

HOUSE OF ASSEMBLY

Tuesday 17 February 1987

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

FISHERIES (GULF ST VINCENT PRAWN FISHERY RATIONALISATION) BILL

His Excellency the Governor, by message, recommended to the House of Assembly the appropriation of such amounts of money as might be required for the purposes mentioned in the Bill.

PUBLIC FINANCE AND AUDIT BILL

His Excellency the Governor, by message, recommended to the House of Assembly the appropriation of such amounts of money as might be required for the purposes mentioned in the Bill.

PETITION: EDUCATION FUNDING

A petition signed by four residents of South Australia praying that the House urge the Government to restore State education funding to pre-budget levels was presented by the Hon. G.J. Crafter.

Petition received.

PETITIONS: ADOPTIONS

Petitions signed by 538 residents of South Australia praying that the House urge the Government to waive the service fee of \$1 200 imposed by the Department for Community Welfare for overseas adoptions were presented by Mr S. J. Baker and the Hon. Jennifer Cashmore.

Petitions received.

PETITION: BUS ROUTE 681

A petition signed by 517 residents of South Australia praying that the House urge the Government to introduce at least two bus services on route 681 on Saturdays was presented by Mr Robertson.

Petition received.

PETITION: THE STAGE COMPANY

A petition signed by 181 residents of South Australia praying that the House urge the Government to review its decision to withdraw funding for the Stage Company theatre company was presented by the Hon. Jennifer Cashmore.

Petition received.

QUESTIONS

The **SPEAKER**: I direct that written answers to the following questions on the Notice Paper, as detailed in the schedule that I now table, be distributed and printed in

Hansard: Nos 65 to 77, 101, 120, 185, 224 to 226, 231 to 236, 238 to 244, 247, 248, 256, 257, and 259 to 262.

PAPERS TABLED

The following papers were laid on the table:

- By the Minister for the Arts (Hon. J.C. Bannon):
State Theatre Company of South Australia—Report, 1985-86.
- By the Minister of Forests (Hon. R.K. Abbott):
Forestry Act 1950—Proclamation—Myora Forest Reserve Revocation.
- By the Minister of Transport (Hon. G.F. Keneally):
Local Government Act 1934—Regulations—Long Service Leave.
Corporation of Adelaide—No. 38—Central Market.
District Council of Central Yorke Peninsula—By-laws—
No. 1—Repeal of Certain By-laws.
No. 4—Controlling the Foreshore.
- By the Minister of Education (Hon. G.J. Crafter):
Classification of Publications Act 1974—Regulations—
Classifications Exemption.
Commercial Tribunal Act 1982—Regulations—Travel Agents.
Travel Agents Act 1986—General Regulations, 1987.
- By the Minister of Correctional Services (Hon. Frank Blevins):
Correctional Services Act 1982—Regulation—Offensive Weapons.

QUESTION TIME

The **SPEAKER**: Before calling on questions, I advise that questions that would otherwise be answered by the Minister of Recreation and Sport will be taken by the Minister of Labour; and questions that would otherwise be directed to the Minister of State Development and Technology will be taken by the Deputy Premier.

PRISONERS' EMPLOYMENT

Mr **OLSEN**: Will the Premier immediately direct the Department of Correctional Services to review its procedures for helping prisoners to obtain employment after their release? I seek urgent action on this matter following revelations in a recent State Industrial Commission case which raise grave questions about departmental procedures and the extent to which the Government is prepared to protect the interests of prisoners at the expense of prospective employers.

The case involved a claim for wrongful dismissal by a man who, while in prison, had been advised by the department to give false information about his criminal record in any application for employment. The man was subsequently employed as a storeman—a position of trust—by a company which dismissed him after finding out about his criminal record, which covered a period of about 20 years. The man had specifically denied any convictions in his application for employment.

In fact, his convictions included falsification of accounts in February 1975; four counts of false pretences; six counts of forging; six counts of uttering; 19 counts of larceny as a servant in 1977; and in 1983, four counts of forgery, three of uttering, two of false pretences, 14 counts of obtaining money by fraud as a bankrupt and five of obtaining credit as a bankrupt. Various Federal, District and Supreme Court

sentences of up to 3½ years were imposed for these convictions.

During the hearing of his claim for wrongful dismissal, evidence was given by a senior psychologist with the Department of Correctional Services, Mr P. K. Burns. I quote the following question and answer:

Am I to understand from your evidence in the commission this morning that you advise these people to lie in their application forms? . . . If you put it bluntly, yes.

In other words, this procedure completely condones dishonesty and falsification of information to which an employer has a legitimate right in assessing the suitability of applicants for employment.

The Hon. FRANK BLEVINS: I will certainly get a report on that for the Leader. We have heard one side of the argument. The Executive Director of the Department of Correctional Services will hear the side of the argument of the officer who was named, and I will bring a response back to the honourable member.

GRAFFITI

Mr FERGUSON: Can the Minister of Transport advise the House how the State Transport Authority is currently tackling the problem of graffiti on stations, in bus shelters and elsewhere on the authority's premises? I ask this question because of concern in my electorate, particularly about the Adelaide to Grange railway line. Both the train itself and every station on the route are suffering from the visual blight of graffiti. Even the new Grange railway station which was erected for many thousands of dollars is suffering from this problem. Some of the graffiti is offensive and cannot be called an art form by any method of comparison.

I understand that this is a problem in all electorates and the visual blight caused by idle hands with spray cans and other tools of desecration is something that occurs in every area. I am aware of the recent statement by Mr Nick Wagner, of the Port Adelaide Unemployed Self Help Group, that the roots of the graffiti problem lie deep, and that just increasing penalties is not a satisfactory answer. Mr Wagner's statement in the local press recently was, 'Why should people treat property with respect, if people with property will not respect them?'. I acknowledge that Mr Wagner may have a point, but what we are talking about here is public property, and I think the public would be interested to know how the problem is being tackled and with what success.

The SPEAKER: Order! Before calling on the Minister of Transport, I point out to the member for Henley Beach that he transgressed in the same way as did the Leader of the Opposition by introducing comment into his question. The honourable Minister of Transport.

The Hon. G.F. KENEALLY: The short answer to the question is that the STA, in its dealings with graffiti, is finding the problem quite serious and difficult. I do not propose to respond to some of the motivation of graffiti artists, whether it be a social statement, a philosophical commitment, vandalism, or however people would describe it. The bare fact, as far as the STA is concerned, is that it is a very serious and costly problem. I expect that the ultimate answer lies in areas other than just trying to paint out graffiti. About two weeks ago I had the opportunity to ride on the Victorian railway system, and following that I can say that graffiti is not a phenomenon that the Adelaide transit authorities have on their own. I think that Victoria is suffering a much more serious problem, as are Sydney and other large cities.

I will point out as briefly as I can what the STA is actually doing, although I can give no assurance about the permanency of the results of its work. I do not want to alert prospective offenders to what is going on, but I think the question is legitimate and the action taken should be spelt out.

Originally, a small team of two painters was employed to paint out all graffiti each day, as it occurred. The thinking was two-fold: first, to clean it up to ease the visual blight; and, secondly, the assumption that graffiti attracts graffiti. After several weeks all graffiti of some age had been painted out. However, as all members would appreciate, new graffiti continued to be a problem. With so many newly painted spaces, of course, the graffiti artists were, I guess, attracted to that and, in fact, graffiti increased. Eventually, the STA was forced to employ four painters full-time. At this stage graffiti proliferated to such an extent that stations repainted one day were completely covered by the next.

In a change of strategy, one station at a time was repainted and the stations that were repainted were closely observed by the police overnight in an effort to catch offenders. In the first few months more than 100 offenders were caught. However, the graffiti continued to appear and police, as everyone will appreciate, could not stay at a station or other site all night. It would be a futile use of their resources and a great cost to the taxpayers. In fact, the whole exercise was proving quite expensive. Therefore, the STA tried another tactic which, on the face of it, might sound a bit odd. However, if members think it through they will realise that it may help a bit. The new tactic is that no graffiti is being painted out, so that there is no attractive bare space to despoil. For the moment it does appear that the amount of graffiti has declined.

Mr S.J. Baker: No free spaces—

The Hon. G.F. KENEALLY: No free space for them to paint on. When I asked members to think it through so they might understand the value of this, I was not allowing for the member for Mitcham. He needs it spelt out in words of small syllables. Clearly, the result of this is a matter of fine judgment because after a certain period it is planned to start out again with a gang of four painters painting out graffiti. We hope that by then the practice will, to some degree, have died out. As I said earlier, there is no single simple answer to the question. It is hoped that the advent of the transit squad, with the police and the STA constables working cooperatively, will have some effect in reducing the amount of graffiti that has been left, in the main, by people who have some anti-social attitude towards community property. I once again reinforce that the real answer lies in other areas, and not by merely painting out or cleaning up the graffiti.

AMDEL

The Hon. E.R. GOLDSWORTHY: Will the Premier table in the House the secret Government document on Amdel which the Federal member for Hindmarsh, Mr John Scott, intends to give to the Thebarton council? I do not know whether or not the Premier missed it, but on television news Mr Scott claimed to have a secret Amdel report, or what he called a 'secret Bannan Government document'.

He intends to make this document available to Thebarton council as part of his private campaign to assist the Public Service Association in its attempts to stop what he describes as the sell-out of Amdel. We all know that Mr Scott has been an opponent of Amdel's activities over a long period. In fact, in 1981 Mr Scott joined with the Premier and the

member for Briggs in public demonstrations against the activities of Amdel at Thebarton.

Members interjecting:

The Hon. E.R. GOLDSWORTHY: In fact, at that stage (I am relaying facts to the House) the member for Briggs, in the publication *Nuclear Hazards*, accused Amdel of paying little regard to worker safety and of engaging in 'duplicitous' (his word) which had not 'assisted the national debate over uranium'. That was at the same time as the member for Briggs and others in the then Opposition's employ were falsifying documents and making them available to the media in their strong anti-nuclear campaign.

I refer to the Government's recent change of mind over Amdel and the Premier's statement on Thursday that Amdel is an important part of the State's research and development effort. It was welcomed by all those who had been appalled by those earlier activities to which I have alluded when the Government (the then Opposition Labor Party) was anti-uranium and anti-Amdel. While Mr Scott has been consistent, with the change of attitude of the Government, particularly in recent times with its advocacy of the privatisation of Amdel, it is imperative, if the Premier wants to scotch Mr Scott's latest activities—now that he is not with him—that that secret document be tabled in Parliament.

The Hon. J.C. BANNON: I am not aware of the document to which the honourable member may be referring or which Mr Scott claims to have in his possession. Over a long period Mr Scott has expressed his concern about the Amdel pilot plant at Thebarton and, in particular, the processing of uranium there, and the dumping of uranium and its storage but, of course, as the honourable member would know, in 1981 certain action was undertaken in relation to further processing and a clean-up of the dump occurred, resulting in a stabilised situation. I am not aware of any new cause for concern in relation to Thebarton but, if there is, no doubt my colleague the Minister will get the appropriate report in due course and take action on it.

As far as Thebarton is concerned, the point must be made that, as the site of the former Government laboratories, subsequently operated by Amdel, most of the wastes in question were brought in from Radium Hill in the Playford days—those days when we were so desperate to get into the nuclear fuel cycle and do anything in that area that we did not worry about the consequences. At Port Pirie, Thebarton and in parts of the outback—

The Hon. E.R. Goldsworthy interjecting:

The Hon. J.C. BANNON: Yes. In those places we have paid a fairly heavy price for that. I just mentioned that in the context of those who are saying—

Members interjecting:

The Hon. J.C. BANNON: Yes, to try to legitimise the process. I mention that in the context of those who are saying that Amdel has some special particular policy in relation to those residual dumps. We do not believe that is so. The Government has a responsibility in that and, indeed, in the proposition that my colleague has discussed with Amdel, the Thebarton land will in fact remain in Government ownership and Amdel, for any continuing operations there, will be under a leasing arrangement. I mention that because there has been some misrepresentation about what will happen. I can add nothing further to that in reply to the question.

RECYCLED WASTE

Mr ROBERTSON: My question is directed to the Minister of Transport, representing the Minister of Local Gov-

ernment. Is the Minister aware that a recent survey conducted in Tasmania indicates that a large proportion of householders favour recycling of household wastes? In the light of the survey results, will the Minister undertake to investigate methods by which local government authorities might be encouraged to recycle household waste presently collected by local authorities in South Australia?

In the November 1986 issue of the Conservation Council newsletter it was revealed that a survey in Glenorchy, Tasmania, had shown that 84 per cent of people favoured recycling of household wastes. In practice, of course, only 10 per cent actually made an effort to do that, but the conclusion of the report is that municipal wide waste separation systems could significantly reduce the cost of private waste disposal. For that reason, I ask the Minister whether she will undertake to investigate methods by which that can be achieved.

The SPEAKER: I point out once again for the benefit of certain members that there is no need to repeat the question at the end of the explanation.

The Hon. G.F. KENEALLY: I will be quite happy to refer the honourable member's question to my colleague in another place. It is an important question which generates quite a considerable amount of public debate. I am well aware, as the previous Minister of Local Government, that there is support for the recycling of all wastes, and waste separation schemes have been tried in various parts of the world with varying degrees of success or efficiency and, indeed, with varying degrees of cost.

I had the opportunity to see some of those in North America. This matter is always on the agenda for the Minister of Local Government as Minister responsible for waste management in South Australia. Her commission officers would be up with the current technology on this matter. I will be happy to refer the honourable member's question to my colleague and bring back an early reply.

WINEPAK

The Hon. JENNIFER CASHMORE: Will the Premier confirm that in 1983 he approved South Australian Government financial assistance to allow marketing of the 250 ml winepak that the Government now wants banned, and will he say how much this has or will cost taxpayers? Early in 1983 the Munno Para Cooperative Limited applied to the South Australian Government for financial assistance to proceed with marketing of a 250 ml winepak—the first of its type in Australia.

I have a sample of the pack, and it is exactly the same as the pack over which the Government has recently made so much fuss. The assistance was approved in August 1983 by the Premier under the Industries Development Act. The Opposition has been advised that, without this assistance, given in the form of a Government guarantee of a \$400 000 bank loan, this sort of winepak would never have come on to the market in the first place.

What is more, the applicant for financial assistance made it very clear at the time that it was intended specifically to appeal to younger people. I quote, from the *News* of 18 November 1983, a statement by the Manager of the Munno Para Cooperative, Mr Tom Tracey, who said:

We are marketing Winepak as a beverage directed at young people with the object of having it gain acceptance as an all occasion leisure drink.

This statement referred to the company's attempts to gain a foothold in domestic as well as export markets. The Opposition has checked with the Department of Environment to confirm that the ban imposed last month applies

to all 250 ml packs containing wine based products, including the one first marketed more than three years ago with direct Government financial assistance and encouragement.

What is more, I understand that the Munno Para Co-operative Winery is in liquidation, meaning that the Government may be liable to repay at least some of the \$400 000 loan it guaranteed. This extraordinary set of circumstances, in which the Government has directly assisted a form of wine marketing that it subsequently moved to ban, requires a full explanation from the Premier.

The SPEAKER: Before calling on the Premier, I remind the member for Coles that it is a longstanding practice of this House not to allow displays of objects or documents in the Chamber.

An honourable member: Disgraceful!

The SPEAKER: Order! That includes the honourable Minister of Labour, who is brandishing a document at the moment. I particularly direct my remarks to the member for Coles. Members are supposed to be making an impact during Question Time with their oratory and not by brandishing material. This is a particularly serious problem now that television cameras are allowed to be present during Question Time, because the opportunity is now available for members to abuse the access granted to the television cameras by deliberately brandishing material for the benefit of those cameras.

The Hon. J.C. BANNON: I hope that the honourable member's question, and the way in which she has framed it, is not a criticism of the Government's support of the wine industry, its marketing and its development.

Members interjecting:

The Hon. J.C. BANNON: I will come to the question in a moment. If the honourable member, as a South Australian who purports to be interested in our tourism industry, can stand here and try to foment matters in this way, some serious examination must be made by the Opposition of its attitude. My Government is concerned that we have a healthy, productive wine industry, and we will provide all assistance for it. We will not be deterred by Opposition attacks on that assistance. Indeed, the industry welcomes our active intervention, both federally and in terms of specific support.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order! Members on my left seem to be showing insufficient interest in the response from the Premier, apparently in an endeavour to drown him out.

The Hon. J.C. BANNON: I am getting rather used to this happening. I suggest that this question was not seriously asked. The starting point is the fact that this Government has in the past supported, and will in the future continue to support, the wine industry. If members opposite want to criticise it, then they should come out directly and say so. Let them attack our policies on the wine industry. The Leader and various members on the other side, such as the member for the Riverland, are quite happy to big deal themselves among members of the wine industry and then to see that industry undermined in this way in this House. Coming to this package, I do not have possession of—

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order!

The Hon. J.C. BANNON: I will send the word around; don't worry. This is the sort of action—

The Hon. E.R. Goldsworthy interjecting:

The SPEAKER: I call the Deputy Leader of the Opposition to order.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order! If members on my left persist in interjecting after the House has been called to order and

after specific members have been called to order, I will name them.

The Hon. J.C. BANNON: I do not know the precise details of the application for assistance to which the honourable member has referred. but, if it was under the Industries Development Act, it plainly would have come as a recommendation from the Industries Development Committee on which the Opposition is represented in equal numbers with the Government. So, I suggest that whatever support was granted on that unanimous recommendation. I suspect again that, if the honourable member has a bone to pick, or a quarrel over that particular support for that cooperative winery and its marketing, then she should take it up not only with them but also with her fellow members on the IDC.

I turn finally to the package itself. At the time the packaging was proposed, there was nothing wrong with it. In fact, the wine industry is to be encouraged to find all forms of appropriate packaging to ensure that its product is readily available and exportable and that there will be growth and development in the wine industry. I make no apology for saying that. At the end of last year a company produced a particular package containing a product with a certain level of alcohol and a certain type of product which has special appeal to young people and which is very like a fruit juice drink. It packaged that drink in what many people would say was a totally dishonest attempt to represent it as some sort of soft drink, and by so doing and allowing these things to be available from refrigerators it could possibly have confused children; that would certainly be undesirable. There is a world of difference between that and a convenient wine pack. If the honourable member does not understand that, there is something wrong with her.

I think that Lindemans, the company which produced the winepak, should stand condemned in the wine industry, and I have already gone on record as saying that. By that irresponsible action, that company forced the wine industry onto the defensive in terms of its marketing posture, it created question marks over the whole concept of wine coolers, and it forced Ministers of Health and Government to act accordingly. It is a case of going too far and, as a result, those companies packaging sensibly in this form (and I include the Munno Para Cooperative in that, although the honourable member clearly does not), have been penalised for it. That is a pity.

I think it is a warning to the industry about the care it must take in its packaging and marketing. I repeat: when the packaging was proposed, there was nothing wrong with the proposed form of the marketing. It was the attempt through the Tropicana packaging to represent that product as a fruit juice which placed a shadow over the whole matter and that product. The matter has been dealt with promptly and effectively. I suggest that it has been a good warning to the industry. However, it is also a warning to South Australians, including members who purport to be interested in tourism and development in this State. Our wine industry is too important to play with politically. We need to be committed to the industry, and we need to ensure that it behaves responsibly so that unreasonable marketing restrictions are not placed on it. That is the action that we have taken throughout, completely consistent with our support of the wine industry, on the one hand, and ensuring that it observes proper standards and methods on the other hand.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order! The honourable member for Price.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order! The member for Price has the call and no-one else.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order! I warn the Leader of the Opposition. Barely five minutes have elapsed since I pointed out to the House that I would deal very seriously with any member who continued to interject after the House or any individual member had been called to order. The honourable member for Price.

LIVE SHEEP EXPORTS

Mr De LAINE: Can the Minister of Marine tell the House what steps have been taken to retain and expand the live sheep export trade, especially in relation to No. 1 berth at Outer Harbor? Last year, South Australia was facing the possibility of losing the valuable live sheep export trade if ship loading facilities at Outer Harbor, especially No. 1 berth, were not upgraded. The live sheep trade injects approximately \$44 million into the South Australian economy and is far too important an industry to lose to another State.

The Hon. R.K. ABBOTT: I thank the honourable member for his question. I am sure that all parties involved in the live sheep trade will be pleased to know that the Government has taken positive action in upgrading facilities at Outer Harbor. The No. 1 berth at Outer Harbor is the key to regaining that part of the live sheep trade lost from Port Adelaide to Portland, in Victoria. A working party examined the entire question of the live sheep export trade and found that there was a more pressing need to upgrade No. 1 berth at Outer Harbor to handle the larger ships now operating. Subsequently, the Public Works Standing Committee recommended that the project proceed at an estimated cost of \$2.35 million. I am pleased to say that that work is proceeding satisfactorily and is expected to be completed within the budget allocation by May this year.

COURT SENTENCE

Mr BECKER: Will the Premier obtain a report on why his Government did not appeal against the leniency of a sentence imposed on Christopher Douglas Disney, a co-conspirator with Reginald Spiers and Barbara Tobin in the importation of \$1.2 million worth of cannabis resin into Australia, who was released from prison last year after serving less than two years of his sentence under the Government's parole system and will he ascertain the conditions of Disney's parole?

Christopher Disney was charged along with Spiers and Tobin in August 1981 with having conspired to import into Australia about 40 kilograms of cannabis resin concealed in hollowed out tape recorders. He absconded with Spiers and Tobin while on bail in October 1981. The three were subsequently arrested and charged in India with drug smuggling after they attempted to screw metal containers of drugs to some Australia-bound vessels in Bombay.

Disney absconded again, this time to the United States, where he eventually surrendered to Australian Embassy officials in Washington in April 1984, and was extradited back to Adelaide. On 22 December 1984, in Adelaide, Disney was sentenced to 5½ years gaol, with a 31 month non-parole period. Under the parole scheme introduced by the Government, he was released on licence last year, having served less than two years gaol for his part in what the judge described as a 'large scale' operation.

I therefore ask the Premier to ascertain why his Government did not appeal against a sentence of this leniency in view of the offender's major involvement in the mass importation of an illegal drug to Australia, as well as having absconded on two occasions; and I also seek full details on the conditions of Disney's parole, so that the community can be assured that it is adequately protected against exposure to any further drug smuggling activities.

The Hon. J.C. BANNON: I will seek a report from my colleague the Attorney-General. I just make the point that the Attorney has always indicated that if in the view of the prosecuting authorities—the Crown Law authorities—appeals should be lodged, they will be lodged, and indeed on a number of occasions he has personally intervened to ensure this.

O-BAHN

Mr TYLER: Will the Minister of Transport inform the House whether the State Government is investigating the extension of the O-Bahn guided busway system to Adelaide's southern suburbs? In the *Sunday Mail* of 21 December 1986, an article on the front page stated that Adelaide could get a second O-Bahn busway serving the southern suburbs. The article quoted the Director-General of Transport, Dr Derek Scrafton, as saying that departmental officers had been looking at possible alignments south of the city. As the Minister and other members of the House will appreciate, this article has generated much interest in the southern suburbs, and I have been contacted by many constituents who are interested in these investigations. My constituents would appreciate the Minister saying whether there is an investigation and, if so, what is the current status of such an investigation.

The Hon. G.F. KENEALLY: I thank the honourable member for his question. I am quite happy to receive his very strong representations for the transport needs of the people living in the southern region of the metropolitan area. I am pleased to have the opportunity to explain the status of the report referred to. I guess I was as surprised as anybody else to see the headlines in the *Mail*. I imagine that the reporter who wrote the story is as interested in southern transport as my colleague is.

There is an investigation—we people in the technical areas describe them as quick and dirty investigations—which arose from my visit last year to some North American cities of similar size to Adelaide that had moved very strongly into rapid transport. I believe it is essential for planning of transport needs in the 1990s that the department and the Government should have available a very strong transport data base on which future transport decisions can be made. It is an internal departmental investigation—not a comprehensive investigation, and it is not really entitled to that status—but nevertheless, when we receive back the data, it will help to fill out the information base that we have.

I should point out to the House that it is a responsible thing for the Department of Transport, particularly the planning division, to continue to look at the transport needs both within and outside the metropolitan area and we have under way almost continuously small-type investigations for the use of the department and the Government in future transport planning. So yes, we have an investigation into rapid transport towards the southern areas, but it is designed to provide some information to assist the planners when they talk about our transport needs of the 1990s.

I point out very clearly that the resources available to the South Australian Government at present are such that any

very expensive transport option is difficult to contemplate. One does not know whether or not that will change, but it certainly would have to change before we can start talking, as a Government, about extending rapid transport in our city, as much as I would like to be able to say to all members representing the southern areas that that is a possibility. In the interim our road constructions in that area will be maintained to ensure that people in that part of Adelaide have adequate transport available to them.

MINERAL PROCESSING PLANT

The Hon. P.B. ARNOLD: Will the Deputy Premier explain why the proposal to construct a major mineral processing plant in a game reserve on the Murray River flood zone near Barmera was not submitted for the consideration of the South Australian Planning Commission? The Minister is aware of the proposal I am talking about. The planning procedures adopted for this proposal have caused widespread concern in the Riverland, with some people suggesting that this case highlights the potential conflict of interest in the same Minister holding the water resources and environment and planning portfolios.

Not only does the proposal involve establishing a complete sand and gravel washing, drying and screening plant on a site locked within the Loch Luna Game Reserve, controlled by the National Parks and Wildlife Service, but it will also force the closure of Chambers Creek which is a very popular recreational boating area running between the Murray and Lake Bonney.

Information provided to me indicates that, in considering a permit for works associated with this project, the Engineering and Water Supply Department asked the Department of Environment and Planning to assess only a pump and pipeline to handle run-off from the plant, and not for an assessment of the plant itself. As a result, the proposal was classified as a minor installation which would not require consideration and approval by the South Australian Planning Commission.

This effectively prevented interested parties, including local government, from making representations, despite the major impact this plant will have. Questions now being asked in the Riverland include why this proposal was not treated as a development application for appraisal by the Development Commission, what impact it will have on Lake Bonney as well as Chambers Creek, and whether the fact that the company that will build the plant also supplies the Engineering and Water Supply Department with filtration sand for metropolitan reservoirs in any way influenced departmental handling of this matter.

The Hon. D.J. HOPGOOD: In addition to the questions that may be being asked in the Riverland right now, I think I will be asking a few questions myself because, if the facts are as recited to the House by the honourable member, there is little doubt that this should have been treated as a section 7 application under the Planning Act and, as such, it would certainly have to be referred to the Planning Commission (although the Crown is not bound), and there are circumstances in which that advice would have to be tabled in this House. In addition, there would have to be consultation with the National Parks and Wildlife Service. I will certainly investigate the matter as one of urgency and bring a full report back to the House and the honourable member.

UNDER-AGE DRINKING

Mr HAMILTON: My question is directed to the Minister of Education, representing the Attorney-General in another

place. Will the Minister advise what further efforts are being considered by the Government to assist the hotel industry, in particular licensees and bar persons, in detecting minors who purchase or attempt to purchase liquor from hotels? At the Port Adelaide AHA Christmas function I was approached by their President, Mr Barry McMutrie, who expressed concern about the incidence of under-age drinking at hotels and the recent amendments to the Liquor Licensing Act. Mr McMutrie's views and those of his association are summed up in the editorial in the AHA's February 1987 edition which states, in part:

Under the new laws, licensees who sell or supply liquor to minors face penalties of up to \$10 000. And bartenders who do likewise can be fined up to \$2 000.

The article continues:

Mr Sumner said the message to licensees was that they must take all possible steps to ensure that minors did not obtain or consume liquor on their licensed premises or else their licence would be in jeopardy. Under the Bill, a licensee convicted for a second time would be required to show cause why the licence should not be revoked or suspended. Mr Sumner said the Bill was aimed at reducing liquor by minors and incidences of disorderly behaviour related to liquor use. What is not taken care of in the legislation is some water-tight means of being able to tell whether a person is 18 years—the age at which the Government says people can legally consume and purchase alcohol at licensed premises. The undeniable fact is that many 14, 15, 16 and 17 year olds look 18. And, of course, a number of 18 year olds look younger.

Some form of reliable identification is needed, such as identity cards with an attached photograph. Then—and only then—can the finger legitimately be pointed at liquor retailers for breaches of the law. Also overlooked in the under age drinking debate is the parental role. They share as much responsibility as anyone. The Government must act urgently to assist hotelkeepers and their staff to be able to police the situation—something they already are doing their best at.

Will the Minister obtain a report on this matter from the Attorney-General?

The Hon. G.J. CRAFTER: I shall be pleased to refer the honourable member's question to my colleague in another place for his response. I might say that there always will be some difficulties for publicans and their staff in proving the age of a person who comes to those premises to purchase or consume liquor. Naturally, it is disappointing to see the attitude being taken by the Party of members opposite with respect to the introduction of the Australia Card, which would in fact give that identification that is required to overcome problems such as this.

The South Australian community has very much appreciated the amendments that have been passed by this Government in recent years to ensure that a responsible approach is taken by licensees to the supply of liquor in the community and to eliminate, to the extent that that is possible, the supply of liquor to minors. That is why the comments of the Premier in Question Time regarding the decision by Health Ministers last week on the supply and packaging of some coolers are of great concern to the community. The question is an important one, and I will ask the Attorney-General to provide information on it to the honourable member and his constituents.

WATER MAINS MAINTENANCE

Mr OSWALD: Can the Minister of Water Resources advise how the Government intends to maintain an emergency after hours service for the repair of water mains that have burst for a variety of reasons following its decision to cut out overtime to repair gangs after 4.30 p.m. each afternoon? In the past, emergency repair work on weekdays has been carried out by gangs which, if necessary, worked past 4.30 p.m. to repair and reconnect services. On weekends

only four gangs are on standby for the whole of the metropolitan area to perform these services. I am informed that instructions have now been issued to all depots stating that no work is to commence after 3 p.m. that cannot be completed by 4.30 p.m. On these occasions the gangs have been instructed to plug the breaks and leave the mains until the next day. It has been put to me that during the week this will mean that, if a service to a house or a street is damaged and requires repair to restore water, unless a special authorisation is obtained on a one-off basis, depending on the size of the emergency, water will not be restored to properties until the next day, leaving families, commercial properties and livestock without water overnight.

The Hon. D.J. HOPGOOD: I will get a reply for the honourable member.

WEA CHILD-CARE CENTRE

Ms LENEHAN: Will the Minister of Education initiate urgent discussions with the Federal Government to ensure that funding is made available for the ongoing operation of the Workers Educational Association Angas Street child-care centre? In an article in last Thursday's *News* under the heading of 'Sorry, kids, the laughter has gone,' the plight of the WEA child-care centre in Angas Street was outlined. I would like to quote from this article, which states:

Here we have a beautifully equipped building, perfect for small children, and it is standing empty every day.

The article goes on to say:

Through its demise, hundreds of parents will not study WEA-courses.

The switchboard operator is further quoted as saying:

I feel really sorry for the parents who cannot get this sort of education or outside interest because they can't leave home.

Since that article appeared in the local paper I have been contacted by a number of people who are concerned about this issue, and it has been put to me that, in fact, courses offered by the WEA and by the Department of Technical and Further Education are for many people the only avenues by which they can develop their skills and confidence to re-enter the work force. I therefore ask the Minister to initiate urgent discussions to ensure that this child-care centre becomes fully operational for those students wishing to attend the WEA.

The Hon. G.J. CRAFTER: I thank the honourable member for her question, and I share her concern about the need for the provision of children's services in the community, particularly child-care and occasional care. It is a matter of concern to us all that there has been, for over a decade or so, a growing awareness in the community of the importance of children's services. Unfortunately, it was not until the election of the Hawke Administration that there was some addressing of the neglect of the past in this area. Throughout Australia 20 000 new child-care places are being established, and South Australia is receiving its share of those.

Just last week I announced a further 19 child-care centres which are being established in South Australia, but this centre is one which intends to provide occasional care in an important educational climate for a key group of people in the community, many of whom are women who are entering into recreational educational courses or those that will lead to further educational opportunities. I can advise honourable members that officers of the Children's Services Office in South Australia have been talking to their Federal counterparts in the Department of Community Services about funding of this program.

One of the difficulties has been the guidelines that the Commonwealth Government has established with respect to occasional care programs. At the Ministers meeting last year I raised the problem of restrictions placed in the guidelines for funding these programs and, as a result of that, South Australia, New South Wales and the Commonwealth have had a series of meetings to try to clarify this matter. It will be raised again at the forthcoming Ministers meeting and, hopefully, can be further clarified there. In the meantime, I will be pleased to make further recommendations to my Federal colleague on behalf of the WEA.

KANGAROO ISLAND

The Hon. TED CHAPMAN: Will the Premier tell the House now or in due course whether, prior to the opening day of 12 February 1987, he, his department, or that of any other of his Ministers had been consulted on the concept of Kangaroo Island becoming Australia's first regional park? When doing so, will he identify the level and nature of the State's input to this notion, if any? Last week, I was informed that the Federal Minister for Arts, Heritage and Environment (the Hon. Barry Cohen) had recently provided grants for a range of his portfolio related studies to be undertaken.

Listed in the Federal Minister's schedule was a substantial amount granted to an Adelaide University student to fund her study into the feasibility of Kangaroo Island becoming Australia's first regional park. Contact on Thursday of last week with the Chief Executive Officer of the Kingscote district council, the local Editor of the *Islander* newspaper, and the State Director of the National Parks and Wildlife Service confirmed that no consultation whatsoever had occurred between the Federal Minister's office and the South Australian and Kangaroo Island based authorities that have been mentioned.

Until I received a report of the Minister's action taken last week, I had not heard of a proposal to expend public money on something that has already been described as a gross waste. The State Director of the National Parks and Wildlife Service in South Australia said words to the effect that he had heard of the notion floating around but that nothing formal on the concept or its specific study had been discussed with him or, as far as he was aware, his officers. Following radio coverage of this matter on Thursday of last week, feedback from islanders and some mainlanders was most critical of the following matters:

1. The appalling lack of consultation with either the relevant State authority or local community in question.
2. The waste of public funds.
3. The absurdity of the study subject.
4. The absence of a perceived appreciation of the island residents' sensitivity to their own land and environmental management.
5. The insult of having a concept of this outrageously ridiculous and impractical kind thrust upon them by the federal bureaucracy, or any other remote, ill informed or eccentric agency without at least having the courtesy of communication with the island people.

The Hon. D.J. HOPGOOD: In 1968 the Flinders University of South Australia was so enlightened, or misguided (whichever way one might regard it), as to decide to pay me \$1 800 per year plus a living allowance to undertake a doctorate in a particular class of study. This related to political history and may have had various ramifications on people living or dead whose relatives were still around the place. That university did this State the discourtesy of not fully consulting with the people of South Australia

before deciding to let this fellow Hopgood loose on the people of South Australia.

What we have here is virtually the same situation: this is a post-graduate student who has been granted \$1 763 to do her Master's degree in geography. There are post-graduate students doing research into all areas of human endeavour all the time. What, if anything, may come from this study no-one really knows. For some time, people in Australia have been a little interested in the British concept of the regional park. I tell the honourable member and the House, if they do not already know, that, in fact, the mainstream environmental movement in this country is not keen on this British concept and sees the introduction of the regional park into our system as breaking down certain aspects of our system.

The honourable member would know, as a former Minister of Agriculture, that there are certain forms of land use which, if undertaken in national parks, draw a great deal of aggro from the environmental movement and others. I believe that during the time of the Government in which he was a Minister there was a good deal of debate about certain matters such as allowing sheep onto national parks and that sort of thing. I would be very surprised if the honourable member had not involved himself in those debates.

The British concept of regional parks would allow such forms of land use, so I have to say that the mainstream environmental movement in this State and throughout the country and I are not particularly enamoured of the British approach. However, there is absolutely nothing wrong with assisting a post-graduate student to examine the possibility or the applicability of such a concept to any part of the country.

I imagine that there is nothing sinister in the choice of Kangaroo Island for the study. I hope that the honourable member's 'people' (as he calls them) would be rather flattered that this student should be so attracted by the beauties of Kangaroo Island that she sees it as an appropriate area for the study of this sort of treatment. As to whether anything will ever come out of this any more than anything ever comes out of any other postgraduate work (my own, for example) is something for the future. Obviously, the honourable member will have any opportunity that he likes to vent his feelings on any specific proposition that ever came forward from either the Federal Government or the State Government or, indeed, from either of the local government authorities on 'his' island.

ROO BARS

Mr PLUNKETT: Will the Minister of Transport advise whether the State Government intends to introduce any restrictions on the use of roo bars by city drivers? Like many other members I am concerned about the high number of deaths on our roads. Recently I had an opportunity to inspect certain roo bars that can be fitted to cars and trucks without restriction. I am concerned about the danger to pedestrians, cyclists and other drivers through the use of roo bars in city traffic.

I have been told that many of the people who drive vehicles fitted with roo bars do so more for fashion than for protection. In fact, the nearest many of them would get to a kangaroo would be when driving past a zoo. I am also told that in an accident with other vehicles a car fitted with a roo bar could most certainly kill or maim. I can recall years ago that car manufacturers were prevented from placing mascots on the front of motor vehicles because they

were potential killers: the mascot acted as a knife on any person hit by a car fitted with such a mascot. Many people interested in road safety are concerned about the growing number of four-wheel drive city vehicles—including Toyotas, Nissans and Datsuns—using roo bars. It has been suggested that the use of these bars should be restricted or regulated.

The Hon. G.F. KENEALLY: I thank the honourable member for his question. He is at least one person who has had wide experience in driving throughout the outback of South Australia and other Australian States and he would be aware of the need for a roo bar (or bull-bar as they are otherwise known) in the bush. This is the first time that this matter has been drawn to my attention. I have had no notice from my department or any other road safety authority that roo bars (or bull-bars) are in fact a traffic hazard. I will have the department look very closely at the honourable member's question to see whether or not bull-bars conform to all safety requirements. Certainly they must conform to standards and, in fact, there would be Australian standards for them.

It is true that most commercial vehicles—big trucks, buses, four-wheel drives, and so on—that travel out into the country have these protective bars, and they do not necessarily frequent the inner metropolitan area all that much (although, of course, there are a few that do so). On the face of it, I believe that the honourable member's question would get some support. I am not too sure whether these protective bars are of all steel or plastic construction, or whether there is an acceptable method or material for their construction. I will look at all these matters. Obviously they are not considered to be a great danger to pedestrians and other motorists because they would have become a matter of controversy before now. However, the member may have come upon an item or area of motoring that has not been looked at adequately; I am prepared to do that for him.

TRAFFIC LIGHTS

Mr S.G. EVANS: Will the Minister of Transport treat as a matter of urgency the installation of traffic lights at the junction of Sargent Parade and Shepherds Hill Road, Bellevue Heights? I have raised this matter over many years, and in more recent times the member for Fisher has raised it. The school council has also raised it and has asked for a pedestrian crossing. However, the request has always been refused because the department argues that there is not enough pedestrian traffic to justify such an installation.

We have now changed our minds and asked for the installation of traffic lights instead of a pedestrian crossing because of a build-up in the amount of traffic going into the aged homes and the hostel accommodation at Bellevue Heights and, more particularly, because on Monday of this week the flag monitor who puts up the flags for the school was knocked down by a motor car and admitted to the Flinders Medical Centre. Her injuries are not serious, but parents and the school are concerned. In fact, I was telephoned and told about the accident immediately after it happened. I now ask the Minister this question in relation to traffic lights and not school crossing lights.

The Hon. G.F. KENEALLY: I will have the honourable member's question investigated. In fact, that is already happening because the member for Fisher, who shares an electoral boundary with the member for Davenport, has already raised the matter with me. I acknowledge the concern of both members for safety near our schools. I convey to the young monitor who was knocked over and to her parents

my deep concern that in doing such public spirited work she was involved in an accident. My sympathy goes to the family, and I hope that she recovers very quickly. I will look at the matter and bring down a report for the member.

LEAVE OF ABSENCE: HON. T.M. McRAE

Mrs APPLEBY (Hayward): I move:

That one month's leave of absence be granted to the honourable member for Playford, Hon. T.M. McRae, on account of ill health.

Motion carried.

STATUTES AMENDMENT (TAXATION) BILL

Adjourned debate on second reading.

(Continued from 4 December. Page 2777.)

Mr OLSEN (Leader of the Opposition): The Opposition supports this Bill. Introduced into the House by the Premier last December it merely seeks to amend five separate State revenue Acts to enable complementary legislation for the proper exchange of tax information with other State, Territory and Commonwealth Commissioners. As the Commonwealth Taxation Laws Amendment Act (No. 2) was passed in October 1985, it has been seen as necessary for respective States and Territories to enact their own legislation. Certainly, the South Australian legislation has been some time coming in. One can only assume that during the course of 1986 the Government had other measures that it wanted to pass through Parliament prior to this measure—for example, the workers compensation and industrial health, safety and welfare legislation—to distance it from the next election. No doubt the Premier wanted to get that legislation through Parliament and out of the way as expeditiously as possible.

The Bill before the House defines the term 'State Taxation Officer' and makes the necessary arrangements for the exchange of reciprocal information. It also ensures confidentiality of information passing between relevant authorities. As is indicated in the Bill, the clauses each deal with a separate State Act, include the necessary secrecy provisions and fines for breach of same, and define 'State Taxation Officer' within that particular Act, or both. As the Bill is essentially a housekeeping measure, the Opposition supports it.

The Hon. J.C. BANNON (Premier and Treasurer): I thank the Opposition for indicating its support. This measure is a simple one: it gives effect to uniform legislation between State and Federal Governments and provides for secrecy protections where there is exchange of information. I commend the Bill to the House.

Bill read a second time.

In Committee:

Clause 1 passed.

Clause 2—'Secrecy.'

Mr M.J. EVANS: Could the Premier give an assurance on a point which I am sure has been covered but which has not so far been detailed in debate on this legislation because of its fairly routine nature? The clause, as do all the other clauses covered here, prohibits a person from divulging or communicating information acquired in or in connection with the administration of the Act. The word 'information' is not particularly defined in any of these parent Acts or in the provisions which we are inserting.

Could the Premier confirm that what is meant by 'information' is in effect personal information and not statistical or general information about particular references? In other words, is it designed to prohibit information about particular people and their activities being communicated, but not to prohibit communication, as it would appear in the general words used which do, in fact, prohibit statistical or overall references, or even references to particular classes of business or individual, so that information of interest to the community, members of Parliament and the Government can be obtained, but without divulging particular information about concerned individuals?

The Hon. J.C. BANNON: I would confirm that that is certainly the intention and the way it should operate. Essentially, this is a secrecy or privacy provision to protect individuals, and I suppose that the other side of that is to ensure that individuals will submit honest and detailed information knowing that that information will be protected from being communicated publicly except, of course, as the Act provides, with their consent, or if it is in connection with the administration. In a sense, the broader statistical figures or data that the honourable member mentions are probably more likely to arise in connection with some broader administrative or other matter. However, concerning personal information affecting that taxpayer, that is the purpose of the protection under this clause.

Mr M.J. EVANS: Could the Premier confirm that asking a question on notice in this place, or seeking information in any other way—for example, a list of those agencies registered under the Act—would not contravene his understanding of it? Will he confirm that he is only seeking to prohibit personal information—not, for example, a list of those registered or even the products they sold under this Act? I could think of a number of categories of information which would not be infringing personal rights but which might well now seem to come under the very broad heading of information—a list of those registered, a list of their annual turnovers of motor fuel spirit, and that kind of question which has broad statistical interest and may even relate back to an individual firm but which certainly does not contravene their right to privacy.

The Hon. J.C. BANNON: I guess there are degrees and lines to be drawn, and I cannot be quite as unequivocal in respect of that sort of thing. For instance, a list of all those businesses which are subject to the Business Franchise (Petroleum Products) Act could well involve questions of individual privacy, although one is not quite sure in what context that might arise. If, for instance, in asking general questions, people are actually attempting to find personal information, then obviously some care would have to be given as to the nature of the information supplied. If, for example, it is believed that X should be licensed under some particular Act, and you ask a general question and then search to see if their name appears and if it does not, you know that they have not been complying. That situation is a very marginal one.

I cannot quite envisage where the problem might arise. Essentially, this is about the exchange of information with the Commonwealth, which is where the divulging comes about. There is already a secrecy provision that the State Commissioner is required to observe. This seeks to modify that in certain circumstances, with the same principles that have been applied to date. I cannot be more specific than that, and I guess perhaps the only way to test it is that, if the honourable member has some particular instances in mind and would like a further report on it, I would be happy to get one from the Commissioner as to his practice in this area.

Clause passed.
 Remaining clauses (3 to 6) and title passed.
 Bill read a third time and passed.

MEAT HYGIENE ACT AMENDMENT BILL

Adjourned debate on second reading.
 (Continued from 3 December. Page 2679.)

Mr GUNN (Eyre): Two Bills are involved here, and the Opposition supports both of them. These pieces of legislation formalise an arrangement which has operated in South Australia since 1965. It makes good sense that, if we are to have a Meat Inspection Authority, it ought to be uniform across Australia, because it is important that, when products such as this are exported, people can have confidence. This legislation resulted from the meat substitution racket and work done by Mr Kelly and the Woodward Royal Commission in 1981. Following that Royal Commission, a joint Commonwealth-State working party was set up to examine and advise on the legal and financial aspects involved.

This legislation refers certain powers to the Commonwealth, and it is not normally the role of the Opposition to support a measure referring any State powers to the Commonwealth. We are more inclined to see the reverse take place, but I will not go into that matter today. This legislation allows the State, by way of proclamation, to recall those powers at any time. However, since the establishment of the Meat Hygiene Authority, the Commonwealth has had a seat on the authority, but it has only been in the capacity of an observer, and it makes commonsense that the Commonwealth ought to have a seat on that authority.

The Commonwealth will not be involved in the licensing or setting up of local slaughterhouses or in the standards of construction which should be enforced from time to time. This matter has been of considerable controversy over a long time. The measures we are now looking at have operated for a considerable time, and this legislation is formalising them. As I understand the situation, basically the rest of Australia has agreed to the legislation and, in my view, the sooner it is enacted the better for all concerned.

This Bill also tidies up one or two minor matters. It provides that all meat sold for human consumption must be branded, inspected by a Commonwealth inspector and passed fit for human consumption. It also allows licensed abattoirs to produce product to be sold as pet food, and to me that is commonsense. Up to this stage that has not been the case and I see no reason why it should not be so. I understand that there have been certain representations in relation to these amendments. I have had considerable consultation with representative groups and have heard no opposition to it whatsoever. I do not believe that there is any purpose in holding up the House, as the Opposition supports both measures. I sincerely hope that they will be beneficial to the industry.

It is essential that we ensure that, when exporting meat overseas, we have a high quality product and that the labelling is correct. We do not want any repeat meat substitution rackets or any other rackets which would in any way call into question the products we are exporting overseas. The abattoir industry across Australia has been in the doldrums for a considerable time. It involves a lot of capital and has to be efficient and well run. I see no purpose in having State and Federal inspectors doing the same job, and it seems that this lies best with the Commonwealth. Under this legislation the Commonwealth has accepted financial responsibility for licensing and other matters, and that may

relieve the State of some financial burden. The Opposition supports these measures. I sincerely hope that they work efficiently and that it is not necessary for the State to have to take back these powers (and I do not think it will be). I hope that the past problems I have raised concerning the Meat Hygiene Authority are not again called into question. I believe that in the administration of legislation of this nature commonsense should prevail, and I hope it does on this occasion.

The Hon. D.J. HOPGOOD (Deputy Premier): I thank the honourable member for the consideration he has given to this measure, and urge all members to support it.

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

MEAT INSPECTION (COMMONWEALTH POWERS) BILL

Adjourned debate on second reading.
 (Continued from 3 December. Page 2679.)

Mr GUNN (Eyre): It must be a drafting peculiarity to have two Bills to put into effect an agreement that has the support of all parties involved in the industry. The Opposition supports this Bill, for the reasons outlined earlier.

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

ADJOURNMENT

The Hon. D.J. HOPGOOD (Deputy Premier): I move:
 That the House do now adjourn.

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

A quorum having been formed:

Mr GUNN (Eyre): During this grievance debate I will raise one or two matters of concern to me. Earlier this year during debate on the Licensing Act I strongly criticised Mr Secker, the Licensing Commissioner. Following some publicity in the local newspaper Mr Secker took it on himself to respond, as of course is his right. Today I take it on myself to respond further in relation to that matter and to say that it is a pity that Mr Secker does not have to live with his recommendations. If he did he would not be so keen to make them without thinking them through.

In the last edition of the *West Coast Sentinel* considerable criticism was again levelled at Mr Secker. The recommendations he makes to the Licensing Commission may be only recommendations, but he holds the office of Licensing Commissioner and is in a position to influence that commission. It is my view that he should be reflecting the views of all the people who in those areas will be affected and that he should not put a narrow point of view which is unrepresentative and does not reflect the views of the majority of that community, and which involves recommendations that could cause considerable problems in the Ceduna area and would not, I believe, be acceptable in any other community of similar size. It is all very well for Mr Secker to go to bat and criticise me: I am happy to accept that. However, I repeat that those communities are entitled to expect commonsense to prevail.

I am most annoyed that Mr Secker has been so shortsighted, narrowminded and quite foolish in his recommendations. It is time he came to his senses. I believe that the

community in which he lives would not accept the same recommendations. Indeed, if that community knew the sort of ramifications that would flow from those recommendations, such as a considerable increase in drunk and disorderly behaviour with people in the community breaking the law, people would be up in arms.

Mr Secker has brought himself into conflict with the Clerk of the district council in the area, and I believe he ought to reconsider the representations that he is going to make. Certainly, he has come into conflict with the publicans who are going to be affected, and I believe he has not fairly represented the views of that community. I am concerned that the state of drunkenness and lawlessness be brought to an abrupt end. I believe that the problems which the community has faced are being addressed by the police, who are doing the best job they can. The police do not need other courses of action taken which will make their job much more difficult. I believe that if this recommendation is put into effect to restrict the sale of alcohol in those hotels west of Ceduna it will make the job of the police a great deal more difficult.

Today, as reported in a local newspaper, we saw the member for Albert Park rightly criticising the conduct of certain people and calling for action. I agree entirely with that. We have had the Lord Mayor making comments. I believe the way to solve the problem in the short-term is to give local councils the power to declare dry areas. This action has worked in Alice Springs, and I believe that the Government should act to give the local community that power.

When I raised this matter of my criticism of the Licensing Commission, the member for Adelaide had to put his bib in and object to what I had to say. I believe that, if the honourable member was faced with the same problem in Walkerville or a similar area, he would be on his feet in this place, quite rightly criticising the Licensing Commissioner, because the commission comprises public officials.

Mr Duigan: They implement Government policy.

Mr GUNN: The Licensing Commissioner implements Government policy? I am absolutely amazed! I was always of the view that the Licensing Commission, like all courts, was an independent body that was supposed to weigh up the evidence put before it. We are now told this. No wonder we are having problems in Ceduna. If the commission acts under Government policy it would be acting under the advice of the Community Welfare Department, and that is half the jolly trouble in these areas.

Members interjecting:

Mr GUNN: I told the Deputy Premier earlier that half the trouble in these areas results from Legal Aid lawyers, bleeding hearts and do-gooders, and I stand by that. I make no apology for what I say, because the community is sick and tired of having bleeding heart attitudes in dealing with people who break the law. This applies especially when people's homes are broken into and when people are attacked in the streets. Only a few days ago it was brought to my attention that a law abiding couple, getting in their car, found that a girl's handbag had been stolen. Cars are broken into. They have been told by police that it is a waste of time going to juvenile aid panels, because when a policeman puts his view, it is overruled. That is an absolute waste of time. It is time to deal firmly with some of these people. I do not believe in unduly draconian measures, but offenders must be taught a lesson so that they will not offend again.

One constituent has had her home broken into seven times and then had her premises, from which she runs a small business, sprayed with paint, with objectionable comments written over them. When she took action, she was

threatened with legal action for assault. What sort of nonsense is this? We have Legal Aid lawyers, with not enough to do, who have to justify their positions. The community should not continue to pay out sums to these people when it is in their interests to see these confrontations continue. I have indicated clearly to Mr Secker that I am far from happy with his role in this matter.

I want to refer briefly to a number of other matters. The House should be aware that grave difficulties are developing in rural areas of South Australia. On occasions when properties have been put up for sale no offer or bid has been received. Some people have had to virtually walk off those properties. South Australia's largest single industry is the rural industry, and there will be great financial difficulties in this State unless something is done to try to alleviate these problems.

I call upon the Minister of Agriculture to have his officers monitor closely all agricultural sales in this State—not only the sale of land but clearing sales—in order to ascertain why such sales have taken place and whether it is through natural attrition, with people wanting to leave the industry and retire, or whether financial pressure has been applied and, if so, whether that pressure has come from banks, stock firms, security companies, or other lending institutions. It is very important that we maintain in the industry young people with initiative and enterprise. I am concerned that there are a large number of properties for sale and that unfortunately there appears to be little interest in their purchase. I know that currently, because of the unfortunate trade war between the United States and the EEC countries, prices are down, and they are down far too low. It amazes me how taxpayers in those countries continue to subsidise such industries.

I refer also to high interest rates, which are probably at a record high for the last 50 years and which are certainly having a serious impact. If high interest rates continue, not only will many rural producers go out of business but many businesses in small and large country towns will go out of business as well. Many more people will go on the scrapheap, and the effect of this will filter through to the cities, because 40 per cent of South Australia's export industry is derived from rural activity. When wheat-growers are receiving \$117.50 a tonne for wheat and are losing 10 per cent to 12 per cent of that in charges before they start, and when one looks at the cost of fuel, superphosphate and sprays, one can see that there is not a great deal there. The Minister should have his departmental officers check with banks in country areas to determine the number of people needing financial assistance and to ensure that everything possible is done to maintain efficient people on their farms. It would be in the interest of all South Australians and the nation as a whole that people who are efficient and who, through no fault of their own, have been placed in this difficult situation be retained to work their land.

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

Mr DUIGAN (Adelaide): On a number of occasions in the past I have taken the opportunity of adjournment debates to refer to planning issues related to the city of Adelaide. In the past I have referred to issues associated with the repopulation of the city in an attempt to capitalise on the infrastructure that already exists for catering and coping with more people. There are a number of other important issues to which I would like to address myself. In particular, I wish to refer today to the question of the parklands, the area put aside by Colonel William Light to surround the city of Adelaide. The parklands, comprising 920 hectares of

land originally set aside for that purpose, are held by most South Australians to be one of the prime assets of the city.

Unfortunately, over the 150 years of our history some of that land has been alienated. In fact, it has been eroded to 680 hectares by a number of Government decisions taken over that period. We are now in the position where general community sentiment and that of this Government and the present Adelaide City Council is that that erosion from this day forward must cease and that much of the land that has been alienated over those past years must be returned to parklands.

I do not think ever before has there been such a unanimity of purpose between the State Government and the Adelaide City Council on the parklands, on the need for their protection, on the need to prevent further alienation and on the need to ensure the rehabilitation of large tracts of parklands which have been taken for institutional, sporting and other public purposes. The record of the return of alienated parklands to public use by this current Government has, over the past few years, been a very positive one.

So that there is a record of the amount of land that has been returned, may I indicate to the House that the decision to return the Hackney bus depot to parkland will mean that 13.1 acres will be returned; 2.1 acres will be returned by the Postal Institute being removed from the west parklands. Also, once the redevelopment of the Adelaide Gaol environs has been undertaken and prisoners have been transferred from the Adelaide Gaol to the Mobilong medium security prison, to the Remand Centre and to other correctional institutions, another 8.03 acres will be available for further public use. Further, as a result of the ASER redevelopment and the redeployment of the land which previously was used for railway purposes, another 10 acres will be available for public use.

In addition, members will recall that over the past few years a number of other sites alienated for public use have been returned to general open parkland use. I refer in particular to the former E & WS depot on the corner of North Terrace and Dequetteville Terrace and, of course, what was for a long time a landmark in West Terrace, namely, the former site of the Bureau of Meteorology, which has now been turned into a small park. So, I think the record of both the decisions that have been made to return land to the parklands, and the actual return of that land to public use are very good and strong indicators to the commitment by both the current Government and the Adelaide City Council of their efforts to ensure that the original bequest of Colonel William Light of some 920 hectares will continue to be made available for this and future generations.

In addition to those decisions that have been made, the Government in the middle of 1985 undertook to look at what other areas within the whole of the parkland area could be returned to parkland use, and the report by Commissioner Tomkinson contained a number of recommendations, some of which are still before Government in terms of those areas that are currently being used for activities like car parking, and so on, which, to the majority of the citizens of Adelaide, are inappropriate, impractical and an unacceptable use of the parklands.

While there has been a record of commitment to restoring the parklands, and while there is a record of decisions being made to enhance and protect the parklands, we also need to look at a process by which the future security of the parklands can be guaranteed and ensured. One must admit that over the 150 years of our history there has been what some might call a cavalier attitude on the part of some Governments to the parklands. Indeed, the whole of what is now called the institutional district of the parklands,

starting perhaps with this very Parliament and extending down North Terrace to the University, Institute of Technology and Royal Adelaide Hospital areas, has resulted in those areas being removed from general parkland and general participation use to more particular institutional use. There has then been a record by successive Governments of, if not neglect, a lack of due recognition to the importance of maintaining that parkland belt for all of South Australia.

It seems to me that there are four ways in which we can go in the future—four options presenting themselves to this Parliament, to the Government and to the Adelaide City Council. The first is to leave the parklands as they are, with the Adelaide City Council being given the general administrative oversight of the parklands.

The second option is to specifically bring the parklands under a legislative umbrella, with a particular parklands authority control Bill or something of that sort. The third—and to my mind the most attractive—proposition is to bring the parklands under the control of the City of Adelaide Development Control Bill. I will address myself to what I think is the most favoured option in a moment, if time allows me.

A fourth option has been suggested by one of the members of the other House, namely, to leave by and large the administration of the parklands within the control of the City of Adelaide and to have no legislative umbrella to guarantee the protection of the parklands but to set up some sort of advisory commission or watchdog body to ensure that the decisions being made by the council were in the best interests of the community. So, that fourth option is a bit of a half-way house idea.

In the brief time remaining to me, I might just indicate the approach that has been taken by the City of Adelaide to the parklands. It intends, with its new City of Adelaide Development Control Plan, to make sure that there is legislative protection for the parklands, and that each of the parkland areas—18 in all—is given a statement of its desired future characteristics—which would guide the city and the City of Adelaide Planning Commission in decisions relating to council development in the parkland and squares, on private development adjacent to the parklands, and on any Government development that involved the parklands. The idea of having those statements of desired future characteristics, which would have statutory effect—

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

The Hon. D.C. WOTTON (Heysen): On 16 February 1983 this State's greatest disaster occurred. I refer, of course, to the second Ash Wednesday. In that fire, which devastated many parts of South Australia, 28 lives were lost; hundreds suffered injuries, major and minor; some 385 houses were destroyed or seriously damaged; 3 200 properties were damaged; 208 400 hectares of land were burnt out; and thousands upon thousands of animals—both domestic and wild—were lost.

Very soon after Ash Wednesday, from across Australia offers of help with goods, temporary housing and money flowed into appeals that had been set up to assist those who had been disadvantaged as a result of the holocaust. The appeals were set up by the media, by the Lord Mayor of Adelaide and indeed by the Premier. According to an advertisement which appeared in the *Advertiser* on 16 August 1983, some \$11 482 843 was received from those in Australia and overseas who had donated to those appeals.

Those gifts were used in various ways: \$906 115 was used for immediate emergency financial assistance for families and individuals; \$27 000 was used for assistance with funeral

arrangements; \$413 750 was used for relocation assistance for those who had residences destroyed or substantially damaged; \$8 551 500 was used for grants to those who suffered property losses due to bushfires; \$593 850 was used for pain and suffering grants to those hospitalised and badly burnt; \$695 500 was given to families and dependents of those killed; and \$350 000 was used for urgent and outstanding needs over the few months following the fire. It was advised that the funds would be wound up on 31 October 1983.

On 27 April of the same year the Prime Minister announced that the special benefits paid to bushfire and flood victims in the first two weeks following the February disaster would be exempt from taxation. It is not my intention, nor do I believe it is necessary, to go over the tragedy of that occurrence. I was very much part of the disasters associated with that day, and I recognise the absolute horror that was experienced by many hundreds of families throughout this State as a result of the Ash Wednesday fire.

My reason for bringing this matter to the attention of the House is that on 6 June last year, following a court ruling in his favour against ETSA, a local primary producer who had suffered considerably as a result of that fire received a letter from the State Disaster Relief Fund Committee quoting section 22a of the State Disaster Act 1980, in relation to administration of the State Relief Fund, as follows:

The State Disaster Relief Fund comprises all moneys received by the Premier for the relief of persons who suffer injury, loss or damage as a result of declared disasters.

The fund includes the moneys that were comprised in the Premier's Bushfire Relief Appeal Trust Fund, established for the relief of Ash Wednesday 1983 bushfire victims. Section 22a (8) of the Act provides that where the committee is of the opinion a person had been overcompensated, by reasons of having been paid moneys from the Disaster Relief Fund and also from another source, the Committee may by notice in writing require that person to repay to the fund the amount of the overcompensation.

A person who is given such a notice is liable under the Act to pay the amount specified in the notice as a debt due to the Crown. The purpose and effect of these provisions is to ensure that the fund is reimbursed when it has paid out relief moneys to persons who later recover compensation for their losses from the disaster. The moneys that are reimbursed can then be distributed to other victims of the disaster or to victims of future disasters.

Although it has been pointed out that the claim made by the victim against ETSA was for damages for losses arising from the property and the business arising from the property and did not include any claim for damages or personal suffering or loss by the five residents of his home, the committee continues to demand the return of the money made by the public in the belief it would go to bushfire victims as a gift. I believe that this situation is completely unacceptable. I have written to the Premier expressing my strong opposition to such a claim. I understand from my reading of the media that the Premier has called for a report from the committee on whether or not those victims of the fire who received compensation from the Electricity Trust should return relief money received by them.

I hope that the Premier will give this matter his most urgent and thorough consideration. The money raised by appeals established soon after the fires came from people who wanted to help the victims in a personal way. It would be completely wrong if any of that money was claimed back by the Government, or by this committee, for any reason. I am sure that people who subscribed to that appeal—many of them very generously, indeed—would be most unhappy if they knew that this was happening so that the Government, through this committee, could fund a permanent, interest accruing relief fund.

It is regrettable that so many additional pressures have been put on the victims of the Ash Wednesday fires. This latest manoeuvre involves what I see as interference with funds provided by the public through the appeal. Unfortunately, there has been, and still is, an enormous amount of heartburn on the part of the victims of this fire with regard to the matter of compensation from the Electricity Trust of South Australia. Many people have been severely disadvantaged as a result of that fire and have still not received adequate compensation from ETSA. It really has been one long battle, and many of the people who have lost everything, or almost everything, are still attempting to reach agreement on compensation.

At the time of or soon after this tragedy, everybody, including various Government authorities, was extremely sympathetic. Unfortunately, however, because of the passing of time, it has become a case of hard bargaining. If the people who are yet to be compensated for their losses must face another claim from the State Disaster Relief Fund Committee that could, in some cases, be the straw that breaks the camel's back. I am sure that very few of us in this House understand the hardship, the massive interest bills, etc., that are part of the day to day life of the people who are waiting for compensation from ETSA.

In my letter to the Premier I expressed the view that the money raised as a result of public appeals was raised in an attempt to meet losses incurred by the victims of that fire. It is public money which should not be mucked around with by the Government and which should have nothing whatever to do with money that victims may or may not receive from ETSA. I am sure that all the people who contributed to the appeal would support that approach.

I was particularly concerned yesterday, on hearing a small portion (and I have since learned more about this) of an ABC talkback program on which people were given an opportunity to comment, to hear statements from people who live in the city suggesting that the money should be paid back. I totally disagree with that approach. This is an extremely serious situation and, on behalf of all those who have suffered, I ask the Premier to give this matter his most serious consideration.

Motion carried.

At 3.58 p.m. the House adjourned until Wednesday 18 February at 2 p.m.

HOUSE OF ASSEMBLY

Tuesday 17 February 1987

QUESTIONS ON NOTICE

MINISTERS' OVERSEAS TRIPS

65. **Mr OSWALD** (on notice) asked the Premier: How many official overseas trips were undertaken by the Premier in the past 12 months, what was the destination, purpose and total cost of each trip, who accompanied him on each trip and what was the cost incurred by each individual who accompanied him?

The Hon. J.C. BANNON: The reply is as follows:

One trip since December 1985, from 30 March to 23 April 1986.

China and Japan—To sign an agreement to establish a friendly relationship with the Shandong Province in China and also discuss bilateral relations with Chinese leaders in Beijing, Jinan and other centres. In addition, a business delegation from South Australia accompanied the Premier and party to survey trade opportunities in Shandong Province and China. Following the visit to China the Premier and accompanying officers proceeded to Hong Kong and Japan for further trade and development discussions.

The Premier was accompanied by his wife, Executive Assistant, Press Secretary, the Director and a Project Officer from the Department of the Premier and Cabinet and Mr A. Crompton, Chairman of the S.A./Shandong and China Committee and immediate Past President of the S.A. Chamber of Industry and Commerce.

A business delegation headed by Mr K. Smith, Director of State Development joined the Premier's party in China. This group included Mr K. Williams, Chairman of Southern Farmers, and President of the Confederation of Australian Industry; Mr R. McNeilly, Broken Hill Proprietary Co. Ltd; Mr P. Fargher, Maunsell and Partners; Mr G. Walls, ATCO Industries (Aust.). The costs incurred by this delegation were met by the Department of State Development.

Costs for this visit were met on a group basis and it is not possible to accurately determine costs incurred for each individual. The total cost of \$134 830 has been dissected as follows:

	DPC	DSD	Total
Airfares, travel insurance, departure tax etc.	25 500	20 900	46 400
Accommodation, meals etc.:			
China/Hong Kong	14 251	16 000	30 251
Japan	14 316	11 250	25 566
Reception, promotions and other expenses	3 345	26 250	29 595
Interpreter expenses	1 675	—	1 675
Freight and sundries	1 343	—	1 343
	60 430	74 400	134 830

It should be noted that the party also included Messrs M. Abraham, Advertiser Newspaper Ltd, T. Baker, News Limited, Mrs G. Crompton, Mrs M. Williams and Ms P. Madsen. All expenses for these individuals were met by the persons themselves or their organisations.

66. **Mr OSWALD** (on notice) asked the Deputy Premier: How many official overseas trips were undertaken by the Deputy Premier in the past 12 months, what was the destination, purpose and total cost of each trip, who accompanied him on each trip and what was the cost incurred by each individual who accompanied him?

The Hon. D.J. HOPGOOD: None.

67. **Mr OSWALD** (on notice) asked the Minister of Lands: How many official overseas trips were undertaken by the Minister in the past 12 months, what was the destination, purpose and total cost of each trip, who accompanied him

on each trip and what was the cost incurred by each individual who accompanied him?

The Hon. R.K. ABBOTT: None.

68. **Mr OSWALD** (on notice) asked the Minister of State Development: How many official overseas trips were undertaken by the Minister in the past 12 months, what was the destination, purpose and total cost of each trip, who accompanied him on each trip and what was the cost incurred by each individual who accompanied him?

The Hon. LYNN ARNOLD: The reply is as follows:

Four trips since December, 1985. In the 1985-86 financial year, from 14 May 1986 to 13 June 1986, on a visit to the United States of America and Canada.

In the 1986-87 financial year: Firstly, from 4 to 12 October 1986 on a visit to Japan and Hong Kong. Secondly, from 4 to 6 December 1986, on a visit to Singapore, and, thirdly, from 17 January 1987 to 8 February 1987 on a visit to Hong Kong.

The purpose of the trip to the United States of America and Canada (14.5.86-13.6.86) was to investigate and promote State Development issues, to look at transferrable ideas and models for the South Australian situation in all of the Minister's portfolio areas, and to open the South Australian office of the Department of State Development in Los Angeles.

In this context, the Minister visited employment, technology, development and further education departments and companies in British Columbia, Ontario, Massachusetts, Michigan, New Hampshire, New York City and California.

He was accompanied by his wife, two of their children and also his Ministerial Assistant. Funding for the trip was from three sources:

- (i) Parliamentary travel allocation (for airfares for Mrs Arnold and Minister, and for the majority of the *per diem* expenses for the Minister).
- (ii) Ministerial and departmental budget lines (for airfares and *per diem* expenses of Ministerial Assistant, and for the balance of the daily expenses of Mrs Arnold and Minister).
- (iii) Personal funding (for airfares and living expenses for two of the children who accompanied him, and expenses for the care of the three children who remained behind in Australia).

The costs were as follows:

	Minister \$	Mrs Arnold \$	Ministerial Assistant \$
Air fares	2 913	2 913	2 947
Accommodation and living expenses, incidentals (incl. insurance) ..	6 560	2 037	6 147
	9,473	4 950	9 094

Of these amounts incurred by the Minister and wife \$10 152 was paid from the Parliamentary Travel Account, the rest from his Ministerial/Department Account.

All costs for the Ministerial Assistant were paid from the Ministerial/Department Account.

All costs of children (airfares \$1 668, daily expenses \$700—Total=\$2 368) were paid from the Minister's Personal Account.

The purpose of the trip to Japan and Hong Kong (4.10.86-12.10.86) was to execute investment and trade co-operation agreements with the Tokai Bank Ltd, and Sumitomo Trust and Banking Company Ltd in Japan; and for discussions with key existing and potential investors, in Hong Kong, and also open the South Australian technology display and participate in technical seminars in Hong Kong.

The Minister was accompanied by his Press Secretary.

Funding for the trip came from the Department of State Development budget.

The costs were as follows:

	Minister \$	Press Secretary \$
Air fares	3 538	3 538
Accommodation and living expenses	2 437	2 437
Insurance	62	62
Stationery	23	—
Total	6 060	6 037

The purpose of the trip to Singapore (4.12.86-6.12.86) was to make presentation of Australian education and technology at the 'Training and Education ASEAN '86 Conference', and to spend other time available pursuing matters related to State Development and Technology.

The Minister travelled alone to Singapore, and funding for the trip was from Ministerial and departmental budget lines.

The costs were as follows:

	\$
Air fares	1 257
Accommodation and living expenses	800
Insurance	42
Total	2 099

The purpose of the trip to Hong Kong (17.1.87-8.2.87) was to address an investment seminar; to maintain contacts established on the visit to Hong Kong in October 1986 in respect of investment, manufacturing, business and commerce; and also for a period of vacation. Work commitment involved 13 days of the period.

The Minister was accompanied by his wife and three of their children. Funding for the trip was from three sources:

- (1) Parliamentary travel allowance
- (2) Departmental budget lines.
- (3) Personal funding

The costs of the trip were as follows:

	Minister \$	Mrs Arnold \$
Air fares	986	986
Accommodation	1 500	1 500
Entertainment	550	—
Insurance	150	—
Living expenses (whole family) ..	2 500	—
Total	5 686	2 486

The Parliamentary travel allowance provided \$4 200, departmental budget lines approximately \$700, and personal funding the remainder of the above amounts plus all the children's travel costs.

The final figures for the costs of the trip may vary slightly due to accounts that have not yet been finalised or received.

69. **Mr OSWALD** (on notice) asked the Minister of Transport: How many official overseas trips were undertaken by the Minister in the past 12 months, what was the destination, purpose and total cost, of each trip, who accompanied him on each trip and what was the cost incurred by each individual who accompanied him?

The Hon. G.F. KENEALLY: The reply is as follows:

One trip since December 1985. Canada and the United States of America including the cities of Vancouver, Edmonton, Seattle, Portland, San Francisco, San Diego and Honolulu. Attendance at the World Conference on Transport Research, Vancouver. Meeting with relevant authorities to discuss transport-related matters including:

- Deficits
- Fares policy
- Level of service
- Patronage
- Welfare
- Industrial relations
- Finance
- Transport for disabled persons

The Minister was accompanied by his wife and the Deputy Director of Policy Research, Department of Transport.

The total cost of the trip was within the Cabinet-approved figure of \$25 000.

70. **Mr OSWALD** (on notice) asked the Minister of Mines and Energy: How many official overseas trips were undertaken by the Minister in the past 12 months, what was the destination, purpose and total cost of each trip, who accompanied him on each trip and what was the cost incurred by each individual who accompanied him?

The Hon. R.G. PAYNE: None.

71. **Mr OSWALD** (on notice) asked the Minister of Education: How many official overseas trips were undertaken by the Minister in the past 12 months, what was the destination, purpose and total cost of each trip, who accompanied him on each trip and what was the cost incurred by each individual who accompanied him?

The Hon. G.J. CRAFTER: None.

72. **Mr OSWALD** (on notice) asked the Minister of Housing and Construction: How many official overseas trips were undertaken by the Minister in the past 12 months, what was the destination, purpose and total cost of each trip, who accompanied him on each trip and what was the cost incurred by each individual who accompanied him?

The Hon. T.H. HEMMINGS: None.

73. **Mr OSWALD** (on notice) asked the Minister of Labour: How many official overseas trips were undertaken by the Minister in the past 12 months, what was the destination, purpose and total cost of each trip, who accompanied him on each trip and what was the cost incurred by each individual who accompanied him?

The Hon. FRANK BLEVINS: None.

74. **Mr OSWALD** (on notice) asked the Minister of Agriculture: How many official overseas trips were undertaken by the Minister in the past 12 months, what was the destination, purpose and total cost of each trip, who accompanied him on each trip and what was the cost incurred by each individual who accompanied him?

The Hon. M.K. MAYES: The reply is as follows:

One trip since December 1985: from 2 July to 28 July 1986. I was accompanied for the whole of the period by my Press Secretary, Mr Alfred D'Sylva. In addition, Mr Ian Lewis, Senior Horticultural Marketing Officer, Department of Agriculture, accompanied me from 2 July 1986 until 10 July 1986 and Mr Graham Thompson, Director of the Department of Recreation and Sport, accompanied me from 20 July 1986, until 26 July 1986. The country by country objectives were as follows:

Japan—To meet with senior Government officials, horticultural importers and wholesalers and visit a fruit packing and farm facility in order to facilitate trade in horticultural products between Japan and South Australia.

Singapore—To visit retail outlets and hold discussions with leading importers and retailers. This region is a traditional market which is important for South Australian exports—in particular, oranges, grapes, melons and plums.

Brussels—To hold discussions with the EEC regarding agricultural policies.

England—To visit sporting venues, hold discussions with senior sporting officials, and a major horticultural importer.

Scotland—To assist in preparing a strategy to win the right to conduct the 1988 Commonwealth Games by examining the type of facilities available, the scope of the organisation required and by meeting with senior officials and organisers.

Fares for the party were as follows:	\$
Minister	6 309
Mr Alfred D'Sylva	6 309
Mr Graham Thompson	4 577
Mr Ian Lewis	3 181

Total \$20 376

75. **Mr OSWALD** (on notice) asked the Minister of Education, representing the Attorney-General: How many official overseas trips were undertaken by the Minister in the past 12 months, what was the destination, purpose and total

cost of each trip, who accompanied him on each trip and what was the cost incurred by each individual who accompanied him?

The Hon. G.J. CRAFTER: The reply is as follows:

One trip since December 1985. Details are contained in Estimates Committee B of 30 September 1986 at page 70. This tour spanned 16 days, departing from Adelaide on Sunday 11 May 1986. From 12 to 19 May 1986, I was in Siracusa, Italy, where I was invited to attend a meeting of experts convened by the International Institute of Higher Studies in Criminal Sciences on the implementation of the United Nations 'Declaration of the Basic Principles of Justice for Victims of Crime and Abuse of Power'. 'The Declaration' had been submitted to the General Assembly by the Seventh United Nations Congress on Crime Prevention in 1985. The institute covered my residential expenses (hotel and meals) but not my travel expenses. These were met from my parliamentary travel allowance and a full report of the parliamentary part of the overseas tour has been prepared and will be lodged with the Parliamentary Library.

From 20 to 24 May 1986, I was in Dubrovnik, Yugoslavia, where I attended a workshop on Victims Rights being conducted by the World Society of Victimology. My attendance at the workshop necessitated the preparation and delivery of a paper, a copy of which is attached to my report to be lodged with the Parliamentary Library. I was not accompanied by any Government (or Ministerial) officers on this trip. The total cost to the Government for this trip was \$913.25. (As already mentioned my travel expenses for the trip were met from my Parliamentary travel allowance).

Perhaps I should point out to Parliament once again that the cost of my overseas trips compare more than favourably with the costs of overseas trips by members of the former Liberal Government. For instance the cost of the overseas Ministerial visit by the former Ethnic Affairs Minister, the Hon. C.M. Hill, in 1982 was approximately \$30 000. Mr Hill was accompanied for the duration of the 35-day visit by his wife; by the Director of the Department of the Arts for 10 days, and by the Chairman of the Ethnic Affairs Commission for 16 days. Further, by way of comparison, the 35-day overseas visit by the former Attorney-General, Mr Trevor Griffin, also in 1982, cost approximately \$43 000. He was accompanied by three people, his wife, a press officer and an officer from the Premier's Department.

76. **Mr OSWALD** (on notice) asked the Minister of Transport, representing the Minister of Health: How many official overseas trips were undertaken by the Minister in the past 12 months, what was the destination, purpose and total cost of each trip, who accompanied him on each trip and what was the cost incurred by each individual who accompanied him?

The Hon. G.F. KENEALLY: The reply is as follows:

During the past 12 months the Minister of Health and Community Welfare made one official overseas visit, to China. He was accompanied by:

- His wife
- The Director, I.M.V.S. and Administrator R.A.H.
- The Women's Adviser, South Australian Health Commission
- The Senior Policy Advisor to the Minister

The major purpose in visiting China was to further develop humanitarian and commercial relations in the health field between the People's Republic and South Australia.

The group travelled together for the whole visit and it is therefore not possible to identify individual costs. The total cost of the visit was \$31 538.80.

77. **Mr OSWALD** (on notice) asked the Minister of Transport, representing the Minister of Tourism: How many official overseas trips were undertaken by the Minister in the past 12 months, what was the destination, purpose and total cost of each trip, who accompanied her on each trip and what was the cost incurred by each individual who accompanied her?

The Hon. G.F. KENEALLY: The reply is as follows:

Two official overseas trips since the December 1985 election. (See Estimates Committee A, 10 October 1986 page 118)

1. Penang—24 August 1986 to 30 August 1986
2. Texas—2 October 1986 to 13 October 1986

1. I was unaccompanied on the trip to Penang which was undertaken as the Government's representative for Adelaide Week in Penang.

2. I was involved in the Neiman Marcus store promotion at Dallas Texas, promoting South Australia during Australian Fortnight. In addition I attended various tourism and Jubilee

150 functions. I was accompanied by my Press Secretary who was responsible for liaising with the media and publicising the promotion.

Costs were met on a group basis; however, the following is a breakdown of the main expenditure.

Penang:	\$	Texas:	\$
Air fare	884	Air fares	8 781
Accommodation, Meals, Miscellaneous	512	Accommodation, Meals, Incidentals	5 537
Total	1 396	Total	14 318

PARTICIPATION AND EQUITY PROGRAM

101. **Mr S. J. BAKER** (on notice) asked the Minister of Education:

1. How much funding was provided by the Commonwealth and the State in 1985-86 for the Participation and Equity Program and what was the breakdown of expenditure on the following—

- (a) head office administration
- (b) teaching resources
- (c) equipment
- (d) advertising material; and
- (e) other items?

2. How many students participated in 1985-86 and what was their total manhour involvement?

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

	1985	1986
	\$	\$
Commonwealth P.E.P.	3 889 790	1 900 000
State Equity	—	—
	3 889 790	1 900 000

Breakdown of Expenditure for Education Department Commonwealth Program

	\$	\$
Head Office Administration	281 000	173 400
Teaching Resources	(1) 3 608 790	(2) 1 726 600
In-school salaries		
Equipment		
Travel Expenses		
Advertising material		
Other Items		
	3 889 790	1 900 000

- (1) Please refer Attachment 1 for details
- (2) Please refer Attachment 2 for details

2. The total population of targetted schools in 1985 was 28 137
in 1986 was 26 674

As P.E.P. has a whole of school focus it is reasonable to suggest that all of the students in targetted schools have participated in one way or another. However, it is not possible to provide total manhour involvement.

As well, many thousands of other students benefited from the other P.E.P. projects summarised in Attachments 1 and 2.

1985 Projects	Attachment 1
School based activity (salaries \$1 222 285) (contingencies \$242 199)	1 464 484
Area Advisers	184 000
Senior Secondary Curriculum Project	184 000
Girls and P.E.P.	44 000
Multi-Cultural Education—P.E.P. Support	80 000
Aboriginal Post-Primary Education Project	35 000
ED/TAFE liaison—Transition Education Coordination	49 000
In Service activities for school teachers	45 516
Multi-Campus project	17 000
Work Experience/Out-of-School Learning	46 000
Senior Secondary School Students Project	240 000

1985 Projects		Attachment 1
ED/TAFE Co-ordination—Linkages	87 000	
Adelaide Area Supervised Alternative Learning Program	28 000	
C.I.T.Y. High Schools project (Department of Labour)	80 000	
Targetted Student Groups:		
Traditional Aboriginal Students Project	70 000	
Non-Traditional Aboriginal Schools Project	30 000	
Geographically Isolated Students Project	70 000	
First Phase Language Learners Project	70 000	
Dis-inclined Learners/Re-Entry Students Project	70 000	
Disabled Students Project	70 000	
Area Issues Projects—5 areas × \$60 000	300 000	
Community Grants	70 000	
Aboriginal Element of P.E.P.	129 790	
Evaluation	40 000	
Schools Grants*	105 000	
	<u>3 608 790</u>	

*\$2 000 was given to each targetted school to bring together teachers, parents and students to prepare projects for 1986.

1986 Projects		Attachment 2
School based activity { salaries \$741 421 contingencies \$282 579	1 024 000	
Community Grants	60 000	
State Committee Support	30 000	
Research, Evaluation, Publications and Public Information	90 000	
Inclusive Curriculum Program	294 800	
Area Consultancy	201 400	
*School Grants	26 400	
	<u>\$1 726 600</u>	

*Grants to each school for preparation of projects for 1987.

COUNTRY FIRE SERVICE

120. **Mr S.G. EVANS** (on notice) asked the Minister of Emergency Services:

1. Does the Government support a limit on the number of volunteers per CFS Brigade and, if so, why and what is the number?

2. Does the Government intend that in future only those volunteers that pass particular examinations and training levels will be registered for insurance and, if so, why?

3. Does the Government intend to make it compulsory for CFS officers to obtain permission from the Department of Environment and Planning before proceeding with slow burn clean-up operations prior to the fire danger season and, if so, why and will the CFS have to apply one year in advance to allow for departmental processing?

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

1. No.

2. No.

3. No. A number of activities that would constitute clearance of native vegetation are exempt from the controls which are provided for under the Native Vegetation Management Act 1985. In addition, clearance specifically by burning can be carried out in accordance with directions provided pursuant to clause 5 (i) of the regulations under the Act.

ASER ACCIDENTS

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

1. How many industrial accidents have occurred on the ASER project?

2. Why did two cranes overturn?

3. How seriously were workers injured in each accident?

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

1. The number of accidents which have occurred on the ASER site is 407.

ASER Early Works Site	87
Convention Centre Site	87
Car Park Site	88
ASER Hyatt Hotel Site	145
	<u>407</u>

Total number of accidents which required days off were:

ASER Early Works Site	26
Convention Centre Site	18
Car Park Site	19
ASER Hyatt Hotel Site	46
	<u>109</u>

The total number of accidents reportable pursuant to regulation 11 of the Industrial Safety Health and Welfare Act are 56 plus one fatality.

2. One was caused by equipment malfunction where the load indicating computer gave false readings. The other was caused by driver error and he has had his crane certificate suspended for 12 months.

3. Injuries that occurred up to 19 November 1986, which required time off and which were reported in the site injury reports, included burns, cuts, punctures, lacerations, gashes, bruises, strains, torn muscles and ligaments, twisted joints and a fatality.

TOLMER GOLD ESCORT RIDE

224. **The Hon. D.C. WOTTON** (on notice) asked the Minister of Emergency Services: What was the total cost to the police or any other Government instrumentality attached to the staging of the Tolmer Gold Escort Ride?

The Hon. D.J. HOPGOOD: The cost was \$3 029.

POLICE TATTOO

225. **The Hon. D.C. WOTTON** (on notice) asked the Minister of Emergency Services: What was the total cost to police or any other Government instrumentality of the Police Tattoo and how was this cost made up?

The Hon. D.J. HOPGOOD: The total cost of the International Police Tattoo was \$78 094. This cost is made up as follows:

Payments		
Administrative/Productive Costs		\$ 46 480
Fares/Accommodation for interstate and overseas participants		76 368
Promotion		50 601
Special Expenditure—staffing, cleaning etc.		16 717
Total Costs		<u>\$190 166</u>
Less Receipts		
Ticket Sales		\$ 92 040
Car Parking		1 920
Programs		7 427
Sponsorships		7 000
Sell-offs (concessions etc.)		3 685
Deficit		<u>\$78 094</u>

POWER CUTS

226. **The Hon. D.C. WOTTON** (on notice) asked the Minister of Emergency Services: Is it intended that it will be the policy of ETSA to introduce power cuts in the Adelaide Hills on days of extreme fire danger and, if not, what action will be taken by the Government in directing SGIC or some other authority to provide a coverage for the cost of damage caused in domestic or business situations as a result of such a policy?

The Hon. D.J. HOPGOOD: During the course of a bush-fire, the Electricity Trust is often compelled to isolate certain mains as the fire front advances towards them in order to safeguard the system. The mains so affected are usually able to be re-energised after a short time. Should another bush-fire catastrophe occur, such as Ash Wednesday, then the supply of electricity could be interrupted for an extended period.

Neither domestic nor commercial insurance policies cover the spoilage of food or the loss of trade where there is a deliberate action to cut or restrict power supplies. However, it should be appreciated that freezers can hold their condition for up to 24 hours provided they are not opened, and indeed a refrigerator with moderate use can keep perishables for about half a day. As mentioned above, other than in the most serious bushfire conditions, power would not be disconnected for this length of time.

SOUTH AUSTRALIAN HOUSING TRUST

231. **Mr BECKER** (on notice) asked the Minister of Housing and Construction—

Lump Sum Housing Contracts let in 1986

S.U. = Single units C.F. = Cottage flats
A.H. = Attached houses W.U.F. = Walk up flats

Month	Contracts Let	S.U.	A.H.	C.F.	W.U.F.	Total Tender Value
January	1	27				1 035 643
	3		19			735 281
	2			*16		445 664
*Includes 1 contract for 7 C.F. in J/V with D.C. of Strathalbyn						
February	2	37	22			2 221 670
	1	4				181 250
	1		2			64 234
	4			*17		564 017
*Includes 3 contracts, total of 15 C.F.s in J/V with D.C.s of Lameroo, Crystal Brook, and Northern Yorke Peninsula						
March	4	116				4 240 460
	1			*13	*14	817 430
	1	28		5		1 371 000
	2		20			654 521
	2				5	158 130
*Includes 1 contract of 14 C.F.s and 13 A.H.s in J/V with the corporation of the city of Elizabeth						
April	3			*34		1 046 027
	7		33			1 140 643
	3	10				402 442
	2	46		14		2 182 420
	1			16	2	531 310
*Includes 3 contracts, total of 34 C.F.s in J/V with the Greek Orthodox Community and the D.C.s of Minlaton and Central Yorke Peninsula						
May	3	20				791 259
	2	24	68			3 582 000
	3				*49	1 383 038
	3		10			354 034
	*Includes 1 contract of 15 C.F.s in J/V with the Greek Orthodox Church					
June	5		31			1 095 052
	2	78	14			3 408 149
	9	112				4 791 825
	1	4	13		5	885 530
	4				*52	1 685 622
*Includes 2 contracts, total of 24 C.F.s in J/V with the Corporation of Henley and Grange and the D.C. of Gladstone						

1. In relation to tenders called and let since 1 January by the South Australian Housing Trust—

(a) how many were let for each category of accommodation;

(b) when were they let;

(c) what was the total value of each tender;

(d) what was the estimated value of land in each contract; and

(e) how many were 'joint ventures' and who were the joint venturers?

2. Why are tenders, when let, not made public?

The Hon. T.H. HEMMINGS: The replies are as follows:

1. Details of the 141 housing tenders called and the resulting contracts let by the trust during 1986 are shown on the accompanying monthly summaries. The number of joint venture projects and the identity of the joint venturers are also indicated.

The information required is assumed to relate only to trust design and tender contracts, and therefore the information provided includes no reference to the design and contract program. Design and tender contracts are let for building on trust land only and the contracts therefore include no land component.

2. The letting of the contract to a specified builder following the assessment of tenders received is made public. Information on those submitting tenders is made available to those seeking it.

The trust's tendering practice has long been understood and supported by the industry. Tendering procedures authorised by the trust board are rigidly adhered to and subject to examination by the Auditor General.

Month	Contracts Let	S.U.	A.H.	C.F.	W.U.F.	Total Tender Value
July	7 3 1 1 1			*45		1 272 075 938 471 399 877 77 800 1 099 000
*Includes 2 contracts, total of 14 C.F.s and 3 A.H.s in J/V with D.C.s of Yorketown and Clare/Nadjuri Lodge						
August	3 2 4 1	3				114 190 821 174 501 501 181 837
			13 15	9		
September	3 4 3	3		*29		118 328 936 711 507 212
*Includes 4 Contracts, total of 29 C.F.s in J/V with D.C.s of Port Broughton, Morgan, Mount Remarkable/Wirrabara and Murray Lands Homes for the Aged						
October	2 7 4	16				749 340 1 614 470 794 175
*Includes 4 Contracts, total of 28 C.F.s in J/V with D.C.s of Goolwa, Willunga and Kapunda and Aged Cottage Homes Inc.						
			40	*28		
November	2 3 3 1 1			*8		244 198 404 625 453 422 862 037 1 323 742
*Includes 2 Contracts, total of 8 C.F.s in J/V with D.C.s of Wakefield Plains and Mallala/Two Wells Community Advancement Assoc.						
		10	11			
December	3 1 2 2 4 2		6 4			255 324 887 205 784 060 74 777 714 576 2 127 710
*Includes 2 Contracts, total of 5 C.F.s and 12 W.U.F.s in J/V with United Returned Service Women's Assocn. and the Corporation of the City of Adelaide						
		19			22	
		2		27		
		*58				

STATE BANK OF SOUTH AUSTRALIA

232. Mr BECKER (on notice) asked the Premier: Does the State Bank of South Australia pay sales tax on its purchases of goods and materials and, if so, for each of the years ended 30 June 1985 and 1986, what was the amount of sales tax paid by the bank in relation to:

- (a) motor vehicles;
- (b) stationery (excluding cheque books);
- (c) cheque books; and
- (d) other items?

The Hon. J.C. BANNON: Yes. However, the bank does not keep separate records of sales tax applicable to its purchases of goods and materials. The following figures provide a conservative estimate of sales tax in relation to each category:

	1984-85 (\$)	1985-86 (\$)
(a) motor vehicles	67 000	121 000
(b) stationery (excluding cheque books)	380 000	380 000
(c) cheque books	330 000	365 000
(d) other items	2 135 000	3 616 000

COUNCIL RATES

233. Mr M.J. EVANS (on notice) asked the Minister of Transport representing the Minister of Local Government: Which councils have a minimum rate in excess of \$300 and, in respect of each of those councils, what is the amount?

The Hon. G.F. KENEALLY: The reply is as follows:

Council	Amount Minimum Rate \$
District Council of Barmera	365
Town of Jamestown	320
City of Port Augusta	306
District Council of Victor Harbor	320

STRESS

234. Mr S.G. EVANS (on notice) asked the Minister of Education: Of those persons who retired on stress claims from the Education Department listed on pages 1458 and 1459 of Hansard dated 21 October 1986:

- (a) how many were primary school teachers in each staff classification and what salaries do those classifications now carry;
- (b) how many were primary school non-teacher staff in each staff classification and what salaries do those classifications now carry;
- (c) how many were high school teachers in each staff classification and what salaries do those classifications now carry;
- (d) how many were high school non-teacher staff in each classification and what salaries do those classifications now carry; and
- (e) how many were other departmental staff in each classification and what salaries do those classifications now carry?

The Hon. G.J. CRAFTER: The time required to provide information of the current salaries and classifications for the positions each retiree hold is not warranted.

235. **Mr S.G. EVANS** (on notice) asked the Minister of Education: What was the total cost in each of the past five financial years for stress leave claims by Education Department staff, other than retirees, in the following categories:

- (a) primary school teachers;
- (b) primary school non-teacher staff;
- (c) high school teachers;
- (d) high school non-teacher staff; and
- (e) other departmental staff?

The Hon. G.J. CRAFTER: The time and effort required to extract the information asked by the honourable member cannot be justified.

236. **Mr S.G. EVANS** (on notice) asked the Premier: In relation to those public servants who retired from stress listed on page 1459 of *Hansard* dated 21 October 1986, what are the present salary ranges for the positions each retiree held?

The Hon. J.C. BANNON: The time required to provide the present salary ranges for the positions each retiree held is not warranted.

238. **Mr S.G. EVANS** (on notice) asked the Premier: What was the total cost in each of the past five financial years for stress claims by public servants, other than retirees, in each department?

The Hon. J.C. BANNON: The time and effort required to extract the information asked by the honourable member cannot be justified.

RENTAL DUTY TAX

239. **The Hon. JENNIFER CASHMORE** (on notice) asked the Treasurer:

1. What was the revenue gained in 1983-84 and 1984-85 from the 1.8 per cent rental duty tax applied to the rental of property other than real property in respect of:

- (a) caravans;
- (b) rental cars;
- (c) trailers;
- (d) plant and equipment;
- (e) videos and television; and
- (f) other items?

2. How frequently is the tax collected and what is the estimated annual cost of collection?

3. For imposition of the tax, on what basis does the Government differentiate between caravans hired from caravan hirers and caravans hired from caravan parks?

4. Is there any statutory prohibition on the identification of the tax on invoices and, if so, why?

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

1. The total revenue from rental duty was—
\$6 114 477 in 1983-84
\$7 112 562 in 1984-85.

A break-down of rental duty in the classifications sought is not available as there is no requirement for those conducting rental business to provide this level of detail.

2. The duty is collected monthly from larger organisations and annually from smaller organisations. The estimated cost of collection of rental duty is \$28 000 per annum.

3. A caravan hired from a caravan park to remain on site in that caravan park is not considered to come within the definition of 'rental business' as defined in the Stamp Duties Act. This approach is in line with the relevant case law.

4. Yes. The prohibition is intended to prevent rental duty being passed on to the consumer.

In introducing the credit and rental legislation in November 1968, the Government stated that the same policy in relation to duty on hire purchase agreements and money lenders' contracts (i.e. placing the onus of payment of duty on the lender and prohibiting recovery of duty from the borrower) would be continued in respect of credit and rental business. Although the Tonkin Government repealed in 1981 the provision preventing recovery of duty from the borrower, it reintroduced the provision in 1982 following an unexpected increase in Bankcard charges. Certain classes of transaction are, however, able to be excluded by proclamation. A proclamation issued on 18 March 1982 exempted commercial leasing arrangements, commercial loan transactions, commercial discount transactions, or any other similar commercial transaction from the prohibition on recovery of duty.

MOTOR VEHICLE REGISTRATION

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

1. How is the \$10 fee to cover the administration cost in establishing or amending motor vehicle registration records substantiated?

2. Is it intended that this fee will increase next year to \$20 after expiry of one day and, if so, how is that increase substantiated?

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

1. The \$10 fee is authorised by a regulation which was published in the *Government Gazette* dated 28 August 1986 and which came into operation from 1 September 1986. It is payable under the following conditions:

(i) where an unregistered motor vehicle is being re-registered by an owner after 30 calendar days after the previous registration has lapsed,

or

(ii) where an unregistered motor vehicle has been registered by an owner who is not recorded as the previous registered owner of that vehicle in the register of motor vehicles.

The \$10 fee is termed a 'registration establishment fee' and it is in keeping with the policy which the Motor Registration Division has followed for some years to recover, as far as practicable, the administrative costs associated with various services which it provides, such as the transfer of vehicles (\$10), cancellation and refund of registration fees (\$12), licence tests (\$12), etc.

The re-establishment fee of \$10 is aimed at recovering the cost of re-establishing the registration of a motor vehicle on the register of motor vehicles. This involves clerical and computer time and also establishes a new registration period for the vehicle. These costs have been estimated as in excess of the \$10 fee charged.

2. No.

NATIONAL ROUTE 1

241. **Mr M.J. EVANS** (on notice) asked the Minister of Transport: Is it intended to upgrade the section of National Route 1 between Tailem Bend and Kingston and, if so, when will the work be undertaken and what is the estimated cost?

The Hon. G.F. KENEALLY: It is intended to commence upgrading of the Princes Highway between Tailem Bend

and Kingston in 1988-89, funds permitting. The first section to be upgraded, entailing reconstruction and minor realignment, will be that immediately south of the Wellington turn-off at an estimated cost of \$2 million.

Other sections requiring upgrading between Tailem Bend and Kingston are presently being identified. Reconstruction of these sections will depend upon their priority on a State-wide basis and the availability of funds for future road-works.

Sections of the Princes Highway south of Kingston are being reconstructed by the District Council of Lacedpede, with funding being provided by the Government.

HEAVY VEHICLE DRIVERS

242. **Mr M.J. EVANS** (on notice) asked the Minister of Transport: In the past financial year, how many heavy vehicle drivers were proceeded against in some way for failing to produce a log book on demand or for not keeping a log book fully completed and up-to-date and, in each case, what was the nature of the legal process used against the offenders and what was the average penalty?

The Hon. G.F. KENEALLY: During 1985-86, the Highways Department proceeded against 698 drivers whilst the Police Department proceeded against 108, a total of 806. The legal process used was the issuing of summonses and the matters were dealt with in courts of summary jurisdiction. With regard to the Highways Department's proceedings the average penalty (fines, costs and fees) was \$65.54 but the Police Department does not keep such records.

GLENELG TRAMS

243. **Mr M.J. EVANS** (on notice) asked the Minister of Transport:

1. What was the cost of replacing the power collectors on the roof of the Glenelg trams?
2. What are the benefits of the new units as against the units which they replaced?
3. In deciding to replace the units, was any consideration given to the effect on the appearance of the trams given their historic and heritage significance?

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

1. The cost of replacing the trolley poles with pantographs was \$154 000.
2. Advantages of pantographs are:
 They do not have to be attended to by the driver at the terminus of each trip.
 The life of the overhead trolley wire is extended by four times (a saving of \$20 000 per annum).
 The tendency to dewire by trolley poles with consequently much damage to overhead wires does not occur with pantographs.
3. Yes. There are two trams and eventually there will be a third preserved in original condition at the St Kilda Museum of the Australian Electric Transport Museum. These trams will be kept with trolley poles by the association. Although the units in use on the Glenelg tramline are of historic and heritage value, they are also commercial units and are constantly being maintained and upgraded as necessary, where safety and economy are a consideration.

PIVOT

244. **Mr S.G. EVANS** (on notice) asked the Minister of Education: In relation to the magazine *Pivot*,

- (a) how many staff hours are used in the publication, printing and distribution of a volume;
- (b) what overhead charges, other than printing and material costs, are debited against the cost of a volume;
- (c) what is the full cost of printing, including material, for a volume;
- (d) how many copies have been produced of each volume;
- (e) how many annual subscriptions of \$19.50 for each volume have been received;
- (f) how many copies have been distributed free, and to whom?
- (g) if annual subscription charges of less than \$19.50 have been received, what were the fees received and how many volumes were sold at each of the reduced fee levels; and
- (h) how many copies of each volume have been distributed?

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

- (a) The Education Department produces six issues annually of the magazine *Pivot*, which forms one volume.
 Education Department staff spend, on average, 370 hours in producing each issue, made up of 220 hours editorial time, 112.5 hours artist time, and 37.5 hours production time.
 Printing and distribution are carried out by the Government Printing Division.
- (b) There are no additional overheads charged against *Pivot*.
- (c) The average cost of all materials plus printing is \$2 492 per copy, or \$13 312.264 per issue, or \$79 873.584 annually, i.e. per volume.
- (d) The total copies produced for volume 13, 1986 was 32 050 copies, an average of 5 342 copies per issue.
- (e) There are currently 310 subscriptions to *Pivot* at \$19.50 per volume from 274 individual subscribers.
- (f) The free distribution list consists of:

Schools	4 638
Education Centre	151
Complimentary	87
Total free distribution	4 876
- (g) There is no discount given on the annual subscription rate of \$19.50.
- (h) The average distribution for each issue has been 5 206 copies. The total distribution for volume 13, 1986 (six issues) was 31 236 copies.

AUSTUDY SCHEME

247. **Mr S.G. EVANS** (on notice) asked the Premier: Will the Premier make representations to the Federal Government pointing out that the Austudy Scheme will, in particular, disadvantage South Australian secondary school students and their families and requesting that eligibility for the grant be varied so that students will be eligible either when they enter year 11 or attain the age of 16 and that payments be made to families rather than the students?

The Hon. J.C. BANNON: Yes. Representations have been made to the Federal Government on this matter. Those representations are continuing.

PROFILE

248. **Mr S.G. EVANS** (on notice) asked the Minister of Water Resources: In relation to the Engineering and Water Supply Department publication *Profile*:

- (a) what was the cost of printing;
- (b) how many copies were printed;
- (c) how many copies have been distributed;
- (d) to whom were copies distributed; and,
- (e) how will the copies surplus to requirements be disposed of?

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

- (a) \$5 636.
- (b) 1 000 copies.
- (c) 362 copies on release plus a further 23 requested by individuals or organisations since.
- (d) South Australian city, town and district councils 126
South Australian Senators, members of the House of Representatives, Legislative Council and the House of Assembly 94
Within the E.&W.S. Department 48
Other State Government departments and private sector organisations 42
Interstate water-related organisations 27
Libraries 24
Agent-General of South Australia, London . . . 1

362

- (e) It is not envisaged that there will be surplus copies of the booklet as there is a constant demand for it, particularly from interstate and overseas visitors to the department.

TAFE COURSES

256. **The Hon. D.C. WOTTON** (on notice) asked the Minister of Education:

1. Is the intention of the Department of Technical and Further Education to increase pensioner charges for enrolment in leisure classes from 25 per cent to 50 per cent of the full fee and will there be an administration fee of \$2 imposed on people with limited income in addition to that increase?

2. Is there to be an increase in 1987 in the full fee payable for TAFE leisure classes?

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

1. In 1986 a number of DTAFE colleges experienced difficulties in providing and maintaining an enrichment education program within their gap funding allocation. DTAFE in fact redirected funds from other areas of its operation to ensure that a reasonable level of enrichment education program could be offered by all colleges in term 3. A major factor contributing to this situation was the number of students, eligible for concessional enrolment at 25 per cent of the full fee, who were admitted to classes thus making it difficult for them to be financially viable. The alternative to overspending in the enrichment education program is to not proceed with classes containing significant numbers of concession students; a course of action adopted by a number of colleges in 1986. This approach however satisfies neither concession nor full fee paying students.

In this context, and to minimise the similar cancellation of classes in 1987, the Government has approved an increase in the fee payable by those eligible for concessional enrol-

ment to 50 per cent of the full fee. A number of DTAFE colleges charge students an administration fee, usually \$1 to \$2 per course. This is used to defray the cost of photocopied material, class notes, etc.

2. In 1987 DTAFE colleges will charge a range of fees for enrichment education courses that will more closely reflect the level of fees operating in the open market and be commensurate with the level of tuition or supervision provided. These fees will range between approximately \$2 per hour and \$4 per hour for full fee payers. Present indications are that the majority of classes will attract a full fee of about \$2.50 per hour. Students eligible for concessional enrolment will of course pay only 50 per cent of the full fee for the particular class in which they enrol.

SEWERAGE RATES

257. **Mr M.J. EVANS** (on notice) asked the Minister of Water Resources:

1. What is the minimum sewerage rate for the 1986-87 year?
2. How many properties are subject to the minimum rate?
3. What proportion of total ratepayers are paying the minimum rate?
4. What is the total amount of money represented by the difference between the normal rates which would be payable and the rates payable as a result of the minimum rate for the year 1986-87?

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

1. \$108 p.a.
2. 94 179.
3. 24.1 per cent.
4. Approximately \$2.5 million.

COMMUNITY WELFARE ANNUAL REPORT

259. **Mr S.G. EVANS** (on notice) asked the Minister of Education representing the Minister of Community Welfare: In relation to the Department for Community Welfare's 1985-86 Annual Report—

- (a) what was the total number of staff hours used in creating and publishing it
- (b) what was the cost of printing
- (c) what was the total number printed
- (d) what was the total number distributed
- (e) to whom were they distributed; and
- (f) how will those surplus to requirements be disposed of?

The Hon. G.J. CRAFTER, for the Hon. J.R. CORNWALL: The replies are as follows:

- (a) Two staff at the Welfare Information and Publications Branch work on the report for a period of three months, at an average of one day per week per person.
- (b) \$8 870.31.
- (c) 2 000.
- (d) Approximately half of the reports have been distributed to date.
- (e) The department has an extensive mailing list for the annual report, which is updated every two years. The following people receive the report:
 - Commonwealth Government departments
 - State Government departments
 - Further education institutions
 - Non-government welfare organisations

- Interstate welfare departments and organisations
 - Libraries
 - State and private high schools.
- (f) It is rare for there to be any surplus reports. Any that remain once the new report has been released are used to provide students with information about the department and its work.

- Tertiary institutions.
 - Clientele of individual staff members.
- (e) We anticipate no surplus of supplies. There is a steady year-round demand for the publication from students, club officials, staff requirements to meet client requests and from interested members of the public. Stocks of the 1984 and the 1985 editions were both exhausted prior to the next edition becoming available.

IMPROVING THE STATE OF RECREATION AND SPORT 1986

260. Mr S.G. EVANS (on notice) asked the Minister of Recreation and Sport: In relation to the Department of Recreation and Sport publication—*Improving the State of Recreation and Sport 1986*—

- (a) what was the cost of printing
- (b) how many copies were printed
- (c) how many have been distributed
- (d) to whom were they distributed; and
- (e) how will those surplus to requirements be disposed of?

The Hon. M.K. MAYES: The replies are as follows:

- (a) Approx. \$7 000.
- (b) 1 220 (ordered 1 000).
- (c) 800.
- (d) ● All MPs.
 - All State-level recreation, sport, fitness and specific populations associations.
 - Racing bodies.
 - Permanent Heads of all other State Government departments.
 - Heads of interstate Recreation and Sport departments.
 - Members of Minister's advisory councils.
 - All local councils.

ELIZABETH RAILWAY STATION CAR PARK

261. Mr M.J. EVANS (on notice) asked the Minister of Transport: What is the present state of negotiations with the South Australian Housing Trust for the purchase by STA of the Elizabeth Railway Station car park?

The Hon. G.F. KENEALLY: The State Transport Authority has decided not to pursue the purchase of the site for development as a car park. Following a re-evaluation of the project the authority could not justify spending \$770 000 for just 120 car parking spaces, the major component of the cost being the land.

PATHOLOGISTS

262. Mr M.J. EVANS (on notice) asked the Minister of Transport representing the Minister of Health: What is the classification, base location and geographic area of responsibility of each qualified speech language pathologist employed by the South Australian Health Commission or an incorporated health unit or hospital?

The Hon. G.F. KENEALLY: The deployment of speech pathologists in South Australian Health Commission units and services is given in the following table with June 1986 data. Geographic responsibility corresponds with the catchment area of each health unit or service.

Table 1. Speech Pathologists by Location, by Establishment and Actual Workforce

Location	Establishment			Total	Actual workforce (FTE) Total
	GR1	GR2	GR3 and above		
Adelaide Children's Hospital	3.4		1.0	4.4	5.4
Pt Pirie Hospital		1.0		1.0	1.0
Royal Adelaide Hospital	2.5		1.0	3.5	3.5
Ingle Farm CHC	0.5			0.5	0.5
Lyell McEwin Health Service	2.0			2.0	2.0
Tea Tree Gully CHC		1.0		1.0	1.0
Hampstead Nursing Home	1.0			1.0	1.0
Eastern DCS	1.0			1.0	0.6
IDSC	3.2			3.2	2.2
Pt Augusta Hospital	1.0			1.0	1.0
The Queen Elizabeth	3.0		1.0	4.0	4.0
Whyalla Hospital	2.0		0.7	2.7	2.7
Parks CHC	1.0			1.0	1.0
Pt Adelaide CHC	0.5			0.5	0.5
Pt Lincoln CHC	1.0			1.0	0.6
Western Rehab	1.0			1.0	
Northern Yorke Pen DCS	1.0			1.0	1.0
Western DCS					1.0
Flinders Medical Centre	4.3		1.0	5.3	5.3
Naracoorte Hospital	1.0			1.0	1.0
Penola Hospital	0.1			0.1	0.1
Clovelly Park CHC	1.0	0.3		1.3	1.3
Noarlunga Health Service	3.5	1.0	1.0	5.5	4.7
Riverland CHC	2.0			2.0	2.0
Southern Fleurieu Peninsula	0.2			0.2	0.2
Southern DCS	0.8		1.0	1.8	1.8
CAFHS		1.0	1.0	2.0	1.0
Julia Farr Centre	1.0	1.6		2.6	2.1
Mt Gambier Extended Care	1.6			1.6	1.6