates of some of the more significant elements of this correspondence are given in 1 above.

4. The Minister for Recreation, Sport and Racing's representative on the management committee is Mr Robert Fletcher, Director Facilities Management in the Office for Recreation and Sport. He has attended every meeting of the committee (see 2 above).

In reply to **Hon. J.F. STEFANI** (7 July) and answered by letter on 16 September.

The Hon. DIANA LAIDLAW (Minister for Transport and Urban Planning): The Minister for Recreation, Sport and Racing has provided the following information.

1. The Office for Recreation and Sport, as the Minister for Recreation, Sport and Racing's agent in this matter, has received a number of written notices as required under clause 9.4 of the Deed.

2.

Date of Request	Amount
18 December 1997	$93 448.00
23 June 1998	$72 824.29
28 September 1998	$79 326.22
22 December 1998	$67 910.00
23 March 1999	$105 683.01
23 June 1999	$105 763.82

3.

Date	Amount
31 December 1997	$93 448.00
30 June 1998	$52 825.00
30 September 1998	$79 326.22
31 December 1998	$67 910.00
31 March 1999	$105 683.01
30 June 1999	$105 763.82

COMMONWEALTH INDIGENOUS EMPLOYMENT POLICY

In reply to **Hon. T.G. ROBERTS** (2 June) and answered by letter on 6 August.

The Hon. DIANA LAIDLAW (Minister for Transport and Urban Planning): The Premier has provided the following information.

The state government will work closely with the commonwealth government to expand job opportunities for Indigenous Australians in the South Australian public sector using an effective, targeted approach.

In October 1998, Employment SA released its Indigenous Employment & Training Action Plan for 1998-99 which was developed after an extensive 7 week consultation process designed to identify indigenous employment and training priority areas and potential projects within these areas. The consultation involved discussions with a range of key public and private sector agencies including the (then) Commonwealth Department of Employment, Education, Training and Youth Affairs, the (now) Commonwealth Department of Employment, Workplace Relations and Small Business (DEWRSB), Division of State Aboriginal Affairs (DEHAA), Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander Commission (ATSIC), Aboriginal Education Employment Development Branch (DETE), South Australian Employers Chamber of Commerce and Industry, Department of Human Services, Department for Correctional Services, various CDEP's (Community Development and Employment Projects) and group training companies.

The result of this process was that four key activity areas were identified as being of primary importance. These are—

· Community Development—improving skills within communities and creating local employment.
· Basic Infrastructure Development—improving Health and Housing infrastructure and the associated skill base.
· Enterprise Development—enhancing Aboriginal businesses.
· Justice issues—addressing offending behaviour and providing employment pathways for offenders.

All of the projects which Employment SA has initiated in these 4 areas have been developed, where appropriate, in consultation with the commonwealth departments mentioned above and in many cases, in conjunction with them to add value to the projects where either the commonwealth or the state may be restricted in providing funding.

This close relationship will continue in the new financial year, however the exact nature of funding constraints of the commonwealth is not yet known. The information which has been announced to date is in general terms and does not specify what the additional funding will be used for. Employment SA will continue to liaise closely with DEWRSB and where possible jointly fund projects with other agencies whether they are state or commonwealth in an effort to address the barriers which Indigenous people face in gaining employment.

MENTAL HEALTH

In reply to **Hon. R.R. ROBERTS** (2 June) and answered by letter on 16 September.

The Hon. DIANA LAIDLAW (Minister for Transport and Urban Planning): The Minister for Human Services has provided the following information.

1. A raft of proposals has been put together in the recently announced state funding package for mental health services to improve assistance to people living in rural and remote areas.

Currently services to the country are as follows—

· 66 full time equivalent community mental health workers placed in rural areas;
· 68 staff who work in the Rural & Remote Mental Health Service Inpatient & Outreach Service;
· staff working with young people with mental illness and managed directly by the Child & Adolescent Mental Health Service;

- 3 youth suicide prevention workers;
- a visiting psycho-geriatric team supported by telemedicine links; and
- visiting forensic mental health, psychiatry and psychology services to Pt Augusta, Pt Lincoln, Mt Gambier, Pt Augusta and Whyalla in particular.

Currently there are unfilled allied mental health worker positions in some areas.

In the $3.4 million mental health funding package recently announced, an additional $550 000 has been allocated directly to rural areas. Pending discussions with key players, it is envisaged that this funding could support up to nine additional staff in rural areas and trial the implementation of an inpatient unit within a rural hospital.

As well, funding in youth mental health, youth suicide prevention, Aboriginal emotional and social well-being, mental health promotion/prevention and consumer projects will make a further amount of some $400 000 available in rural and remote areas. It is expected that this funding injection, managed collaboratively, will make a significant difference in rural and remote areas.

Other funding changes which will assist mental health service provision in rural and remote areas include the incorporation of case conferencing and coordinated care planning in Medicare rebates, the commonwealth drug and suicide prevention initiatives and other commonwealth health care improvements for indigenous Australians and residents of rural and remote areas.

2. See answer to 1 above.

The issue of recruiting and retaining resident psychiatrists in rural and remote areas can be viewed in the context of recruitment of General Practitioners and other medical specialists. These issues are being addressed centrally for example with student training and placement and peer support initiatives, but they also require consideration within regions.

An amount of $100 000 of mental health summit funds has been set aside to establish a pilot inpatient service in a Regional Hospital. This funding would be targeted at supporting training for hospital staff and providing additional allied health, medical and psychiatric staff in the hospital or the associated community venues. There are 14-17 beds available overall for allocation in this way.

Subject to general support for the proposal, the system issues, which will then need to be addressed, include

- change in legislation to facilitate detention and revoking of detention via telepsychiatry consultation;
- accreditation of hospitals where beds are to be located;
- gazettal of rural hospitals or parts of them;
- provision of indemnity for staff in both local hospitals and rural and remote community mental health services; and
- on-going funding for staff development and telepsychiatry use.

3. Mental Health:

In relation to mental health, the Mental Health Summit package provides an amount of $100 000 for further development of accommodation and respite services in the context of a $1 200 000 package of community treatment and support improvements.

Disability:

Since 1996, the Government has provided over $11 million of additional recurrent funds including $3.3 million in the 1999-2000 state budget and has redirected over $6 million of recurrent efficiencies back into services to clients. The larger proportion of these funds was to directly support people with intellectual disabilities.

Since 1996, the Government has attracted a further $2.4 million of new funds through the Home and Community Care Program (HACC) to support people with disabilities.

A further $6.1 million ongoing funding has come from the commonwealth as part of the Commonwealth State Disability Agreement with another $2.8 million of recurrent growth funding expected by the year 2002.

These funds will be used to maintain people with disabilities, including those with an intellectual disability, in their own homes or with families. For example, the Intellectual Disability Services Council Board of Management has a plan for the redevelopment of Strathmont Centre. The Plan, supported by the Parents and Friends of Strathmont, recommends relocating half of the residents in the community, in the first instance.

HOUSING TRUST DISPUTES

In reply to **Hon. R.R. ROBERTS** (9 June) and answered by letter on 6 August.

The Hon. DIANA LAIDLAW (Minister for Transport and Urban Planning): The Minister for Human Services has provided the following information.

1. Trust procedures for dealing with disruptive behaviour by its tenants were the subject of review in 1996 when Trust tenancies became subject to the limited jurisdiction of the Residential Tenancies Act.

In 1998, the Trust conducted a further review of its disruptive tenancy procedures with the involvement of several tenant representatives and other Government organisations. This review concluded that the current arrangements were generally appropriate and no further review of the Trust's disruptive tenancy procedures is planned at this time.

2. Not applicable. No review is taking place.

3. Not applicable.

4. The Residential Tenancies Tribunal will not grant an Order for Possession lightly, and will make its decision on the basis of the evidence before it. In many cases, the Trust can only provide relief to tenants who are experiencing problems with their neighbours if they are prepared to assist by providing written statements and appearing as witnesses before the Tribunal. The Trust cannot proceed on the basis of hearsay.

The Complaint Form referred to in the honourable member's explanation has been in use since the review of Trust procedures in 1996. It forms an important part of the Trust's evidence when making applications to the Tribunal for an Order for Possession under Section 90 of the Residential Tenancies Act.

The form also informs the complainant that the contents may be disclosed to the alleged offender—this could happen through either the Tribunal hearing processes, or possibly where the alleged offender makes application under the Freedom of Information Act for access to his/her Trust records. It would therefore be remiss of the Trust if it did not provide complainants with this advice.

New tenants occupying Trust dwellings since 1 September 1998 have been placed on six month probationary leases. The introduction of probationary leases has given the Trust a further means of ensuring tenants meet their obligations, particularly with respect to neighbourhood disruption. If, during the term of a probationary lease, there are serious breaches of the conditions of tenancy that are not addressed, the Trust can require the tenant to vacate the premises and the lease will not be extended.

ARTS SA

In reply to **Hon. CAROLYN PICKLES** (8 and 27 July) and answered by letter on 18 August.

The Hon. DIANA LAIDLAW (Minister for the Arts): I provide the following information in relation to the honourable member's question without notice asked on 8 July 1999 and contribution to the Appropriation Bill on 27 July 1999.

Funding for the arts

The 1999-2000 budget provides increased funding of 12.80 per cent in real terms from 1998-99. The increase is 8.3 per cent in real terms after removal of the funds formerly administered by Living Health.

Subsidised organisations have not received adjustments for inflation because the increase has been applied to—

- the second part of an Enterprise Bargaining Agreement for 380 Arts SA employees;
- increased funding for the Adelaide Symphony Orchestra for the 3rd year of its supplementary assistance; and
- targeted initiatives such as an increase for Patch Theatre.

Over the last five years, 26 out of 49 subsidised organisations have had their funding increased in real terms. For 19 organisations, an offer of triennial funding makes it possible to lock in funding provided in 1998/99 for the next three years. For four of the organisations (Doppio Teatro, Australian String Quartet, Vitalstatistix, Leigh Warren and Dancers), this will lock in significant increases provided in 1998-99.

A list of funding provided to Major Funded organisations on both a financial and calendar year basis—including explanations for variations in allocations between 1998-99 and 1999-2000 has been forwarded to the honourable member.

Lion Arts Centre (LAC)

The Government has been made aware of an opportunity to move the Visual Arts School of the University of SA from Underdale to the West End. This move could only be achieved by providing the University with all or most of the space occupied by the present LAC tenants.

Arts SA has been working with LAC tenants on developing options in Hindley Street. This is a detailed process as every effort is being made to accommodate the specific needs of each tenant. If a fit cannot be found for the tenants they will stay where they are. The Fringe's proposal is different because it is about refurbishing a whole building to give it permanent venues. I advised Parliament late in 1998 that a separate consultancy had been let to consider this proposal. It is still being finalised. However, it appears the costs are very substantial and that there is little support for the proposal from the Fringe's Board.

West's Coffee Palace

Arts SA's lease at the Capital Building (11th & 12th Floors) in Pulteney Street expires on 30 June 2000.

In planning a potential move to the West End, Arts SA had several options available. West's Coffee Palace was selected as the preferred option because it offers a much greater street presence for Arts SA and for the arts than any of the alternatives. This is principally because it offers two major shopfronts in the middle of Hindley Street's retail precinct. This not only can be used to establish a highly-visible arts presence but can also be used as an accessible resource centre for artists and for potential purchasers of arts product.

However, this street presence comes at a cost—and that is the investment needed to make habitable the only street level accommodation which is currently available and of sufficient size to meet Arts SA's needs. The investment is required for both refurbishment of the building and for basic fit-out.

The developer's cost will be $1.32 million which will be invested in providing base air-conditioning facilities, the installation of a lift and lift shaft and other access facilities for people with disabilities, fire protection, lighting, IT cabling and protection of the structural integrity of the building.

The Arts SA fit-out will be a basic fit-out providing a standard of office accommodation which falls within the standards applied by the Government Office Accommodation Committee. The planned fit-out includes—

- a reduction in the average space per employee from 23m² to 20m²;
- a reduction in the number of enclosed offices from 30 to 11;
- no increase in meeting rooms; and
- the re-use of all existing office furniture.

Detailed costs of the fit-out have now been received and the revised estimate is $750 000 due principally to the need to plan around a number of internal walls which need to be retained to protect the structural integrity of the building.

The cost is being met from a reserve kept by Arts SA for contingencies associated with North Terrace operations. These funds are required in the event of problems with the building and operational facilities. They are a normal part of prudential management. With the absence of major operating incidents, the funds have built up over the last two years. At the same time, Arts SA believes the level of contingency required can be reduced following redevelopment of the Art Gallery and the South Australian Museum.

The terms of the commercial negotiations have yet to be concluded and are subject to final Ministerial approval.

The answers to the specific questions asked on 8 July 1999 are as follows—

1. This project cannot proceed unless the owners achieve an economic return on their investment. With the assistance of the Real Estate Management Group within the Department of Administrative and Information Services, Arts SA has negotiated a commercial arrangement which enables it to provide some uncommitted capital funds to the fit-out in exchange for a reduced rental and therefore reduced impact on recurrent spending.

2. It is accepted that Arts SA's relocation to West's Coffee Palace will give it a retail presence and that the rentals associated with retail accommodation and the inefficiencies of a heritage building are in excess of those for office accommodation in an office tower. The rental arrangement is considered acceptable for the benefits to be achieved in terms of the arts leading the revitalisation of the West End—and the creation of a precinct for the arts which is unique in Australia.

3. There are no capital projects which will go unfunded because of the capital cost associated with West's Coffee Palace, as the capital cost will be met from reserves. All arts capital projects which have reached the design stage of development are being funded fully from funds in Arts SA's capital program. This program will see $87.4 million invested between 1997-98 and 2000-01. Some smaller projects are being progressed conceptually and may reach the detailed design stage later in 1999-2000. If they prove to be soundly based, these projects are expected to be able to be funded from capital budgets in 2000-01 and 2001-02.

Jam Factory

The Jam Factory has advised that it is on budget and will be meeting its loan repayment commitments. It has experienced operational difficulties and costs have been cut, principally administrative costs.

Meanwhile, in order to advance the craft industry generally in South Australia, I have approved a recommendation from Arts SA to commission a craft industry development strategy. This initiative has the support of both the Board of the Jam Factory and CraftSouth.

PERFORMING ARTS COLLECTION

In reply to **Hon. CAROLYN PICKLES** (2 June) and answered by letter on 6 August.

The Hon. DIANA LAIDLAW (Minister for the Arts): I undertook to the honourable member to give a further statement on the issue of the Performing Arts Collection if this were necessary after further research.

I am advised by the Curator of the Performing Arts Collection, Ms Jo Peoples, that the name 'Colin and Gwenneth Ballantyne Performing Arts Collection' has never been formally given to the collection.

When Colin Ballantyne died the suggestion was made that the name Colin and Gwenneth Ballantyne Collection should be given when the collection had a permanent home – at that stage the Adelaide Festival Centre was not seen as its permanent home.

For a time, the name appeared on the letterhead of the Performing Arts Collection but was never formally adopted either by the management committee of the collection (the Performing Arts Collection has no independent legal status) or by the Adelaide Festival Centre Trust.

NATIVE VEGETATION

In reply to **Hon M.J. ELLIOTT** (9 June) and answered by letter on 6 August.

The Hon. DIANA LAIDLAW (Minister for Transport and Urban Planning): The Minister for Environment and Heritage has provided the following information.

The Minister for Environment and Heritage believes the honourable member's question relates to a recent initiative by the Department for Environment, Heritage and Aboriginal Affairs to explore options to shift the burden of assessing native vegetation clearance applications from the tax payer to the developer. The Department has been increasingly concerned at the expense of carrying out native vegetation clearance assessments, particularly those associated with large development proposals. Assessment of some very large applications can cost in excess of $10 000, for which the Native Vegetation Council recoups an application fee of $50 from the applicant.

Native vegetation clearance applications are often received from large companies with the capacity to pay a reasonable contribution toward the cost of assessing the applications. They are usually associated with vineyard, forestry or olive developments.

The objective of the Department's initiative has therefore been to develop a more efficient process for assessment of vegetation clearance applications, particularly relating to large scale development. Some time savings may result, but the main outcomes are a more substantial contribution to processing expenses by the applicant, while still incorporating strict checks and balances.

In the case alluded to, the developer, in consultation with the Department, made a business decision to engage environmental consultants to assess approximately 400 trees in order to expedite the assessment process as efficiently as possible.

The consultants concerned are qualified native vegetation assessors who undertake tree assessment work on contract for the Department. The work undertaken was a purely objective assessment of habitat value, using exactly the same assessment methods as used by the Department in assessing tree applications. The degree of consultation with the Department during this process ensured a factual and objective outcome. The assessment report was reviewed and endorsed by the Biodiversity Branch of the Department.

The public of South Australia can rest assured that this particular assessment was carried out in a manner consistent with the rigour applied to all other clearance applications, using the same assessment methods and the same criteria to determine if the clearance would

be seriously at variance with the principles of the Native Vegetation Act 1991.

DONAGHEY, Mr L.

In reply to **Hon. SANDRA KANCK** (29 July) and answered by letter on 16 September.

The Hon. DIANA LAIDLAW (Minister for Transport and Urban Planning): The Minister for Human Services has provided the following information.

1. Protocols do exist. The Police at the Communication Centre are trained to call ACIS. In this case, no contact was made between the Police Communication Centre and the parents (call was traced after parents put phone down), therefore, no information was passed through to the Police. The Police were not able to make an assessment. Police at the scene often subdue a client even if an ACIS team is involved, in their agreed role of 'keeping peace and protection'.
2. Yes. The Police and ACIS have strong links and provide support to each other on a daily basis.
3. This matter is the subject of a Coronial inquiry.
4. There is no reason to expect that an ACIS team would not have been available.

PATAWALONGA HARBOR

In reply to **Hon M.J. ELLIOTT** (10 March) and answered by letter on 15 August.

The Hon. DIANA LAIDLAW (Minister for Transport and Urban Planning): The Minister for Government Enterprises has provided the following information.

1. The arrangements with the Holdfast Shores Consortium did not include a guarantee on a minimum depth. The Government maintains the Harbor suitable to its intended purpose while meeting the obligations of the Agreements with the original Kangaroo Island Ferry Service and the Australian Ferry Service.
2. The agreement with the Holdfast Shores Consortium is that the Government 'will undertake such dredging as may be reasonably required or necessary in order to maintain the depths of water within Glenelg Harbor and in and about the entrance channel to the Glenelg Harbor commensurate with functions contemplated for the use of Glenelg Harbor'.

The Consortium or its Assignees has a similar commitment for the marina basin.

3. See 1 above.
4. The Chappell report was not ignored. It was part of the design and certification process for the harbor.
5. Direct maintenance costs for dredging of the harbor to the end of June 1999 were $306 000. Future annual expenses for further dredging are not expected to exceed this figure.

There are no current proposals to extend the breakwaters or deepen the harbor, however, further investigation into these issues will be considered.

In relation to the EIS and the Chappell report, see 4 above.

PORT STANVAC OIL SPILL

In reply to **Hon M.J. ELLIOTT** (6 July) and answered by letter on 16 August.

The Hon. DIANA LAIDLAW (Minister for Transport and Urban Planning): The Attorney-General has provided the following information.

1. The Crown Solicitor's role is two fold—
   (i) to provide advice to those investigating the oil spill as required, and
   (ii) once the investigation is complete and all necessary evidence obtained, to consider that evidence and advise as to whether there is a realistic prospect of succeeding on any prosecution instituted under either the Environment Protection Act, 1993 or the Pollution of Waters by Oil or Noxious Substances Act, 1987.

While the offences contained in section 26 of the Pollution of Waters by Oil or Noxious Substances Act, 1987 are not, on their face, complicated, it is nonetheless necessary that evidence be obtained in a properly admissible form in order to prove any offence.

This requires that a formal investigation be conducted pursuant to the legislation. It is necessary in the investigation to exclude the possibility that one or other of the possible defences alluded to in section 26(3) of the Act could be successfully invoked. In particular, the possibility that the defence contained in placita (d) could be successfully invoked must be excluded. This necessitates that the origin of the spill be precisely identified and the cause thereof determined. Evidence of such matters must be collected in an admissible form. Matters can easily be complicated both factually and legally and it is in this regard that the advice of the Crown Solicitor is required.

2. The 1996 oil spill was initially investigated without the benefit of legal advice. The investigation did not produce definitive and admissible evidence as to the cause of the equipment rupture which led to the oil leak.

Subsequent inquiries instigated as a result of legal advice did not rectify this deficiency. Accordingly, the evidence was not definitive in excluding the potential application of available statutory defences.

After careful consideration of legal advice, it was decided that no prosecution would be instituted on this occasion.

EYESIGHT TESTING

In reply to **Hon T.G. CAMERON** (4 August) and answered by letter on 21 September.

The Hon. DIANA LAIDLAW (Minister for Transport and Urban Planning):

1. As I pointed out in my previous replies to the Honourable Member on this matter, the approach taken in South Australia, in respect to eyesight testing, is to focus on 'high risk' groups, rather than to require every applicant to submit to an eyesight test. 'High risk' groups include applicants for the first time issue of a learner's permit who have declared that they wear glasses or contact lenses, have undergone an eye operation, or have lost the sight in one eye.

While those applicants who declare that they wear glasses or contact lenses may well have previously been seen by an optometrist, it does not necessarily mean that they meet the minimum eyesight standards for driving, even if corrective lenses are worn. As people who wear corrective lenses have an obvious defect in their vision, they are required to have their eyes tested before a learner's permit is issued. As these people are first time applicants for a learner's permit, there would not have been any previous duty on an optometrist to advise the Registrar if the corrective lenses prescribed by the optometrist did not sufficiently correct the person's vision. The duty on optometrists to advise the Registrar applies where the person is the holder of a learner's permit or driver's licence at the time of the examination.

A similar approach is taken where people declare that they have a medical condition that may impair driving. That is, only people who declare that they have a medical condition are required to be examined by a medical practitioner.

It is considered that the system currently operating in South Australia, which requires those applicants in 'high risk' groups to undertake a more comprehensive eyesight test than reading a simple line of print on a Snellen chart, together with the requirement for registered medical practitioners and optometrists to notify the Registrar if a person is unfit to drive, is equal to, if not more successful in identifying risk, than the conventional tests conducted by interstate counterparts. It is also considered that a person whose eyesight has deteriorated to any significant extent, after the initial issue of a learner's permit or driver's licence, is likely to seek professional help, if only to manage normal day to day activities.

2. In my previous replies to the honourable member on this matter I have referred to research that has been undertaken into the effectiveness of vision testing for driver licensing. This research showed that there was no substantial evidence of any relationship between vision defects and crashes. In the absence of any evidence to support the introduction of mandatory eyesight tests for all applicants at the initial issue of a learner's permit or driver's licence, it is considered that its introduction would not contribute any further to road safety.

If all applicants for the initial issue of a learner's permit or driver's licence were required to be tested, the additional costs for establishing and administering the tests would result in increases in the costs for obtaining a learner's permit and driver's licence. Even a relatively simple low cost test, funded by Transport SA, could not be justified in terms of identifiable road safety benefits.

In reply to **Hon T.G. CAMERON** (27 May) and answered by letter on 15 August.

The Hon. DIANA LAIDLAW (Minister for Transport and Urban Planning): As advised in my reply on 10 June 1999, I referred questions 2 and 3 to the Minister for Police, Correctional Services and Emergency Services for consideration.

The Minister for Police, Correctional Services and Emergency Services has been advised by Police of the following—

2. Legislation in other States compelling drivers to undertake eyesight testing after involvement in a crash, and in the furtherance of an investigation, is similar to the power contained in Section 80(1) of the Motor Vehicles Act—

'if in the opinion of the Registrar it is desirable that the ability or fitness of an applicant for the issue of renewal of a learner's permit, or of the holder of a learner's permit or driver's licence, to drive a motor vehicle should be tested, the Registrar may require the person to undergo such test or furnish such evidence of ability or fitness to drive as the Registrar directs.

Police do not have an independent power to require a person to submit to an eyesight test. Legislative power to conduct medical examinations contained in Section 81(1) of the Summary Offences Act is confined to circumstances—

where a person is in lawful custody on a charge of committing an offence where there are reasonable grounds for believing that the examination will afford evidence as to the commission of the offence.

Following involvement in a vehicle crash, eyesight testing of drivers is not part of standard crash investigation. However, if poor eyesight is considered by investigators to be a contributing factor in a crash, a provision exists to obtain medical records or have the driver medically examined.

3. Police do not maintain official records of crash statistics of whether or not faulty eyesight is a cause. As the majority of road crashes are not attended by Police, the cause of the crash is described by the reporting person. Consequently, any statistical results would be questionable.

While inattention is clearly a contributory factor in the cause of road crashes, there are few crashes attributed to poor driver eyesight.

MEDICAL TREATMENT, CONSENT

In reply to **Hon. L.H. DAVIS** (4 August) and answered by letter on 16 September.

The Hon. DIANA LAIDLAW (Minister for Transport and Urban Planning): The Minister for Human Services has provided the following information.

1. No—the Consent to Medical Treatment and Palliative Care Act does not contemplate the collection of data of that nature.

Section 14 requires the establishment of a register where in people may voluntarily (not compulsorily) seek to have a direction under Section 7 or a medical power of attorney registered.

The minister for human Services has been advised that, to date, 108 people have registered.

2. No—no details are available.

ADELAIDE CASINO

The Hon. NICK XENOPHON: In relation to any negotiations with respect to the sale of the Adelaide Casino, will the Treasurer ensure that any agreement entered into with any prospective purchaser takes into account measures to reduce the impact of problem gambling arising from gambling available at the casino, and further that any agreement entered into does not provide any impediment or disincentive, commercial or otherwise, for this parliament to subsequently enact legislation aimed at reducing the level of problem gambling which could in turn affect the nature and operation of games at the casino?

The Hon. R.I. LUCAS (Treasurer): I will refer those questions to my colleague in another place and bring back a reply.

MOUNT BARKER PRODUCTS

The Hon. M.J. ELLIOTT: I seek leave to make a brief explanation before asking the Minister for Transport and Urban Planning, representing the Minister for Environment and Heritage, questions about the Mount Barker Products emission test results.

Leave granted.

The Hon. M.J. ELLIOTT: My questions relate to results that were released yesterday by an independent analysis of chromosome samples of nine individuals who live in the vicinity of the Mount Barker foundry, six of which indicated chromosomal damage. A question also touches on an ongoing concern in the community about the quality of testing that is being carried out by the Environment Protection Agency. As the minister is aware, the EPA started testing emissions from the Mount Barker Products foundry only as a result of extensive complaints from the local community.

My office first became aware of the complaints on 11 May this year, but tests were not carried out by the EPA until 15 and 16 July—more than two months after those initial complaints. It has been suggested that if it had not been for the zinc induced headaches (the indicated cause of the headaches at this stage), which were behind those initial complaints, no testing would have been done at all. Certainly the people of the Mount Barker community have the view that the delay was unacceptable. It highlights the very real possibility that other environmental and individual health damage coming from industries around South Australia may be going undetected because no testing has been done.

In relation to the situation at Mount Barker, tests have been carried out but reports now seem to suggest that the tests were far from adequate. For instance, I have been told by people in Mount Barker that, while the factory of Mount Barker Products has four stacks, only one stack was tested and over a fairly short period of time. There is still some question as to what precisely was tested for. I am told that it was only today that the results of testing in relation to substances other than heavy metals were released, but I have not had an opportunity to see them at this stage. With these points in mind, I ask:

1. Will the minister confirm that only one of the four Mount Barker Products stacks was tested?

2. Will the minister explain why a new plant with a known, significant pollution risk, given the type of industry involved, was not extensively tested when operations commenced?

3. Will the minister also explain why, once difficulties arose at Mount Barker Products, a comprehensive testing program was not immediately initiated?

The Hon. DIANA LAIDLAW (Minister for Transport and Urban Planning): I will refer the honourable member's questions to the minister and bring back a reply.

The Hon. T. CROTHERS: I have a supplementary question. Will the minister further inform the Council how many other active foundries there are in the state of South Australia?

The Hon. DIANA LAIDLAW: I will refer that question to the Minister for Environment and perhaps also to the Minister for Industry. I suspect that the honourable member is suggesting that what has been nominated as the standard by the Hon. Mr Elliott might be quite unreasonable to apply to all the other foundries in the state. I am not sure about the motivation for the question, but it seemed to be expressed in that manner. I will certainly seek the information and do so promptly.

RESPITE CARE, PORT AUGUSTA

The Hon. J.S.L. DAWKINS: I seek leave to make a brief explanation before asking the Minister for Disability Services a question about respite care at Port Augusta.

Leave granted.

The Hon. J.S.L. DAWKINS: I noted a news item on ABC radio this morning that disabled children at Port Augusta have been forced into hospitals for respite care after the closure of that city's only respite service. The news item also stated that the City of Port Augusta has called for urgent federal and state funding to address this situation. Can the minister advise the Council whether this news report is accurate and, if so, what action the government plans to take in regard to this matter?

The Hon. R.D. LAWSON (Minister for Disability Services): I thank the honourable member for his question and I note the interest he takes in services to regional and rural South Australia. I was made aware in June this year by the mayor of Port Augusta, Her Worship Joy Baluch, that the respite service conducted in Port Augusta by the Community Accommodation Respite Agency (CARA), which receives substantial government funding, I think to the extent of about $6 million, was closing.

After the mayor raised those issues with me, I took up the matter with CARA and was informed that it was true that it was altering its respite services in Port Augusta. Previously they had been conducted from a house with four bedrooms, which accommodated four people with disabilities and provided a good service. However, two of those beds were occupied more or less on a permanent basis by two people with disabilities and that reduced the availability for respite in the remaining rooms. I was advised by CARA that the rooms were not being utilised to the best advantage.

CARA decided that it would adopt a more flexible approach to respite, which was consistent with the needs of the families using the service. CARA decided that it would close the respite service that was being conducted from a particular house and would provide service for respite on a more flexible means in the Iron Triangle area, specifically by using other, short-term services—cabins, for example, at a caravan park—and services at Stirling North. I was a little surprised to hear that, because I would have thought that a residence provided better respite services than holiday accommodation. However, I was informed that CARA has found that holiday accommodation is much preferred by many of the people using the service and is a form of respite that the young people concerned greatly appreciate. They appreciate the holiday atmosphere, they appreciate the opportunity for change and they appreciate the fact that they can go for short breaks to various places.

The Hon. M.J. Elliott interjecting:

The Hon. R.D. LAWSON: It is all very well for the Hon. Mr Elliott to laugh at this suggestion. He is no expert in the provision of respite services.

The Hon. R.I. Lucas interjecting:

The Hon. R.D. LAWSON: Indeed, as the Treasurer says, he knows everything about everything.

The Hon. M.J. Elliott interjecting:

The Hon. R.D. LAWSON: It is not sending him to a caravan park. It was suggested on the radio news this morning that—

Members interjecting:

The Hon. R.D. LAWSON: That was the arrangement that CARA, an expert in the field which operates services throughout the state, had decided for Port Augusta. It knows its clients, it consulted with the families, and I am told that those families were supportive of the new measures. I am not aware of the fact as reported this morning that respite is being sought in hospital facilities in Port Augusta, nor am I aware of the fact that the council has sought a specific report or produced some new report. I will certainly call for further information in relation to that and I will provide the Council with additional information if that is relevant to the honourable member's question.

YEAR 2000 COMPLIANCE

The Hon. CARMEL ZOLLO: I seek leave to make a brief explanation before asking the Treasurer, representing the Premier, a question on the year 2000 date problem.

Leave granted.

The Hon. CARMEL ZOLLO: In June this year I asked a question of the Premier concerning the year 2000 date problem and the State Disaster Plan, and I thank him for that reply. His response stated that, although the State Disaster Plan had not been modified to account for the Y2K problem, a supplementary plan and exercises had been run by the State Disaster Committee. In particular, two exercises had been run: one in April 1999 called Purple Mist 1-1999, and another in August called Purple Mist 2-1999. The response also mentioned an operational exercise called Team Spirit to occur on 27 October. My questions to the minister are:

1. What were the outcomes of Purple Mist 1 and 2 and were any deficiencies in state Y2K preparedness identified?

Members interjecting:

The PRESIDENT: Order!

The Hon. CARMEL ZOLLO: Further:

2. What modifications, if any, have occurred to the supplementary Y2K disaster plan as a result?

3. Which specific agencies were involved in the exercises and, following these exercises, has it been found necessary to modify the State Disaster Plan to account for Y2K related issues?

4. Will the planned exercise named Team Spirit occur as scheduled, and which agencies will it involve?

The Hon. R.I. LUCAS (Treasurer): I will be delighted to provide to the honourable member information on Team Spirit. Indeed, she may well take wise counsel on that information. As part of that, I will also give the honourable member some information on Purple Mist 1 and 2. I suspect there has been a bit of purple mist surrounding the various machinations within the Labor Party factions over the last few months.

SUPPLIES AND SERVICES EXPENSES

In reply to **Hon. M.J. ELLIOTT** (1 June).

The Hon. R.I. LUCAS (Treasurer): I provide the following response to the honourable member's supplementary question.

Premier and Cabinet

The increase of $3 million in expenditure mainly reflects:

- initiatives such as 'Centre for Lifelong Learning and Development', 'Centenary of Federation' and 'Office for Year 2000 Compliance' financed from available funding included in the 1998-99 Budget to meet cost pressures and new initiatives; and
- transfers from agencies to fund the whole of government communications strategy and a functional transfer—investment attraction function from Industry and Trade.

Primary Industries and Resources

The increase in expenditure of $11 million mainly reflects:

- the carryover of budgeted commitments ($7.7 million) from 1997-98 to 1998-99 not anticipated at the time of the 1998-99 Budget with no adverse impact on the non commercial sector financial position. Programs which have been committed include the National Heritage Trust, the Farmed Seafood Initiative and the Remote Areas Energy Supply.
- $1.9 million for the grasshopper plaque in northern South Australia funded from reserves in the Bio Security Fund held by the portfolio and extra appropriation from available funds in the

Budget to meet cost pressures and new initiatives. Other Bio Security activities targeted include Ovine Johnes Disease and Newcastle Disease.

Attorney-General's Department

Expenditure increase of $6 million for 1998-99, in the main, reflects carryover of 1997-98 funded commitments to 1998-99, funding of cost pressures and new initiatives from existing cash reserves of the agency and cost recovery activities undertaken by the agency which are anticipated to increase revenue. Refer 'Sale of Goods and Services' and 'Other Receipts' lines which are estimated to exceed budgeted levels.

A once-off carry over of Crime Prevention Unit funds has been directed to a range of initiatives including the Crime Prevention Strategy Project. The Project contributes grants to such activities as Operation Flinders, Ministerial Forum for the Prevention of Domestic Violence, National Motor Vehicle Theft Reduction Council and the Australian Violence Prevention Awards. Another initiative to benefit is the Public Transport Project which involves working with the Passenger Transport Board, SA Police and the transport companies to review safety on public transport in Adelaide and recommend improvements.

Other carry over from 1997-98 to 1998-99 includes once-off Information Technology Projects for the Attorney-General's Department, the Equal Opportunity Commission, Office of the Liquor and Gaming Commissioner and the Office of Consumer and Business Affairs.

YEAR 2000 COMPLIANCE

In reply to **Hon. CARMEL ZOLLO** (1 June).

The Hon. R.I. LUCAS (Treasurer): The Premier has provided the following information:

The State Disaster Committee has been examining its responsibilities regarding the possible impact of the Year 2000 (Y2K) phenomenon since July 1998. Since then, the Committee has conducted a series of workshops and training exercises including one in November 1998 which identified the need to prepare a specific Y2K Plan as a supplement to the State Disaster Plan. A further exercise conducted in April 1999, called Purple Mist 1/99, was designed to further develop the issues involved.

The Y2K supplementary plan will be completed in August 1999 when it will be tested in an operational exercise, called Purple Mist 2/99 scheduled for 25 August. All Agencies involved in State Disaster Organisations plus the Office for Y2K Compliance will be involved in the exercise. A further operational exercise, called 'Team Spirit' and scheduled for 27 October, will also include Y2K scenarios and possibly other national agencies. In addition, the State Disaster Committee will have observers at a New Zealand Y2K exercise scheduled in September. It should be noted that liaison for Y2K will be established between emergency management authorities in Canberra and Wellington. New Zealand has a two and a half hour lead time over South Australia.

In effect, the State Disaster Plan has not been modified for Y2K as it is a plan designed for a wide range of threats and possible impacts. However, because of the peculiarities presented by the potential consequences to the State Disaster Organisation from the Y2K phenomenon, it was considered prudent to prepare a supplementary plan which addressed special arrangements for the following:

- Continuity of State Disaster Organisation communications, including links with the Commonwealth's Emergency Management Australia (EMA).
- Conveying information to the public in real time via the media.
- Alternative sources of weather information in the event of a Bureau of Meteorology failure.
- Reporting arrangements to EMA in order that commonwealth authorities can be informed of the locality and severity of the problems arising from Y2K.
- Co-ordination arrangements for predetermined activation levels of Emergency Operations Centres and State Control Centres; and, for call-out of State Disaster Organisation personnel including State Emergency Operations Centre operational staff.
- Coordination for incidents/events that have emergency management and/or 'Whole of Government' implications.

BANK CHARGES

In reply to **Hon. A.J. REDFORD** (6 July) and answered by letter on 20 August 1999.

The Hon. R.I. LUCAS (Treasurer): The Minister for Consumer Affairs has provided the following response:

The Uniform Consumer Credit Code ('the Code') was formulated over a period of ten years through the co-operation of fair trading agencies of all States and Territories. Its adoption was agreed to by all States and Territories and it came into operation on 1 November 1996. The Code was adopted by South Australia as template legislation from the Consumer Credit (Queensland) Act 1994 under the *Consumer Credit (South Australia) Act 1995.*

The purpose of introducing uniform national credit legislation was to standardise such things as the calculation of interest rates on various loans and to provide consumers with information on disclosure of fees and charges by all providers of credit for personal, domestic or household purposes.

One of the most important aspects of the Code is the change to the way interest on loans is calculated. Consumers now pay interest based on a daily actuarial method rather than the old system of predetermined credit charges assessed at the start of the contract. Under the new method consumers effectively only pay interest on the money they use, because a daily percentage rate is applied to unpaid daily balances.

The Code presently contains a formula for the calculation of a comparison rate, which the lender may use if it wishes. The comparison rate takes into account interest as well as fees and charges and provides consumers with a single figure for the comparison of credit products expressed in terms of an interest rate.

The requirement for the comparison rate to be compulsory was rejected by previous Consumer Affairs Ministers as there were mixed views about how useful such a rate could be. Sometimes a comparison rate could be confusing for consumers as rates may differ depending on the credit product being offered—specifically the amount of credit and the term of the loan. The situation is further complicated depending on whether extraneous fees and charges (eg, a cheque dishonour fee) are factored in or not.

The Code is presently undergoing a national review. This review was contemplated by the Code upon its introduction. One of the terms of reference for the review is to consider the question of 'truth in lending'—that is, what consumers need or want to know about their loan. The review will examine, partly through independent market research, the effectiveness of the existing consumer disclosure provisions.

An issues paper prepared for the review has already been published and copies of the paper, which discusses truth in lending at length, are available from the South Australian Office of Consumer and Business Affairs.

ASSET SALES

In reply to **Hon. P. HOLLOWAY** (8 June) and answered by letter on 20 August 1999.

The Hon. R.I. LUCAS (Treasurer): The costs can be broken down as follows:

Costs Associated with Asset Sales	1998-99 $'000	1999-2000 $'000
Government Enterprise Reform—Operating Payment [1]	5 000	2 000
(Payment made to The Office for Government Enterprises from Consolidated Account via Treasury Administered Items)		
Asset Sales Unit		
Revenue from sale of Assets	(550)	-
Recoveries—Salaries and Oncosts	(76)	(50)
Administration Expenses	2 409	49
Accommodation and Service Costs	13	-
Consultant Costs	349	-
ERSU		
Supplies and Services Expense	3 110	-
Supplies and Services Expense	14 250	-
Total	24 505	1 999

[1] Ports, TAB, and Lotteries are included in this number

One of the assumptions under which the costs associated with asset sales was calculated at the time of the budget was that the sale of electrical assets would not occur, therefore, no costs associated with the proposed leasing of the electricity assets were included in the 1999-2000 Budget. It is logical to expect that additional expenses will be incurred associated with the leasing process.

SMALL BUSINESS, INTERNET

In reply to **Hon. T.G. CAMERON** (25 May) and answered by letter on 20 August 1999.

The Hon. R.I. LUCAS (Treasurer): The Minister for Industry and Trade has provided the following information:

Small business access to the Internet is seen by the Government as a key determinant in the future competitiveness of the sector. This is not only due to the potential export and marketing opportunities it provides, but also to the emergence of key business services on-line.

The Small Business Advisory Council, in conjunction with the Department of Industry and Trade and other key stakeholders from the private and public sectors (including key small business associations), is in the process of developing a '10 Year Vision for the South Australian Small Business Sector' over the course of 1999.

A number of key issues were identified at the first workshop in the Vision project, held on 1 June 1999, one of which was access to information technology, including the Internet. The second workshop scheduled for 14 July, will commence a process which will see the development of collaborative initiatives/solutions to the key issues raised at this first workshop. It is anticipated that the small business associations and other participants in the process will give close consideration to the possible merits of an education campaign focusing on the economic benefits of being connected to the Internet.

ADELAIDE CASINO

In reply to **Hon. CARMEL ZOLLO** (8 June) and answered by letter on 20 August 1999.

The Hon. R.I. LUCAS (Treasurer): The Adelaide Casino Pty Ltd has written to the Government seeking approval to develop and operate an internet gambling site. The Government is still considering its position on this.

Legislation would not be required to extend the Casino licence to include internet gambling. The Gaming Supervisory Authority can approve an amendment to the Casino Licence to change the conditions of the Licence so as to incorporate internet gambling as an element of Casino operations.

INTERNATIONAL TRADE AND COMMERCE COUNCIL

In reply to **Hon. CARMEL ZOLLO** (26 November) and answered by letter on 20 August 1999.

The Hon. R.I. LUCAS (Treasurer): The Premier has been advised of the following information from the Minister for Industry and Trade:

1. Grant applications are assessed by a Grants Committee in accordance with the Country Specific and Region Specific Chambers of Commerce Grants Scheme Guidelines. Responsibility for CITCSA and the Grants Scheme lies with the Department of Industry and Trade. The Minister for Industry and Trade has approved the Grants Scheme Guidelines.

The Grants Committee consists of:

- Chair of CITCSA
- Department of Industry and Trade representative
- South Australian Employers Chamber of Commerce and Industry representative
- Austrade representative
- Three members drawn from members of CITCSA
- CITCSA Manager (non-voting)
- A non-voting Executive Officer of Committee (provided by DIT)

The Committee presents its recommendations to the Chief Executive, Department of Industry and Trade, for approval.

2. There has been a change in the Board membership of CITCSA to reflect more closely the Departments and agencies that have key roles in funding the operations of CITCSA. CITCSA has appointed a new manager who is streamlining the grants process as well as ensuring that the grant approval guidelines reflect the principles of access, equity and flexibility as outlined in the review.

Other changes include a firm directive in the Guidelines that Chambers who are in receipt of a grant application will be required to complete a detailed report on the activity within three months of its completion. Only at the acquittal of the benefits and outcomes will final funds be made available.

3. CITCSA has been given the opportunity to provide input to the Minister on grants through the following mechanisms:

- through Department of Industry and Trade participation on the CITCSA Board; and
- through the Chair of CITCSA's presence on the Grants Advisory Committee.

4. The Office of Multicultural and International Affairs no longer has any responsibility for administering the CITCSA Grants Scheme, hence its membership has been removed. The composition of the Grants Committee has been detailed in the answer to the first question. The reconstituted Grants Committee will ensure that recommendations regarding grant applications are representative of both external and 'peer groups' (eg CITCSA) and the industry development areas of the Industry and Trade portfolios.

GOODS AND SERVICES TAX

In reply to **Hon. CARMEL ZOLLO** (9 June) and answered by letter on 20 August 1999.

The Hon. R.I. LUCAS (Treasurer): In relation to increased compliance costs for small business arising from the changes to the coverage of the GST, the South Australian government has not compiled any estimates of such costs. However, media reports immediately following the announcement of the tax reform changes negotiated between the commonwealth government and the Australian Democrats quoted the Federal Treasurer as stating that an indicative estimate of the additional compliance costs may be of the order of $100 million per annum. These costs would be predominantly incurred by small businesses involved in the food business, and would result from the compliance costs associated with delineating between those food items which are taxed and those which are GST-free. There will also be additional costs incurred by the Australian Taxation Office in relation to the changes to the GST coverage of food. The additional ATO costs have been estimated at $60 million per annum.

The overall costs of compliance of the GST, in its revised form, are estimated by the commonwealth to be $385 million in net terms

for the 1.6 million taxpayers forecast to be registered for GST by 2001-02. This estimate represents the net additional compliance cost for business after offsetting the benefits of associated tax deductions, the removal of compliance with WST and state taxes being abolished, and cash flow benefits flowing from the GST. The net compliance costs represents $240 per registrant on average.

NUCLEAR WASTE

In reply to **Hon. T. CROTHERS** (2 June) and answered by letter on 20 August 1999.

The Hon. R.I. LUCAS (Treasurer): The Deputy Premier and Minister for Primary Industries, Natural Resources and Regional Development has provided the following information.

The proposal by the Federal Government involves a repository for low level radioactive waste, and short-lived medium level radioactive waste, such as smoke alarms, exit signs, and a certain amount of material from hospitals, universities and research facilities.

The federal government has consulted with this government and we have indicated that there are a number of issues that need to be addressed. These include such matters as Aboriginal heritage issues, health issues, native title issues and environmental issues, including geological and groundwater aspects.

Once the state government is satisfied with the information that will be forthcoming, we will be in a position to make decisions in relation to the proposed facility.

YEAR 2000 COMPLIANCE

In reply to **Hon. T. CROTHERS** (16 February) and answered by letter on 20 August 1999.

The Hon. R.I. LUCAS (Treasurer): The Minister for Information Services has provided the following information:

1 & 2. All PCs provided to Members of Parliament provided through the MAPICS Project were purchased through the Whole-of-Government Standard PC (SPC) Contract.

The SPC Contract requires all suppliers on the panel to guarantee Year 2000 compliance. Accordingly, all hardware is certified Year 2000 compliant.

4. As indicated in Question 3 above, the hardware is Year 2000 compliant, and the basic software set installed on the PCs (Microsoft Windows 95 and Microsoft Office 97) has also been acquired through the Whole-of-Government Microsoft Agreement, which again requires Year 2000 compliance certification.

ELECTRICITY, PRIVATISATION

In reply to **Hon. P. HOLLOWAY** (7 July) and answered by letter on 20 August 1999.

The Hon. R.I. LUCAS (Treasurer):

1. The Information Memorandum that will be prepared for the bidders (who have signed confidentiality agreements) at this stage is intended to include updated (i.e. updated from the State Budget) forecast earnings for the years ending 30 June 2000, 2001 and 2002. The forecasts will be based on budgets prepared by the entities consistent with the process adopted in preparing for the State Budget.

2. As the auditor, the Auditor-General has access to all Department of Treasury and Finance information.

It should also be appreciated that the forecasts provided in the Information Memorandum will be based on updated information. There will usually be differences between forecasts, updated forecasts and actual results because events and circumstances frequently change. This is particularly evident in an industry environment which is currently going through restructuring and reform, is very competitive and where various types of risks exist. In addition, forecasts involve assessing many key variables and risks of which many are highly subjective and which have a significant impact on forecast earnings.

EMPLOYMENT TRAINING PROGRAMS

In reply to **Hon. CAROLYN PICKLES** (9 June) and answered by letter on 20 August 1999.

The Hon. R.I. LUCAS (Treasurer): The Minister for Education, Children's Services and Training has provided the following information.

Details of employment training programs to assist the establishment, restructuring and/or the expansion of industry in this State, are outlined below.

In May 1999, the State Government Employment Statement allocated an additional $28.5 million over three years to employment assistance and job creation activities. Within this package, the following program allocations relate to assisting industry:

- $4 million for an extra 1 000 trainee and apprentice places under the Small Business Employer Incentive Scheme (SBEIS). SBEIS provides a financial incentive of up to $4 000 to enable small business to engage a trainee or apprentice.
- $4 million for the Mature Age Employer Incentive Scheme to facilitate the employment of at least 2 000 mature age job seekers. South Australian businesses are provided incentive payments of up to $2 000 to employ a job seeker aged 40 years and over.
- $1.3 million to Targeted Priority Sector Workforce Programs, which will facilitate the placement of 300 people into employment or training positions in high growth sectors.
- $800 000 to facilitate the expansion of the non-tuna sector of the State's aquaculture industry.
- $800 000 to the Human Resource Advisory Service to subsidise human resource consultancy services for approximately 1 000 businesses.
- $400 000 per annum over 3 years to the Regional Industry Training and Employment program (RITE). RITE provides training and employment services to clusters of businesses in industry growth sectors.

In addition to these initiatives, the Department of Education, Training and Employment administers two main programs designed specifically to assist the establishment, restructuring and expansion of industry in South Australia. These programs are:

Open Training Market (OTM)—The OTM program aims to provide opportunities for Registered Training Organisations to expand the delivery of vocational education and training in accordance with the priorities expressed in the State Strategic Plan for Vocational Education and Training—1998 to 2000.

A main focus of the OTM program is to upgrade the skills of the existing workforce in a way that will make South Australia more competitive on a national and international basis. It also aims to provide training which will address identified skill shortages in areas which are strategic to the State's economy.

The program also supports the delivery of accredited training in industries/occupations of strategic importance to the State. In 1998-1999 $8.8 million was allocated to the OTM program. This will be maintained in 1999-2000.

User Choice—User Choice is a process for enabling employers and their apprentices and trainees to exercise choice over their Registered Training Organisation and the training program to be delivered. The provision of government support funds to registered training organisations is influenced by the choice made by users (employers and new apprentices).

The budget to support apprenticeship and traineeship training under these arrangements is determined by the numbers of apprentices and trainees recruited in the market place. Government funding is guaranteed on an ongoing basis to support the formal training of apprentices and trainees. In 1998 funds in the vicinity of $25 million were expended in this way. Government funding will continue to be maintained at the levels required to support the recruitment and training of apprentices and trainees in 1999 and 2000.

The state government has also expanded its funding in the area of industry development.

In 1998-1999, the Department of Industry and Trade expended $34.875 million on industry and other related financial assistance. Furthermore, one facility was made available under the 'Industrial and Commercial Premises Corporation Scheme' at a cost of $2.89 million.

The 1999-2000 funding devoted to these activities has been increased. The base allocation of $36.5 million has been supplemented by additional funding of $49 million over the next three years, with $19 million of this earmarked for 1999-2000. This additional allocation will be cooperatively managed by the Department of Industry and Trade, Tourism SA and the Office of State Development.

In addition to the above programs is the very substantial contribution made by TAFE SA to industry through a wide range of government funded training programs which prepare new entrants to the workforce or upskill the existing workforce.

The above relates to recurrent funds and excludes commonwealth specific purpose grants.

ELECTRICITY, PRIVATISATION

In reply to **Hon. SANDRA KANCK** (27 July) and answered by letter on 20 August 1999.

The Hon. R.I. LUCAS (Treasurer):

1. In 1997-98, $6.8 million was paid to consultancies. In 1998-99, of the $34.6 million paid to consultancies, $19.6 million related to disaggregation, $12.7 million related to privatisation and $2.3 million related to Pelican Point.

2. No further costs relating to disaggregation are anticipated in the years 1999-2000 and 2000-01. Operating budgets for privatisation for those years are currently being developed as initial budgets were based on the premise that privatisation would not continue. However, total consultancy costs are expected to be between 1 per cent and 2 per cent of total lease proceeds.

MEDIA ENDORSEMENTS

In reply to **Hon. P. HOLLOWAY** (5 August) and answered by letter on 20 August 1999.

The Hon. R.I. LUCAS (Treasurer): The Electricity Reform and Sale Unit has not paid any money, either directly or indirectly, to any individual or company associated with an Adelaide radio station.

ELECTRICITY SUPPLY

In reply to **Hons P. HOLLOWAY** and **SANDRA KANCK** (11 February) and answered by letter on 20 August 1999.

The Hon. R.I. LUCAS (Treasurer): When required to implement load-shedding in response to a shortage of available electricity capacity to meet system demand, I am advised that the standard practice adopted by ElectraNet is to shed load on a rotational basis so as to avoid significant impacts on industry and essential services. On each occasion the standard procedure is to avoid individual customers being impacted by load-shedding for more than an hour at a time. Established practice also involves the rotation of load-shedding events over time so as to avoid impacts on the same suburbs on consecutive occasions.

Load-shedding is undertaken in accordance with the operating procedures of the National Electricity Market Management Company (NEMMCO) based on established load-shedding priorities determined by the jurisdiction under the National Electricity Code, on the advice of the electricity businesses.

Load-shedding on 4 February 1999 impacted upon customers in Clearview, Hillcrest, Broadview, Walkerville, Vale Park, Valley View, Highbury, Clovercrest, Hope Valley, Para Vista, Modbury, Northfield and Holden Hill for a period of approximately 25 minutes, commencing at approximately 2.55 p.m.

The previous load-shedding incident experienced in South Australia occurred during storm conditions on the night of 30-31 October 1997. Prevailing weather conditions included electrical storms, wind gusts of up to 100 kph and a maximum temperature that reached only 11.9 degrees. The storm activity caused distribution line faults, and faults on both circuits of the transmission interconnect with Victoria. Consequently, demand exceeded locally available generation capacity, requiring rotational load-shedding to be administered.

Load-shedding on this occasion affected Port Pirie, Blackwood, Elizabeth South, Kingswood, Lower Mitcham, North Unley, Panorama, Campbelltown, Cudmore Park, Kent Town, Noarlunga Centre, Richmond, Seacombe, Snuggery, Ascot Park, Happy Valley, Holden Hill, Morphettville, Glenelg North, Linden Park, Fulham Gardens, Flinders Park, Findon, Keith, Hummocks and Templers. Interruptible loads of two major customers were also utilised. The interruption interval for each affected customer on this occasion averaged 37 minutes. Customers affected on this occasion differed from those affected by the load-shedding on 4 February 1999, in accordance with the established practice of rotation.

While this incident occurred prior to the commencement of the National Electricity Market and therefore did not involve NEMMCO, the required load-shedding was undertaken in accordance with the same arrangements as currently employed.

On the issue of oil firing, the insufficient gas pressure available to Torrens Island Power Station on 4 February 1999 created a need to commence oil fired generation in order to meet generation requirements. On the morning of 4 February, Torrens Island Power Station commenced a process of transition from gas fired operation to oil fired generation for around 30 per cent of its plant in order to maintain adequate gas pressure to its remaining plant. While the station has significant short-term oil firing capability, plant reliability during oil firing has been demonstrated to be inferior to gas firing, particularly during the transition to oil firing. Although oil firing had commenced, the limited notice of the gas pressure difficulties on this occasion did not enable Torrens Island Power Station to convert to oil firing in sufficient time to achieve stable oil fired operation. As a result, a series of short-term generation plant failures – known as unit trips – were encountered during the period in question and insufficient plant was available to manage the combined effects of the oil firing difficulties and lack of gas generation, resulting in the need for load-shedding.

From an operational perspective, it is important to recognise that certain recovery periods of gas fired operation are necessary following oil firing.

It is noted that on two previous occasions during the 1998-99 summer period, oil fired generation operated reliably at Torrens Island Power Station when called upon to meet generation requirements. Since the events of February 4, Optima has taken action to improve the reliability of oil firing operations at Torrens Island Power Station and the Electricity Reform and Sales Unit has undertaken a review of the electricity industry vesting contracts and has implemented changes to improve the short-term management of gas supplies.

TORRENS ISLAND POWER STATION

In reply to **Hon. NICK XENOPHON** (24 November 1998) and answered by letter on 20 August 1999.

The Hon. R.I. LUCAS (Treasurer): The Pelican Point Power Station will be a more modern and efficient plant than Torrens Island and will be able to produce more electricity from the same amount of gas. Consequently, Pelican Point will provide for more efficient use of the available gas. It should be noted that it is possible that extra capacity from Pelican Point will lead to reduced production from the Torrens Island Power Station (TIPS).

On occasions the TIPS may burn oil, as it has done this year and in other years. Approximately one third of the plant was originally designed as an oil firing plant, and all of TIPS currently has the capability to burn oil. The ability for TIPS to burn an alternative fuel, as a back-up to gas, contributes to system security. Further, it allows greater flexibility and certainty to the operation of TIPS. I have been advised that in terms of meeting peak requirements it is likely to be economic to burn oil rather than contract for additional gas.

It needs to be recognised that given the very peaky nature of electricity consumption in South Australia and its sensitivity to summer temperatures, it would be unduly expensive to ensure sufficient pipeline capacity to guarantee TIPS and all other gas fired South Australian plant could operate on gas only at all times of the year. Nevertheless, potential exists to add capacity to the pipeline at reasonable incremental cost.

Pipeline capacity was upgraded last summer, which boosted capacity by 40 TJ per day. National Power has entered into contracts with Terra Gas Trader on normal terms and conditions for gas and pipe capacity for the 250MW equivalent of its gas needs in relation to its proposed new 500MW gas-fired plant, with the need for it to contract under separate arrangements for the remainder at its own cost.

Under normal operating conditions the burning of oil at TIPS is within the standards set by the EPA. To the extent that it ever became an issue, options could be explored to examine the feasibility of burning a lighter grade of oil with consequential improved environmental impacts. The cost of generating electricity by burning oil is more expensive than when burning gas.

Notwithstanding that National Power may contract for additional pipe and gas, I am advised that our projections indicate that, in general, there is sufficient capacity in the gas pipeline to meet the State's energy needs in the short to medium term, except for summer peak load periods when substitute oil burning at TIPS would be required.

POISON, 1080

The Hon. T. CROTHERS: I seek leave to make a precied statement before asking the Minister for Transport and Urban Planning, representing the Minister for Environment and Heritage, questions about the poison 1080.

Leave granted.

The Hon. A.J. Redford interjecting:

The Hon. T. CROTHERS: It is for use with rats. I will explain it to you after.

The Hon. A.J. Redford: I don't think it works any more.

The Hon. T. CROTHERS: Well, you would know. In the September issue of the *Australian Shooters* journal, an article appeared about the use of the poison 1080, scientifically known as sodium fluoroacetate. Although this poison, according to the article, is primarily used to kill wild dogs, foxes and feral cats, conservationists are now questioning its effect on wildlife in general and native predators in particular—that is what I want to talk to Angus about. The poison is supposed to be buried for vermin to dig up, but the article states that, in many cases, aerial baiting is being used. For instance, in Western Australia, some 8.5 million hectares of state forest are treated with 1080. The same system used on Queensland stock routes has resulted in a number of farm dogs being found dead on their chains in backyards some kilometres away. Crows are suspected as being the agents.

The article further states that, because 1080 is so deadly, it is manufactured under the same conditions as chemical and bacterial weapons. Its use in the United States is banned and in other countries permitted only in isolated conditions, yet it is freely available in Australia. My questions to the minister are:

1. Is the poison 1080 utilised by any government department on public land in an endeavour to eradicate wild dogs, foxes and feral cats?

2. Can the minister inform the council whether the practice of aerial baiting with the poison 1080 is deployed? If so, what precautions, if any, are taken to ensure that wildlife for which the poison is not intended is not harmed in the process?

3. Have there been any reported incidents of family pets being inadvertently poisoned in South Australia similar to such reported in the article that I have in my possession due to the aerial baiting of 1080?

4. What observable warning notices if any are present to warn members of the public entering such areas where aerial baiting of 1080 is taking place?

5. What reasons can be given for the poison's being freely available in Australia when it has been banned in the US and so many other countries?

The Hon. DIANA LAIDLAW (Minister for Transport and Urban Planning): I will refer the honourable member's questions to the minister and bring back a reply.

RISDON PARK SCHOOL SITE

The Hon. R.R. ROBERTS: I seek leave to make an explanation before asking the Treasurer, representing the Minister for Education and Children's Services, a question about the old Risdon Park school site at Port Pirie.

Leave granted.

The Hon. R.R. ROBERTS: In 1993, when the government came to power, a proposal was mooted to look at incorporating the operations of the Port Pirie high school as it was then and the Risdon Park high school. Events have led to the closing down of the Risdon Park high school and the amalgamation of those two schools into what is now called the John Pirie High School. That left some reasonably modern facilities by education department standards vacant at the site of the Risdon Park high school.

Since that time there have been a number of proposals and a number of rumours about what the future of those facilities would be, none of which have reached fruition, and it seems as though there has never been a firm proposal. This has led to a situation now in 1999 where a great deal of vandalism has been taking place, and that has prompted a series of articles in the *Recorder* newspaper headed 'Our Shame: Neglect of the Risdon Park high school site.' There have been a number of articles which have received a great deal of attention from the community at Port Pirie.

Some of the rumours have been that the land will be sold and redeveloped as residential. A number of community leaders have expressed a point of view and have been invited to make a contribution to the series of articles headed 'Our Shame: Neglect of the Risdon Park high school site.' Indeed, I was invited to make a suggestion, and I outlined a proposal about a retirement precinct. In fact, I was delighted with the public response to that proposal on the basis that many of these buildings have been established for public use, so they are equipped with fire and airconditioning systems and they are designed for the quick removal of people on safety grounds.

The local member was also invited to make a contribution, and he suggested that the buildings be bulldozed and the site redeveloped. Most people are not of the view that we ought to be crashing very hard-won public facilities to the ground when there may be a better use. My questions to the minister are:

1. How much of the land at the old Risdon Park high school site has been sold and to whom and for how much?

2. What infrastructure still remains in government hands, and what is the estimated replacement value of those facilities?

3. What proposals to utilise this infrastructure in the best interest of Port Pirie and its districts has the government received and for what purposes?

4. Finally, what price has the government placed on the remaining infrastructure that it still holds at the old Risdon Park high school site?

The Hon. R.I. LUCAS (Treasurer): I will refer the questions to the minister and bring back a reply.

ABORIGINAL AFFAIRS NEWSLETTER

The Hon. T.G. CAMERON: I seek leave to make a brief explanation before asking the Minister for Transport, representing the Minister for Aboriginal Affairs, a question about the July edition of the Aboriginal Affairs newsletter.

Leave granted.

The Hon. T.G. CAMERON: My office has only just received the July edition of the newsletter from the state government's division of state aboriginal affairs. The newsletter is most interesting. It includes a comprehensive article about the Colebrook journey of healing and the unveiling on 30 May of the grieving mother statue. The newsletter promotes the reconciliation process and the minister's role in working towards this outcome on behalf of the state government. In fact, the eight page newsletter contains three pictures of the minister.

However, what I find most disturbing is the lack of information regarding the Native Title Bill. Any mention or information whatsoever regarding this bill is missing from the minister's newsletter. My office has been made fully aware that this bill is under the jurisdiction of the Attorney-General with the support of the minister in cabinet. However, it surprises me that there is no mention or any information regarding this bill, one of the most important bills affecting Aboriginal people in this state. My questions are: considering

the importance of the Native Title Bill to the future of Aboriginal people in this state, and the implications for farming and regional communities, why did the minister fail to take the opportunity to make any mention of this bill in her newsletter, and can the minister explain what steps she has taken to inform the Aboriginal community and others of the bill?

The Hon. DIANA LAIDLAW (Minister for Transport and Urban Planning): I will refer the honourable member's questions to the minister and bring back a reply.

PRISONS, SUICIDES

The Hon. IAN GILFILLAN: I seek leave to make a brief explanation before asking the Minister for Justice, representing the Minister for Correctional Services, a question about prison suicides.

Leave granted.

The Hon. IAN GILFILLAN: The Australian Institute of Criminology has recently released two studies on suicide in prisons: one is a statistical survey; and the other examines what policies and procedures are being used around Australia to reduce the incidence of suicide and self-harm in prisons. Vicki Dalton's statistical research shows that, on a national level, suicides make up 46 per cent of all deaths in prison. The rate of suicide in prison has steadily increased over the past 19 years—up a total of 240 per cent in that time. The rate of suicide in the community has also been increasing in that time, but the rate of suicide in prison is roughly 10 times the rate of suicide in the community and is getting worse. It is much greater than the increase in the prison population.

In South Australia we are not immune to or exempt from these national trends. However, when it comes to strategies for managing suicide and self-harm in prisons, South Australia does seem to be unique. Research by McArthur, Camilleri and Webb identifies 10 various strategies being used by prison authorities in Australian states and territories to minimise the risk of suicide. The strategies include: the introduction of screening programs to identify at risk prisoners (Western Australia, New South Wales and the ACT); the introduction of crisis care units for prisoners at highest risk (New South Wales, Queensland, Victoria and Western Australia); the use of cameras as tools of observation for such prisoners (Western Australia, the ACT and the Northern Territory); peer support programs to help monitor inmate distress after reception (Western Australia); visitor support programs; unit management in prisons (New South Wales, Victoria and the ACT); staff training in suicide awareness (New South Wales, Western Australia and Queensland); reduction of prisoner stressors (Western Australia); induction programs for new inmates (New South Wales, Queensland and Western Australia); and departmental reviews of suicide prevention programs (Victoria, Northern Territory and Western Australia).

However, in the research not one of these strategies was attributed to the South Australian government. In South Australia only the privately run Mount Gambier prison was said to be using a peer support program. Every other state and territory, except Tasmania, was reported to be using at least two of these strategies. But, in South Australia, there was not one. It might be that the researchers did not bother to investigate the South Australian situation, or it might be that they simply omitted this state's strategies from their published work—and I hope so. If so, I am sure that the government would welcome this opportunity to put the record straight. My questions are:

1. What is the government doing to reduce the incidence of self-harm and suicide in prisons?

2. Which, if any, of the strategies reported on by the Australian Institute of Criminology has been evaluated or tried in South Australia, and are such strategies continuing?

3. Which of the others have been ruled out, and why?

The Hon. K.T. GRIFFIN (Attorney-General): I will refer the questions to my colleague in another place and bring back a reply.

SPEED CAMERAS

The Hon. T.G. CAMERON: I seek leave to make a brief explanation before asking the Attorney-General a question about speed camera signs.

Leave granted.

The Hon. T.G. CAMERON: My office continues to receive dozens of phone calls and letters each month from people complaining about the use of speed cameras and, recently, about the size and placement of speed camera signs. The size of the signs telling people they have just passed a speed camera are considered to be far too small and are placed after the location of the speed camera itself. Other Australian states, including Victoria and Tasmania, have elected to display prominent signs on main highways and cities and towns across their states. Recently, I travelled to Victoria. In country Victoria particularly you are constantly reminded by signs to slow down and that speed cameras are operating in the area. I cannot think of a more effective way of bringing those matters to the attention of motorists, particularly if they happen to be speeding at the time.

However, once one has crossed the border, one notes that are there no signs anywhere warning people of the dangers of speeding, that speed cameras may be in use in the area and that they should show down. If one were to compare and contrast the situation in Victoria with that in South Australia, one would see that a responsible attitude to this matter appears to be being displayed by the Victorian Government. Yet, in South Australia, after we were not long over the border, we were waved to the side of the road by a police officer. We were somewhat puzzled about what we had been doing wrong. We were advised that we had been travelling at 114 km\h. We were warned that we were travelling over the speed limit, and we were asked why we were doing that. Fortunately, the driver of the vehicle—not I—was not charged.

By way of example, I have a recent photograph of a sign in the small town of Queenstown, Tasmania (and, if the honourable member is interested, I will show him this photograph later). The photograph depicts a sign which states, in large clear letters, 'Caution: speed cameras operate in Tasmania.' It does not warn people that there is a speed camera down the road or even that there is one operating in the area. I can assure members that they have an affect on you if you are driving in excess of the speed limit. The sign is about 2 metres long and about 1 metre wide, and is clearly visible to all, as it is bolted onto two poles about 2 metres from the ground. In South Australia speed camera signs are pathetically small, and they are only chained to the bottom of stobie poles. In fact, they are almost impossible to notice. My question is—

The Hon. A.J. Redford: You're not talking about mobile random tax collectors, are you?

The Hon. T.G. CAMERON: Yes, I am, and I understand that the honourable member has his own views about these devices. My question to the Attorney-General is: in order give motorists an even break, will the government introduce speed camera signs of a similar size and in a similar location as those used in Victoria and Tasmania, or would that interfere too much with the obvious revenue raising capacity of the cameras?

The Hon. K.T. GRIFFIN (Attorney-General): I will have to refer the question to my colleague in another place and bring back a reply. I am not sure what the honourable member was referring to about giving motorists an even break. If they are breaking the law by speeding, a situation of danger is created, and they just should not be breaking the law. It is as simple as that. I do not believe in giving people an even break when they are breaking the law. In relation to those smaller signs to which the honourable member referred, I have seen a few in the past week, and they seem to me to be reasonably obvious.

The Hon. T.G. Cameron: You're not driving. You're sitting in the back seat of a white car, gazing out the window, daydreaming.

The PRESIDENT: Order!

The Hon. K.T. GRIFFIN: I never have time to daydream—although I would like to sometimes. I will refer the question and bring back a reply.

The Hon. R.R. ROBERTS: Supplementary to that, how effective have been the signs which were displayed on some long weekends by Speedway Park at Bolivar and which say, 'Speed cameras are operating on this highway'? What has been the effect on the number of people charged for speeding on those highways?

The Hon. K.T. GRIFFIN: Again, I will refer the question to my colleague in another place, although I think it will be impossible to measure.

TRANSPORT, PUBLIC

The Hon. T.G. CAMERON: I seek leave to make a brief explanation before asking the Minister for Transport questions about public transport timetables.

Leave granted.

The Hon. T.G. CAMERON: The Retail Traders Association has claimed that city shop workers have to wait nearly an hour for buses and trains because of inadequate services. In some cases, southern suburbs residents who finish work in the city at 9 p.m. cannot get home until 11.15 p.m. The association's Executive Director, Mr Stirling Griff, was reported in the *Advertiser* as saying:

> . . . the biggest problem is the buses leaving the city at five minutes past the hour, making it nearly impossible for people who finish work at 5 p.m., 6 p.m. or 9 p.m. to get to their bus stop in time. We don't see a need for major changes, just making them leave five or 10 minutes later would make all the difference.

As an example, Mr Griff cited a Sunday train leaving Adelaide for Noarlunga at 5.02 p.m.—just two minutes after shops closed—and the next train not departing until 6.02 p.m. and not arriving at Noarlunga until 6.46 p.m.—a wait and travel time of over 100 minutes. My question to the Minister is: do you believe that a 100 minute wait and travel time to get from the Adelaide train station to Noarlunga is acceptable, and will you have the Passenger Transport Board investigate as a matter of urgency bus and train timetables to ensure that the present situation is at least looked at if not rectified?

The Hon. DIANA LAIDLAW (Minister for Transport and Urban Planning): Such a time frame is unacceptable. The retail traders have been working with the PTB for some time now and also with TransAdelaide, Serco and Adelaide Hills Transit to see how we can improve services. One of the difficulties concerns the connections. Because our system relies on connections and interchanges, a change to one area can impact across the board.

All the companies I have mentioned have been very involved in submitting bids for tenders for bus contracts. I am being made aware that, rather than make major changes plus the cost of timetabling and informing the public now, they want to wait until January when they will know what contract areas they have won. I think that they are aware that they are not serving the public. I know that we are not serving people who work in the city as well as we could be. However, I am sympathetic to the scheduling and cost issues that face the operators when they are uncertain about their future in terms of the bids.

I hope the honourable member will take it on good faith that I am keenly aware of the issue, as are the contractors. I think he will find that, between the period when the successful contractors are known in January and when the new contractors start in April, there will be some major rethinking about timetables and scheduling.

STANDING ORDER 14

The Hon. R.I. LUCAS (Treasurer): I seek leave to move a motion without notice concerning the suspension of Standing Order 14.

Leave granted.

The Hon. R.I. LUCAS: I move:

That Standing Order 14 be suspended.

This procedure has been adopted in recent times to allow the consideration of other business before the Address in Reply has been adopted.

Motion carried.

JOINT COMMITTEE ON TRANSPORT SAFETY

The Hon. R.I. LUCAS (Treasurer): I seek leave to move a motion without notice concerning the Joint Committee on Transport Safety.

Leave granted.

The Hon. R.I. LUCAS: I move:

That the members of this Council appointed to the committee have power to act on that committee during the present session.

Motion carried.

SELECT COMMITTEE ON INTERNET AND INTERACTIVE HOME GAMBLING AND GAMBLING BY OTHER MEANS OF TELECOMMUNICATION IN SOUTH AUSTRALIA

The Hon. R.I. LUCAS (Treasurer): I seek leave to move a motion without notice concerning the Select Committee on Internet and Interactive Home Gambling and Gambling by Other Means of Telecommunication in South Australia.

Leave granted.

The Hon. R.I. LUCAS: I move:

That the committee have power to sit during the present session and that the time for bringing up the report be extended until Tuesday 29 November 1999.

Motion carried.

SELECT COMMITTEE ON OUTSOURCING OF STATE GOVERNMENT SERVICES

The Hon. R.D. LAWSON (Minister for Disability Services): I seek leave to move a motion without notice concerning the Select Committee on Outsourcing of State Government Services.

Leave granted.

The Hon. R.D. LAWSON: I move:

That the committee have power to sit during the present session and that the time for bringing up the report be extended until Tuesday 29 November 1999.

Motion carried.

SELECT COMMITTEE ON WILD DOG ISSUES IN THE STATE OF SOUTH AUSTRALIA

The Hon. IAN GILFILLAN: I seek leave to move a motion without notice concerning the Select Committee on Wild Dog Issues in the State of South Australia.

Leave granted.

The Hon. IAN GILFILLAN: I move:

That the committee have power to sit during the present session and that the time for bringing up the report be extended until Tuesday 29 November 1999.

Motion carried.

SESSIONAL COMMITTEES

The Hon. R.I. LUCAS (Treasurer): I move:

That for this session a Library Committee not be appointed.

Motion carried.

Sessional committees were appointed as follows:

Standing Orders: The President and Hons K.T. Griffin, R.I. Lucas, Carolyn Pickles and G. Weatherill.

Printing: The Hons J.S.L. Dawkins, A.J. Redford, T.G. Roberts, J.F. Stefani and C. Zollo.

ADDRESS IN REPLY

The President having laid on the table a copy of the Governor's opening speech, the Hon. R.I. Lucas (Treasurer) moved:

That a committee consisting of the Hons J.S.L. Dawkins, P. Holloway, R.I. Lucas, A.J. Redford and C. Zollo be appointed to prepare a draft Address in Reply to the speech delivered this day by His Excellency the Governor and to report on the next day of sitting.

Motion carried.

ADJOURNMENT

At 4.31 p.m. the Council adjourned until Wednesday 29 September at 2.15 p.m.