HOUSE OF ASSEMBLY

Tuesday 12 February 1985

The SPEAKER (Hon. T.M. McRae) took the Chair at 2 p.m. and read prayers.

ASSENT TO BILLS

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

Australian Formula One Grand Prix,
Building Societies Act Amendment,
Companies (Application of Laws) Act Amendment,
Co-operatives Act Amendment,
Correctional Services Act Amendment,
Country Fires Act Amendment (No. 3),
Equal Opportunity,
Evidence Act Amendment (No. 2),
Family Relationships Act Amendment,
Golden Grove (Indenture Ratification),
Nurses,
Planning Act Amendment (No. 4),
Prices Act Amendment (No. 2),
Prisons Act Amendment (No. 2),
South Australian Metropolitan Fire Service Act Amendment,
State Lotteries Act Amendment.

CLASSIFICATION OF PUBLICATIONS ACT AMENDMENT BILL

The Hon. D.J. HOPGOOD (Minister for Environment and Planning): I move:

That Standing Orders be so far suspended as to enable the sitting of the House to be continued during the conference with the Legislative Council on the Bill.

Motion carried.

PETITION: VIDEO CLASSIFICATION

A petition signed by 72 residents of South Australia praying that the House reject a new 'extra restricted' video classification in South Australia was presented by the Hon. Jennifer Adamson.

Petition received.

PETITION: CHILD/PARENT CENTRES

A Petition signed by 306 residents of South Australia praying that the House exclude child/parent centres for administrative and curriculum purposes from the Children's Services Bill was presented by Mr Gregory.

Petition received.

PETITION: WEST BEACH GOLF COURSE

A petition signed by 1 089 residents of and visitors to South Australia praying that the House urge the Government to oppose the closure of the existing Marineland Par 3 golf course, West Beach, until a new course is completed was presented by Mr Becker.

Petition received.

PETITION: ETSA

A petition signed by 1 221 residents of South Australia praying that the House call upon the Governor to establish an inquiry into the financial management of the Electricity Trust of South Australia was presented by Mr Becker.

Petition received.

PETITION: INDOOR ENTERTAINMENT CENTRE

A petition signed by 34 980 residents of Australia praying that the House support the establishment of an indoor entertainment centre in Adelaide was presented by Mr Mayes.

Petition received.

PETITIONS: OPEN SPEED LIMIT

Petitions signed by 468 residents of South Australia praying that the House reject any proposal to reduce the open speed limit from 110 km/h to 100 km/h were presented by Messrs Gunn and Lewis.

Petitions received.

PETITION: CHILDREN'S SERVICES BILL

A petition signed by 121 members of the Kathleen Mellor Kindergarten community praying that the House defer consideration of the Children's Services Bill to allow for more consultation was presented by Mr Ashenden.

Petition received.

PETITION: ADELAIDE ICE SPORTS CENTRE

A petition signed by 431 residents of South Australia praying that the House intervene so as to restrain Payneham council from forcing the closure of or rezoning land associated with the Adelaide Ice Sports Centre, Payneham, was presented by Mr Groom.

Petition received.

PETITION: ELECTRICITY CHARGES

A petition signed by 72 residents of South Australia praying that the House consider the effects of increased electricity charges on disadvantaged members of the community was presented by Mr Olsen.

Petition received.

PETITION: PRE-SCHOOL EDUCATION

A petition signed by 64 residents of South Australia praying that the House urge the Government to provide increased funding for pre-school education in rural areas was presented by Mr Lewis.

Petition received.

LEADER OF THE HOUSE

The Hon. J.C. BANNON (Premier and Treasurer): I wish to advise the House that as from today the Minister for

Environment and Planning will be in charge of Government business in the House.

QUESTIONS

The SPEAKER: I direct that the following written answers to questions on the Notice Paper, as detailed in the schedule that I now table, be distributed and printed in *Hansard:* all except Nos 174, 211, 242, 251, 269, 294 to 306, 327 to 339, 364, 367 and 370; and I direct that the following answers to questions without notice be distributed and printed in *Hansard.*

LEGAL AID

In reply to **Ms LENEHAN** (30 October).

The Hon. G.J. CRAFTER: Section 10 (1) *(c)* of the Legal Services Commission Act provides that:

The Commission shall determine the criteria upon which legal assistance is to be granted in pursuance of this Act.

The ultimate responsibility therefore for fixing eligibility criteria does not rest with the Commonwealth Attorney-General. I am informed that the Legal Services Commission will provide legal advice in all cases although it will not 'ordinarily' grant legal assistance in the following matters:

1. Proceedings for divorce unless the applicant would be able to obtain a divorce by any other means within a reasonable time, or unless circumstances exist which, in the opinion of the Director, render it imperative that the marriage be dissolved and the applicant is in a position of special hardship. Instead, the Commission will assist people to obtain divorces through its Do-Your-Own Divorce classes.
2. Applications for disputes over custody and access (other than in emergency situations or applications by children) unless it is not possible to settle the matter by agreement.
   (This guideline is presently under review).
3. Traffic offences, unless there is a real risk of imprisonment or the applicant is in particular need of his or her licence and there is a real risk that a period of disqualification may be imposed.
4. For conveyancing or simple probate matters.
5. To make complaints against lawyers. These are initially referred to the Law Society Complaints Committee for investigation. Assistance may be granted where the available evidence justifies the institution of legal proceedings.
6. Defamation cases.
7. Restraining orders, where the other party to the application is not legally represented by a lawyer.
8. Application for re-employment under the Industrial Conciliation and Arbitration Act.
   (This guideline is also currently under review).
9. Matters for which adequate assistance can be obtained elsewhere. These include maintenance (Department for Community Welfare), simple consumer complaints and wills (Department of Public and Consumer Affairs).

As a matter of general policy the Commission does not grant aid where the merits of the matter are such that an action has little chance of success. This policy is designed to ensure that legal aid funds are not wasted on unmeritorious claims. As to financial considerations it is essential, in the Commission's view, that assistance should not be provided where the applicant can afford to pay in full for legal services without undue financial hardship. The Commission has not adopted a rigid means test to give effect to this principle but it applies the Henderson Poverty Commission after housing poverty line as the basis for assessing financial capacity. In instances where the Commission considers the matter has legal merit and the applicant does have some means to make a contribution for legal aid, then aid is granted on the basis that a part payment be made for the service provided.

SUN PROTECTION

In reply to **Mrs APPLEBY** (6 December).

The Hon. D.J. HOPGOOD: Both the Minister of Health and I view the matter raised by the honourable member as being particularly important. It is well known that Australia has the highest incidence of skin cancer in the world and that much of the preliminary damage to our skin is done during the childhood years. With this in mind, the Anti-Cancer Foundation of the universities of South Australia and the health promotion services of the South Australia Health Commission developed a 'Skin Protection Primary School Teaching Pack'. This was widely distributed to primary schools in South Australia during 1982-83, and absorbed into the school curriculum in support of a health education unit on skin protection. One of the packs has been made available to the honourable member.

The Anti-Cancer Foundation has set aside an amount of $50 000 to be used in 1985 to develop further materials that will inform young children and their parents of the dangers of skin exposure to the sun's rays. It is envisaged that collaboration with health promotion services will continue. Furthermore, organisations such as Child, Adolescent and Family Health Service (CAFHS) offer continuing advice and support to parents of young children in the area of skin protection.

PAPERS TABLED

The following papers were laid on the table:

By the Premier (Hon. J.C. Bannon)—
Pursuant to Statute—
Film Classification Act, 1971—Regulations—P.G. Warnings.
State Disaster Act, 1980—Regulations—
Authorised Officers.
Disaster Plans.

By the Treasurer (Hon. J.C. Bannon)—
Pursuant to Statute—
Financial Institutions Duty Act, 1983—Regulations—Merchant Banks Foreign Exchange.

By the Minister for the Arts (Hon. J.C. Bannon)—
Pursuant to Statute—
Adelaide Festival Centre Trust—Report, 1984.

By the Minister of Labour (Hon. J.D. Wright)—
Pursuant to Statute—
Long Service Leave (Building Industry) Board—Report, 1983-84.

By the Chief Secretary (Hon. J.D. Wright)—
Pursuant to Statute—
Architects Act, 1939—By-laws—Subscription Fees.

By the Minister of Emergency Services (Hon. J.D. Wright)—
Pursuant to Statute—
Listening Devices—Report, 1984.

By the Minister for Environment and Planning (Hon. D.J. Hopgood)—
Pursuant to Statute—
Botanic Gardens—Report, 1983-84.
City of Adelaide Development Control Act, 1976—Regulations—Signs and Fees for Internal Work.

Coast Protection Act, 1972—Regulations—Prescribed Works.
Environmental Protection Council—Report, 1983-84.
Planning Act, 1982—Crown Development Reports by the South Australian Planning Commission on proposed—
Lease of Land at Birkenhead (5).
Lease of Land at Gillman (3).
Erection of Classroom, Le Fevre High School.
Erection of Classroom, Kapunda Primary School.
Erection of Classroom, Ru Rua Nursing Home.
Land Division, West Lakes.
Erection of Navigation Lights, Carpenters Rocks.
Land Division, Port Augusta.
Erection of Classroom, Kingston College of Technical and Further Education.
Erection of Classroom, Whyalla High School.
Erection of Classroom, Mulga Street Primary School.
Lease for Electorate Office, Tapleys Hill Road, Seaton.
Land Division, Hundred of Rivoli Bay.
Premises for Central Southern Youth Services, Glenelg.
Erection of Classroom, Balaklava High School.
Erection of Classroom, Blair Athol Junior Primary School.
Erection of Bus/Rail Interchange, Salisbury Railway Station.
Erection of a Fire Spotting Tower, Para Wirra Recreation Park.
Erection of Classrooms, Port Adelaide TAFE Branch, Grange.
Lease of Land at Outer Harbor Passenger Terminal.
Erection of Classroom, Kapunda High School (2).
Land Division, Port Victoria.
Borrow Pit, Hundred of Monbulla.
Land Division, Hundred of Blanche.
Extensions to Angas Creek Substation.
Erection of Dwelling at Glencoe.
Erection of Classroom, Alberton Primary School.
Erection of Classroom, Alberton Junior Primary School.
Quarrying Operations, Dukes Highway, Bordertown.
Erection of Classrooms, Para Vista High School.
Erection of Classroom, Port Adelaide TAFE.
Community Service Centre, Kilkenny.
Erection of Classroom, Gawler East Primary School.
Additions to Glenside Hospital.
Extensions to Administration Building for Pipelines Authority of South Australia.
Activity Hall, Brighton High School.
Land Division and Transfer of Land at Bute.
Division of Land, Gawler Railway Station Yard.
Erection of Classroom, Gawler Primary School.
Holding Tank, Streaky Bay Jetty.
33 kV Transmission Line, Warooka-Marion Bay.
Erection of Classroom, Parafield Gardens Primary School.
Erection of Classroom, Kimba Area School.
Erection of Classroom, Seaton High School.
Erection of Classroom, Mitcham Primary School.
Electrical Supply to Booleroo Centre and Wirrabara.
Erection of Classroom, Willunga High School.
Erection of Classroom, Torrensville Primary School.
Division of Land at Grange.
Erection of Classroom, Gawler Primary School.
Erection of Headquarters for Dog Squad at Yatala.
Erection of Courts at Fulham North Primary School.
Erection of Classrooms at Northfield High School.
Division of Land at Kilkenny.
Erection of Classroom, Plympton High School.
Crown Lands Act, 1929—
Remissions Granted—Return, 1983-84.
Closer Settlement—Return, 1983-84.
Surrenders Declined—Return, 1983-84.
Discharged Soldiers Settlement Act, 1934—Disposal of Surplus Land—Return, 1983-84.
Pastoral Act, 1936—
Conservation Reserve, Hundred of Angas.
Pastoral Improvements—Return, 1983-84.

By the Minister of Transport (Hon. R.K. Abbott)—
Pursuant to Statute—
Police Offences Act, 1953—Regulations—Traffic Infringement Notices.
Road Traffic Act, 1961—Regulations—
Forward Control Passenger Vehicles.
Parking and Lighting Equipment.

By the Minister of Marine (Hon. R.K. Abbott)—
Pursuant to Statute—
Boating Act, 1974—Regulations—Brighton Beach Zoning.

By the Minister of Education (Hon. Lynn Arnold)—
By Command—
Australian Agricultural Council—Resolutions of the 119th Meeting, Townsville, 30 July 1984.
Australian Fisheries Council—Resolutions of the 14th Meeting, 28 July 1984, Townsville, Queensland.
Learning from Disasters—A Report of the Post Disaster School Support Project.
Pursuant to Statute—
Advisory Committee on Soil Conservation—Report, 1982-83.
Meat Hygiene Act, 1980—Regulations—
Pet Food Works.
Pet Foods.
Metropolitan Milk Supply Act, 1946—Regulations—Milk Prices.
Seeds Act, 1979—Regulations—Fees for Seed Analyses.
South Australian Egg Board—Report, 1983-84.
Vertebrate Pests Control Authority—Report, 1983-84.

By the Minister of Tourism (Hon. G.F. Keneally)—
Pursuant to Statute—
Food and Drugs Act, 1908—Regulations—
Buprenorphine.
Chlorinating Compounds.
Folpet.
Institute of Medical and Veterinary Science—Report, 1983-84.
Lyell McEwin Health Service—By-laws—Change of Name.
Medical Practitioners Act, 1983—
Regulations—Registration of Medical Practice Companies.
Correctional Services Advisory Council—Report, 1983-84.
South Australian Psychological Board—Report, 1983-84.
South Australian Health Commission Act, 1975—Regulations—
Prescribed Hospitals.
Incorporated Hospital Charges.
Prescribed Health Centre Audits.

By the Minister of Local Government (Hon. G.F. Keneally)—
Pursuant to Statute—
Building Act, 1970—Regulations—Building Footings.
Impounding Act, 1920—Regulations—District Council of Riverton.
Local Government Act, 1934—Regulations—Proceedings of Councils (Amendment).
District Council of Lucindale—By-law No. 23—Dogs.
Libraries Board of South Australia—Report, 1983-84.

By the Minister of Community Welfare (Hon. G.J. Crafter)—
By Command—
Elizabeth District By-Election—Statistical Return of Voting.
Pursuant to Statute—
Commissioner of Statute Revision, Schedule of Alterations Made—
Criminal Law Consolidation Act, 1935.
Motor Vehicles Act, 1959.
Road Traffic Act, 1961.
Administration and Probate Act, 1919—Regulations—Improvements to Property.
Building Societies, Registrar of—Report, 1983-84.
Credit Unions, Registrar of—Report, 1983-84.
Legal Practitioners Act, 1981—Regulations—Professional Indemnity Insurance Scheme.
Rules of Court—Juries Act, 1927—Trial by Jury or Judge Alone.
Trustee Act, 1936—Regulations—C.B.F.C. Trustee Investments.

By the Minister of Aboriginal Affairs (Hon. G.J. Crafter)—
Pursuant to Statute—
Aboriginal Lands Trust—Report, 1983-84.

By the Minister of Water Resources (Hon. J.W. Slater)—

Pursuant to Statute—

Irrigation Act, 1930—Regulations—Regional Advisory Boards.

By the Minister of Recreation and Sport (Hon. J.W. Slater)—

Pursuant to Statute—

Racing Act, 1976—Betting Control Board Rules—Betting Sheets.

South Australian Trotting Control Board—Report, 1983-84.

Racecourses Development Board—Report, 1983-84.

Greyhound Racing Control Board—Report, 1983-84.

By the Minister of Public Works (Hon. T.H. Hemmings)—

By Command—

Adelaide Railway Station Development Act, 1984—Exemption from Building Act.

Pursuant to Statute—

Fees Regulation Act, 1927—Regulations—ASER Building Fees.

MINISTERIAL STATEMENT: ILLEGAL FIREARMS

The Hon. J.D. WRIGHT (Minister of Emergency Services): I seek leave to make a statement:

Leave granted.

The Hon. J.D. WRIGHT: I wish to make a statement to allay any fears that may have arisen in the community as a result of certain media reports yesterday concerning the illegal trafficking of firearms in South Australia. These reports alleged, among other things, that at some time South Australia had been a major distribution point for the sale of illegal firearms to other parts of Australia and international terrorist organisations. The media reports were based on a document prepared six years ago by two junior officers in the Commonwealth Police. Because of the seriousness of the charges contained in that document and the equally serious implications that flowed from those charges, I requested a briefing from the Acting Commissioner of Police on the matter. As a result of that briefing and on the written advice given to me by the Acting Commissioner, I can now tell the House that there is very little of substance contained in the document prepared by the two Commonwealth Police officers.

South Australia is not an arsenal of illegal arms, as alleged in the original document, and there is no evidence to support the allegation that South Australia is a major source of illegal arms for terrorist organisations throughout the world. The document that contained these allegations should be put into an historical perspective. The events described by the Commonwealth Police document are alleged to have occurred in the early to mid-1970s.

As the Acting Commissioner pointed out in his briefing to me, there were problems with legislation controlling the import into Australia and subsequent sale of firearms. I am informed that, as a result of this state of affairs, illegal firearms often found their way into the hands of criminals. The Acting Commissioner informs me that at times unscrupulous gun dealers were responsible for using the loopholes in existing legislation to acquire firearms for dubious purposes. South Australia was no exception to this trade which sometimes saw dangerous firearms finding their way into the hands of criminals.

However, it was stressed by the Acting Commissioner that at no stage could this ever be considered an organised case of large scale gun running as alleged in the Commonwealth Police document. The Acting Commissioner also pointed out to me that in 1980 as a result of an initiative by the South Australian police the loop-holes that allowed the importation of firearms were significantly tightened so that it is now much harder in South Australia for criminals to maintain a supply of illegal firearms.

It has been put to me by the Acting Commissioner that the document by the Commonwealth Police was based on the events of the mid to late 1970s: that some cases of illegal or dubious dealings were linked, and in the subsequent Commonwealth document were represented as a major gun running operation. I would now like to briefly deal with the document itself. It was compiled in January 1979, is 30 pages long and contains many allegations, the vast majority of which are based on hearsay and opinion. I am informed by the Acting Commissioner that in most cases they are not substantiated by hard evidence and the allegations cannot be tested.

Indeed, correspondence by a senior Commonwealth police officer at the time refers to the report as dealing with fact, innuendo and hearsay, and states that its conclusions are drawn on inconclusive evidence. The Acting Police Commissioner has told me that the South Australian police have been aware for some time of the existence of the report. He points out that the report does contain some facts. For example, he cites the evidence of an army rifle stolen from an armoury in Adelaide being located in Ireland in the possession of the IRA.

As a result of this incident, investigations were carried out with the fullest co-operation of the Army authorities into the possibility of organised gun running based in South Australia. No hard evidence was obtained to substantiate this beyond the incident mentioned. The Acting Commissioner also points out that the document contained the names of a number of known criminals in South Australia, but once again no substantiating evidence was produced to connect them to a systematic, organised gun running operation in South Australia.

The Acting Commissioner also informed me that a suspended South Australian police officer is now facing criminal charges relating to firearms and is on remand to appear before the court. As honourable members would appreciate, as the matter is before the courts it would be improper to discuss the case, but it can be stated that there is no suggestion that the charges are linked with gun running activities. In 1978 a South Australian policeman was investigated regarding a suspicion that he had committed a fraud on the department involving ammunition. He subsequently resigned. The Acting Commissioner says that the investigation in no way disclosed any basis for linking that member of the Police Force with any gun running activities.

The Acting Commissioner also states that any implications from the Commonwealth Police document that members of the South Australian Police Force have been or are involved in the illegal supply of weapons to either criminal or terrorist organisations simply have not been sustained. Following the briefing from the Acting Commissioner, I contacted the office of my Federal counterpart, the special Minister of State, to determine what status the report was being given by the Federal Police.

In a statement issued this morning the special Minister of State said that he had been informed that at the time the document was compiled in 1979 it was tested for veracity by senior officers of the Commonwealth Police Force. It was subsequently decided there was insufficient evidence to pursue the matter. The Minister said there had been no new evidence given to the Australian Federal Police relating to the inquiries forming the basis of the 1979 document.

In short, claims that South Australia was an arsenal for weapons which found their way to criminal elements both in Australia and overseas simply cannot be substantiated. The elements in the Commonwealth Police report of 1979 which came to the notice of the South Australian Police would have been investigated in the normal course of events,

but as I stated earlier, the police were unable to establish any link with a systematic gun running operation. The special Minister of State in his statement this morning said the Australian Federal Police were preparing a detailed report on the matters raised in the 1979 document to bring knowledge of those matters up to date.

I shall, of course, ensure that my office is kept fully informed of any new developments in this matter. The Acting Commissioner assures me that any information that any person may have which could relate to the matters I have discussed will be welcome and thoroughly investigated by the South Australian Police Force.

I trust that my statement will allay any fears that may have resulted from media reports of the past two days that South Australia is the centre of a vast international gun running operation. From the evidence before us, and based on the advice of both the Federal and South Australian Police Forces, this is simply not the case.

PUBLIC WORKS COMMITTEE REPORTS

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

Australian International Grand Prix—Track and Facilities Development—Interim Report

The SPEAKER laid on the table the following reports by the Parliamentary Standing Committee on Public Works, together with minutes of evidence:

South Australian Museum Redevelopment—Stage I (Phase D)

Evanston Temporary Tank and Outlet Main (Construction)

Parafield Gardens North West Primary School (Construction)

The SPEAKER laid on the table the following final report by the Parliamentary Standing Committee on Public Works, together with minutes of evidence:

Australian International Grand Prix—Track and Facilities Development

Ordered that reports be printed.

QUESTION TIME

The Hon. D.J. HOPGOOD (Minister for Environment and Planning): I move:

That the time for asking questions be extended to 3.23 p.m.

Motion carried.

MOTION FOR ADJOURNMENT: STATE TAXES AND CHARGES

The SPEAKER: I have received this day from the Leader of the Opposition the following letter:

Dear Mr Speaker,

I desire to inform you that this day it is my intention to move:

That this House, at its rising adjourn until 1 p.m. tomorrow for the purpose of discussing a matter of urgency, namely:

That in view of the escalation in State taxes and charges which had a major impact on the rise in Adelaide's CPI for the December quarter, this House calls for no increase in real terms in total State taxation and State charges for at least the next two years and some relief in specific areas, particularly land tax and electricity tariffs.

Yours sincerely,

JOHN OLSEN, Leader of the Opposition

I call upon those members who support the proposed motion to rise in their places.

Members having risen:

The SPEAKER! More than the necessary number of members having risen, the motion may be proceeded with.

Mr OLSEN (Leader of the Opposition): I move:

That, in view of the escalation in State taxes and charges which had a major impact on the rise in Adelaide's CPI for the December quarter, this House calls for no increase in real terms in total State taxation and State charges for at least the next two years and some relief in specific areas, particularly land tax and electricity tariffs.

I have moved this urgency motion on the first day of the 1985 Parliamentary sittings because this will be a year of unprecedented debate about taxation levied by the Federal and State Governments. Next month, a special ALP State Convention will consider proposals for radical changes to our State taxation system. At the Premiers Conference in June, the States' tax sharing formula is to be reviewed. In July, there will be a national tax summit and a South Australian election is likely by the end of 1985, when taxation will continue to be the major issue. These forums will allow many different points of view to be put.

But this afternoon this Parliament in this debate has a unique opportunity to speak for all South Australians in defining the parameters within which these debates need to be conducted so far as State taxation in South Australia is concerned. I have deliberately framed a motion capable of support from the Premier when he speaks because I believe that the vast majority of South Australians want their elected representatives—all their elected representatives—to declare an end to the spiral in land taxes, electricity tariffs, water rates, public transport fares, and all other Government imposts which have been going up so often and by so much.

Rises in Government revenue collection from taxes and charges which are in line with inflation can be justified and, I believe, are accepted by most fair minded people, provided that the money is used efficiently for activities in which Government has a legitimate role. But, when taxes and charges rise regularly, as Governments take more of the weekly pay packet, leaving less for wage earners to spend in the way they choose, a revolt from taxpayers is inevitable. That is what is occurring right now because State tax collections have gone up by almost 40 per cent or just over 27 per cent in real terms since the Government was elected. As the latest CPI figures demonstrate, at a time of relative wage stability there has been a tax explosion in South Australia. The Premier, who promised not to increase taxes and limit rises in charges, has increased the rate of six taxes, introduced a new tax, and put up at least 160 individual charges.

It is little wonder that taxpayers now are as cynical as they are angry. They demand and they deserve better. The South Australian public is demanding tax relief. To achieve this, the public deserves a tax debate conducted free of the immediate demands and temptations of an election campaign. That is why the debate needs to start now—before the Premier calls an election.

It is why the major Parties have an obligation to start putting their cards on the table now. The choice available to South Australians at the next election must be an informed one in which policies and promises have been the subject of scrutiny and debate over an extended period. The false promises made by the Labor Party during the 1982 election campaign and the cynicism they have produced must not be repeated. The December CPI result for Adelaide and initiatives by some other State Governments make it all the

more important for this House at this time to express an opinion about taxation.

The 2.1 per cent rise in Adelaide's CPI for the December quarter, the largest of any capital in fact, was 35 per cent higher than the average for the eight capital cities of Australia, and Government charges accounted for about a third of that rise—0.7 per cent of the 2.1 per cent rise. This Labor sponsored result has moved the *Advertiser* to call Adelaide 'the inflation capital of Australia'. This is a tag successive Governments, over more than four decades, have given the greatest priority to avoiding. But the plain fact now, Mr Speaker, is that no Premier in so short a period has done more than this one has to put in jeopardy South Australia's reputation as a low cost State. His first two Budgets provided for a rise in State taxation more than three times the rate of inflation.

Members interjecting:

Mr OLSEN: It is interesting to note the sensitivity coming from Government benches.

The Hon. J.D. Wright: Get to facts.

Mr OLSEN: We will get to facts. The facts are that this Government has in two Budgets increased State taxation by three times the rate of inflation compared to the first Budget of the former Administration—the Liberal Government—which reduced State taxation in real terms by 3.1 per cent. That is the track record on which people will judge Governments and political Parties in this State.

The efforts of the former Government to maintain South Australia's cost competitiveness have been significantly eroded during the past two years. The December consumer price index result is a pointer to that fact. We will quickly fall further behind unless some firm direction is set now about future rates of State taxation in South Australia.

In Western Australia, financial institutions duty has been reduced this financial year, and the West Australian Premier is now promising land tax relief of $5 million. During the current State election campaign in Victoria, both major parties are promising tax relief. Only last night, in his policy speech, the Victorian Premier said that under a Labor Government there will be no increase in real terms in current taxes, nor any new taxes, for the next four years, and that some taxes are to be reduced. I hope his track record is a little better than we have seen here during election campaigns.

In this motion I am not asking the Premier to do any more than his colleagues to the east and west of this State. We now need real tax relief—not tokenism. While the Premier's announcement earlier today on FID for pension cheques is welcome news for pensioners, it will do virtually nothing to offset the 40 per cent tax slug that South Australians have experienced during the past two years. The net cost this financial year is $50 000 for State Treasury—it is tokenism. South Australia cannot afford to wait until the next election for real tax relief. We need commitments now.

We have led the tax surge during the last two years. It is time for a tax freeze. Support from the Premier for the motion that I have moved this afternoon is vital to demonstrate South Australia's determination to regain our competitive edge—to retain our attractions as a low cost State.

In seeking the Premier's support, I refer to two areas of State imposts which are causing concern across the board—to individuals, families and business, whether big or small—land tax and electricity tariffs. In dealing with land tax, I seek leave to incorporate in *Hansard* a table I have prepared, which is purely statistical, to demonstrate movements since 1980-81 in land tax.

Leave granted.

EXAMPLES OF LAND TAX BILLS—1980-81 TO 1984-85

* Indicates Site Value

Location	Tax Paid 1980-81	Tax Paid 1983-84	Tax Paid 1984-85	Per cent increase over year 1983-84—84-85	Per cent increase since 1980-81
	$	$	$		
Warehouse					
College Road, Kent Town	80.68	112.90	186.26	+65.0	+130.9
	* (33 920)	(41 580)	(54 810)	(+31.8)	(+61.6)
Factory					
Bacon Street, Hindmarsh	804.10	1 285.00	2 158.24	+68.0	+168.4
	* (112 200)	(140 250)	(179 200)	(+27.7)	(+59.7)
Factory					
Manton Street, Hindmarsh	108.00	159.88	259.68	+62.4	+140.4
	* (40 600)	(50 750)	(64 960)	(+28.0)	(+60.0)
Retail Premises					
Goodwood Road, Kings Park	399.40	693.28	1 294.00	+86.6	+223.0
	* (80 400)	(104 520)	(140 700)	(+34.6)	(+75.0)
Retail Premises					
Main North Road, Prospect	1 745.60	2 528.68	4 913.02	+94.3	+181.5
	* (162 200)	(194 640)	(291 960)	(+50.0)	(+80.0)
Retail Premises					
Main North Road, Nailsworth	187.50	268.00	617.50	+130.4	+229.3
	* (55 000)	(66 000)	(99 000)	(+50.0)	(+80.0)
Factory					
King William Street, Kent Town	816.50	1 463.20	2 577.19	+76.0	+215.6
	* (113 000)	(149 160)	(196 620)	(+31.8)	(+74.0)
Office Block					
Greenhill Road, Eastwood	8 435.87	15 081.50	18 545.80	+23.0	+119.8
	* (435 750)	(707 000)	(848 400)	(+20.0)	(+94.7)
Factory					
Glenside	2 905.00	4 865.00	6 286.00	+29.2	+116.0
	* (210 000)	(290 000)	(348 000)	(+20.0)	(+65.7)
Shops					
Mount Barker Road, Stirling	27.84	35.96	52.40	+45.7	+88.2
	* (16 420)	(20 320)	(25 800)	(+30.0)	(+57.0)
Shops					
Mount Barker Road, Aldgate	24.40	38.32	65.00	+69.6	+166.4
	* (14 700)	(18 200)	(30 000)	(+64.8)	(+104.0)

Location	Tax Paid 1980-81	Tax Paid 1983-84	Tax Paid 1984-85	Per cent increase over year 1983-84—84-85	Per cent increase since 1980-81
	$	$	$		
Shop					
Unley Road, Unley	347.50	598.75	1 118.12	+86.7	+221.8
	* (75 000)	(97 500)	(131 250)	(+34.6)	(+75.0)
Factory					
Somerton Park	267.99	296.80	408.20	+37.5	+52.0
	* (66 000)	(69 600)	(81 200)	(+16.7)	(+23.0)
Warehouse					
Parkside	38.80	72.92	120.25	+64.9	+209.9
	* (24 600)	(31 980)	(43 050)	(+34.6)	(+75.0)
Showroom					
Brighton Road, Brighton	152.16	387.40	535.00	+38.1	+251.6
	* (49 430)	(79 200)	(92 400)	(+16.7)	(+86.9)
Shop					
The Parade, Norwood	58.01	241.60	424.16	+75.6	+631.2
	* (27 660)	(62 700)	(82 650)	(+31.8)	(+198.8)
Offices					
Tolleys Road, St Agnes	69.80	465.40	691.60	+48.6	+890.8
	* (31 200)	(86 400)	(104 400)	(+20.8)	(+234.6)
Shops					
North East Road, Walkerville	238.30	535.00	630.00	+17.8	+164.4
	* (66 000)	(92 400)	(100 000)	(+8.2)	(+51.5)

Mr OLSEN: This table details land tax accounts payable on eighteen sites throughout the metropolitan area between 1980-81 and this financial year. The properties involved are factories, shops, office blocks, showrooms, warehouses and the like. In the main, these are small businesses subject to enormous cost pressures where even marginal movements can mean the difference between viability and bankruptcy, between employing additional people and sacking existing workers.

They are businesses that are constantly urged by Government to limit the price of their goods and services. Yet, most of these premises are facing increases in their land tax bills this financial year which are nine, ten and eleven times more than the rate of inflation. The increases since last financial year range up to 130 per cent. Since 1980, one of these properties has had a land tax rise of almost 900 per cent and another more than 600 per cent. This is a rort, a rip off, a windfall for the Government from rising property values. In most cases, the rate of tax is rising much faster than the property valuation, as well as inflation.

This tax has a wide net: for example, its costs are passed on to people living in private rental accommodation or who lease small shops. Rising land taxes have become a significant component of rising home and commercial rents in metropolitan Adelaide, yet it has been customary in South Australia to periodically adjust land tax rates. For example, in 1977 the Dunstan Government adjusted the marginal rates of land tax to take into account rising land values.

In 1980, the former Liberal Government abolished land tax on the principal place of residence. But, no further relief measures have been introduced, despite the massive escalation in land values during the past 18 months in particular. As a result, Government revenue from land tax increased in real terms by 36.4 per cent since 1980-81.

In money terms, the amount of land tax collected this financial year is estimated at $32.8 million—almost double the amount collected in 1980-81. When this is compared with trends in New South Wales—which has had a real terms growth of 15.2 per cent in land tax (less than half ours)—and Victoria, a real reduction of 11.7 per cent—the need for action in South Australia becomes all the more apparent, all the more urgent. Here and now I commit the next Liberal Government to providing land tax relief. As a starting point, we will remove the metropolitan levy surcharge applied in respect of land at the rate of one cent for every $20 or part thereof of the taxable value of the land. The next Liberal Government also will reduce the marginal rates of land tax. The precise amount of this reduction will be announced before the election in our taxation policy.

I now turn to electricity tariffs of which State taxation is a component in the form of the 5 per cent levy on the Electricity Trust's turnover. The impact of rising tariffs is biting every man, woman and child in South Australia. As accounts now become payable under the latest rates increase from November, many families increasingly have had to go without summer air-conditioning and, in winter, heating will have to go as well.

Rising tariffs also hit the household budget in many other indirect ways—at the supermarket counter, in the hotel and restaurant, and so on. Even technical and further education courses have become a casualty, with colleges having to commit rapidly increasing proportions of their already stretched budgets to pay power bills.

I anticipate that in his response the Premier will attempt, yet again, to blame the former Government for the escalation in tariffs. Before he does, let him contemplate some of the facts. The former Liberal Government faced a combination of difficult circumstances—rapidly rising wages, high ETSA capital commitments to build the new Northern Power Station and the natural gas supply contracts inherited from the Dunstan Government—all facts. These factors were the principal reasons for a real terms growth of 19.6 per cent in tariffs under the former Liberal Government. The present Government has had an advantage in that wage movements have been much less and more predictable, and ETSA's capital commitments have reduced as the new Northern Power Station nears completion.

Yet, if tariffs rise again later this year by 10 per cent (and this is the figure to which the Government is already trying to condition consumers), this will mean a rise in real terms in tariffs under this Government of 26.9 per cent—7.3 per cent more than under the previous Government in circumstances much more conducive to limiting rather than escalating tariffs, and that at a time when pay packets are shrinking compared to those that applied between 1979 and 1982.

Let me put this escalation into another perspective to highlight the increasing extent to which electricity tariffs are biting into pay packets and eroding disposable income. At the time the former Government left office, a person on average weekly earnings having to meet the average ETSA account had to work almost 46 hours, or about six days, to earn enough to meet the annual electricity bill. With a 10 per cent rise later this year, that period will go up to 55

hours or about one and a half working weeks just to earn the money to keep the lights and heating on.

The Hon. J.C. BANNON (Premier and Treasurer): The Leader of the Opposition began well, I felt, on a more calm and rational note than I had expected. I hope that, if he can maintain that during the year, debates on issues will be based on facts and not on some of the nonsense that we have had to sit through in this place and read about in the press from the Leader of the Opposition over the past two years. It is absolutely vital that the South Australian electorate, the voters, and members of Parliament, particularly those opposite, understand precisely what this debate is about and what the facts are, because, if they do not, we will simply revert to the disaster that saw a Government elected in 1979 on a great rash of promises relating to the cutting of the State's revenue with absolutely no concept of how it was to balance the books. The resulting blow-out of our finances brought us to the point of bankruptcy.

I am encouraged by some aspects of the Leader's address. I was certainly encouraged back in 1983 when he addressed the issue very squarely. I suggest that that was because it was a considerable time away from the election. The Leader actually told the truth when he said that he acknowledged that some tax rises were needed. In fact, far from the policy that he is enunciating now, my Government having gone through all the problems, hassles and political unpopularity involved in reponsibly re-establishing our base, the Leader was at that time able to specify some areas in which he would raise taxes. I suggest that some of those areas were quite regressive; for instance, he advocated higher bus and tram fares. The Leader castigated our Government when it tried to do something about holding the $70 million deficit on the STA.

However, that is what the Leader recommended at that time, and I applauded his realism. But, the closer we get to an election, and the more he sees that he can catch a few cheap votes, the less responsible the Leader becomes on this vital issue of public sector financial viability. There is absolutely no point in a tax debate that refuses to face the facts and is not realistic. I have never shrunk from that type of debate, nor has any member of my Government. We knew the problems that we were courting when we embarked on trying to set our revenues in order, but the fruits are being borne. Today's announcement of the ability to make an exemption in a key area is an example of the way in which progressively I would hope to see our tax base reduced. But, that can only be done in the context of realism, because to do otherwise would get us into the dreadful error of an Opposition going to the people with a cheap jack policy of cutting taxes and maintaining services while at the same time spending more.

Members interjecting:

The Hon. J.C. BANNON: Members opposite, including the member who is interjecting, are in grave danger of doing that at present. Just recently I have totted up about $50 million worth of extra expenditure promises, a combination of capital and recurrent expenditure, made by members opposite. The Leader of the Opposition stated this very morning that we must have an entertainment centre and that it should have been incorporated in the ASER development over the road. That is what the Liberals would have done. We examined that in great detail. It involved $30 million extra capital cost and at least $2 million or $3 million extra recurrent expenditure. Where is the money coming from? That is the familiar cry. It must come from the same source. We have had the member for Alexandra wanting $5.5 million spent on a new high school immediately.

We have the Leader of the Opposition, who, having helped stir up a campaign in relation to Finger Point, is now trying to damp it down. Another $7 million has to be spent immediately, but he is ignoring the fact that there is also a $2 million recurrent cost increment in that scheme. We have to try to proceed with it, but we cannot do so at the same time as we are suggesting to people—we are conning people—that these things can happen when all our revenue base is being reduced. That is totally irresponsible. I suggest that this debate ought to be couched in responsible terms, that we ought to be looking at this matter realistically, and if members of the Opposition continue, as they have been doing, to call for increased services, increased expenditures and more resources (and each and every one of them has) they had better be responsible about where we will get the money to pay for it.

That is what this Government has done: we have been responsible about it, and we have been responsible in the context of the worst financial crisis in the State's history. It is all very well for the Leader of the Opposition to bob up today and say, 'Now we are going to halt taxes. Now we are going to ensure that there will be no real increases.' That is all very well, unless he has addressed the problem of what our financial position will be. I would have thought that it was the height of irresponsibility to enunciate a fixed and rigid policy in relation to revenue without knowing what sort of capacity the State would have to maintain its services. We have hanging over our head in 1985 the outcome of the Commonwealth Grants Commission. We have made a very spirited case, but the writing is on the wall. Western Australia and South Australia have particular problems as a result of that examination, and there is, apart from the Grants Commission determination, whatever decision is made by the Commonwealth Government. That could cost us millions of dollars of revenue, with no way of making it up. I would make this point, too.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order! I just want to make two points. First, I ruled this matter one of urgency because, although it has been widely canvassed in the press, there was no reason why it should not be dealt with in the House. Secondly, I draw attention to the fact that when the Leader spoke in the main there was very little interjection, and I ask that the same courtesy be shown to the Premier.

The Hon. J.C. BANNON: Until we know the outcome of that particular study and the Premiers Conference, we are not in a position to make any kind of rash commitment about what we can do in terms of our own revenue raising. I would also make the point that we are in a position of arguing for support. If at the same time we are seen as being irresponsible in terms of our own revenue base, we are simply inviting the Grants Commission to come down even harder on us. In fact, one of the problems we have had with the Grants Commission is the attitude of the Tonkin Government in simply giving away revenue at a difficult economic time and at the same time asking for more money from the Commonwealth. One cannot balance both sides of the equation. Again, one has to be realistic.

So, we are in a crucial position as far as our revenues are concerned, but I can assure the House that it is not the Government's intention to put tax imposts on people or to raise charges above the cost of living. Why should it be? It is not in our interests, and it is not in theirs, and progressively, as the economic recovery develops and as the restoration of our State finances firms up, so we will be able to provide that measure of relief which is looked for and which we recognise. As I said, today I announced at least one aspect of what can be done, but I will not go to the people or suggest that a policy of borrow and hope—the sort of thing that the Opposition is proposing—is appropriate for this State.

It was tried from 1979 to 1982, and it brought us to our knees. In terms of the CPI for December, yes, it was higher than the other State capitals. I point out, however, that we did not see any debate generated by the Leader of the Opposition in relation to any other quarter of the year when in fact our CPI was either on average or below the average. In December of last year, let me remind the House, the change from the previous quarter in South Australia was, in fact, 2 per cent while the weighted capital average was 2.4 per cent. Was anything said at the time? Was a debate generated?

In the March quarter there was nil increase. In the June quarter we had a .2 per cent increase, the same as the national average. In the September quarter it was 1.2 per cent, below the national average. On any of those occasions did we hear the Opposition congratulating the Government on its policies, marking the fact that we were maintaining our position below the national average? Dead silence! We get one bad indicator, one bad result, and suddenly they are braying in the House about the impact of taxes and charges.

Let me point out that an analysis of the CPI shows indeed, as the Leader of the Opposition said, there was a contribution of local government and selected State and local government charges, .78 per cent of the figure being contained in that. Again, let us look back over the quarters: in March it was −.14; June, −.17, and September, .01 per cent. That was the contribution of State Government taxes and charges. Does that line up with what the Leader of the Opposition was saying? Absolutely not, because he has used the figures dishonestly and selectively. In December, certainly, it was so, but it comes about because there has been a bunching of charges. In fact, water and sewerage rate increases, which came in in July, appeared for the first time in the December quarter. They were added to a number of others, including local government rate increases, and that resulted in a somewhat higher figure.

There were also increases in house purchase and other prices relating to housing, and of course there is, because there is a boom, a massive boom, in home building and construction in this State. And thank goodness there is. We have got it moving again. Of course, that is increasing costs to an extent, and we have to expect that, but they are being contained overall and comparatively. The price of fresh fruit went up. Is the Government to be blamed for that? The price of clothing, the price of petrol—because of the unequal discounting that occurred—also had an impact on the index.

I suggest that we had better analyse these things a little more carefully before the Leader of the Opposition tries to claim that there is something unusual or exceptional in this State. Let me repeat, as I have done before in the House: the rate of increases in taxation receipts in this State between 1979-80 and 1983-84 is well below any other State except Tasmania. The rate of tax increases is about fourth, which is what one would expect, as is the per capita taxation. Yet I will add that South Australians expect to have the best in education, the best in health and in a whole lot of other areas. We cannot pay for that with nothing. We cannot pay for it on a borrow and hope basis. We have to pay for it in a realistic way out of what we raise by self-help.

That is part of the problem we have in this State: we are not a wealthy State but we do expect good services; our people rightly expect them, and no Government can reduce in a major way our revenue base without drastically reducing the services that we want. I assure the House that any grumbling about the level of State taxation is nothing compared to what we hear if we cut a swathe through our roads, education, hospitals and other public sector services.

I would be more encouraged if the Opposition approached this debate from that realistic point of view. I would be interested in hearing members opposite talk about some of the positive indicators in this State and attempting to put us on the path of recovery. There was a 90 per cent improvement in new dwelling approvals between December 1982 and December 1984. The latest three months shows that we are 34 per cent higher in dwelling approvals in the final quarter of 1983. Non-housing building has gone up drastically. Our growth rate in the past three months was 63.5 per cent, double the national average.

Do we hear anything about that? Further, new motor vehicle registrations increased by 17.5 per cent: something like 7 000 more new cars were bought last year in South Australia, putting us above the national average. Does anyone hear the Opposition talking about that? Employment rose by 3.2 per cent. The average number of unemployed fell by 4.8 per cent in 1984. Job vacancies grew by 43 per cent in the year to December 1984. Population rose by .86 per cent, and the net outflow of population has declined sharply each year from 7 800 in the final year of the Tonkin Government to 1 900 last year. In relation to industrial disputes and retail sales, we hear nothing. Let us have some positivism.

The SPEAKER: Order! The honourable member's time has expired. The Deputy Leader of the Opposition.

The Hon. E.R. GOLDSWORTHY (Deputy Leader of the Opposition): I shall just spend a moment or two referring to some of the specious points raised by the Premier. He suggests that we are talking nonsense, but we all remember only too well the platform on which the Labor Party regaled the public of this State for many months prior to the last election, namely, that 'We will put more people on the public pay-roll and we will cut your taxes.' That is what he said, yet the Premier accuses the Tonkin Government of not keeping its pledges. In fact, the Tonkin Government did reduce taxes significantly. We wiped out succession duties—a tax very dear to the hearts of Labor Party members. They believe that it is taxing the tall poppies, and I would be very suprised if their tax conferences here and elsewhere did not get right back into that. However we abolished that tax almost immediately on coming to Government.

Further, we abolished gift duties; we abolished stamp duty on the first home; and we gave significant pay-roll tax relief. We managed to do this not by bankrupting the State but by running a lot tighter State Budget than the present Government could ever hope to do. In fact, the present Government's overspending over two years has been no less than $50 million over and above its Budget, and it has put 3 600 additional people on the public pay-roll. The Tonkin Government cut the size of the public sector by about that number not by cutting services but by running a tight ship. It has taken the Bannon Government two years to put them all back. That is where the public's taxes are going, and any suggestion that we bankrupted the State is a completely false one.

The Premier says that he is unable to give tax relief at this time because the Premiers Conference is to be held later in the year. What about his colleague in the West? Premier Burke is about to give relief in relation to land tax. Premier Cain is fronting up to an election in Victoria and is promising a whole range of things (I think I heard on the air last night that it is about $70 million worth) in relation to tax relief. The conclusion is clear: either Premier Cain is perpetuating the series of untruths that he visited on the public of Victoria before he was elected, or else he is in a far better position and is far more capable of running the affairs of his State than is this Premier.

A complete misrepresentation occurred in relation to a point raised by the Leader of the Opposition. The Leader

acknowledged that the bush fires had incurred a once-off increase in expenditure to the State Treasury, and he suggested a once-off limited duration tax to solve that problem. However, what did the Premier do?

Mr Olsen: Abused my bipartisan approach.

The Hon. E.R. GOLDSWORTHY: In this so-called 'bipartisan acknowledgement' he completely misrepresented the Leader's point, and I would bet my bottom dollar that any tax that this Premier puts on will not be temporary, because he is in a mess. Despite the enormous increase in taxes and charges in South Australia (a record number at record levels), he is still in trouble with his Budget. In relation to the Premier's now infamous policy speech, the Leader has already mentioned this reference:

> I will not use charges as a form of backdoor taxes, nor will I impose any new tax or increase the rate of tax.

The Premier finished off his stirring speech with these resounding words:

> Well, I say to you that wanting to protect your jobs and wanting to see jobs for your children to go to when they grow up is not an experiment—it is vital, it is necessary. We certainly propose a new direction from what we have now and it is a direction we must take. We ask you to join us in that great community purpose because we want South Australia to win.

Of course, when Premier Bannon 'fights' (and his method of fighting is to have a little pow wow in the corner somewhere, a conference) South Australia loses. He fought for the railway to Darwin: he went to Canberra to have a pow wow. He fought the wine tax, and confidently declared that we would not get a wine tax. He was going to fight for Jackson oil to come to South Australia, but he did not even have a pow wow. He closed the Honeymoon and Beverley mines when they were going to make money for us and it looks as though the submarine project is mighty shaky.

I was attracted to a quote in which there was one of those rare flashes of insight from a Labor Premier (and they do not occur often) when Premier Burke was talking to one of his colleagues, namely, Holding. Mr Speaker, we are not allowed to use the word 'lie' in this place, we have to express it in a different way. I have been reminded of that on numerous occasions.

The Hon. J.D. Wright: That's because you're—

The Hon. E.R. GOLDSWORTHY: If the cap fits, I suggest that the Deputy Premier wear it. In one of those rare flashes of insight, Burke said:

> It appears to me that Mr Holding and the truth are complete strangers.

That is his colleague, the Federal Minister. Anybody rereading the policy speech of the Premier in relation to promises of no new taxes, no increase in the rate of taxes, no back door taxes by increasing State charges would have to come to the inescapable conclusion that we should turn Premier Burke loose on Premier Bannon, because it appears to me and to all who read those words of the Premier in that policy speech that he and the truth are complete strangers.

The fact is that land tax is biting, and biting hard, in that area to which this present Government pays lip service: it is biting in the area of small business. The Labor Party, as I have already said, put 3 600 extra bods on the public payroll and I invite honourable members to do the sums to find out what impact that has on the State Budget. We did not get a lot of complaints about a reduction of level of services. We tightened up and saw that we did things more efficiently and we managed to reduce the size of the public sector. The Government says that small business is the major employer in the nation: indeed it is. What is the Government's answer? It is to spend more public money, set up a Small Business Corporation and tax them blind to pay for it. The Liberal Party supported the Small Business Corporation. It was in the Government's policy speech and the public bought it. However, one does not solve the problems of small business (or any business) or problems of employment by setting up Government instrumentalities and putting more people on the public pay-roll, because the public pays. It picks up the tab and is picking up the tab now in terms of an enormous escalation in land tax.

Let me quote quickly some examples relating to small business at three sites at Prospect and Parkside. In the first example, in 1983-84 the land tax was $658.28, yet one year later it was $1 405.41, an increase of 113.5 per cent. No Small Business Corporation will solve that problem. A commercial property on the Parade at Beulah Park in 1983-84 was taxed $187.50 and in 1984-85 it was $268, an increase of 43 per cent. These may not sound particularly high figures. I could quote larger businesses where the impact appears even more significant. However, these are small businesses struggling to stay in business and to employ people. These are the ones the Government purports to try to help, yet it is taxing them out of business. A factory at Edwardstown paid $2 317 for the year 1983-84. In one year the tax has gone up to $2 772.70—an increase of 20 per cent. So it goes on.

The Leader tabled a document in the House today, and I hope members take the time to look at it because some increases in larger businesses are even more spectacular than that. If one is interested in small business, one can look at page 5, which cites a factory in Somerton, a warehouse in Parkside, two showrooms on Brighton Road, a shop on the Parade at Norwood, and offices in Tolley Road, St Agnes. In those cases the increases are of the order of 20 to 40 per cent in one year. Premier Burke has indicated that he will do something about it in his State: Premier Bannon has indicated that he will do nothing about it.

The other matter in this motion refers to electricity tariffs. It has been the Premier's habit to blame the former Government for increases in tariffs. One of the major items has been the price of fuel, although that is not the major item. The major items have been largely Government imposed. The contracts in relation to fuel, as I have pointed out in this House on numerous occasions, were negotiated by the Dunstan Government. They were some of the poorest pieces of work ever seen, and we have had a legacy of those 10 years. We renegotiated a disastrous decision and obtained relief from an enormous 80 per cent increase imposed as a result of those disastrous contracts.

One of the major imposts is Government tax on turnover. Premier Bannon, then Leader of the Opposition, made this interesting comment:

> The Premier, Mr Tonkin, has a vested interest in higher electricity charges because his Budget receives 5 per cent of all ETSA revenue.

What sort of hypocrisy is that? That tax was introduced by the pace-setting Dunstan Government, back in 1973 initially, and increased by that Government. That was an impost of a Labor Government that was talking about taxing the tall poppies. It instituted this regime of taxing virtually every man, woman and child in South Australia through this iniquitous tax on electricity.

An honourable member interjecting:

The Hon. E.R. GOLDSWORTHY: The honourable member may think so, but what I am saying is factual. The Labor Party imposed this tax, and to suggest that the Liberal Party was enjoying the fruits of it was absurd. We would like nothing more than to further reduce some of the Labor Party's imposts. The question is what is the Premier going to do about this tax? He fiddled the long-term arrangements for interest repayments by ETSA, with a resultant very significant $14 million impact on the taxation and revenues of ETSA. If that is not backdoor taxation, I do not know what is. The Premier thought that he could get away with

it quietly, but it was picked up by the Opposition and exposed. This is the Premier who is the so-called spokesman for the little people!

The member for Chaffey has supplied me with figures in regard to the cost of irrigation in South Australia. It is quite clear that the Government is seeking to tax these people out of business. Honourable members opposite shed crocodile tears every time they go up the Murray River. They acknowledge the enormous problems in the fruit-growing industry and try to put growers out of business with an enormous escalation in water rates. There was a demonstration on the front steps of the House the like of which we rarely see here, and the Government backed off part way. What did it do with electricity tariffs on the Murray River? Let us compare ETSA charges with corresponding charges imposed by the Murrumbidgee County Council, the Murray River County Council and the State Electricity Commission of Victoria. On one property ETSA charged $1 361; the Murrumbidgee County Council, for the same supply of electricity, would charge $986; the Murray River County Council would charge $1 106; and the State Electricity Commission of Victoria would charge $1 167. ETSA is by far and away the highest charging authority for such a property. Other examples which I have indicate quite conclusively a similar result.

The only other point I wish to make in this debate is that when we were in Government the then Opposition made a big song and dance about unemployment. In Government its answer has been to put more and more people on the public pay-roll and to raise taxes to higher and higher levels. The end result is that we have the worst employment record in the nation when we consider youth unemployment; we have the highest level of long-term unemployment of any other State. The Government strategy has failed: one does not do anything in the long term for unemployment by spending more Government money on band-aid schemes and by putting more permanent employees on the public pay-roll: that mitigates against long-term recovery quicker than anything else. The fact is, unless the Government can stimulate—

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

The Hon. R.G. PAYNE (Minister of Mines and Energy): Initially the Premier in responding to this motion, which I oppose as vehemently as he does, said that he thought it was promising that the Leader was showing some signs at least of addressing the matter. I listened carefully to what the Leader said and I noticed that in his earlier remarks he said that taxpayers are cynical. I can agree that taxpayers have become more cynical: they have a lot to be cynical about after several years of Fraserism and three years of Tonkinism. It would be a miracle if they had not become more cynical. The taxpayers of South Australia are entitled to be cynical about a Leader and a Deputy Leader of the Liberal Party who have the gall to call for reduced taxes and charges and reduced electricity increases after presiding over a period in Government when electricity tariffs rose at an unprecedented rate in terms of increased costs.

The Hon. E.R. Goldsworthy: Not in real terms.

The Hon. R.G. PAYNE: No amount of interjection or persiflage from the Deputy Leader can gainsay the facts that I now put before the House. Every reader of *Hansard* will have the privilege of seeing the real position after having waded through, if they are unlucky enough, the garbage put forward by the Leader and the Deputy Leader in relation to electricity charges. Between September 1979 and May 1982 the increase in electricity charges in South Australia (in a 22 month period) was 48.3 per cent.

The increases year by year were 1980, 12.5 per cent; 1981, 19.8 per cent; and they probably wanted to increase the tariff by 20 per cent but they did not have the guts and drew back slightly to make it sound better at slightly under 20 per cent. What an incredible increase! In May 1982, not even a year after the previous increase in July 1981, the tariff went up again by 16 per cent. These are the people who are calling on the Government of South Australia, elected by the people to replace their ineptitude, to reduce the rate of increase in the cost for a commodity such as electricity or for that matter other State charges and taxes. What a sham, what a phoney approach to these matters! I differ from the Premier in this matter in that perhaps he was able to perceive something in the remarks by the Leader which indicated some kind of consistency or a better and more sensible approach to this matter. I am sorry, but I could not detect that at all. Most likely, that is my fault because I failed to perceive something that the Premier observed.

The Hon. H. Allison: You are charging—

The Hon. R.G. PAYNE: The member for Mount Gambier should restrain himself, because it is not likely that he will have much more time in this House.

The Hon. H. Allison: Not to listen to you, anyway.

The Hon. R.G. PAYNE: In the time he has got, he should make some sensible remarks that some of us might remember, but not that sort of rubbish. If we in fairness look at a slightly longer period, from September 1979 to December 1982, immediately after we came into Government, it can be seen that the increase was 60.3 per cent, due solely to the actions of the previous Liberal Government. I do not want the taxpayers of South Australia who are not cynical about the Labor Party to become cynical because of some error of judgment on my part, so it is fair to put forward our record. In relation to electricity tariffs to this point—

Mr Meier interjecting:

The Hon. R.G. PAYNE: The member for Goyder might be interested to know what the Electricity Trust thought about the rise which was necessary in December 1982. Certainly, we had then taken over the reins of Government but I do not think even the honourable member would lay at the door of the incoming Government the blame for an increase which took place within a few weeks of its coming into Government. Being a person of integrity and some understanding he would recognise, I think, that that increase was also due to the previous Administration. In a press release to all radio stations and the *Advertiser,* the General Manager of ETSA, commenting on electricity tariffs that were to rise in December, stated:

> The recently announced increases in the price of natural gas of 40 per cent from 1 January 1982 and 80 per cent from 9 September 1982 over 1981 prices will substantially increase the Electricity Trust's fuel costs. Natural gas is at present used to generate about 80 per cent of the State's electricity. The retrospective nature of the gas price increase means that the Trust will have to pay the higher prices for the large amounts of gas already consumed from the beginning of the year.

The General Manager was explaining the situation as it stood at that time. How did we get those gas price increases?

The Hon. E.R. Goldsworthy: Because we had a dopey contract.

The Hon. R.G. PAYNE: I could not agree more. We had one of the dopiest three year contracts I had ever heard of, and it was negotiated by the Deputy Leader, who just opened his mouth and walked into it. The Goldsworthy agreement, which was negotiated over a three year period, sold out the consumers of electricity in South Australia. That price was enshrined in a Government agreement negotiated, organised, fixed by the Deputy Leader, the Hon. Mr Goldsworthy, and he will go down in history. Far be it from him to use the word 'infamous', as he did when referring to members on

this side of the House earlier today; he will be an infamous person who warrants that title as long as there is a *Hansard* record of the proceedings of this Parliament. When another arbitration hearing was pending in another State the Deputy Leader was prepared to negotiate an agreement which gave away 20 per cent increases for three years ahead. If ever there has been a dopey contract, then the honourable member stands damned from his own mouth, and I am sure all members would agree that it was a dopey contract. What were the circumstances of that contract? When was that dopey contract concluded, arranged?

Just 24 days before the 1982 election a deal was done. Were the people privy to the details of the deal? Was it negotiated in this House? No. A deal was done with an election only days away, the Government knowing that it was going down the gurgler and desperate to do anything that would enable it to hang on to power. It signed up the State for the three years ahead for a shocking range of increases while arbitration was to take place in another State on the same commodity—natural gas.

The Hon. E.R. Goldsworthy: You would have allowed the 80 per cent to stand.

The Hon. R.G. PAYNE: The Deputy Leader is trying his usual ploy of attempting to divert speakers who make true statements that hurt him. The Deputy Leader presided over a 60 per cent increase in ETSA tariffs in three years and left us the heritage of the gas price. He was prepared to mortgage the future of South Australia for political gain in the hope that his Party would be re-elected to Government, but even there his judgment was at fault because the people saw through that kind of shabby trick and elected a Labor Government. The Deputy Leader can pontificate on the point if he wants to, but the fact remains that he presided over the real major reason for the increase in electricity tariffs in this State. The second reason relates to the situation of the State and of this main utility: that is, 80 per cent of the electricity generated in South Australia is generated from natural gas and we have only one major source of natural gas—the Cooper Basin. That is why we are locked in to a degree.

What has the Labor Government done about that since it assumed office just over two years ago? First, it has recognised that this is an intolerable situation and realised that the State must look to other fuels that are available to us. Among those fuels are immense resources of lignite in South Australia. The Government set up the Stewart Committee and set in train all the events to which the whole House has been privy. There were no secret deals behind closed doors or pre-election in order to win an election a few days later. There was an open, calm approach which was fully aired in the Parliament. Our policy was well known: we must have better energy planning for the future so that the cost could be kept to a minimum. What should we do about the matter? This is the way in which the matter should be handled, and those steps are in train. At present, an evaluation is being done of which fuels that we have available should be used.

The SPEAKER: Order! The time for this debate has expired.

STATE DISASTER ACT AMENDMENT BILL

Adjourned debate on second reading.

(Continued from 5 December. Page 2189.)

The Hon. D.C. WOTTON (Murray): The Opposition supports the Bill, although certain questions will be asked of the Minister responsible for it during Committee. Opposition members recognise that the State Disaster Act provision for the declaration of a state of disaster has been used only once—on Ash Wednesday 1983. Following that tragedy, a number of special inquiries were set up to look at the aftermath and some of the reasons why that event was such a tragedy. The Government set up a review team comprising Brigadier Lewis and Mr Max Scriven (then Director of Lands). A working party was also set up as a subcommittee of the State Disaster Committee. That subcommittee comprised representatives of the Police Department, Country Fire Services, Metropolitan Fire Service, the Department for Community Welfare, local government, and State Emergency Service. The recommendations contained in the report from that working party and those of other investigations were discussed at a seminar in November 1983, when it was accepted that the Act and regulations within the State disaster plan needed amending.

That was a significant report, which was handed to the Premier towards the end of 1983. Certain major recommendations included the integration of the two fire services over a period of two years, preserving the CFS volunteer system. Another key recommendation was the creation of a small highly skilled full-time team that was referred to in the report as the State Emergency Management Organisation, the purpose of which was to co-ordinate the disaster management structure and have access to all disaster planning decisions. The review found that 'it is quite unreasonable to expect the Commissioner of Police, whose role demands complete dedication to the administration of one of the State's major organisations, to assume control of a disaster'. Much has been written through Government circles and through the media since that report was brought down.

Other recommendations included a greater role for the State Emergency Service in disaster work. The minimal use made of the EFS structure on Ash Wednesday is referred to particularly; it was seen as a disturbing aspect of the response to the fires. Another recommendation involved a new system of dealing with disaster threats and pre-disaster alerts incorporating the new command structure. Reference is also made to a better flow of information to the media and, as one who lives in one of the most fire prone areas of the State, I support that strongly, because I recognise the need for appropriate communications.

The recommendation states that 'one of the most unfortunate aspects of the Ash Wednesday disaster was the quality of information carried to the public by the electronic media'. The report hastens to add that this shortcoming was not the fault of the media and recommends direct on-air and on-screen access, which is essential to the emergency operation centre. It recommends the funnelling of information through only one well advertised broadcasting station.

The report further recommends the establishment of a permanent disaster relief fund with an initial State Government seeding grant, relying on special appeals at times of disaster. It also recommends a swift relocation of the emergency operations centre to the present CFS headquarters at Keswick when the two fire services are integrated. I do not wish to deal with the report at greater length, but I point out that it was an important report, and it concerns me that only a few of those recommendations are being implemented. I hope that the Government will not just pigeonhole that report and those recommendations, as has been the case with so many others.

As the Opposition supports the Bill in total, I do not intend to speak on it at length. Clause 5 provides that the State Disaster Committee will now include nominees of the State Emergency Service, the Metropolitan Fire Service, the Country Fire Services and the Minister of Community Welfare, and, of course, the Minister covering many of the organisations.

I strongly support that provision. It is important that those emergency services under the State umbrella come together with community bodies, and it is vitally important that they all have the opportunity to have their say on the State Disaster Committee. Clause 7 makes clear that a state of disaster declared by the Governor lasts for 96 hours from the time of making the declaration. That makes sense to me. Clause 8 restates the measures that can be taken during a State disaster in a form that empowers both the State co-ordinator and any authorised officer to do any of these things. In first looking at some of those measures, one could almost say that they are somewhat Draconian. They are very harsh indeed, but I believe that in emergency situations at the times that come under this State Disaster Act provision there is a need for certain action to be taken and that, of course, is spelt out in the legislation.

Clause 9 inserts a new Part that deals with post-disaster operations. I am certainly aware of the need for these provisions to be inserted in this legislation, because much work is carried on at the post-disaster stage and it is appropriate that it is considered in this legislation. Therefore, new section 16a provides that the Governor may declare a post-disaster period for a specified number of hours from the end of the state of disaster, but being no more than seven days. In the Premier's second reading explanation we are told that this period cannot be extended or renewed, and I would be interested in gaining some information from whichever Minister reponds.

The Hon. D.J. Hopgood: It will be the Premier.

The Hon. D.C. WOTTON: I hope that the Premier is able to give us a little more information on the necessity to ensure that the period cannot be extended or renewed, because it is certainly very definite in the Premier's second reading explanation. New section 16b spells out the measures that an authorised officer may take at the request of an owner of a property during a post-disaster period and, of course, basically we see these measures in the nature of assistance in mopping up operations and action to prevent further loss or injury. Of course, we again recognise the assistance provided at these times by volunteers, and it is spelt out quite clearly that volunteers may assist an authorised officer in this work.

Clauses 10 and 11 both relate to the post-disaster period. Clause 10 extends the provision provided by the section in respect of absence from employment to authorised officers involved in post-disaster operations, and clause 11 extends the workers compensation cover provided by the section to authorised officers and volunteers who assist in carrying out post-disaster operations, and I support that.

One of the matters to which I have referred in one of the recommendations coming from the report related to the administration of a fund into which donations for disaster relief may be paid; that will happen through this legislation. The fund will be administered by a committee subject to direction from the Governor.

I realise that the Premier is not in the Chamber at present, but I would be interested in his answer to a matter that has been brought to my notice where there are significant problems. I think that it would be an administrative matter rather than one relating to legislation, but there are significant problems in regard to funds being utilised over an extended disaster period. For example, even if we consider the Ash Wednesday situation we see that there is still a necessity for funds to be provided in part of that mopping up operation. Originally, I thought that it might have been necessary to consider amending the legislation to enable funds to be utilised over an extended period of time subject to Ministerial approval. In talking to Parliamentary Counsel this morning, I am informed that that provision exists under section 14 of the Act, and I would hope that that would be the case. However, I would like the Premier to clarify and confirm that, and I am sure that members on this side of the House who have had some experience and who recognise some of the problems associated with the administration of that particular provision would be prepared to make that information available to the Premier in order to try to overcome some of the problems that are being experienced.

The only other matter to which I want to refer is that which has been brought to the attention of the Government a number of times, that is, the need for an up to date State disaster centre. That is a matter to which the Police Commissioner has referred recently. I think that he was addressing publicly a meeting of one of the Red Cross organisations in this State. Mention was made by the Commissioner at that time of the need for a suitable centre. I know that this has been bandied around for a very long time, but the situation is quite serious, and I would like to know just what plans the Government has in regard to that centre. With those few words, I indicate that the Opposition supports the legislation. I am particularly pleased to see that the amendments are being brought forward. One only hopes that the legislation to set up such disaster periods will not be required.

I certainly would not want to see another situation such as Ash Wednesday, and I am sure that I speak for all people in the State when I say that. However, in case it does occur it is good that we have the appropriate legislation to deal with those matters and, with that in mind, on behalf of the Opposition I support this legislation.

The Hon. J.C. BANNON (Premier and Treasurer): In the second reading debate the member for Murray raised a number of specific points, but, first, I thank him for the general support that he gives to the measure, in which I do not believe there is anything very controversial. As the honourable member pointed out and as was pointed out in the second reading explanation, a number of inquiries have been making recommendations. Those recommendations have been assessed, and this is really part of an on going process. A lot of administrative and other changes were set in place well before we moved to this need for legislative change.

I am sure that going on into the future there will be some changes. I would say that particularly in the context of remarks made about the Scriven-Lewis Report, which I agree is a very valuable document and which took a fairly radical approach (and that was their brief) to what might be done in this whole area of State disasters. Of course, some of their recommendations are embodied in this Bill, and others are embodied in actions that have been taken, but it is true that some have not been taken up.

The honourable member mentioned a couple which I could deal with now. The integration of the fire services has certainly been looked at, and we have not discounted that as a possibility at some time in the future. It seemed to the Government that there was much to be done in terms of improving co-ordination and efficiency involving disaster procedures which could well be addressed more effectively first, and there is no need for an urgent or immediate decision on whether or not there should be integration, bearing in mind the sensitivity of this matter, particularly as regards the Country Fire Services and the volunteer component which the report rightly recognised as being most important.

The question of there being one broadcasting source or agency in times of disaster was also looked at and discussed in some detail with the media, and at this stage certainly there are arguments against the practicality of such a move. The plea by the media that, provided there is a proper information source, a single source from which they get

their information which they in turn broadcast, there will be no problem of confusion as far as the public is concerned—again, that has to be refined and put to the test but it is not being picked up as an immediate matter to implement. However, there are a number of other matters involved in the Bill to which the honourable member referred, and they are probably best dealt with in the course of the Committee proceedings. I conclude by commending the Bill to the House and thanking the member for Murray for the support of the Opposition.

Bill read a second time.

In Committee.

Clauses 1 to 5 passed.

Clause 6—'Functions of the Committee.'

The Hon. D.C. WOTTON: As I mentioned in the second reading debate, much has been said over an extended period about the need for an upgraded centre, and the Police Commissioner has recently referred to such a need. I would be interested to know what the Government has in mind in regard to the building and equipping of such a centre in the metropolitan area.

The Hon. J.C. BANNON: I understand there has been further consideration of this matter and, in fact, thinking has changed quite drastically. There has been for many years a proposal for a permanent State disaster centre and, indeed, at different times specific sites have been identified. I understand that during the term of the previous Government there were fairly concrete proposals which were not acted on or developed. These have been reassessed, and the current thinking, as I understand it, by the State Disaster Committee and the sort of advice we are receiving is that it may well be better to have a mobile State disaster centre, that is, one that can be established on different sites using temporary buildings—tents and other equipment. I guess that that is partly a factor of the great improvement there has been in communication equipment both in terms of its bulk and its efficiency, and that suggestion certainly would overcome some of the basic objections that are made to a permanent site, that is, whether it can be placed close enough to a disaster area to be effective, whether it can, indeed, be placed in a totally secure area, and various other questions that are always raised when an attempt is made to find a site. So, at the moment, the State disaster centre, in terms of the equipment, materials, and so on, that would be necessary to have such a centre, is certainly being assembled, but the thinking on a permanent location is apparently at this stage not in favour of the sort of proposals that there have been in the past.

Clause passed.

Clauses 7 and 8 passed.

Clause 9—'Insertion of new Part IVA.'

The Hon. D.C. WOTTON: It has been brought to my notice by members on this side—and I do not know whether other members have had matters referred to them—that there are some administration problems regarding the payment of funds some time after a disaster period and, in fact, it has been brought to my notice that specific funding for various services is still required following Ash Wednesday and the Barossa flooding. I looked originally at the need to amend this legislation to provide for funds to be utilised over an extended period subject to Ministerial approval. I am told this morning by Parliamentary Counsel that that is not necessary and that section 14 of the Act covers that situation, but I would like that matter clarified by the Premier.

The Hon. J.C. BANNON: I am advised that, while it is true that moneys expended specifically by warrant of the House or under the Supply provision could be subject to that problem, moneys under this Act can in fact be expended after the disaster period and that there is no problem and no limit on that time. If the expenditure has been incurred legitimately and for whatever reason the claims or the exact amounts are not known, this cut-off does not affect the ability to pay in terms of the Act.

Clause passed.

Clauses 10 to 12 passed.

Clause 13—'Insertion of new s. 22a.'

The Hon. D.C. WOTTON: When the Scriven-Lewis Report was brought down it was indicated that a permanent disaster relief fund would be established, and it was suggested at that time that there would be an initial State Government—what they referred to as a—seeding grant, and then it would rely on special appeals. Can the Premier indicate, once this fund is established, whether or not the Government intends starting off the fund by putting a certain amount into it, and can he indicate how much is likely to be contributed by the Government for such a fund?

The Hon. J.C. BANNON: Consideration has not been given to that matter as yet. Of course, if particular disasters occur the Government will always respond either in making a seeding or specific grant in the context of an appeal or in some other way supporting the fund-raising activities that take place. Of course, it makes sense for there to be some money in the fund, but I think following the passing of this Bill the Government will be guided by the recommendations of the committee. I think it is a good idea to appoint the committee and to get it to assess what its needs might be and suggest something to the Government. I do not think I can take it much further, but if there is some specific need for a seeding grant or some money to be actually in the fund then I am sure that the Government will respond. However, I think we will wait for the committee established for that purpose to advise the Government.

Mr S.G. EVANS: When established will the committee that administers this fund have the right to lay down the conditions for which the funds will be made available to individuals? I think it is now quite evident that in the past some people in the community have given quite generously to bush fire, flood or storm disaster appeals (and this is particularly in relation to bush fires) knowing that in some cases people have lost all their personal effects, which may or may not be covered by insurance, in an effort to help people get re-established in some form of living quarters with some of the necessary household effects and other comforts. Subsequently, either through insurance or other claims the people affected have received compensation for material lost which enables them to replace that.

Recently comments have been made by people in my electorate about why there is not a provision stipulating that people who receive compensation from insurance or other claims should pay some of the relief money that they received back into a fund in order to provide an on-going fund. This would ensure that there was no double-dipping, such as that which occurs now and which will perhaps occur on a large scale when the South-East claims start to come in. I think that this is something that must be considered quite seriously.

It may well be that some people in the community who themselves are not very well off but who give to disaster appeals could end up being worse off in financial terms (I am not talking about personal effects that are lost or about all the mental traumas) than those people who lose effects due to the disaster and who sometimes receive large sums of money from the appeals. Has the Premier considered this matter and, particularly, whether the committee will have an opportunity to lay down conditions in relation to money given or whether this would require an amendment to the Act? An amendment could be made in another place if it were considered that this proposition had some merit.

The Hon. J.C. BANNON: I do not think an amendment to the Act is required. In fact, the committee can lay down conditions. The honourable member will notice that the committee's administration is subject to the direction of the Government so, if you like, the Government stands behind the committee, and I guess it also has a monitoring role. I can only refer back to the experience of the committee formed to manage a huge fund following the Ash Wednesday bush fires of 1983 which was comprised of a fairly wide diversity of interests.

Mr S.G. Evans: No conditions were laid down.

The Hon. J.C. BANNON: Yes, there were. In fact, guidelines were laid down, and the money was all disbursed in accordance with criteria established by the committee. In some cases donors attached particular conditions to donations to be taken into account in terms of disbursement.

Mr S.G. Evans: But no move was made to reinstate money paid to the fund where people may have been reimbursed twice, if you like, for the same loss.

The Hon. J.C. BANNON: That is true, but there is nothing to prevent something of that kind occurring. The pay-out of the fund was adjusted taking certain factors into account: for instance, if someone had an insurance policy and therefore stood to get some restoration which meant that the funds from the public appeal would be needed only for a top-up or for further assistance. This resulted in a fairly substantial philosophical debate around the committee, that is, that one should not be seen to penalise those who have had the foresight to insure themselves and pay their premiums for it, as opposed to those who had not done so and who have simply relied on the fact that following a natural disaster of major consequences a relief fund would simply pick up their loss, notwithstanding that they had made no insurance provision for it. I know that these things were looked at very carefully by the committee, and I think that a fairly acceptable balance was struck on those points.

So, to a large extent, what conditions are laid down and how they are enforced will depend on the committee's assessment as to both the size of the fund and the nature of the disaster and the other possible steps that people could take or the steps that they have actually taken. All that requires a fair bit of discretion on the part of such a committee. I have just been advised that, at the time when money was paid out (if we refer back to the experience to which the honourable member referred in 1983), that was done so on an urgent basis. It was felt that there was no point in getting a massive public paying-in response while telling people in need that they would just have to wait until it was quite certain that there were no other forms of possible assistance. At that time any damages claims against ETSA were not really being canvassed, so in that instance it is unlikely that insurance money will be paid back. In the course of court proceedings, it may be that some regard may be had to relief or assistance of that sort, but there would certainly be no problem in relation to making it a requirement in future. The Act does not preclude that, and I think that based on the 1983 experience it is probably a reasonable thing to do.

Clause passed.

Clause 14 and title passed.

Bill read a third time and passed.

CARRICK HILL TRUST BILL

Adjourned debate on second reading.

(Continued from 14 November. Page 1907.)

The Hon. D.C. WOTTON (Murray): The Opposition supports this Bill but we will be looking to significantly amend the legislation during the Committee stage. This Bill proposes to establish a seven member trust to administer, develop and maintain the Carrick Hill property. We would all recognise that Carrick Hill is a magnificent bequest to the State of South Australia made by the late Sir Edward Hayward and Lady Ursula Hayward. I have had the opportunity, as have, I guess, many other members of this House, of visiting the property. A number of very successful open days have been held, and it is certainly a property of which South Australians can be very proud. We should recognise how fortunate we are in having such a bequest made to the State.

The legislation proposes that the property be used for all or any of the following purposes: as a gallery for the display of works of art, a museum, a botanic garden and a venue for musical or theatrical performances. The Trust also has the function to promote and encourage public interest in Carrick Hill, its collections and the services and amenities funded by the Trust.

A Carrick Hill committee reported in 1974 on the most appropriate use and development of the property upon its being vested in the Crown. Late in 1974 the report was reassessed and updated by another interdepartmental committee. I was interested to read in *Hansard* the reply given by the Premier to this question asked by the member for Hanson:

> What were the findings and recommendations of the interdepartmental committee inquiries into the use of Carrick Hill and when will the recommendations be implemented?

The reply from the Premier was as follows:

> The interdepartmental committee inquiring into the use of Carrick Hill made the following recommendations:
>
> (i) That Carrick Hill be developed as a museum, art gallery, and botanic park and garden, or any one or more of the former purposes.
>
> (ii) That Carrick Hill not be used as a residence for the Governor.
>
> (iii) That a Carrick Hill Trust be established to assume responsibility for the management of Carrick Hill.
>
> (iv) That Carrick Hill be a Jubilee 150 project and be opened during 1986 Adelaide Festival of Arts as a feature of the State's sesquicentenary celebrations.

A further question, also of interest, was this:

> Have any *objets d'art,* books or other items included in the donation to the State been misplaced, lost or stolen?

The answer provided by the Premier was:

> To the best of my knowledge, no *objets d'art,* books or any other items in the bequest have been stolen. I understand discussions are still taking place between representatives of the Carrick Hill Interim Committee and the trustees of the Hayward estate with a view to seeking further clarification on some items in the bequest.

I know that there was considerable concern expressed when the suggestion was first made that some items might have been missing. I appreciate the interest that the local member (the member for Davenport) has taken in this project. He has been very much involved with local residents in discussing the future of Carrick Hill, and is quite properly concerned for constituents who expect high standards of civic control and behaviour in what is a prestigious suburb of Adelaide.

As I mentioned earlier, a number of amendments will come before the House, but the Opposition certainly would like to see the Mayor of the City of Mitcham, together with a person recognised as being interested in the local environment, a nominee of the local member of the House of Assembly who is a resident living in the near vicinity of Carrick Hill, as members of the Trust. It is very important that there be close liaison between the activities of Carrick Hill and the local residents. There is a need to ensure that the opening and closing times and public functions are fixed only after consultation with and approval by the Mitcham

council and that any land, improvements or items not required by the Trust should be first offered to the State. If the State does not want them they should be offered to the National Trust. If the National Trust does not want them or has no need for them, as a result of the matter going before both Houses of Parliament, they could be sold.

We are also anxious to see that adequate parking facilities for all public activities be provided on the property, that public entry be via Fullarton Road, and that Carrick Hill is used for public functions only in a manner that is compatible with the surrounding residential area and amenity. We will have more to say about that later on.

I reiterate that Carrick Hill is one of the finest bequests ever made to the people of South Australia. It includes a large and magnificent ornamental staircase and oak panelling. It is of particular historic interest being, we are told, the oldest interior in Australia, unique in this country and a considerable tourist attraction in its own right. We recognise the magnificent collection of art—the finest private art collection in Australia, including nineteenth and twentieth century British, European and Australasian paintings. It is recognised as a unique tourist asset of wide community interest. As I said earlier, the opening days that have occurred would suggest the vast number of people who are showing an interest in this magnificent property.

We are very fortunate that the Trust will be set up and that the State will have such an asset. While Minister for Environment and Planning, I was partly responsible for the setting up of the old Beechwood home in the Adelaide Hills. That magnificent old home set in a garden of significant heritage value was to be sold and the Government was able to arrange with a private school that it should become responsible for the home and that the garden should be turned over to the Botanic Garden. It is again a great asset to South Australia and one that attracts many tourists at different times of the year. Later, when the facilities are provided, I hope that the Government will open it on a more regular basis. That, along with Carrick Hill, will provide a magnificent tourist asset for South Australia. So, the Opposition supports the Bill but will move certain amendments in Committee.

The Hon. D.C. BROWN (Davenport): First, I would like to pay a tribute to the significance of the gift made by Sir Edward and Lady Ursula Hayward to the South Australian people. The home that they have left for this State is very historic. Magnificent grounds surround it and they are in a delightful setting. There is a very valuable collection of paintings, sculptures and other objects of artistic, historic and cultural significance. It is perhaps the most significant gift left in more recent years to South Australians. It should now be developed and used for the enjoyment of as many South Australians as possible.

I fully support the establishment of a Trust with overall responsibility for developing and managing Carrick Hill. I also believe that David Thomas will contribute greatly to that development. As honourable members would realise, David Thomas was the former Director of the Art Gallery. He then took up the position (on an interim basis) of Director of Carrick Hill after the death of Sir Edward Hayward. The wills of Sir Edward and Lady Ursula Hayward are very specific in the bequest that was made to the South Australian Government. Because it really gets to the hub of this Bill before the House this afternoon, it is pertinent that I read portion of Dame Ursula Hayward's will which was made out, as I read from the front section of the will, on the sixth day of April 1971: the last will and testament of Dame Ursula Hayward late of 2 Glenwood Road, Springfield, in the State of South Australia. She, of course, was married then to Sir Edward Hayward, who died in 1983. Upon his death the property was transferred to the State. I have studied the wills of Dame Ursula and Sir Edward Hayward. Both have virtually identical wording of the relevant sections relating to the property and the bequest to the South Australian Government. Page 6 of Dame Ursula Hayward's will states:

After the death of my said husband my trustees shall hold my share in the said land and chattels (including any replacement chattels purchased by my husband after my death) in trust for the State of South Australia upon and subject to the following condition:

the Premier or Acting Premier of the said State on behalf of the Government of the said State shall within six calendar months after my death undertake in writing to my trustees in a form approved by my trustees

(a) that after the death of my said husband the said residence and grounds and such of the said furniture contents and articles as shall be considered suitable shall at all times be used and maintained

(i) as a home for the Governor of the said State, or

(ii) as a museum, or

(iii) as a Gallery for the display of works of art, or

(iv) as a Botanical Gardens or partly for one and partly for another or others of such purposes

(b) that the said State or the Government thereof will at the expiration of six calendar months after my death or at the expiration of three calendar months after the assessment thereof respectively (whichever shall be the later) pay to my trustees for the benefit of my estate a sum equal to the total of all South Australian succession duty and Commonwealth estate duty paid or payable by my trustees or by my estate upon or in respect of my share in the said land and chattels or any interest therein and any interest paid or payable by my trustees on any such duties provided that if the approval of the Parliament of the said State shall be required as a condition of the acceptance of the said gift by the said State then the foregoing provisions of this clause shall be read and construed as if the words 'twelve calendar months' were substituted for the words 'six calendar months' wherever such last-mentioned words appear therein. Any moneys paid by the said State or by the Government thereof to my trustees pursuant to this clause shall sink into and form part of my residuary estate and be held in trust accordingly.

13. If the Premier or Acting Premier of the said State shall notify my trustees in writing that it does not desire to accept the gift of my share in the said land and chattels or shall for any reason fail to comply with the condition imposed by clause 12 of this my will within the time therein limited then the trust of and concerning my share in the said land and chattels which by clause 12 hereof is declared in favour of the said State shall cease and determine and as from the date of such notification or failure (but subject to the life interest therein of my said husband) my trustees shall hold my share in the said land and chattels in trust for The National Trust of South Australia upon and subject to the condition that within six calendar months after my trustees shall have given notice in writing to the said The National Trust of the cessation of the said trust in favour of the said State (and in the event of such cessation my trustees shall forthwith give notice in writing thereof to the said The National Trust) the said The National Trust shall enter into a Trust Deed with my trustees (such Trust Deed to be prepared at the expense of my estate) whereby the said The National Trust shall undertake that after the death of my said husband the said The National Trust will hold and maintain the said residence and grounds and chattels so that the same shall be and become available for display and exhibition to the public or for such other uses and purposes consistent with the aims and objects of the said Trust as shall be approved by my trustees and shall be specified in the said Trust Deed and I expressly declare that the said The National Trust shall be at liberty (and the said Trust Deed shall so provide) at any time or from time to time tc sell or to subdivide and sell in one or several lots any portion of the said land (other than the said residence and a garden area surrounding it which shall in the opinion of the Council of the said The National Trust be adequate and appropriate) in order to provide a fund sufficient in the opinion of the said Council to answer out of the income thereof the cost of maintaining the balance of the said land and the said residence and the said chattels.

14. If the said The National Trust of South Australia shall fail to comply with the condition imposed by clause 13 hereof within the time therein limited then (subject to the life interest therein of my said husband) my share in the said land and chattels shall

sink into and form part of my residuary estate and follow the destination thereof.

I will not proceed beyond that. I have read out what I believe is the pertinent part of the will. It has concerned me, from various discussions, that until the end of last year the responsible Minister, along with certain other people who have been responsible for the preparation of the Bill, have not read the details of that will. I stress that the will of Dame Ursula Hayward is almost identical in wording to the will of Sir Edward Hayward. This is a bequest to the State of South Australia and it is inherent therefore upon the Government of this State, particularly upon the Premier, as it is left to him on behalf of South Australians, to act with the best of good will to ensure that in future the property is used in the manner spelt out in the will, particularly as the will is so specific.

The Bill before us, in setting up the Trust, contravenes the spirit of the will that I have just read to the House. Clause 13 provides:

(1) The functions of the Trust are as follows:
(a) to administer, develop and maintain Carrick Hill for all or any of the following purposes:
(i) as a gallery for the display of works of art;
(ii) as a museum;
(iii) as a botanical garden;
(iv) as a venue for musical or theatrical performances;

I have read to the House what the will says. It states four specific uses—the first three that I have read out from the Bill and the use as a Governor's residence. Nowhere does the will suggest, imply or permit the use of that property as a venue for musical or theatrical performances. Therefore, obviously the Bill is in contradiction to the intent and stated purpose for which the land should be used as spelt out in the will. I therefore intend to amend clause 13 to ensure that it does comply with the will.

I stress the importance of this, because the Premier and this Government will do enormous damage to the future possibility of this State's having large bequests made to it by people with significant funds if they deliberately act in contravention to the stated purpose of the bequest as spelt out in a person's will. The residents of Springfield and in the surrounding area certainly have noted the extent to which the will has stated one thing and the extent to which this Bill, if passed in its present form, will allow the Government to go beyond the purposes spelt out in the will. I will strongly oppose the inclusion of the paragraph relating to the use as a venue for musical or theatrical performances. I stress that that does not mean that chamber music, for instance, could not be played within the rooms of Carrick Hill.

In fact, chamber music from the sixteenth and twentieth centuries was played there at 3 p.m. on 9 and 16 December last year. The residents are not complaining about that, and I believe we all realise that music of that style and character would be quite compatible with the use of the premises as an art gallery, museum, or botanic garden. However, the Bill proposes to extend its use to a general use for musical and theatrical performances which is going well beyond the original intention. If rock concerts were held in the grounds of Carrick Hill—and the honourable member opposite smiles, but I point out that a rock concert would be entirely compatible with the last use contained in the Bill, that is, musical or theatrical performances.

Ms Lenehan: Do you really think they would have rock concerts there? Are you suggesting that?

The Hon. D.C. BROWN: Madam, the Bill your Government has introduced will allow it. The residents are saying that that is in contradiction of the terms of the will.

Ms Lenehan: Be serious!

The Hon. D.C. BROWN: Therefore, if the honourable member is serious in her comments across the House, she will support my amendment to make sure that such activities cannot be carried out at Carrick Hill. That is all we are looking for. The residents want an assurance that that type of performance will not take place at Carrick Hill.

I am speaking on behalf of the residents who do not wish to put a barrier against all musical performances at Carrick Hill, but they want to make sure that those performances are compatible with the specific uses as laid down in the will which are as a Governor's residence, a museum, an art gallery, or a botanic garden. It beats me why someone—I do not know who it was, but someone (and the Premier must take responsibility)—has decided deliberately to include another provision for its use. The new provision was not mentioned anywhere in the will. All the other uses are specifically spelt out in the will. The Government has made a decision that it should not be used as a Governor's residence. The Premier has that right, but he is still confined by the other uses spelt out in the will. Why has he decided to include this other use as a venue for musical and theatrical performances when the will itself did not allow for that use? The Premier must answer that question.

Ms Lenehan interjecting:

The Hon. D.C. BROWN: The title of the land, madam—I suspect you have not bothered to look at the title of the land—contains the same conditions for use as those contained within the will. The second point I wish to raise relates to the sale of the land. The Bill allows for the sale of the land or 'real property' with the approval of the Minister. The will is quite specific in that, if the State does not want Carrick Hill and the surrounding land, it automatically should pass within six months (or if it needs the approval of this Parliament, within 12 months) to the National Trust. It is then up to the National Trust to become the owner of the property, and the National Trust must retain the house and surrounding land, although some of the peripheral land can be sold off, but only after the approval of the trustees.

I believe it is a serious breach of the intent of the bequest to this State for the State Government to say that it will accept it under the conditions of the will and then turn around and say that it will start selling off, for commercial purposes, perhaps, some of the land involved. Therefore, I will move amendments to the Bill to make sure that the original intention of the will is followed. If real property is to be sold it must automatically pass to the National Trust for its use. Furthermore, if the National Trust does not want that property, it would need the approval of both Houses of Parliament before that land could be sold. I point out that the will stated that, if the National Trust did not want the property, then it should become part of the residue of Lady Ursula and Sir Edward Hayward's estate to be passed on to relatives and friends of the family.

Again, I stress that it is absolutely essential in preserving the Government's credibility in this matter and in handling delicate bequests to the State worth millions and millions of dollars that one does not underestimate the value of this property. Anyone can see that the value of the real property would be over $10 million. The value of the art work, the historic artefacts, and other items of cultural significance has not been brought to any public attention, but I estimate that it must be worth several, if not many, millions of dollars.

I am arguing that only both Houses of this Parliament should have the right to allow any of this land to be sold off. Whilst I am not accusing the present Premier, because I believe he is sensitive to the value of the arts and to the value of Carrick Hill, I am concerned that a future Premier or Minister for the Arts, with little regard for some reason for Carrick Hill and its significance and local impact, could easily be persuaded to sell off portion of the land, and that

would be in clear breach of the bequest to this State and in clear breach of the intent of Sir Edward and Lady Hayward.

As the local member of Parliament I intend to move to protect the interests of the will, because I believe that should be our prime importance this afternoon; any legislation passed by this Parliament should give due regard to the clear intent as spelt out in the will, especially as it was spelt out in such detail. To do anything but that is being less than honest with the Haywards' bequest to this State, especially when this State sat back and indicated it would accept over a 12 to 13-year period after the death of Lady Ursula Hayward, when the intent of her will was made known publicly.

The next point that I wish to raise concerns the development of this area. Carrick Hill is in the centre of Springfield, which is an A1 residential area. Development at Carrick Hill must take account not only of the fact that it is in a residential area and maintain the residential nature of the area but at the same time it must also help further development of the residential nature of the area. In no way should activity be in conflict with the existing development and use.

I can just imagine the sort of cry that would come from the other side of the House if something like this were to be undertaken in the electorates of members opposite. Therefore, to help preserve the interests of the local community it is essential, I believe, that the local community has at least two representatives on the Carrick Hill Trust. The first representative should be the Mayor of Mitcham, the local government representative, a person who has been formally elected through the democratic process, and the second representative should be appointed by the local member in the House of Assembly. This is not an unusual procedure by any means.

All House of Assembly members of Parliament have the right to appoint people to school councils in their area and also to councils of colleges of TAFE. It is not an unusual procedure for members of this House to put a local representative on a school council or on the council of a Department of Technical and Further Education institution. In this case we are extending it, if my proposal is accepted, to put a person on the Carrick Hill Trust. I would like to highlight the sort of responsible people whom that could include. The member for Murray foreshadowed this when he indicated that, whoever the representative is, the representative should be a representative of the immediate locational vicinity of Carrick Hill. One classic and wellknown South Australian who lives adjacent to Carrick Hill is Mr Charles Wright, who would, I believe, make an excellent contribution to the Carrick Hill Trust and at the same time ensure that its development was compatible with that of the surrounding area. In a moment, I would like to read to the House a letter that Mr Charles Wright has written to me in relation to how development should take place at Carrick Hill. Another matter that needs examination concerns the entry to the property and car parking. The property was opened twice to the public early last year.

An honourable member: Three.

The Hon. D.C. BROWN: There have been a number of occasions, but only two significant occasions, on both of which literally thousands of people turned up and cars were banked up everywhere. I can understand and I do not criticise the fact that permanent parking was not provided on those occasions: after all there had been no chance to provide it. I am delighted to see the action that has already been taken by Mr David Thomas to provide sealed parking space and improve access so that the dust does not affect the surrounding neighbourhood. I am delighted that the member for Brighton is taking an interest in this matter, unlike the member for Mawson, who seems to be scoffing at every point I raise.

The DEPUTY SPEAKER: The honourable member should not reply to interjections from the Government benches.

The Hon. D.C. BROWN: They are not interjections: they are looks of anguish from the member for Mawson. The residents around Carrick Hill are concerned that there be adequate sealed parking space on site to cope with the number of people who are likely to attend Carrick Hill. Adequate space is available for such car parking. The member for Mitcham joins me in this plea because, after those two opening occasions last year, there was considerable traffic congestion in the area and cars were parked literally throughout the whole residential area, causing residents trouble in getting to their properties.

I do not criticise the people who organised those functions last year because such functions were on a trial basis. However, we should ensure that there is no recurrence of that congestion. Adequate parking space must be provided, as well as entry from Fullarton Road. There are two points of possible access: from Fullarton Road and from the residential heart of Springfield. It would be most unfortunate if the public was allowed to enter from Glenwood Road and the other streets of Springfield. I am delighted that the Director at Carrick Hill has decided that the public must come from Fullarton Road.

The local residents have asked that I stress that the entry from Fullarton Road should be moved farther south away from the existing houses on Fullarton Road. At present, that entry is adjacent to the nearest house on Fullarton Road, and I support the suggestion that it be moved considerably farther south on Fullarton Road so that these residents suffer less noise and less dust. Frankly, it is unfair to impose on these private residents a major public thoroughfare on each Saturday, Sunday and possibly Wednesday once Carrick Hill is open on a permanent basis. We should not underestimate the traffic that will be entering and leaving the property.

I also believe that the Mitcham Council, as the local government body concerned, should have a say over the opening and closing times of Carrick Hill. While I do not say that every time there is a function at Carrick Hill the Council's approval should be sought, I believe that the Trust should seek approval of the council regarding the general opening and closing times and the days of the week, particularly public holidays, on which the property should be open to the public. That is one way of trying to ensure the maintenance of the residential nature of the area around Carrick Hill. I have received the following letter from Mr Charles Wright:

Dear Mr Brown,

Dorothy and I thank you for your letter on the subject of the development of Carrick Hill and thank you, too, for your activities in the matter. We are nearest Carrick Hill and on the approach road to the rear gate so we are likely to be affected by ill-considered action. However, as I was with Perce Collier responsible for the campaign to save what is now Edmund Wright House my interest in Carrick Hill is not merely self centred. We applaud the changes you propose to seek in the Bill. Our special interests include:

1. That the area of land between the house and the present unmade part of Glenwood Road never be sold but be retained as parkland.
2. That Glenwood Road remain unmade and we will continue to try to improve it with trees and garden plots.
3. That car parks in the grounds be kept away from the Glenwood Road area and be confined to the park near the road in from Fullarton Road.
4. That activities at Carrick Hill be cultural and quiet and not recreational and noisy.

It is to be hoped that no land will be sold off, as the whole area has the potential to be a State treasure many generations from now.

With many thanks, most sincerely, Charles Wright.

I would also like to bring to the attention of the House the main points from a series of meetings and correspondence between Mr David Thomas, the Premier and some of the local residents, particularly the residents of Coreega Avenue, Springfield. They have asked for the following points to be made:

1. That roads should be located further away from our boundaries than at present, preferably out of sight.

That means moving the entrance farther south along Fullarton Road. The points continue:

2. That the roads should be sealed.
3. That suitable fire resistant planting should be made so as to form a visual screen between the roads and our properties.
4. That pedestrian traffic should be discouraged from entering the area between the roads and our boundaries.

I support that. These people have every right to privacy. The final point is as follows:

5. Any parking or picknicking areas should be located at considerable distance from the boundaries.

I support those developments and, whilst supporting the intent and purpose of the Bill to establish a trust, I shall move a number of significant amendments to protect the rights of the local residents and to ensure that the trust is developed in accordance with the bequest made by Sir Edward and Lady Ursula Hayward.

Bill read a second time.

In Committee.

Clauses 1 and 2 passed.

Clause 3—'Interpretation.'

The Hon. D.C. BROWN: Will the Premier say when the development plan for Carrick Hill (and I ask a general question in terms of the development of Carrick Hill), as he spelt out, will be available for examination by local residents at the Mitcham council? I understand that the development plan will have to be approved by the Mitcham council. Is that still the case, and, if so, when will the plan be available?

The Hon. J.C. BANNON: I will obtain that information for the honourable member.

Clause passed.

Clauses 4 to 6 passed.

Clause 7—'Membership of the Trust.'

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

Page 2, lines 27 and 28—Leave out subclause (1) and insert subclauses as follows:

(1) The Trust shall consist of seven members, of whom—

(a) six shall be persons appointed by the Governor; and

(b) one shall be the Mayor of the City of Mitcham, *ex officio*.

(1a) One of the members appointed by the Governor shall be appointed upon the nomination of the member of the House of Assembly for the electoral district in which Carrick Hill is situated, being a person whose principal place of residence is within that electoral district.

Both the member for Davenport and I take this opportunity to refer to the need to have local people very closely involved with Carrick Hill and any future development that might occur.

The amendment would mean that the Trust would consist of seven members, six being persons appointed by the Governor, one being the Mayor of the City of Mitcham *ex officio*. Surely, if we are to have local representation and a local environment input then the Mayor would be the most appropriate person to provide that. One of the members appointed by the Governor shall be appointed upon the nomination of the member of the House of Assembly for the electoral district in which Carrick Hill is situated, being a person whose principal place of residence is within that electoral district. It is not necessary for me to go into a great deal of detail again on that matter. I just reiterate what I said before.

The member for Davenport indicated that it was a common occurrence that happened now, namely, that an opportunity was provided for the local member to have a representative on, for example, high school committees, councils and TAFE councils, and I am sure that there are other situations where there is the opportunity for local representation on such a Trust. The member for Davenport who, as I said earlier, has been vitally involved in this matter since Carrick Hill first became the responsibility of the State has worked closely with the local residents and the local community. I am sure that he is able to recognise the most appropriate person who could assist in this way and he has in fact referred today to correspondence that he has received from one person who lives in the vicinity of Carrick Hill and who obviously has a very good understanding of what is needed in regard to the future development of Carrick Hill.

Therefore, I would strongly urge the Government to accept this amendment. It is vitally important as far as the future of Carrick Hill is concerned and I am sure that every member of this House would want the future activities of Carrick Hill to run smoothly, and that will best happen if there is local involvement and local liaison with the people who live in that area. I strongly urge the Government and the Premier to accept this amendment.

The Hon. D.C. BROWN: I support the amendment. I stress that local residents wish to co-operate with the Director of Carrick Hill and the new Trust. I think that everything that has occurred so far has indicated that there has been good co-operation. They want to increase and improve that understanding. I stress that there are people who live in the areas immediately surrounding Carrick Hill who could not only make a valuable contribution to the Trust but also, if they became enthusiastic, even become significant benefactors to the Trust.

I have highlighted the quality of some of these people. For instance, there is Mr Charles Wright, who lives immediately adjacent to Carrick Hill. He is a person who has been held, and still is held, in the highest regard by Governments of this State of both political persuasions. I am putting forward a proposal and mentioning people who could be members of the Trust and who could make a valuable contribution to it. I urge the Premier to think carefully about this matter, because the reaction I have received in relation to it from local residents is that unless there is a local representative on the Trust they are concerned that the sort of mutual co-operation that has existed so far will not continue and that misunderstandings will start to occur between the Trust and local residents.

If a local resident is a member of the Trust, his task will be to communicate to other residents what is occurring. He can do that within the normal limits of the confidences that must always apply in relation to a Trust. He can put forward points of view on behalf of the residents. If this does not happen, their concern could well become hostility. That would be unfortunate and is the last thing that we want with the development of a property such as Carrick Hill. I am sure it is the last thing that the Haywards wanted when they bequeathed this property to the State of South Australia.

The Hon. J.C. BANNON: With reference to an earlier point made by the honourable member, I point out that work is well under way on the draft development plan but that it is still some months from completion. It is the intention that it will be submitted through the normal processes and that council and public displays will be presented so that there will be an opportunity for examination and input.

I turn to the amendments of the member for Murray relating to the membership of the Carrick Hill Trust. I can understand the thrust of both amendments and the desire

to import some local component into the Trust. However, I do not support the amendments, particularly in the form in which they have been moved. I think that they tend to be misconceived. I make two points: first, the amendments and some of the remarks made about the Bill generally indicate an excess of caution—almost a presumption that some kind of abuse will occur. In fact, the administrative arrangements and the controls embodied in this Bill reflect the sorts of controls that are in any similar piece of legislation—controls that have caused no problems at all.

It is not unique for a heritage item, a national museum or something of this nature to be in a suburban area. It may be unusual for the particular area: it may make the residents there feel a little uneasy, and perhaps they are unfamiliar with the concept but, in a sense, the use of Carrick Hill as a museum/art gallery with the various concepts that are involved potentially could cause less disturbance or problems to the neighbourhood than, in fact, I think could be the case in private hands. In other words, let us say that Sir Edward and Lady Ursula Hayward were wild and roistering characters who wanted to throw vast garden parties with loud rock music, and so on, on their grounds.

The Hon. D.C. Brown: They weren't, though.

The Hon. J.C. BANNON: They certainly were not and did not.

The Hon. D.C. Brown: You know darn well that the noise control legislation would have stopped them.

The Hon. J.C. BANNON: Exactly; that is the very point I am going to make—that there is in operation a noise control Act that would prevent them.

The Hon. D.C. Brown: It doesn't apply to Crown property.

The Hon. J.C. BANNON: But the Crown observes it. It will obviously be observed in this case.

The Hon. D.C. Brown: Is that an undertaking you're giving?

The Hon. J.C. BANNON: Yes, there will be no undue disturbance or disruption to the neighbourhood. What I am simply saying is that in private hands neighbours can have problems with residents and also in public hands, but in public hands they are far less likely to happen because the public bodies that control them must have a greater concern about the disturbance of amenities of neighbourhoods, and so on. The situation is one of much greater care and concern, and the people who have been involved in Carrick Hill and will be involved in an ongoing activity—the Director, his interim committee and the Trust to be established—will obviously be concerned about this as a vital matter. So I am suggesting that while the concept may be unusual or unfamiliar to residents in that particular area, it is certainly not unusual or unfamiliar in other parts of the city or in many other parts of the world.

So I suggest that we ought to approach this great State asset and its proper development and use for the enjoyment of all citizens on the basis that that will be done properly, respecting the wishes of residents but bearing in mind that they do have in their midst a State asset to which people of the State must have access. In terms of the management and control of that area, of course they will have some interest in it. I would have thought that any Government in looking at the composition of the Trust, would bear that in mind.

The Hon. D.C. Brown: Not necessarily.

The Hon. J.C. BANNON: I believe that it would be foolish to overlook that local component or interest, quite obviously for some of the reasons the member for Davenport suggested, namely, the involvement of residents in whatever is going on, their active support in programmes that have been developed. All these things, I am suggesting, will be furthered by having some kind of local residential participation. In appointing the Trust, I can certainly speak for my Government, and I am sure for future Governments, in saying that we will ensure that that will be so.

However, it is a different matter to actually enshrine particular individuals *ex officio* or particular nominees. In some cases it may be appropriate, but I suggest that in this case it is not. We will be looking not only for some form of residential involvement but for a mix of skills in Carrick Hill, skills which reflect the wide range of interests and uses that the Carrick Hill museum itself will be put to, and to be restricted or constrained in this *ex officio* way is, I think, wrong in principle. Who is to say that the Mayor of the City of Mitcham at a particular time has any interest or involvement in or commitment to Carrick Hill? I do not know about the present Mayor. I assume that the present Mayor has an interest in it.

The Hon. D.C. Brown: Who is to say the future Minister has any interest in it?

The Hon. J.C. BANNON: But he is subject to the constraints of Parliament and the legislation it passes. The fact is that making the Mayor of the City of Mitcham *ex officio* does not in any way necessarily guarantee the sort of local involvement that members have talked about. That Mayor may come from a totally different part of the City of Mitcham, he may be totally uninterested in art or cultural activities as embodied in Carrick Hill and may feel that it is irksome and onerous to attend the meetings. This will defeat the purpose of putting on that individual. In those terms I think it is an unnecessary and unreasonable restriction on the power of appointment.

Also, I do not see a reason to have a member of Parliament, whoever that may be at a particular time, in such a position to nominate, for similar reasons. Who is to know that that nominee will be an appropriate person or will be able to make some sort of major contribution and work in well with the board, or whatever? There is no ability to secure that. Certainly, in appointing a board, the local member should be consulted about possible nominees or individuals he thinks could be appropriate to be on it, but to enshrine it in legislation is wrong in principle in this instance.

The Hon. D.C. Wotton: Are you prepared to give an assurance that the local member, whoever he may be, will be consulted?

The Hon. J.C. BANNON: I am certainly prepared to invite the local member to submit to me some names of persons he may think would be useful to serve on the Trust. I am also prepared to say that at least one of the persons envisaged there should be someone from the local vicinity who has a particular interest and, I hope, skills to offer in relation to Carrick Hill. I do not see a major problem in that area if the right spirit prevails, and there is no reason why it should not. This is not a controversial area, I would have thought, where there are major doctrinal differences or whatever between the Parties. I suggest that the Trust that we propose, both in size and with the flexibility of appointment that is provided, should be maintained. I have indicated my attitude to the question of some kind of local interest or involvement and will undertake to honour that. But, I do not think it should be there restricting Ministers or Parliaments in future terms of the Act. Therefore, I am not prepared to accept the amendment.

The Hon. D.C. BROWN: I am disappointed that the Premier has refused this amendment. I believe that it is a reasonable offer to make on behalf of the Government to ensure that the local community has some say. I will certainly be taking up the Premier's offer to submit to him a list of suggested appointees from the local community who may be able to serve on the Trust. I will be bitterly disappointed if at least one of those representatives is not on the Trust, particularly because there are people of such capability in the area immediately surrounding Carrick Hill. I will make

sure that the list the Premier has from me of suggested appointees includes people of the calibre to make a great contribution to the Trust. The Premier said that of course the noise control legislation would apply, but it does not because the Crown is exempt from the noise control legislation. The Premier says that of course it would be the intention of the Government to ensure that it did comply. The Premier may give that assurance, but that assurance means nothing once he is no longer Premier.

The Hon. D.C. Wotton: That won't be long.

The Hon. D.C. BROWN: That will not be long, for sure. We want an assurance that the noise control legislation will effectively apply. Perhaps the Premier will give me an answer to whether or not he is prepared to have written in specifically that the noise control legislation will apply to Carrick Hill. If it is, then I would be prepared to accept it.

The Hon. J.C. Bannon: This is not the relevant clause.

The Hon. D.C. BROWN: No, it will not go in this clause. I ask this because of the assurance that the Premier gave that we could draft something, even if it was moved in the other House before it came back here, and he would accept that the noise control legislation apply to Carrick Hill.

The CHAIRMAN: I have been very reasonable and very lax in not pulling up the honourable member before this, but I cannot allow him to continue on that line. There is nothing in the clause that suggests that we can deal with the noise pollution legislation as it presently stands.

The Hon. D.C. BROWN: I point out that all I am asking for is clarification of what the Premier has already said. It was the Premier who introduced the noise control Act into this discussion.

The Hon. J.C. Bannon: I used it as an illustration.

The Hon. D.C. BROWN: The Premier brought up the suggestion, and I am asking for an assurance that if an amendment is moved in another place (where I suspect there are sufficient numbers to achieve it) the Premier will accept it. I again express my disappointment, I am sure on behalf of the local residents, that the Premier is not prepared to put a local representative on the Trust. I am sure that the Mayor of Mitcham will be somewhat insulted by the sort of remarks made by the Premier.

The Hon. J.C. BANNON: I cannot accept that. That is a gratuitous, snide remark that the member should not indulge in. He knows very well what I was saying about the Mayor of Mitcham: I was talking about the office and the possible attitudes of incumbents. There was certainly no disrespect intended to or comment on the present incumbent. I am not able to make such a comment, and the honourable member well knows it. So, just for the *Hansard* record (because I am sure that the honourable member will send it off to the Mayor and say how clever he was in drawing to the attention of the Committee the fact that I had insulted the Mayor), I point out that what the honourable member alleges is absolutely not true.

The Hon. D.C. Brown: You insulted the office of the Mayor of Mitcham.

The CHAIRMAN: Order!

The Hon. J.C. BANNON: I have made clear what I meant, and I think that what I said stands up quite logically.

Amendment negatived; clause passed.

Clauses 8 to 12 passed.

Clause 13—'General functions and powers of the Trust.'

The Hon. D.C. BROWN: This provision relates to the use to which Carrick Hill can be put. Before proceeding with my amendment, I ask the Premier why subclause (1) *(a)* (iv), which refers to use 'as a venue for musical or theatrical performances', has been included, when in fact the wills of Sir Edward and Lady Ursula Hayward are quite specific (and a search of the land title also shows this specifically) in stating that the property was to be used as a Governor's residence, art gallery, museum, and botanic garden, or for any one of those purposes. The provision under placitum (iv) is in contradiction of the intent of the wills.

The Hon. J.C. BANNON: I do not agree that it is in contradiction of the intent of the wills. Carrick Hill as a venue for musical and theatrical performances under the Carrick Hill Trust, and its new role as a State asset, is only reflecting a very large part of the role it performed under its previous owners who had enormous interests in musical and theatrical work. In fact, at least one person who acted as adviser and personal friend to the Haywards sees this as being a very important part of the function of the property and quite consistent with the intention—

The Hon. D.C. Brown interjecting:

The Hon. J.C. BANNON: I am not prepared to use the name of that person without first checking whether that person wishes the name to be used. The provisions of the clause are there to make it quite clear that that use referred to is one that can be contemplated by the Carrick Hill Trust. Indeed, some successful musical and other performances have already been held, and I think they have emphasised just what great value there is in Carrick Hill as an asset if it is so used. At this stage, before we get down to the close considerations of the forthcoming amendments, which are the most substantive part of the Committee's deliberations, I suggest that progress be reported.

Progress reported; Committee to sit again.

POLICE REGULATION ACT AMENDMENT BILL (No. 2)

Adjourned debate on second reading.

(Continued from 6 December. Page 2289.)

The Hon. D.C. WOTTON (Murray): The Opposition supports this Bill, recognising that it is the culmination of a lengthy process of consultation between the Police Department and the Aboriginal people in this State. I believe that it will have particular importance in relation to the use of police aides on Aboriginal lands. The proposal is that the authority to appoint a special constable will be limited to the Police Commissioner. I believe that that is appropriate. The Police Commissioner will also be able to vary or revoke limitations on the powers of a special constable as particular circumstances change. I believe that to be most appropriate as well.

An amendment is also made to the regulation-making section to provide that regulations may be of general or limited application and may vary according to particular classes of special constable. The purpose for this is that it will allow for greater tailoring in relation to the various classes of constable. The second reading explanation indicates that it is envisaged that Aboriginal police aides will be selected from the various communities and be specially trained to perform the duties of a police aide. When responding, perhaps the Minister can briefly indicate whether there will be special training, whether the police aides will be trained at Fort Largs as part of the normal training procedures, or just what the case will be. It is also intended that this programme will be subject to constant monitoring and evaluation.

Not long ago I had the opportunity to attend the opening of the new Marla Bore Police Station. I appreciated the invitation that was extended on behalf of the Police Commissioner to enable me to attend that function. It was an important function for that part of the State, and I was pleased to attend, with the local member, my colleague the member for Eyre. It was an interesting and pleasant day

indeed. While I was there I had an excellent opportunity to talk about the proposal with some of the many Aboriginal people. In fact, they already accept some responsibilities in that area. A few of them wore tartan bands around their hats, indicating that they were working with the police in the area and were assisting the police in numerous ways.

I think the scheme is to be commended. I particularly commend the South Australian Police Department and the Police Commissioner on introducing the scheme, because the police consider it to be urgently needed in tribal communities, and they also believe that it will stimulate initiatives involving rural and urban Aborigines.

I am aware that a similar scheme is working very well indeed in the Northern Territory, where I understand about 10 Aboriginal communities have nominated aides who have been trained by the Northern Territory Police Department. They work in their own communities with their own people and are visited regularly by their supervising officers from the Northern Territory Police. Up there they have powers of arrest, overnight detention and release on bail for such offences as disorderly behaviour. They collect evidence, take statements and carry out a wide range of other police duties.

Recently, I had the opportunity to learn at first hand about the success of those activities in the Northern Territory, and I am sure that the programme will work just as well in South Australia. A number of interesting points came out of the major review of police-Aboriginal relations in South Australia that was set up as part of a discussion paper resulting from a police research team established by the Commissioner of Police (Mr Hunt). The aim of the research team was to create a greater and more effective understanding between police and Aborigines. A number of initiatives were included in the paper. One was expansion of the South Australian Police-Aboriginal Liaison Committee which examines Aboriginal issues and has contributed to policy changes within the Police Department throughout the State to ensure its effectiveness, and another initiative involved changes to the criminal justice system so that Aboriginal law is recognised by the legal system in tribal areas.

I recognise that a top level meeting of Aborigines and Government Ministers and officers (including police) in Adelaide recently considered a discussion paper and also considered methods of encouraging Aborigines to graduate from the Fort Largs Police Academy as fully qualified police. The Minister might be able to indicate whether that is happening and whether any Aborigines are graduating from Fort Largs at present.

The report summarised problems identified as sources of tension between police and Aborigines, including negative attitude studies, and so on. I do not intend to spend much time on the legislation. I again commend the Commissioner of Police on having shown the initiative in bringing forward this scheme. I hope that it will significantly improve liaison between the Police Force and the Aborigines in this State and that it will work well in support of police duties in South Australia.

Mr M.J. EVANS (Elizabeth): I would like to join in congratulating the Minister and the Commissioner of Police in bringing forward this legislation. It is an important step in introducing special policing measures in areas of the State where they are required. However, I would like to raise one matter with the Minister, who perhaps might be good enough to canvass these aspects of the Bill in his response or during the Committee stage. I am a little concerned that members of the public will now be confronted with constables who have powers which might vary in relation to the area of South Australia in which they are located, or according to the nature of the Act or regulations that they administer.

Accordingly, I wonder what measures will be taken to ensure that the public is aware of the limitations of the powers of a constable with whom they might be confronted in outback or other areas of the State if this legislation is used in general terms, and it is, of course, couched in very general terms indeed in proposed section 36 (2). I wonder whether any thought has been given to that aspect of the matter.

Also, in the event that a constable acting under limited powers were to misapprehend his legal duty in these matters and through misadventure rather than deliberate purpose were to falsely or wrongfully arrest a person, what recourse would the public have under the general provisions of the Police Regulation Act or the general law of the State either to take action against that officer, which would seem most unreasonable in the circumstances, or against the Commissioner of Police in the State of South Australia, which would seem a much more reasonable alternative for someone who has been wrongfully arrested or imprisoned as a result of an officer's acting in pursuance of what he assumed his powers were when, in fact, his powers were more limited than he may have imagined them to be.

I would be grateful if the Minister could address the two issues there: first, the question of the public being informed as to the nature of the powers that the person can exercise and, secondly, how the public could go about seeking redress from someone who had acted wrongfully under those powers.

The Hon. J.D. WRIGHT (Minister of Emergency Service): I thank the Opposition for its support. I expected to get support from the independent member for Elizabeth, because he had something to do with the Bill in the first place when he was working in my office. I was fortunate enough to attend some months ago a seminar which was arranged by the Police Commissioner and which was attended by interested people within the Aboriginal movement in South Australia and an officer from the Northern Territory who has been the main driving force behind this scheme in the Territory.

There is a lot of very weighty evidence from the Territory that indicates to me that this scheme has worked well. I understand that the people in the Northern Territory were the innovators of it. In any innovation, trial and error, mistakes and frustrations occur in the initial stages. The police sergeant who attended from the Territory was quick, and very honest in his approach, to point that out to this seminar. Having had it in operation for many years there, he said that they had ironed out many of the problems that were inherent in the initiative when they first introduced it into the Northern Territory.

It is opportune for South Australia to have the opportunity to draw on that experience and not experience the same pitfalls, which would be foolish. We have not got a foolish Commissioner; so I am sure that he will not make mistakes by not picking up the very large amount of experience that the Northern Territory police have had.

I join with the member for Murray in commending the initiative by the police in this State. We are getting used to this Commissioner's creating new initiatives. He is an ideas Commissioner and this is another one of his, which I, like him and the community of South Australia, and now the Opposition, will be very hopeful is successful. I see no reason why it should not be. We have as efficient training methods as any police force in Australia has. There will be special training, as requested by the member for Murray, for these people.

There is in the communities already, as I understand it, a very concerned number of Aborigines who have already started thinking about this problem of selecting people who could be made aides or constables, or whatever one likes

to call them. That will be the most important part of the whole exercise: how the Aboriginal communities choose their people. Choosing the right people in the first instance is a very important factor. I understand that a great percentage of those people chosen have been successful in the Northern Territory, even to the extent of a few—I do not think that there are a great many at the moment, but I am not sure of the numbers—who have gone on to become full policemen. One would hope that the ability of the people chosen in South Australia—and I am sure that there is sufficient intelligence out there—will enable them, with the proper training and experience, at some stage to receive the full powers of police constables as we know them.

The Hon. D.C. Wotton: Could you give us more detail about the training? How different is it from normal police training?

The Hon. J.D. WRIGHT: I cannot go into major detail on it. There will be special training courses. If I was told, I have forgotten.

The Hon. D.C. Wotton: Would you be able to ascertain that information?

The Hon. J.D. WRIGHT: I do not see that it will be any different to the ordinary training that a constable goes through; I do not see why it should be. After all, we are training special constables in these areas, and I do not see why that training that other officers go through should not suffice. I notice the honourable member smiling, but what he is smiling about I do not know. I know that he has been critical of Aboriginals from time to time over the years.

The Hon. D.C. Wotton: That is not fair; it has nothing to do with that.

The Hon. J.D. WRIGHT: I am referring to the member for Alexandra who has, from time to time, made some criticisms in this House regarding Aborigines. I do not know whether he is smiling at something that I said or about something about which he is thinking.

The Hon. Ted Chapman: That's a gross reflection, and I take some exception to it.

The Hon. J.D. WRIGHT: It is on the record, if the honourable member wants us to find it.

The Hon. Ted Chapman: That's not what I said.

The Hon. J.D. WRIGHT: The honourable member had to go down to the parklands to argue his point. I can remember the incident quite well.

The Hon. Ted Chapman: I don't deny that—

The SPEAKER: Order! The honourable member is interjecting but, even worse, he is doing so out of his seat.

The Hon. Ted Chapman: With due respect, Sir, I am copping a reflection—

The SPEAKER: Order! I ask the honourable member to resume his seat and to obey Standing Orders.

The Hon. Ted Chapman: Quite unjustifiable and unreasonable references were made by the Deputy Leader.

The Hon. J.D. WRIGHT: I do not want to get into trouble or to have a row with the honourable member.

The Hon. Ted Chapman: I hope not. Withdraw what you said.

The Hon. J.D. WRIGHT: If the honourable member withdraws his supercilious grin, I will withdraw what I said. I was prompted into making those comments because the honourable member was grinning at what I was saying. I withdraw what I said, as it is not important. I ask the honourable member to not sit alongside his counterpart and look at me with that grin, because it is rather upsetting.

The Hon. D.C. Wotton interjecting:

The Hon. J.D. WRIGHT: If it will satisfy the member for Murray, I will ask the Commissioner to set out in detail whether there is to be any special training for these constables and will forward such information to him. I doubt that there would be special training: I think they will go through the ordinary course and pick it up reasonably well.

The member for Elizabeth raised a couple of questions about limitations of power and the recourse of problems that may occur following arrest. The honourable member was good enough to advise my staff that he was going to ask these questions, so we were able to contact the Acting Commissioner and get a full answer for the honourable member.

The appointment of special constables has particular significance to the Aboriginal Lands and Police Aide Scheme. In these areas special constables will be in uniform and therefore easily identifiable. Police aides will also carry identification which will include a statement to the effect that their appointment is pursuant to the Police Regulation Act for the area prescribed. The powers of special constables on Aboriginal lands must be seen in the same context as powers of any member of the Police Force. If one looks at the Act, which I checked a moment ago, one sees that such power is readily available under Part IV, clause 30, which sets out those matters to which the Acting Commissioner now refers.

It is not anticipated that police aides will have a greatly reduced range of powers. The limitation imposed will in the main be territorial. In fact, after a transitionary period of appointment as special constables police aides will be granted the full powers of a member of the Police Force, subject to territorial limitations. This transitionary period will enable the training of police aides in the exercise of their responsibilities and enable them to develop the confidence of the communities in which they work.

The identification of special constables in the metropolitan area will continue to be by way of identification cards, which is indicated in the Act. As with police aides, it is envisaged that the identification will indicate any territorial or geographic limitations. The second question asked by the honourable member is: 'What recourse is available to a member of the public aggrieved by the actions of a special constable—'

The Hon. Ted Chapman interjecting:

The Hon. J.D. WRIGHT: I am only responding to questions, my friend—'and if any liability is attracted will it be borne by the special constable or by the Police Department?' A person aggrieved may exercise any one of a number of options, including formal complaint to the Minister responsible or, in future, to the Police Complaints Authority or the Commissioner. In addition, a number of civil remedies are available to the public if it is shown that police powers have been abused. In these cases the Crown, as employer, would be vicariously liable. This situation does not differ from that which applies to other members of the Police Force.

Having answered the questions raised by Opposition members and the member for Elizabeth and finally having assured the member for Murray that I will obtain information about training programmes for him, I have answered the points that have been raised. I know that everyone will join with the Government in wishing this legislation every success, because it is important, especially for Aboriginal communities.

Bill read a second time.

In Committee.

Clauses 1 to 4 passed.

Clause 5—'Duties and powers of special constables.'

Mr MEIER: Although I did not hear all the Minister's comments and so may have missed this point, I could not find any reference in the second reading speech to the matter about which I am concerned. The second reading explanation indicates that this measure will have particular importance in relation to police aides on Aboriginal lands. Will the

Minister say whether it is envisaged to use police aides at Point Pearce, an area of Aboriginal land that is worked by Aborigines? Will police aides be appointed at Point Pearce in the near future, that is, in the trial part of the programme?

The Hon. J.D. WRIGHT: This legislation is not intended to be compulsory. It is an encouraging type of legislation and it will not be in the province of the Commissioner even to force the people of Point Pearce to take on police aides if they do not want to do so. Certainly, they will be encouraged to do so. The good thing about this legislation is that the community can decide whether or not it wants police aides, and it will have the choice of those police aides. It is entirely up to the communuity whether or not it requires them.

Mr MEIER: I thank the Minister for his reply, especially as he said that the community will be encouraged to use police aides or to consider that possibility. Members may be aware that the area around Point Pearce has experienced ups and downs for some years and over the past two or three years things have been relatively peaceful, although since this House last sat unfortunately there have been incidents relating to the local Aboriginal community where many local residents felt that more police protection and perhaps more police personnel were required. I hope that that requirement will be met because of the aides. As the Minister would be well aware, I believe that there is a limited budget for the number of police who can serve in the G5 area, yet it seems very obvious from the conversations I have had with various people connected with the Police Force in that area that more officers could be used if resources were available. I thank the Minister for his reply: it will be interesting to see what the future brings on that score.

Clause passed.

Clause 6 and title passed.

Bill read a third time and passed.

LOCAL GOVERNMENT ACT AMENDMENT BILL (No. 4)

Adjourned debate on second reading.

(Continued from 6 December. Page 2295.)

The Hon. B.C. EASTICK (Light): The Opposition is always pleased to assist the Government to get its programme functional, albeit that on this occasion it has caught everyone a little short of time so that the amendments that we will be discussing some time after dinner are not yet available for distribution. The Opposition intends to support this measure and recognises that it is a housekeeping Bill in practically every aspect of its presentation. However, it is also a very useful vehicle for a matter that is currently very much in the mind's eye of the local government fraternity, and we will talk about that in Committee when it is appropriate to do so.

It could be said that the Local Government Act has been extensively amended over many years. The Minister will appreciate just how many dozens of times that has occurred since the legislation was put into place, and we have mentioned that in the rewrite process. It is a little unfortunate that 10 months down the line from the last major rewrite we are not really addressing ourselves to major issues at the second stage of the rewrite. I believe it is a measure of the difficulties that the Minister would acknowledge are associated with rating and with various aspects of the money tree relating to local government that prevent us doing that at this juncture.

However, let me assure the Minister that the Opposition is willing to assist in the promulgation of that additional activity at an early opportunity so that any difficulties that exist can be sorted out. I do not mind and I do not believe that the Minister minds the House's being acquainted with the fact that there has been dialogue with some of his officers in relation to identified difficulties associated with ratings, assessments and the application of those two activities by certain local government bodies. It could be clearly indicated that some of the amendments have not necessarily meshed in well with those parts of the Local Government Act that remain.

In fact, there have been occasions when the attempt to overcome confusion has led to further confusion because there is an ambiguity of words or there have been occasions (this is not an outright criticism—it is the reality of the difficulties of the Act) when some of the references to specific clauses have not been correct. Even the most recent changes (the preliminary rewrite of the Bill) have created some ambiguity in the current Bill, and I use the Minister's words as follows:

> . . . designed to improve the administration of the Act, to ensure that it is given effect to in the manner intended when the legislation was enacted, to clarify areas where doubt about the intention of a provision has arisen, and to remove obsolete provisions.

That is a summation of the Bill that we have before us at present. There was an undertaking by members from both sides of the House to address themselves to necessary changes if, when the implementation of the first rewrite was undertaken, difficulties arose. I want to list in a few moments the various areas of activity that are encompassed by the amendments. There are 18 particular areas that can be identified in the series of amendments. Suffice to say that clause 5 of the Bill might be recognised as perhaps the major issue contained in this piece of legislation. It relates to the register of interests and to some difficulties which are perceived and which led to some rather unfortunate experiences in October 1984 when people we might say were forced out of local government in advance of a need to leave local government.

Clearly, the intention of the House was that a register of interests would apply. It was resisted, but at the end of the battle, so to speak, the register of interests was within the legislation. It had been fine-tuned from its original form. It clearly then became a responsibility of those people who wanted to be practitioners in local government as elected members to fulfil an obligation. In fact, the Minister made some quite strong remarks that inflamed the situation for those people who I believe have every right to stand on principle and whose interpretation of the Act as it was tended to put them beyond the position in which the Minister and perhaps the Department thought they ought to be in the revelation of their interest.

Because of the strong words, a number of people gave their resignation to the clerks of the various councils. There were two at Angaston, one at Morgan, and one at Woodville. There has been a series of others, and a number of people have threatened to resign. Subsequently, it was quite correctly stated by the Minister publicly that those persons who had transgressed in this particular way would be permitted to conclude their term of office up to midnight on Friday 2 May 1985. However, from the first election in May 1985 they would be expected to comply. Indeed, the provisions of clause 5 of this Bill are written so as to fine tune some aspects of the information that needs to be given in respect of the register of interests. The first provision is a machinery one that states that the alterations applying at present or which were sought to be introduced would not come into effect until after May 1985, and that is fit and proper.

The second part provides an appeal mechanism for those people who are able to show some good reason why they were unable to comply. Again, I laud the fact that that

concession has been granted, because there are circumstances when people are in hospital, overseas, on leave of absence, or who are unable, unfortunately to return from interstate because of a transport strike (and we have witnessed a series of air and railway strikes in recent times). Such people would be outside the provisions of the Act. I think that any reasonable person would accept that in such cases there was a good reason why those involved had not complied, and provided they made the necessary declaration at the first opportunity after they returned then they would be accepted as having complied.

It is important that any legislation is not so Draconian as to be unbending. I am not suggesting that any piece of legislation should necessarily be rubbery. However, the appeal provision here does allow for those contingencies which will always arise and which were a problem to persons who wanted to comply with the law. The other 17 areas of the Bill can be put in perspective in this particular way. There is, in the first instance, the interpretative section, which more clearly expresses the meaning of the word 'absent' and the words 'absence from office'. They are quite important issues to be resolved. I believe that common sense would allow these matters to be provided for under normal circumstances. However, to put the matter beyond any doubt, and to give it legality, these changes are made.

The second provision removes from the section dealing with the insurance of members and their spouses the unintended extension of the degree of insurance to apply and returns the position to what one might call the pre-1984 status. It is publicly acceptable that persons who are providing a community service, and under certain circumstances their spouses and children, should be protected by insurance. However, due to the changes made in 1984 there was almost a double insurance situation existing. This was not done intentionally but was a result of the words that were used then. We see with this measure a return to the earlier provision of adequate but not over-adequate insurance.

The third provision fine tunes the nature of agenda and minutes material to be posted on the notice board. This, again, flows from the changes made last time in the public disclosure of material. I believe that there are likely to be problems in the area from a purely logistical point of view, because if one instances large councils and the size of the agendas and material issued as part of those agendas and as an extension of the minutes they would need a notice board almost the size of this Chamber to fulfil what some people in the community believe is the intent of the law in relation to this matter. Common sense ought to prevail again. Also, the cost factor involved in the duplication of such material makes it impossible and an undue expense on the public. I believe that the measures before us are not unreasonable ones, but that we may yet find that we have to further amend these various provisions in relation to the distribution of council material.

The fourth provision rationalises the procedures for holding special committee meetings. Again, this is a fine tuning. In fact, one of the paid practitioners of local government has said that we are really getting down to fine fine tuning with some of the measures contained in this Bill. It is an indication of the responsibility that the Government is showing to a very important area of government. Unless all these precautions are taken it may lead to litigation; litigation is additional cost, and additional cost is wasted money so far as the ratepayers or electors of a district, municipal or city council are concerned. Anything that we can do to ensure that money is not wasted in that way is to be lauded.

The fifth area provides for the recording of minutes in the absence of the Chief Executive Officer. This was one of those simple slips where certain circumstances require that the Chief Executive Officer is not present at a council meeting, particularly when his position is being discussed. There was no alternative provision made for the adequate recording of the minutes of the particular meeting, and this is fine tuning to cover that situation.

The sixth area provides for regulations in respect of fees, for qualification committee functions, for appeals, for the granting of a certificate and for the various other activities associated with qualification. It is part of a fairly consistent approach allowing for a number of fee structures to be undertaken by regulation rather than, as was the case in the past, being entrenched in the Acts. The argument will go on for many a long day as to whether it is a good thing that a Government can make these changes overnight away from the scrutiny of Parliament, particularly when Parliament is not sitting; that it may become a fact of life and it is a little late to try to change things back three or four months later. Once again, we are moving away from definitive requirements of an Act towards more executive control or activity which can be exercised through the regulation method. It is subject to eventual debate by Parliament but, as I have indicated, sometimes it is too late for an effective change to be made.

The seventh area more clearly identifies procedures for the nomination of a person to vote on behalf of a company or group. Again, it is an area where there has been legal question as to the effectiveness of the provision included in the earlier Bill which has become the new section in the Act, and I see no problem with this provision. That does not necessarily say that the exact wording of the amendments is in the terms that legal practitioners or people involved in local government would use, but there is a style about the provisions which is consistent with those we passed previously and, unless anybody can demonstrate that the intent is unclear or that the opportunity to manage local government in a proper way is seriously affected by the wording in question, I have no serious objections.

I believe that the relevant provisions are in a very readable form compared to the provisions as they used to be and compared to the old part of the Act as it still is. I said that publicly when we were looking at the rewrite, and I am more than convinced, after having worked with the Act now for some 10 months, that the belief I expressed at that time was correct. It is a much more readable document and much better understood not only by those in local government but those who are impacted upon by local government, including those who from time to time have to read various sections of the Local Government Act.

The eighth area restates how interest on credited ratepayer funds is to be determined and reflects Reserve Bank advice. This was a measure inserted by the Opposition in approximately November 1983, reflecting concerns that we had that councils could hold large sums of money belonging to ratepayers at the same time as ratepayers were paying bank interest or other interest on the funds they had provided to local government to meet a bill which was subsequently found to be in excess of that ratepayer's indebtedness to the council.

The banking fraternity drew to the attention of the Department of Local Government that the terminology used in the 1983 amendment, whilst it was adequate to a point, did not always clearly reflect the actual interest rate applicable. This is more clearly stated as information from the Reserve Bank, rather than from a trading bank, and the Opposition is happy to accept this variation. The important thing is that the promotion made in 1983 is now recognised by local government as fair and reasonable to all. This measure will provide a better way of advising the interest rate.

The ninth area requires consideration and adoption of a budget before declaring a general or differential rate. Occa-

sionally councils have made a decision about rates before they have adopted their budget. The classic example would be a publicly stated difficulty that evolved at Thebarton. There have been other circumstances in which the method of determining rates has been questioned and, hopefully, we will look at that and tidy any other problem up in due course. The Opposition has no difficulty in accepting this provision. It is only fit and proper that the council act in a top managerial manner so that at the end of a 12-month period it will not be devoid of funds and almost bankrupt, which is a problem for ratepayers, or swimming in funds, which means that ratepayers have provided far greater sums than the council can spend. The provision calls into question any council that does other than make a proper assessment of its needs.

The tenth area deletes sections that partially duplicate the expenditure of money on council insurance and is a slight variation on the insurance factor I mentioned previously. It is an identification that needs correction, and the Opposition is quite happy about it. The eleventh area more clearly defines the role of a council's engineer in certain survey matters, and the Bill contains a number of clauses correcting the present terminology. The twelfth area removes the offence of riding or wheeling a cycle or riding or leading a horse over median strip safety zones. This provision was inserted some years ago and has become archaic. It is quite proper that for the safety of the horse or bicycle rider use is made of the protection afforded by the median strip safety zones and it is only right that what has become an anomalous situation, albeit correctly intended when it was first introduced, has now been clearly identified and is to be corrected.

The thirteenth area provides for Ministerial approval of a commencement date for joint council operations. There is an increasing number of joint council operations where major engineering works and other activities are being undertaken for the benefit of the broader community than exists in one council area. The end result is that it is more cost efficient for all the councils involved, and therefore of financial benefit to the electors and ratepayers who are being provided with this service. It allows the Minister to approve a commencement date so that the necessary financial functions and other activities can be brought into proper alignment.

The fourteenth area tidies up matters relating to the various responsibilities of the Central Board of Health, the councils, and the Minister in respect of common effluent schemes. A large number of these schemes are currently in operation throughout South Australia and they have benefited the health and welfare of those in many rural communities. A letter that I received from the Minister earlier this week indicated that sufficient towns and cities in local government areas had been identified as still requiring a common effluent scheme to utilise the funds that can be made available for this purpose at least to the year 2000. Some 50 towns still require a common effluent system. This measure is a tidying up provision and one about which there can be no quibble.

The fifteenth area is in relation to the repealing of destruction of sparrows provisions in the Act. These provisions are really archaic and have existed for many years. They have been the butt of many jokes over a number of years and although these provisions have existed they have not been used for almost half a century, a clear indication that they are no longer required. Sections 647 to 660 under Part XXXVII of the Act contain these provisions, and provide, for example, that:

The Governor may by proclamation declare that any area shall be an area to which this Part applies and may, by proclamation, revoke or vary any such proclamation. The council of every area to which this Part applies shall, as regards all lands, including Crown lands, situate within the area, be charged with the duty and have authority to suppress and destroy sparrows thereon, and to prevent them breeding and increasing, and for that purpose to take all such measures and do and perform all and every such acts and things as may be proper or necessary.

As much as local government likes to serve its community, the destruction of sparrows hardly comes into the area of real need at present. Provisions contained in the Vertebrate Pests Act together with other provisions that exist enable such activity, if necessary, to be undertaken.

The sixteenth area provides for direct co-operation between councils and the Road Traffic Board in the preparation of by-laws for 'the suspension or prohibition of traffic on streets or roads or the temporary closure of streets or roads'. This matter has provoked the greatest reaction from practising members of local government whom I have consulted. They are not totally opposed to what is proposed; their reaction is more a reflection of the problem that they claim to have had with the Road Traffic Board in years gone by in relation to not necessarily being able to get a response as quickly as they should, as well as some problems between the Road Traffic Board and the Road Safety Council, and various other authorities.

In relation to this provision it is to be hoped that dialogue will take place between the Minister or the Minister's department and the Road Traffic Board so that there will be no disadvantage to local government, and that the *modus operandi* as between the local government fraternity, as provided for in these provisions, and the Road Traffic Board will be beneficial to all concerned. Hopefully, delay or procrastination will not occur to the degree that some clerks and executive officers of local government would have us believe has occurred in the past.

[*Sitting suspended from 6 to 7.30 p.m.*]

The Hon. B.C. EASTICK: Before the dinner break I had indicated sixteen of the seventeen areas of involvement other than clause 5, which looks at the register of interests. The seventeenth is really one that encompasses a number of clauses, because it corrects obsolete and incorrect cross-references. There are quite a number where change has taken place. Whether the original clause has been deleted and replaced by another or whether it was in error at the time of original amendment is not quite clear at the moment. That is immaterial. Suffice to say that the arrangement is to bring into proper perspective the cross-referencing which is neccessary for the issue.

I indicated that I had consulted widely with many practising members of the local government fraternity. I indicate very clearly that the Local Government Association and members of the local government fraternity are completely happy with the provisions of the Bill. They question one or two of the words but are happy to accept the Bill as it is. When we rose for dinner I had mentioned to the House that there was a concern that the Road Traffic Board arrangement would be functional and that there would be no delays. That being the case, I am quite happy to seek that assurance from the Minister.

I briefly make the point that in due course this Bill will become a vehicle for discussion of other matters that are vital to local government for activities that it must address on the election date of 3 May. Given the fact that nominations are to be called within a short time, it is important that these matters be discussed at the earliest possible moment, preferably within the terms of this Bill rather than seeking to put up another Bill. I am gratified to note that the Government is going to accept the additional debate. Indeed, it desires the additional debate to address the problems that I want to address in relation to electoral procedures. This is basically a Committee Bill. I will be asking a number of questions in relation to several of the clauses as we go

through; I will then address the other matters, as I have just indicated.

Mr FERGUSON (Henley Beach): I rise to support the amendments put forward to the House by the Minister. Although I do not intend to speak on this subject for very long, I refer briefly to the disclosure of interests, for which amendments have been proposed. It is nice to see that there is general agreement on this proposition. I remind the House of what the Minister said about this matter in his second reading explanation on 6 December. He stated:

> In recent months there has been much media attention paid to the grandstanding of a few local government members who say they have refused to meet their legal obligation to lodge the required return under the Act and are prepared to be seen as martyrs for the cause by being imprisoned for their contempt of the legislation and the courts by failing to pay any fine imposed.
>
> This irresponsible approach has brought discredit on the local government industry and in particular the great majority of members who have acted responsibly and met their obligations. Their action avoids the real issue that a person who undertakes public office and is involved in public decison making must be prepared to demonstrate that his involvement is not for personal gain. If a person is not prepared to subject himself to such scrutiny, then he has an obligation to stand aside and make way for a person who is prepared to be openly seen to be acting in the public interest.

In my electorate I have two local councils in one of which two members took it upon themselves to defy, if you like, the provisions of the Act. One of them eventually resigned, which was his right, because, if he could not meet the obligations of disclosure, I believe the honourable thing was to resign.

The other person, after eventual discussion and persuasion, complied with the Act. It is probably important, so far as local government is concerned more than in any other arm of government, for a disclosure of interests to come into operation. In local government there is no such thing as compulsory voting and, in many instances, the interest in electing a councillor is so small that that councillor is elected either unopposed or by a very small percentage of the electorate indeed.

So, this leads to the situation where single issue candidates may from time to time present themselves for election and, although I have no evidence of this, they may have an interest in a particular development or proposition. Incidentally, they may never again set themselves up for election; having served their term and achieved their purpose they drop from public life altogether. In those circumstances it is extremely important that the general public should know what is their register of interests.

I was extremely surprised to see the interest shown by local newspapers in those people who were not prepared to disclose their interests, and I found it very strange that they were given that publicity and in some instances were treated as local heroes, defeating the purpose of the legislation and not giving a true picture of their personal situation to the people that they represented.

All members of Parliament would believe that every person standing for public office ought to disclose his interests. The Australian Labor Party has, for more than 20 years to my knowledge, had a policy that any person standing for public office should disclose the interests of themselves and their families. In September 1974 a private member's Bill was introduced into this House to require all members of the State Parliament to disclose annually the sources of income in excess of $500 received by them. It took no less than the introduction of six Bills into this House before that objective was achieved.

In the United Kingdom Parliament there has been public disclosure since 1975, and in the Victorian Parliament since 1978. The Administration in Victoria at that time was not a Labor Party Administration. It is possible that the Victorian land scandals had something to do with hastening the introduction into that Parliament of a disclosure of interests Bill. The Labor Party believes that members of Parliament, as trustees of public confidence, ought to disclose their finances and other interests in order to demonstrate both to their colleagues and to the electorate at large that they have not been or will not be influenced in the execution of their duties by consideration of personal gain.

I have referred to agreement on both sides of the House on this question. I believe—and I can go only on the past record and on what members have said in the House on this matter—that all members of the House believe in this principle. Indeed, certain members of the Liberal Party have suggested in debate that this principle ought to be extended. I personally, although there is no particular Labor Party policy on this point of view, support them when they want to extend this principle into other areas.

On 20 April 1983, in the Legislative Council, the Hon. K.T. Griffin said:

> Of course, in the context of public disclosure of the interests of members of Parliament, one needs to give further consideration to other public offices. If members of Parliament are required to disclose publicly those interests which will have a bearing on whether or not there is a conflict or potential conflict, then one must question seriously why the Judiciary should not also be required to disclose their interests because of the variety of issues which come before the judges. Why should public officers and public officials (for example, the Auditor-General, Police Commissioner, Ombudsman, and various other statutory officers and senior public servants who exercise considerable influence over the day-to-day decisions of Government) not also be required to disclose publicly those interests which may have a bearing on whether or not there is a conflict of interest?

I support the Hon. K.T. Griffin on those sentiments expressed in another place. I can only go by what he said to the Parliament. If his proposal is that disclosure of interests ought to extend to other people, including the Auditor-General, the Police Commissioner, the Ombudsman and various other statutory officers and senior public servants, then I totally and absolutely support him. On this issue I am expounding a private view and not one that has been discussed and decided upon by my Party.

This view from the Hon. Mr Griffin was backed up further in the Legislative Council on 21 April 1983 (page 989 of *Hansard*) when the Hon. M.B. Cameron, Leader of the Opposition, stated:

> I am concerned that the Bill does not include public servants and judges. I do not intend to move that way at this stage, but I think this is a matter that does have to be looked at in the near future.

I totally agree with this viewpoint and the concern expressed by the Hon. Mr Cameron in another place. There is little conflict between the two Parties on this issue. We had a difference about the implementation of disclosure of assets. The previous Bill forwarded by the Liberal Party suggested that the assets of members should not be public but should be kept by the Speaker and President of the respective Houses. That was probably the great bone of contention over many years in relation to whether a list of assets should be supplied by members of this House.

In summary, it is extremely important that candidates in local government, bearing in mind the special conditions that apply to it, the fact that not everyone votes for local government and that it is possible for a small percentage of the electorate to elect any member, be prepared to disclose assets. To my knowledge, since the introduction of the Bill, apart from a couple of small hiccups, the system has worked extremely well. I support the changes, especially on this aspect of the Bill. It is supported by all people, and it will add to the ability of local government to continue to govern in the exemplary way that it does.

Mr GUNN (Eyre): I support the remarks of my colleague the member for Light. In doing so, I make it clear that I am always pleased to support improvements to any legislation. However, much of the debate so far has been in regard to the requirement that people elected to councils and corporations have to disclose their interests. Let me make my position clear: I am opposed to such people and members of Parliament having publicly to disclose their interests.

On the other hand, it is not often that I agree with the member for Henley Beach, but I do agree that if members of Parliament and elected members of local government are forced by Statute to declare their financial interests then in my view the people who advise us ought to be placed in a similar position because they are more likely in my opinion to be under the influence of any temptations put in their way. Fortunately, that has not taken place so far to my knowledge, but people who advise Ministers and Governments, people who are responsible for recommending contracts and successful tenderers are the ones who should have to disclose their interests. Obviously, to require this would involve treading new ground but, as I say, if it is necessary for members of Parliament and local government members to disclose their interests then the people who advise them should do the same. I see no reason why judges should not also be included under such a provision. True, I have strayed slightly from this matter.

Certainly, I have been concerned ever since the amendments to the Local Government Act were passed by both Houses of Parliament about this matter. Again, we saw a clear example of the wobbly Democrats. At one stage they were going to do one thing; the Hon. Mr Milne was going to stand firm, but then he deviated from his original proposals further than he does on most occasions. As soon as he came under pressure—the hour was late—that was the end of his stance.

Of course, this proposal was put into law. I have been concerned that people who virtually for nothing give their time and effort are compelled to disclose their interests, because most people who are elected to local government are well known in their local communities. People vote for them as individuals—not because they have or have not certain assets or because they are involved in certain undertakings or businesses. If anyone has been involved in any underhand activities, I am quite confident that the local community would be aware of that, and I do not believe this requirement is necessary.

I refer to one of the local papers circulating in my electorate, the *West Coast Sentinel* (16 January 1985), where, under the heading 'Dismissal threat over interest declarations', the following statement appeared:

> The District Council of Murat Bay may lose two of its councillors. This was revealed at its meeting last Wednesday when [two] councillors notified of their intent not to register their interests, as will soon be required under a proposed amendment to local government acts.

One councillor stated:

> '... he was prepared to sacrifice his position on council by not declaring his interests. There is too much corruption in government and Government departments and little is being done about it. I think it is disgusting that people who are working for nothing have to declare their interests. It is not on that we are getting hounded whilst the ones who are getting paid big money are getting away with it.'
>
> Councillor ... said he hoped councillors throughout the State would oppose the filling out of the form. 'Unless we make a stand it will only get worse,' he said. 'I have got nothing to hide. I would will the form out tomorrow if they straightened the Government out.'

Another councillor said:

> 'I think it is an invasion of privacy. It is just another socialist step towards total socialism control in this country.'

Members interjecting:

Mr Plunkett: Who was that?

Mr GUNN: That councillor was enlightened. I knew that the local paper headline would raise the hackles of members opposite. There is a fair bit of truth in what that particular gentleman had to say. I cannot say why he should be compelled to fill out one of these blasted forms. Certainly, I have not examined the register of this House—I have no intention of doing so; I am not a bit interested in what other members have or have not got.

Mr Hamilton: I know what you've got.

Mr GUNN: That is a typical Labor Party attitude. The honourable member has studied the matter, and if he makes those comments he will probably be in conflict with the Act in any case, as I understand it.

An honourable member interjecting:

Mr GUNN: I could not hear what the honourable member said.

The SPEAKER: Order! He was quite out of order.

Mr GUNN: Thank you, Mr Speaker. I want to complete my remarks by saying that from the article I have quoted it is clear that these problems have occurred in a number of parts of the State and they have caused a lot of concern. I sincerely hope that the Government will further consider this matter. I also hope that the proposals to be put forward by the member for Light in relation to other matters will be supported by the Government, because I believe that otherwise there will be a considerable amount of confusion. A lot of concern has been expressed over the past few weeks by people involved in local government. I have no further comment to make at this stage and I intend to support the amendments moved by my colleague.

Mr MAYES (Unley): I, too, support the Bill, and in doing so I would like to commend the Minister for the manner in which he has dealt with this matter. Clause 5 contains the most popular amendment relating to the register of interests. It is important to refer to the reactions that I received from local councillors who had pleaded with me to make representations to the Minister to amend the Act because they felt that it would 'force out all the good members of council'. Some six months later it is quite obvious that the Act has worked successfully and none of those members saw fit to resign their position on the local council.

It is also important that we note that the original clause relating to the declaration of interests was passed, and this amendment is intended to alter that section so that in fact members of council can, if they see fit, not put in a declaration: there is a way out for them, and there is a safety net for those who fail to meet the requirements of the Act if they have legitimate reason. The register of interests is an important matter. It should be the responsibility of all people in public office to make a declaration, and I believe that it should be a public declaration—that is my personal position. It offers accountability and a safety valve for people in public life: in fact, it is protection for those people, and those of us who have been involved in local government have often heard rumours and innuendo about what people do or do not own. That has never been a problem in my case, but there have been criticisms about other members of local government in relation to their interest in various developments. We must bear in mind that local government deals with millions of dollars worth of property development each year. In fact, the Unley council dealt with development around the $50 million mark in 1984. This is an important measure and I commend the Minister for bringing in this provision to provide an appropriate mechanism to cater for people who see fit not to meet the requirement of the Act as it stands.

Regarding clause 7, over the past two or so years during which I have been a member of Parliament I have received comments from local residents who have had difficulty in obtaining agendas and minutes from local councils. People have constantly said that it is impossible to follow the conduct of a meeting or to understand the direction in which a meeting is going when they are part of the audience at a council meeting or a committee meeting. This measure is one step and I would like to see other steps taken to provide further facilities for residents to understand and participate perhaps not so much in a vocal sense in the processes of local government but as members of the community that elects local government members to represent it.

I think the important factor is that those who have been involved in local government can reflect on their own experience. I remember the first time that I took my seat in the Unley council. I was very inexperienced and had little idea of the direction being taken, and it was really a matter of learning the ropes as one went along and gaining from experience. A local resident who perhaps has no experience of or exposure to local government cannot be expected to understand the process of local government with its complicated committee system and recommendations being made now in a way that I think most councils have adopted.

With such a principle of committee recommendations, people find it hard to follow the processes. I think that clause 7 is a small step in the direction of helping local communities understand how local government operates. Again, I commend the Minister for this clause, which I believe will provide an important process by which the community can have a greater say in local government, and I think that that in itself is an important objective.

Clause 9 deals with the record of minutes. I think that that is again an important aspect of local government which must be addressed, as there have been some problems in this regard. It may be seen as just a mechanism by which the records of council decisions and discussions can be kept, but I think that it is another important recommendation from the Minister to improve the efficiency and conduct of local government, which, of course, is a government body, and a responsible and accountable government body it must be. Clause 12 involves another important aspect that I think has always irritated many residents who perhaps see themselves as not having an opportunity to be heard or represented at local government level, and this has been the process by which companies or organisations can nominate or take part in the council election process. We go back to before 1984, before the previous major overhaul of the Local Government Act, when we had an anomalous situation where companies and organisations had multiple votes in elections.

We now have in this amendment a declaration that they must nominate an agent to represent them in voting in an election, and I think that that is an important factor that will not only assist local government in its process of election but also provide perhaps a more 'democratic' process in the elections that take place. Of course, we are looking at May this year when this amendment will come into force.

Finally, I wish to make some comments on clause 15 of the Bill which provides the mechanism that will allow a Town Clerk to notify the Minister if anyone fails to meet the provisions of the Act. Again, I think that the Minister ought to be commended for picking this up as a machinery provision. It is important, if anyone fails to nominate or indicate their interest to the Town Clerk, that he or she has some mechanism to ensure that no vacation can occur and, as I have said already, this is a machinery mechanism that will provide for the Chief Executive Officer to notify the Minister and the council if there is a failure to meet the requirements of the Act. This important amendment will provide smoother running overall for local government legislation. In summing up, I think that these amendments are important and will assist local government in the more efficient conduct of its processes and, personally, I think that the Minister should be congratulated on bringing forward these amendments at this very early stage of the autumn session so that we can soon institute them for the coming local government elections in May.

Mr HAMILTON (Albert Park): I did not intend speaking on this Bill, but because of remarks made by the member for Eyre I thought I should put on record my comments about it. I applaud the Minister for his action in bringing this Bill before the Parliament. The clause to which I wish to speak principally involves the declaration of interests. Much has been said tonight by the member for Henley Beach and others about the declaration of public interests to be made by people in local government. Particular reference was made to threats of resignations by many people when this Bill was being discussed and comments printed in the media about the relative merits of disclosing public interests.

A wellknown member of the Woodville council attacked the Labor Party's Bill relating to this matter, despite the fact that he has often said that there are no politics in local government. He was prepared to make outrageous statements about the Bill. If one was a cynic, one might suggest that that alderman was instrumental in influencing another councillor to resign from the council. One had a lot to say and the other did not say much at all, but the ward councillor from Semaphore Park eventually resigned, and the alderman who had had so much to say, even thought many people had spoken to him about the benefits of this Bill and told him that it was not as Draconian as he thought, was reported in the media as attacking this Bill. Eventually, he was not able to put his money where his mouth was—he did not resign and is still a member of that council.

That alderman is a well-known member of the Australian Democrats and proudly wears the badge of that Party on his lapel. We all know that it is Alderman Manhire from the Woodville council to whom I refer. It gives me no pleasure to stand in this place and say these things about that alderman, but after the attacks he has made on the ALP it is necessary to set the public record straight, particularly in light of the press reports read out by the member for Eyre during his contribution here tonight. I support the Bill.

The Hon. G.F. KENEALLY (Minister of Local Government): I thank members for their attention and comments in relation to this Bill. There were one or two comments made by members from both sides of the House that dealt with the general philosophy of declaration of interests but not with specific matters to which we need to address ourselves. I listened with interest to those comments and have noted them, but do not intend taking the matter any further because we have a provision for declaration of interests, and there is no proposal to extend that provision to include further people. That is a matter for another debate.

I thank the member for Light, the shadow spokesman on local government matters, for the attention he has given to the Bill and for the assistance he has given both to me and to departmental members during discussions about this legislation and other legislation we are proposing to bring before the House. It is certainly of assistance to us to know that we can talk about amendments at such an early stage with an Opposition spokesperson who can be trusted. I thank the honourable member for that.

I also want to acknowledge that the member for Light, though he fought strenuously against some of the provisions that are now part of the Act, has acknowledged that the Act as it stands needs to be made to work. I can recall that, when legislation went through the House in a major revision of the Local Government Act, he gave an undertaking to me as Minister and to the House that he and his Party would assist as far as they were able to ensure that any anomalies that might occur while the major review of the legislation was taking place could be rectified by an ensuing Bill. I can recall his saying that inevitably this would happen because he had been around long enough to know that as always problems would arise. These problems did arise, and the present legislation addresses them.

The Government intends and I am sure that the Opposition intends, particularly in this debate, to try to ensure that the legislative framework for local government is sensible, practical and workable, and I believe that slowly we are providing such a framework for local government. There ought not to be, and I expect in most cases there is not, a political debate about what is good for local government. Nevertheless, on certain issues there are fundamental differences, and I guess those issues will be debated in Parliament, the most appropriate place. I thank all of those members who have contributed to this debate. The member for Light pointed out that, in a sense, it is a Committee Bill, and he will raise questions during Committee.

The Hon. B.C. EASTICK: Mr Speaker, I draw your attention to the state of the House.

A quorum having been formed:

Bill read a second time.

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

That it be an instruction to the Committee of the whole House on the Bill that it have power to consider a new clause relating to voting.

Motion carried.

The Hon. B.C. EASTICK (Light): I move:

That it be an instruction of the Committee of the whole House on the Bill that it have power to consider new clauses relating to voting.

Motion carried.

In Committee.

Clauses 1 to 6 passed.

Clause 7—'Meetings of council.'

The Hon. B.C. EASTICK: I indicated earlier that I was aware of the benefit that would accrue to local government as a result of the alteration in relation to meetings of councils. It has been suggested to me by practitioners that there may still need to be further refinement of this issue because of the sheer volume of material that is needed to be placed on display. Currently there is a variable appreciation of what should be displayed and how far it is supposed to go. While we are cleaning up one of the anomalies about which the Minister and I have spoken, it may be that it is not practical from a cost efficiency point of view to follow through what is intended here. The preparation of the material in a book form, which is available other than on a notice board, etc., may well be the only practical answer. It is a matter which, as costs are taken out on the provision of this benefit, will have to be looked at. I believe that Parliament, in due course, would be in error if it did not ensure that it was providing for local government a venue that was not costly to the eventual elector, be they a ratepayer or rentpayer, whose rental is reflected on by council rates.

Mr M.J. EVANS: New section 58 (3) provides that the notice and agenda of the meetings is to be placed on public display. I seek an assurance from the Minister that he will give consideration to the problems that could arise from this clause. Certain matters are set out in the Act that may be regarded by councils as confidential and any proceedings and minutes in relation to them are protected as confidential by the Act.

However, many of those prohibited confidential items could find their way very readily into the agenda, and notices of motion can often be quite detailed and touch on confidential items. I notice that there are no similar exemptions as appear for proceedings and minutes of councils in relation to the agenda and notices of motion. I believe that that could cause some concern to council in the execution of its business. I seek an assurance from the Minister that he will give some consideration to the difficulties that might arise in relation to this clause.

The Hon. G.F. KENEALLY: I referred to this in the second reading explanation. I can give an undertaking to the Committee that the Government intends to ensure that the legislation from this House will be for the benefit and the betterment not only of local government but also the people whom local government serves. I listened closely to what the member for Light had to say previously and here again in Committee, and I am aware of the concerns of the member for Elizabeth. I am prepared to have a closer look at those concerns that have been expressed. I shall have my departmental officers examine the points raised by the two members. I would like to discuss those matters with the Local Government Association and also with those within my own Party.

I want to see this legislation pass this House now. If as a result of those discussions it is considered that amendments should be made I give an undertaking that they will be moved by my colleague in another place. So, the members for Light and Elizabeth can be assured that discussions with them will take place within the next couple of days in relation to their concerns about clause 7 so that if need be amendments can be made. At this stage I do not want to give any indication of what my position as Minister would be. I think that will be best determined as a result of discussions, because some new elements have been introduced into the debate; I was not aware of them, although perhaps my officers have been. I hope that honourable members will accept that undertaking: if it is necessary amendments will be moved by the Government in another place.

Clause passed.

Clause 8—'Meetings of council committees.'

Mr M.J. EVANS: I raise a small point but it is one that I would like the Minister to take on board in the same vein as he has expressed in relation to the previous clause. I refer to subclause (5) which provides:

The Chief Executive Officer shall, at the request of two members of a council committee, call a special meeting of the committee.

It is normal practice in local government for the Chairman of the committee, and indeed the Chairman or Mayor of a council, to have the power himself to call special meetings of the committee. It would only be the case that two members of the committee could exercise their right in relation to that if the Chairman failed or refused to call the meeting. I believe that to keep it consistent with the normal practice of local government in relation to councils the power of the Chairman to call a special meeting of the committee should be noted in that provision so that it would then provide that the Chairman, or failing that, two members of the committee may call a special meeting of the committee. I would appreciate it if the Minister could give consideration to that proposal in the same way as he has indicated that he is prepared to do in relation to other matters that were raised.

The Hon. G.F. KENEALLY: I appreciate the honourable member's desire for consistency between the council itself and the council committees. I give an undertaking that this

provision will be looked at while we are reviewing the legislation during its passage from here to another place.

Clause passed.

Clause 9 passed.

Clause 10—'Chief executive officer.'

Mr M.J. EVANS: I refer to subclause (4) *(c)*, which provides for the appointment of an acting Chief Executive Officer when the Chief Executive Officer is not available to discharge his duties. I notice that the clause proposes that the Mayor or Chairman or any three or more members of a council may appoint someone to act in that office. It could be the case that the Mayor or Chairman of a council might make one appointment and three members of the council could simultaneously appoint a different person. I realise that that is unlikely, but in this sensitive matter, the appointment of an acting Chief Executive Officer, I believe that a hierarchy of appointment should exist and that only if the Mayor or Chairman fails to make an appointment should the power be exercised by three or more members of the council.

I certainly believe that the Bill provides sufficient standby provisions for someone to act in the office of Mayor if the Mayor is not available. It would be preferable to have the authority to appoint an acting Chief Executive Officer, and because of its importance it would be useful to have that authority vested in the chief elected person of the council rather than simultaneously with three or more separate members of a council.

The Hon. G.F. KENEALLY: This provision is for very small councils. As the member for Elizabeth will appreciate, many councils in South Australia have only one executive officer and do not have back-up staff. In such cases there are relieving Town Clerks who move around the State and act for councils which are in that position. I can see the point made by the honourable member: it could be addressed in paragraph *(c)* if it was changed to read, 'A suitable person shall be appointed by the Mayor or Chairman or in his absence by any three or more members of the council to act in the office.' I take the point made by the honourable member and I give the same undertaking that I have given on two previous occasions: I will discuss the matter with my Department, the Local Government Association and my Party. Personally, I see no reason why the amendment cannot be made. However, on the other hand, before giving any clear undertaking, I would like to enter into the discussion procedure that I have described.

Clause passed.

Clause 11 passed.

Clause 12—'Entitlement to vote.'

The Hon. B.C. EASTICK: My question makes use of this clause because it refers to the voters roll, which will be the vital instrument for the holding of elections. Having regard to the difficulties associated with the roll identified during the recent Federal election and because the local government roll has been prepared in the same area by the same authority, has the Minister been able to obtain a clear assurance that, in relation to the first set of elections on 3 May, that authority will have the ability to provide an adequate and proper roll for local government?

Members will know from material that has been distributed to their electorate offices that the roll for the recent Federal election closed some time earlier than it was deemed to have closed and that supplementary material has since been distributed to electorate offices dealing with the balance of people who were deemed to have been duly enrolled by the correct time. This is not a matter that specifically relates to this clause, unless in the time between the transmission of the Bill between this Chamber and another place members of the Minister's staff identify that the roll material which we expect to use satisfactorily for local government will not adequately cater for local government. In that case I believe we should seek some variation or some supplementary arrangement to reduce to an absolute minimum any difficulties which arise from the central authority's inability to provide up-to-date and effective roll material.

The Hon. G.F. KENEALLY: The honourable member raised a very critical matter. I am happy to say that the Chief Electoral Officer has given us the assurance, as mentioned by the honourable member, that the rolls will be available. I will read into *Hansard* some dates that I have here. For the 3 May election nominations are to be invited by 14 March and that is the first day on which nominations can be lodged. Nominations close on 4 April and the rolls close on 14 March. The Electoral Commissioner has undertaken to provide details of House of Assembly electors by 28 March and the rolls are to be available by 4 April. That is the situation as I have been advised. I see no reason why those timetables cannot be met but, in response to the honourable member's question, I will have those dates confirmed and he will be provided with the information.

Clause passed.

New clauses.

The Hon. B.C. EASTICK: I move:

Page 4, after line 20—Insert new clauses as follows:

12a. Section 100 of the principal Act is amended—

(a) by striking out the word 'or' after paragraph *(a)* subsection (1);

(b) by inserting after paragraph *(b)* of subsection (1) the following word and paragraph:

or

(c) where the method of counting votes applying at the election is the method set out in section 121 (4a)—by placing the number 1 in the square opposite the name of the candidate for whom he votes as his first preference and by continuing his votes for all the remaining candidates by placing consecutive numbers beginning with the number 2 in the squares opposite their names in the order of his preference for them;

and

(c) by inserting after subsection (1) the following subsection:

(1a) Where the method of counting votes applying at the election is the method set out in section 121 (4a) and a voter has indicated preferences for all candidates except one, it shall be presumed that that candidate is the one least preferred by the voter and that the voter has accordingly indicated his preferences for all candidates.

Page 4, after line 23—Insert new clauses as follows:

13a. Section 121 of the principal Act is amended—

(a) by inserting after subsection (4) the following subsection:

(4a) Where the council has so determined under section 122, the returning officer shall, with the assistance of any other electoral officers who may be present, and in the presence of any scrutineers who may be present, conduct the counting of the votes according to the following method:

(a) in relation to the first vacancy to be filled—

(i) if the candidate who has received the largest number of ballot papers in his parcel has received an absolute majority of votes, the returning officer shall make a provisional declaration that the candidate has been elected;

(ii) if no candidate has received an absolute majority of votes, the returning officer shall exclude from the count the candidate who has the fewest ballot papers in his parcel and place each ballot paper that was in his parcel in the parcel of the candidate next in order of the voter's preference;

(iii) if a candidate then has an absolute majority of votes, the returning officer shall make a

provisional declaration that the candidate has been elected, but if no candidate then has an absolute majority of votes, the process of excluding the candidate who has the fewest ballot papers in his parcel and counting each of his ballot papers to the continuing candidate next in order of the voter's preference shall be repeated by the returning officer until one candidate has received an absolute majority of votes;

(iv) when a candidate receives an absolute majority of votes, the returning officer shall make a provisional declaration that the candidate has been elected;

(b) in relation to the second vacancy to be filled—

(i) the returning officer shall rearrange all the ballot papers under the names of the respective candidates in the same manner as they were arranged in subsection (2) *(g)*, except that each ballot paper on which a first preference for an elected candidate is indicated shall be placed in the parcel of the candidate next in order of the voter's preference;

(ii) the returning officer shall then count the ballot papers in the parcel of each candidate;

(iii) if a candidate then has an absolute majority of votes, the returning officer shall make a provisional declaration that the candidate has been elected, but if no candidate then has an absolute majority of votes, the process referred to in subparagraphs (ii) and (iii) of paragraph *(a)* shall be repeated until a candidate has received an absolute majority of votes, except in those subparagraphs any reference to first preference votes shall be read as a reference to all votes counted to a candidate in pursuance of the paragraph;

(iv) when a candidate receives an absolute majority of votes, the returning officer shall make a provisional declaration that the candidate has been elected;

(c) further vacancies shall be filled one by one in the manner provided in paragraph *(b)* as regards the filling of the second vacancy, except that a ballot paper on which a first preference for any elected candidate is marked shall be placed in the parcel of the continuing candidate next in order of the voter's preference;

(d) in an election where there is only one vacancy to be filled the candidate to be elected shall be determined in the manner provided in paragraph *(a)* for filling a first vacancy;

(e) if during the process of counting two or more candidates have an equal number of ballot papers in their parcels and one of them has to be excluded from the count the returning officer shall in the presence of any scrutineers who may be present, draw lots to determine which of the candidates is to be excluded;

(b) by striking out from subsection (5) the passage 'subsection (3) or (4)' and substituting the passage 'subsection (3), (4) or (4a)';

(c) by inserting after subsection (6) the following subsection;

(6a) in subsection (4a), a reference to an absolute majority of votes means a greater number than one half of the whole number of unrejected ballot papers that are being counted;

and

(d) by striking out from subsection (7) the passage 'subsection (3) or (4),' and substituting the passage 'subsection (3), (4) or (4a),'.

13b Section 122 of the principal Act is amended—

(a) by striking out subsection (1) and substituting the following subsection:

(1) Subject to this section, a council may determine that the method of counting votes to apply at elections for the council shall be—

(a) the method set out in section 121 (3) rather than a method set out in section 121 (4) or 121 (4a);

(b) the method set out in section 121 (4) rather than a method set out in section (3) or 121 (4a);

or

(c) the method set out in section 121 (4a) rather than a method set out in section 121 (3) or 121 (4);

and

(b) by striking out paragraph *(a)* of subsection (3) and substituting the following paragraph:

(a) a council may make a determination before the close of nominations for the periodical elections for the council to be held on the first Saturday of May in 1985, but any subsequent determination may be made only within the period of two months following the conclusion of any periodical elections for the council;.

In essence, this amendment is a test clause for all the amendments that I seek to insert, including new clauses 13a and 13b which embrace sections 100, 121 and 122 of the current Act. Mr Chairman, with your concurrence and that of the Committee I would like to believe that all that material could be inserted as part of the debate at this stage, because it is pertinent to the subject matter.

The CHAIRMAN: We can allow it, but we cannot allow the honourable member to move the other amendments. However, the Committee can allow the honourable member to canvass these amendments.

The Hon. B.C. EASTICK: With the total of that material recorded, we now enter into a general debate on voting procedures as they apply to local government. There is no wish on the Opposition's part to interfere with or in any way alter the decision of the House in May 1984. It is agreed that the decision of the conference of managers on that occasion saw fit to offer two options: one was the Government's optional preferential bottoms up voting system and the second, inserted following the conference of managers, was a proportional representation scheme available to those councils that do not have wards.

There seems to be a difference of opinion on whether there are four or five of those councils; it is a very small number. However, that is by the way. I am aware that the Minister will in due course seek to perhaps alter the criteria relative to one of those two options that are currently available. However, following the representations that the Opposition—and I believe the Government, independent members, and others throughout the community—have had from the local government scene, there is grave concern that the two options are insufficient to provide (in the minds of a number of people) an adequate voting procedure. I stop short of saying 'the one that is most favoured by each individual' because we would have pages and pages.

A number of combinations have been suggested: for example, individual aldermanic vacancies in each council that has an aldermanic vacancy. If there are six of them, there are six individual elections for those six aldermen. The Opposition cannot and does not accept that that proposal is worthy of consideration. I am not saying that we do not

accept the right of the individuals to put it forward as a proposal, but we do not believe that it is a form of voting that eventually would be in the interests of local government.

An option ought to be made available to local government to exercise. That system is not, as was recorded in the morning press today, a 'winner takes all' system of voting but a form of voting which means that each person who votes will play a part in the election of every person who is elected, be it for a one or two person ward election or a 10 or 12 person council election. The proposition which we put to the House, and which is a brief explanation of the four pages of amendments that we have here, is that the election of the first person in the electorate, be it a ward, council, aldermanic or mayoral electorate (although that is a 'one person only' winnable position), will be precisely as is provided for in the Labor Party's optional preferential bottoms-up voting system.

The variation, however, is that, after a successful candidate has been elected with 50 per cent plus one of the votes or more, as the case may be, one will return to a first preference pile for each of the candidates, including the person who has won the first elected position. The person who is elected as the first candidate will then have those votes standing in his name as first preferences distributed to the second preferences of those who have supported him. They will pass on to the remaining persons in the ballot, and one will then revert to the bottoms-up voting system as applies elsewhere: that is, the person with the least number of augmented first votes will be eliminated, and one will move up until the next position is determined by a 50 per cent plus one parcel of votes. If one is moving to a third or fourth position, one does it in precisely the same way.

The statement has been, could be and, no doubt, will be made that the proposition that the Opposition puts to the House will lead to Party voting or ticketing voting. I do not believe, from the discussions that I have had with a number of others, that that will necessarily be the case, any more than, for example, the Labor Party does at present in a number of areas.

I believe that the system offered—one used previously in this State in the Legislative Council well before the 'winner takes all' system which applied during the late 1950s, 1960s and early 1970s—commends itself to a large number of scholars of voting systems. It is more appropriate for the electorates seeking to return up to three candidates than for the multiple electorates beyond three. It can be arguable as to whether three, four of five is the right figure. So far as the Opposition is concerned, it would seek to allow it to flow through for all positions, but I highlight the fact that the proportional representation scheme, which is now part of the Bill, with strictures, would appear to be a better way of determining multiple electorates—beyond three candidate electorates. Again, one could have a lengthy debate as to whether the suggestion that I make that it be three is the case or not.

Another feature that the opposition puts to the House in this amendment that differs from the proposal currently existing is that there will be the requirement of full preferential voting by the elector. If there are six candidates it will be necessary to vote at least one to five, it being accepted that the blank position at the end truly indicates that the person did not want to support the final position and, for the purpose of voting, the person who has not received any votes at all will be taken as the candidate with the least number of votes. Their position is picked up in the voting system without difficulty, and provision for such is made in the measure I have before the House.

Of the public statements that have been made on this issue (and they have been quite voluminous over the period from last September, hotting up during late October, coming to the fore in December and running through to January 1985), one of the most compelling letters to the Editor during that time—one widely commented upon by people in local government—was the statement made by the Mayor of Millicent wherein he gave a formula for voting which he found quite obnoxious and which clearly pinpointed the fact that a person who had been a very good second councillor in an area would not necessarily be elected under the scheme currently applying even though he had all second votes; that is, he was the second most popular candidate for a contest in an electorate where two candidates were to be elected.

We could all go back to our own sphere of operation and acknowledge that a long term councillor, who had been highly regarded over very many years, would probably take out the number one position as a result of normal expectation. His number two candidate, or the person who had been the second in that ward over a long period of time but perhaps had not been there as long, was not so outward going, did not seek the limelight through having his photograph in the newspaper, but nonetheless was a solid worker, would get the number two position and could be eliminated from the contest.

I quickly point out a changed feature of the voting system to apply as from 3 May 1985; that is, instead of voting for single persons we will be voting for multiple persons—a complete new aspect of local government voting. Hitherto, one person was elected to a ward; on some very rare occasions, two persons were elected to a ward if it happened to be a three councillor ward, with two going out one year and one the following year, but a different set of circumstances is applying from this year onwards where people are going to be elected in multiples of at least two or more.

The statement to which I referred and which was presented to the *Advertiser* on 18 January 1985 by His Worship Mr E.J.F. Altschwager of Millicent is relevant and is as follows:

Much has been written about the Local Government Act, the council elections in May and the optional preferential voting system. The whole affair is a shemozzle. The lack of understanding by the State Government really shows out when it comes to counting the votes at the next local government elections. In the following exercise, where two candidates are required for a ward, the person most wanted as a councillor or alderman by the electors is the first to be defeated.

I seek leave to have the statistical material in that letter inserted in *Hansard* without my reading it.

Leave granted.

Voting Analysis

JACK:	1	1	1	1	1	3	3	3	3	3
JILL:	2	2	2	2	2	2	2	2	2	2
TOM:	3	3	3	3	3	1	4	1	4	4
MARJ:	4	4	4	4	4	4	1	4	1	1

The Hon. B.C. EASTICK: The letter continues:

Remember, two councillors are required. Under the present intended system Jill would be balloted out first and Tom out second. As Jill was voted to be a councillor by all the voters, Jill should be elected first. In my opinion there is only one fair way to elect representatives in the above example and that is to add the numbers under the respective candidates and those with the lowest numbers would be elected. The wishes of the electors are then realised. Jack and Jill would both be elected with a score of 20 each with Tom and Marj 27 and 31 respectively.

I do not accept the premise of the election method that His Worship goes on to propound, other than to say that the exercise that he put out in the statistical material is the type of problem that local government is going to be beset with if there is no change to the existing provisions of the Act. My Party and my colleagues firmly believe that the better proposition is that proposed in the amendments that I now present to the Minister.

We recognise that there may be some local governing bodies that want to try once or perhaps for ever the Government's optional preferential bottom-up voting. There may be a number of councils which do not have wards and which want to use the proportional representation or, presuming what the Minister might do shortly in regard to extending the proportional representation to be given as an option to any council, it may well be that some councils would want to use that method. A number of local governing bodies have expressed concern that even the proposition which I understand the Minister will seek to incorporate shortly would not fulfil all of their desires, all of their expectations of what the voting system should be.

So, without in any way denigrating what exists in the Bill and without seeking to prevent what the Minister might seek to do in respect of his system, I respectfully ask him to accept on behalf of the Government and therefore pass into legislation this third option so that the local governing fraternity can make their decision as to which of the three options they want to exercise for their voting system.

The Hon. G.F. KENEALLY: I should point out at the outset that the Government will not accept the amendment. I can sum up the reasons why very quickly by saying that as to determining the method of counting votes the Government has been advised by the Local Government Association and has taken that advice. I should give the Committee some little history of this matter. It is Government policy that the method of voting should be optional preferential, but the method of counting votes was a matter on which we had no policy. After discussions with local government, which urged us to introduce a system that above all prevented ticketing and political endorsement of candidates, we accepted its advice; we went to the electoral officer and asked him to devise a system that gave account to optional preferential voting and to the desire of local government that politics be kept out of local government.

It was the electoral officer who came up with the system of bottoms up: it was not a design or a plot of the Goverment. That system is one of 400 possible options, and it was the method recommended to us by the electoral officer. That method of voting was voted on at the annual meeting of local government last year and was supported. On two other occasions local government debated and voted on this issue. We decided to give this voting system a chance. I as the Minister take my advice from and have consultations with the Local Government Association, not with individual councils or with a number of councils independently that have a point of view, although I suggest that those views would be reflected through the organisation that deals directly with the Government, that is, the Local Government Association. Because the Association supported the system of bottoms up to prevent ticketing and the proposal for endorsement of candidates for local government, I took a very strong stand in relation to all the letters sent and representations made to me throughout South Australia. I said that the Government would not vary the system of counting votes but would review the results of the 3 May election to see whether the system had worked, whether there were any problems and, if there were problems, to address them.

That was my position until last Friday, when I had a discussion with the President of the Local Government Association, a gentleman for whom I have the highest regard, and I imagine that local government, and certainly State Governments, would share that view. He had been requested by a number of councils to lobby the Government to extend an option for local government in the 3 May election in regard to counting votes, and that option was to include proportional representation. The reason why proportional representation was accepted by me and the Government, albeit begrudgingly, was that the Act already contains provision for proportional representation for those councils that do not have wards.

So, it is not a new system. We are not introducing at this very late stage (a few months before the election) a totally new system. We still have the bottoms up and PR systems. I know that this matter could be debated when my amendments are moved, but I think that it is as well to have the debate now, and when those particular clauses are introduced certainly the debate will be much shorter. It was the Government's decision to allow local government the option between those two systems. Quite frankly, with great respect, I believe that this new element is too late and is very confusing, and we have an awareness programme starting in March. I really do not believe that we can accommodate another system.

In addition, I believe that two systems in itself will cause some confusion. I personally believe that three systems would be almost impossible. As Minister and for the Government, I must say that we would have preferred to stay with one system of counting votes. It is because we have been encouraged to do so by local government, to whom we have always given credence and of whose views we have taken account in so far as this matter is concerned, that we have decided to extend that option. What we will have as a result of that, if Parliament decides that that will be the method of counting votes, is two clear options. There will be a system of counting votes from the bottom up which will prevent ticketing, which will ensure that the minority views are represented in council and which will keep, on the face of it anyway, political endorsements out of local government.

I am one of those people who, frankly, do not believe that there is no politics in local government. I believe that people are political. We were all political animals in a sense, to start with, and just because one is in local government one does not neglect one's political philosophy. However, what one does not do is become party to political endorsements, which I think is quite a significant difference; so, we will have a system, on the one hand, that will allow local government to maintain its desire to keep politics out of local government, and it can opt for that system of counting votes. On the other hand, it will have the option of the PR system and, of course, ticketing if that is what local government wishes. That is an option that is available to local government.

I guess that one of the reasons why we were persuaded to go along this track was that New South Wales has an option of PR and Victoria is moving to PR, and moving away from the system that the honourable member is introducing into the debate. With great respect, I would argue that the old Legislative Council system in South Australia is a winner take all system, which has been the method of counting votes in Victoria and which has been rejected by the Victorian Government, which is now moving to PR.

Fundamentally, there are three reasons why I oppose this amendment. First, I have no charter from local government to accept it. I have not discussed it with local government. Secondly, I oppose it and the Government opposes it on principle. It is a system that we have used in Parliamentary elections over the years, and we have moved away from it. Thirdly, I believe that it is in a sense (and the member for Light has pointed out that this criticism will be made) strictly a winner take all system and will result in Party endorsements. Lastly (probably not importantly, but it is a matter of some consideration to me as Minister, the Local Government Association and my Department), we are now setting out on a campaign of awareness in South Australia to encourage people to vote for local government and to explain to them what the voting system is.

Two voting systems will be difficult enough to explain to the electorate in South Australia, which finds this whole subject complex enough, anyway. However, I believe that three systems would make matters almost impossible. They are the reasons why the Government opposes this new clause. I point out to the honourable member that after the May election, whatever system for counting votes the Parliament decides on, there will be a review of the results of that election, and it would be quite competent for the honourable member, speaking on behalf of this Party, to put to the members of the review team (whomever they might be) the opinions of the Opposition on the counting of votes. I am not prepared to accept the amendment now, but give notice to the honourable member that he or his Party will have an opportunity to recommend this system to the review team after 3 May. I ask the Committee to oppose this amendment.

The Hon. B.C EASTICK: The Minister has made two or three points that need to be taken up. The last offer he made is one that any responsible Opposition would accept. However, it will not be possible to adequately determine the effectiveness of the alternative scheme with a system of optional preferential voting when one will not be able to go through an exercise involving the votes lodged in selecting councils to determine how the third alternative method would line up result-wise or otherwise. However, that is a technicality. I point out that it is not possible for there to be a critical and effective review of the relative merits of the systems because of the scheme that the Minister claims that he will enforce. Whether or not that will be the case after the matter has been to another place is something that is yet to be determined. The second matter involves a suggestion by the Minister that local government wants optional preferential voting and has voted for that.

The Hon. G.F. Keneally: They voted to give it a try.

The Hon. B.C. EASTICK: They voted to give it a try, but continued to remark when discussing this issue, as they did at the recent quarterly consultation on 24 January 1985, that what they sought was what the Opposition sought to gain for them, a first-past-the-post voting system. I indicated on behalf of the Opposition after that argument had been lost that we could not go back to that system and that there needed to be a promotion of a fairer system than the one that the Government proposed, which was the bottoms-up optional preferential voting system that will become part of the review later on.

Let us not get away from the fact that the Local Government Association promoted, and continued to promote until the last moment, first-past-the-post voting. In fact, letters from Mr Ross, President of the Local Government Association and the letters that came from Mrs Crome as the former President of the Local Government Association, all pressed that Association's desire for first-past-the-post voting. The Minister claims that he heeds what local government says and provides only that which it wants. However, he is hoist on his own petard in relation to that issue and other issues not the least of them being the register of interests, which is now part of the Local Government Act.

That apart, let us go back to what the Local Government Association said to the Minister and others after the quarterly consultation. The Minister, in saying that he has heeded the requirements of the Local Government Association in what he is now prepared to accept into his Bill, is heeding only part of or one of the alternatives that was put to him by the Local Government Association, because the special meeting of the Association moved:

That this meeting calls upon the State Executive to approach the Government requesting a change in the system of voting and putting forward the alternatives of the system promoted by the City of Adelaide where each vacancy could be declared a separate election or proportional representation.

The Minister has accepted one of the two but quite clearly, as the Association has made clear, it cannot speak positively on behalf of its members of one system being better than the other. They were prepared at that meeting to accept two alternatives. The matter is not clear cut and the Government has only met part of the requirements of the Local Government Association in what it is seeking to do at present.

The material which I present to the Committee has been discussed with the Local Government Association, not as fully as had been expected, because of the deployment of individuals associated with the Local Government Association and members in this Committee tonight. There has been a discussion. I am not suggesting that it was a commitment by the Association that what we were seeking to do was precisely what they would have wanted, but they appreciated the information given to them and were not unduly surprised to find that it was not as had been promoted elsewhere, indeed, as has been suggested as the winner-take-all system.

This debate undoubtedly will go on because the Liberal Party will see that it goes on in the forthcoming State election, because local government practitioners are asking for an alternative to what the Government has said it is prepared to give them. Whether we like it or not, many people deployed in local government are unable to find a direct voice through the Local Government Association on every matter on every occasion. That is not being critical of the Local Government Association; it is a fact of life that with 125 councils it is not always possible to reflect that area of opinion in a directive. There may well be a consensus of opinion or a majority opinion, but it may be a changing opinion, as we have found.

The Minister has reacted to a change in opinion because, as he said, 'Only a few days ago there was no way' that he was going to shift from where he is at the moment. However, he will shift because he has felt the wind of that changing opinion within local Government itself, and that is quite obvious from the set of amendments which we will discuss in a minute.

I am disappointed that the Government does not accept the challenge which is provided—not a challenge in a sense that it is a fly-by-night situation; it is a challenge which is an alternative which is acceptable to a large number of people within local government. It has been tried and found to be satisfactory. To say that it is changing so far as Victoria is concerned, so did the State Government change its political colour at the last election in Victoria and therefore it is seeking to undertake certain changes which are part and parcel of a Party platform. That Party platform figured heavily in the debate which saw the first rewrite of the Local Government Act. We will not go into the political aspects; they have been canvassed previously. The Minister would well know that certain aspects of the Act as it exists at the moment are not satisfactory to local government. If we are not going to have this particular provision in the Local Government Act for the 3 May election, certainly it will be a matter which will continue to be canvassed and that is an expectation of many people in local government.

Mr MATHWIN: I would have thought that the Minister would have given us some explanation of how he will carry out the assessment. What a poor excuse the Minister put up tonight: we are going to see how it goes, and then we will change it. The member for Light asked how the Minister was going to do it. The Minister did not move off his seat to give us an idea of how it will be done. The Committee deserves an explanation of how the Minister will do it. The Minister said earlier that he takes notice of the voice of

local government. I suggest, with due respect, that he has taken no notice at all of local government.

The Minister will find out, to his detriment, and he will burn his fingers if he starts interfering too much in local government. Previous Ministers have burnt themselves pretty badly by interfering too deeply in local government, against its wishes. If the Minister does not believe that, he can have a word or two with a previous Local Government Minister, Geoff Virgo, who burnt himself pretty badly during his earlier term. The present Minister, who was relieved of his duties in other areas to get on to this quiet area of local government, with no experience in it, which is well seen by what he is trying to do tonight in this Bill—

Mr Ferguson: You are better picking out raffles.

Mr MATHWIN: Do not worry about that, because if I won a prize like you I would put you straight back in the box.

Members interjecting:

The CHAIRMAN: Order! I point out to the honourable member for Glenelg that the Chair was following this debate until he got up. I suggest that he now comes back to the new clause.

Mr MATHWIN: I support the member for Light in relation to the great problems he pointed out, and the Minister has not even tried to explain how he is going to get over it. It was a simple question, and the Minister did not budge from his seat to try to answer it. The Committee deserves an answer.

The Hon. G.F. KENEALLY: Quite simply, the Government will have available to it all of the voting in local government in South Australia. We will have available to us all the preferential voting that takes place and we will be able to see whether or not the most preferred candidates are elected. If they are not, obviously there is a failure with the system. We are confident that that will not be the case. It is a fairly lengthy procedure, but simple. It is the same sort of procedure that is being undertaken by the Federal Government concerning the last Federal election, when there was a lot of informal voting. It is looking at the voting for the Senate and the House of Representatives and will be able to determine how those preferences were placed and whether or not people were disfranchised, if you wish, because of the system. We will be able to determine that, although it will be a fairly lengthy process.

The Committee divided on the new clause:

Ayes (21)—Mrs Adamson, Messrs Allison, P.B. Arnold, Ashenden, Baker, Becker, D.C. Brown, Chapman, Eastick (teller), S.G. Evans, Goldsworthy, Gunn, Ingerson, Lewis, Mathwin, Meier, Olsen, Oswald, Rodda, Wilson, and Wotton.

Noes (23)—Mr Abbott, Mrs Appleby, Messrs L.M.F. Arnold, Bannon, Crafter, M.J. Evans, Ferguson, Gregory, Groom, Hamilton, Hemmings, Hopgood, Keneally (teller), and Klunder, Ms Lenehan, Messrs McRae, Mayes, Payne, Plunkett, Slater, Trainer, Whitten, and Wright.

Pairs—Aye—Mr Blacker. No—Mr Peterson.

Majority of 2 for the Noes.

New clause thus negatived.

Clause 13 passed.

The Hon. B.C. EASTICK: I do not intend to proceed with the other amendments standing in my name. The first amendment was the test one.

New clause 13a—'Council may determine method of counting at elections.'

The Hon. G.F. KENEALLY: I move:

Page 4, after line 23—Insert new clause as follows:

13a. Section 122 of the principal Act is amended—

(a) by striking out subsection (2); and

(b) by striking out paragraph *(a)* of subsection (3) and substituting the following paragraph:

(a) a council may make a determination before the close of nominations for the periodical elections for the council to be held on the first Saturday of May in 1985, but any subsequent determination may be made only within the period of two months following the conclusion of any periodical elections for the council;.

The intent of this new clause is to provide for all local governments in South Australia the option to decide whether they should have the 'bottom up' system of counting or proportional representation. If the Parliament agrees with this proposal the result will be that there will be a need to change the timing for which a council may make a determination that it seeks to have either the 'bottom up' system or the proportional representation system. Section 122 (3) *(a)* presently provides that:

The determination may be made only within the period of two months following the commencement of this section or following the conclusion of any periodical elections for the council.

Of course an amendment is required so that councils can decide before the May election which of the two options they wish to take. I point out that nominations close on 2 April. I have canvassed the reasons why the Government has moved to extend the option to local government. I do not believe that I need go through that again, unless it is as a response to questions from members.

The Hon. B.C. EASTICK: The Opposition supports the Minister's proposal, which is an improvement on what presently exists, albeit that we believe there should be other improvements. However, for the time being that decision has been reached against our judgment. As I indicated earlier, it is interesting to note how quickly the winds of change have come upon the Minister. I am quite sure that the local government fraternity will appreciate not what the Government alone is doing but what Parliament as a whole is doing in accepting this measure. If no other changes are effected to the Bill (and I expect them to be made in due course), it will be interesting to see just how many councils elect to take a course of action which will be much better for the communities that they serve than the straight optional preferential bottoms-up voting system.

New clause inserted.

Clauses 14 to 43 passed.

Clause 44—'Passing of by-laws.'

The Hon. B.C. EASTICK: I take this opportunity to seek an assurance from the Minister that there will be dialogue between his Department, the Road Traffic Board and the Minister responsible for the Board so that the changed circumstances which are to apply will be effectively beneficial to the community. It is the one area that was consistent in the returns that I had from local government and from executive officers of a fear, not an accusation, that it may be a breakdown point—desirable as they could see the change that has been made—but an area for subsequent difficulty. Would it mean an effective delay in the delivery of a service which would not be to the benefit of the community? I ask the Minister to take on board that situation and ensure that local government will really be able to deliver on behalf of its community.

The Hon. G.F. KENEALLY: Yes, I will certainly take on board the honourable member's comments. This is one of the clauses that we will consider during the passage of the legislation into another place, and I am sure that my officers will contact the honourable member in that examination. However, a number of options could be available to us in relation to this clause. I am aware now of the matters raised by the honourable member and, of course, of the concern of local government to ensure that there is consultation rather than the Road Traffic Board making decisions that could have a Draconian effect in relation to other decisions made by elected officers in local government. As I am not

prepared to go any further until I have had those consultations, I give an undertaking that they will take place and that the honourable member will be involved in them.

Clause passed.

Remaining clauses (45 to 48) and title passed.

Bill read a third time and passed.

ADJOURNMENT

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

That the House do now adjourn.

The Hon. P.B. ARNOLD (Chaffey): The Bureau of Agricultural Economics predicts a further decline in the profitability of the fruitgrowing industry. It is little wonder when we consider that in South Australia we have the highest water rate charges in Australia and the highest Government electricity charges in Australia for the horticultural industries. I indicate to the House the difficulties with which the industry is confronted because of the situation that has been created not only by the South Australian Government but also by the Federal Government.

The South Australian Government is taking out of the Electricity Trust by way of tax some $42 million this financial year. That is made up of $25 million, which involves a 5 per cent tax on turnover, $12 million resulting from higher interest rates because the State Government has increased the rate of interest on ETSA loans and a further $5 million that ETSA must pay to the South Australian Government in the form of royalties on gas used in the generation of electricity.

In an endeavour to relieve the situation the Murray Citrus Growers Co-op Association has put a proposal to the Electricity Trust of South Australia. In brief, it amounts to this: the concessional electricity charges off-peak tariff from 9 p.m. on Friday to 7 a.m. on Monday, that the night rates should start at 8 p.m. during daylight saving periods, and that special tariffs apply to those in agricultural production pursuits.

This proposal has been put to the Electricity Trust of South Australia for its consideration. I certainly hope and trust that the proposal will be accepted. However, that is only a contribution that the Trust could make to the fruitgrowing industries in South Australia to try and relieve the position with which they are confronted.

The real crux of the problem is that some $42 million is being taken out of the Electricity Trust by the Government, and naturally the Trust has to produce $42 million in revenue and profit before it can start to look at a breakeven point. Naturally, that $42 million has to be passed on to the consumer and, since the irrigators in South Australia are among the major consumers of power in this State, the burden on the fruitgrowing industry has increased dramatically.

The Murray Citrus Growers Association has done a comparison between South Australia and the Eastern States. It is interesting to note that in the four samples taken of average fruit properties in the Riverland the State Government charge for electricity in the first example was $1 361; for a like situation in the Murrumbidgee County Council it was $986; in the Murray River County Council it was $1 106; and in the State Electricity Commission of Victoria for a like situation it was $1 167. So, it is obvious that the South Australian irrigators are certainly paying more for electricity than their counterparts in the Eastern States.

Three other examples are contained in a statistical chart that has been prepared. I seek leave to have it incorporated in *Hansard.*

Leave granted.

ELECTRICITY USED FOR HORTICULTURE
COMPARISON OF CHARGES FOUR AREAS
E. & W.S. SUPPLIED BLOCKS

Sample Blocks 1983-84	ETSA (N) (1)	Murrumbidgee County Council (2)	Murray River County Council (3)	State Electricity Commission of Victoria (4)	Non-ETSA Average
CHAPPLE one	1 361	986	1 106	1 167	1 086
CHAPPLE two	637	474	504	584	521
WEBSTER one	1 006	760	873	829	820
WEBSTER two	700	536	602	618	585

NOTE (N) (1) ETSA figures are actual charges for four average size blocks in the Riverland supplied with E. & W.S. water. N.B. ETSA night rate available for 10 hours × 7 days.

(2) MCC—Murrumbidgee County Council supplies MIA horticultural area. Concessional rates available 9 hours × 5 nights + weekends 48 hours. Above calculated charge adjusted to take extra hours into account.

(3) MRCC—Murray River County Council supplies NSW side of Sunraysia area. Concessional rates available 8 hours × 5 nights + 48 hours. Above calculated figure adjusted accordingly.

(4) SECV—State Electricity Commission of Victoria supplies Victorian Sunraysia area.Concessional night rate available for 8 hours. Figures adjusted.

The Hon. P.B. ARNOLD: The situation exists not only whereby South Australia has the highest water rates and electricity charges, but in the fruitgrowing industry we are also confronted with the recent impost in the last Federal Budget of a sales tax of 10 per cent on the wine industry and, at the same time, a significant reduction was made in the duty on imported wines. This has resulted since the last Federal Budget in an increase in imported wine into Australia of some 29 per cent. That will be reflected in a significant reduction in the sales of Australian-produced wine.

The same thing is occurring in relation to brandy. The French Government has once again dumped significant quantities of brandy in Australia and the Federal Government is doing little about it. Brandy is being landed in Australia, heavily subsidised by the French Government, at a price that represents only about 50 per cent of the production cost in Australia. Yet, France is a relatively high

cost structured country equivalent to Australia, and we have brandy being landed here at 50 per cent of what a winery in South Australia can produce it for from its own grapes. Obviously this is an impossible situation: it cannot occur. For the Federal Government to allow that to continue is an absolute disgrace!

Moving on to the dried fruit industry, I point out that the Federal Government is again allowing fruit from the EEC to be dumped in Australia with a massive $800 a tonne subsidy, which is being applied to the dried sultanas being produced in Greece and with an end price being paid to the Australian grower of something like $750.

Any person who believes for an instant that the Australian industry can compete with that sort of subsidy is being totally illogical. If the State Government is not prepared to stand up and fight for the fruit growing industry in South Australia, the likelihood of growers in the Riverland being able to meet the demands placed upon them for payment of water rates by the Minister of Water Resources becomes even more remote. I do not argue with the fact that the E&WS Department and the State Government are not a banking resource but, by the same token, the situation that has developed, whereby a number of growers over the past 40 or 50 years have fallen into arrears with the payment of their water rates, is something that cannot be reversed overnight. Undoubtedly the problem has to be addressed, but it will take four or five years, particularly under the present economic circumstances in the industry, for the matter to be resolved.

As long as the Government of South Australia continues to increase water rates, has the highest water rates in Australia along with the highest electricity charges, does not fight the Federal Government when it comes to allowing wine, brandy and dried fruits to be dumped in Australia, as well as threatening to cut off the water supplied to producers in the Riverland, the situation can only worsen. It is unrealistic for the Government to make demands on the growers and try to reverse the situation that has been allowed to develop over the last 40 or 50 years.

The Hon. R.G. Payne interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order!

The Hon. P.B. ARNOLD: It is about time Ministers opposite got up to the Riverland and learnt something about the problems of that area.

The Hon. R.G. Payne interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order!

The Hon. P.B. ARNOLD: The Riverland has been totally abandoned by this Government: that is well known by every grower and resident in that part of South Australia.

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

Mr FERGUSON: Mr Speaker, I draw your attention to the state of the House.

A quorum having been formed:

CLASSIFICATION OF PUBLICATIONS ACT AMENDMENT BILL

The Hon. D.J. HOPGOOD (Minister for Environment and Planning): I move:

That Standing Orders be so far suspended as to enable the conference on the Bill to continue during the adjournment of the House.

Motion carried.

ADJOURNMENT

Debate on motion to adjourn resumed.

Mr FERGUSON (Henley Beach): In this grievance debate I wish to refer once more to a matter to which I have referred several times in the Parliament, that is, the need for the appointment of a strata titles adjudicator. During the Parliamentary recess I have more than once received several complaints from people who are having difficulties with the strata title company with which they are a part. Unfortunately, their only redress to the problem that they may have at any point in time is to take the matter to the Supreme Court when agreement cannot be reached with the other strata title partners.

I am aware that the Act provides for annual general meetings and special meetings where grievances of any nature whatsoever can be aired. But, the problem is quite often, in the first instance, that a meeting has to be called. I know of several instances within my electorate where strata title companies have not been running properly and to my knowledge have never called an annual general meeting.

This is strictly against the provisions of the Statutes Amendment Property Act of 1980 and the Real Property Act, 1886-1978. As I have stated previously, the problem relates to the fact that in order to rectify the situation where an unsatisfactory set of circumstances is occurring and the occupants of a strata title company can only do this by reference to the Supreme Court.

As soon as one starts talking about reference to the Supreme Court we are immediately talking costs, we are immediately talking about legal representation and all the associated costs that go with it from time to time. In addition, between strata title owners there would be an immediate worsening of relations when a matter, which is sometimes fairly trivial, must be adjudicated in the Supreme Court.

Many of the residents of the strata title units in my electorate are elderly. They have sold their own properties quite often within the electorate elsewhere and have taken a unit because of the necessity to reduce the maintenance on their own homes, which are usually bigger homes, to reduce the size of the garden and to move into a smaller amount of living space which in itself, of course, cuts down the amount of work they have to do. Quite often they are on their own and a large proportion of these people are widows. It is usually the case that their only source of income is social security payments and, therefore, putting aside money for legal representation and for legal action is not the sort of thing that they are prepared to do. In fact, some of these people are living in uncomfortable circumstances or they may not even be uncomfortable circumstances: it may involve just some niggling little problem that could be easily settled by way of the introduction of an arbitrator, and they then would not have to put up with the sort of discomfiture that they are now experiencing.

I have had the satisfaction of receiving correspondence from the Attorney-General, who has assured me that the Office of the Attorney-General and the Office of Corporate Affairs are well aware of the problems that I have alluded to, and the Lands Department has made representations to both these offices along the lines that I am now making to Parliament. They are aware of the situation and agree that something ought to be done. I present this matter to the House, of course, for the same reason that most Parliamentarians do, that is, to see whether I can be of assistance in bringing this matter to resolution. The letter I received from the Attorney-General dated 12 November 1984 states:

I refer to your letter of 24 October 1984 concerning an inquiry received by you on behalf of a constituent—

the constituent is then named—

regarding the appointment of an arbitrator for strata title units. I advise that Cabinet has approved in principle the appointment of a strata titles commissioner for strata title unit owners subject to the Public Service Board and Treasury assessments of resources and cost implications. I am unable at this stage to give any firm indication as to when the proposal for the appointment of a strata title commissioner might be implemented.

C.J. Sumner, Attorney-General.

In effect the argument for the appointment of a strata titles commissioner has been won, but it is now necessary to convince the Public Service Board and Treasury that, after consideration of the assessment of resources and cost implications, the matter ought to be rectified. Some of the problems of which I have been informed in relation to the strata title situation relate to simple things, such as the fact that one water meter was installed to supply two strata units when subdivision actually took place. No doubt when the arrangements were first made for strata titles the significance of excess water was very minimal indeed. But, due to the arrangements for charging for water made by two Government, the significance of excess water has become a deeper consideration.

We are now in a situation where arguments are occurring about who is using how much water. When the accounts for excess water are received the arguments between unit holders take place. This matter is so trivial that to have to refer it to the Supreme Court is nothing short of ludicrous. This situation, I believe, should never occur; one water meter should be available for each unit. This is where an arbitrator would be invaluable, because eventually all the problems that are now occurring (and I have mentioned just this one at this point in time) would be overcome by suggesting to the arbitrator changes to legislation. The various legislation that governs the building and maintenance of these units must be amended so that such problems will be eliminated. I am fully aware that anyone can apply for an additional meter on a property through the E & WS Department, but again we are talking about additional costs, and additional costs are something about which someone who is receiving social service payments as the only means of income is very conscious.

Many of these arguments could be avoided if the strata title unit problems were looked at in the first instance before the titles were granted. I lay no blame on the Lands Department. The Lands Department is absolutely inundated with problems such as this from time to time and I know that, in fact, its function was never to settle disputes in the strata titles arena. I have referred in the past to other problems that have occurred in the strata title area, one of them relating to the arguments that occur regarding the maintenance of strata title units. Quite often, strata title companies do not put aside money on a regular basis to provide for the maintenance that must eventually occur, and when it is carried out from time to time levies are struck in order to provide the money required. Often, especially in an area where no care is taken in relation to this maintenance, maintenance and repairs quite often involve a rather large account. In this area of provision for maintenance there must be a more business like approach from some of the strata title companies.

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

Mr BAKER (Mitcham): Before I use my time, I would like to respond to two items that have been raised tonight. One is the strata title legislation, and I am forever amazed at the statements made by the member for Henley Beach. He is a member of the so-called Government team that is cracking at the seams, yet he seems to be bitching a lot about the things that his Government has not achieved, and I would have thought that he would be wiser to whisper in the ear of the Attorney-General and convince him otherwise.

As far as electricity charges are concerned, I am sure that we could all do with a public inquiry into the excess expenditure involved in the relocation of Leigh Creek and I am sure that the Minister would be quite dismayed at the enormous debt that has accumulated as a result of that relocation and some of the bad decisions that have resulted from it.

Getting on to the subject of my little dissertation tonight, I wish to raise a matter that probably other members on both sides of the House encountered in the last Federal election, resulting from changes in the Commonwealth Electoral Act. Let me explain it to the House. Certain establishments were declared establishments for the purposes of the Federal election, just as they are in the State election. When they are declared establishments there are provisions under the new Electoral Act which prevent entry of people with electoral material into those establishments. I am not sure how many members on the other side of the House received complaints from people in nursing homes and residential care, but I certainly received a large number.

I make it a policy to visit nursing homes in my electorate at least twice a year and when I visited them at Christmas time a number of elderly residents raised with me what they believed was their disfranchisement as a result of the changes to the Electoral Act. Anyone who has ever been involved with nursing homes will know that there are some people in those places who value their vote very highly. There are many people who are infirm, but others have a great deal of regard for and look forward to election time.

The Hon. R.G. Payne interjecting:

Mr BAKER: I am speaking about the elderly, and I know that we had legislation regarding the ageing before this House earlier this session, and some very wise pronouncements were made from the other side of the House about our need to care for the aged in our community. On other occasions various statements have been made about democracy, the right of people to vote, and one vote one value. A great deal of importance has been placed on democracy as we see it in Australia today, yet the one fundamental right that is available to these people and the thing that they do appreciate assistance with is their right to vote and to be able to vote in the fashion that they so determine.

It has been my policy in the past, as I have said, to visit nursing homes, and where assistance has been needed—example, someone might say, 'I want to vote Liberal' or 'I want to vote Labor. How do I do it?'—I have assisted people before and since I have been elected to Parliament in this process.

Mr Trainer: But not as a candidate, I hope.

Mr BAKER: Not as a candidate.

Mr Trainer: Because you would have been in breach of the Electoral Act.

The SPEAKER: Order! There are too many interjections.

Mr BAKER: People wish to express their opinion and they need a little help, and everyone here should recognise that. Under the Federal Act no person has the right to enter that establishment and distribute electoral material.

Under that Act the most that one can do is put the material involved in the matron's hands, or in the hands of the person in charge of the establishment. It is up to that person's discretion as to whether or not that material is made available to these people. We have had a few problems with this system because the material was put in places where the people concerned could not find it. Electoral officials came through several of my establishments early and did not have any material in their hands. We had arranged for everyone in those homes and hostels to have a how to vote card from our Party. I am sure that the people

on the other side did the same thing on behalf of their Party. There is nothing untoward about that. These people have a right to make a decision and to have the appropriate information before them to do so.

In this case, that right has been removed. The reason I now raise this issue is that we have been informed by the Attorney General that we are to consider changes to the Electoral Act. I am not sure whether or not the Attorney-General will follow the Commonwealth's lead in this matter or whether there will be a whole range of nursing homes or other establishments declared before the next State election. However, I draw to the attention of members the fact that if the same procedures operate at that election as operated in December 1984 the same problem will arise as arose then.

I believe that we owe it to the elderly members of our community to provide as much assistance as possible so that they can fulfil their wishes and desires. In the case of an election the process is simple: we can place material in their hands and allow the matron or a friend to assist them when the time comes. One of the interesting things about the Electoral Act was that many of the officials who visited these homes broke the law because they had to do it. When they found someone who did not know how to vote and who said, 'I want to vote Liberal' or 'I want to vote Labor', and asked how to do it, although a friend can be asked to assist in this matter with the permission of a prescribed officer there is no allowance in the Bill for an electoral officer to do this. There are a number of anomalies that have arisen as a result of that experience.

This is a small matter, so I have raised it during this grievance debate. However, it is an important facet of living for these people. As I said at the beginning of my speech, a number of people are quite upset that they are being treated less humanly than people with their full faculties who can walk to a polling booth. I need not tell members of this House that these people have rights and a need to be treated with dignity. I believe that we can give more thought to this simple matter of the conduct of elections in South Australia thereby preventing some of the problems that arose during the last Federal election recurring in this State.

Motion carried.

At 9.59 p.m. the House adjourned until Wednesday 13 February at 2 p.m.

HOUSE OF ASSEMBLY

Tuesday 12 February 1985

QUESTIONS ON NOTICE

CEP FUNDING

84. **The Hon. JENNIFER ADAMSON** (on notice) asked the Minister of Labour:

1. What are the eligibility criteria for CEP funding?

2. Who are the members of the Federal/State secretariat administering the plan in South Australia?

3. Who are the project officers?

4. Who are the members of the South Australian consultative committee?

5. What was the date of the application for a CEP grant by the Storemen and Packers Union and in whose name was it made?

6. What was the nature of the assessment made by the committee of the application?

7. Was a site inspection made to assess the application and, if so, on what date(s) and by whom was the inspection made and, if it was made by a committee, who were the members?

8. Of the projects listed in Appendix 2 to the answer to Question on Notice No. 254 in *Hansard* of 6 December 1983, which have been the subject of application for a CEP grant, which, if any, have been given a grant and what was the value of the grant in each case?

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

1. Eligibility criteria for the Community Employment Programme are detailed in the publication *Guidelines for Project Sponsors*. Due to the size and format of the booklet it is not considered appropriate for printing in *Hansard*. A copy will be provided to the Parliamentary Library for use by members.

2. *(a) State Officers*

Mr W. Bean	Mr A. Bruno
Ms A. Bohlmann	Mr T. Moore
Mr P. Callahan	Mr V. Gelzinis
Ms A. Cuthbert	Ms A. Mahomet
Ms C. Moir	Ms J. Andrews
Mr O. Wolfe	Ms S. Schultz
Mr G. Loizi	Ms J. Vivian
Ms P. Hurley	Ms H. Payne
Ms N. Brown	

(b) Commonwealth Officers

The request for details relating to Commonwealth officers should be referred to the Commonwealth Minister for Employment and Industrial Relations.

3. *(a) State Project Officers*

Ms A. Bolhmann
Mr P. Callahan
Ms C. Moir
Mr O. Wolfe
Mr G. Loizi
Ms P. Hurley
Ms N. Brown

(b) Commonwealth Project Officers

Refer 2 *(b)* above.

4.

Organisation	*Member*	*Deputy*
Department of Labour (Chair)	P. Bentley	A. Dangerfield
Department of Employment and Industrial Relations	T. Rowe	P. Jeffries
Chamber of Commerce	L. Miller	K. Harrison
United Trades and Labor Council	A. Begg	D. Trenouth
Workers Women's Centre	S. Key	L. Batsiokis
Youth Affairs Council of S.A.	K. Smith	D. James
Local Government Association of S.A.	C. Maher	L. Nowak
National Aboriginal Conference	G. Wilson	
South Australian Council of Social Services	J. Grealy	G. Walker
Department of the Premier and Cabinet Womens Advisory Unit (Non Voting)	C. Treloar	C. Byrt
Department of Local Government (Non Voting)	B. Coates	

5. The revised final application considered by the Committee was dated 16.4.84 and was signed by G. Apap for and on behalf of the Storeman and Packers Union.

6. The application was assessed against criteria established for all CEP applications and detailed in the publication *Guidelines for Project Sponsors* (refer 1 above).

7. The site was inspected on 6 May 1984. It is not considered appropriate to identify individual officer(s) who in the course of their duties undertake inspections in respect of project proposals which are in any case subject to subsequent examination by the CEP Consultative Committee and consideration by the South Australian Minister of Labour and the State delegate of the Federal Minister for Employment and Industrial Relations.

8. As the project description given in Appendix 2 to the answer to Question on Notice No. 254, (*Hansard* 6.12.83) are brief it has not been possible to determine conclusively which have been subject of a CEP application. Those projects that have been identified as being the subject of an application for funds under either the Wage Pause Programme or the Community Employment Programme have been included on Appendix 1.

APPENDIX 1

Wage Pause Program *Sponsor*	*Project Title*	*Status*
DC Berri	Marine Boat Haven, Final Stage Development	deferred
DC Burra	Paxton Square Cottages Conservation and Adaptation	app'd $151 423
DC Kadina	Wallaroo Mines Upgrading	app'd $13 200
DC Paringa	Develop Paringa Reserves	app'd $47 030

Community Employment Program *Sponsor*	*Project Title*	*Status*
Coober Pedy Progress and Mines Association	Coober Pedy Water Supply	app'd $1 126 464
CC Glenelg	Tourist Information Centre and Public Toilets	app'd $72 500
DC Hawker	Hawker Caravan Park extensions	pending
DC Lacepede	Develop Maria Creek—Dredging	app'd $22 920
CC Mount Gambier	Lady Nelson Park Development	pending
CC Mount Remarkable	Port Germein foreshore development	app'd $22 829
DC Robe	Redevelop Sea-Vu Caravan Park	pending
DC Yankalilla	Normanville Caravan Park Development	app'd $511 098
DC Tatiara	Tourist Information Bay—Keith	app'd $8 300

SOUTH AUSTRALIAN MARKETING

97. **The Hon. JENNIFER ADAMSON** (on notice) asked the Minister of Tourism:

1. What sums were allocated by the Department of Tourism for marketing South Australia in each of the years 1982-83 to 1984-85 in New Zealand, Singapore, United Kingdom, Japan, West Coast of the United States, Melbourne, Sydney, Perth and South Australia, respectively?

2. What have been the visitor numbers from each of those markets (where available) in each of the relevant years?

3. What is the average daily expenditure of visitors from each market?

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

1. The amounts listed below constitute actual expenditure for the past two financial years along with the Budget allocation for 1984-85.

	1982-83	1983-84	1984-85
New Zealand	112 588	128 165	110 000
South East Asia	9 447	24 785	50 000
UK and Europe	39 190	37 160	70 000
Japan	—	60 228	108 500
North America	3 401	22 076	60 000
Victoria	352 111	298 181	470 000
NSW	2 184	298 053	355 000
WA	7 623	5 849	40 000
South Australia	109 918	207 555	182 000

2. The latest data card released by the Australian Tourist Commission includes comparative information on arrivals in Australia for each of the past three calendar years as follows:

	1981	1982	1983
USA	113 964	125 985	140 000
Asia	108 363	122 493	132 700
Japan	53 699	60 389	71 800
Canada	30 948	32 447	33 000
New Zealand	284 372	233 256	225 000
United Kingdom	145 957	177 782	152 700
Europe	120 158	122 562	115 400
Other countries	79 266	79 760	73 300
	936 727	954 674	943 900

It is not possible to provide a year-by-year comparison of those visitors to Australia who spent some time in South Australia.

The Australian Tourist Commission Data Card reveals the following percentages of overseas visitors in 1983 spent some time in South Australia:

USA	13.4%
Asia	7.7%
Japan	13.8%
Canada	28.1%
New Zealand	10.1%
UK and Ireland	19.0%
Europe	23.2%
Other countries	14.1%

3. Average daily visitor expenditure information is only available for 1982-83.

	$
New Zealand	36
South East Asia	43
United Kingdom	20
Japan	78
North America	57

INTERNATIONAL AIR TERMINAL CONGESTION

101. **The Hon. JENNIFER ADAMSON** (on notice) asked the Minister of Tourism:

1. Is the Minister aware of the congestion which occurs at the Adelaide international air terminal when inbound and outbound visitors are forced into queues and, if so, has he made representation to the Federal Minister requesting relocation of doorways and the pedestrian crossing to overcome it?

2. Is the Minister aware that there is chaos when the terminal is in use and that there are inadequate sitting and litter collection facilities and, if so, will he make representations to the Federal Minister to overcome these defects?

3. Is the Minister aware of long delays at check-in points and will he make representation to the Federal Minister to overcome such delays?

4. Is the Minister aware that there is inadequate provision of concrete aprons which severely inconveniences the efficient loading and unloading of cargo and, if so, will he make representation to the Federal Minister to overcome this deficiency?

5. Is the Minister aware that there is a need for a retail outlet enabling the sale of South Australian products at the terminal and will he make the necessary representations to ensure that such an outlet is established?

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

1. Congestion is known to occur at times. Investigations are currently under way to see whether there is anything that can be done to alleviate this problem, by relocating doorways.

2. There are adequate seating and litter collection facilities at the airport for normal crowd conditions. However, there are occasions when large numbers of visitors are present, taxing these facilities to their limit.

Two cleaning staff are in attendance in the terminal building during flight times and this is considered adequate by the Department of Aviation.

3. I am not aware of any abnormal delays at check-in points. As an indication it is aimed to process each passenger in two minutes at all Australian ports and this is generally achieved at Adelaide.

4. I understand there were difficulties experienced in the early days of the terminal's operation, but these have now been resolved.

5. It is understood that the high cost of staffing an outlet, compared with the hours the outlet would be open, have influenced the decision by private operators not to take up such an option. However, whilst it is unlikely that an outlet can be established unless it can be demonstrated that it will be economically viable, the Government will continue in its attempt to seek an appropriate operator.

RED LIGHT CAMERAS

144. **The Hon. D.C. BROWN** (on notice) asked the Minister of Transport:

1. What will be the specific locations of the red light cameras?

2. How many cameras are being purchased and at what cost?

3. What will be the length of the trial period for these cameras?

4. Will people be prosecuted during the trial period if they breach the law and are detected by a camera?

The Hon. R.K. ABBOTT: The replies are as follows:

1. No decision has been made regarding specific locations.

2. No decision has been made regarding purchase of camera equipment.

3. The trial period was for three months and concluded on 17 January 1985.

4. Traffic infringement notices were issued during the trial period and, in the event of failure to expiate the notice in any particular case, the driver concerned may be prosecuted in accordance with normal procedure.

HIGHWAYS DEPARTMENT WORKERS COMPENSATION

148. **The Hon. D.C. BROWN** (on notice) asked the Minister of Transport: What has been the cost of workers compensation in the Highways Department for each of the past four years?

The Hon. R.K. ABBOTT: The reply is as follows:

	$
1980-81	858 071.06
1981-82	1 047 235.64
1982-83	1 256 648.57
1983-84	1 334 086.20

YATALA LABOUR PRISON

162. **The Hon. D.C. WOTTON** (on notice) asked the Minister of Tourism representing the Minister of Correctional Services: Has a person been delegated the responsibility of assisting staff at Yatala Labour Prison affected by stress and, if so, what does this responsibility entail and how many members of staff, including officers, are being assisted by this person?

The Hon. G.F. KENEALLY: The Department of Correctional Services has appointed an officer on a temporary basis to advise and support all departmental managers of the department (not only Yatala Labour Prison) on matters of occupational health, safety and welfare. This not only involves matters of stress, but also includes workers compensation, rehabilitation of injured workers, loss and accident prevention. As at 22 November 1984, there were 12 officers on workers compensation due to stress. There are five officers who have been placed in alternative employment to assist in their rehabilitation.

HOUSING REGULATIONS

170. **The Hon. D.C. WOTTON** (on notice) asked the Minister for Environment and Planning: Is it the intention of the Government to introduce regulations which will enable councils to have more control in the type of houses being built in fire prone areas of the Adelaide Hills and, if so, when?

The Hon. D.J. HOPGOOD: Presently, the development of houses in the Adelaide Hills fire prone area, which covers part or the whole of 17 council areas, is subject to planning consent in all but two councils. In these two councils, areas of some classes of dwellings are permitted uses. Where council can process dwelling applications as consent proposals they already have the opportunity to impose conditions on approvals. These conditions can include measures which seek to reduce the impact of bushfire on houses and the occupants.

The Adelaide Hills Fire Prone Area Supplementary Development Plan now being prepared will focus attention on special policies relating to development in fire prone areas. Some policies exist in a few council areas. The SDP will ensure that more detailed policies apply on a regional basis. It is the Government's desire to ensure all councils with fire prone areas will have the means to control the siting, lay-out, building design, construction and materials of dwellings in the Adelaide Hills fire prone area. This will be done by amending the Development Plan rather than a regulatory amendment.

Hazard zone designation within the fire prone area is almost complete. The Supplementary Development Plan policies relative to hazard zones are presently being drafted. The policies will provide guidance for those seeking to develop in fire prone areas. Councils, as planning authorities, will be able to assess an application against the policies before determining the application. In some instances the assessment will be rigorous. At this stage, it is anticipated the SDP will go on public exhibition in the first half of 1985 and be in effect before the fire season towards the latter part of 1985.

REGISTRATION OF FIREARMS

171. **Mr ASHENDEN** (on notice) asked the Minister of Emergency Services: Further to the question asked by the member for Morphett in Estimates Committee B on 25 September 1984, what is the number of crimes that have

been solved as a result of the introduction of registration of firearms?

The Hon. J.D. WRIGHT: The Commissioner of Police has advised that it is not possible to advise the number of crimes which have been solved as a result of the introduction of firearms legislation unless a manual search is undertaken of all crime-related reports compiled since the introduction of the current firearms legislation. It is considered that the time and cost involved cannot be justified.

GRAND PRIX

184. **Mr BECKER** (on notice) asked the Premier: What are the estimated numbers of short and long-term jobs, respectively, that will be created by Adelaide's hosting the Formula One Grand Prix?

The Hon. J.C. BANNON: The following are the preliminary and conservative estimates of the number of full-time and temporary jobs associated with the conduct of the Australian Formula One Grand Prix:

*Total** Employment Impact*

	Full	Part	Total
1985	350	600	950
1986	150	600	750

**Includes secondary (multiplier) effects.

INSTANT CASH LOTTERIES

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

1. How many tickets are printed and sold in each series of instant cash lotteries?

2. How many tickets are there in each series with a prize value of $25 000, $1 000, $100, $25, $5 and $2, and what is the number of free tickets?

3. How many unclaimed prizes are there in each series, and what effort was made to contact prize winners in the past two series?

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

1. Five million tickets, comprising five lots of one million tickets, are printed and sold in each series of instant cash lotteries.

2. The number and value of prizes may vary in each series. However, the total value of prizes is fixed at $610 000 for each lot. Listed hereunder are the numbers of prize-winning tickets in the current game 'Money chaser':

Prize Value	Number of Winning tickets
Free tickets	100 000
$2	100 000
$5	24 000
$25	2 600
$100	250
$1 000	25
$25 000	3
	226 878

3. The following prizes remain unclaimed in each series (a major prize is one with a value of $50 or upwards):

Lucky 7's	Minor	92 302
	Major	13
Cash in a Flash	Minor	12 736
	Major	14
Double Luck	Minor	20 850
	Major	156
Joker's Wild	Minor	43 233
	Major	110
Double Up	Minor	41 193
	Major	30
Treble Three	Minor	23 179
	Major	62

All lotteries have 'bearer tickets' which must be presented to claim a prize. The names and addresses of participants are not available to the Commission. However, posters and brochures are freely available in each series to make the public aware of how prizes are won.

HERITAGE LOANS AND GRANTS

208. **Mr BECKER** (on notice) asked the Minister for Environment and Planning:

1. How many applications for heritage loans and restoration grants were received in the past 12 months, and what was the total amount of financial assistance sought?

2. How many applications were approved, and what was the total amount of funds provided?

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

1. Seventeen written applications for heritage loans and restoration grants have been received in the Department of Environment and Planning in the past 12 months. The total amount of assistance sought was $1 230 500.

2. Eight applications totalling $170 000 in loans and grants have been approved.

KARIDIS PROJECT

214. **Mr BECKER** (on notice) asked the Minister of Tourism:

1. What has happened to the 'Karidis' Disney-type project planned for Marineland Park, West Beach?

2. What was the estimated cost of the project?

3. Did the Government offer any assistance for the project; if not, why not and, if so, to what extent?

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

1. The period of option given to the Karidis Corporation for the development of a theme park expired on 31 May 1984.

2. Estimates given at various times by the Karidis Corporation on the cost of the project varied between $11 million and $20 million.

3. The Karidis Corporation was formally advised that the Government was prepared to consider assistance and incentives to the project. However, the development has not reached a position where land tenure can be resolved; nor has a final and full feasibility study been undertaken by the Karidis Corporation. Therefore, the Government is unable to consider appropriate incentives and other assistance.

MARINELAND BOAT RAMP

216. **Mr BECKER** (on notice) asked the Minister of Local Government:

1. When was the boat ramp adjacent to Marineland at West Beach destroyed, and why?

2. What was the original cost of building the ramp?

3. Will a replacement ramp be built at Marineland, West Beach and, if not, why not?

4. What improved boat launching facilities will be provided to members of Holdfast Bay Yacht Club Inc., in particular, for rescue craft and, if none, why not?

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

1. The boat ramp at Holdfast Bay was removed in September 1984. The ramp was removed because it had been damaged by storms and was considered dangerous.

2. The original ramp was built in 1973 at a cost of $10 000.

3 and 4. No replacement ramp will be built at Holdfast Bay. The area is unsuitable for boat ramps, as a result of the construction of the Glenelg groyne and the rip-rap from North Glenelg to West Beach Trust which has dramatically lowered sand levels on the beach.

MARIJUANA

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

1. How many persons were apprehended for growing, possession of and selling marijuana, respectively, in the year 1983-84, and how do these statistics compare with the previous year?

2. What is the estimated value of marijuana seized in the year 1983-84?

3. How many persons were convicted for growing, possessing and selling marijuana, respectively, in the year 1983-84?

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

1. *(a)* There were 503 persons apprehended in 1983-84 for cultivating Indian hemp; in 1982-83, 255 were apprehended—an increase of 97.3 per cent.

(b) There were 3 803 persons apprehended in 1983-84 for possession of Indian hemp; in 1982-83, 2 775 were apprehended—an increase of 37 per cent.

(c) There were 320 persons apprehended in 1983-84 for selling Indian hemp; in 1982-83, 244 were apprehended—an increase of 31.1 per cent.

Note: *(b)* and *(c)*—these totals include both Indian hemp and hashish.

2. An overall valuation of the marijuana seized in any single year cannot be provided. In some individual cases where a large volume of drugs is seized an estimated value is provided for the benefit of the relevant court. No overall tally is maintained and in any case the Police Department prefers not to publicise profits which may be made from illegal drug trafficking.

3. Statistics relating to court results are not maintained by the Police Department. These figures are collated by the Office of Crime Statistics, Attorney-General's Department. The Director of the Office of Crime Statistics advises that the figures for 1983-84 are not yet available.

HISTORIC SHIPWRECKS ACT

236. **The Hon. D.C. WOTTON** (on notice) asked the Minister for Environment and Planning:

1. Who is currently given the responsibility of carrying out the work of inspectors under the Historic Shipwrecks Act?

2. How many reports from these inspectors have been received by the Department of Environment and Planning?

3. How many prosecutions have been carried out following complaints of damage being caused to or people found in the vicinity of shipwrecks in restricted areas?

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

1. At present, 17 officers from the Department of Environment and Planning; 31 from the Department of Fisheries, and 30 from the Department of Marine and Harbors have been appointed inspectors. In addition, police officers are automatically declared inspectors.

2. The Department of Environment and Planning has received a number of reports that various inspectors have warned people that they are, or could be, committing an offence under the Historic Shipwrecks Act, 1981. In these cases, officers from my Department have followed up the report with a warning letter to the people concerned. A further two reports have been received from Fisheries Department inspectors that seven people have been caught committing an offence under the Act on a particular site. These reports will be investigated and may proceed to prosecutions.

3. There have been no prosecutions under either the Commonwealth or the South Australian Historic Shipwrecks Act. In fact, there have been no prosecutions under any historic shipwrecks legislation in Australia, and some States have had legislation in force since 1973.

MARITIME ARCHAEOLOGY SECTION

238. **The Hon. D.C. WOTTON** (on notice) asked the Minister for Environment and Planning:

1. What expenditure has been involved in providing the following:

(a) facility at Netley to house the Maritime Archaeology Section;

(b) the boat recently acquired to assist in this work;

(c) the shed to house the boat; and

(d) a vehicle needed to tow the boat?

2. What action has been taken to provide an appropriate staffing infrastructure needed to make effective utilisation of the assets allocated to maritime archaeology?

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

1. *(a)* about $50 000.

(b) The boat including its electronic equipment, $60 000.

(c) Nil.

(d) The vehicle has not yet been delivered.

2. At present, two temporary staff members are employed in the programme, the funding coming from the Community Employment Programme. Utilising these two officers and staff of the Department of Environment and Planning who are available to assist with the marine archaeology programme, effective use can be made of the allocated resources.

TEACHERS LONG SERVICE LEAVE

250. **The Hon. MICHAEL WILSON** (on notice) asked the Minister of Education: Has the Minister decided that:

(a) no applications for teacher long service leave for less than one term will be granted in 1985; and

(b) no applications for change of leave status will be accepted for budgetary reasons, and, if so, when and with whom did the Minister consult before making the decisions and will many teachers be disadvantaged by the sudden implementation of new guidelines for short-term long service leave?

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

(a) Teachers whose applications are for less than one term were asked to indicate whether there were special circumstances which should be taken into account. As a result, 19 398 calendar days have been approved for applications of less than one term out of a total of 125 119 calendar days approved.

(b) It must be said that there is no sudden change in the guidelines. Teachers seek short periods of leave, during the school year, for many reasons, but mainly for compas-

sionate ones. A judgment must be made about the urgency of the need, the effect on the school's curriculum and the ability of the Education Department to find replacement teachers. The South Australian Institute of Teachers has brought the matter of long service leave before the Industrial Commission. Two voluntary conferences have been held and further meetings will be held. Cabinet has considered the matter and allowance will be made in the 1985-86 Budget for an increase in approvals for the last half of 1985 and the first half of 1986.

SOLAR PERGOLAS

255. **Mr BECKER** (on notice) asked the Minister of Community Welfare representing the Minister of Consumer Affairs:

1. Has the Consumer Affairs Division received any complaints concerning 'solar pergolas' and, if so, how many and of what nature and what action, if any, was taken to resolve them?

2. Were most of the complaints against any one particular supplier and, if so, whom?

The Hon. G.J. CRAFTER: The replies are as follows:

1. Records of the Consumer Affairs Division show that nine complaints were received concerning 'solar pergolas' between March and December 1983. Six complaints concerned faulty materials or erection problems, and the remaining three involved a contractural dispute over a price variation, non-completion of a contract, and one instance of non-delivery of materials. All of the above complaints were investigated and resolved by conciliation. In the six instances of defective work, the firm agreed and subsequently carried out the required remedial work. A compromise offer was made in the instance of the contractural complaint, in the matter involving non-completion the contract was cancelled and the consumer permitted to retain materials, and in the third matter the materials were delivered.

2. All of the above complaints were against D.L Timber Supplies. 'Solar pergola' was a trade description applied to the firm's product which by virtue of its design allowed sunlight to penetrate in winter but provided shade in summer months.

256. **Mr BECKER** (on notice) asked the Minister of Mines and Energy: Did the Energy Information Centre evaluate the effectiveness of the 'solar pergola' and, if not, why not and what other testing and technical information was obtained by the centre before displaying a sample and, if none, why not?

The Hon. R.G. PAYNE: Late in 1982 the Energy Information Centre (EIC) was approached by D. L. Timber Supplies for assistance with the design of a pergola which, by the angle of its battens, would provide summer shade but allow winter sun to penetrate. Using sun-angle charts and the solar angle simulator, EIC staff assisted D. L. Timber Supplies to determine the best angle and spacing of battens of a pergola when added to the north side of a house. Advice was also given on the appropriate angles and spacing if the pergola was added to the east or west side of a house.

A full-scale version of the solar pergola was displayed at the Energy Information Centre from November 1982 for six months for interested inquirers. A scale model was also used with the model house and solar angle simulator to demonstrate the amount of summer shade and winter sun due to the angled battens. In keeping with its policy of unbiased information EIC staff discussed the effectiveness of the solar pergola with visitors as part only of giving advice on appropriate shading devices. I would point out that there are many other products displayed at the EIC which have been provided by private companies and which are used to illustrate particular principles concerned with the way in which energy can be used more efficiently.

OMBUDSMAN'S REPORT

258. **Mr BECKER** (on notice) asked the Minister for Environment and Planning: What action has the Minister taken to ensure such incidents as referred to in the Ombudsman's Report, 1983-84, on pages 42 and 43 will not happen again?

The Hon. D.J. HOPGOOD: The incident referred to by the Ombudsman is an isolated case and arose due to an unfortunate misunderstanding by a demolition contractor. Strict adherence to the existing policy of no demolition prior to a signed contract and production of a certificate of insurance should prevent any further occurrence.

POTATO BOARD

262. **Mr BECKER** (on notice) asked the Minister of Education representing the Minister of Agriculture:

1. Who are the members of the Potato Board and—
   (a) when were they appointed;
   (b) who do they represent;
   (c) what are their terms of appointment; and
   (d) what remuneration and expenses do they receive?

2. What visits interstate or overseas did members take on behalf of the Board in the year ended 30 June 1984 and what was the cost of each visit?

3. How many Board meetings were held in the year ended 30 June 1984 and how does the number compare with the previous two years?

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

1. Mr George Robert Muir—Appointed 1 March 1980—Chairman

Mr Arthur Frank Bradshaw—Appointed 1 July 1967—Retail Representative

Mr Douglas Paul Schirripa—Appointed 1 July 1978—Merchant Representative

Mr Robert Cannizzaro—Appointed 1 July 1981—Merchant Representative

Mr Terry John Buckley—Appointed 1 July 1983—Grower Representative District 1 (South-East)

Mr Geoffrey Leonard Hodge—Appointed 1 July 1970—Grower Representative District 2 (Southern Hills)

Mr David Charles Henry Paschke—Appointed 1 July 1975—Grower Representative District 3 (Northern Hills)

Mr Brian Robert Braendler—Appointed 1 July 1974—Grower Representative District 4 (Central Hills)

Mr Brian Francis Clark—Appointed 1 July 1978—Grower Representative District 5 (Adelaide Plains and Early Districts).

Board members are selected for a term of four years (if a member retires from the Board prior to the completion of the four years, a new Board member is appointed to complete that particular term).

Since 1 July 1984, the Chairman of the Board receives $4 100 (Board fees) plus an expense allowance of $800 annually. All other Board members receive $1 725 (Board fees) and an expense allowance of $500 annually. Recoverable expenses (mileage) are also paid (where applicable).

2. No members have made overseas trips at the Board's expense. The Chairman has visited Sydney to attend the Federal Potato Co-ordinating Committee in March 1984, at the cost of a business air fare. Other costs including travelling

and accommodation were paid for personally by the Chairman at no cost to the Board.

3. 1 July 1981 to 30 June 1982

Board Meetings	12
Executive Meetings	11
Special Board Meetings	2
1 July 1982 to 30 June 1983	
Board Meetings	12
Executive Meetings	9
Special Board Meetings	3
1 July 1983 to 30 June 1984	
Board Meetings	12
Executive Meetings	3
Special Meetings	—

POTATOES

263. **Mr BECKER** (on notice) asked the Minister of Education representing the Minister of Agriculture:

1. Have South Australian potatoes described as 'a heap of garbage' on page 25 of the Ombudsman's Report, 1983-84, been sold interstate and, if so, when, why, what quantity, for what price and to whom?

2. Were any complaints received from interstate purchasers and, if so, what are the details?

3. What effect did such poor quality potatoes have on subsequent interstate markets?

4. Have poor quality potatoes been disposed of on interstate markets since and, if so, why?

5. What action will be taken to prevent a repetition?

The Hon. LYNN ARNOLD: The replies are as follows: Deliveries of potatoes from the South-East of the State were not as high a standard as anticipated as a greater percentage of special grade as distinct from premium grade potatoes were produced by growers due to seasonal conditions. This is a question of grading standard and does not reflect the wholesomeness of the product.

The comment, 'a heap of garbage', reflects an exasperation that the sought after premium grade was in short supply adding to market difficulties. South Australian potatoes are regarded as being the highest grade standard in the Commonwealth.

264. **Mr BECKER** (on notice) asked the Minister of Education representing the Minister of Agriculture:

1. On how many occasions have potato growers been disadvantaged because of 'overpayments' made from potato pools by the Potato Board particularly during January and February 1982 and at other times from the year 1979-80 to date and what are the details?

2. Were any discrepancies of the various potato pools since the year 1979-80 'made up' from the McCain fund and, if so, why?

3. What action has been taken by the Minister and the Board to avoid 'overpayments' in future?

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

1. No growers were financially disadvantaged under the then existing system in regard to first payments.

2. The short term loan from the McCain Contingency Fund was confined to the circumstances outlined in the Ombudsman's inquiry.

3. The financial and marketing procedures implemented since January-February 1982 have prevented a repetition of the events highlighted in the Ombudsman's Report.

TREE-PULL SCHEME

266. **Mr BECKER** (on notice) asked the Minister of Education representing the Minister of Agriculture: Did the Director-General of Agriculture instruct an officer of his Department not to discuss matters with the Ombudsman in the course of an investigation of compensation under the Commonwealth Government's tree-pull scheme and, if so, why and was such instruction unwarranted as claimed by the Ombudsman and, if so, what action has been taken by the Minister?

The Hon. LYNN ARNOLD: The Minister of Agriculture has discussed the report with the Director-General of Agriculture and considers that the matter has been satisfactorily resolved.

OMBUDSMAN'S REPORT

267. **Mr BECKER** (on notice) asked the Minister of Education representing the Minister of Agriculture:

1. What action has the Minister taken with the Director-General of Agriculture following the tabling of the Ombudsman's Report, 1983-84 and, particularly, in relation to the statements on pages 22 and 23?

2. Did the Minister in his investigation into the Ombudsman's Report find the Department of Agriculture's attitude was 'defensive, unreasonable and an attempt to fetter full and proper investigation' and, if so, what Ministerial instructions have now been issued and, if none, why not?

The Hon. LYNN ARNOLD: Refer to Question on Notice No. 266.

CONSUMER TRANSACTIONS ACT

268. **Mr BECKER** (on notice) asked the Minister of Community Welfare representing the Attorney-General:

1. Was the Commissioner for Consumer Affairs aware of a Crown Solicitor's opinion that the Consumer Transactions Act did not apply to a body corporate such as the Highways Department when bestowing his inaugural Gobbledegook Award on the Commissioner of Highways and, if so, why was the award made and, if not, why did the Commissioner not first check the legality of his actions?

2. Will the Minister ensure such an incident involving senior public servants is not repeated?

3. Does the Minister support the findings of the Ombudsman on the incident which appear on page 19 of his Report for 1983-84?

The Hon. G.J. CRAFTER: The replies are as follows:

1. The Commissioner for Consumer Affairs was aware of an opinion of the Crown Solicitor that the Consumer Transactions Act did not apply to the Commissioner of Highways. The basis of this opinion was not that the Commissioner of Highways was a body corporate, but that he was an instrumentality of the Crown. The Crown solicitor also advised the Commissioner of Highways that the conditions printed on the form of contract should be sensibly readable. The Commissioner for Consumer Affairs bestowed his Gobbledegook Award on the Commissioner of Highways (and his managing agent, R.W. Miller and Co. (S.A.) Pty Ltd) in respect of the conditions of contract for the carrying of goods on the M.V. *Troubridge* because he considered this contract to be 'the worst example of the use of unnecessarily complicated and legalistic language in a consumer transaction'. The application or otherwise of the Consumer Transactions Act is irrelevant in this context. In any event, the Commissioner did not say that this Act applied. He simply pointed out that the print size was so small that the contract 'would be unenforceable . . . when used for the purposes of a consumer contract to which the Consumer Transactions Act applies'.

2. and 3. The findings of the Ombudsman on this matter appear to have been based on a misunderstanding on his part. They are not supported by the Minister and he does not propose to take any further action.

PSYCHIATRIC PATIENTS

270. **Mr BECKER** (on notice) asked the Minister of Local Government representing the Minister of Correctional Services:

1. What special programmes, care, treatment and facilities are available for psychiatrically ill prisoners?

2. Will new improved programmes be developed as a matter of urgency following continual reporting by the Ombudsman of his concern for psychiatrically ill prisoners?

3. What other actions will the Minister take to prevent the Ombudsman saying 'I am becoming tired of raising this issue year after year' when expressing his concern for psychiatrically ill inmates in his Report for 1983-84?

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

1. The majority of health care including psychiatric care, is supplied by Hillcrest Hospital, Northfield. All metropolitan prisons are serviced by full time medical officers and rural institutions receive medical services from local general practitioners. All medical officers are able to refer prisoners believed to be psychiatrically disturbed to the Director, Security Hospital, Northfield. The Security Hospital is located in the Yatala Labour Prison complex. The Director will arrange for all referred prisoners to be examined by psychiatrists and, if appropriate, admitted to the Security Hospital, Northfield. Within the hospital, prisoners are able to be observed by psychiatric staff supplied by Hillcrest Hospital and medication provided. Some occupational therapy programmes are also offered within the Security Hospital.

2. The remarks in the Ombudsman's Annual Report for 1983-84 were aimed at a particular subsection of disturbed prisoners. Prisoners such as the Mr X referred to by the Ombudsman are not regarded as psychiatrically disturbed by the Director, Security Hospital, Northfield. Therefore, admission to a facility such as the Security Hospital, Northfield, is not viewed as appropriate. Prisoners, such as the Mr X referred to by the Ombudsman, are regarded as behaviourally-disordered. At present, these prisoners have to be housed within normal prison environments. The Department of Correctional Services is endeavouring to improve the management of the behaviourally-disordered prisoner through relevant training of correctional officers. The Department also intends to devote a section of one of its prisons to the care of the behaviourally-disordered.

3. The management of the behaviourally-disordered is not only a problem for the Department of Correctional Services. The recent review of services for the behaviourally-disordered conducted by Dame Roma Mitchell was brought about through community and Governmental concern. The Department of Correctional Services has presented a submission to Dame Roma on the need for community-wide facilities for the behaviourally-disordered. Dame Roma's review will provide a basis for action to deal with the problem of the behaviourally-disordered in the general community as well as correctional institutions.

FIRST OFFENDERS

271. **Mr BECKER** (on notice) asked the Minister of Local Government representing the Minister of Correctional Services:

1. What action is being taken to implement programmes for the rehabilitation of first offenders in prisons and, if none, why not?

2. What action does the Minister propose to take following comments by the Ombudsman in his Report, 1983-84, page 12, regarding rehabilitation?

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

1. The Prisoner's Assessment Committee exists to assess newly sentenced prisoners. After consideration of reports from various sources a sentence plan is developed in consultation with the prisoners, together with plans for employment, education and other appropriate programmes. It is at this point that first offenders are identified. In general, such prisoners are moved immediately to a low security institution where they are able to participate in programmes available to low security prisoners. An offer is also made at some time near the end of sentence for the prisoner to move into a pre-release programme at the Northfield prison complex. First offenders together with all other prisoners, have access to a programme of contact visits in each institution, comprehensive employment and educational programmes and further contact with their families by means of telephone. There are social workers and psychologists located in the major institutions and longer serving prisoners have access to the pre-release programme at the Northfield prison complex.

A pilot fitness programme is being conducted at the Adelaide Gaol for prisoners on remand and a pilot programme for sex offenders will be conducted at the Port Lincoln Prison before Christmas this year. Extended hours out of cells for evening activities have been provided at Yatala Labour Prison, and programmes teams are being established in each institution in order to provide a range of therapeutic and recreational programmes for prisoners.

Activities officers have been appointed in three prisons, that is, Yatala Labour Prison, Port Augusta and Northfield prison complex to co-ordinate leisure activities for all prisoners. Special arrangements have been made to provide extended hours out of cells for prisoners at Adelaide Gaol during the daylight saving period, which is allowing for further activities to be provided for prisoners.

2. The Government is very conscious of the need for the rehabilitation of prisoners. To this end, major actions have been taken to improve the physical environment in which prisoners live by embarking upon an unprecendented programme of capital expenditure to build new facilities and renovate existing inadequate facilities.

Programmes personnel have been employed and a Social Work Unit has been established to work exclusively within institutions. These initiatives have led to the development of more relevant activities for prisoners, planning for introduction of programmes to minimise the detrimental effect of imprisonment and to prepare for the successful return of prisoners into the community is a constant task in the Department of Correctional Services.

DEPARTMENT OF CORRECTIONAL SERVICES

272. **Mr BECKER** (on notice) asked the Minister of Local Government representing the Minister of Correctional Services:

1. What action is the Minister taking to speed up replies to correspondence from the Ombudsman by the Department of Correctional Services?

2. Were there delays in correspondence with the Ombudsman towards the end of the past financial year and, if so, why?

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

1. The Department of Correctional Services has implemented new procedures relating to the processing of all correspondence and in particular those matters concerning replies to the Ombudsman. Responses are now co-ordinated by a senior officer of the Department and forwarded direct to the Ombudsman's office rather than through my office as was the procedure in the past. Every effort is being made to respond within the period of one month; however the nature and complexity of some inquiries require additional time.

2. It has been the Department's policy to reply to Ombudsman inquiries promptly. Towards the end of last financial year several delays occurred which were caused by a number of compounding internal problems. In the main the unavailability of appropriate manpower resources coupled with a total Head Office accommodation relocation and other extremely urgent departmental activities during this period led to more lengthy response times than the Department would normally expect.

TRI-CARS

277. **MR BECKER** (on notice) asked the Minister of Transport:

1. How many tri-cars are owned by Government departments or statutory authorities and for what purpose are they used?

2. How much did they cost and how frequently are they replaced?

3. How many new tri-cars are purchased each year on average?

The Hon. R.K. ABBOTT: No tri-cars are owned by the Department of Services and Supply.

YOUTH AFFAIRS COUNCIL

278. **Mr OLSEN** (on notice) asked the Minister of Labour: What submissions on issues concerning young people have been made to the Government by the Youth Affairs Council of South Australia since November 1982?

The Hon. J.D. WRIGHT: The Youth Affairs Council of South Australia has recently forwarded a detailed submission in response to the South Australian Discussion Paper on Youth Policy to the Youth Bureau, Department of Labour. The detailed submission covered the following issues of concern to young people:

employment and unemployment,
education, training and skills for living,
income arrangements,
housing and health,
youth participation,
transport, recreation, leisure,
law, road safety and road trauma,
disadvantaged youth.

This submission will be considered along with those from individuals, local government, State Government Departments and a variety of youth and community agencies in the formulation of a South Australian Government Youth Policy.

The Youth Affairs Council was asked by the Inter-departmental Working Group on Youth Policy to co-ordinate the consultation throughout the non-government sector, and to include in this process young people, youth workers and youth organisations. Submissions have been received in the Department of Labour from the Youth Affairs Council of South Australia on matters pertaining to the *Review of Youth Worker Training Scheme* and a report on the incident earlier this year at Glenelg.

Further, a submission for State Government assistance to host the 33rd Council Meeting of the National Youth Council of Australia in Adelaide in International Youth Year (which was held in January 1985) was received last year. Appropriate support was given by the Government. Finally, the Youth Affairs Council of South Australia has been an active participant in, and formulated submissions for, project activities to:

Youth Committee of Jubilee 150
Participation and Equity Programme
Migrant Youth and Ethnic Youth Services Review.

COMMONWEALTH EMPLOYMENT PROGRAMME

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

1. Is the Minister aware of the future of the Commonwealth Employment Programme and Wage Pause Programme and, if so, what are the details and, in particular, will they continue beyond 30 June 1985 and, if so, to what degree, and if not, why not?

2. How many applications have been received since 1 July 1984 for funding under either programme and what is the total amount of applications?

3. How many persons have obtained employment under the programmes?

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

1. The Wage Pause Programme was completed as at 30 June 1984 as originally proposed by the Federal Government at the time. The enabling legislation for the Community Employment Programme provides for that Programme to continue until 30 June 1986. Prior to that date a review will be undertaken as to whether it is to be continued. Total funding levels for the 1985-86 financial year are subject to Federal Government budgetary considerations and are not known at this time. However, an amount of $11.4m from the 1985/86 allocation will be forward committed this financial year.

2. 445 involving applications for grants totalling $24.76m.

3. Community Employment Programme—3 480 to end of October 1984. Wage Pause Programme—2 061 to end of June 1984.

GOVERNMENT VEHICLES

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

1. How many Government motor vehicles were involved in accidents in the year ended 30 June 1984?

2. What was the total cost of damage, what was the cost to the Government, what amounts were or are recoverable from other parties and what is the total amount not recoverable and how do these figures compare with those of the previous year?

The Hon. R.K. ABBOTT: The replies are as follows:

1. Central Government Car Pool (11.11.83-30.6.84) 49 Government Motor Garage (1982/83) 7 (1983/84) 4.

2. Central Government Car Pool—Cost to Government: Estimated $8 000.00

Government Motor Garage	1982/83	1983/84
Total cost of damage	$3782	$4338
Total cost to Government	$3578	$2226
Recoverable costs	Nil	$2112
Non-recoverable costs	$3578	$2226

PUBLIC BUILDINGS

284. **Mr BAKER** (on notice) asked the Minister of Public Works: With respect to the additional $1 400 000 allocation for urgent maintenance work on public buildings announced during October 1984, what is the source of such funds and what is the breakdown of expenditure amongst the various portfolios (including specific detail on Government primary and high schools)?

The Hon. T.H. HEMMINGS: The additional $1 400 000 allocation for urgent maintenance work on public buildings was made available from the Premier's Miscellaneous Line. The breakdown on expenditure amongst the various portfolios, including specific detail on Government primary and high schools, is as follows:

Arts		40 107
Community Welfare		18 946
Education		
Adelaide H. S.—Repair and paint	91 905	
Aldinga H. S.—Alterations to doors	2 000	
Banksia Park P. S.—Upgrade switchboard	1 500	
Blackwood H. S.—Repair and paint	46 000	
Blair Athol P. S.—Repair and paint	51 885	
Bowden-Brompton H. S.—Electrical works	5 000	
Brahma Lodge P. S.—Security lighting	6 000	
Christies H. S.—Paint fascias	5 300	
Direk P. S.—Repair and paint	6 711	
Elizabeth Community College—Repair and paint	31 160	
Elizabeth H. S.—Repair and paint	92 482	
Elizabeth Downs P. S.—Repair and paint	39 112	
Elizabeth East P. S.—Repair and paint	36 700	
Gawler H. S.—Replace electrical distrib. board	15 000	
Gepps Cross Girls H. S.—Power to activity room	8 000	
Highbury P. S.—Upgrade switchboard	4 600	
Kidman Park H. S.—Repair and paint	34 900	
Macclesfield P. S.—Renew fencing	4 500	
Mansfield Park P. S.—Repair and paint	67 000	
Marryatville H. S.—Replace electrical sub-boards	2 500	
Mawson H. S.—Sick room	5 000	
McLaren Flat P. S.—Reroof single unit	2 600	
Mitcham P. S.—Alterations to doors	5 000	
Moana P. S.—Reroof timber buildings	23 500	
Modbury H. S.—Replace switchboard and lights	6 000	
Munno Para P. S.—Repair and paint	31 214	
Nailsworth H. S.—Replace electrical submains	4 400	
Nailsworth P. S.—Replace electrical distrib. board	4 100	
Parafield Gardens H. S.—Replace electrical submains	23 000	
Port Adelaide H. S.—Computer room	20 000	
Salisbury H. S.—Replace electrical switchboard	15 000	
Salisbury East H. S.—Repair and paint	26 800	
Salisbury North P. S.—Repair and paint	17 466	
—Replace classroom wiring	3 000	
Salisbury North West P. S.—Repair and paint	31 850	
Salisbury North West J. P. S.—Security screens	2 000	
Seaton H. S.—Conversion to mastics	25 000	
Seaton H. S.—Conversion to printing	25 000	
Seaton Park P. S.—Upgrade electrical	5 000	
Sheidow Park P. S.—Paint timber-framed unit	7 500	
Smithfield P. S.—Replace electrical switchboard	2 500	
Strathalbyn H. S.—Replace electrical switchboard	11 500	
—Reroof	28 600	
Strathmont P. S.—Repair and paint	40 734	
Sturt P. S.—Repair fencing	7 500	
Torrensville P. S.—Repair and paint	45 000	
Underdale H. S.—Conversion to plastics	30 000	
Unley H. S.—Repair and paint	49 985	
Urrbrae H. S.—Replace sewer pipes	13 300	
Vermont H. S.—Replace gym floor	20 000	
Victor Harbor P. S.—Repair ceilings	12 000	
Wattle Park Technical College—Replace diffusers	2 700	
Wirreander H. S.—Repair and paint	35 000	
Woodville H. S.—Computer room	20 000	
Yankalilla A. S.—Renew fencing	11 200	
Emergency Services		41 002
Tourism		23 000

In addition, an amount of $133 000 has been allocated for general assistance for the above projects. It must be noted that the above figures represent estimates only and accordingly, as actual costs vary from the above, adjustments between the allocated funds and general recurrent funds may be required.

STA OFFICE

287. **Mr BAKER** (on notice) asked the Minister of Transport: What will be the space requirements (floor equivalent) of STA in the proposed new office block on the corner of Bank Street and North Terrace, what sections of STA will be involved and how many staff will be accommodated?

The Hon. R.K. ABBOTT: The State Transport Authority will occupy approximately 6 500 m^2 of the new building comprising office accommodation, computer suite, staff amenities and public facilities. All STA staff currently accommodated in the Adelaide Railway Station Building, approximately 350, will transfer to the new building.

HAWKER STREET BRIDGE

290. **Mr BAKER** (on notice) asked the Minister of Transport: Is it intended that the Hawker Street Bridge will be upgraded or rebuilt and, if so, when will work commence and, if not, what plans are there to overcome the traffic congestion on Torrens Road caused by the closure of the bridge and when will remedial action be taken?

The Hon. R.K. ABBOTT: The Hawker Street Bridge is to be demolished and replaced with a railway level crossing. This work is expected to commence in early 1985 and will enable traffic to again use Hawker Street.

VEHICULAR MOVEMENT

291. **Mr BAKER** (on notice) asked the Minister of Transport: Have any studies been undertaken in the past year into the likely impact of increased housing developments in the northern and southern suburbs on future vehicular movement and, if so, what were the results in terms of peak hour traffic loadings at O'Halloran Hill and Grand Junction Road?

The Hon. R.K. ABBOTT: The Department of Transport, in consultation with the Department of Environment and Planning, the Highways Department and the State Transport Authority, periodically produces projections of travel demand for metropolitan Adelaide based on population projections released by the Interdepartmental Forecasting Committee. The latest August 1984 projections produced by the Department of Transport for the period 1981 to 1996 took account of present and expected future housing development in the northern and southern sectors of the metropolitan area. The projections indicate that, by 1996, the morning peak hour traffic loadings on:

1. South Road at O'Halloran Hill could be 7 089 vehicles/hour northbound and 2 226 vehicles/hour southbound.

2. Grand Junction road (just east of intersection with Main North Road) could be 3 161 vehicles/hour westbound and 1 354 vehicles/hour eastbound.

LAKE PHILIPSON

293. **Mr GUNN** (on notice) asked the Minister of Mines and Energy:

1. Have exploration licences or permits in the Lake Philipson area been issued and, if so, to whom?

2. Have any objections been raised about exploration work in the area and, if so, by whom?

3. Does the Government support exploration in the area?

The Hon. R.G. PAYNE: The replies are as follows:

1. Yes. CRA Exploration Pty Ltd.

2. Yes. UMOONA Community Council.

3. Yes. Under the conditions which have been applied to the licence.

UNOCCUPIED PREMISES

307. **Mr BECKER** (on notice) asked the Premier: What was the amount of rent paid for unoccupied premises by departments and authorities within each portfolio under the Minister's control during the past two financial years and how long and why were the premises unoccupied in each case?

The Hon. J.C. BANNON: An area of office space on the 10th floor of the GRE building was acquired from the Department of Public and Consumer Affairs from 31 March 1982 for use in the future office requirements of the Ombudsman's Office. However, from January 1983 this area was used in conjunction with the adjacent courtroom for the Splatt Royal Commission, and was so used until the Commissioner vacated the area in June 1984. The rental payable during the 1982-83 financial year for the period when the area was unoccupied was $3 402.

The State Government Insurance Commission paid $5 975 for the remainder of lease periods where the Commission had either closed a branch or moved to new premises, as follows:

Branch	Annual Rental $	Lease Expired	Vacation Date	Rent $
St. Agnes	8 689.80	24.7.84	12.12.83	5 355
Millicent	676.08	30.9.84	27.10.83	620
				$5 975

308. **Mr BECKER** (on notice) asked the Deputy Premier: What was the amount of rent paid for unoccupied premises by departments and authorities within each portfolio under the Minister's control during the past two financial years and how long and why were the premises unoccupied in each case?

The Hon. J.D. WRIGHT: The reply is as follows:

Agency	Rent Paid	Period Unoccupied	Reasons Unoccupied
Aud-Gen.	Nil	Nil	Nil
CFS	Nil	Nil	Nil
Dept Labour	Nil	Nil	Nil
Police Dept	$413	6 weeks	Acquisition and erection of fittings.
Police Dept	$27 491	6 months	Planning, estimating, documentation and tender call, alterations and commissioning.
SAMFS	$1 600	3 weeks	To ensure tenancy agreements and for the installation of telephone equipment during the headquarters rebuilding programme.

309. **Mr BECKER** (on notice) asked the Minister of Community Welfare, representing the Attorney-General: What was the amount of rent paid for unoccupied premises by departments and authorities within each portfolio under the Minister's control during the past two financial years and how long and why were the premises unoccupied in each case?

The Hon. G.J. CRAFTER: The reply is as follows:

Ethnic Affairs Commission

1982-83	1983-84	1984-85
Nil	$867	$650

The Commission has continued to pay rent to the Public Buildings Department on a small part of a building at Berri since the Commission closed that office in November 1983. The Commission was required to continue paying rent on the vacant office space as none of the other Government tenants in the building took up the surplus accommodation.

310. **Mr BECKER** (on notice) asked the Minister for Environment and Planning: What was the amount of rent paid for unoccupied premises by departments and authorities within each portfolio under the Minister's control during the past two financial years and how long and why were the premises unoccupied in each case?

The Hon. D.J. HOPGOOD: Nil.

311. **Mr BECKER** (on notice) asked the Minister of Transport: What was the amount of rent paid for unoccupied premises by departments and authorities within each portfolio under the Minister's control during the past two finan-

cial years and how long and why were the premises unoccupied in each case?

The Hon. R.K. ABBOTT: Nil.

312. **Mr BECKER** (on notice) asked the Minister of Tourism representing the Minister of Health: What was the amount of rent paid for unoccupied premises by departments and authorities within each portfolio under the Minister's control during the past two financial years and how long and why were the premises unoccupied in each case?

The Hon. G.F. KENEALLY: Nil, with the exception of newly leased premises undergoing commissioning and already being renovated.

313. **Mr BECKER** (on notice) asked the Minister of Education: What was the amount of rent paid for unoccupied premises by departments and authorities within each portfolio under the Minister's control during the past two financial years and how long and why were the premises unoccupied in each case?

The Hon. LYNN ARNOLD: Details are as follows:

Dept/Authority	Financial Year	Accommodation Office/Housing	Amount $'000	Period of Vacancy	Reason for vacancy
Education	1982/83	Office	Nil	—	—
		Housing	*252	various	(1) Held in anticipation of occupancy.
	1983/84	Office	Nil	—	—
		Housing	*316	various	(1) Increase reflects approved rental increase approved October 1983.
TAFE	1982/83	Office	Nil	—	—
		Housing	*25	various	(1) Held in anticipation of occupancy.
	1983/84	Office	Nil	—	—
		Housing	*22	various	(1) Improvement due to increased occupancy.
KU	1982/83	Office	Nil	—	—
		Housing	*1	various	(1) KU use very few THA properties.
	1983-84	Office	1	1.4.84-30.6.84	Lease terminated as a new regional office of larger size was established. Required to pay remaining period of lease.
		Housing	*2	various	(1)
TEASA	1982-83	Office	Nil	—	—
		Housing	Nil	—	—
	1983-84	Office	Nil	—	—
		Housing	Nil	—	—
TRB	1982-83	Office	Nil	—	—
		Housing	Nil	—	—
	1983-84	Office	Nil	—	—
		Housing	Nil	—	—
SSABSA (Formerly PEB)	1982-83	Office	Nil	—	—
		Housing	Nil	—	—
	1983-84	Office	*3	February 1984	SSABSA moved to the premises at 134 Fullarton Road, Rose Park on 1 February this year. The area previously occupied by the Public Examinations Board at Elizabeth House, North Terrace, Adelaide was vacated as of that date. The February rent was required in order for the Public Buildings Department to make good the space to be handed back to the proprietor.
		Housing	Nil	—	—

*Accrual statement Auditor-General's Report payments to THA

(1) The Teacher Housing Authority and the employing education bodies have been concerned at the level vacancies and positive action has been taken to reduce the level of accommodation which, whilst not required for the housing of teachers, is retained and unoccupied.

314. **Mr BECKER** (on notice) asked the Minister of Tourism: What was the amount of rent paid for unoccupied premises by departments and authorities within each portfolio under the Minister's control during the past two financial years and how long and why were the premises unoccupied in each case?

The Hon. G.F. KENEALLY: There are no departments and authorities under my portfolios that have paid rent for unoccupied premises.

315. **Mr BECKER** (on notice) asked the Minister of Mines and Energy: What was the amount of rent paid for unoccupied premises by departments and authorities within each portfolio under the Minister's control during the past two financial years and how long and why were the premises unoccupied in each case?

The Hon. R.G. PAYNE: The Department of Mines and Energy and Amdel did not rent any premises during the past two years which were not fully occupied for the period. The Electricity Trust rents nine houses from the South Australian Housing Trust at Port Augusta under a special arrangement. These houses were vacant for periods of from 6-32 weeks pending the appointment and transfer, sometimes from interstate or overseas, of officers required for key positions at the new Northern Power Station. The total rent paid in respect of these premises for the two financial years while unoccupied was $14 880. In the period under review more houses have remained unoccupied for longer periods than is usual due to the initial staffing of the Power Station.

The Pipelines Authority of South Australia rents six houses at Peterborough on a permanent basis from the South Australian Housing Trust. Following resignation or transfer of employees over the past two years, these houses have been vacant for a combined total of 52 weeks each year while replacements have been appointed. The rent paid while the houses were unoccupied was $3 341 in 1982-83 and $3 494 in 1983-84.

316. **Mr BECKER** (on notice) asked the Minister of Community Welfare: What was the amount of rent paid for unoccupied premises by departments and authorities within each portfolio under the Minister's control during the past two financial years and how long and why were the premises unoccupied in each case?

The Hon. G.J. CRAFTER: Details are as follows:

RENT FOR UNOCCUPIED PREMISES

The amount of rent paid on behalf of this Department for the past two financial years is as follows:

1982-83	$5 721.68
1983-84	$5 705.34

The premises involved are as follows:

Southern Country Regional Office — 3 months
Murray Bridge

Leasing for these premises was secured on 1.10.83; however, the commissioning of the premises were not completed by Public Buildings Department until 12.12.83.

Far North District Office — 3 months
Coober Pedy

The original office was burnt out and the building was restored. The office space was available on 11.6.82; however, the commissioning of the premises were not completed by Public Buildings Department until 6.9.82.

Windsor Gardens Branch Office — 5 months
Windsor Gardens

The premises were available and under lease as at 1.3.83. Again, the Department had to wait for the Public Buildings Department to complete the commissioning.

Staff Flat — 4 months
51 Flinders Street, Whyalla

There were difficulties in recruiting suitable staff for the Whyalla Office and consequently there was a delay in occupancy of the flat.

DEPARTMENTAL RENT

317. **Mr BECKER** (on notice) asked the Minister of Water Resources: What was the amount of rent paid for unoccupied premises by departments and authorities within each portfolio under the Minister's control during the past two financial years and how long and why were the premises unoccupied in each case?

The Hon. J.W. SLATER: Neither the Engineering and Water Supply Department nor the Department of Recreation and Sport paid rent for unoccupied premises during the past two years.

The only Statutory Authority which did so was the South Australian Totalizator Agency Board. The details are as follows:

Premises	Rent Paid	Period Premises Unoccupied
Rostrevor	$390	2 months
Woodville	$1 056	3 months

These premises were unoccupied because the TAB resited the agencies to a more suitable location. The period the premises were unoccupied is the time left until the lease expired at the old locations.

318. **Mr BECKER** (on notice) asked the Minister of Housing and Construction: What was the amount of rent paid for unoccupied premises by departments and authorities within each portfolio under the Minister's control during the past two financial years and how long and why were the premises unoccupied in each case?

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

South Australian Housing Trust

During the past two financial years, the Trust paid out the sum of $5 681.32 for rent of unoccupied premises at 38 Waymouth Street, Adelaide. The premises were formerly occupied by the Emergency Housing Office, and the period of vacancy was from 24.2.84 to 31.7.84.

Due to a substantial increase in demand for the service provided by the Emergency Housing Office, it was recognised that the premises were inadequate. Accordingly, the Emergency Housing Office was relocated to 101 Currie Street, Adelaide. With the lease due to expire on 8.9.84, arrangements were made to seek a tenant for the balance of the lease. However, this was not achieved until 1.8.84.

Public Buildings Department

The attached schedule provides details of the amount of rent paid for unoccupied premises and the associated periods of vacancy for the past two financial years. The schedule identifies the client department for whom the accommodation was arranged by the Public Buildings Department. It should be noted that all payments relate to pre-occupation rental costs.

To obtain the reasons why these premises in individual cases were unoccupied would require an exhaustive investigation. However, the main factors which contribute to delays in occupation include the following:

(1) Because of the competitiveness of demands for accommodation, it is often necessary to commence lease payments from the desired date of completion of lease agreements and not from the date of occupation.

(2) The majority of leased accommodation requires investigation and further physical work before occupation can commence. This includes the final approval of layout requirements by clients, for example, partitions, furniture, telephones, etc.

(3) Disruption caused by injection of an accommodation project into existing programmed works.

STATEMENT OF PRE-OCCUPATION RENTAL PAID 1982-83

Building	Client Department	Area M^2	Lease Commencement	Occupation Date	Annual Rental	Pre-Occupation Rental paid 1982-83
					$	$
Port Augusta—SGIC Building	Correctional Services, Environment and Planning, Lands, Public Trustee, Public Service Board	735	8.3.82	4.10.82	61 759	15 936
Trade House—Unit 3, Solomon Street	State Electoral	45	15.3.82	1.11.82	2 496	832
Coober Pedy Shopping Plaza	Community Welfare	203	11.6.82	6.9.82	8 500 to 31.7.82 13 120 from 1.8.82	2 456
Adelaide—Rechabite Chambers	Correctional Services	350	1.7.82	6.12.82	20 267	8 717
Adelaide—SGIC Building, 7th Floor	Trade and Industry, Labour	586	1.8.82	12.10.82	54 791	10 752
Outer Harbour Terminal Building	Agriculture	12	10.8.82	16.8.82	625	8
Mile End, 117C Henley Beach Road	Police	44	23.8.82	4.10.82	3 572	413

STATEMENT OF PRE-OCCUPATION RENTAL PAID 1982-83—*continued*

Building	Client Department	Area M²	Lease Commencement	Occupation Date	Annual Rental	Pre-Occupation Rental paid 1982-83
					$	$
Murray Bridge, 6 Third Avenue	Lands	224	1.9.82	6.9.82	11 648	162
Adelaide—SGIC Building, 6th Floor	Services and Supply, Data Processing Board	988	1.9.82	27.9.82	92 378	6 672
Adelaide—Reid Building	Fisheries	121	1.9.82	1.10.82	8 486	707
Port Adelaide, 12 Todd Street	Lands	380	6.9.82	18.10.82	8 000	921
Kadina, 56 Graves Street	Electorate Office	48	13.9.82	27.9.82	3 634	131
Sydney, 113 King Street	Tourism	454	1.2.83	23.5.83	188 040	31 340
Adelaide Reserve Bank Building, Part 5th Floor	Public Service Board	83	21.2.83	1.3.83	9 969	208
Adelaide South British Insurance Building	State Electoral	233	21.2.83	7.3.83	20 055	751
Windsor Park Shopping Centre, Northeast Road, Shops 6 and 7	Community Welfare	121	1.3.83	July 1983	10 285	3 428
Adelaide—TAA Building	Public Works Standing Committee	159	15.3.83	30.3.83	14 586	588
Adelaide—General Accident Building	Technology Park Corp.	155	5.4.83	12.4.83	9 149	176
Wallaroo—John Terrace	Agriculture	35	11.4.83	14.4.83	2 080	17
Adelaide—Public Trustee Building	Courts	131	1.6.83	27.6.83	10 575	793

STATEMENT OF PRE-OCCUPATIONAL RENTAL PAID—1983-84

Building	Client Department	Area M²	Lease Commencement	Occupation Date	Annual Rental	Pre-occupation Rental paid 1983-84
					$	$
Adelaide—55 Grenfell Street	Environment and Planning	240	7.7.83	26.10.83	22 560	6 852
Victor Harbor—3 Eyre Terrace	Agriculture Fisheries	148	1.8.83	2.12.83	6 864	2 324
Adelaide—52 Flinders Street	Labour	324	16.9.83	26.9.83	33 696	1 029
Murray Bridge—SGIC Building	Community Welfare, Motor Registration Division	285	1.10.83	12.12.83	30 386	5 980
Nuriootpa—33 Murray Street	Lands	87	11.10.83	3.1.84	5 181	1 183
Modbury—116 Reservoir Road	Motor Registration Division	241	1.1.84	24.5.84	26 510	10 475
Adelaide—52 Flinders Street	Agriculture	463	1.1.84	18.3.84	45 142	9 586
Adelaide—48-60 Angas Street	Police	520	1.2.84	August 1984	50 377	20 990
Port Pirie—Lot 162 Lamm Street	Fisheries	171	7.2.84	14.3.84	2 600	269
Kilkenny—39 Gray Street	Correctional Services	388	14.2.84	December 1984	10 500	3 982
Port Adelaide—33 Commercial Road	Courts	205	1.3.84	July 1984	11 330	3 776
Adelaide—1 Sturt Street	Recreation and Sport	1 000	19.3.84	1.5.84	77 000	9 107
Parkside—186 Greenhill Road	Mines and Energy	307	1.4.84	18.6.84	30 700	6 651
Adelaide—135 Pirie Street	Fisheries	1 225	1.5.84	November 1984	181 602	30 267
Goodwood—129 Goodwood Road	Electorate Office	44	10.5.84	September 1984	6 760	963
Prospect—Northpark Shopping Centre	Electorate Office	57	4.6.84	August 1984	6 844	513

319. **Mr BECKER** (on notice) asked the Minister of Education, representing the Minister of Agriculture: What was the amount of rent paid for unoccupied premises by departments and authorities within each portfolio under the Minister's control during the past two financial years and how long and why were the premises unoccupied in each case?

The Hon. LYNN ARNOLD: Details are as follows:

1. *Department of Agriculture*

An amount of $10 877 was paid by the Public Buildings Department for unoccupied premises during the past two financial years on behalf of the Department of Agriculture. Two cases were involved, one involving premises being unoccupied for 4 months, the other for 2½ months. In each case commissioning works were being carried out prior to occupancy.

2. *Department of Woods and Forests*

An amount of $388.50 was paid during the period 25 November 1983, to 17 March 1984 for a residence at Mount Burr which has vacant awaiting the appointment of a Mill Manager.

3. *Department of Correctional Services*

During the past two financial years, all Department of Correctional Services premises were either owned by or leased through the Public Buildings Department. The Department of Correctional Services was 'cross-charged' an amount of $2 600 by the Public Buildings Department in 1983-84 in respect to the District Probation and Parole Office at Gladstone, which was unoccupied for that period.

4. *Department of Fisheries*

An amount of $30 974 was paid for unoccupied premises during the past two financial years on behalf of the Department of Fisheries. Two cases were involved, one involving the Reid Building on Frome Road which was unoccupied from 1.9.82 until 1.10.82 to allow decontamination of the building prior to occupancy, the other involved the Harcorp

Building which was unoccupied from 1.5.84 until 3.12.84 to allow for extensive commissioning works.

REPORT ON THE DESIGN OF BUILDINGS IN BUSHFIRE PRONE AREAS

321. **The Hon. D.C. BROWN** (on notice) asked the Minister of Emergency Services:

1. When did the Government receive the Report on the Design of Buildings in Bushfire Prone Areas and has it been considered and, if so, what action has been taken to implement the recommendations and, if not, when will it be considered?

2. Does the report indicate that the standards and specifications of construction of houses in bushfire prone areas are satisfactory or not and, in either case, does the Government accept the findings?

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

1. The Government received the manuscript of the report and arranged for its printing. It was publicly launched by the Minister of Emergency Services on 7 March 1984. The Government has considered the report 'Design of Buildings in Bushfire Prone Areas' and has established an interdepartmental committee to ensure that there was no duplication of effort by the various agencies involved in reviewing the report so that a co-ordinated response could be given by the Government. The interdepartmental committee will continue to provide a co-ordinated approach for the Government and a clearing house on problems associated with building development in bushfire areas which are not the sole preserve of a single government agency.

Implementation of the report's recommendations, some of which were in hand prior to its presentation, are: The bushfire hazard maps for the Adelaide Hills Fire Prone Area are almost finalised and will lead to the preparation of a supplementary development plan which will include a uniform set of fire protection policies for all councils in that area. A technical booklet containing guidelines and advice to encourage minimisation of bushfire impact in all areas of the State has been published. The information contained includes information about fire and the way it behaves, siting, layout, building design principles, materials, construction details, vegetation and other protective measures. There were 30 000 copies and they are being distributed widely.

The Building Advisory Committee has recommended those matters considered appropriate for the building regulations. Because of the time lapse incurred with the authorisation of a development plan, the Building Advisory Committee has designated by council boundaries those areas to which the amendments are to apply. Appropriate areas for research will be placed before the Australian Uniform Building Regulations Co-ordinating Council for early consideration. The Building Advisory Committee is the appropriate and properly constituted body to advise architects, designers, builders and local government regarding the suitability of design and detailing of buildings to be built in bushfire prone areas.

2. The report indicates that some of the standards and specifications for construction of houses in bushfire prone areas are not satisfactory. These comments are generally accepted by the Government, which, as indicated above, has taken action to implement changes. The Government does not accept some matters of detail on mandatory/advisory regulations and methods of implementation of policy in relation to agencies advising the Government. The Government acknowledges the concern and work of the Building Science Forum in producing the report.

HOUSING TRUST PROPERTIES

322. **The Hon. B.C. EASTICK** (on notice) asked the Minister of Housing and Construction: In relation to the 31 commercial properties owned by the South Australian Housing Trust:

(a) what is the location of each property;

(b) what was the book value of each property as at 30 June 1984; and

(c) what valuation was placed on each property at the June 1980 revaluation?

The Hon. T.H. HEMMINGS: It is understood that the member is referring to the 31 properties owned by the South Australian Housing Trust as at 30 June 1984. Since that time the status of some of the properties has altered. The following summary will provide advice regarding the status of each property as at 29 November 1984, together with advice concerning location, 1980 valuation and the 1984 value. The following centres have been sold or are under contract for sale and purchase:

Location	1980 Valuation	1984 Sale Price	
	$		
Christies Beach, 100 Gulf View Road	120 000	260 000	(under contract)
Elizabeth Downs, 34 Hamblynn Road	325 200	617 500	(under contract)
Elizabeth East, 53 Midway Road	160 000	451 000	(under contract)
Elizabeth Field, 130 Peachey Road	380 000	510 000	(under contract)
Elizabeth Grove, 50 Fairfield Road	373 554	720 000	(under contract)
Elizabeth North, 165 Woodford Road	330 000	675 000	(under contract)
Elizabeth North, 4 Hilcott Street	68 000	140 000	(under contract)
Elizabeth Park, 110 Yorktown Road	290 000	545 000	(sold)
Elizabeth South, 41 Goodman Road	86 782	105 000	(under contract)
Elizabeth South, 100 Philip Highway	730 118	1 000 000	(under contract)
Elizabeth Vale, 44 John Rice Avenue	260 531	380 000	(sold)
Ferryden Park, 2 Inverway Street	25 000	25 000	(sold)
Findon, 150 Findon Road	60 000	105 000	(sold)
Glenelg North, 100 Tapleys Hill Road	67 000	100 000	(under contract)
Morphett Vale, Elizabeth Street	184 526	195 000	(under contract)
Northfield, 323 Hampstead Road	99 941	176 000	(under contract)
Parafield Gardens, 382 Salisbury Highway	373 094	500 000	(sold)
Salisbury North, 9-14 Trinity Crescent	424 565	746 000	(sold)
Woodville Gardens, 66 Hanson Road	34 000	97 000	(under contract)
Woodville West, 48 Alma Terrace	53 000	90 000	(under contract)

Two shopping centres are currently under offer to interested tenant/purchasers. At the time of advice it was expected that contracts would be signed in the near future. The properties concerned are:

Location	1980 Valuation	1984 Sale Price
Elizabeth West, 45 Peachey Road	310 000	730 000
Smithfield Plains, 240 Peachey Road	270 000	530 000

The Elizabeth City Centre is leased and managed by the Myer/Jennings Group and is currently undergoing major redevelopment estimated to cost $47m. As such a 1980 valuation is considered to have little relevance. The remaining commercial properties remain uncommitted for sale:

Location	1980 Valuation	1984 Valuation
	$	$
Blair Athol, 89 Florence Avenue	30 000	80 000
Clearview, 1 Leicester Street	30 000	56 000
Enfield, 13 Durand Terrace	72 000	125 000
Ferryden Park, 3 Coker Street	35 000	66 000
Ferryden Park, 6 Oban Street	52 000	61 000
Munno Para, 18 Maltarra Road	205 100	210 000
Hackam West	260 008	255 000
Hillcrest	81 968	—

For the member's information, the Hillcrest shopping centre will not be offered for sale while negotiations for housing development in the area adjacent to the shops continue with the Enfield council. The other seven uncommitted centres were offered to the tenants for purchase at the respective sale prices listed above. These offers were subsequently declined by the tenants concerned.

HEALTH COMMISSION EXECUTIVES

324. **Mr INGERSON** (on notice) asked the Minister of Tourism, representing the Minister of Health: How many executives employed by the South Australian Health Commission have salaries:

(a) between $35 000 and $50 000 per annum;

(b) between $50 000 and $60 000 per annum; and

(c) in excess of $60 000 per annum?

The Hon. G.F. KENEALLY:

(a) Executives, salaries between $35 000 and $50 000 p.a.—18.

(b) Executives, salaries between $50 000 and $60 000 p.a.—14.

(c) Executives, salaries in excess of $60 000 p.a.—4.

It should be noted that these employees are considered to be Line Managers and are employed in Central Office and Public Health Services. In addition there are 22 professional staff whose salaries are above $35 000 but who are not Line Managers.

PUBLIC BUILDINGS DEPARTMENT

325. **Mr BECKER** (on notice) asked the Minister of Public Works: Have the following position numbers within the Public Buildings Department been created and, if so, why:

287451, 417949 to 417957, 417965 to 417973, 417981 to 417990, 418001 to 418010, 418028 to 418036 and 418044 to 418052?

The Hon. T.H. HEMMINGS: In response to submissions made by the Public Buildings Department to the Public Service Board concerning the organisation structure of its Regional Operations Branch, the Board recommended the creation of the positions in question. The positions were subsequently approved in Executive Council and published in the South Australian *Gazette* of 4 October 1984. The positions were 1 position of Regional Manager, 6 positions of Senior Electrical Inspector and 6 positions of Senior Mechanical Inspector.

Creation of the positions was necessary to provide adequate staffing arrangements for the Department's Regional Operations Branch. Once the Branch's approved structure has been fully implemented it will be possible to abolish a number of positions that become vacant as a result of appointments to the newly created positions.

TEACHERS LONG SERVICE LEAVE

326. **The Hon. MICHAEL WILSON** (on notice) asked the Minister of Education: Has the Treasury Department asked the Education Department to refuse long service leave to teachers and, if so, why and how many applications have been refused?

The Hon. LYNN ARNOLD: The allocation of funds to meet the cost of replacing teachers who are on long service leave has been maintained, during 1984-85, at the same real level as it was in 1983-84.

It is not correct to say that the Treasury Department has asked the Education Department to refuse long service leave to teachers. Rather, a level of funding for replacements has been set and officers of the Education Department have approved leave up to a level which has allowed it to contain replacement costs to the funds available.

It should be noted that the current concerns stem from an increased demand for leave. This has been recognised by Government: a review has been called for by the Premier, not only of leave requests and entitlements in the Education Department but also in other Government departments. It is expected that this review will enable the Government to fully understand the level of entitlements held, and the likely growth of entitlement and then to adopt appropriate financial and administrative arrangements.

Cabinet has approved an increased allocation of funds to long service leave replacements for teachers for 1985-86. The level will be announced soon. Thus, more approvals will be granted for the second half of 1985 and for 1986.

The following data relates to the 1985 school year (not to the financial year) and represents the situation at 7 December 1984. Further applications will be made during 1985 and further withdrawals are expected.

Long Service Leave Applications and Approvals (Teachers) as at 7 December 1984 for 1985.

	Applications		Days of Leave Applied For	
	Number	%	Number	%
Approved	1 370	61.0	125 496	75.5
Not Approved	803	35.7	32 886	19.8
Withdrawn	73	3.2	7 702	4.6

ENTERPRISE INVESTMENTS

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

1. What were the total amounts of convertible unsecured notes and fully paid shares of 50 cents at time of launching of Enterprise Investment (South Australia) Limited, and what are the totals now?

2. What commissions and other establishment expenses have been incurred to date, including cost of advertising?

3. How many loans have been made to date and what is the total amount?

4. What is the average interest earned by the company on funds invested or lent?

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

1. At the time of launching, Enterprise Investments (South Australia) Limited had the following issued and paid up ordinary share capital:

	$
200 005 50 cent shares=	100 002.50
200 000 'A' Class 50 cent shares =	100 000.00
TOTAL	$200 002.50

There were no convertible unsecured notes on hand at date of launch. A further 1 million ordinary 50 cent shares were subscribed in the public issue which closed on 21 November 1984 bringing in a further $500 000, so that ordinary share capital currently totals $700 002.50. In addition $5m worth of convertible unsecured notes were subscribed in the public issue.

2, 3 and 4. Enterprise Investments is a public company and such information as is requested to be made available by the company to its shareholders will be disclosed in the company's accounts.

GRAND PRIX

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

1. When and how will the racing cars and spares arrive in Adelaide for the Grand Prix in October 1985?

2. What method of transport will be used and, if air cargo, will the Adelaide Airport curfew be strictly adhered to?

3. What extra air traffic to and from Adelaide Airport is anticipated for the Grand Prix?

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

1. Racing cars and spares will arrive in standard air freight containers on Wednesday prior to the event.

2. Air freight. Yes.

3. Discussions are being held with the Manager of the Adelaide Airport about the capacity and operational aspects of the airport. This includes consideration of domestic, overseas and private air traffic. At this stage, volume of traffic is not known but will be closely monitored.

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

1. What are the classifications and current annual salaries of all persons employed by the Australian Formula One Grand Prix Board?

2. What office accommodation is used by the Board and at what annual cost?

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

1. Dr Mal Hemmerling, Director, Cabinet Office, has been seconded full-time as the Chief Executive of the Grand Prix Authority for the first Grand Prix EO-3 ($53 162)

Mr Glen Jones, Marketing Manager, seconded from Lands Department AO-3 ($34 561)

Mrs Pat Croucher, Secretary, seconded from Department of the Premier and Cabinet CO-2 ($18 971)

Mr Chris Overland, Manager, Finance and Administration, seconded from Executive Development Scheme—until 8.2.85 AO-1 ($29 842)

Mr Terry Plane, Manager, Media and Public Relations—from 11.2.85 MO-2 ($29 925 + $7 481—25 per cent allowance)

Mrs Ann Hubbard, Secretary, temporary staffing CO-1 ($17 048).

2. New office accommodation on the corner of Kensington and Fullarton Roads at Rose Park is being rented at $34 000 per annum.

PREMIER'S OVERSEAS TRAVEL

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

1. Is the Premier planning a visit to Europe and England in March/April 1985, and, if so:

(a) why;

(b) when;

(c) which countries and cities will be visited and for how long;

(d) who will accompany the Premier and in what capacity; and

(e) what is the estimated cost of the visit?

2. Has Dr Roger Sexton of the State Development Department visited Europe and England recently to make preliminary arrangements and, if so, when and at what cost?

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

1. Yes.

(a) To encourage European and British investment and trade with South Australia.

(b) April 1985.

(c), (d), (e) These matters have not been finalised.

2. Yes, in December 1984; the final cost is not yet available.

PITJANTJATJARA

345. **Mr GUNN** (on notice) asked the Minister of Mines and Energy: Is the Government taking action to overcome exploration problems caused by the Pitjantjatjara Land Rights Act and, if so, what?

The Hon. R.G. PAYNE: Yes. Following Haematite Petroleum's withdrawal of its application for a Petroleum Exploration Licence (PEL) in the Officer Basin the Department of Mines and Energy called for applications from other interested parties. Several individual companies and consortiums have now applied for PELs in the Basin and their applications are currently being assessed by the Department.

TAXIS

346. **The Hon. D.C. BROWN** (on notice) asked the Minister of Transport: Has the Metropolitan Taxi Cab Board stipulated that an alarm system must be attached to all taxis as from 1 April 1985 and, if so, why did the Board make this decision:

(a) without a full investigation into the proposal;

(b) without consultation with the industry;

(c) without a full knowledge of the costs involved, either to a taxi owner or to the radio company; and

(d) when the installation of such an alarm system is regarded by the industry as being ineffective?

The Hon. R.K. ABBOTT: The Metropolitan Taxi Cab Board has stipulated that all taxi cabs are to be equipped with a radio alarm system of a type approved by the Licensing Officer by 1 April 1985. A grace period of up to three months will be allowed from that date. The particular replies are as follows:

(a) A full investigation was carried out.

(b) The industry, through its representation on the Board, was kept fully informed. Over 30 per cent of the industry fitted this system before the Board moved to enforce its implementation.

(c) The Board was fully aware of the costs involved in fitting and operating the system. The only area where the Board has incomplete knowledge of costs is for those cabs not fitted with radio.

(d) The radio alarm system is the most effective system operating in Australia. The New South Wales taxi industry, which was formerly plagued by attacks, opted for the mandatory fitting of this system in 1983 and since then there has not been a serious effective attack perpetrated in the Sydney transport district where the system is operating.

GOVERNMENT PUBLICATIONS

347. **The Hon. B.C. EASTICK** (on notice) asked the Minister of Local Government

1. What was the cost of supplying a copy of all South Australian Parliamentary and Government publications to the libraries of the University of Adelaide, Flinders University, South Australian Institute of Technology, South Australian College of Advanced Education and the Adelaide College of Technical and Further Education and to the State Library in the year ended 30 June 1984 and what is the estimated cost for the year ending 30 June 1985?

2. To which departments will the cost be apportioned in 1984-85?

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

	1983-84 $	1984-85 $
1. Barr Smith Library, University of Adelaide	604	764
Flinders University Library	511	520
Acquisitions Librarian, SAIT	628	729
Library, SA College of Adv. Education	188	290
Library, Adel. College of TAFE	180	185
Acquisition Section, State Library of SA	3 314	3 933
	5 425	6 421

The above costs relate to 'standing orders' only—a record of *ad hoc* requests is not maintained.

2. The cost of supplying the Parliamentary and Government publications to the above during 1984-85 is a charge against the following:

Division of Service	Publication/s
The Legislature	Hansard, Bills, Acts, Regulations, Awards, etc.
Minister of Lands, etc.	*Government Gazette*
Deputy Premier and Minister of Labour	*Industrial Gazette*

COMMITTEE MEMBERS

348. **Mr GUNN** (on notice) asked the Minister of Transport:

1. Who are the members of the consultative committee set up under the Motor Vehicles Act, 1959?

2. Does the Government intend to act on the Ombudsman's criticism of the committee?

3. Has the Government given consideration to abolishing the committee?

The Hon. R.K. ABBOTT: The replies are as follows:

1. K.J. Collett, Registrar of Motor Vehicles—Chairman, M.L. Bowering, Assistant Crown Solicitor, Chief Superintendent G.J. Brown—Police Department.

2. The comments of the Ombudsman have been referred to the Chairman, Mr L.K. Gordon, of the task force set up to review the Motor Vehicles Act for consideration and recommendation.

3. The Goverment will give consideration to the future of the consultative committee upon receipt of the report of the task force referred to in 2 above.

MARLA SCHOOL

349. **Mr GUNN** (on notice) asked the Minister of Education—When does the Education Department intend to build a school at Marla?

The Hon. LYNN ARNOLD: As a result of the proposed realignment of the Ghan railway line and the Stuart Highway, a township is planned to be developed at Marla, some 60 kilometres south of Indulkana and nearly 280 kilometres north-west of Coober Pedy. The nearest two settlements are Mintabi opal field, 53 kilometres north, and Chandler, where the Australian National regional workshop is located and which is approximately 50 kilometres to the north.

Since the township of Marla was officially opened by the Minister of Environment and Planning in November 1982, there have been discussions regarding the establishment of a permanent Marla school. Demographic assessment of Marla and its surrounding area which was carried out by the Education Department in mid 1983 indicated that immediate provision of any educational facilities in the area was not justified.

Presently at Marla there is a trading post complex comprised of a hotel, motel, restaurant, camping ground and other service related facilities. The Department of Mines and Energy and the Department for Community Welfare have each estabished a residential dwelling at Marla. The construction of a police/law court complex with accommodation facilities for both married and single staff has just been completed. Several other departments have considered establishing regional offices at Marla but have deferred making the final decision to relocate their staff.

In July 1984 MacMahon Construction Pty Ltd informed the Acting Regional Director of Education, Northern Region, that, as the company was successful in winning further contracts on the Stuart Highway, MacMahon workers would be transferred progressively from Coober Pedy to Marla. The extent of the demand for school facilities at Marla as a result of the relocation of MacMahon workers, according the company, would depend on whether the company wins further contracts at Coober Pedy as if it wins a further 12 months contract at Coober Pedy the potential number of school going age children at Marla would be reduced. In the event, in November 1984 MacMahon's announced that they had won the contract; thus the enrolment potential for the Marla school will remain at approximately six students and will not therefore justify the establishment of a new school.

The Marla Primary School is currently listed in the Education Department forward building programme subject to demographic justification. The Education Department will continue to monitor the development at Marla and Mintabi. As soon as there is some trend to indicate that a school is need at Marla, the Education Department will proceed in liaising with all relevant departments and organisations for the planning and development of the school. It would take the Education Department approximately 12 months to fully establish a school at Marla.

ORROROO TO HAWKER ROAD

350. **Mr GUNN** (on notice) asked the Minister of Transport: In view of the increasing importance of the Orroroo to Hawker road to the tourist industry and its being the most direct route between Adelaide and Moomba, has the Government given consideration to providing extra funds to increase the rate of sealing it?

The Hon. R.K. ABBOTT: Although the Orroroo to Hawker road carries a mixture of commercial, tourist and local traffic, the volume of vehicles involved is low compared to volumes on the existing sealed arterial network. To increase the rate of sealing of the road would be at the expense of urgent reconstruction works required on the more highly trafficked sealed arterial roads within the State. However, should additional funds for roadworks become available, consideration will be given to increasing the rate of sealing this road.

NORTHERN ROADS

351. **Mr GUNN** (on notice) asked the Minister of Transport: Has the Highways Department carried out investigations into the requests to provide a ring route to link the Flinders Ranges to Andamooka and in particular to shortening the distance for people who wish to visit Leigh Creek, Flinders Ranges, Copley, Marree, Andamooka, Woomera and Port Augusta?

The Hon. R.K. ABBOTT: The Highways Department has provided technical advice and cost information to the Lake Torrens Ring Route Committee which subsequently recently submitted to me a report proposing the establishment of a road linking the Olympic Dam/Andamooka area with the Northern Flinders Ranges area. The Highways Department is at present evaluating the report and I expect to be in a position to respond to the Lake Torrens Ring Route Committee in the near future.

PORT AUGUSTA TO WOOMERA PIPELINE

352. **Mr GUNN** (on notice) asked the Minister of Water Resources: Has the Commonwealth Government approached the Engineering and Water Supply Department to operate the pipeline from Port Augusta to Woomera and, if so, what is the estimated cost?

The Hon. J.W. SLATER: The Engineering and Water Supply Department has not received a request from the Commonwealth Government to operate the pipeline from Port Augusta to Woomera. In 1982 the Commonwealth Government indicated that it was looking at establishing Woomera Village as a normal country township divorced from the Department of Defence administration and access restrictions. This proposal also involved the pipeline.

The Engineering and Water Supply Department has had discussions with the Commonwealth Government regarding this proposal; however, to date the matter has not been resolved. The Department prepared a report in 1982 entitled 'Proposed "Normalisation" of Woomera—Implications on the Water Supply and Sewerage Facilities'. In this report the annual cost of operation and maintenance of the pipeline was estimated at $1 030 000.

WOOMERA HOSPITAL

353. **Mr GUNN** (on notice) asked the Minister of Tourism, representing the Minister of Health: Has the Commonwealth Government requested the State Government to take over and manage the Woomera Hospital and, if so, what is the estimated cost?

The Hon. G.F. KENEALLY: The Commonwealth Government has not recently formally requested the State Government to take over the Woomera Hospital. However, the matter has been raised in discussions regarding the 'normalisation' of the town of Woomera. It is not possible to estimate the net additional cost to the State which would be associated with the transfer of Woomera Hospital from Commonwealth to State control, due to the lack of specific detail in proposals which have been made at this stage.

OLYMPIC DAM

354. **Mr GUNN** (on notice) asked the Premier: What action is the Government taking to prevent further demonstrations or blockades at Olympic Dam?

The Hon. J.C. BANNON: The Government will continue to ensure that the law is upheld in relation to demonstrations at Olympic Dam and support the police in carrying out their duty. I appreciate the honourable member's concern and I assure him that the residents in the area will be afforded the rights and protection to which they are entitled.

355. **Mr GUNN** (on notice) asked the Minister of Emergency Services: What was the total cost of the police presence at the Olympic Dam anti-uranium blockade?

The Hon. J.D. WRIGHT: The total cost of the police presence at Olympic Dam was $1 860 105, which represents a cost of $984 000 above normal operating costs for the number of personnel involved over the period.

PUBLIC TRANSPORT FOR THE DISABLED

356. **Mr ASHENDEN** (on notice) asked the Minister of Transport:

1. What plans does the Government have to provide methods of public transport that would be suitable for disabled persons?

2. Does the Government intend to provide methods of public transport which will ensure that disabled persons have the same facilities and frequency of service that are available to the non-handicapped?

The Hon. R.K. ABBOTT: The replies are as follows:

1. The Government is concerned not only that public transport services be suitable for disabled persons but also that other services and facilities are made as suitable as possible for disabled persons. To that end, the Government has appointed Mr Richard Llewellyn, as Disability Adviser to the Premier, to examine and report on issues affecting people with disabilities. Transport and public transport are but small parts of Mr Llewellyn's work but, even so, a special task force has been established to examine the transport needs of people with disabilities.

2. The task force set up by the Disability Adviser to the Premier is seeking to determine those needs.

UNION MEMBERSHIP

357. **Mr ASHENDEN** (on notice) asked the Minister of Labour: Does the Government intend to allow those persons working in sheltered workshops the opportunity to join, and be represented by, unions?

The Hon. J.D. WRIGHT: There is no legal impediment to prevent anyone joining a union whether employed in a sheltered workshop or in any other work situation.

HANDICAPPED PERSONS' WAGES

358. **Mr ASHENDEN** (on notice) asked the Minister of Labour: Why is there a discrepency between the wages paid to handicapped persons employed by the Royal Society for the Blind as compared with handicapped persons working in sheltered workshops?

The Hon. J.D. WRIGHT: The rates of pay for persons who work in sheltered workshops are matters for negotiation between persons being assisted and the workshop. This is as a consequence of section 89 of the Industrial Conciliation and Arbitration Act 1972, as amended, which provides that no award shall apply to, or in relation to, work being performed by a person being assisted or trained in a sheltered workshop.

The Royal Institution for the Blind is proclaimed as a sheltered workshop. By virtue of the provisions of section 89, therefore, it is not possible to compare wages paid there

with wages paid to persons working in other sheltered workshops.

MINISTER FOR THE HANDICAPPED

359. **Mr ASHENDEN** (on notice) asked the Premier: Is it the Government's intention to appoint a Minister for the Handicapped?

The Hon. J.C. BANNON: The Government has undertaken a number of significant initiatives with regard to disabled people including the appointment of the Disability Adviser, the establishment of the Disability Adviser's office, the establishment of the Disability Information and Resource Centre and the preparation of equal opportunity and access legislation. Work is proceeding in the adviser's office on accommodation needs of and transport options for disabled people.

The Disability Adviser reports to me and the office is located within the Department of Premier and Cabinet. The adviser makes regular reports to the Human Services Committee of Cabinet and relates closely to the Attorney-General on policy matters. As such, regular and comprehensive consideration is given by Ministers to the needs of disabled people. Given the suitability of existing arrangements, it is not proposed by my Government to nominate one Minister as having responsibility for the disabled.

UNITED NATIONS WORLD ACTION PLAN

360. **Mr ASHENDEN** (on notice) asked the Premier: What action is the Government taking to implement the United Nations World Plan of Action concerning disabled persons?

The Hon. J.C. BANNON: The Government has implemented the United Nations World Plan of Action by:

(a) the appointment of the Disability Adviser and the establishment of the Disability Adviser's office;

(b) the establishment of the Disability Information and Resource Centre;

(c) its Equal Opportunity and access legislation.

DISABLED PERSONS

361. **Mr ASHENDEN** (on notice) asked the Premier: Does the Government recognise any particular organisation or organisations as representing the disabled and, if so, which?

The Hon. J.C. BANNON: There are over 300 organisations in South Australia involved in the disability area. The four following organisations are operating as umbrella groups:

ACROD—Australian Council for the Rehabilitation of Disabled, which mainly represents organisations involved with physically disabled;

AAMR—Australian Association for the Mentally Retarded, representing mainly organisations involved with intellectual disability;

AIDD—Australian Institute for Developmental Disabilities, representing service providers and people who work in the intellectually disabled area; and

DPI—Disabled People's International (S.A.), which represents all people with disabilities.

NON-ANGLO-SAXON DISABLED PERSONS

362. **Mr ASHENDEN** (on notice) asked the Premier: Does the Government recognise any particular organisation or organisations as representing the non-Anglo-Saxon disabled and, if so, which?

The Hon. J.C. BANNON: The Government is aware of the special additional problems disability brings to people who have come from backgrounds other than Anglo-Saxon. Following the formation of a special committee to advise on disability matters in 1983, the Ethnic Affairs Commission has undertaken a very extensive survey into the needs and problems of those disabled South Australians from other cultural backgrounds. The Disability Adviser is currently examining ways in which a special effort can be made to assist these members of our community.

ASER

363. **Mr BAKER** (on notice) asked the Premier: As a result of the ASER development:

(a) which rowing sheds and facilities will have to be moved;

(b) what will be the impact on parking and access to the facilities for viewing and participation in rowing activities; and

(c) what alternative arrangements have been made to offset any disadvantages likely to be experienced by the rowing fraternity?

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

(a) None.

(b) There will be no adverse impact on parking and access. Parking will be enhanced when the ASER 1 200 car park is completed;

(c) The ASER project will not create any disadvantages to the rowing fraternity.

HENS

365. **Mr BECKER** (on notice) asked the Minister of Education, representing the Minister of Agriculture:

1. How many registered battery and free-range hens, respectively, are there in South Australia?

2. What is the colour code guide for egg yolks?

3. What is the supplement to poultry diets to colour egg yolks for battery hens and how does the colouring compare with yolks of free-range hens?

4. What is the nutrition value of the colouring agent in such eggs and poultry meat compared to free-range hens?

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

1. There are no accurate figures as to the numbers of hens in South Australia kept in cages or on free range. There are approximately 520 registered egg producers in South Australia producing eggs from 800 000 hens. Non-cage housing is more commonly used on the smaller farms and there are about 298 producers with fewer than 500 hens who keep a total of 50 000 hens. There is also an unknown number of large producers who run hens on deep litter or on free range.

2. The colour code guide for eggs in South Australia is described in the regulations under the Marketing of Eggs Act, 1941-1973. The regulations state that 'First Quality' eggs, among other things, must have yolks which conform in colour to a standard colour sample of not less than number 8 on the Roche Yolk Colour Fan. This testing procedure is accepted by the Standards Association of Australia and is described under Australian Standard 1383 of 1974.

3. The colour of egg yolks is produced by oxycarotenoids, commonly known as xanthophyll pigments derived from the hen's feed. Yolk colour is influenced by yellow and red oxycarotenoids and both natural and synthetic forms will

colour egg yolks. Synthetic pigments have chemical structures and properties similar to naturally occurring pigments and are added to layer feeds at a rate of about 3 parts per million. These very low levels of pigment are sufficient to ensure that egg yolks conform to the required colour standard. Eggs from free range hens vary in colour depending on the amount of green feed available. During the dry summer period when green feed is in short supply egg yolks from free range hens would be expected to be below the colour standard unless the hens have access to irrigated green feed. However, must hens used for commercial egg production are fed formulated feeds which contain yolk colouring pigments whether the hens have access to free range or not.

4. Yolk colour pigments, whether they are natural or synthetic, can be converted into vitamin A by the hen if the hen's diet is deficient in vitamin A. However, any nutritional benefits will be very small due to the small quantities of additive used. Most free range hens are given layer feeds as well as having access to plants and insects but there is no evidence that these natural supplements have any significant effect on the nutritional value of eggs or poultry meat.

CFS PILOTS

366. **Mr BECKER** (on notice) asked the Minister of Emergency Services:

1. Are any members of the staff employed by the Country Fire Services qualified to pilot light aircraft and, if so, how many and, if none, why not?

2. Is it intended that a staff member of the CFS hold a current light aircraft pilot's licence and, if so, why and, if not, why not?

3. How many times in the past two years has the CFS hired or chartered light aircraft, for what purposes and to where were they used, and what was the cost on each occasion?

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

1. No member of the staff employed by the Country Fire Services is qualified to pilot light aircraft. All members of the staff are currently fully occupied attending to fire suppression, prevention, protection and administrative duties. There are many well qualified pilots, both employed by aerial operators and self-employed, available at short notice if required.

2. It is not intended that a staff member of the Country Fire Services obtain a current light aircraft pilot's licence for the same reasons given in answer to question 1.

3. Details of every light aircraft flight undertaken by Country Fire Services staff over the past two years are not readily available. Research of these details is a time consuming task which will place a significant additional burden on staff resources during this crucial period of the summer. In the circumstances the work necessary to answer this question cannot be justified.

TRANSPORT CONCESSIONS

368. **Mr BECKER** (on notice) asked the Minister of Community Welfare: How was the budget allocation of $3 660 000 for transport concessions to unemployed persons arrived at, by whom was it calculated, how is this amount monitored and on what basis?

The Hon. G.J. CRAFTER: The replies are as follows:

1. The Transport concessions to unemployed allocation for 1984-85 is:

Contributions to the STA for unemployed persons.	$3 610 000
Contributions to country bus services in rural cities for unemployed persons.	$50 000
TOTAL	$3 660 000

2. The allocation is based on passenger surveys undertaken by the State Transport Authority. The reimbursement is based on the difference between the actual fare charged and the standard adult fare for the journey undertaken.

3. This area of concessions is monitored by Treasury.

BRUKUNGA MINE

369. **Mr BECKER** (on notice) asked the Minister of Water Resources: When did the operation and maintenance of the neutralisation plant at Brukunga Mine commence, how much has been spent on capital infrastructure and recurrent costs in each year to date, is any of this amount recoverable and, if so, how much and from whom and, if not, why not?

The Hon. J.W. SLATER: The upgrading of the waste interception system originally provided at the Brukunga Mine by Nairne Pyrites Pty Ltd, was initiated in 1975 and the neutralisation plant was commissioned in September 1980. Details of the capital and recurrent costs on an annual basis since 1975 are as follows:

CAPITAL COSTS

Year	Cost	Source of Funds
1975-76	$49 741	Nairne Pyrites
1976-77	$100 904	Nairne Pyrites—$25 259 Mines Department—$75 645
1977-78	$7 131	Mines Department
1978-79	$119 014	Mines Department
1979-80	$390 072	Mines Department
1980-81	$79 231	Mines Department
1981-82	$59 947	Engineering and Water Supply Department
1982-83	$31 363	Engineering and Water Supply Department
1983-84	$25 197	Engineering and Water Supply Department
1984-85 (to 31.12.84)	$7 016	Engineering and Water Supply Department

OPERATING AND MAINTENANCE COSTS

Year	Cost	Source of Funds
1977-78	$17 622	Mines Department
1978-79	$28 152	Mines Department
1979-80	$37 944	Mines Department
1980-81	$126 869	Engineering and Water Supply Department
1981-82	$121 961	Engineering and Water Supply Department
1982-83	$134 305	Engineering and Water Supply Department
1983-84	$140 799	Engineering and Water Supply Department
1984-85 (to 31.12.84)	$105 305	Engineering and Water Supply Department

In 1976 Nairne Pyrites Pty Ltd, in accordance with an agreement signed with the South Australian Government on 23 August 1976, paid the sum of $75 000 as full and final contribution towards the costs of the rehabilitation works.

GRAND PRIX

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

1. Have negotiations been completed for the television rights of the Australian Formula One Grand Prix and, if

so, which countries and which states in Canada and the United States of America will televise the event?

2. What is the total sum of television royalties the State will receive and how does this fee compare with amounts paid in relation to other Grand Prix events?

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

1. Negotiations on television rights are not part of the Government contract. Channel 9 Network is conducting these negotiations.

2. Nil. Not known.

TRAFFIC INFRINGEMENT NOTICES

372. **Mr LEWIS** (on notice) asked the Minister of Emergency Services:

1. How many traffic infringement notices were issued during the year 1983-84, what was the gross value of the expiation fees and what was the gross value of payments made in expiation in relation to those notices for alleged offences committed within the metropolitan area and outside the metropolitan area, respectively?

2. How many traffic infringement notices were issued during the year 1983-84 for offences detected and allegedly committed on the South-Eastern Freeway and the Dukes Highway, contiguous between Bridgewater and Tailem Bend, on the section of the road where the State limit speed zone applies, what was the gross value of the expiation fees and what was the gross value of payments made in expiation in relation to those notices?

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

1. 122 609 traffic infringement notices were issued in 1983-84. The gross value of the expiation fees was $6 431 370, of which $5 465 655 was paid. Statistics are not kept to identify the value of payments made in relation to alleged offences committed within and outside the metropolitan area.

2. Statistics are not kept which identify offences committed on particular roadways or sections of roadways.

ART FOR PUBLIC PLACES COMMITTEE

373. **Mr BECKER** (on notice) asked the Minister for the Arts: Who are the members of the Art for Public Places Committee and what is the term of appointment and remuneration of each?

The Hon. J.C. BANNON: The reply is as follows:

Art for Public Places Committee

Members	Term of Appointment	Remuneration
Tony Bishop (Chairman)	1.7.84-30.6.87	$60 per meeting
David Wynn	1.7.84-30.6.87	$50 per meeting
Daniel Thomas	1.7.84-30.6.87	N/A (public servant)
Colin Norton	1.7.84-30.6.86	$50 per meeting
Jenny Strickland	1.7.84-30.6.86	$50 per meeting
Jane Hylton	1.7.84-30.6.86	N/A (public servant)