HOUSE OF ASSEMBLY

Tuesday 10 March 1987

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

ASSENT TO BILLS

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

Meat Hygiene Act Amendment,
Meat Inspection (Commonwealth Powers),
Petroleum (Submerged Lands) Act Amendment,
Statutes Amendment (Taxation).

PETITION: MARIJUANA OFFENCES

A petition signed by 20 residents of South Australia praying that the House reject legislation proposing an expiation fee for marijuana offences was presented by the Hon. B.C. Eastick.

Petition received.

PETITION: POLICEMAN'S POINT TAVERN BAR

A petition signed by 397 residents of South Australia praying that the House urge the Government to allow the establishment of a tavern bar at Policeman's Point was presented by Mr Lewis.

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 161, 194, 250, 264, 269, 271, 272, 274 to 282, 287, 300 to 303, and 305; and I direct that the following answer to a question without notice be distributed and printed in *Hansard*.

COURT SENTENCE

In reply to **Mr BECKER** (17 February).

The Hon. J.C. BANNON: The Attorney-General has advised me that, as the question accurately recites, Christopher Douglas Disney was a coconspirator with Reginald Spiers and Barbara Tobin with respect to the importation of cannabis resin. Spiers' file came into the Supreme Court list in October 1981, as did Tobin's. By virtue of the fact that he absconded, Disney did not come into the list until August 1984.

Although these matters came into the list at the times mentioned, the Office of the Crown Prosecutor has not and never has had the conduct of this matter. It was a Commonwealth matter, investigated by the Australian Federal Police and prosecuted by the Director of Public Prosecutions (Commonwealth). The Commonwealth did appeal against the sentence imposed on Disney but it was dismissed.

The Commonwealth advised that Disney was released on licence late last year subject to certain conditions. The relevant conditions of his release are as follows:

From the day on which he is released from prison until 20 July 1990 or until his licence is sooner revoked or cancelled, he will—

(1) be subject to the supervision of such person (hereinafter referred to as 'his parole officer') and is from time to time appointed for the purpose by the said Officer-in-Charge;

(2) obey all such reasonable directions in relation to his supervision as are given him by his parole officer;

(3) reside at an address and engage in employment approved of by his parole officer;

(4) not change his address or employment without first obtaining the permission of his parole officer or, if that is not practicable, then inform his parole officer of any change of address or employment within 48 hours after such change;

(5) not unlawfully use, possess or sell any substance that is a drug or narcotic preparation within the meaning of the Narcotic Drugs Act 1967;

(6) not knowingly associate with any person who unlawfully uses, possesses or sells any such substance;

(7) not leave the State of South Australia for any other State or Territory of the Commonwealth of Australia without first obtaining the permission of the Director, Community Corrections Division, Department of Correctional Services, 3rd Floor, Rechabite Chambers, Victoria Square, Adelaide;

(8) comply with every condition subject to which the said Director may grant him permission to leave the State of South Australia for any other State or Territory of the Commonwealth of Australia; and

(9) not leave the Commonwealth of Australia without first obtaining the permission of the Attorney-General of Australia.

PAPERS TABLED

The following papers were laid on the table:

By the Minister of Marine (Hon. R.K. Abbott):
Department of Marine and Harbors—Report, 1985-86.

By the Minister of Forests (Hon. R.K. Abbott):
Forestry Act 1950—Variation of Proclamation—Second Valley Forest Reserve.

By the Minister of State Development and Technology (Hon. Lynn Arnold):
Riverland Development Council—Report, 1985-86.

By the Minister of Employment and Further Education (Hon. Lynn Arnold):
The Flinders University of South Australia—By-Law No. 19—Expiation Fee.

By the Minister of Transport (Hon. G.F. Keneally):
Drugs Act 1908—Regulation—Food and Drugs Advisory Committee Remuneration.
Motor Vehicles Act 1959—Regulations—Pre-licence Motor Cycle Training.
South Australian Waste Management Commission Act 1979—Regulations—Prescribed Wastes.
District Council of Tatiara—By-law No. 41—Keeping of Animals and Birds.

By the Minister of Education (Hon. G. J. Crafter):
Commissioner for Consumer Affairs—Report, 1985-86.
Justices Act 1921—Rules—Crimes (Confiscation of Profits).
Bail Act 1985—Regulations—Child Provisions.
Children's Protection and Young Offenders Act 1979—Regulations—Bail Provisions.
Crimes (Consfiscation of Profits) Act 1986—Regulations—Search Warrants.
Trade Standards Act 1979—Regulations—

Sparkle Bangles,
Puller Winches,
Silos and Water Storage Tanks.
Trustee Act 1936—Regulation—Trustee Investment Status (Amendment).

By the Minister of Correctional Services (Hon. Frank Blevins):

Department of Correctional Services—Report, 1985-86.

By the Minister of Agriculture (Hon. M.K. Mayes):

Marketing of Eggs Act 1941—Report of Auditor-General on, 1985-86.

By the Minister of Fisheries (Hon. M.K. Mayes):

Fisheries Act 1982—Regulations—
Southern Zone Rock Lobster Fishery—Pots and Licences.
Northern Zone Rock Lobster Fishery—Pots and Licences.
Marine Scale Fishery—Licences.
Fish Traps.

MINISTERIAL STATEMENT: DEPARTMENT OF STATE DEVELOPMENT AND TECHNOLOGY

The Hon. LYNN ARNOLD (Minister of State Development and Technology): I seek leave to make a statement.

Leave granted.

The Hon. LYNN ARNOLD: On 28 August last year the Premier informed the House of plans to merge the Ministry of Technology and the Department of State Development. I am pleased to inform the House that the Government has now finalised details of the amalgamation. This important move will complete the formation of the new Department of State Development and Technology, and will place the technology portfolio in its appropriate place within the department responsible for economic development issues in this State. The Government is determined to continue its commitment to technology issues, and sees the amalgamation as a way of strengthening the input of the Technology Advisory Unit in development matters.

The newly created Office for Technology will report to the Executive Director—Industry and Technology within the department, and will advise the Director of the Department of State Development and Technology. The Office for Technology will also have direct access to the Ministry on matters relating to the SA Council on Technological Change, and any other issues nominated by the Minister. The council will remain independent of the Department of State Development, but will continue to be serviced by the Office for Technology. The office will be established in such a way that its independent advisory role will be maintained and strengthened. It is considered that the integration will optimise the relationship between State Development and Technology and ensure coordination of our strategies in both areas.

As a separate entity Mintech played a significant role in raising and increasing awareness of the challenge of technology. It is now appropriate that, for maximum coordination and integration of our strategies on the appropriate use of technology to benefit both society and economic development, the Technology Advisory Unit should become a significant part of the Department of State Development and Technology. The amalgamation will be effective from 16 March 1987.

MOTION FOR ADJOURNMENT: TROTTING CONTROL BOARD

The SPEAKER: This morning I received the following letter from the honourable Leader of the Opposition (Mr Olsen):

Dear Mr Speaker,

I desire to inform you that this day it is the intention of the Liberal Party to move:

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

That in view of continuing widespread concern about and further evidence of serious malpractice by the Trotting Control Board in South Australia, the Government must immediately appoint a judicial inquiry into trotting administration by the board and, pending the completion of such an inquiry, all members of the Trotting Control Board should stand aside.

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

Members having risen:

Mr INGERSON (Bragg): I move:

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

That, in view of continuing widespread concern about and further evidence of serious malpractice by the Trotting Control Board in South Australia, the Government must immediately appoint a judicial inquiry into trotting administration by the board and, pending the completion of such an inquiry, all members of the Trotting Control Board should stand aside.

Last week allegations of serious malpractice in the administration of trotting in South Australia were again raised publicly. Last week, the Minister of Recreation and Sport again demonstrated a complete neglect of his responsibility to act to have these allegations thoroughly investigated. Instead, he invited me to 'put up or shut up'. Since it is clear that the Minister intends to do nothing except shut up, today I put up. I put to the House information not so far revealed publicly, but mostly known to the Minister which—

clearly demonstrates that the Trotting Control Board was, at best, incompetent, at worst, crook, in dealing with a positive swab;

raises serious questions about the board's swabbing techniques;

exposes threats by two members of the board to those prepared to bring these matters into the open so that they can be investigated.

In summary, there is a huge cloud hanging over the administration of trotting in this State. It has been hanging around for almost a year, because the Government has been completely unwilling to take any positive action. As a result, the vast majority of people involved in the industry who are honest and hard working are being caught up in it. This can be put right only by the inquiry proposed in the motion.

Such an inquiry must have as its starting point the result of one of the most important events on the State trotting calendar—the South Australian Breeders Plate, raced on 24 May last year. This prestigious $10 000 event was won by the heavily backed Batik Print. A routine swab taken by the stewards from that horse was sent to the Institute of Drug Technology in Melbourne for testing. It was analysed and found to be positive to the drug dexamethasone.

The Chief Steward of the Trotting Control Board, Mr Alan Broadfoot, notified the owner and trainer, and the Trotting Control Board, that a positive swab had been returned. The trainer was offered the opportunity of having the swab tested again by his own nominee, but he refused. However, 44 days later the owner decided to take up this option, and an independent analysis was scheduled to be undertaken on 7 July. But this did not occur, because on 3 July a snap meeting of the board was held and the following press statement was released:

After considering all the available evidence, the board has agreed not to proceed in the matters involving the swabs of Columbia Wealth and Batik Print on 5 May and 24 May 1986, respectively.

The board's decision to drop all charges in these cases came as a shock to the industry. I now reveal to the House the following facts:

1. The Chief Steward was not notified of the board meeting, despite the fact that he was in attendance at Globe Derby while the meeting was held. Mr Broadfoot had previously been instructed by the board to attend all board meetings.

2. One board member, Mr Pat Rehn, was also present at Globe Derby Park, but was also not informed that the board was meeting.

3. I remind the House that the board's own statement claims that a decision to drop all charges was reached after 'considering all the available evidence'.

The truth of the matter is that this rather sudden gathering of certain board members had no evidence to consider. The Chief Steward, the only person who had the evidence and documentation necessary for any real evaluation of the Batik Print case, was deliberately not informed of the meeting. About two months later, Mr Broadfoot, a man highly respected throughout the trotting industry, resigned. He is prepared to give evidence to the inquiry I am seeking.

In response to widespread industry concern about the board's unprecedented decision in the Batik Print affair, the Acting Minister of Recreation and Sport (Mr Payne) issued the following statement on 8 July:

> I am satisfied with the validity and propriety of a decision by the South Australian Trotting Control Board not to proceed further.

On what basis did the Minister reach this conclusion? Was he just reciting words put into his mouth by the board—a body very much under a cloud in this case? The Acting Minister also said:

> The board had before it evidence of a technical discrepancy in a recent Victorian case involving the same drug.

That statement is untrue. At best, the Minister was negligent in accepting advice to this effect from the board. At worst, he actively participated in a cover-up. I refer to a decision of the Appeal Committee of the Trotting Control Board delivered on 24 February—three weeks ago. It was in the case of an appeal against the board's decision on the Batik Print affair. The committee stated:

> There simply is no evidence before this committee to indicate what decision was made by the board, or, in fact, whether the board made any decision at all. The lack of evidence and the information available to this Appeal Committee is a matter of some concern to us.

In the circumstances, the Appeal Committee let the board off lightly. Not only does its finding expose the untruths in the Acting Minister's statement of 8 July, but also it shows that the board took no minutes of the meeting which decided to take no action on the Batik Print swab. That is a breach of the Racing Act, which requires in section 13 (5) that the board shall cause proper minutes to be kept of its proceedings at meetings.

Despite this clear evidence of malpractice and cover-up by the board—a snap, stacked board meeting possibly to cover up a rigged race—all that the Minister of Recreation and Sport could say last week was that he was unaware of any allegations or concerns about the industry. This is despite the fact that in September last year a ministerial officer in the Minister's office, Mr Peter Campaign, was provided with information setting out concerns about the board's conduct on this matter. There are further reasons for asking other serious questions about the board's attitude to swabbing.

Soon after Batik Print was positively swabbed, the Trotting Control Board decided that it would stop sending swabs to the Institute of Drug Technology in Melbourne. I ask the House to recall that it was this institute which uncovered the presence of dexamethasone in Batik Print. Instead, the board decided that swabs would in future be sent for analysis to the Australian Jockey Club in Sydney, despite the fact that the Melbourne operation was no more expensive, usually faster in providing results, had more advanced techniques to detect a wider range of drugs and was the recommended analyst of the Chief Steward. The institute was never informed by the board of reasons for the change.

The board's decision is all the more astonishing considering a quality control test last year designed by the Victorian Harness Racing Board which showed that the AJC failed to find at least two-thirds of drugs in samples designed to test its analytical proficiency, while the Melbourne institute had a confirmation rate of almost 90 per cent. I have also been informed that the Sydney operation did not have the capacity to test for the presence of etorphine, or elephant juice as it is commonly called, while this test was available in Melbourne.

Through detailed research, the Melbourne institute has also discovered that dexamethasone cannot be detected after a lengthy period in a once positive swab. The South Australian Trotting Control Board was informed in writing of these findings on 14 August. This discovery raises further far-reaching questions about the lengthy delays approved by the Trotting Control Board for second swab analysis in both the Batik Print case and another involving Columbia Wealth, which returned a positive swab on 5 May last year. While the acting Minister, in his statement on 8 July last year, said that the board had sought evidence on this matter, the acting Minister confirmed, when later interviewed, that all the board did was read a Victorian newspaper article.

I now refer to industry concern about penalties handed down by the board in cases involving positive swabs. An owner, Mr Lindsay Heath, was recently fined $750 and lost prize money after his horse Bowilla returned a positive swab to the drug theobromine when it won the Breeders Plate at Port Augusta on 30 January this year. On 16 February the pacer Royal Columbia won the Strathalbyn Cup and returned a positive swab revealing the presence of eftolon. I am informed that this drug has qualities which mask several other drugs in a horse's system. It is known within the industry as a cover-up drug and it is not even a registered drug for veterinary purposes in South Australia today. It was withdrawn from sale at the manufacturer's request. Despite this, all the board did was remind the trainer/reinsman involved, Mr Sugars, of his obligation to inform stewards of the condition of any horse which may affect performance. He was not fined a single dollar.

The issues that I have raised today are extremely serious and have repercussions for the entire trotting industry. It is no use the Minister saying that the Batik Print case was an isolated affair. The attitude of certain board members to the whole question of trotting administration is causing serious concern throughout the industry. The Minister has been kept fully informed of the situation. He has in his possession the same information and the same documentation given to me. Owners and trainers have been implicated and a special police squad is investigating. Board members are under suspicion.

He is no doubt also aware that two members of the Trotting Control Board, Mr Bob Zerella and Mr Fred Jones, have kept in contact with me over the past week, reminding me of what could happen to my political career if I do not 'put up or shut up'—a phrase that the Minister himself has adopted. Mr Zerella and Mr Jones came to my office last week and threatened to finish me once and for all—in a political sense.

I am not the only person with information, and I am not the only one to have been subjected to threats from these two board members and warnings to keep quiet. Other trotting identities have been subjected to behaviour which is quite extraordinary coming from members of a Government board. These threats have been reported to the Criminal Investigation Bureau.

Today, interestingly, I received a hand delivered request to appear before the stewards. Last year, the board did not accept the advice of the stewards. I wonder whether it will accept the advice this time. The police have also been informed of an anonymous telephone call that I received last Wednesday night in which the caller referred to the fitting of concrete shoes if I persisted in raising this matter.

Mr Jones and Mr Zerella have also provided statements to the media which, apparently, do not have the official sanction of the board Chairman, Mr Harry Krantz. These two board members have embarked on a deliberate campaign to silence people in the industry who have information that is vital in clearing up the extent of corruption afflicting the industry. Their behaviour alone demands the fullest and most urgent inquiry.

The Hon. M.K. MAYES (Minister of Recreation and Sport): I certainly treat the motion before the House today very seriously and I certainly consider that it is a matter that must be dealt with by this House. It is an attempt by the Opposition to bring the matter before the public, and I think that the statements made by the shadow Minister over the past few weeks and today indicate that obviously a great deal of interest is being shown on this issue.

In relation to the position that I have taken as Minister of Recreation and Sport, I indicate that I have certainly not said that there are no allegations that have credibility. Obviously, incidents have occurred, which the Acting Minister addressed while I was overseas and which were brought to my attention on my return. Any argument at this time that there is widespread corruption or that the mafia is deeply involved in the industry cannot be substantiated, and I have no evidence before me to suggest that a motion such as that before the House today should be supported.

The Hon. E.R. Goldsworthy interjecting:

The Hon. M.K. MAYES: I sat in silence and listened to the shadow Minister and would appreciate it if the Deputy Leader of the Opposition would show the same courtesy.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order! I call the Deputy Leader of the Opposition to order. The Minister has the floor. The honourable Minister.

The Hon. M.K. MAYES: Thank you, Mr Speaker. It certainly concerns the Government and me as Minister that allegations of this sort should be afloat within the industry. I have kept daily contact, through my departmental officer, the Manager of the Racing and Gaming Section, with the chief of the Vice and Gaming Squad, who has been responsible for investigating these allegations.

I repeat my earlier call of last week, which I think has been somewhat distorted by the shadow Minister's statement, and that was that if anyone has evidence to support these allegations then I argue very strongly that such a person should go to the appropriate judicial body, the police, who have the responsibility and carriage of investigating this matter. That is the way that it should be dealt with. If, in the eyes of the police, these allegations can be substantiated, then I as Minister would certainly act immediately. However, at this point of time I do not have that evidence before me. I have, as the shadow Minister has put before the House, some information which suggests that perhaps there has been some poor judgment with regard to earlier matters that were brought before the Trotting Control Board—and those matters have been addressed. In fact, the shadow Minister has got some of his evidence incorrect.

The matters referred to have been addressed. In regard to the Batik Print case, the swab that was taken later of Columbia Wealth in fact was the swab that returned on the second occasion a negative indication. That particular loophole in the provisions contained in the rules has been addressed. The situation is now such that the Trotting Control Board has a requirement which overcomes that particular problem. With regard to the series of allegations that have been raised, I say once again that if evidence is held by any member of the community which suggests widespread corruption on the part of the Trotting Control Board, or widespread malpractice on the part of any individual in authority in the office of that board, then they must, as responsible citizens, urgently put that evidence before the police and the Trotting Control Board.

An honourable member interjecting:

The Hon. M.K. MAYES: The honourable member opposite thinks that this is amusing. I can assure him that it—

Members interjecting:

The Hon. M.K. MAYES: If these allegations cannot be substantiated, then the whole industry will have been done a grave disservice. That is the problem that I face. It is very easy for the shadow Minister to make a bullet, fire it and disappear, but I must look at the matter carefully and in a balanced manner to ensure that allegations that are put forward can be substantiated and shown to be true and correct. If I were to support this motion for a major judicial inquiry into the actions of the Trotting Control Board, I would be reflecting on the total credibility of that body and would be required to take further steps which I think would completely dislodge the industry.

I refer now to comments made by the Leader of the Opposition when it was announced that there would be an inquiry into racing. If there are structural problems with the operation of the Trotting Control Board (and individuals within the industry have said this to me), and if there are problems within the industry as a whole, then there is a method by which this Parliament has dealt with such issues previously, and it is certainly the way in which we should deal with the matter at this time.

I refer to the *Advertiser* of 16 February 1987 in which the Leader of the Opposition is reported as slamming the Government's proposed committee of inquiry into racing in South Australia. He called for it to be abandoned. The very points that the shadow Minister has put forward have raised issues in relation to how the Trotting Control Board operates as a statutory body. I refer the Leader to the Act containing the powers of the Trotting Control Board, namely, the Racing Act 1976-1979: that Act contains under division II the powers of the controlling authority for trotting. Of course, that is a parliamentary blessing under which the Trotting Control Board acts. So, it is important to note at the outset that there is Government involvement in the industry. The shadow Minister argues strongly that there should be further Government involvement, that there should be a full judicial inquiry into the industry, and that the Trotting Control Board should be suspended while that inquiry is conducted. I refer to the *Advertiser* article, which states:

> The Government's dithering and indecision could easily be resolved by deciding not to proceed with the inquiry.

The Leader of the Opposition is later reported as saying the following—

Mr Olsen: Get to the motion before the House.

The Hon. M.K. MAYES: I am addressing it. The Leader might have the courtesy, which is more than he often shows—

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order! It is for the Chair to determine questions of relevancy. The honourable Minister.

The Hon. M.K. MAYES: Thank you, Mr Speaker. This is very relevant, and obviously the Leader does not enjoy having this matter brought to his memory, which has a short span. He is reported in that article as follows:

> If the Government proceeds with a committee of inquiry, all it will do is appoint people it knows who will come to the conclusion the union movement wants. I am totally opposed to any move to establish total Government control of racing.

The honourable member does not even see the hypocrisy of the motion that he has put before us today. We have the Opposition raising the suggestion that we have a full judicial inquiry and that the Government suspend the Trotting Control Board while that inquiry is conducted, thereby creating total Government interference in the industry, yet he says that there should be no Government involvement in that industry. Of course, the life of the Trotting Control Board comes from an Act of this very Parliament. So, they really do not have their act together in respect of this issue. The statement continues:

> All Mr Mayes has done is create uncertainty for the industry at a time when it is facing the challenge posed by severe competition for the gambling dollar.

What has the shadow Minister achieved by making his allegations? I call on him again, if he has the evidence, to put it before the Vice and Gaming Squads which is the appropriate thing to do. That is why we have that State enforcement body, but he has failed to do that. He has made sweeping allegations and undermined the confidence of the industry.

The member for Light is uncomfortable about this, because he has connections with the trotting industry. I am sure that he feels that these sweeping statements, which are unsubstantiated, are creating much uncertainty and are damaging the industry. If the honourable member has any evidence, he should put it before the people to whom I have referred. Finally, I quote the following statement, which sums up the Opposition's attitude:

> If we cannot have horse racing without total Government control, what will be next?

Here, this afternoon, the Opposition seeks to suspend the Trotting Control Board, the authority that controls the industry, and to provide for Government control while a judicial inquiry is held. These allegations are serious and must be dealt with as such. We have to consider this matter responsibly and, if the allegations are substantiated through the appropriate authority, certainly as Minister I will act on that. However, at this time we do not have substantiated evidence to suggest any widespread cover-up, corruption or malpractice in the industry and I cannot in all conscience support such a motion given the uncertainty and distress that this has caused in the industry as a whole.

I also draw to the attention of the House a letter provided for me today by the Chairman of Stewards which highlights the fact that Mr Ingerson has been called to produce the evidence which he says he has but which, I understand, he has not put before the Vice and Gaming Squads. They have called for the evidence and are prepared to hear the shadow Minister so that the board may have the opportunity to hear any allegations substantiated concerning widespread malpractice or corruption in the industry. I am sure that most sensible people in the community would see that as the appropriate way in which this matter should be dealt with, rather than by using such a wide scattergun approach that suggests total malpractice in the industry.

I am afraid that, if the issue had been handled with any discretion by the shadow Minister, it would have been dealt with differently, which would have at least given the industry the opportunity to answer the charges sensibly and reasonably. I am sorry that there has been such a reaction to the situation concerning the shadow Minister's personal involvement, and I refer to his allegations this afternoon about the way in which he says he has been dealt with by members of the board. If he is prepared to put them before me, I will certainly have them investigated and dealt with appropriately. However, I have had no contact from the shadow Minister on those points.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order! I call the House to order.

The Hon. M.K. MAYES: Again, the shadow Minister wants to go public and not deal with this matter in the appropriate way. If he wishes to approach me, I am more than happy to deal with it appropriately and responsibly. We must be responsible to this Parliament. It is easy for an Opposition to make these allegations and not have to live with them but, as a Government, we must see that such allegations are properly and appropriately weighed and that we investigate these that are seriously substantiated and supported.

Mr OLSEN (Leader of the Opposition): What a pathetic, rambling response from the Minister to the serious allegations put before the House today. The Minister said several times that he needed evidence. Well, the shadow Minister has outlined that evidence today. He has detailed the accusations, allegations and documentation which the Minister should follow through, but once again the Minister has referred to structural problems that the racing inquiry will consider, not the corruption referred to by the shadow Minister in the evidence that he put before the House today.

The Minister clearly has no answer to those allegations of corruption within the industry and has sought rather to lay a false trail. Last week the Minister said that if we had evidence it should go to the committee of inquiry and that Ms Nelson would investigate and report on it. Today he said at one stage that it ought to be referred to the Police Department and on a second occasion he said that it ought to be referred to the Trotting Control Board. It is about time the Minister made up his mind about the authority to which he wants the evidence to be given. There is no more public or serious forum to which evidence of this nature can be given than the Parliament. That is what the Opposition has done in a very responsible and effective manner today, yet the Minister has not taken account of that, nor has he responded effectively, efficiently or responsibly as a Minister of the Crown.

Let me pick up the point about referring the matter to the committee of inquiry. Last week in the *Advertiser* the Minister said that the committee being chaired by Ms Frances Nelson, QC, could and ought to investigate the allegations and evidence placed before it. Ms Nelson is an eminent QC in this State, one of high repute and standing, let me say from the outset. But the Minister's statement that 'Frances will fix it' shows how ignorant and out of touch he is. The Minister has had all the evidence that we have presented to the Parliament today since September last year, but he has failed to act or take any corrective action and has failed to inform himself; or, at worst, he has been prepared to cover up what is a quite serious matter within the racing industry in South Australia.

On the information the Minister has in his office and at his disposal, he knows perfectly well that Ms Nelson cannot

inquire into this matter. He knows full well how empty that offer was when made to the South Australian public, because Ms Nelson was the counsel initially approached for legal advice by Mr Lou Ward, the owner of I'm Happy, which ran third to Batik Print in the South Australian Breeders' Plate, the race we are talking about. In fact, Mr Ward's current lawyer, Mr Alan Hunter, wrote to Mr Ward advising him:

> We can retain Ms Nelson, QC, for general advice and bring her in if and when it is necessary.

That was on 24 July of last year. The Minister's office was made aware of that fact in September last year. The Minister should have known that Ms Nelson cannot act as counsel to a person questioning activities of the Trotting Control Board and at the same time conduct an inquiry into allegations implicating the same board. In this position Ms Nelson would have to disqualify herself from any investigation of that matter as suggested by the Minister. I am sure the Minister made the suggestion without first consulting Ms Nelson, because I know that her reputation is beyond reproach and she would not have allowed the Minister to make the statement in the first place. The Minister has put Ms Nelson in an ethically embarrassing position to avoid facing up to the issue raised by the shadow Minister. Frances cannot fix it: only the Minister can.

A judicial inquiry is required to look into the specific questions raised in the House today and not at the structure of the trotting, racing or greyhound industries. What a red herring that was! We are talking about a specific case of a positive swab and lack of action by the board, lack of minutes being kept by the board and lack of accountability by that board. It is the Minister's responsibility to ensure that the industry is above reproach in South Australia. Some of the questions the board ought to be inquiring into are posed as a result of the shadow Minister's presentation of the evidence to the House today.

Under what rules of racing did the Trotting Control Board act in overriding the chief steward on the Batik Print positive swab? Why was not the chief steward invited to the board meeting that considered the matter? The chief steward was on course the day the board held its meeting. Why was a member of the board, Mr Rehn, not invited to that meeting when he too was on the track the day the board held that meeting? Did the board take minutes of the meeting which made the decision on the Batik Print positive swab? We have evidence from the appeals committee to indicate that the board did not take minutes of the meeting, which is in contravention of its Act, as the Minister well knows.

An honourable member interjecting:

Mr OLSEN: The Minister has done nothing about this subject, despite information having been in his possession for months. The Minister has taken no action to try to overcome a very serious allegation in relation to the industry. What evidence did the board consider at that meeting? We have it from the Appeals Committee (and it has been tabled) that no evidence was presented to the board meeting prior to its making that decision.

The Minister has taken no action to try to overcome a very serious allegation in relation to the industry. What evidence did the board consider at that meeting? We have it from the Appeals Committee (and it has been tabled) that no evidence was presented to the board meeting prior to its making that decision.

Did the board seek any information from the Melbourne Institute of Drug Technology before making its decision? Why did the board, soon after the Batik Print decision, dispense with the services of the institute? What action has been taken following the Minister's statement in the *Advertiser* on 8 August last year that the board would investigate the need for more stringent testing procedures? Has the Minister received a report from the board following this investigation? If he has, what does the report reveal? I have no doubt that, if the matter had been followed up, the Minister would have revealed that in his reply today. The fact that he did not refer to the matter at all means that he has not followed it up and does not have the evidence to present to the House today in any sort of defence.

An honourable member: He's probably covered it up.

Mr OLSEN: I suppose we could go on and ask, 'Has the Minister asked the board why the matter has not been pursued?' I bet he has not asked the board that question. This is all in response to the Minister's statement of 8 August last year—a direct response to the Minister's own statement. Are penalties imposed by the board consistent in cases where positive swabs are detected? Evidence has been put before the House today that positive swabs have been detected, yet the penalties have varied significantly—from zero to $750.

The Hon. E.R. Goldsworthy: Plus stake money.

Mr OLSEN: Plus stake money being at risk. Have individual members of the board threatened persons or organisations involved in trotting following allegations of malpractice? In reply to that pearl, the Minister said, 'Give me the evidence.' The shadow Minister has just finished detailing the allegations and has said who made them—members of the statutory board in South Australia. The Minister has a responsibility to act and to follow up the allegations. Once again, the Minister has no defence: he hedged, putting forward red herrings and laying false trails, not answering the questions or the allegations but rambling all over the place.

Another question that should go to the judicial inquiry is, 'Are current swabbing techniques adequate to detect the presence of the stimulant elephant juice?' There is a series of questions, questions that appropriately and responsibly should be directed to a judicial inquiry so that the inquiry can get to the bottom of the matter. The plain facts are that racing is big business in this State. It supports more than 12 000 jobs and represents an investment of more than $1 billion. As such, it is an industry in this State that should be protected and not be subject to inaction by the Minister with the actions of a few within the industry casting aspersions over the whole industry. There is a stigma over the whole industry at present because the Minister has had the evidence but he has failed to act for some nine months. Despite the evidence being in your possession, you have been prepared to cover up and not bring matters into the open. You well know that drugs are being used to affect results in the industry.

The SPEAKER: Order! The honourable Leader is aware that he should direct his remarks to the Chair. He must not use the first person 'you'. Secondly, he should at least glance in the direction of the Chair at some point during his 15 minutes.

The Hon. J.C. Bannon interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order! The honourable Premier is out of order.

Mr OLSEN: The scenario is that drugs are being used to affect the performance of horses in the trotting industry. The Minister admitted as much in replying to this motion. He said on one occasion, 'I don't know the extent of corruption in the industry,' acknowledging that there is corruption in the industry. They were the Minister's own words. Therefore, if there is corruption, ought it not to be investigated to determine its extent? It is well recognised in the

industry that there is a select group of punters who benefit from blatant race rigging. In at least one case, the board has failed to take positive action and has been negligent, if not dishonest, in dealing with a positive swab.

No suspicion must hang over the industry, as it has, for month after month because of Government inaction and a willingness by the Government to cover up the matter. No effort should be spared by the Government to remove the suspicion that hangs over the industry. We have an industry that involves a large number of honest, fair-minded, responsible people—the vast majority of punters—who are investing about half a billion dollars with the TAB and bookmakers each year.

Do not members think that they want a reassurance, to ensure that the industry is above suspicion and that it is being conducted in such a way as to give a fair deal to all people in all sections of the industry? That is what we seek. Only the Minister can remove the suspicion, but he can only do that by appointing a judicial inquiry to investigate the questions, allegations and evidence that have been put before the House today. It is clear that he cannot refer it to Miss Nelson's Committee of Inquiry into the Racing Industry of South Australia because of Miss Nelson's involvement with Mr Lou Ward, one of the aggrieved owners of a horse which ran in that race.

The Hon. Ted Chapman: What about the unfortunate punter who backs the horse that is not going to win?

Mr OLSEN: When we talk about the investment of half a billion dollars each year in the industry, it is important that all those investors be assured that their investments are receiving a fair deal on the track. The Minister acknowledges that there is corruption, but he is not prepared to do anything about it. Although he admits that there is corruption, he is not prepared to investigate it in a judicial inquiry. If the Minister believes that the actions of two members of a statutory board in South Australia in threatening and trying to intimidate a member of Parliament in bringing allegations before the public relating to such a serious matter as this one are not worth investigating, then he is abdicating his responsibility as a Minister, to the industry and to the portfolio that he is supposed to represent in this House.

Mr Tyler: What do the police say?

Mr OLSEN: Those threats have been referred to the Police Department.

Mr Rann interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order!

Mr OLSEN: The member for Briggs would well recall the document that he doctored and released to the people of South Australia when he tore a few pages from that document and then presented it. Talk about credibility, honesty and reliability! After a performance like that, the honourable member would have zilch.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order! I ask the Leader to return to the subject of the debate.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order! The honourable member for Briggs is completely out of order. The honourable Leader.

Mr OLSEN: Following allegations of such a serious nature, there is only one way in which confidence can be restored in the trotting industry in South Australia. The Minister was prepared to concede that in two instances the allegations were serious, that they ought to be taken on board and that they ought to be actioned. If that is the case, we have indicated clearly to the House today that there is only one way in which they can be properly and appropriately dealt with. The Opposition and the shadow Minister, the member for Bragg, have been prepared to detail to the House those accusations, threats and allegations, which have been backed up and substantiated by documentation and evidence that the member for Bragg has referred to the House today. Clearly, it is specific and irrefutable.

The Minister acknowledges that there is corruption and he therefore has a clear duty and a basic responsibility to the majority of honest people in the trotting industry of South Australia to set up a judicial inquiry in order to remove suspicion and uncertainty related to the industry so that it can get on with its job of participating and being a very important industry in South Australia. While the Minister refuses to act and to investigate, the suspicion will continue and the industry will falter as a result of the Minister's inaction. The responsibility is his alone. He cannot pass the buck, because the buck stops with the Minister.

The SPEAKER: The honourable member for Florey.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order! The Leader has concluded his remarks. The honourable member for Florey.

Mr GREGORY (Florey): I have been in this House for only a short period of time, but I have never heard such a load of rubbish from members opposite as I have heard this afternoon. Allegations have been made about corruption. When I first went to work as an apprentice I heard about allegations of corruption in the racing industry and those allegations have been there for as long as I can remember. I am always interested to hear about allegations pertaining to the racing industry, because they lead people to believe that the races are fixed. If one listens to people who go to race meetings and bet, that happens.

Stewards committees, racing committees and, in this case relating to trots, a Trotting Control Board, exist to stop that corruption and the fixing of races. The Trotting Control Board is supposed to oversee and to ensure that the trots are run properly. I am of the view that, if the board investigates the matter and does not come to the conclusion that something is wrong, and if we need to look at the operations of the board, it needs to be done in an overall manner in relation to racing in South Australia. That is precisely what the Government is doing. It is looking at the form of the operation of the racing industry as a whole. It does not involve just the trots but it includes also the gallops and the dogs. It is having a look at the whole of the management of those codes. When the Government announced that, guess who rubbished the idea and tipped a bucket on it? It was none other than the Leader of the Opposition, who raised the spectre of the involvement of the trade union movement. He said that all the Government wanted to do was give the control of the racing industry to the trade union movement.

A perusal of an article published in the *Advertiser* on 16 February indicates that that is the position. The indication was that if the Government proceeds with the committee all it will do is appoint people who it knows will come to the conclusion that the trade union movement wants. A little earlier today the Leader of the Opposition made it quite clear that he had full confidence in the Chairwoman of that committee, yet he is saying in this article that she will do what the trade union wants. That just shows how the Leader misrepresents things. On the one hand, he said today that the Chairwoman would be quite fair and reasonable and come to a proper conclusion, but on the other hand, he says that she will do what the union movements wants. I wish that he would make up his mind.

I treat all allegations with some suspicion. I think that we need to be very clear about this. A lot of allegations are made in this House about the conduct of other people,

particularly the member for Unley, by the member for Bragg. He never has the decency to apologise for them. I think that needs to be noted. I also make the point that the member for Bragg made some reference in his address to the House this afternoon about being threatened by members of the Control Board. He has claimed in this House that that is a matter about which he gave information to the Police Department. I would hope that he would, but the member for Bragg then made the point here (and the Leader has also made this point) that perhaps the Minister should do something about the matter. I would have thought that members opposite, who claim to know a bit about management, would realise that one does not have two people doing the same thing. If the member for Bragg considers that his right in this House as a Parliamentarian and his ability to do his job are being threatened by someone, he ought to bring them before the bar of the House.

Members interjecting:

Mr GREGORY: He should not say that he might; he should do it. This is the point. The honourable member talked about cement shoes. Notwithstanding the member for Bragg's colourful language, perhaps someone did say something, but it must be proved. One must prove one's suspicions and if that is not possible that is tough luck. I thought that in this country we have laws in respect of the areas in which the police are operating at the moment, in that one is innocent until proven guilty. Members on the other side of the Chamber today have convicted and hung out people to dry, without that benefit of the law. I hold to that benefit very dearly. It does mean that from time to time corrupt people have been presumed innocent because an offence could not be proved beyond reasonable doubt. That is the imperfection in our law. Until we can change our system that is the way it is going to be. That is the way that responsible people need to behave and conduct themselves when they are investigating and dealing with allegations of malpractice. It is very easy indeed to make all the allegations in the world, but it is very hard to prove them. Our Police Department has been praised by members opposite as being very efficient. I have no doubt that if the allegations are true the police will get the evidence and will launch the necessary prosecutions and deal with them.

The member for Bragg said by way of interjection, 'Let's have a judicial inquiry.' I wonder whether he is a knave or a fool, or whether he knows that, by having a judicial inquiry and getting these people to give evidence, once they have gone along and given evidence they cannot be prosecuted. I believe that that is one of the problems associated with having a Royal Commission. If people are involved in cheating at the trots, or indeed in relation to any event, I would prefer that they were prosecuted under the appropriate law in this State rather than our having a judicial inquiry, which would allow them to get off. That is precisely what the member is advocating. The member for Mitcham interjects a lot: he is a very shallow member in relation to a number of matters. He understands that one cannot make allegations and then go away, but that is what members opposite want to do today.

Ms Lenehan: He hasn't written it out. You complain if people read it out, and then you are not happy when—

Mr GREGORY: Yes. The member for Mitcham complains about people reading written speeches yet, at the same time—

Ms Lenehan interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order! The honourable member for Florey has the floor, and not the honourable member for Mawson.

Mr GREGORY: Both members opposite who have spoken on the matter read prepared speeches. The other point I make about the member for Bragg is that he interjected that the matter has already been referred to the Vice Squad and that we ought to go there and have a look. Who is conducting that investigation, the Minister or the Vice Squad? I suggest to the member for Bragg, and to other members opposite, that once a matter is in police hands a situation exists where they are supposed to be separate from the Crown—members opposite arranged that there should be no political interference. One cannot have the Minister going to the police every day asking, 'What have you got? Let me have a look.' I thought that we were beyond that. That is what has been suggested by members opposite. That would be a grave invasion into police operations. It is wrong to suggest that. We need to let this matter follow its course, because if it does so and the police get evidence the people involved will be quite severely punished.

An honourable member: When did he inform the police?

Mr GREGORY: I do not know whether he did or not. The member for Chaffey, by way of interjection, said that we would finish up like New South Wales. I do not know what he was talking about. If the committee that has been appointed by the Minister to inquire into the racing codes creates a stewards committee as effective as the one that the Australian Jockey Club runs in Sydney, then that will do me.

If the member is making allegations about corruption in this State, or in this Government, then let him make those allegations in this House and try to prove them thereby demonstrating to this place where we are corrupt. I know (and I am confident of this) that he would not find one skerrick of evidence in relation to such matters. For a long time members opposite have used gutter politics. Every time that they have done that they have been the ones who have slipped and fallen in the mud. They have been put up to doing that.

I listened with some incredulity to the contributions from two members opposite, as this is really a beat-up with no foundation. When this matter has been fully investigated we will worry about it, but we cannot start jumping in and doing other things while this matter is being investigated. The matter must run its natural course—it cannot do anything other than that: members opposite know that, and we know that! We cannot do anything else. When the investigation comes to its conclusion, and if that conclusion results in a prosecution, then the people concerned will be punished according to the laws of our State, laws determined by this Parliament.

My final remark is directed to the member for Bragg: if he believes that his activities as a member of Parliament have been threatened, then he should bring the people concerned before this House and not stand here making broad allegations. He should bring them before this House so that they can answer the questions put by members of this place and defend themselves. That is a reasonable way of doing things, because nobody in this House condones pressure being applied on people, whether on this side or the other side of the House. I do not support the motion.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order! I call the honourable member for Mitcham to order. The honourable member for Light.

The Hon. B.C. EASTICK (Light): This is the first time in the 17 years that I have been in this Parliament that I have seen a Minister left stone motherless, without a feather to fly with, and without the support of any other Minister. What do we have here? We have a Minister standing up in response to my colleague the member for Bragg and saying, 'This is a serious matter. It is a matter that has been

addressed by the Acting Minister (Mr Payne) and me.' The member for Florey told us that the whole thing from the Opposition benches this afternoon had been a matter of rubbish. Let us at least give the Minister credit for accepting and recognising that this is a serious matter. Indeed, it is a far more serious matter than the treatment that the Minister has accorded it throughout the time that he has had information in his hands would indicate. The evidence this afternoon clearly indicates that many of the issues that have been outlined have been in the hands of the Minister or his officers since September last year.

The member for Florey was probably correct when he said, 'Let it flow and see what comes out.' That seems to be the attitude of the present Government: do not address the matter with any vigour; just let it dissipate in the hope that it will disappear. Here we have a situation that evidence has been led over a considerable time. Obvious public concern has been expressed in the press and over the radio for many months relating to issues. Although the motion refers specifically to the trotting industry, let me take up one of the points made by the member for Florey with which I agree: that the matter is under the aegis of the Racing Act, which relates to gallopers and greyhounds, as well as trotters. Consequently, if there is a smudge or smear on any one of those three industries, there are sufficient people who will believe that it impacts on all three. Therefore, let us not say that we are worried about only one sector because, if a question is raised against any one of the racing industries that is controlled by the Racing Act, an element will rub off onto the other racing codes.

The Hon. Jennifer Cashmore: He just said it was all a beat-up.

The Hon. B.C. EASTICK: Yes, a beat-up has been suggested. Talking of beat-ups, let me refer to a point made by the Minister. Having agreed that this was a serious matter, he said that the allegations concerning the mafia and so on that were introduced by the member for Bragg were so much rot. However, the member for Bragg has never talked about the mafia. The fact that the press may well have used that term and sought to put those words into the mouth of another person does not allow anyone to presume that that person (in this case the member for Bragg) made that statement. I am aware that the member for Bragg never made that statement, so I turn that allegation back on the Minister, who is trying to hide behind a false argument in attributing that statement to the honourable member.

The Minister continued to say, 'If there is any evidence, give it to the police.' However, the member for Bragg had already pointed out that he had consulted with the police and that he had made the information available to them. Yet, the Minister continued to ask him to do just that. Where was the Minister's mind when the member for Bragg made that statement? During his speech, the member for Bragg said:

> The South Australian police confirmed last week that they are investigating the possible use of the stimulant elephant juice with police in Victoria and Western Australia.

Apart from the fact that some South Australians have been prepared to say that elephant juice was not in South Australia and that there was no evidence of it, the police and others have clearly indicated that they have found elephant juice in this State, and their present investigation seeks to determine who carried it into the State (not who used it in this sense), what was its source, and how it got here. The member for Bragg also said:

> Four years ago the Bureau of Criminal Intelligence warned about the infiltration of organised crime into trotting in Australia. The Costigan Royal Commission found significant evidence of criminal involvement in racing. That information has been with the South Australian police for a considerable time, and it is confirmed that they are acting on that advice, and they will continue to act on that advice.

Mr Klunder: You don't trust them?

The Hon. B.C. EASTICK: Who said that—the honourable member for Newland?

An honourable member: No, the member for Todd.

The Hon. B.C. EASTICK: The honourable member for Todd: he would hide behind the fact that I used the term 'Newland' when he knew it was the member for Todd, and would not bail out his colleague. I have the greatest regard for the police in this State, but the police in this State at present are acting with their hands tied behind their backs because of the restrictions placed on them by the present Government. I will debate that—

An honourable member interjecting:

The Hon. B.C. EASTICK: An increase in the size of the Drug Squad—not that it is relevant to the motion, but I have been asked the question.

The SPEAKER: Order! The honourable member for Light is correct. It is not relevant, and I ask him to try to return to the basis of this rather wide ranging debate.

The Hon. B.C. EASTICK: May I return to the contribution of the Minister, when he suggested that perhaps the board had exercised poor judgment? What an understatement that is. That is a board that has responsibility under the statute of this State. It is required to meet after due notice has been given to all its members, and it is required to record the discussions that take place at its meetings and to reduce that to writing. That board has been found wanting by the appeal that has been set up by the Minister because, first, it did not invite everyone to attend; secondly, it did not record what was said; and, thirdly, has not tried to provide the information widely, as is required and, more particularly, to other board members.

What are the responsibilities of the Trotting Control Board under the Racing Act? Section 16 of the Act provides:

> (1) The functions of the board are as follows:
> *(a)* to regulate and control the sport of trotting and the conduct of trotting race meetings and trotting races within the State;
> and
> *(b)* to promote the sport of trotting within the State.
> (2) The board may, for the purpose of performing its functions and discharging its duties under this Act—
> *(a)* establish offices;
> *(b)* appoint officers and employees;
> *(c)* make grants to, or provide subsidies for, any registered trotting club;
> *(d)* make a loan, which may be free of interest, to any registered trotting club;
> *(e)* provide a subsidy or make a loan (which may be free of interest) for, or in connection with, the operation of any training track for trotting;
> *(f)* provide any amount for, or towards, the prize money for any trotting race;
> *(g)* borrow any amount, with or without security;
> *(h)* enter into reciprocal arrangements with any authority, association or person having the same or like powers as the board in administering or controlling the sport of trotting, horse racing or greyhound racing in any part of the Commonwealth or any other part of the world with respect to the registration of horses or greyhounds, the endorsement and recognition of disqualifications, licences, permits, defaulters and any other matter or thing relating to the administration and control of those sports;

I emphasise those words: 'any other matter or thing relating to the administration and control of those sports'.

What has the Government done in relation to this issue? It has gone behind the requirements of its own Act. It has not taken seriously the positive evidence placed before it. It has left some of its own members in ignorance of what decisions were taken by the other members of the board

who did meet and it has, I suggest very positively, poured scorn upon its own actions. Now we find the Minister and the acting Minister condoning the actions that were taken.

The SPEAKER: Order! The time for debate having expired, the motion stands withdrawn.

PUBLIC FINANCE AND AUDIT BILL

Adjourned debate on second reading.
(Continued from 19 February. Page 2999.)

Mr OLSEN (Leader of the Opposition): We support the Bill, which was introduced by the Premier into the House on 19 February and which repeals two interrelated Acts, the Audit Act 1921 and the Public Finance Act 1936. Both Acts have been amended numerous times over the period of their currency and by governments of both sides of the political spectrum. It has become increasingly evident in recent years that there is a need to streamline these two Acts. The Liberal Party therefore welcomes this move towards deregulation by the Government and recognition of the complementary nature of public finance and the role of auditing.

While we welcome the Bill as a deregulatory one, I express the hope that much more will be done in the whole area of deregulation. For example, the plan released by the Attorney-General two weeks ago on deregulation was quite simply too little too late, and I find it quite extraordinary that it came only several weeks after questions on notice were placed on the Notice Paper by the Opposition regarding the Government's attitude to deregulation and its lack of action on the issue. I am pleased that at least we have prodded the Government into making some move, even if it was announcing Liberal Party policy, or part of it, in the deregulatory move last week. For that reason we were obviously pleased to support that move, having been the architects of a good policy direction.

However, what businesses in this State need is not mere words and further paper shuffling but action. It is most unfortunate that the Government, 18 months after the last election, has not acted on specific areas that it has been advised to act on, such as the establishment of a one-stop shop for information and access to all Government forms, licences and permits. Neither has the Government established a regulation review unit with a limited three year life, which was endorsed by its own task force on deregulation. All it has done is abolish the deregulation unit set up by the previous Government. While South Australian businesses are struggling with record interest rates, high taxes and charges, the Government is now, after four years, proposing a piecemeal approach.

The Bill results from, as I have said, the close interdependence of auditing and the financial administration of the State. Sections of the Bill result from the report of the Barnes committee (review of Government financial management arrangements), including the adoption of measures to incorporate all legislation relevant to the administration of public finances into one Act. The Premier's second reading explanation states that, while 'important principles associated with the administration of the public finances and public sector auditing' will be contained in the Bill, 'matters of lesser principle are to be promulgated by way of regulations'. Apparently these new regulations will be fewer in number than the present situation with audit regulations because there is a new type of procedure to be known as 'Treasurer's instructions'. We will seek clarification in the Committee stage on how such instructions differ from regulations, including the ability for parliamentary scrutiny.

The Premier stated that in future all Commonwealth funds will be channelled through Consolidated Account. This will enhance the ability for public scrutiny through the Parliament and is something that is to be welcomed, although I would appreciate clarification as to the extent of the information to be placed in the monthly statement of Consolidated Account. The Bill discusses the principle of appropriations, and the need to ensure continued ability to scrutinise by Parliament. It also outlines several other forms of appropriation authority such as the authority to expend money for special deposit accounts, to transfer appropriations from one department or purpose to another, or expenditure necessary as a result of wage fixing decisions.

It refers to the power to invest, and updates the powers to invest with a provision to allow some short-term investment to be made outside SAFA. We would like some clarification of this new power, and in particular information as to the type of amounts proposed. The authority to borrow is transferred from the annual Appropriation Acts to the new Bill. The reasons given are that, as the central component of financial administration is to be contained in the new Act, so too should this authority.

The Bill includes an appropriation authority to authorise any indebtedness incurred by the Treasurer on behalf of the State to be repaid. On the question of accountability, and in accordance with the recommendations of the Barnes committee, the Bill makes several changes to provide for more comprehensive reporting. Such improvements in reporting are to be welcomed and will enable better scrutiny of public finances, including details of special deposit accounts, imprest accounts, SAFA transactions and other organisations the Treasurer has invested funds with, to be publicly stated.

We also welcome the commitment to ensure continuing ability by Parliament to scrutinise appropriations. This will enable better scrutiny of public finances, including details of special deposit accounts, SAFA transactions and other organisations with which the Treasurer has invested funds. The Bill also deals with the Auditor-General's office, its powers and the appointment and dismissal conditions of the Auditor-General. On the subject of the Auditor-General's office, the definitions of this office are largely the same as those within the present Audit Act.

Provision exists for the appointment of a Deputy Auditor-General, which is a new permanent position although admittedly there has been a provision in the past for the 'appointment of a deputy'. I would raise the question as to the desirability of Parliament being involved in the appointment, and not only in the dismissal, of persons in such categories. The House would recall the difficulties experienced in this State when the controversy arose over the office of Ombudsman, and the role of the Parliament needs to be clearly spelt out, mindful of this. I ask the Premier to explain whether any parliamentary role is intended in that process.

The definition of 'public authority' is one area on which we would seek clarification. This is defined widely to include bodies other than a department, Minister or instrumentality of the Crown, and it would be helpful to know just what other bodies are meant to come within the ambit of this definition. It is a very wide definition and could be seen to include anybody carrying out functions of public benefit, having received taxpayer funds by way of grant or loan. Public money is not defined in the Bill but perhaps should be, as it could include anybody receiving money from the Commonwealth. Small community bodies, even those receiving $50 or $100, would come under the Act: I would therefore appreciate knowing the value of Government sup-

port before the Auditor-General has the power to step in and examine the accounts of a particular body. Will it relate to a specific grant or donation, however large or small, or will it relate to all transactions concerning that particular body? This is an important point and needs clarification.

While we certainly support the accountability of publicly funded bodies, it seems ludicrous to suggest that, if an organisation receives a small amount from the Government, the Auditor-General has the automatic power to step in and audit that body's accounts. One way of overcoming this may be for the power to be defined as allowing the Auditor-General to audit the grant or loan *per se*. In other words, the taxpayer is protected without a full scale bureaucracy being created to investigate every single body and its operations. However, we welcome the development: it enables an independent auditor to be appointed to examine the accounts of the Auditor-General's office. Notwithstanding the concerns I have expressed, the Opposition supports the Bill.

Mr KLUNDER (Todd): I will restrict my comments to one small part of the Bill—clause 5 *(b)*—which provides that money received by the Treasurer from the Commonwealth will be credited to the Consolidated Account. The Treasurer referred to this in a complementary fashion when he stated in the second reading explanation that section 35 of the Public Finance Act, which is to be repealed, provides that the Treasurer may set up a special account to deal with moneys provided by Treasury and that that provision will not appear in the new legislation. That is, in fact, intended: it is recommended by the so-called Barnes committee on the review of the Government's financial management arrangements that all Commonwealth funds be channelled through the Consolidated Account so that they will be subject to the scrutiny of Parliament.

I am particularly pleased with that arrangement because, while it is clear that any special purpose funds from the Commonwealth can and still will be tied and therefore the decision about how to appropriate those funds is not open to the State Parliament, it will provide for a much clearer perception of how funds flow through the State budget. I must say that this is not a particularly new interest for me: I spoke about this matter as long ago as 1984 in Brisbane when the figures available at the time related to the 1983-4 Federal and State budgets. I will refer to those figures: the fact that they are somewhat dated does not matter, because they show the principle behind the flow of money.

Basically, as members will know, Commonwealth funding to the States can be divided into three categories: there are the programs for which funds are made available by the Commonwealth and flow through the Consolidated Account; secondly, there are the programs where the funds do not go through the Consolidated Account but are paid to State departments or authorities over which there is considerable ministerial or departmental control; and, thirdly, there are those programs where the funds come through the State but in respect of which the State virtually acts as a post box in passing on funds to statutory or non-government bodies (the universities are a case in point).

In 1983 and 1984 (and I acknowledge that the then Under Treasurer, Ron Barnes, was of particular assistance in providing me with these figures) total funds to the State from the Commonwealth in the three categories referred to were $471 million in recurrent funds and $218 million for capital purposes. If one subdivides those amounts in terms of the three categories to which I have referred, one ends up with category 1 payments, namely, those which went through the Consolidated Account, of $247 million in recurrent funds and $40 million in capital funds. Secondly, category 2 funds, where funds did not go through the Consolidated Account but where there was reasonable departmental or ministerial control over the funds once they were in State hands, consisted of $9 million in recurrent funds and $149 million in capital funds. In the third category, where funds came through the State but where the State basically acted as a post box, there was $311 million in recurrent funds and about $29 million in capital funds.

If any members are swift enough with their arithmetic to add up those figures, they will realise that the sum of the parts is greater than the whole. That is because some funds defy categorisation and, in fact, fit into more than one category, so that it was not possible to isolate individual components at that level. This in itself is as good an indication as any that there would be severe problems facing a member of Parliament or anyone else who tried to follow the flow of funds through the State budget.

In addition, the majority of funds from the Commonwealth did not flow through the Consolidated Account and was not subject to State parliamentary scrutiny through the budget process or any other process. For that reason, I thoroughly endorse the change proposed in this Bill. It will enable all those funds to flow through the Consolidated Account.

However, there are other reasons why I am particularly pleased that this provision has been included. For instance, I hope that this will lead to a complete change in the way in which what are called the white pages—the parliamentary Estimates of Payments set out as white pages during the Estimates Committees debate—are set out. Before I say why I believe that, I will cite a little of the history of the white pages. In a number of years previously, the white pages—the estimates—have been presented to the Parliament on a line basis while the yellow pages, which are produced by the departments, have been set out on more or less a nominal program basis. In the past it has been impossible to reconcile one with the other.

Two years ago, I believe, some of the departments moved from a line basis in the white pages to a program basis but, unfortunately, capital expenditure was still shown on a line basis, which, if anything, confused the matter further. Last year, as I recall, all departments moved to a line basis for the white pages for both recurrent and capital expenditure. That left only the Commonwealth payments to cause a discrepancy between the white pages and the yellow pages.

I can give an example of that. In last year's Estimates Committee debates, I asked the Deputy Premier about the apparent disparity between the yellow pages and the white pages with respect to expenditure on behalf of the River Murray Commission. The yellow book showed $3.3 million in recurrent expenditure and $1.988 million in capital expenditure. But, under the same heading, the white pages showed an expenditure of only $157 000. The Deputy Premier's response was that the $157 000 was, in fact, the State costs associated with administering the expenditure and activities of the River Murray Commission. In other words, the inability to bring to book the funds of the River Murray Commission through the Consolidated Account produced a disparity between the white pages and the yellow pages which had a considerable capacity to confuse.

This provision in the Bill will clarify that situation. I look forward to finally being able to reconcile the Estimates of Payments with the departmental yellow books as a result of the improvement that will be brought about by this measure. I certainly look forward to the fact that for the first time, as far as I am aware, Parliament will have an

overview of Commonwealth and State funds as they flow through the Consolidated Account.

The Hon. J.C. BANNON (Premier and Treasurer): I appreciate the support that has been indicated by the Leader of the Opposition and also note with interest the remarks made by the member for Todd, who has, of course, a special interest in this matter not only in general but also in relation to his role as Chairman of the Public Accounts Committee. I can certainly assure him that some of the consequences of this Bill will be a much better, more readable, more informative presentation of accounts. Many of the changes that are taking place have that as their aim. The Leader of the Opposition foreshadowed a number of matters about which he may ask questions. I suppose that the appropriate place to deal with those matters is during the Committee stage. I commend the Bill to the House.

Bill read a second time.

In Committee.

Clauses 1 to 3 passed.

Clause 4—'Interpretation.'

Mr OLSEN: What bodies are to come within the ambit of the definition contained in paragraph *(d)*? What is meant by 'other bodies prescribed from time to time'?

The Hon. J.C. BANNON: I was trying to ascertain a specific example, but I am not able to do that. The clause has been drafted to provide a catch-all situation to cover a contingency whereby, for instance, a committee may be established without some particular statutory authority, but nonetheless it could have the characteristics that would require its audit to be conducted in conformity with this legislation and it may not come easily under any of the other definitions. It is not an attempt to lead a definition of 'public authority' into what is called 'a publicly funded body' in the definition immediately following; in other words, we could not use this to cover a body which is only in receipt of moneys, for instance, from the State directly as a public authority, which I think is one of the concerns of the Leader of the Opposition. We would not have authority to do that. It simply picks up the situation where some *ad hoc* group or body might have been established not having a statutory or departmental authority and therefore we have some provision on which to fall back to require the appropriate audit to take place.

Mr OLSEN: I take it that, in the reporting procedures to Parliament on a regular basis, there will be inclusion of details of the other bodies so prescribed so that, whether they be bodies to which the Premier has referred that are not statutory bodies, or whether they are committees or functions that are established from time to time, as is the case with the accounts that we seek from SAFA and the like, there is detail of what bodies have been included in such a provision.

The Hon. J.C. BANNON: I understand that the Auditor-General in his report will refer to any such bodies so that such a list would be available.

Mr OLSEN: In relation to a publicly funded body, we support the principle that any statutory body or any organisation that receives taxpayers' funds ought to be accountable for the expenditure of those funds, but in relation to small amounts, the specific grant, whatever it might be, is open to audit, along with all other books of that organisation that bear no relevance whatsoever to the grant. In my view, that has some quite wide-reaching implications for a range of organisations. We have not identified what 'public money' is. If we identify 'public money' as a grant or a loan specifically from taxpayers' funds, then we limit the auditing procedure to that identifiable public money, but 'public money' is not included in the definition and therefore it is left wide open. I believe that the implications of that are wide reaching, particularly for a whole range of organisations. I seek some clarification from the Premier on that point.

The Hon. J.C. BANNON: If the clause were limited, it could create barriers to a proper and appropriate audit, even on a small amount. Obviously, the interest of the Auditor-General in a publicly funded body in receipt of Government funds would relate to whether those public funds are being properly expended. To that extent his inquiries need not go beyond a simple question of the accounting of those moneys, but it may be that during the course of an investigation he will need to go further than that. If some prescription is included either in the definition or in the clause authorising it, I think that that could create some problems.

As a matter of principle I think that any body in receipt of Government assistance, by taking that assistance, is rendered accountable for it and it is appropriate that that accountability should, if required (and that is the other qualification), be exercised by the Auditor-General on behalf of the Parliament. I do not think that publicly funded bodies have anything to fear about the Auditor-General going in and doing some massive exercise on their books or accounts because they receive a $100 grant or loan assistance from the Government, but to begin to prescribe the clause could create problems where the Auditor-General, quite legitimately, would need to move into areas that perhaps at first glance do not seem to be covered by a simple look at the way in which Government moneys have been expended.

The ACTING CHAIRMAN (Mr Duigan): The Leader has spoken three times on this clause.

The Hon. E.R. GOLDSWORTHY: It appears to be too wide-ranging, and we will seek an amendment in another place.

Clause passed.

Clauses 5 to 8 passed.

Clause 9—'Imprest accounts.'

Mr OLSEN: Subclause (2) prevents the bypassing of parliamentary appropriation on a continuing basis. Emphasising 'continuing basis', what is the purpose and necessity for such accounts and are any guarantees attached to them if they are subject to abuse? I would like a definition of 'continuing basis'. How long can the situation continue and what is the interim period? Are we talking about a 12 month period, or are we talking about a period in excess of a normal accounting period?

The Hon. J.C. BANNON: These were formerly called advance accounts and they were authorised under audit regulations, so no new procedures are involved. The name 'imprest account' has been adopted and this clause in effect reproduces what was done under this advance account procedure in the past. The sort of situation where these funds are used (and we are talking only about quite small amounts) is where, for example, an officer travels to the country or interstate on official business and an advance can be made to cover expenditure that may be incurred. I understand that they are drawn to account on a two-weekly basis, so there is constant surveillance. The amounts are small. It is simply a convenience which is adopted in certain instances.

Clause passed.

Clause 10 passed.

Clause 11—'Investment of public money by Treasurer.'

Mr OLSEN: As indicated in my second reading speech, there appears to be an additional power or new power given to the Treasurer to make some short term investments outside SAFA. What type of investments are envisaged,

what amounts are proposed and how do we define 'short-term' in that respect?

The Hon. J.C. BANNON: The point to be made here is that this is not an increase in power. Under the previous Public Finance Act the Treasurer held an investment power to deposit money with a bank or an approved dealer in the short term money market or through SAFA under the Government Financing Authority Act. Obviously, the intention is—and this is the practice at the moment—to provide that power of deposit through SAFA which has as its primary role the handling of those moneys. But there may be instances where that is not appropriate or desirable, and this simply reproduces the power that applied formerly.

Clause passed.

Clauses 12 to 15 passed.

Clause 16—'Power to borrow.'

Mr M.J. EVANS: I move:

Page 7, lines 13 to 15— Leave out subclause (3) and insert the following subclause:

(3) The amount that may be borrowed pursuant to subsection (1) (including the amount that may be borrowed by way of overdraft) must not exceed the amounts prescribed for that purpose by an annual Appropriation Act.

First, I shall use this opportunity to congratulate the Treasurer for taking the step of incorporating in this Bill the previously very confused and archaic legislative authority. However, I think a couple of points should be looked at in detail by the Committee. One of them relates to the very in some way contentious but most important area of public borrowing. The public debt and its size and the relative importance of its size has been a matter for some public debate in the last few years and lately has been focused on particularly in the context of Australia as a whole and also statements made by the Commonwealth Government in relation to borrowings of the States.

While I do not share that hysteria that has been promoted in some quarters about the level of public debt, it is a matter that I think should quite properly be debated by Parliament at regular intervals, as Parliament, after all, acts exclusively on behalf of the people of South Australia to safeguard the public position in relation to the finances of the State and, as the Barnes Committee correctly pointed out (and the quotation reproduced in the second reading explanation), Parliament no longer exercises its authority by denying funds because to do so, unfortunately under our Westminster model, is taken as a total vote of no confidence. But in the process of the approving process for those funds Parliament does of course discuss in some detail the funding that is proposed. In this case, I propose that Parliament should also discuss at some length if necessary the level of public borrowings by the State.

So, while I am not moving this amendment out of any sense of fear that the Treasurer will proceed to borrow to excess, or anything like that, I do believe that, as the Treasurer has pointed out in his second reading explanation, it is essential that Parliament should periodically debate these matters. I believe that by including a limit on the amount and by requiring that it should become in total—not in individual amounts—a part of the Appropriation Bill debate each year, that will ensure that Parliament has every opportunity to discuss the level of the public debt and the way in which it is proposed to expand or contract that debt in the coming year.

So, I believe that the amendment is appropriate for that reason, because I am not able to discern in the clause currently before us any limitation on the Treasurer's borrowing power. I do understand, I believe correctly, from the Bill that any money which the Treasurer borrows must be paid directly into the Consolidated Account and that to pay out that money he will require parliamentary appropriation. But, of course, that is parlty approval for expenditure, and is a very indirect way of approving the borrowing in the first place. Quite clearly, the borrowing comes before the expenditure, and it is a little pointless Parliament's seeking to debate the appropriation and then seeking to discern from where that money came, given that it has been lost in the consolidated revenue barrel. When the Treasurer pays money into consolidated revenue it is simply a large conglomeration of funds, and who is to say what money he has used when he appropriates that money? It would be ludicrous to trace it through in that way. Thus, I believe that the only appropriate mechanism of ensuring a regular parliamentary debate on borrowing and the public debt is by including an annual provision in the legislation. It is for that reason that I move my amendment.

The Hon. J.C. BANNON: I would have to oppose this suggestion. I understand the honourable member's thinking behind the proposal. However, I suggest that there is in fact ample opportunity to debate the level of debt and the debt structure of public finance in the course of each annual budget debate in relation not only to the Government's appropriation proposals and receipts but also when one looks at SAFA and its money management, the reports of which are available at the same time as that debate takes place. So, I do not think that there is any lack of accountability to Parliament in one of the senses that the honourable member referred to, that is, the ability to subject to some scrutiny and question what the Government is doing in that respect.

However, there are some fairly severe practical constraints in making it a requirement that it must not exceed amounts prescribed by an annual Appropriation Act, as proposed by the honourable member. The first one of those of course is the power and authority of the Loan Council. In a sense, the State has ceded its total borrowing powers or its borrowing levels to the Loan Council, and on a periodical basis (this may happen during the year and not just annually, although annually is the normal situation, but there are frequent references to the Loan Council through a year) decisions are made as to when certain borrowing might take place, under what terms and conditions, and it depends on agreement that has been reached between the States and the Commonwealth. We would be needlessly constrained if it had to be, from South Australia's point of view, within the confines of a particular annual appropriation and decisions made at that time, because borrowing decisions have to be made during the year.

The second aspect of that in relation to Loan Council and its authority is that through the course of a year we have to have some sort of flexibility in borrowings, and I guess it would mean in practice that, if a Government was constrained by a clause of this kind, we would have to put in such a very large figure as to make it meaningless. It would certainly generate the sort of debate that the honourable member is interested in but, as I have said, I think that can take place anyway. But the figure itself would not have very much significance because of the very fluid nature of the borrowing requirement of the State in the course of any one year. While noting the honourable member's intention behind the amendment, for the reasons outlined I oppose it.

Mr M.J. EVANS: I accept what the Premier has said. I agree that it would certainly act as a constraint and that there would therefore be a temptation to include a larger than necessary figure. I must say that I personally would accept that action on the part of the Government, as my primary intention in moving the amendment was not so

much to constrain the Government in the amount because, in effect, ultimately the amount can be debated as an appropriation, as what goes in must come out, and obviously Parliament controls what comes out. That is quite clear.

I was simply seeking to pick up the point made by the Barnes Committee that it is not the literal approval of the exact amount that matters: it is parliamentary discussion and public attention which is focused on the activity of any Government in relation to both its expenditure, which I believe is more than adequate, and on its borrowing powers, which I believe are not. Both aspects are important in modern financial management. One has to look not only at the expenditure but also at the way in which it is raised and the way in which the funds are borrowed. If the Treasurer accepts it on that basis (and he has indicated that the Parliament will have the opportunity in debating other statements to make those points) I accept that viewpoint.

I would be happy if he came into this place annually with a figure which was a generous one and which, while realistic, might have been expected to exceed the figure simply to provide us with an opportunity to focus on that expenditure and commitment of borrowing power. Once the Treasurer has exercised his power under section 16 the State has acquired the money and is legally obliged to repay it. It is then rather pointless for Parliament to argue over its expenditure, as we already have it in the bank. Provided the Treasurer is on the record as agreeing with that, I am quite satisfied with his explanation.

Amendment negatived; clause passed.

Clauses 17 to 23 passed.

Clause 24—'Appointment of Auditor-General.'

Mr M.J. EVANS: I move:

Page 11, line 25—After 'Governor' insert 'but the appointment will be subject to confirmation by both Houses of Parliament within 21 sitting days after it is made'.

My amendment is quite a radical one, and I expect that members will view it in that way. I think that when looking at it one should be quite clear about the role of the Auditor-General. The Premier referred to that matter a number of times, both in his speech and in his comments in response to the Leader. It is quite clear that the Auditor-General has an individual statutory role. Of course, that relates directly back to his function as an agent, if you like, of this Parliament in providing the Parliament with a mechanism for addressing the actual day to day dollars and cents as they are expended and the efficiency in the way in which they are expended in accounting and economic terms.

Although it is quite clear from the Bill (and very well provided for) that the Parliament has the right to dismiss the Auditor-General in the event that he acts in ways that are inappropriate (and this includes such things as incompetence, mental and physical incapacity, neglect of duty and dishonourable conduct), it may well be that, given the role of the Auditor-General on behalf of the Parliament, his relationship with the Parliament should be made even stronger. The mechanism that I propose to bring that about is one that is as yet untried or tested in the Australian parliamentary context: that is, in effect, giving the Parliament a right of veto over the appointment of a new Auditor-General. I am suggesting not that the Parliament should become involved in the process of selecting appointees, or become part of the appointment process but, rather, that in order to achieve a permanent appointment the Government should be required to place the name of its nominee before the Parliament and obtain approval for that nominee.

I believe that the Parliament can be trusted to conduct that debate in a responsible way, given that any government is not likely (with that kind of process in place) to nominate or appoint anyone other than a highly desirable and reputable person. It has not been my experience, or an experience in South Australia's history, that an Auditor-General has been appointed in whom we have not had full confidence. To ensure that relationship between the Parliament and the Auditor-General is seen to be what it is and is brought forcibly to everyone's attention, my amendment will ensure that process and give the Parliament a somewhat greater role in relation to that office than it has to date.

Mr OLSEN: The Opposition supports the amendment. During my second reading speech I raised concerns that the Parliament is not involved with dismissals or in the appointment of people to positions such as that of Auditor-General. While it could rightfully be put that a cumbersome procedure that would follow such appointment to a position should involve the Parliament, confirmation by the Parliament of the appointment would at least give it an opportunity to express a point of view. I think that that is appropriate. I referred during my second reading speech to the difficulties that arose in recent times with the position of Ombudsman, and in this way, by the process of consultation and involvement and by having the capacity to confirm such an appointment, the Parliament is consulted and involved, and that is a worthy step forward.

The Hon. J.C. BANNON: I oppose the amendment. I first make the point that among the things that we are doing in this Act we are clarifying and ensuring that the Auditor-General's powers and responsibilities are defined and can be exercised totally independently. Certainly, the member for Elizabeth was not implying this, but it is worth putting on the record that there is no question that the Act gives the Auditor-General that independence of Government that is obviously necessary for the proper conduct of his duties. However, to take it a step further and require some sort of parliamentary endorsement of the appointment of an Auditor-General is something that is not common or would be well understood under our Westminster system. It is something that is common in the United States, but there is a very different relationship there between the Executive and the Legislature, because there is a system of committees and surveillance and a need to confirm appointments made by the administration of a kind that we do not have in this country.

To graft practices of that kind onto the Westminster form of government that we have here could well create problems for us and for any officer appointed under that system. It need not always be, but it could be a political process: it could see polarisation of attitudes. It could result in a confirmation of an Auditor-General's appointment, but under some air of controversy. I suggest that in such an instance it would be very difficult for an Auditor-General, if he was being subjected to criticism either by a political Party or by an individual as part of a confirmation process, to carry out his duties confident in the belief that he had the support of the Parliament. In effect, we could well be conferring some sort of veto, not on the Parliament as such but on individuals within it. I think that that would be most undesirable.

Certainly, over the years, we have been very fortunate with the Auditors-General that we have had in South Australia: there has never been any problem or question about their administration. In fact, some of them have been extremely eminent, and not just in the area of auditing. One thinks of individuals like Wainwright, who was regarded as making a major contribution to this State's development in an ancillary capacity. Therefore, I do not think that we need have any fear about the process of appointment that has resulted in such able individuals filling the job. For Parliament to be brought into that appointment process

would muddy it considerably and would create pressures and difficulties for the Auditor-General in the traditional discharge of his duties.

I come back to the point that, once an Auditor-Genral is appointed, there is no question that they are charged with doing their duty independently and, if the Parliament perceives that not to be the case, then the provisions lie there for dismissal. That is certainly a grave step which would also require the sanction of Parliament.

Another statutory office, that of Ombudsman, was mentioned. There is no question that appointments made to that office, whatsover subsequent problems may have arisen, were regarded as appropriate, qualified and acceptable. So, I do not see any problem with our current appointment process. It would impose undue pressures on the Auditor-General, on the Parliament, and indeed on our political process to subject this officer to confirmation proceedings before both Houses.

Amendment negatived; clause passed.

Clauses 25 to 27 passed.

Clause 28—'Appointment of Deputy Auditor-General.'

Mr OLSEN: Clauses 28 to 30 relate to the appointment of the Deputy Auditor-General. To ensure the independence of the office of the Auditor-General, should not the clause be amended to ensure that the deputy, when acting as Auditor-General, is not subject to Government direction under the Government and Management and Employment Act? After all, the Auditor-General is not responsible under that Act, so we seek that the deputy, when acting as Auditor-General, should not be held accountable under the Government Employment and Management Act. It should be clearly stipulated that the deputy, when so acting, is responsible to this Parliament.

The Hon. J.C. BANNON: The interpretation is that, while someone acts in a position, that individual is clothed with the powers and authorities of that position. So, the Deputy Auditor-General, when acting as Auditor-General, has all the trappings and authorities of that office. No qualification is necessary in clause 28 to provide for that. The clause merely dispenses with a requirement in section 10 of the old Audit Act whereby the formal approval of the Governor had to be obtained each time that the deputy was required to act. So, if the Auditor-General was absent interstate for a week, or going on annual leave, all the formal paper work would have to go before the Governor in Executive Council to formalise the appointment.

This provision simply allows a procedure whereby the deputy, pursuant to clause 28, can act during any absence or incapacity but, when so acting, is subject not to the Government Management and Employment Act, but to the powers of the Auditor-General.

Mr M.J. EVANS: I had contemplated suggesting an amendment to this clause along the lines of providing the deputy with the same sorts of immunities and protections as has the Auditor-General himself, but I decided not to proceed with that amendment because of its difficulty and complexity and because I felt that it would be sufficient to draw the matter to the Government's attention.

When Parliament passed the Electoral Act in 1985, it provided that the Deputy Electoral Commissioner should share the same immunities and privileges as the Commissioner himself, and that is the model that should commend itself as a long-term view to the Government rather than the model that we have before us. That inconsistency is unfortunate, and I hope that perhaps the Premier will, as a result of this debate, take it on board and institute his own personal inquiry as to whether, as a long-term policy, the Government should seek to protect both the officer and the deputy as in the case of the Electoral Commissioner and his deputy, the Auditor-General and his deputy, the Police Commissioner and his deputy, and so on. Given the complexity of modern administration of the Public Service, the size of the Public Service and the relationship between the two individuals, it is equally important that they both be immune to any suggestion of outside pressure or influence, and that is what we are seeking to do here.

I do not believe that any comments made about this Bill, certainly by me, relate to any fear of what may have happened in the past or any complaint about what may have happened in the past. However, we are totally reviewing the operations of the whole Act and this is therefore an appropriate occasion on which to raise these broad issues of concern so that they may be addressed in future. Given that we have those two alternative strategies before us, I, as a member of Parliament, would prefer the security which offering a deputy the same privileges has, because it ensures that the leadership of that office, which I believe these days is shared, is something in which we want to have every confidence.

The Hon. J.C. BANNON: The practice varies. I will certainly note what the honourable member says about some of the deputy positions. Within the general realm of Government departments and even in some statutory authorities, the trend has been increasingly to have not a stand alone deputy but a hands-on deputy: in other words, rather than have a line of management going from the chief executive officer to the deputy to the various divisional managers, the deputy is usually someone who also has a specific responsibility for either a division, department, or whatever in the structure. That makes sense.

In the workings of the Auditor-General's office, the same sort of situation would apply regarding the Auditor-General's deputy. Further, if the Deputy Auditor-General is clothed with all these powers and authorities as suggested by the honourable member, it could be argued that, rather than providing a better focus for leadership, it could detract from it. The Auditor-General is given certain unusual powers and abilities by Parliament, and the focus and responsibility very much impinge on that individual. Granted that the deputy gets statutory recognition, if one nonetheless clothes the deputy with those same powers and authorities and conflict arises, or Parliament is uncertain which officer is involved in a certain transaction, problems and confusion could be created.

I suspect that, from the Auditor-General's viewpoint, it could also create difficulties, because he would see himself as the officer who is answerable to Parliament but in charge of his office, whereas the deputy and all others in his office obviously work under his direction. By clothing a deputy with the sort of authority that the honourable member suggests, it could be that the Auditor-General's authority, in relation to his deputy, was undermined by Parliament using the Act to make certain requirements or demands on the deputy. That would unduly complicate things.

When a deputy acts for the Auditor-General and obviously carries the powers and responsibilities of the Auditor-General, the focus of the office is the statutory office and the individual holding it. It is an office involving tremendous responsibilities and Parliament should feel confident in an undiluted fashion that it knows who that individual is and with whom it is dealing. That relationship should not be affected by others claiming some sort of relationship with the Parliament as well.

Clause passed.

Clauses 29 to 33 passed.

New clause 33a—'House of Assembly may request audit, etc.'

Mr M.J. EVANS: I move:

Page 14, after clause 33—Insert new clause as follows:

33a. (1) The Auditor-General must, at the request of the House of Assembly—

(a) audit the public accounts, or the accounts of a public authority in relation to a particular period or matter specified in the request;

(b) audit accounts referred to in section 33 (2) in relation to a particular period or matter specified in the request;

(c) examine the efficiency and economy with which a public authority uses its resources or the efficiency and economy with which a body corporate or other person referred to in section 33 carries out the functions referred to in that section;

(d) examine the accounts of a publicly funded body.

(2) The Auditor-General must prepare a report in relation to an audit or examination under this section and must deliver the report to the Speaker of the House of Assembly.

(3) The Speaker of the House of Assembly must, not later than the first sitting day after receiving the report, lay it before the House of Assembly.

My new clause gives the House of Assembly certain powers, and I have particularly limited those powers to the House of Assembly because that is the House that bears the primary responsibility for determining which Party shall form the Government in this State under the Westminster system, and it is also the House with the primary responsibility for initiating expenditure and taxation proposals. Indeed, it has the pre-eminent responsibility in that field. That is a matter of my personal judgment.

I believe that it is appropriate that the power should exist for one branch of the Parliament to require the Auditor-General to undertake a specific investigation in relation to the way in which any public funds are being used. Although the House of Assembly has the Public Accounts Committee which can undertake that kind of investigation, there is no doubt that the Auditor-General, being an agent of Parliament in this respect, must be able to be directed by the House to undertake such an investigation where the House considers it to be necessary.

A special report would then be presented to the Parliament and, of course, it could then be debated and acted upon by the Government if it saw fit. There is no implication in this that the House will in any way interfere in the processes of Government in determining what would happen as a result of that investigation, but certainly the very conduct of the investigation and the tabling of that report in public would provide a mechanism and focus the attention of the Government on areas of future action. I believe that it is essential that that power exist if the Auditor-General is indeed to be properly accountable to Parliament and the Government's accounting processes are to be subject to the scrutiny of Parliament in particular instances where that is necessary and essential. Of course, it would require a debate and vote in this House to produce that result. In order to ensure that we do have access to a power to require a special report on a motion of this House and not on the volition of the Auditor-General himself, it is appropriate that this new clause be inserted.

The Hon. J.C. BANNON: I do not support the new clause. It suggests some ambivalence in attitude, on the honourable member's part, towards the Auditor-General and his role. The Auditor-General has, as we have been discussing earlier in the course of this debate, specific powers and powers of independence and authority secured by statute. Ultimately the Auditor-General reports not to the Government but to the House, and under clause 36 of the Bill he reports generally and specifically on an annual basis. Under clause 37 he reports in those circumstances where he believes action is necessary or desirable. He reports in those instances to the Parliament, that is, to both the Legislative Council and the House of Assembly. It is appropriate that he does so, and the procedure is laid down in clause 37 under which that can be undertaken. If we have confidence in the Auditor-General, the House should not put itself in the position of interfering with the way in which or the matters with which the Auditor-General is concerned. This is specific to the House of Assembly—it is not the Parliament making such a request.

I understand why the honourable member would move in that way, because to go through a full parliamentary procedure would be very clumsy, but he is also looking at the supremacy of the Government in the House of Assembly, whereby one would assume that if the Government has the confidence of the House then a motion of the House requesting the Auditor-General to do something would come with the consent of the Government. I can understand those arguments, but repeat that it is not the Parliament being asked to make these requests but the House of Assembly. The House of Assembly may have all sorts of motives for wishing the Auditor-General to do something that does not accord with the Auditor-General's priorities or attitudes. For the House to have the power to direct him in those circumstances could be dangerous.

The House does have its own procedures, and the honourable member has already referred to the Public Accounts Committee. One could argue that if this clause was inserted we could dispense with the Public Accounts Committee and load any special inquiries or investigations on to the Auditor-General. Some would argue that that may be a more appropriate way of doing it in some instances, but that would not be my view. The Public Accounts Committee does perform a useful function and can investigate and explore in specific areas in a way the Auditor-General may not want to do or be able to do.

Equally, it is worth pointing out that the Public Accounts Committee and the Auditor-General obviously do not work in a vacuum in completely separate areas: each has regard for the work of the other. I am aware, for example, that on occasions the Chairman of the Public Accounts Committee would refer, on an informal basis, matters that could properly be the concern of the Auditor-General and *vice versa*. The Auditor-General may believe that something is better pursued through the Public Accounts Committee than through his processes of audit. That is an informal arrangement. The important thing is that the Public Accounts Committee cannot instruct the Auditor-General in those instances nor, unless this clause is passed, could the Parliament. It is important that we preserve that situation. For those reasons I oppose the clause and suggest that if the Parliament has specific concerns they can always be raised, but ultimately the Auditor-General must have discretion to decide whether or not those matters are worth pursuing, in his view, where action is necessary and, if he so determines, he will then report to the Parliament as a whole.

Mr M.J. EVANS: I thank the Treasurer for his explanation and viewpoint. It is my view that if the House of Assembly resolved in relation to an investigation by the Auditor-General that that would be the priority of the State. It seems that the House of Assembly as a component of the Parliament, particularly as the House of Government, is the avenue by which the priorities of South Australia are determined. If the Auditor-General has priorities that clash with the House of Assembly then the view of this House should prevail. I have never seen his independence to be independent of the House of Assembly and the Parliament. I have rather seen him as reporting to Parliament and, where the exigencies or circumstances were such that it was nec-

essary for the House to pass a resolution requesting an investigation, it would be in extreme circumstances.

If the House had that view the Auditor-General would appropriately fall in with it and comply with the request of the House. I do not see his independence as being independence from direction by Parliament, or by the House in this case as I have proposed, because what the House does it does in the full glare of publicity and with an absolute majority of elected members of Parliament. That in itself is protection from inappropriate direction itself. It is not a negative attitude: I am not suggesting that the House should be able to require that he not investigate something, but rather that he investigate something. We are approaching this matter from a different angle. I was attempting not to interfere with his independence but rather to provide for an ultimate mechanism of control and investigation in the way the Auditor-General's office should be used by the Parliament to discover the truth of any matter that may be of concern to the Parliament or the House. That was my objective in moving the provision, but I certainly understand the Premier's concerns in speaking against it.

The Hon. J.C. BANNON: The honourable member is using the term 'Parliament' and 'House' somewhat interchangeably, and that is one of the flaws in his proposal. The Parliament as the legislative body has certain rights to set the agenda and lay down legislation and other requirements and satisfy itself as to appropriation. However, it is the role of the Executive to determine priorities of action. Similarly, it is the role of the Auditor-General to determine his priorities of action. Certainly if the House (and there is nothing to prevent it doing so) passed a resolution requesting the Auditor-General to do certain things, I am sure he would give it full and important consideration.

I am really disagreeing with the honourable member, in that it could be translated into a requirement on the Auditor-General. One could even see a situation where such instructions to the Auditor-General could be used to prevent the Auditor-General carrying out functions in an area that the House or the Government of the day felt he should not avoid. We are not empowered to specifically so prevent. That is appropriate, and the honourable member has referred to that, but one could frame instructions in relation to audit requirements that the Parliament demands within a certain time scale that would simply prevent the Auditor-General from pursuing certain other requirements. There are all sorts of problems associated with the proposal, and therefore I oppose it.

New clause negatived.

Clauses 34 to 40 passed.

Clause 41—'Treasurer's instructions.'

Mr OLSEN: I seek clarification about the difference between instructions and regulations laid before the House. There is a new terminology of Treasurer's Instructions. Will the instructions be gazetted as regulations are gazetted?

The Hon. J.C. BANNON: These are purely accounting matters. In the past, many of these matters have been dealt with under audit regulations, and others have been dealt with under a system of instructions that have no particular authority. This provision will regularise a practice that occurs already. Initially, it is the responsibility of the Treasurer to determine how a number of procedures that relate to the form and content of accounts, and in the setting out of accounts, are handled. The responsibility of the Auditor-General is to comment on whether the instructions are appropriate and whether they meet his requirements or needs. They came under the audit regulations under the previous Act, but no-one is quite sure why that was. One suggestion is that, because the Audit Act predated the Public Finance Act, they were given some authority by coming under an Act in the absence of a Public Finance Act.

It must be noted that, in formulating instructions under this clause, the Treasurer must follow the appropriate practices and standards that the major national accounting bodies adopt. In fact, that is embodied in subclause (4) and, presumably, if there is variation from that or if the procedures are not appropriate, the Auditor-General will advise the Treasurer and the Treasurer will take steps to amend the instructions accordingly.

Clause passed.

Remaining clauses (42 and 43), schedule and title passed.

Bill read a third time and passed.

STATUTES AMENDMENT (FINANCE AND AUDIT) BILL

Adjourned debate on second reading.

(Continued from 19 February. Page 2999.)

Mr OLSEN (Leader of the Opposition): This Bill is consequent on the Bill just passed. Basically, it amends 10 State Acts to remove requirements for an audit carried out by the Auditor-General on bodies established under these Acts to be given to the relevant Minister and for those reports to be tabled in Parliament. This will enable, as a result of the requirements of the new Public Finance and Audit Bill, the financial statements of public bodies to be included in the Auditor-General's Report to Parliament. This provides for improved reporting procedures and therefore is welcomed.

The Bill also, as the Premier's second reading explanation points out, provides for the removal of the requirement for the Governor to issue a warrant for the expenditure of public money. The Public Finance and Audit Bill already stipulates that appropriated money can be spent only in accordance with the purpose for which it was originally appropriated. Therefore, the Opposition supports the Bill.

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

WATERWORKS ACT AMENDMENT BILL

Adjourned debate on second reading.

(Continued from 19 February. Page 3002.)

The Hon. P.B. ARNOLD (Chaffey): Unless there is some sinister or ulterior motive behind this Bill that I have not been able to detect, my comments on it will basically apply to the Sewerage Act Amendment Bill. The Government is creating a legislative framework that will enable it to introduce extensive policy changes by way of regulation in the administration of the provision of water and sewerage facilities in this State. If that is the case, there is very little in the Bill before the House.

However, we will watch very closely when the Government introduces the regulations to put into effect the policies that it has outlined in the Minister's second reading explanation. One or two parts of the second reading explanation give some insight into the Government's thinking and what it intends to do by way of regulation. The Minister said:

> The most serious problems arise because of inconsistency between policies for new land division and policies for provision of services to existing unserviced allotments. Developers, and hence purchasers of new serviced allotments, bear the full cost of reticulated services in addition to incurring normal rates which

pay for the use of existing headworks and distributing works, in common with other ratepayers, and any additional operating and maintenance costs incurred in meeting the additional system demand.

However, most allotment owners served by mains laid at Government expense incur only normal rates so that reticulation costs are generally not recovered in country areas, and are only recovered over a long period of time in the Adelaide metropolitan area through higher rates to all ratepayers. Not only does this have an adverse impact on Government finances but a significant inequity exists between ratepayers.

Under the heading 'Discussion' in the second reading explanation the Minister states:

The proposals seek to establish logical, consistent and fully integrated policies which comply with Government objectives for the Engineering and Water Supply Department. This depends upon more consistent application of beneficiary pays principles in order to enhance both equity and cost recovery.

I do not have any great aversion to the objective of the Government if it does not go overboard in this regard.

It is interesting to note that on numerous occasions in this House the Premier, when referring to the cost of water and water rates, has pointed out that they would not be as high if it were not for the fact that metropolitan ratepayers to some extent subsidise country users, but the Premier does not use the same argument when referring to the $100 million deficit of the STA of which country residents have to pay an equal share while receiving no service whatsoever in return. At least in South Australia, the vast majority of people, whether they live in the metropolitan area or in the country, receive that essential service of a water supply. The other essential service of a public transport system is virtually totally denied country people, but the Premier does not apply the same comparison there. He stated:

This depends upon more consistent application of beneficiary [or user] pays principles . . .

So, it is acceptable to apply that principle in one area, but the Premier does not want to know about it in another.

I foreshadow amendments which I will move to both Bills, related particularly to the principle of the Government that the beneficiary should pay. Numerous instances have been put before the House of cases where a ratepayer has gone to the department and has applied for an extension of water and sewerage facilities in relation to a subdivision. One or two years ago I cited the case of a ratepayer in St Marys who received a quote from the department of about $10 000 or $12 000 for some 30 metres of water mains extension and sewerage outfall. I believe that the member for Gilles was the Minister at the time and, if I remember correctly, a quote obtained from a private contractor was less than half the department's figure.

My amendments will enable a ratepayer, if he or she is dissatisfied with the figure quoted by the Minister for an extension or connection to the service, to seek a quote from a recognised contractor to carry out that work. If the Minister and the Government are serious about the beneficiary or 'user pays' principle, then the ratepayer must be in a position to obtain that service at the best possible price and not at a price nominated by the Minister, by the Government or by the department, which figure is determined without the normal competitive processes applying. The 'user pays' principle is all right to a certain point, but not only must we have a viable city metropolitan area, but also we must have a viable country area. If that principle is applied to the nth degree, then quite obviously there will be no development in the country. Unless we take into account that more than 50 per cent of South Australia's income is generated in the rural areas, and a little commonsense prevails, Parliament will do country areas and South Australia generally a great disservice. I foreshadow those amendments and I trust that, when the time comes, the Government will see fit to give serious consideration to those amendments because, when these issues have been raised on other occasions and quotes have been obtained, in some instances the ratepayer has received considerable benefits. During the Committee stage I will cite a few other instances which support my contention.

Mr GUNN (Eyre): The member for Chaffey has outlined the position of the Opposition in relation to this Bill, particularly as it relates to the 'user pays' principle. I do not particularly object to the 'user pays' principle if it is fair and reasonable. Many constituents in my electorate would like to be users of the system and would like to have the ability to pay for such a system. Other constituents in my electorate would like to have their existing services upgraded to a fair and reasonable level. This will probably be the last chance that Parliament has to debate this matter, because the Government will give itself the power to exercise authority by regulation in relation to revenue and its collection. I believe that this will simplify administration, but it denies Parliament the opportunity of debating these issues.

The Hon. P.B. Arnold: There might be a few motions for disallowance.

Mr GUNN: I think that there is a possibility that a motion will be moved for disallowance. When this legislation is passed, what effect will it have on those schemes that are currently listed as being uneconomic? Will funds be provided so that some of those schemes can be completed? What effect will this legislation have on the standards involved?

The water system west of Ceduna was costed by the department to be in excess of $6 million, but I understand that a private consultant recommended that it could be done by private enterprise for about $2 million. The people in that area are not only entitled to a reasonable water scheme, but also, if it is good enough for the majority of the residents in this State to receive a service and if we can spend millions of dollars on the transport system, it is good enough for some money to be spent on upgrading the water service in country areas. Yesterday the Minister of Transport was involved with celebrating 12 months successful

An honourable member: No.

Mr GUNN: It is not too much short of $130 million in relation to the whole system. I do not believe it is unreasonable for people living in country areas to expect to have a few million dollars spent on upgrading their water systems. I refer to the problems being experienced at Terowie, Hawker, and the area west of Ceduna, and the deplorable situation at Smoky Bay, where they cannot get enough water through the mains. I want to know whether under this new arrangement people at Smoky Bay will have to pay increased costs for a deteriorating service. It is essential that urgent action be taken to upgrade that service. In recent times the department has used booster pumps for pumping but I understand that that was discontinued on the ground of costs.

This is the only opportunity that I have had in recent months to raise this matter with the Minister. I point out that residents in the areas that I have referred to have no access to underground water and the areas are not suitable for catchments such as dams or underground tanks. It is therefore essential that they have a reasonable and reliable water service. Those people west of Ceduna, who suffer because of poor seasons every now and again, could normally if they had a reasonable reticulated water system continue to hold their stock without a great deal of trouble. In today's economic climate, the costs of carting water 30 or 40 kilometres is out of the question. Therefore, I ask the Minister to please explain to the House whether, when this

new legislation comes into effect, the Government will be in a position to provide the necessary funds at least to make a start on some of the schemes that are needed, and I refer particularly to the upgrading of the Smoky Bay system and the extension of a water supply to Denial Bay and west of Ceduna. The people in those areas are at their wits' end in trying to get some justice in these matters.

The Government and the department have often referred to the losses incurred on country water works, but when one balances out the sort of costs involved in administering the State transport system, and various other systems in South Australia, and when one also considers that as a whole the nation is facing a serious economic down-turn and a crisis because of the loss of our agricultural industries, I believe that the various calculations that have been made do not add up. So, could the Minister please advise this House, clearly and precisely, on the long-term likelihood of these schemes being completed and, secondly, whether the people in places like Smoky Bay will be expected to pay on a 'user pays' basis for a second-rate and deteriorating service. Members of this place and my constituents are entitled to know that.

I also want to know whether the Government is considering allowing the department to alter its standards so that it can provide services such as that recommended by the private consultants who investigated the matter of reticulation of water west of Ceduna. I raise this because the experience at Coober Pedy has been that the scheme put in there by the local governing authority, although it may not have been to Engineering and Water Supply standards, to this day has worked exceptionally well. A considerable cost was involved. Therefore, I invite the Minister to respond to both those issues, which I regard as being very important for my constituents.

In conclusion, I point out that recently the Government has been involved in extending or taking over the electricity supply to the township of Olympic Dam (Roxby Downs), and I ask where the Government currently stands in relation to the water pipeline from Port Augusta to Woomera.

The Hon. J.W. Slater: Good question! It's Commonwealth.

Mr GUNN: Yes, but as I understand it the Commonwealth is rather keen to—

The Hon. J.W. Slater interjecting:

The DEPUTY SPEAKER: Order! The member for Eyre.

Mr GUNN: Thank you, Sir. I am easily put off, as I am rather shy on my feet and those interjections normally upset me, Mr Deputy Speaker! As we are dealing with finance, perhaps on this occasion the Minister could respond. I understand that negotiations have been taking place for a long time in relation to this pipeline, and I believe the Commonwealth would be keen to relieve itself of that burden. However, I sincerely hope that the State Government does not pick up the tab at least until the pipeline has been put in an A1 condition. I also want to know whether any timetable has been entered into on that matter.

Mr MEIER (Goyder): I am pleased that the member for Eyre has referred to a few matters relevant to this Bill that I believe are very important to the future of South Australia. I support some of his remarks and I shall direct some questions to the Minister concerning specific works in the electorate of Goyder. I, too, am concerned at how these amendments might affect the future implications for providing reticulated water services at various points in Goyder.

The Minister would be well aware that one of my chief areas of concern is in relation to the Moorowie to Hardwicke Bay water supply extension, which has been in contention ever since I came into this place and well before that. The previous Minister remembers it well and in fact the Minister before him remembers it. In fact, I believe that it was No. 1 on the list of the previous Liberal Government's priorities when it went out of office, but the present Government rearranged the priorities and has not further considered the matter. No wonder that the rural people are not too happy with the way that the Government tries to run the State. In fact, I think that part of the rural decline can be directly attributed to the inaction of the State Government. That is another argument in itself.

I refer not only to the provision of water to the Moorowie to Hardwicke Bay area but also to Balgowan, one of the growing coastal towns on western Yorke Peninsula, and to other coastal towns on the eastern side of the peninsula, north and south of Ardrossan. These are isolated communities and from time to time I receive phone calls and letters from residents of these areas seeking further information on what is happening in relation to water supply. Further, at the bottom of the peninsula there is the matter of the possible extension of a water supply to Warooka and the Point Turton area.

I have been invited to a meeting on Friday 20 March at Maitland for the release of some details on the Yorke Peninsula coastal planning study, which I know has dealt with Yorke Peninsula water supply concerns. I am just hoping that a positive announcement might be made there. It may be that the Minister can at least give some hint as to whether these amendments will have any effect on the future provision of water services. Of course, I should also mention areas on the eastern side of my electorate, and I refer to the provision of water to towns such as Bowmans, the major extension in the Two Wells area and how people will fare with the reticulated water supply there, let alone the ever recurring problems that irrigators in the Virginia and Adelaide Plains areas are having in finding sufficient water to keep their horticultural produce at a level sufficient to supply the Adelaide market. I will be interested in the Minister's comments on matters that I have raised in connection with this Bill.

Mr BLACKER (Flinders): This Bill allows the Minister greater flexibility, and hopefully more constructive arrangements will result from it. One of the problems in many of the areas mentioned by the member for Goyder and the member for Eyre is uneconomic programs which have been designed in various parts of the State and which, because of financial limits, have not succeeded. I had hoped that the former Minister of Water Resources would still be in the Chamber when I spoke, because I think I owe him a word of thanks in relation to Coffin Bay, which may have been the last uneconomic scheme constructed in this State and which was constructed through his good graces. I know that he did a lot of hard personal work to bring it about. The finance in that instance came predominantly from the CEP scheme. However, the whole arrangement had to be put together by the Minister and the many others who were involved with it. For that I am thankful.

Many other uneconomic schemes have been proposed in my electorate. Although I recognise the department's difficulty, there must be room for flexibility in the design and construction of those schemes. I will quote the figures off the top of my head for one scheme which involved 47 kilometres of pipe to service 19 landholders with stock water: it was not for irrigation purposes. I approached the Government and the department at the time about whether it was possible to negotiate a lower rate for the supply of

that water. The Government was not disposed to allow that water to be purchased in bulk at a lower rate, although I believe that there was a good case for that being done. In that case the Government was not responsible for maintaining or servicing the 47 kilometres of pipeline, for the collection of revenue for the area or for the maintenance and reading of meters.

I believe that that was a justifiable case for the Government to say that the water could be made available at 2c a kilolitre less. That would have provided an account within which that scheme could operate. Will the Minister indicate whether there is flexibility in this Act to enable arrangements of that kind to be reached?

Mention was made of the 'user pays' principle. I am concerned about that principle, because, if one takes it to the extreme, people in the extremities will have to pay the most. Therefore, any discussion relating to the 'user pays' principle must be accompanied by an appropriate compensating factor to ensure that people in outer areas are not disadvantaged.

The supply of water is a basic, essential service to which every citizen in the State is entitled. Unfortunately, the practicalities of the situation in this State do not allow that to occur in totality. To suggest that the 'user pays' principle should apply in an area such as the Eyre Peninsula is foolish because I know, as every member knows, that the cost of servicing individuals in such areas is considerably higher than the cost of servicing metropolitan users: to that end, the 'user pays' principle would break down.

I will raise one or two matters during the Committee stages of the Bill which I wish to discuss and about which I have foreshadowed amendments. I look forward to the Minister's response and hope that he can shed light on whether or not there is sufficient flexibility to allow private schemes to be negotiated and whether or not they can be made workable. I have already quoted the Mangalo case. There is another case of a construction taking place between Cowell and Kimba, but that probably will not be eligible for ongoing assistance because the scheme is effectively under way. There are many future schemes that will obviously be taken into account relating to people who are now obliged to cart water. I was at Streaky Bay yesterday, and on the way home I passed a farmer who was driving a tray top truck with four or five water tanks on it with the water splashing over the road. I thought to myself, 'What hope has a person of making a go of a farming enterprise when he must cart water?' If ever there was a dead-end job, it has to be water carting!

The Hon. D.J. HOPGOOD (Deputy Premier): I thank honourable members for the consideration that they have given this legislation. It is to be expected that members would take the opportunity of the passage of this Bill to raise some of the concerns that their constituents hold in relation to water supplies. I must say that I must agree entirely with what members have said in this debate when they make the point that water is a basic commodity which has to be provided from which the State cannot, overall, expect to get complete cost recovery. The member for Chaffey, for example, instanced a comment which he attributed to the Premier and with which I am familiar because it has been made from time to time in this Chamber during the many long years that I have been here.

In relation to the comment ascribed to the Premier, I do not believe that that was made with any polemical intent: it is merely a statement of matter of fact. What I am really saying is that I do not think that the Premier or I decry or deplore that situation except inasmuch as we perhaps deplore the necessity for it. The member for Eyre hinted at what that relates to, that is, the basic meteorological conditions, the climate, in which goods are produced in this State. Everybody expects that there will be some element of subsidy to people living in rural areas in general in relation to water supplies, just as there is some element of subsidy in relation to people who rely on public transport to cart them around the great metropolis of Adelaide.

I do not know how that accounting finishes up. I do not know how, on balance, people finish up—whether some people living in a particular location finish up ahead or behind. I think that, probably, the element of subsidy is greater for people living in more remote locations. I would have thought that that was entirely proper and that there is little point, in fact, in engaging in any sort of polemical debate in relation to that particular matter. None of that is all that germane to this Bill except in so far as the Bill, as the member for Chaffey has indicated, establishes a framework for regulations which will allow for such costs as are passed on to be more equitably passed on than has been the case in the past.

I guess that the classic situation that people tend to discuss when this legislation is put forward (because this is not easy legislation to understand but this is an example that everybody can understand) is that in perhaps the peri-urban areas of the State where there are existing subdivisions with little development, where a person wants a water extension under present policies, that person must pay the full cost of that extension. Therefore, that person is paying costs that would have otherwise been borne by people who came along later and developed adjacent allotments. That is a case of inequity that this legislation will address. It does not seek to address some of the broader questions. We, as a Government, see that some of those broader questions cannot be adequately addressed. It will always be more expensive to deliver water to country areas than it will to metropolitan areas. That is an inescapable fact of life—something that we need not deplore—because there is little point in deploring it. It is like deploring death: it is inevitable.

Before passing to some of the more specific matters that were raised, in pressing this legislation on honourable members I simply make the point that where statements like that are made perhaps it is important that they be made. People need to know where they stand. I do not believe that those statements are made with any specific polemical intent. The member for Eyre raised the matter of the effect that this legislation will have on uneconomic schemes. The passage of this legislation and the bringing down of the consequential regulations will not of themselves magically provide lots of resources.

Last Friday morning I spent an enjoyable hour or so at Mount Compass, where we were able officially to open the Country Water Supplies Improvement Program (COWSIP), which is funded largely by the Commonwealth Government. Indeed, I took the opportunity while there, as one would perhaps expect, to compliment the Federal Government on that initiative and the money that is flowing as a result of it. I also took the opportunity to compliment the local people because an element of local resource input was made available from that community, and that certainly helped to get the local scheme up in the priorities.

As I recall the figures that were given me, there were 33 of these schemes about which my department was puzzling, and this scheme was about eleventh or thirteenth in those priorities. However, because it was appropriate in terms of COWSIP, that scheme got the nod well in advance of what otherwise would have been the case. I am glad that the member for Flinders referred to the involvement of my

predecessor in the Ministry (Hon. Jack Slater), because Mr Slater also got an honourable mention at Mount Compass in relation to the local scheme. This program provides some hope for some of these uneconomic schemes to be picked up and for a supply to be provided well in advance of normal financing requirements.

Where there is the potential for that to occur in some of the communities to which the member for Eyre referred, the honourable member, as well as the member for Flinders and any other member, may in the first instance advise their local councils to take up a request to see whether they can get a guernsey in that respect. That is the only hope that I can see in the short term for some of these areas to be supplied effectively. This legislation will not magically provide for those schemes, however.

The non-urban policy is very little changed under the proposals before members, and I assure the member for Flinders that some of the flexibilities that we have been able to use in the past are not affected by this legislation, and their use will still be possible. I should try to get more detailed information for the honourable member and for other members.

Other members have asked specific questions about places such as Moorowie, Hardwicke Bay, Balgowan, and the Woomera pipeline. In some of those cases I do not have complete information in front of me, so I can only undertake to get that specific information and make it available to members, if not in this debate then directly by way of letter or in whatever way seems appropriate to those members. I commend the legislation to the House.

Bill read a second time.

In Committee.

Clause 1 passed.

Progress reported; Committee to sit again.

SEWERAGE ACT AMENDMENT BILL

Adjourned debate on second reading.

(Continued from 19 February. Page 3004.)

The Hon. P.B. ARNOLD (Chaffey): The objectives of this Bill are exactly the same as those of the Waterworks Act Amendment Bill, and the comments that I made during the second reading debate on that Bill are equally applicable to this legislation. In fact, if we go through the Minister's second reading explanation of this Bill, in many instances it is almost word for word the same as it was for the Waterworks Act Amendment Bill. Therefore, we support the second reading of this Bill with the same reservations and with the intention during the Committee stage to move an amendment.

The Hon. B.C. EASTICK (Light): During the debate on the previous Bill my colleagues took the opportunity of outlining deficiencies which exist in their electorates, and the Minister indicated that he would provide some additional information. Specifically in relation to the Sewerage Act, the Minister has probably been made aware that a number of connections in the Salisbury North and Burton area (that is south-east of Salisbury township) were the subject of some developments which appear to have gone wrong. They involved arrangements entered into between the E&WS Department and private developers, with the concurrence of the council. In some cases, in relation to sewerage, opportunity was given to provide a service by way of a—

The Hon. P.B. Arnold interjecting:

The Hon. B.C EASTICK: Common effluent drainage may have been involved in some instances, but I am thinking more of the septic tank aspect. Dialogue has gone on for anything up to seven or eight years, during which period these people are prevented from getting proper title to their property and from benefiting from the provision of other services, as well as being charged by departments other than the Minister's, as well as the Minister's department, for services rendered, because it is deemed to be a private arrangement rather than a departmental arrangement. I suggest there is plenty of evidence of a commitment by some of these departments, the council and ETSA to take over the responsibility for the services provided.

Notwithstanding that there has been a tremendous box-up and that the Government departments are not necessarily responsible for the problems which have arisen, although they may have been party to discussions—because we are legislating for an increase in the cost of providing services, has the Minister considered whether the restrospectivity of costs should not apply to those blocks concerning which Government and local government combined, if it is possible to find the original developers and secure a contribution from them which will put right the services currently denied to these people and overcome what is really a blight upon a civilised society?

The Hon. D.J. HOPGOOD (Deputy Premier): I do not really think I need to respond to the member for Chaffey on this occasion, but the member for Light has raised something very specific. When this legislation arose, I was very concerned to ensure that in passing it we did not entrap people who had been part of council generated schemes for common effluent drainage. The point is that these people have been getting less than a full sewer service, but in many cases it acts very much like a sewer service. They possibly bought their land on that basis and assume that they have in effect got a full service and that one day it will be upgraded but that it would be no different to replacing an old sewerage scheme or something like that.

I was very concerned to ensure that it would not entrap those people and that there would be flexibility for me as Minister or any future Minister to ensure that that would be treated just as a normal new sewerage scheme would be treated. I am talking more of a highly urbanised situation. The same flexibility exists for the Government to treat the situation that the honourable member raised in the House as exists in the other situation to which I referred.

I can give the honourable member that assurance, but I cannot give him any assurance as to when the problems caused in that situation can be resolved, running as they do over the whole question of electricity supply as well as water, sewerage, and so on. I can give the assurance that there is enough flexibility for whatever rules are brought down by regulations to be set aside to take account of the situation such as the honourable member envisages.

Bill read a second time.

In Committee.

Clause 1 passed.

Clause 2—'Commencement.'

Progress reported; Committee to sit again.

ADJOURNMENT

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

That the House do now adjourn.

Mr HAMILTON (Albert Park): In the almost eight years that I have been in this Parliament, on numerous occasions,

as with most members, my constituents have come to me and raised questions pertaining to local government. Invariably those people are unaware of who is their ward councillor and what services are available to them. Of course, knowing my electorate as I do, I refer them to the appropriate ward councillor and assist them in matters of interest to them. I make no criticism of the Woodville council as such, despite the fact that over the years I have offered a criticism or two on various matters about which I have felt strongly.

The Hon. J.W. Slater: Constructive criticism.

Mr HAMILTON: Yes, as my colleague says, constructive criticism—the only type I would make. I believe that councils should provide information to new ratepayers coming into the district. I raise this matter because of fascinating information put out by the Subiaco council in Perth. It sends out a large A4 size envelope stating, 'Welcome to Subiaco, with compliments' on the envelope and giving also the address and telephone number of the municipal offices. It is a commendable practice, and one that I would hope the LGA in South Australia can look at with a view to encouraging councils along such lines.

It is particularly frustrating, I am told, for ratepayers to not know how the local council operates. For example, many people do not know from where their local councils operate, they do not know when council meetings are held, they do not know what a committee system is or how it operates, or who is responsible and for what they are responsible. Indeed, people are unaware of the involvement of health and welfare committees and town planning committees.

Many people are unaware of the terms of office of the ward councillor and how legislation works in terms of local government. Certainly, many people move from State to State and of course the legislation pertaining to local government varies from State to State. Rate assessment notices are of general interest to most people and ratepayers are entitled to know what percentage of rates is used in the annual budget of their council.

Ratepayers are also entitled to know whether their rates, if paid by a certain date, attract a discount. I do not know whether that situation applies in South Australia, but it seems to be a very good practice that, if rates are paid within a certain time, the question of a discount applying could be examined. Certainly, I know that if rates are not paid within the prescribed period they incur a penalty, because in the past I have had to pay the extra sum when I have overlooked payment by the due date.

Other matters dealt with by councils include the provision of footpaths, and the collection of rubbish, and we are all aware of the old 'roads, rates and rubbish' slogan of our councils. Of course, there are also many other activities of councils of which people are unaware. For example, local government can provide—indeed, as the Subiaco council in Western Australia does—a list of Government services, people who can be approached for legal advice, and justices of the peace.

Although many members of Parliament are justices of the peace in South Australia it is not always convenient for an MP and the ratepayer to meet at a mutually acceptable time. Therefore, I believe it is important to have this information provided for ratepayers. The council refers in this information to parking and transport. Again, many people are unaware that semitrailers are not premitted to be parked in certain streets because of the congestion that they cause. Equally important are the community services that are available to people within local council municipalities. Many senior citizens come to me and ask what services are available for them after they have retired, and that information is important, too. It provides alternatives to sitting at home and dying of boredom.

Other information available from Subiaco council includes weekly rubbish collection dates and the location of children's facilities. Such information is important to many parents who move into a municipality. They want to know where the preschools, playgrounds, child-care centres and public and private schools are located. Information about the location of medical facilities is equally important to all people in the community.

Recreational facilities are equally important, as is the question of school terms. In short, the information provided by the Subiaco council, some of which I have been able to obtain, is, I believe, commendable. It is certainly worthwhile for the LGA to consider encouraging councils to at least have a look at this practice that operates in Western Australia. Amongst other leaflets supplied by the Subiaco council to ratepayers is a leaflet on dog laws. Any member who has been in this Parliament for longer than six months would have had an inquiry about dogs from one of their constituents—about dogs roaming the streets, messing on lawns, or barking, or about registration and the penalties for non-registration.

Other leaflets refer to noise in the community, whether from parties, dogs or vehicles, in regard to which there are a considerable number of complaints to MPs. I know that local councils, such as the council in my district, supply information on those topics. Library and information services are also important to all sections of the community. There are leaflets on flies and mosquitoes. Nothing is worse than being bitten by flies and mosquitoes at a barbecue. Information on electoral rights and responsibilities and on claiming for enrolment is also supplied.

Last but not least there is information about rats, which I found rather fascinating and which should perhaps be included in the *Guiness Book of Records*. It is stated that a pair of rats can produce up to 15 000 descendants in a year. That is rather remarkable. A rat can tread water for three days—that is fascinating information. But seriously, the health risk to the community from rats is one that we all acknowledge, and the mention of rats is abhorrent to most of us. It is important that information, such as that contained in some of the leaflets to which I have referred in the brief time available to me today, is available. I hope that some if not all councils pick up the suggestion and provide information similar to that provided by the Subiaco council.

Mr S.J. BAKER (Mitcham): Questions were asked in the House today about the competence of the Minister of Recreation and Sport. I do not wish to dwell on those facts, but I question the propriety of another Minister in this House, namely, the Minister of Correctional Services. I refer to an incident that occurred in Parliament on 17 February 1987. It relates to the circumstances surrounding a prisoner's employment and the fact that the prisoner, after being released from prison, sought employment but did not reveal that he had a prison record. Members would recall that that person had spent some time in gaol. It was stated:

> 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.

The information provided included such items as that the Department of Correctional Services psychologist, Mr P.K. Burns, admitted that it was a practice of the department to

advise prisoners not to reveal their prison records. As a result, the Minister said very loudly to the press at large that this man would face prosecution, that it was disgraceful and disgusting that this behaviour should occur.

Mr Tyler interjecting:

Mr S.J. BAKER: If the member for Fisher waits for a second, he will find out a little bit more. On 18 February, having recovered from admitting that the situation was serious and should not have happened, the Minister made two revelations to the House. The first was that Mr Burns really could not be prosecuted under section 67 *(e)* of the Government Management and Employment Act, and the second was that, in fact, the alleged offence took place in 1981. I would like members opposite to operate as a jury in this case and test the facts that were revealed by the Minister against the record that I will now reveal. When this matter was heard in the Industrial Court, the psychologist (Mr Burns) said to the court, 'Sir, I interviewed the prisoner on 30 occasions in 1982 and 1983.' Not once did he mention 1981, as revealed in the Minister's statement.

Perhaps I can test some logic with members here, because it is important that we understand that the sort of thing that the Minister has talked about is a little difficult to believe. Not only could the Minister impart on behalf of Mr Burns this information that he had admitted that it was 1981, but the facts are that he omitted to tell or emphasise to the House that this prisoner was in gaol in 1982 and 1983 and that the same psychologist had advised him. That leaves one or two assumptions to be made. One is that it was policy in 1981, when it is suggested that the alleged offence took place. The other is that it was an ongoing policy, and that the prisoner was never given any other advice in 1982 or 1983 when he was in gaol. It stretches the imagination a little far. I intended to mention this in an earlier grievance debate, but when the Parliament last sat, we did not have time.

It is important to understand that this person was in gaol after 1981, and we presume that the evidence that was supplied by the former prisoner in this case was sustained during the 1982-83 period and that, somehow, the information given in 1981 was never counteracted or contradicted. It tests the logic of anyone here to say that a psychologist who advises prisoners suddenly said, 'In 1981, I told you to go and tell lies,' yet in 1982 and 1983 he made no mention of that fact. If the 1954 statement that the Minister talked about had been adhered to, this would never have happened. I question whether 1981 is relevant to the argument, and I question the truth of the statement made by the Minister. In fact, I question the statement because it tests logic to suggest that the 1981 directive (which was never given in evidence before the Industrial Court but which was used by the Minister) was the piece of advice that the prisoner used in 1986 to apply for a job.

The paragraph that becomes of interest is that the Minister said that this person cannot be charged under the Government Management and Employment Act. You be the judge! The Acts Interpretation Act 1915-1975, when referring to Acts that have been repealed, states quite clearly:

> . . . such repeal, amendment or expiry shall not—
> 1. revive anything not in force or existing at the time at which such repeal, amendment or expiry takes effect; or
> 2. affect the operation of the repealed, amended or expired Act or enactment, or alter the effect of the doing, suffering, or omission of anything, prior to such repeal, amendment or expiry;

In clear terms the Act says that the repealing of an Act does not derogate from the responsibility of the Government in this case to prosecute if a breach has taken place. The Minister revealed before the House that there was a terrible breach, and the person should be prosecuted; yet suddenly—overnight—he was given advice by the best counsel possible that this person could not be prosecuted. Given the evidence that the Minister is responsible for prosecuting this person but has said that the Government will not prosecute, and given that the prisoner was in gaol beyond 1981 (which to me is just a smokescreen for the fact that the Minister again has been derelict in his duty), I suggest to the House that, on the weight of evidence—*(a)* that there is no restriction on prosecution in this case; and *(b)* that the person was imprisoned for some time after this so-called magical date of 1981 (that is, Tonkin Government responsibility time)—serious questions must be raised about the behaviour of the Minister.

Mr Klunder interjecting:

Mr S.J. BAKER: Pardon?

The DEPUTY SPEAKER: Order! There shall be no interjections across the floor, and I would ask the honourable member to address the Chair.

Mr S.J. BAKER: Thank you, Sir. It raises some serious questions. First, why could a person who gave evidence before the court relating to 30 occasions during 1982 and 1983 suddenly come up with a 1981 date in order to embarrass the former Tonkin Government? Secondly, why did the Minister mislead this House on the ability—

The DEPUTY SPEAKER: Order! I ask the honourable member to resume his seat. In a grievance debate it is quite within the realms of the honourable member to criticise the actions of the Minister (which he has done) and it is quite within his province to do so, but in these debates he must not reflect on the character of the Minister and he must not make a serious charge to the extent that he is misleading the House. I call on the honourable member for Mitcham.

Mr S.J. BAKER: Thank you for your guidance, Sir. I merely make the point that, on the evidence I have available, it seems somewhat strange that the actions and the statements that have been put before the House do not fit very well together. I do not know what the practices were in the prison system in 1981, because I was not in the prison system in 1981 to judge them. Only prisoners can make a judgment on that, but there is no doubt from the public statements made by a person whose name I do not like to mention (Mr Apap) that those practices continued. The fact that the person was in prison during the period of the Bannon Labor Government raises some very serious questions in my mind.

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

Mr KLUNDER (Todd): Last week, when I completed answering a telephone inquiry, someone else who happened to be in the office at the time said, 'Gee, you MPs are really supposed to know it all, aren't you?' While I have no objection to being occasionally touched by the mantle of omniscience, this grievance debate deals more with the ignorance in which MPs often find themselves on crucial and important issues. For instance, some weeks ago I received some information from an organisation called 'People Against Drunk Driving'. I assume that other members also received that information. It seemed a worthwhile organisation with an aim that was certainly worthwhile. I noted that it was still in an embryo form at the time that it wrote to me. In my view, the organisation did something perfectly sensible: it made MPs aware that it existed and asked for attitudes to certain questions. That then made me think about the priorities and the apparently hardhearted way in which we sometimes have to make decisions. Also, it made

me think about the research base that is necessary for us to make decisions.

Parliament ratifies Cabinet decisions regarding the distribution of taxpayers' money. As a Parliament, we make decisions which clearly affect the lives, either directly or indirectly, of the citizens of this State. I cite the example that extra money not being given to purchase extra breathalysers may in turn cause extra road deaths, depending on what one considers to be the effectiveness of RBT units and what one considers their saturation level to be. Another example is that money not spent on extra renal units may cause extra deaths amongst kidney sufferers and extra money that is not given to the Police Department may lead to additional traffic accidents, crime deaths, and so on.

There are literally dozens—if not hundreds—of such situations and decisions which are inherent in each budget, well before we even come to the relative importance of, say, education spending as preparation for the future as against community welfare spending as a repair for the past, as perhaps in the case of rectification of problems caused by child abuse. Within the overall limitations of a fixed amount of money available from taxes and charges, we clearly make decisions of physical life and death, as well as economic life and death. Since all areas are clearly underserviced by money, some death will occur in some areas. Nor is it entirely clear to me that, even given a sufficiency of money in any particular area, that would wipe out the occurrence of death or injury in that given area.

I return to the questions asked by People Against Drunk Driving. I was struck by my basic ignorance when it came to trying to answer the questions asked by the group. For instance, the group's first question was whether I believed that RBT in its present form was effective. Of course, belief is easy; but it is better to know. It makes you start to think what are the indicators of effectiveness in this area. Are there performance indicators? If one believes the newspapers, for instance, the death toll has increased over the past few years (and probably since the introduction of RBT). Therefore, the simplistic response might be to say that, if the death rate has increased, perhaps RBT has not been as effective as some people might have hoped. However, anecdotal evidence clearly indicates that people no longer drink away from home as often as they used to and they do not drink as heavily away from home as they used to. However, I guess the scare effect of RBT units (again, based on anecdotal evidence) is no longer as great as it used to be.

My personal belief is that perhaps people are able to use RBT as an excuse not to drink, and that excuse is socially acceptable in an environment where there is social pressure to drink more. Of course, in that sense it has some effect, but I would be very hard put to quantify it. Therefore, one must assume that RBT and road deaths do not have a simple relationship. However, it is an assumption and, if the relationship is not simple, what is the answer? Does a marginal increase or decrease (or a major increase or decrease for that matter) in the number of RBT units affect the death and injury rate? Finally, one needs to consider, the cost effectiveness of an increase in RBT units as against increasing other preventative measures such as police visibility or police numbers.

The People Against Drunk Driving asked for my belief. However, my belief is irrelevant because it is not based on factual knowledge. Instead, we should be checking whether anyone has done (or is capable of doing) that fairly complex multi factor analysis which presumably will require regression analysis and various other mathematical tools. It is only when one cannot establish the facts that belief forms a second best basis for action. It is for this reason that I recently asked the Minister of Transport for information about road deaths and statistical analyses of the various factors involved. I suspect that members of the People Against Drunk Driving would have liked me to respond, 'No', 'Yes' and 'Yes' in answer to their first three questions. However, I give them credit for not having tried to straitjacket the questions towards desirable responses. I further suspect that, if they get those answers, they will use them (again, quite legitimately) to push for an increase in the number of RBT units, especially near hotels (and that was the basis of their second question), and for a reduction in the permissible blood alcohol level—the basis of their third question. Again, that is a very legitimate path for a pressure group such as this to take.

I am quite sure that within this organisation many people have lost a relative or friend because of a road accident caused by drunk driving, or are looking after a person severely injured from the same cause. I am also sure that they strongly believe that the measures inherent in their questions are utterly necessary to curb the road toll—and they may be right. However, if they are not right, scarce resources would be put towards second best remedies and people will unnecessarily continue to die and sustain injury on our roads.

In these days of a tight economy, after all, no extra money is available, and money that is used, for instance, to increase the number of RBT units will need to be drawn away from other areas where it may or may not be doing more good. Once money has been shifted from one area to another, administrative inertia and empire protection makes it very difficult to shift it back. Furthermore, parliamentary enthusiasm is as fickle as most other forms of enthusiasm, and once Parliament has legislated there is usually a period before parliamentary attention returns to the same subject which, again, may leave an incorrect or second best solution in place.

In a just world it would be easy to run a cost benefit analysis of, say, RBT units *versus* a similar exercise for using the same police personnel in visiting hotels or being visible on motor cycles or, indeed, against a similar cost benefit analysis of having extra CAT scans or extra renal units, since those units also appear to have the capacity to save lives. In reality, I am not sure if an analysis of RBT units and their effect on accident or injury rates is being done or in fact can be done. I am certain that cross-departmental analyses of, for instance, RBT units as against the equivalent dollar value of renal units has not been done—and perhaps it is time that it was. I certainly agree that life would be easier for MPs and perhaps more easily preserved for everybody if some hard facts were available instead of beliefs, no matter how sincerely, strongly or eloquently held.

Motion carried.

At 5.42 p.m. the House adjourned until Wednesday 11 March at 2 p.m.

HOUSE OF ASSEMBLY

Tuesday 10 March 1987

QUESTIONS ON NOTICE

HAHNDORF

161. **The Hon. D.C. WOTTON** (on notice) asked the Minister for Environment and Planning: Has a survey been carried out by the Heritage Unit of the Department of Environment and Planning to investigate the possibility of declaring a portion of the Main Street, Hahndorf, a heritage area and, if so, when, and when was it completed and has such a declaration been approved by the *(a)* State Heritage Committee; and *(b)* Cabinet, and, if so, when and, if not, why not?

The Hon. D.J. HOPGOOD: During the first months of 1986 the State Heritage Branch of the Department of Environment and Planning carried out a survey on this matter. A report was submitted to the South Australian Heritage Committee on 10 April 1986. The committee has recommended that the area identified in Main Street be declared a State Heritage Area. The implications of such a recommendation are currently being assessed.

TERTIARY EDUCATION COSTS

194. **Mr BECKER** (on notice) asked the Minister of Employment and Further Education: How much does it cost to educate fully students undertaking tertiary education in preparation for the following professions in South Australia:

(a) doctor
(b) dentist
(c) lawyer; and
(d) engineer,

and how do these figures compare with other States?

The Hon. LYNN ARNOLD: The following information, provided by the Commonwealth Tertiary Education Commission which funds the tertiary institutions, does not include the costs of buildings and equipment associated with the respective programs. The figures provided are estimates only.

Column 1 below indicates at which institutions the relevant studies are available in South Australia and the length of the course, column 2 the approximate costs in South Australia in 1986 and column 3 the approximate cost nationally. The estimates of the costs are for the entire course (that is, not per annum). Those in column 2 are based on data from all the relevant South Australian institutions; those in column 3 based on University data—national figures are not available for colleges of advanced education.

Column 1	Column 2 South Australian Cost $	Column 3 National Cost $
Doctor		
Six-year course at either the University of Adelaide or the Flinders University of S.A.	85-90 000	75-85 000
Dentist		
Five-year course at the University of Adelaide	95-100 000	80-90 000
Lawyer		
Four-year course at the University of Adelaide plus one-year course in legal practice at the South Australian Institute of Technology (Note: Legal Practice is unique to South Australia and is not undertaken by all students. Excluding this the estimate is	30-35 000 22-27 000	25-30 000
Engineer		
Four-year course at the University of Adelaide or the South Australian Institute of Technology (Note: the low end of the South Australian range reflects institute costs, the high end university costs)	30-50 000	45-55 000

None of the above costs include costs to the students of living expenses, union fees, books, supplies, etc. Nor do they include the costs of TEAS allowances or other Government or private subsidies to individual students. They reflect only recurrent costs to institutions.

DEPARTMENTAL VEHICLE

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

1. To which Government department has a white Sigma UQG 947 been allocated?

2. What Government business was the driver of the vehicle conducting whilst parked under trees parallel to Fifth Avenue near the Edinburgh Air Base on Sunday 16 November 1986 for several hours from approximately 2.00 p.m.?

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

1. Goverment vehicle UQG 947 is owned by the Aboriginal Health Organisation and is the responsibility of the Adelaide Children's Hospital.

2. At the time in question, the vehicle was in the possession of an Aboriginal hospital liaison officer, who had taken two Aboriginal inpatients to Edinburgh Air Base to view the air show. Hospital liaison officers are often engaged in providing recreational activities for patients and accordingly this is not considered unusual.

SOUTH AUSTRALIAN HOUSING TRUST

264. **Mr M.J. EVANS** (on notice) asked the Minister of Housing and Construction:

1. How many tenants under the age of 18 years are currently in receipt of rent relief?

2. What was the total amount paid in rent relief to minors in the past financial year?

3. How many current tenants of the South Australian Housing Trust are under the age of 18 years?

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

1. At 30 June 1986 a total of 660 people aged 18 years or less were in receipt of assistance under the Rent Relief Scheme. This represented 7.85 per cent of the total pool of recipients (8 404) at that time. So far this financial year the pool of recipients has remained relatively constant so there is unlikely to have been any signifiant variation in the proportion of young people currently receiving assistance.

2. The estimated value of assistance paid to people aged 18 years or less in the 1985-86 financial year was $482 362.

3. The trust does not keep detailed statistical information on the age of all its tenants. However, it is able to provide data on the number of allocations to young people aged 18 years or less. Since 1984-85, for example, it has allotted a total of 499 dwellings to this group, as follows:

1984-85	139 allocations
1985-86	176 allocations
1986-87 (to the end of Jan.)	184 allocations

Included in these figures are allocations made under the trust's Direct Lease Scheme, which provides young people with access to medium term public housing.

ELECTORATE OFFICE COMPUTERS

269. **Mr M.J. EVANS** (on notice) asked the Minister of Housing and Construction: Is the Government considering the installation of word processing or computer equipment in the electorate offices of members of the House of Assembly and, if so, what are the terms of reference of the investigation and by whom is it being undertaken and, if not, will the Minister initiate such an investigation in time for provision to be made for the supply of the equipment in the 1987 budget?

The Hon. T.H. HEMMINGS: The Government has approved an allocation of $25 000 for a pilot program to assess the benefits that accrue from the installation of dedicated word processors in electorate offices. Through the placement of machines in a variety of offices, the program will aim to address the impact of a word processing facility on the productivity of each sample office, and also consider less quantifiable factors such as effect on work stress and job satisfaction

The investigation will be undertaken by staff from the Minister of Housing and Construction's Office, who are responsible for administration of the electorate offices with guidance and assistance from the Management Improvement Branch of the Department of Housing and Construction. Details of the program are currently being finalised. However, the trial will last for approximately six months, and will commence during this financial year.

GOVERNMENT VEHICLES

271. **Mr BECKER** (on notice) asked the Premier: Further to the answer to Question on Notice No. 156, what criteria are used when approving Government motor vehicles for personal or family use?

The Hon. J.C. BANNON: Prior approval in writing was sought to use Government vehicle UQG-443 on official business, accompanied by family members. The vehicle was being returned from Port Lincoln to Adelaide for disposal. As with all officers in the Department of Tourism, officers do not have personal use of vehicles; however in this special instance, approval was given.

GOVERNMENT EMPLOYEES

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

1. Are dossiers kept on daily paid workers and public servants and, if so, by whom and why?

2. If any file containing health reports or any internal documents are kept on Government employees, what access do such employees have to such files and, if none, why not?

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

1. Personal files are kept for all staff employed under the Government Management and Employment Act in accordance with Administrative Instruction 285. Files are kept by individual departments with respect to staff employed in those departments. The files are generally located in management services/personnel branches. No comprehensive policy exists for daily paid workers. Some departments have personal files while others do not. There is a need to record/maintain a variety of information about staff, e.g.:

- historical information relating to the appointment of the employee
- special medical information which is relevant to employment
- basic employee details, e.g.:
  - age
  - address
  - next of kin
  - qualifications etc.
  - contract of employment.

2. A range of documents, as outlined above, including medical or other reports relating to an employee's health, which are relevant to employment, may be kept on personal files. In accordance with the policy on personal files (refer to Administrative Instruction 285) employees under the Government Management and Employment Act have the right of access to their own files. With regard to daily paid workers, separate files (when no personal file exists) are kept on employees' health records when these are relevant to employment. (e.g. pre-employment medical report, workers compensation matters etc.) As with employees under the Government Management and Employment Act, daily paid workers have access to information kept on personal files or where no personal files exists, to separate files relating to health.

MOTOR REGISTRATION DIVISION

274. **Mr BECKER** (on notice) asked the Minister of Transport:

1. What action, if any, is being taken to relocate the Lockleys Branch of the Motor Registration Division in an effort to alleviate the shortage of parking facilities for clients?

2. What action is proposed to curb unauthorised parking by clients of the Lockleys Branch in neighbouring commercial properties?

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

1. The Motor Registration Division is aware of the parking difficulties in the vicinity of its office at Lockleys. If a suitable alternative site becomes available and funds are provided to cover the costs, the division is prepared to relocate this branch office.

2. The division cannot be held responsible for unauthorised parking by members of the public in neighbouring commercial properties.

PRAWN FISHING

275. **The Hon. TED CHAPMAN** (on notice) asked the Minister of Fisheries:

1. What were the grounds on which the Minister decided to remove two prawn fishermen from fishing in the waters of Investigator Strait during December 1986?

2. Was the Minister's decision made on the recommendation of the Department of Fisheries and, if not, why did he not call for a recommendation on the matter and if the Minister did call for, receive or consider a departmental recommendation, what was the content of that recommendation?

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

1. State Cabinet's decision with respect to vessel removal in the Gulf St Vincent/Investigator Strait prawn fishery was based on the inquiry undertaken by Professor Copes, together with the subsequent comments made by those people most directly affected by his recommendations.

2. See 1 above.

INDUSTRY DEVELOPMENT PAYMENTS PROGRAM

276. **Mr OLSEN** (on notice) asked the Minister of State Development and Technology:

In each of the years 1984-85 and 1985-86—

(a) how many applications were received for assistance under the industry development payments program

(b) how many of those applications were approved

(c) what was the total amount of assistance provided as a result

(d) what amount of assistance was provided under each of the categories, new industry, existing industry—expansion and existing industry—investment, respectively; and

(e) how many jobs were created as a result?

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

(a) 78 applications for assistance were given formal consideration under the Industry Development Payments Program from its commencement in September 1985 to 30 June 1986.

(b) Of those applications, 34 were formally approved, with another 24 still under consideration as at 30 June 1986.

(c) $2 725 340 was approved and $374 250 was paid to 30 June 1986.

(d) Assistance was approved as follows:

new industry	$1 915 275
existing industry—expansion	$762 565
existing industry—investment	$47 500

(e) It was estimated that 658 full-time jobs would be created as a direct result of the assistance approved to 30 June 1986.

STRUCTURAL ADJUSTMENT PROGRAM

277. **Mr OLSEN** (on notice) asked the Minister of State Development and Technology:

1. How many and which industries were designated as eligible for assistance under the structural adjustment program?

2. In each of the years 1984-85 and 1985-86:

(a) how many applications were received for assistance under this program,

(b) how many of those applications were approved,

(c) what amount of financial assistance was paid; and

(d) how many jobs were created as a result?

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

1. The motor vehicle industry was designated as eligible for assistance under the structural adjustment program.

2. *(a)* 23 applications for assistance under SAP were received (the scheme commenced operation on 1 September 1985).

(b) All 23 applications were approved.

(c) $725 196 was paid during 1985-86 financial year.

(d) The program is designed to promote South Australia's general competitiveness by means of assisting necessary structured adjustments to nominated industries. This thrust provides a climate of greater security for existing employment and the opportunity for additional employment if the competitive position is enhanced. Direct employment that may be created by each application is therefore only a secondary benefit and consequently is not measured.

TECHNOLOGY AND INNOVATION PROGRAM

278. **Mr OLSEN** (on notice) asked the Minister of State Development and Technology: In each of the years 1984-85 and 1985-86—

(a) how many applications for financial assistance were made under the technology and innovation program,

(b) how many of those applications were approved,

(c) what amount of financial assistance was paid; and

(d) how many jobs were created as a result?

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

(a) 29 applications were made under the Technology and Innovation Program from the scheme's introduction in September 1985 to 30 June 1986.

(b) Of those applications 28 were approved and one declined.

(c) $278 575 was paid to 30 June 1986.

(d) The scheme is intended to promote the adoption of new technology, the impact of which would be to promote South Australia's general competitiveness, thus providing a climate of greater security for existing employment and the generation of additional employment. Direct employment that may be created by each individual application is therefore only a secondary benefit and consequently is not measured.

REGIONAL INDUSTRY PROGRAM

279. **Mr OLSEN** (on notice) asked the Minister of State Development and Technology: In each of the years 1984-85 and 1985-86:

(a) how many applications for financial assistance were received under the regional industry program,

(b) how many of those applications were approved,

(c) what amount of assistance was paid,

(d) what types of industry were assisted; and

(e) how many jobs were created as a result?

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

(a) Nine applications were received for financial assistance under the Regional Industry Program from the scheme's introduction in September 1985 to June 1986.

(b) Eight applications were approved.

(c) $30 965 was paid to 30 June 1986.

(d) The assistance was paid to a regional council and to fund feasibility or market survey studies, which included companies considering the establishment of:

a cherry orchard
an oil seed crushing plant
manufacture of carbon briquettes, and
manufacture of garden furniture.

(e) It was estimated that 130 jobs would be created if the proposals went ahead.

PAYROLL AND LAND TAXES

280. **Mr OLSEN** (on notice) asked the Minister of State Development and Technology: In each of the years 1984-85 and 1985-86:

(a) how many manufacturing industries located in near metropolitan areas applied for reimbursement of 50 per cent of payroll and land taxes;

(b) how many of those applications were approved;

(c) what amount of revenue was foregone as a result; and,

(d) how many jobs were created as a result?

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

(a) In 1984-85, fifty-six companies applied for reimbursement of 50 per cent of payroll tax and land tax. One company applied for registration of eligibility to receive reimbursement under the Payroll Tax and Land Tax Reimbursement Scheme and was declined.

In 1985-86, fifty-seven companies applied for reimbursement of 50 per cent of payroll tax and land tax. One company applied and was accepted for eligibility to receive reimbursements under the scheme.

(b) All applications were approved (it should be noted that only firms registered to receive rebates may apply).

(c) Reimbursements made in 1984-85 totalled $721 763.57 and in 1985-86 $789 723.77.

(d) The scheme is not intended to directly create new employment but to assist country industries to overcome cost disabilities associated with regional location. In 1984-85, companies with 1 776 full-time and 233 part-time employees received reimbursement of 50 per cent of payroll tax and land tax paid.

In 1985-86 companies with 2 046 full-time and 282 part-time employees received reimbursement of 50 per cent of payroll tax and land tax paid.

281. **Mr OLSEN** (on notice) asked the Minister of State Development and Technology: In each of the years 1984-85 and 1985-86:

(a) how many manufacturing industries located in outer regional areas have applied for reimbursement of 100 per cent of payroll and land taxes;

(b) how many of those applications were approved;

(c) how much revenue was foregone as a result; and,

(d) how many jobs were created as a result?

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

(a) In 1984-85, 234 companies applied for reimbursement of 100 per cent of payroll tax and land tax. Eight companies applied for registration of eligibility to receive rebates under the Payroll Tax and Land Tax Reimbursement Scheme. Of these, seven companies were accepted and one was declined.

In 1985-86, 232 companies applied for reimbursement of 100 per cent of payroll tax and land tax. Four companies applied for registration of eligibility to receive reimbursement, all of which were approved.

(b) All applications were approved (it should be noted that only firms registered to receive rebates may apply).

(c) Reimbursements made in 1984-85 totalled $5 695 585.16 and in 1985-86 $5 419 245.38.

(d) The scheme is not intended to create new employment but to retain existing job numbers. In 1984-85, companies with 8 710 full-time and 1 108 part-time employees received reimbursement of 100 per cent of payroll tax and land tax paid.

In 1985-86 companies with 8 375 full-time and 1 143 part-time employees received reimbursement of 100 per cent of payroll tax and land tax paid.

BOWMANS COAL DEPOSIT

282. **Mr OLSEN** (on notice) asked the Minister of Mines and Energy:

1. When will the second phase of the feasibility study into gasification of the Bowmans coal deposit be completed?

2. Have any progress reports been received on the second phase and, if so, what do they show?

3. What is the cost of the feasibility study so far, and what is the estimated completion cost?

The Hon. R.G. PAYNE: The replies are as follows:

1. July 1987.

2. A preliminary report has been prepared by the Gasification Steering Committee based on reports from South Australian technical observers who attended the tests. The report shows:

(a) Bowmans coal was gasified under a range of conditions.

(b) Although mechanical and physical problems related to the specific pilot plant design prevented a planned 10-day test from being achieved, data required to be obtained in the test program was gathered in a series of shorter tests.

(c) Receipt of the final test reports, analyses and process review will be essential before the results of phase II can be assessed.

3.

	$
Phase I	343 722
Drying and transport of coal	241 034
Phase II (to date)	378 390
Total to date	$963 146
Estimated total cost at the completion of phase II	$1.5 million

If it is decided to proceed to phase III an estimated additional $2.8 million would be required.

GOVERNMENT PROPERTIES

287. **Mr OLSEN** (on notice) asked the Premier:

1. How many properties in the Adelaide metropolitan area does the Government own?

2. What is the current market value of those properties?

3. How many are not being used by a Government department or agency?

4. How many are unused?

5. How many are surplus to present and anticipated future requirements and what is their market value?

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

1. As at the close of business on 24 February 1987 and based on the number of Government property occupations identified in the valuation assessment files of the Department of Lands, there are 4 279 Government owned properties located within the Adelaide metropolitan area.

2. To ascertain the current market value of those properties would require individual special valuations. However, based on the valuations assessed by the Valuer-General for rating and taxing purposes, the value of those properties is $1 168 million.

3. Except for a limited number of interim reorganisation purposes, all Government properties are being used by departments or agencies.

4. Consistent with reorganisation needs and the marketing of surplus properties, there are no otherwise unused surplus properties and the actual determination of such properties would require a lengthy and expensive investigation. Hence this figure is not readily available.

5. The centralised Government Property Register System operated by the Department of Lands records 208 properties as being surplus to present and anticipated future requirements and the total value of such properties as assessed for rating and taxing purposes is $29.1 million. In the process of disposal of such properties, individual special valuations will be prepared to assist in establishing the market value for sale purposes.

TREASURY BUILDING SALT DAMP

300. **Mr BECKER** (on notice) asked the Minister of Housing and Construction: Has any salt damp or other building corrosion appeared on the Treasury Building since renovations were completed last year?

The Hon. T.H. HEMMINGS: There has been minor disturbance to the safety of the walls and plinth of the Treasury Building. This is occurring mainly on the western and southern facades. 'Blistering' of the paintwork is confined to the vicinity of the plinth, is strictly cosmetic and is minor in comparison with the total scope of the project undertaken. It should be noted that the Treasury Building was built in six stages from 1858 to 1907 and the areas in question are located in the older (first three) stages along King William Street. There is no damp proof coursing or solid foundation to the walls of these early parts of the building and mild salt damp is evident in some lower parts of the walls and the plinth.

The 'blistering' of small areas of paint is the result of a small residue of the caustic gel used to clean off the paint from those portions of the plasterwork that were retained, and some salt damp. It was anticipated that some flaking would occur near the plinth area and that minor ongoing maintenance work would be required. This is typical of conservation works where the minimum possible intervention in the original fabric of the building is pursued. In projects of this nature there is a natural conflict of philosophies between 'curing' salt damp and other deterioration activities (usually involving extensive removal of, or disturbance to, the fabric of the building), and 'stabilising' an existing condition in an attempt to reduce further deterioration. Heritage policies lean towards the latter.

Several techniques for salt damp containment and stabilisation were considered, including undersetting and chemical injection. Undersetting was considered to be too destructive to the building fabric and impractical in view of the nature of the construction (i.e. soft mortars and loose rubble core). Chemical injection was therefore considered to be the only viable alternative. There was doubt, however, as to the validity of any long-term guarantees given by respective manufacturers/installers of chemical injections to solve the particular conditions of the Treasury Building walls. In view of the above and the considerable cost involved in whatever system was adopted, it was determined that the S.A. Department of Housing and Construction should not proceed but conduct its own testing of salt damp treatment systems appropriate for S.A. heritage buildings. At that time there had been no independent comparative testing of injected damp proof coursing.

Accordingly, a test site has been established and the Department, in co-operation with Amdel, is examining and monitoring the relative performance of several chemical injection systems over a three-year period. When conclusive evidence is available consideration will be given to the treatment of the Treasury building and other similarly affected structures. The patching of the Treasury Building facade will be completed soon and the performance of the new painting will be monitored closely.

SOUTH AUSTRALIAN COLLEGE OF ADVANCED EDUCATION

301. **Mr BECKER** (on notice) asked the Minister of Employment and Further Education:

1. Of the 49 vehicles owned by the South Australian College of Advanced Education, how many carry a college logo or are publicly identifiable as college vehicles?

2. Are any of the vehicles used for private purposes and, if so, by whom and is this practice within official guidelines of SACAE policy?

3. Does the college pay fringe benefits tax in relation to the private use of these vehicles or for any other benefits provided?

4. Further to the answer to Question on Notice No. 193, when did the accident occur, for what purpose was the vehicle being used at the time and is it a fact that the replacement Holden Commodore station wagon has since been involved in an accident and, if so:

(a) who was the driver;

(b) for what purpose was the vehicle being used at the time;

(c) what circumstances surrounded the accident and which driver was at fault;

(d) what was the extent of damage to the SACAE vehicle;

(e) were any injuries sustained by the driver of the SACAE vehicle and occupant/s of the other vehicle; and

(f) were any passengers in the SACAE vehicle and if so, who were they and what SACAE business were they conducting:

The Hon. LYNN ARNOLD: Before proceeding to answer the question, I wish to remind the member for Hanson of my comments at the beginning of my reply to Question on Notice No. 193 concerning the autonomy of the South Australian College of Advanced Education. Replies to the honourable member's specific questions are:

1. Of the 49 vehicles owned by the college, 11 are publicly identifiable as college vehicles. The college is currently considering the matter of identification for all its vehicles.

2. The college policy is that vehicles are to be used for official purposes only, except that travel between home and work is permitted for designated senior staff. As the honourable member will recall, 14 vehicles are assigned to the extent that senior staff have first call on them. Those staff are permitted to garage the particular vehicle at home.

3. The college pays fringe benefit tax in respect of the appropriate proportion of the use of those 14 vehicles. For the September and December 1986 quarters the college paid fringe benefit tax of $8 773 and $7 625 respectively.

4. The accident occurred on Sunday 1 June 1986. At the time the staff member was using the vehicle for private purposes contrary to the college's policy. The staff member concerned has been counselled about this and the college is re-examining its procedures for the use of vehicles. The replacement Holden Commodore station wagon was involved in an accident on Thursday 29 January 1987 and:

(a) the driver was the college Librarian;

(b) the vehicle was being driven between two sites of the college on official business;

(c) the accident report indicates that another vehicle turned blind into Sturt Road and collided with the college vehicle even though the college vehicle was approaching on the right hand side of the other; the college driver is not considered to have been at fault;

(d) the college vehicle suffered extensive damage to the left front end, repairs costing $4 400;

(e) the college employee sustained minor bruising and the accident report indicates that there were no injuries to the occupants of the other vehicle; and

(f) there were no passengers in the college vehicle.

STOLEN BOATS AND EQUIPMENT

302. **Mr BECKER** (on notice) asked the Minister of Employment and Further Education: Have any power, speed or sailing boats or equipment been stolen from the Underdale campus of the South Australian College of Advanced Education in the past 12 months and, if so:

(a) when;

(b) what were the items stolen and how much was each item valued at;

(c) was each item fully insured and, if not, why not;

(d) what were the circumstances relating to each theft;

(e) what were the security measures in force at the time; and

(f) has any action been taken to avoid further thefts and, if not, why not?

The Hon. LYNN ARNOLD: Two boats have been stolen from the Underdale campus of the South Australian College of Advanced Education in the past 12 months.

(a) The first theft occurred on 17 September 1986 and the second on 8 December 1986.

(b) Items stolen were a 420 class yacht and trailer and a Rover 4.570 runabout boat and trailer valued at $2 220 and $4 000 respectively.

(c) Each item was fully insured at replacement cost.

(d) The yacht was stolen at 11.30 a.m. from the fenced stores compound and the runabout was taken during the night from the same compound; in the latter instance the chain and bolt were cut using bolt-cutters.

(e) Underdale has had a seven day security service from 7.00 a.m. to 11.00 p.m. and the stores compound is locked outside those hours.

(f) The college has built a boatshed adjacent to the Port River as a central location for its aquatic equipment; the shed has been secured and the property on which it is located will soon be fenced.

HOUSING TRUST ACCOMMODATION

303. **The Hon. D.C. WOTTON** (on notice) asked the Minister of Housing and Construction:

1. What is the current waiting time for South Australian Housing Trust accommodation at Mount Barker following the lodgement of an application?

2. How many people are currently on the trust list waiting for accommodation at Mount Barker?

3. How many trust houses, semi-detached and other forms of accommodation, respectively, are now situated in Mount Barker?

4. What plans does the trust have for each year to 1990 for the purchase of land for development and the construction of accommodation in Mount Barker?

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

1. The trust is currently offering family housing in the Mount Barker area to applicants who applied prior to May 1984. This equates to a waiting time of 33 months.

2. There are currently 374 outstanding applicants for various types of trust accommodation at Mount Barker.

3. As at 31 December 1986 the trust owned 335 rental properties at Mount Barker comprising 246 detached houses, 61 double units, 6 one-storey maisonettes and 22 cottage flats.

4. The trust currently has 16 dwellings under construction at Mount Barker, and proposes to let contracts for a further 27 dwellings in the remainder of this financial year. Preliminary design has commenced for an additional 41 dwellings to be contracted during 1987-88. This then exhausts the supply of presently owned trust land holdings and future building programs would be dependent upon the purchase of suitably priced and located land. The trust would ideally like to commence approximately 40 dwellings annually to 1990, either through its own building programs or through the Design and Construction method of construction. This will naturally depend on each year's financial budgets.

STATE WAR MEMORIAL

305. **The Hon. D.C. WOTTON** (on notice) asked the Minister of Housing and Construction:

1. What role does the Department of Housing and Construction have in regard to the new addition to the State War Memorial referred to in an article in the *Sunday Mail* on 14 December 1986?

2. Where did the granite used in the new monument come from?

3. Who has been involved in the design and any sculpture work associated with the monument referred to in the article?

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

1. The South Australian Department of Housing and Construction is designing and project managing the provision of a monument to commemorate members of the armed forces who enlisted in South Australia and who lost their lives in post World War II conflicts.

2. The stone proposed for the monument is Harcourt granite and is being used to match the stone of the War Memorial, North Terrace. Harcourt is near Bendigo in Victoria. However, stocks of this stone are available in Adelaide.

3. The design, comprising stone masonry and metal engraving, has been prepared by the South Australian Department of Housing and Construction staff. The design has been agreed by the R.S.L., the City of Adelaide Planning Commission and the Corporation of the City of Adelaide.