

## HOUSE OF ASSEMBLY

Wednesday 4 November 1987

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

### OMBUDSMAN'S REPORT

The **SPEAKER** laid on the table the report of the Ombudsman, 1986-87.

Ordered that report be printed.

### QUESTION

The **SPEAKER**: I direct that the following written answer to a question, as detailed in the schedule I now table, be distributed and printed in *Hansard*.

### JUSTICE INFORMATION SYSTEM

(Estimates Committee B)

In reply to Mr S.J. BAKER (15 September).

The Hon. C.J. SUMNER: The information is as follows:

- PROJECTS KNOWN TO BE REQUIRED FOR JIS
- Attorney-General's Department:
- Provide JP Inquiry Service
  - Provide Document Monitoring Service
  - Monitor Legal Officer Workload
  - Statistical Data History
  - Police Statistical Report
  - DCS Statistical Report
- Police Department:
- Administer Warrants
  - Victim Person Identification
  - Modus Operandi Codes
  - Administer Police Bail
  - Area Code Encoding
  - Criminal Incident
  - Statutes Inquiry
  - Document Tracking
  - Wanted Persons
  - Missing Persons
  - Antecedent Reporting
- Department of Correctional Services:
- Prisoner Movement
  - Register Community Offender
  - Prisoner Induction Interviews
  - Prisoner Movement Documents
  - Pre-sentence/CSO/Bail Reports
  - DCS Office/Officer
- Department for Community Welfare:
- DCW Office/Officer
  - Client Files
  - Child Protection
  - Secure Care
  - Screening Panels/Children's Aid Panels
  - Children's Court
- Department of Labour:
- Award Test Maintenance and Inquiry
  - National Wage Rate Calculation
  - Labour Rates Sheet
  - Publish Award Text/Variation
  - Industrial Regulation Applications
- General/Housekeeping:
- Security
  - Freedom of Information

NOTE: The feasibility study identifies many more projects. As time goes by these will be specified in accordance with standards for the JIS. The above are the priority projects.

A schedule of statistics from Justice Information System required by Office of Crime Statistics will be forwarded separately to the honourable member.

### MINISTERIAL STATEMENT: ISLAND SEAWAY

The Hon. R.K. ABBOTT (Minister of Marine): I seek leave to make a statement.

Leave granted.

The Hon. R.K. ABBOTT: I would like to inform the House of facts concerning the m.v. *Island Seaway*, following statements in this place yesterday by members of the Opposition. Questions were raised concerning the ability of the ship to cope with conditions on the open seas. I would like to point out to the House that m.v. *Island Seaway* has in fact undergone trials along a number of open sea routes.

The facts are as follows: on 30 August m.v. *Island Seaway* undertook a gulf water and preliminary trial; on 15 September the vessel underwent gulf water endurance trials; on 16 September the vessel went through Lloyds classification trials and course keeping experiments; on 24 September manoeuvring safety tests, Upper Gulf and berthing manoeuvre tests were completed; on 2 October the vessel underwent, in the Upper Gulf, engine tests, further berthing tests in Outer Harbor and crash stop manoeuvres; on 6 October manual steering and auto pilot tests in adverse conditions were completed in gulf waters and, in particular, Investigator Strait off Kangaroo Island; on 7 October m.v. *Island Seaway* undertook further berthing manoeuvre tests; and on 8 October the vessel completed a familiarisation test in Outer Harbor.

The Leader of the Opposition refers to 38 deficiencies on the new m.v. *Island Seaway*. Such a list is not unusual given that the items are generally minor in nature and have to be rectified before the vessel goes into service. If the m.v. *Island Seaway* was not a safe and seaworthy vessel, certificates would not have been issued by Lloyds Classification Society. This certifies that the vessel has been built to Lloyds 100 AI standard. This covers the strength, construction, and stability of the vessel. It also covers inspection of machinery and equipment.

Overall, the construction of the vessel has taken 18 months. This is not an unreasonable time frame for a project of this complex nature. Also, we should not lose sight of the importance of this project in establishing South Australia's capacity to handle the submarine project. The vessel will be handed over to Howard Smith Industries Limited this afternoon, and that company will be aiming to get the vessel into service early next week.

### QUESTION TIME

The **SPEAKER**: Before calling on questions, I advise members that questions that would otherwise be taken by the Minister of Education will be taken by the Minister of State Development and Technology and that questions that would otherwise be taken by the Deputy Premier will be taken by the Premier.

### TIMBER COMPANY

Mr OLSEN: Following the recommendation in the report that the Minister of Forests received in April from Peat Marwick Mitchell and Company that the Government would have to provide further financial assistance to its New

Zealand timber joint venture by the end of October, will he confirm that within the last fortnight the Government has injected an additional amount of some \$3 million into the venture, bringing its total investment now to some \$16 million?

**The Hon. R.K. ABBOTT:** I have made the Government's position clear on this matter previously, and this is consistent with the advice that was provided to the Auditor-General. There is a choice with regard to IPL New Zealand, of either selling the company now in a period of non-activity in the industry, and therefore making a loss, or seeking to improve the operations of the company to allow a decision to sell with a much better result at a later date. A variety of steps have been undertaken following the Coopers and Lybrand report, and the particular significance is the appointment of a new manager in New Zealand. Members should be aware that Satco makes a major contribution to the economy of the South-East, and that is important to all South Australians. For instance, in the last decade Satco made a total contribution of \$50 million to the South Australian Treasury. I have consistently informed the House that I have no intention of providing here any information that may damage our case now before the courts—

*Members interjecting:*

**The SPEAKER:** Order!

**The Hon. R.K. ABBOTT:** —and I remain firm to that commitment. The Auditor-General has looked, and will look, as is his duty, into the South Australian Timber Corporation, and I am satisfied that the House is adequately informed by this process.

*Members interjecting:*

**The SPEAKER:** Order! I call the Premier, the Leader of the Opposition, and the Deputy Leader to order. Does the honourable Minister intend to continue?

**The Hon. R.K. ABBOTT:** I do not intend to elaborate further on that matter.

*Members interjecting:*

**Mr Olsen:** An absolute disgrace!

**The SPEAKER:** Order!

*Mr Olsen interjecting:*

**The SPEAKER:** Order! I call the Leader of the Opposition and the member for Briggs to order. The honourable member for Newland.

#### EXTRACTIVE AREAS REHABILITATION FUND

**Ms GAYLER:** Can the Minister of Mines and Energy provide the House with information on the present activities provided by the Extractive Areas Rehabilitation Fund, which, as most members would be aware, uses the proceeds of a levy on extractive minerals to rehabilitate worked out areas of land for other useful purposes? I ask my question today because I have received reports that a significant project is to occur in my electorate, namely, Peter Brook's performance of the Mahabarata during the 1988 Festival of Arts.

*Mr Lewis interjecting:*

**The Hon. R.G. PAYNE:** If the honourable member who is interjecting from the other side is not interested in the answer, I think some other members will be. I am very happy to advise that a significant project of the nature outlined by the honourable member will take place in her area. It is one of 10 rehabilitation projects recommended by my department that I have approved in the past few weeks. The total value of these restoration works is about \$210 000, and they range in scope from projects involving only a few hundred dollars to others involving many thou-

sands of dollars. Several of the projects are in and around the metropolitan area, but work will also be undertaken in the Far West, on Eyre Peninsula, in the Riverland, in the Clare Valley, and in the South-East, so that will please quite a number of Opposition members.

The particular project of interest to the honourable member involves the Anstey Hill Open Space Reserve, which is controlled by the National Parks and Wildlife Service. The reserve contains four long-abandoned quarries which are in need of rehabilitation both to improve public safety and improve the visual impact of the area.

One of these quarries was the venue for a performance during the 1980 Festival of Arts and, as has been pointed out by the honourable member, it will again be used for this purpose during the forthcoming festival. The total cost of rehabilitating the four quarries is \$142 000. While the festival quarry is considered the most urgent from a public safety point of view and will be dealt with first, economies can be achieved by dealing with the others while the machinery is on site. The work will be undertaken by E. M. Earthmovers Pty Ltd of Basket Range, and should start within the next week.

**The SPEAKER:** The honourable Deputy Leader.

**The Hon. E.R. GOLDSWORTHY:** My question—

*Members interjecting:*

**The SPEAKER:** Order! I call the House to order. If the Leader would resume his seat for one moment—

*Members interjecting:*

**The SPEAKER:** Order! In accordance with the call list, I gave the call to the Deputy Leader. I have to go through the formality of asking him whether he is prepared to yield to the Leader of the Opposition.

**The Hon. E.R. GOLDSWORTHY:** Yes.

#### TIMBER COMPANY

**Mr OLSEN:** My question is to the Treasurer, and it will be interesting to see whether the House actually gets a reply to a question from the Opposition. Has the Treasurer sanctioned the injection of about \$3 million into the New Zealand timber venture in recent weeks?

**The Hon. J.C. BANNON:** I am not prepared to add anything to the answer.

*Members interjecting:*

**The Hon. J.C. BANNON:** You would not listen to me if I began to answer it.

*Members interjecting:*

**The SPEAKER:** Order! I ask the Premier to resume his seat. The Chair has made clear that, in accordance with the past customs of the House, the Chair is prepared to tolerate a certain amount of interjection that falls within the traditional parameters. However, the Chair will not allow interjection that becomes disorderly or is obviously designed to harass or intimidate the person who is on his feet or have him shouted down. The honourable the Premier.

**The Hon. J.C. BANNON:** What we are confronted with—

**The SPEAKER:** Order! A point of order? The honourable Minister.

**The Hon. R.G. PAYNE:** There was a good deal of noise, but it is my impression anyway that that question was asked here only in the last few minutes and it is my understanding that duplication of questions is not usually permitted.

*The Hon. E.R. Goldsworthy interjecting:*

**The SPEAKER:** Order! Without checking the exact wording of the two questions, I am unable at the moment to uphold the point of order of the honourable Minister. I will act on the assumption that there were sufficient variations

for it not to have been the same question. The honourable Premier.

**The Hon. J.C. BANNON:** It is clear that Opposition questions, not just today but on other occasions, are purely rhetorical. We had the example yesterday where one honourable member, when he got the honest answer from the Minister here, implied that he knew precisely what the answer was, or thought he did. In fact, it was on a different matter and the Minister's statement today on the *Island Seaway* proved that.

*Members interjecting:*

**The Hon. J.C. BANNON:** As we can see now as I talk, with this childish display by the Opposition, unless the Minister is prepared to get up and give precisely the answer that the Opposition wants—not answer it in his own way, not answer it by giving some of the background to put it in context—we get subjected to harassment, interjection and a whole lot of nonsense.

*Members interjecting:*

**The Hon. J.C. BANNON:** I can take it and I will dish it out, too; do not worry about that. It is clear there is no intention of seeking information on this matter. How many times do we have to say on some of these detailed financial questions about IPL (New Zealand)—

*Members interjecting:*

**The Hon. J.C. BANNON:** Look, they will not even let me get it out.

*Members interjecting:*

**The SPEAKER:** Order! The next member interjecting will be warned.

**The Hon. J.C. BANNON:** I just want to be able to speak in this Chamber and have some of the words recorded by *Hansard* and understood.

*The Hon. Ted Chapman interjecting:*

**The Hon. J.C. BANNON:** Come on, Ted, you know better than that. Get back in the pen with your bull.

*Members interjecting:*

**The SPEAKER:** Order! I warn the honourable member for Alexandra.

*Mr D.S. Baker interjecting:*

**The SPEAKER:** Order! I warn the honourable member for Victoria. The honourable the Premier.

**The Hon. J.C. BANNON:** How many times do we have to say in this place and elsewhere that the particular aspect on which the Opposition seeks to question us is the subject of legal action? Neither I, nor the Minister, any member of the Government, or the Opposition, has a right to prejudice the legal and financial rights of the State of South Australia. That is what they are doing. All will be revealed. We have never attempted to cover anything up. We have said that we have had problems here. We have said that IPL (New Zealand) has caused us to direct some particular energy and effort. We have had the benefit of advice from the Auditor-General and other sources that are helping us to get this right but we will not prejudice the legal and financial rights of our Government. For the Opposition to try to do it, as it has done week after week and day after day, is disgraceful.

#### OPPOSITION STAFF

**Mr RANN:** I ask the Minister of Housing and Construction: did he mislead the House on the matter of staff numbers for the Opposition in the Legislative Council? On 21 October in this House the Minister answered a question from the member for Albert Park relating to an alleged media monitoring unit that the Opposition claimed was

being operated by the Government. In the course of dispelling that claim, the Minister said:

Along with the rather outrageous press release referring to a media monitoring unit, the same hoary chestnut came up about the Government receiving more assistance and the Opposition receiving little or none. I will put the record straight: in the Legislative Council, the Opposition has four staff members; the ALP has two. No-one is complaining about that.

**The Hon. TED CHAPMAN:** On a point of order, I ask whether the honourable member for Briggs has to seek leave like the rest of us.

**The SPEAKER:** Order! The Chair's attention was momentarily distracted, quite legitimately, by the Opposition Whip. If the honourable member for Briggs did not seek leave, I am sure that he will do so at this moment. If he has already sought leave, there is no point of order.

**Mr RANN:** I did seek leave, Mr Speaker.

**The SPEAKER:** The honourable member for Briggs.

**Mr RANN:** Later that day in this place the Deputy Leader of the Opposition stated:

I want to put the record straight in relation to some of the misinformation and the complete lack of truth in the comments made by the Minister of Housing and Construction in the House today, when he sought to justify the Government's parsimony in providing staff for the Opposition and its absolute munificence in supplying its own needs.

The Minister sought to tell the House that there were four secretaries servicing the Opposition in the Upper House and two for Labor members.

**The Hon. T.H. HEMMINGS:** I thank the member for Briggs for asking that question, as this matter needs to be made very clear. Certainly it is not a case of my misleading the House. As a Minister of the Crown I am well aware of the responsibilities that I have in this Parliament, namely, to give only factual information to the Parliament in response to questions from either side of the House, although I cannot speak for the Deputy Leader.

I was in my office the night when the Liberal Party's top gun set about in a grievance debate to imply that I was misleading the House. He attacked me in a most unkind manner. It made me rethink my attitude, because I had been going around and saying to the general community that the Deputy Leader of the Opposition had mellowed. He might be the longest serving Deputy Leader in the Commonwealth of Australia and New Zealand, but he has mellowed and is quite a nice fellow to deal with. He then set out to viciously attack me. When close friends of mine read the pull from *Hansard* they wondered what I was doing down here.

I wish now to set the record straight. Apart from accusing me of misleading the House, the Deputy Leader made some rather outlandish statements that need correcting for the record. The Deputy Leader said that some Liberal members in the Upper House hire their own staff. That is news to me, and I am sure that it is news to those people in the Upper House on our side of politics. He also said that Labor members do not do this, as they do not want to spend their money hiring additional staff. I again repeat what I have said in this place: Labor MLCs are capable of doing their own research. That is why they are elected into this Parliament as Labor members. They are quite capable of utilising research facilities provided within the parliamentary research offices and Library, which is something I suggest Opposition members should do. They should make use of those facilities. The member for Light uses those facilities very often.

In some areas Labor members use retired Labor members of Parliament, who give their services to the Party free of charge, whereas in the Liberal Party retired members of Parliament ask for payment for their services. Before mem-

bers opposite leap to their feet to defend their colleagues in the other place, I place on record my admiration for some members of the Upper House, including the Hons Trevor Griffin, Di Laidlaw and Rob Lucas, who work diligently on their electoral matters and their shadow ministerial portfolios. They do not whinge or carry on; they simply work very hard. They might produce a load of rubbish, but that is beside the point: they work on their own. The one whinger in the other place spent six weeks painting his office, working through until 3 a.m.—

**Mr S.G. EVANS:** On a point of order, Mr Speaker, I believe that it is against Standing Orders to reflect on members of another place and to say that they produce rubbish—

*Members interjecting:*

**The SPEAKER:** Order! The Chair could not hear the second part of the honourable member's point of order.

**Mr S.G. EVANS:**—and to say that a section of them are a mob of whingers is a reflection on members of another place and therefore out of order.

**The SPEAKER:** The Chair cannot completely uphold the point of order as no individual member of the other place had been directly reflected on by the Minister, but it is clear that the general tenor of the Minister's last sentence was heading in that direction. If he proceeds further along that path, the Chair is of the view that the honourable Minister would be reflecting on a member of the other place.

**Mr S.G. EVANS:** Then, Mr Speaker, are you indicating that it is all right to reflect on another place so long as one does not reflect on individuals in another place?

**The SPEAKER:** Reflecting on the institution is clearly out of order. Reflecting collectively on members of that institution is out of order, and reflecting on individuals is out of order. Although I did not hear the exact words used by the honourable Minister, I was of the impression that he was heading in a direction where, with another one or two words, he would have breached the Standing Orders.

**Mr S.G. EVANS:** On a further point of order, Mr Speaker, if I follow what you are saying, that it is against Standing Orders to reflect on the other place—the institution—or individuals, but it is all right to reflect on a group in the other place, not on all of them or just an individual, that is what the Minister was doing.

**The SPEAKER:** On that basis I caution the honourable Minister to be wary of reflecting on members of another place. The honourable Minister.

**The Hon. T.H. HEMMINGS:** Thank you, Mr Speaker. It seems strange that, when I praise members opposite, they accept it but that, when I damn them, they are on their feet like little ferrets.

**Mr LEWIS:** On a point of order, Mr Speaker, the Minister by his last remark has admitted that he damned members of another place and I therefore ask you to rule that his statements about those members were out of order.

**The SPEAKER:** Order! I was of the view that the Minister was dealing with a hypothetical situation. The honourable Minister.

**The Hon. T.H. HEMMINGS:** Thank you, Mr Speaker. Bringing it down to a question of numbers, I am a simple working class lad with no tertiary education who was brought up in a homely fashion, but one thing I was taught was to count, and that is where either I or the Deputy Leader was misleading the House. So, without asking those people who serve members of Parliament, I will use their names and I am sure that they will not mind. The two secretaries serving ALP members in the Upper House are Julie Andrews and Liz Foster. Concerning those serving Opposition members in the other place, there is a position that could be filled soon by Mr R. Pearce, and the other persons are Sharon

Lock, Paula Marshall and Cynthia Richardson. So, there are two serving ALP members and four serving Opposition members of the other place.

*Members interjecting:*

**The Hon. T.H. HEMMINGS:** The Deputy Leader of the Opposition may have implied that the Hon. Anne Levy should be counted as an ALP member of the other place and her secretary included, but that secretary serves the President of the Legislative Council. Like you, Mr Speaker, the President occupies an onerous and responsible position. Indeed, you and the President occupy the two most senior parliamentary positions in the State, and the two persons who serve you, as Speaker of the House of Assembly, and the President of the Legislative Council, provide the service required for these high offices. So, my figures are correct: two for Labor and four for the Opposition.

I do not expect an apology from the Deputy Leader of the Opposition for those rather outrageous statements that he made about me but hopefully I have put to rest the furphy that is raised constantly: that this Government is providing more facilities for Labor members than for members of the Liberal Opposition. There were many references in the Deputy Leader's speech to my continually smiling. Well, I am a happy man. I belong to a Party that is successful and that makes me want to smile. Indeed, this corner is called the 'happy corner'. Therefore, I suggest to the Deputy Leader that he either put up with the facts or shut up.

#### TIMBER COMPANY

**The Hon. E.R. GOLDSWORTHY:** I address my question to the Minister of Forests, and I trust he will answer it. I hope that we do not get the stock answer whatever the question is, which is what we got the last time: no matter what the question, read the same answer!

*Members interjecting:*

**The Hon. E.R. GOLDSWORTHY:** Members opposite are getting a bit excited. Last time—

**The SPEAKER:** Order! The honourable Deputy Leader will resume his seat. The honourable member for Albert Park has a point of order.

**Mr HAMILTON:** My point of order, Sir, is that comment is out of order. It is a regular occurrence in this House that every time the Deputy Leader of the Opposition asks a question he comments before he asks it.

**The SPEAKER:** Order! The honourable Deputy Leader was clearly out of order, but the Chair's moves in the direction of restraining him were hampered by the amount of interjection that was taking place at the same time. The honourable Deputy Leader should ask his question without comment.

**The Hon. E.R. GOLDSWORTHY:** I would be delighted, Sir. Will the Minister explain why the company involved in the Government's New Zealand timber venture has been unable to report its financial results for last year, when will the results be available and what is the current estimate of the loss involved? The annual report of the South Australian Timber Corporation, tabled yesterday, reveals that International Panel and Lumber (Holdings) Ltd has not yet reported its financial result for 1986-87. This company is 70 per cent owned by the Government through the Timber Corporation and has a subsidiary operating the New Zealand timber venture which is in serious financial trouble.

**Mr Ferguson:** Who wrote this for you?

**The Hon. E.R. GOLDSWORTHY:** Who wrote the Minister's answer, might I inquire? Whatever the question—

*Members interjecting:*

**The Hon. E.R. GOLDSWORTHY:** If we ask what day is tomorrow—

**The SPEAKER:** Order! The interjection from the honourable member for Henley Beach was completely out of order, as also was the comment in response by the honourable Deputy Leader, who should not allow himself to be provoked by interjections. The honourable Deputy Leader.

**The Hon. E.R. GOLDSWORTHY:** Thank you, Sir. The Premier was provoked into a lengthy response and I must also admit that I went down that same track. While the Timber Corporation's annual report indicates that International Panel and Lumber (Holdings) will record a loss for 1986-87, taxpayers are entitled to more prompt and more detailed reporting than this, given that they already have at least \$21.5 million invested in this company. I do not think this matter is *sub judice*.

**The Hon. R.K. ABBOTT:** In the normal course notes accompanying financial statements comment upon operation and results for the year under review, that is, 1 July 1986 to 30 June 1987. The Companies Code also requires that directors comment on any significant event occurring subsequent to balance dates. Whilst the corporation is not subject to the Companies Act it follows the general standards that are required. The directors' report, on page 4 and note 7.2 on page 10, comments on the present position of International Panel and Lumber (New Zealand) Pty Ltd and IPL(H), and in particular about the Coopers and Lybrand business plan and the present legal action against Wincorp. Note 7.2 was discussed with senior Crown Law officers and was agreed as appropriate recognising that trading results and balance sheet information are the subject of the corporation's claim.

#### FESTIVAL CENTRE MANAGEMENT

**Mr DUGAN:** Is the Minister for the Arts aware of any significant maintenance or management problems at the Adelaide Festival Centre? In the most recent edition of the *Adelaide Review* Peter Ward has written an article that is strongly critical of the physical state of the Adelaide Festival Centre and, in fact, of the operations of the Public Works Standing Committee. In addition, Mr Ward implies that the management of the Festival Centre is somehow lacking adventure and is languishing.

**The Hon. J.C. BANNON:** I have read the articles referred to by the honourable member and I quite enjoy a lot of the lively interchanges that take place in the *Adelaide Review*. I must say, however, that I was very disappointed with that article which, in part, was a response to a reply to an original article from the General Manager of the trust. I would have thought that his response was factual, was not overly defensive and he is being rewarded by his reasonable and I think reasoned response with another diatribe about the state of the Festival Centre. Admittedly, I guess, I could take some issue with the fact that, while in Mr McFarlane's letter he constantly talks about the trust, its desires and the fact that it makes applications to the Government, we are all in the same boat. The problems in which the trust has found itself in relation to financial allocations are shared by the Government, and we have certainly attempted to address those problems.

I do not think that there is any reason to be overly defensive about it because I think that our Festival Centre and the activities surrounding it, which after all are more important than the physical structure of the centre, are in pretty good shape and are being strongly supported. One of

the fundamental points I would make is that we have been grappling for some time now with this monumental problem of the state of the plaza and the fact that it has had major construction faults that were not anticipated at the time of its building. In fact, that has coloured our whole attitude and the ability to apply funds to the overall maintenance of the centre.

No-one would have possibly contemplated that within 10 years or so of its being fully commissioned we would have to spend another \$10 million on the plaza problem. This has been fully identified and recognised only in the past few years. Really, that has been the major issue of maintenance with which we have been trying to grapple. Mr Ward is quite right when he points out that some of the money could easily have done a number of other major arts capital works projects, for example, the restoration of the Torrens Building in Victoria Square, or something of that kind.

The fact is that we have been stuck or caught with this problem and the need to spend money on it, and we are doing so, but we are not getting much credit for that. Of course, that has provided constraints in other areas of maintenance, but they are not being neglected, as I think the General Manager of the trust makes clear. Since 1982-83, \$1.6 million has been allocated for repair and maintenance of AFC, and that is a substantial sum of money. In 1987-88 we have allocated \$155 000 for repair work, and \$195 000 for asbestos removal, which is not work that any of us wanted to spend money on. It has become necessary because of the problems that have been identified. Asbestos has affected public and private sector buildings alike. I would love to have that \$195 000 to put in a new carpet or for further repainting, etc., but that is obviously not possible. We have to deal with the asbestos problem just as we have to deal with the plaza rectification, and those moneys are being applied.

The trust has another \$300 000 in its ongoing maintenance program to spend as well, and over the next two years we are going to see considerable amounts put into maintenance, and that is an appropriate stage of the development of the building. True, it is showing its age, but I believe that it is being well looked after. The unfortunate and somewhat snide remarks about the state of visual arts and the priority of visual arts in the Festival Centre are not warranted. In any case, it is primarily—and most energy must be directed towards facilities for—the performing arts and public participation venues in the centre.

Within that context there has been and is continuing a good visual arts program. The other point I would make is that in moving from maintenance, which was the subject of the article and Mr McFarlane's reply (so naturally he concentrated on that), Mr Ward seems to then jump into the whole question of the artistic management of the Festival Centre and its artistic product. Again, I think that that is unfair because the article was not directed to that. There is no need to be defensive about it. There has been a good, sound, and publicly well accepted program and some exciting, adventurous, and interesting things carried out.

What also should be recognised is the way in which the trust in a self-help mode has generated all sorts of activities that have got more and more people into the venue. The cabaret season, the Friday night jam sessions, and some of the other use of the areas have been quite adventurous and have introduced many people to the festival. All that is ignored as if it never happened, but it has only happened in the past two or three years.

The other thing is the trust's great success—again, one of those maligned accountants, in this case Mr Kevin Earle (a

former General Manager), had a lot to do with it—in co-producing things like *Cats*. A surplus of \$890 000 has been generated to June this year on our participation in *Cats* and we are going to be earning more as the production goes on in Melbourne. We are also involved in the production of *Les Miserables* and of *Starlight Express*. They are terrific feathers in the cap of the trust, and that brings me to my final point. We had a great time in the early 1970s when we were effectively the only venue and the only place where this sort of thing was happening. Since then, all the other States have discovered what benefits there are and what can be done and, one by one, all the other places in Australia have imitated the initiatives that were undertaken in South Australia in the 1970s.

There are brand spanking new centres in places like Melbourne and Brisbane. They are obviously generating product. If one tries to compare them with our centre, at this stage of their development they obviously look much more fresh and innovative—as well they should, they have only just opened. However, when one looks at the spaces one will find that they mirror, very closely, what we have in our centre; and if one looks at the costs one will find that they have been very much higher than the costs involved in our centre.

Nonetheless, that tends to give the impression that perhaps we are being left a bit behind. The fact is that we are not. We still stage the only appropriate and world ranking Festival of the Arts in this country. We still see Adelaide as a centre (as I have mentioned, with the entrepreneurial and other ventures) for arts product throughout this country. I think that that is what we have to concentrate on—not just developing the centre and a centre here, but developing South Australia's image as a centre for the arts by what we can export as well. All that is being done. None of that was acknowledged in these strictures against the Festival Centre Trust.

#### TIMBER COMPANY

**Mr GUNN:** My question is directed to the Minister of Forests. Following his commitment in answer to my question on 21 October to provide a report on shares held by Mr Geoffrey Sanderson in Westland Industrial Corporation Limited, will the Minister now provide that report and confirm that at the time Mr Sanderson was conducting negotiations on behalf of the South Australian Timber Corporation for a joint venture with this New Zealand company, that he held a personal shareholding of 100 000 shares in Westland Industrial Corporation and, if this is so, did it not constitute a very serious conflict of interest?

**The Hon. R.K. ABBOTT:** I think that the harder members opposite thump their chests the sillier they look in the public eye. The best way to reply to this question is to read to the House a letter that I received from Mr Geoff Sanderson.

**The Hon. E.R. Goldsworthy:** You read everything else; you might as well.

**The Hon. R.K. ABBOTT:** You are not bad at reading, either. I have watched you a lot.

**The SPEAKER:** Order! Interjections are out of order.

**The Hon. R.K. ABBOTT:** This letter, addressed to me and dated 30 October 1987, states:

Dear Mr Abbott,

I am writing this letter to defend myself against the scurrilous attack mounted against me by Mr Dale Baker and Mr Leigh Davis concerning the purchase of the New Zealand plywood company, IPL by Satco.

This attack which suggests some impropriety in my position and dealings within the Satco group of companies, has been

carried on behind the protection of parliamentary privilege, and neither gentleman has even had the courtesy to contact me personally to verify their statements.

The facts of the matter are that my shareholding and involvement in Wincorp was not only known to Satco directors but also my interests were noted in documents prepared and circulated by Satco prior to the acquisition.

I was certainly involved in most of the discussions as Chief Executive of the Australian operation; it would have been nonsensical to have been excluded. The negotiations however were controlled by Satco personnel and although my opinions and participation were sought, the team was responsible for the decision-making.

I cannot allow these innuendoes and oblique insinuations to continue as they are having a detrimental effect, not only on myself and my family but also on IPL's loyal and dedicated factory personnel who have worked so hard to build up the Australian side of the company's operations in the South-East of the State. The effect on IPL in a business sense is also quite deplorable.

These two people should, I feel, be appraised of the true situation concerning my employment by the Satco group of companies in order to stop the insinuations. First, I have never been employed as a full-time employee by any Satco entity.

I have been well-known to the Woods and Forests Department over many years both as a customer and consultant as well as a supplier of wood-working machinery. I was approached by Satco in June 1984 to work as resident Director taking charge of the O.R. Beddison operation (which was performing very badly at the time) on a three days per week basis.

My involvement with the original IPL Australia, in which I had held a 40 per cent shareholding since it was formed in 1981, was discussed at the interview, as was the fact that the company's main function was the distribution of plywood for a New Zealand company, Aorangi Forest Industries, situated at Greymouth in the South Island of New Zealand. I had also been a director of Aorangi from 1982 to early 1984.

This association eventually led to the suggestion that Beddisons and Aorangi should jointly market their products under the IPL banner, and a number of discussions between Satco Chairman, Mr Peter South, the Directors of O.R. Beddison (including myself), and Mr B. Stanley-Jackson and Mr Jack Ferguson (both Directors of Aorangi's holding company, Wincorp), culminating in preparation of a joint marketing agreement, which although never signed or registered was implemented in principle during 1984. A company called Wincorp Australia was registered in December 1984 but has never traded.

I had for some time prior been promised shares in Aorangi itself, but when Wincorp New Zealand was created around the middle of 1984 this decision was changed and I was told on 3 August 1984 that if I agreed to buy 30 000 shares at NZ\$50c each, I would be issued with a further 70 000 bonus shares. This arrangement of issuing bonus shares to company personnel who purchased some shares in Wincorp was also extended to several of the Aorangi executives. The shares were finally issued to me on 14 January 1985, and were declared by me prior to the merger discussions which commenced around the middle of 1985.

As part of the Satco IPL merger settlement, my shares in IPL Australia were purchased by IPLH for a consideration of \$10 000. Wincorp's shares in IPL Australia were also taken up at settlement. The reason put forward for buying me out was that neither Satco nor Wincorp wanted minor shareholders. For this reason Ralph Zanella was also asked to sell his Beddison shares. As far as I was concerned I had previously been promised shares in O.R. Beddison, and had lodged an amount of \$20 000 for this purpose. This money was also returned to me prior to the merger commencing.

A further part of the merger involved a contract re-engaging G. A. Sanderson Pty Ltd to provide management, technical and sales personnel, including my wife (previously an IPL(A) employee), to the joint venture. This contract replaced the existing letter of appointment with Satco.

With regard to the office situation, when I was originally engaged for Beddisons I had operated from 1 Arnold Street, Cheltenham (which was the headquarters for both G. A. Sanderson Pty Ltd and IPL Australia) for a number of years. When the merger was consummated in January 1986, I was required to move to a more suitable head office environment and the Brighton premises were accordingly leased by IPL(H).

A separate office was provided for G. A. Sanderson Pty Ltd in the same building and \$600 per month was paid to IPL(H) by G. A. Sanderson Pty Ltd until late 1986 when the technical person employed by G. A. Sanderson Pty Ltd left the company. The engineer employed by IPL Australia took over this office at the beginning of February 1987.

G. A. Sanderson Pty Ltd has continued to pay a service fee because the Commander phone system owned by G. A. Sanderson Pty Ltd was still in use in the offices until late October 1987. The fax and telex machines have also been used by G. A. Sanderson Pty Ltd and a strict record is kept of all usage and paid for separately by G. A. Sanderson Pty Ltd. The telephone account for the G. A. Sanderson Pty Ltd Commander system was of course always paid by G. A. Sanderson Pty Ltd.

During the course of G. A. Sanderson Pty Ltd's engagement by the company, various services, machinery etc. have been supplied by the company to O. R. Beddison and this has been declared and noted in the annual reports each year.

I think this covers most of the aspects that have been reported to me except for the mention of my consulting to consultants reporting to Satco and the mention of shares supposedly held by me in West Coast Investments. I have no knowledge whatsoever on those two matters.

Many of the statements made in the House are totally out of context. The minutes of Beddison's in fact reflect simply my reporting to the board of Beddison's what was occurring in negotiations where the New Zealanders were involved. The ones from 12/2/85 were headed quite clearly acquisition and referred to companies being targeted for joint takeover by Satco and Win-corp.

Yours sincerely,  
G. A. Sanderson.

That should clarify Mr Sanderson's involvement in IPL(H).

### EAST GRANGE RAILWAY STATION

**Mr FERGUSON:** Can the Minister of Transport inform the House whether he will request the State Transport Authority to survey the East Grange railway station with a view to making alterations to the platform to make it easier for elderly people to board trains at that station? I have been approached by residents of the Carisfield retirement village at 199 Frederick Road, Seaton, seeking alterations to the station. At present, a 30 centimetre gap must be negotiated by intending passengers when boarding a train. It has been put to me that people with arthritis and similar problems cannot board the train because of the design of the platform. It has also been suggested that simple alterations to the platform might overcome this difficulty.

**The Hon. G.F. KENEALLY:** I thank the honourable member for his question. This matter is of considerable importance to those people who wish to use the rail services provided by the State Transport Authority but who, because of disabilities, are unable to do so without a deal of inconvenience. This is important in attracting people to the service. I will ask the State Transport Authority to look at the matter to ascertain the degree of the problem and to see whether remedies can be found to provide for his constituents greater access to STA services. It is still the best transport authority in Australia.

### THIRD PARTY APPEALS

**The Hon. JENNIFER CASHMORE:** Will the Premier clarify the Government's attitude to the proposed abolition of third party appeals, as raised in the papers accompanying the release by the Minister for Environment and Planning of the Government's urban consolidation policy? In *Architecture* magazine, released on a regular basis, the Minister for Environment and Planning said that the Government had no intention of abolishing third party appeals. However, the statements clearly indicate that that is what the Government does intend to do and I and many other Adelaide citizens would be grateful to know what is the Government's policy.

**The Hon. J.C. BANNON:** Rather than respond off the cuff to a question like that, it would be better if I give a

considered reply after consulting with my colleague the Minister for Environment and Planning.

### HANCOCK ROAD

**Ms GAYLER:** Will the Minister of Transport advise my constituents and me when the section of Hancock Road between Golden Grove and Yatala Vale Roads will be reconstructed? In reply to a letter from me the Minister acknowledged that the road needs reconstruction. It adjoins a section of the new Golden Grove housing development of some 250 homes at Surrey Downs and has been described to me as a 'series of interconnected potholes rather than a road'. My neighbouring colleague the member for Todd nods in agreement. It also adjoins Tilley Recreation Park and a number of quarries and carries substantial residential traffic. While the Minister has said that every effort will be made to include the work in future programs, residents have asked me for a firm commitment on road construction. If that is some time off, they would like to know what interim improvements can be made.

**The Hon. G.F. KENEALLY:** I thank the honourable member for her question. I acknowledge the representations that she has been making in relation to this road. I have to respond to my colleague, as I have responded to all other members who have made representations on behalf of their electorate over recent years, and indicate that funds available to the Government to provide road improvements—whether they be for urban roads, rural arterials, national highways or local roads—are limited indeed and will certainly in the next few years remain that way. Even though the road as the honourable member describes it may not be to the standard that either the local member or her constituents would desire, nevertheless it is not on the forward program before the 1989-90 financial year. On present programming, upgrading work would not start until the next decade. However, that does not mean that there may not be an argument to do some minor maintenance or improvement work. I will ask the Highways Department to have an engineer look at it and bring down a report. However, I point out, as I do to all local members, that funds available for roads are limited indeed.

To respond to an interjection from the other side of the House before I was able to answer the question, I point out that last week I drove along the Hawker to Orroroo road, and from Eurelia to Cradock the road is in very good condition.

**Mr Lewis:** The pronunciation is 'You're a liar'.

**The Hon. G.F. KENEALLY:** That describes the honourable member, but I do not know whether it describes the town. From Cradock to Hawker the road is fairly rough, but from Cradock to Eurelia it is in good condition for an unsealed road. Last week, I was on the Kimba-Cleve and the Lock-Elliston roads, and the members for Flinders and Eyre will appreciate that. I also drove to Blinman in my own vehicle when I had a few days off. So, even on my days off I am on a study tour looking at the condition of roads around the State. With the full knowledge of road needs in South Australia, we will see what can be done if the condition of the road in question is such that some short-term remedies are required. If the long-term upgrading of the road is not on the forward program before the end of this decade, I will consider its priority and report to the honourable member.

### ISLAND SEAWAY

**The Hon. P.B. ARNOLD:** Will the Minister of Marine confirm that the cost of building the *Island Seaway* will be



at least \$5 million more than the amount for which the Government has already sold the vessel? The loss to taxpayers is mounting as a result of mismanagement of this project. Yesterday, it was established that it was costing taxpayers an extra \$8 000 a day in lease and operating subsidy funding because of the need to keep the *Troubridge* in service. The construction cost of the *Island Seaway* is also escalating. The original estimated cost, including the Commonwealth bounty, which is also payable by taxpayers, was \$15.6 million. At 30 June this year, the cost had risen by almost \$4 million and it is understood that there has been a further significant escalation because of the modifications necessary to overcome design faults. As the Government has already sold the *Island Seaway* to the National Bank for \$16 million, it seems that the completion cost will be at least \$5 million more than the sale price.

**The Hon. R.K. ABBOTT:** My advice is that the cost of the *Island Seaway* will be fairly close to the budgeted amount that I have previously reported to the House. I have also reported the additional charges to the Estimates Committee. I have these figures with me today. The March 1986 estimate, exclusive of price increases, was \$12.456 million and the rise and fall, including foreign exchange adjustments and price increases for specified cost items, was \$1.512 million, making a subtotal of \$13.968 million. The following increases in estimated cost have occurred since March 1986:

	\$m
(i) Contract variations—changes in scope . . . . .	0.711
(ii) Owner supply items . . . . .	0.050
(iii) Inclusion of full DMH project management costs in estimate . . . . .	0.170
(iv) Naval architect—Change in scope . . . . .	0.062
(v) Project consultant—increased supervision . . . . .	0.120
(vi) Minor consultancies—painting, vibration analysis, interior design . . . . .	0.047
(vii) Lloyds Classification—increased scope . . . . .	0.016
(viii) Payment to Eglo for losses arising from delay in issue of final drawings . . . . .	0.383

Those increases in estimated cost amount to \$1.559 million, which makes the total cost \$15.527 million. Obviously, because of the further delays and the two new fins that were added to the aft section of the *Island Seaway*, there will be additional costs. I do not yet know exactly what they will be, but the Department of Marine and Harbors considers that it has a strong case and those factors will be negotiated with Eglo Engineering Company.

### TRAINING PROGRAMS

**Ms LENEHAN:** Will the Minister of Employment and Further Education initiate discussions with the Federal Minister for Employment, Education and Training to ensure that people removed from the sole supporting parent's benefit or the widow's pension are offered appropriate and comprehensive training or retraining programs? I have recently been approached by a constituent who 4½ years ago assumed total care and responsibility for her grandchild following the total breakdown of the marriage of her daughter and son-in-law.

At the time my constituent was employed as a data entry operator, and as her grandchild was then 2½ years old she gave up her employment to provide total care for the child. Following a recent review by the Department for Community Services, my constituent was told that she had been taken off the sole supporting parent's benefit as she had 'no qualifying child' and would therefore have to go on unemployment benefits. Her grandson, now seven years old, has had to be returned to his father while my constituent vainly looks for work.

It is relevant to note that my constituent was given a week's notice of the changeover and has been looking for work continuously since this time. At 43 years of age my constituent is being told that she is too old and has been out of the work force too long. She informs me that one of the solutions to her particular problem is that she needs to be offered either a refresher or a retraining course in data entry operation or a similar area, plus the opportunity to prove her determination to obtain and hold a full-time position in the work force.

**The Hon. LYNN ARNOLD:** I thank the honourable member for her question. It would seem to me that certain aspects involved in the case raised by the honourable member would be worthy of follow-up discussion with the appropriate Federal department and with the Minister for Social Security with respect to the definition of a qualifying child, given the circumstances as related to this House by the honourable member, and I know that she will be doing that.

As to the specific question that she has raised—and that is programs that the Commonwealth may be providing for retraining of those who come off benefits, be it fairly or be it for the reasons as stated by the honourable member—I will certainly take that matter up with the appropriate Federal Minister, who in this instance is John Dawkins, Minister for Employment, Education and Training. I will also draw this matter to the attention of the Office of Employment and Training, which is a State department, so that they can pursue discussions at the State level to see what kinds of programs may be available under the new funding arrangements announced in the recent Federal budget.

This matter is of great importance indeed and is highlighted by the experiences related by the honourable member of a person who has left the work force for a period of only 4½ years. In that period, significant changes have taken place in the work force in the skill area in which that person has expertise, rendering that person no longer able to take up work in that area of expertise. That highlights the importance of the whole question of retraining and of ongoing training in the years ahead. It is not simply the very important issue of providing training needs for young people when they leave school and enter the work force. There is the ongoing need for retraining for people right throughout their working lives. These matters are coming more and more to the attention of the State Government and the Federal Government.

I can also indicate that the Federal Government, through another ministerial area, has indicated support for the establishment of information technology centres, and that these centres will be available to help people upskill themselves in areas of information technology. There are a number of proposals being considered by the Federal Government—at least two within South Australia. It may be that at centres like that such courses may be able to be offered but, of course, the question of income support then arises. Such support may be needed by people so that they can undertake such courses.

This is a complex issue. I appreciate the honourable member's raising it and I will certainly obtain whatever information I can and pursue the matter with the appropriate Federal Minister.

**The SPEAKER:** Call on the business of the day.

### ROAD TRAFFIC ACT AMENDMENT BILL (No. 3)

**The Hon. G.F. KENEALLY (Minister of Transport)** obtained leave and introduced a Bill for an Act to amend the Road Traffic Act 1961. Read a first time.



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

*That this Bill be now read a second time.*

I seek leave to have the second reading explanation inserted in *Hansard* without my reading it.

Leave granted.

#### Explanation of Bill

The first object of this Bill is to exempt drivers of the State Transport Authority's buses and trams from the necessity of reporting accidents in person to a member of the Police Force or a police station.

The exemption is only to allow the method of reporting of accidents to be changed and does not exempt drivers from a penalty under the Road Traffic Act for not reporting an accident which will continue to be up to a maximum of \$2 000 as stated in section 43 of that Act.

For at least 20 years accidents involving the authority's drivers have been reported to the Police Department through a report to that department by the authority.

Discussions between the Police Department, the Crown Solicitor and the authority's officers indicate that the current practice is not in conformity with section 43 (3) (d) of the Road Traffic Act.

The authority operates about 1 000 vehicles which travel approximately 49 million km per annum with approximately 82 million passenger boardings each year. To comply strictly with the current provisions of section 43 (3) (d) of the Act would create numerous operational difficulties and incur considerable costs in rostering; industrial relations; disruptions to passenger services; additional vehicles; and additional labour resources.

All alternatives were closely examined by officers of the organisations concerned and it was found that the most effective means of ensuring that accidents involving the State Transport Authority's buses and trams are properly reported to the police would be for the Road Traffic Act to be amended to formalise current practice.

Secondly, the Bill provides for a member of the Police Force or an inspector to enter premises where hire cars are kept and to inspect those cars for their roadworthiness.

There are a number of firms in South Australia which hire out motor vehicles or trailers to the public and unfortunately some of these businesses do not maintain their vehicles in a satisfactory state of repair. As a result, hirers can sometimes suffer the consequences of driving vehicles which contain mechanical defects. Such defects would often not be detectable during a reasonable preliminary inspection by the hirer.

Once driven on roads, police can stop and examine these vehicles and if necessary defect them, but they do not have the power to enter premises to inspect hire vehicles.

Legislation already exists for members of the Police Force to enter premises where vehicles are exhibited or kept for sale and an expansion of this section to include premises where vehicles are available for hire seems appropriate.

This Bill also provides for more flexibility for the driving of a defected vehicle before and after repair.

Some 50 000 vehicles are defected by the Police Force each year and when a vehicle is defected it can only be driven to a place of repair and then to a place of inspection regardless of the seriousness of the defect. The place of inspection is determined by the defecting police officer at a police station for a minor defect or the Vehicle Engineering Branch of the Road Safety Division for a major defect.

This Bill provides for the defecting officer to exercise some discretion. This can be used for example to provide time for a commercial vehicle to complete a journey or to

allow a private car to be driven for up to three days before replacement of a faulty light. There would still be occasions when this discretion would not be used and a dangerous vehicle would not be allowed to move at all. This type of discretion is used in the defect systems operated in New South Wales and Victoria.

Significant problems do occur at times with regard to clearance of some major defects. These include waiting periods for the owner during which time he may not use the repaired vehicle as in the metropolitan area it takes usually two to three days to obtain a booking although in cases of hardship the period can occasionally be reduced. In country areas there can be delays of up to seven working days although three to five days is typical in carrying out an inspection. Allowing a brief period of grace between the time when defects have been repaired and the defect notice is formally cleared will result in a system which is more convenient for the vehicle owner and more efficient and less costly to the Government. It is not considered that allowing vehicles that purportedly have been properly repaired to operate for a brief period before formal inspection and clearance would cause any significant safety problems.

Clause 1 is formal.

Clause 2 provides for commencement by proclamation.

Clause 3 provides State Transport Authority bus and tram drivers with an alternative method of reporting accidents in accordance with special arrangements made between the Authority and the Police Commissioner or, if no such arrangement exists, in accordance with stipulations (if any) of the Minister. This provision does not prevent a driver from reporting the accident in person if he or she so chooses.

Clause 4 provides, first, that a member of the Police Force or an inspector may enter premises where hire cars are kept and may inspect those cars for their roadworthiness. Secondly, it is provided that defect notices may provide a little more flexibility for the driving of the vehicle both before and after repair. The person issuing the notice is given a discretion to permit a car to be driven for up to three days before it must be repaired. After repair, the owner can seek permission from a member of the Police Force or an inspector to drive the car for a period up to 14 days before it must be produced for examination.

**Mr INGERSON** secured the adjournment of the debate.

#### ROAD TRAFFIC ACT AMENDMENT BILL (No. 2)

Consideration in Committee of the Legislative Council's amendment:

Page 1, lines 22 to 30 and page 2, lines 1 to 46 (clause 3)—  
Leave out all words after the word 'is' and insert in lieu thereof the words 'amended by striking out subsection (2) and substituting the following subsections:

- (2) A person of whom a request is made under subsection (1) must forthwith comply with that request.  
Penalty: \$5 000.
- (3) Where a court convicts a person of an offence against subsection (2), the court may order that the person be disqualified from holding or obtaining a driver's licence for a period not exceeding three months.
- (4) If an order for disqualification is made under subsection (3), the person's driver's licence is cancelled as at the commencement of the period of disqualification.

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

That the Legislative Council's amendment be disagreed to.

I have moved disagreement to the Legislative Council's amendment because I believe that what the Legislative Council has done in its amendment has not only frustrated the intent of the Government but also it has detracted from

the existing legislation and from amendments to that legislation. I am sure that that was not the intention behind the amendment when it was moved. I relate to the Committee some of the concerns that have been given to me by the Deputy Commissioner of Police highlighting his concern about the actions taken by the Opposition in opposing the provision of ample and appropriate powers to the authorities to be able to deal with an ever increasing problem, not only in a legal sense but also in terms of the damage resulting to our roads and the threat to road safety from the behaviour by an admittedly small but nevertheless significant minority of drivers and owners of heavy trucks in South Australia.

It has been pointed out to me that allowing the existing section 152 (1) provision to remain will not overcome the technicality alluded to in my speech when I introduced the measure. Where a police officer or an inspector requests the driver of a vehicle to proceed to a weighbridge to determine the mass of the vehicle, it has been held in a case before a magistrate that, as there was no weighbridge at the site where the driver was directed to proceed (portable weighing instruments carried by the inspector were to be used), the inspector's request was not valid because there was not, at the time of the request, a weighing instrument at the site.

That is a very important matter for the Committee to consider. Clearly subsection (1), clause 3, page 1, lines 24 to 33 and page 2, lines 1 to 3, must be retained. It is fair to say that the Opposition would not be in disagreement to that. Clause 3, page 2, lines 5 to 9, deals with the direction being given where the vehicle is not on a road. I point out to the Committee the difficulties that the authorities had where a vehicle that was subject to police interest or other interested authority moved off the road onto private property. The difficulties were caused to the authorities when trying to determine the weight or volume of the vehicle's load.

If such a provision is not contained in the Road Traffic Act, a direction to proceed to a weighbridge or other place where portable scales are used cannot be given where the driver proceeds onto private property, for example, through a fence into a paddock. Drivers of overloaded vehicles are becoming increasingly aware of this weakness in the Act. This Bill stipulates that the police officer or inspector could not give a direction off road unless there were reasonable grounds to believe that the vehicle had been driven on a road in contravention to the mass limits, that is, the vehicle had been observed driving on a road.

Removing the powers of police to seize vehicles and drive them to a weighbridge and replace it with a substantial fine, as is intended by this amendment, and also possibly licence suspension, will only work as a deterrent if that penalty is likely to be as substantial as the penalty assessed on the overload. Unfortunately if the vehicle is not weighed—under the Opposition's amendment it cannot or will not be weighed—the seriousness of the offence cannot be determined. The court will not know if it is two tonnes or 20 tonnes overloaded. It really makes the whole purpose of the legislation a laughing stock. If the authorities cannot weigh and if there is no way to determine whether the vehicle is two tonnes or 20 tonnes overweight, it certainly restricts the ability of the authorities.

Section 156 of the Act enables a police officer or inspector to direct the driver to reduce the load on a vehicle to the legal limit where it has been ascertained by weighing, that the vehicle was overloaded. If the mass of the vehicle is not determined, this direction cannot be made. A potentially dangerous vehicle can continue to drive on many of our

State highways. We would prefer not to have highly overweight vehicles on them, but we would be particularly concerned about some, for example, the Mount Barker Road.

*Mr S.G. Evans interjecting:*

**The Hon. G.F. KENEALLY:** I point out to the honourable member, and anyone else who wants to query that, that there has been no road accident involving the STA where injury affected anyone, which cannot be said for other types of vehicles.

**The CHAIRMAN:** Order! I call the member for Davenport to order.

**The Hon. G.F. KENEALLY:** The number of drivers who refused to weigh in 1986 was 18. For the nine months to the end of September 1987 the number was up to 31. It is anticipated that refusals to weigh will escalate. Drivers who become aware that the penalty to disobey is potentially less than the overload fine have a financial incentive to refuse to weigh.

The maximum penalty for refusing to weigh or stop is \$1 000, and the average penalty imposed by the courts is in the order of \$200-\$300. Penalties for overloading on the other hand can amount to many thousands of dollars. For example, the penalty for an overload of 20 tonnes is minimum \$3 835, maximum \$7 800. During the year ended 30 June 1986, 1 402 overloads exceeding two tonnes were reported. Of these 119 exceeded nine tonnes, and 43 exceeded 20 tonnes. The penalty for an overload of two tonnes is minimum \$235, maximum \$600.

I refer these figures to the Committee so that members are aware why many drivers refuse to stop and weigh: it is much cheaper for them to run the risk of being penalised for refusing to do so. As the Opposition suggests that the penalty should be increased to \$5 000, there is still no certainty that the courts will impose significantly higher penalties. Although the Crown can appeal, the grounds for appeal are weak indeed if the extent of the overload is not known. It is difficult for the Crown to sustain a substantial appeal if it does not know what the degree of the overload is, and it does not know what the overload is because it does not have the power to require the vehicle to be weighed. This ties the hands of the authorities.

Although there is an amending proposal from another place for the court to disqualify a person from holding or obtaining a driver's licence in South Australia for up to three months, appeals against such disqualification on the grounds of undue hardship are likely. In any event, regardless of licence cancellation, some drivers are known to hold more than one licence, that is, one for South Australia, one for Western Australia, one for New South Wales, and so on. If we take their South Australian licence away from them, it will have no effect at all. They will drive on their interstate licence. Alternatively, a false name and address is sometimes given. It is doubtful whether the threat of licence disqualification will be a deterrent when there are ways open (whether by appeal or otherwise) to continue to drive.

I am referring to a direct briefing from an Assistant Commissioner of Police, and trying to explain to Parliament why the existing laws are not working and why it is unlikely that just increasing the penalty of the existing law will not necessarily work. Police officers and inspectors are concerned at the increase in this type of offence which, on average, occurs about once a week. I was told of two incidents that occurred in 1985 near Poochera on the West Coast. Both vehicles were conventional semitrailers with prime movers. Members would know that that means a front axle, two drive axles, and a tri-axle at the rear. The first vehicle was carrying steel and batteries, and the second

vehicle was carrying steel plate and scaffold. The total mass of the first vehicle was 77.55 tonnes, which was an excess mass of 33.65 tonnes. The second vehicle's total mass was 75.35 tonnes, which was an excess mass of 33.45 tonnes. Both drivers were found guilty and fined \$10 000 each.

These drivers have indicated—and I am not sure whether they have stated, but they have certainly indicated—that in future they will refuse to be weighed. In fact, one driver has been reported for refusing to weigh on two occasions. Without power to seize, vehicles such as these will continue to travel on the State's roads with no incentive to comply with legal mass limits.

The police are not seeking extra powers for the sake of having those powers. What we are dealing with here is a problem that is incapable of being resolved merely by increasing the existing penalty. What we need to be able to do is to require vehicles to stop and to be weighed, and unless we are able to do that then the degree of the offence can never be determined. Unless one knows the degree of the offence one cannot impose an appropriate penalty. While drivers continue to drive and refuse to weigh, they know that they can only be penalised a portion of the maximum penalty for that offence and know that it is cheaper for them to refuse to weigh than for them to stop and be weighed and to pay the appropriate penalty.

As the Minister in charge of road safety I have a real concern about these very heavily weighted trucks driving on our roads. Everyone knows that the existing speed limit for a heavy truck is 90 km/h. All of us who spend a lot of time on South Australian roads know that it is a strange occurrence to find a driver of a heavily laden vehicle travelling at 90 km/h—the maximum speed that is allowed. We know that drivers out on the roads travel in excess of 120 km/h to 130 km/h, and at even greater speeds. That is no secret to us. If one combines that with 20 or 30 tonne overloads, even having regard to the excellent braking facilities that modern vehicles have, it has to be understood that that puts the braking capacity of the vehicles under enormous stress—greater stress than was intended and certainly greater stress than the Australian design rules would require.

There we have a potentially dangerous situation on the roads, yet the Opposition's amendment from another place will not allow the authorities adequately to deal with that problem. That is the problem that the police have. The problem that the inspectors of the highways have is in exercising—and I wish to reinforce the word 'exercising'—the responsibilities and laws provided to them by members of this Parliament. Highways inspectors have a concern about overloading because of road and bridge deterioration, and so on. However, they, like the police, have no power to control what is becoming an increasing problem because Parliament, under this amendment, is refusing to give them power to do so.

I know that both members opposite and members on this side of the House acknowledge that there is a problem, and want to do something about it. I am just putting to the Committee that with the best will in the world the amendment from another place will not satisfactorily address the problem. Whether we like it or not in this particular circumstance, as we have had to decide in other circumstances, there is a very strong argument that these powers should be given to the authority to ensure that these offences are minimised. I believe that the problems that the Opposition has with entry, and so on, would happen on few occasions. Once the industry knew that the Government, the police, and the inspectors understood the seriousness of the problem and were going to do something about it, I believe that any responsible driver would then be in total control of

their vehicle and would drive to where they are instructed to go so that their vehicle could be weighed.

Without in any way suggesting that the Opposition is not concerned and has not made some efforts to try to come up with a remedy for this problem, I have to say, in all seriousness, that it has not been able to achieve that. In any event, if this amendment was to be carried by this place and another place, the legislation would be a whole lot worse than it is now, having regard to no other amendments (and I do not think that anyone wants that). I suggest that the Committee reject the amendment from the Legislative Council so that this matter can go back to that place and so that it can reconsider its decision in light of the information that has been provided here and will be provided to the other place through the briefing note from the Deputy Commissioner.

**Mr INGERSON:** We do not accept the Minister's comments. We believe—as stated previously in relation to this matter and in discussions in this Parliament when the legislation was before us—that we put forward the clear argument that, by increasing the penalty—and the penalty has been increased from \$1 000 to \$2 000—and with the application of the extra penalty of losing one's licence, there would be a significant deterrent effect. As a consequence, we believe that that will enable the police and the inspectors to administer, with more teeth, the law as it is today.

The Minister—and I thank him for this—said that we strongly support the need to ensure that people who exceed weight limits are adequately dealt with. There is no question in the minds of members on either side about where we stand on that. However, we do not believe that there is any necessity to increase the powers of the police, because we say that the interim method will do. The Minister said that there was a problem with people having several licences. My reply is simple: that if an individual keeps breaking the law there will come a time when he will run out of licences, whether those licences are held in South Australia, New South Wales, or Victoria. I think that that matter is a red herring.

In relation to excessive speed and weight, there is no question that we recognise that there is a need to act in both areas. This Bill purely and simply looks at weight. However, the Minister mentioned excessive speed. If there is a problem with excessive speed, perhaps it is about time that the Government put more patrols on the roads so that something could be done about it. It seems to me that this problem, while not falling under this Bill, is a problem that the Government, if it was prepared to allocate adequate patrols, could control. We support the amendment that has come from the other place, and ask the Government to consider them in that light.

**Mr GUNN:** I support the amendment. The reasons for it are due to the manner in which the present legislation is being administered. Those people with responsibility for administering these various Acts of Parliament have acted in such a pedantic and aggressive fashion that they have brought about this attitude. Today I have had another complaint. Yesterday I had a visit from a group of responsible people who are trying to make a living carting large buildings around the State. They have asked me to approach the Minister so that they could wait on him and give him a list of very adequate complaints which are dealt with in the most efficient and effective manner interstate, and yet the Minister wonders why we are not prepared to sanction these draconian powers to a group of administrators who have made life impossible.

The unfortunate thing is the attitude of those people administering the permits and all those other things: 'You

will do as we say'. What arrogance! I was enraged by what I was told yesterday: they will not even accept the credit of another Government department. We will provide the Minister with a list of these things. That is why some of us are so determined. I know that people are angry. The Government's financial backer, Mr Otte, sent me a rocket, but I will give him chapter and verse before I am finished in this place.

*An honourable member interjecting:*

**Mr GUNN:** Mr Otte financed the anti-privatisation election strategy last time, and I heard what Mr Schacht said in the background at the declaration of the Adelaide poll. Some of us are fully aware of these things, and there is no way that we will sit idly by and see such provisions enacted into legislation when average law-abiding people—I am not talking about the fly-by-nighters and the crooks; I have no counsel for those people—try to go about their lawful business to help the economy of this State. How many members in this place are allowed to drive heavy vehicles? I wrote today to the Minister in charge of police, seeking from him details of the number of officers who are qualified to shift heavy vehicles. I want that recorded in *Hansard*. I will seek similar information from the Minister of Transport. I have also made a number of other suggestions in correspondence.

There is no way that we will give in. Before we have finished, we will bring commonsense and sanity to this operation. Why is it that faxed copies are not accepted in this State? They have them in Victoria, New South Wales most probably, and Queensland. Why will the bureaucracy in South Australia not fax back a permit? It is an accepted means of communication. We can fax money around the world. Why is the Highways Department in South Australia so naive that it will not do it? It is absolute nonsense! People with low loaders wanting to shift Government vehicles wonder why we stand in this Parliament and raise these matters. We would be abrogating our responsibilities if we did not strongly criticise these proposals. I want other assurances from the Minister as to how these powers will be exercised.

What does a member of Parliament say when he gets a telephone call at home on a Sunday night and is informed that the highway patrol has put vehicles off the road for the most ludicrous things, such as one tail light? A farmer has to drive down a narrow road with overhanging trees. He is not allowed to prune back the trees, and a branch knocks out the top indicator light—and that vehicle has been put off the road. The member for Flinders would know about this, and the member for Murray-Mallee would have similar examples. Why, when they come into the yard, after a vehicle has been over the weighbridge, will they not let the vehicle unload on the side because they claim that the tyres are unsatisfactory?

We have every right to raise these issues. People can smile at what I have to say, but we will win. If the officers who advise the Minister want to give some good advice, they should include proposals to introduce volume loading and all of those sensible things. Does the Minister know that a previous officer in the Highways Department told a person who came to me yesterday to install a fax machine so that they could fax through the information? But now there is a new officer and he will not accept it. That sort of nonsense is going on in this State. We want some answers.

It is about time that the Public Accounts Committee had a look at some of these things, if nobody else will. It is absolutely outrageous! That is why we are not prepared to give one inch on these issues. The Minister knows me well enough. I really try to be reasonable, except when I see what is going on in this area. Why is it that suddenly these

people come sneaking around the country? The Public Service Association said that I victimised inspectors. Well, I make no apology, because my constituents have been victimised.

If the management of the Highways Department is directing them in that fashion, it is time that the Minister took them in hand and told them to act like sensible normal Australians and use a bit of commonsense. I hope that the people in the Highways Department listen to what I have to say, because if this law unfortunately comes into operation I guarantee that on every occasion that it is misused all concerned will be named in this House. It is a terrible state of affairs when we get to that, but the only way to get justice for people in isolated communities is for members of Parliament to take up these matters. The legal system is such that unless a man is very wealthy, he cannot afford to go to court and defend himself.

*The Hon. G.F. Keneally interjecting:*

**Mr GUNN:** There are two laws, I quite agree. The average person who is convicted of a minor offence—

*Mr S.G. Evans interjecting:*

**Mr GUNN:** That is right. The summons forms are so designed as to discourage people from standing up for their rights. It is really an outrage, and I do not intend to let these things go by. Members get things put over them but, the longer I stay in this House, the more concerned I am about the power of the bureaucracy and about the misuse of power and how ordinary citizens going about their business are having their rights trodden on. I will support this and hope that it goes to a conference, because we will sort out some of these people and some of these things. It does not give me any pleasure. The Highways Department has an important role to play. I know that interstate trucks travel on our roads at 130 km/h or 140 km/h. No-one spends more time on the road than I do. I have had them pass me, and I am not noted as a dawdler.

*Mr S.G. Evans interjecting:*

**Mr GUNN:** I thought I was doing pretty well. I know the problems that the police and the Highways Department may be having, but our concerns have been brought about by past actions. I want from the Minister an assurance and an undertaking that these powers will not be misused and officers will not enter into people's properties, because I can just imagine what will take place.

I will give another example of how these people take the law into their own hands. In 1979, as part of the Tonkin Government's election program, it was stated that we would give more tolerances for farm vehicles. The then Minister of Transport (Hon. Michael Wilson) made a statement, and I got a phone call about 10.30 Sunday night from some of the most irate people I have had to deal with. I was told that the inspectors had said that the old law would stand, and they would start weighing and booking people. As this was in the days of the manual telephone exchange, I had to go to the local telephone exchange and get the local postmaster to open up so that I could get through to Minister Wilson. The conversation was pretty blunt—

**Mr S.G. Evans:** It would have been a good one.

**Mr GUNN:** It was a good one, all right. He asked whether I had a copy of the press statement. When I said, 'Yes,' he asked if I would put it on the notice board. I drove 120 miles to the Ceduna weighbridge, had the statement photocopied, and stuck it up on the weighbridge noticeboard. Two characters who were there got the shock of their lives. They asked, 'What is the meaning of this?' I told them to ring Minister Wilson. I understand that, by that time, he had been in touch with Mr Johnke and had counselled him—and that was one occasion when he needed some

counselling, because he had a peculiar attitude to certain aspects of administration.

I make no apology for what I have had to say today. I will not sit by idly and see these things take place. I know that people will be annoyed with me, but a member of Parliament has a responsibility to do his duty as he sees it. The last two days have brought more complaints. Yesterday it was the drivers of low-loaders. When one Government department will not accept the credit of the Department of Housing and Construction, it is a nonsense. I will be interested in the Minister's response and I hope that he can give an assurance that, during this harvest, commonsense will prevail and the highway patrols and the police will use some sense.

**The Hon. G.F. KENEALLY:** I will respond immediately to some of the matters raised again by the member for Eyre, although I thought that some of them were dealt with appropriately when the matter was before the House previously. I will clarify first the matter concerning entering private property. I spelt out today that an inspector or police officer needs very good reason to believe that an overloaded vehicle has been on a road before he is able to enter private property to weigh that vehicle. To be in possession of that knowledge, an inspector would have to see the vehicle travelling on the road. The honourable member should be reassured by that. Inspectors and police officers will not just indiscriminately go on to people's property without having seen the vehicle travelling on the road. It sometimes happens that very astute, quick-witted drivers, knowing that their vehicles are likely to be detected or pulled over by the police pull off into private property. Currently, the police and inspectors have no power to deal with that problem.

The honourable member pointed out that some of his constituents had been pulled over with a fully laden vehicle that has a broken rear light, and the vehicle has been defected. If the honourable member looks at the legislation that I introduced today (I realise that he probably has not had the opportunity to do so, although his colleague the shadow Minister may have), he will find that that problem will be dealt with. If it is not a serious matter, that Bill provides a time of grace between the time of an officer defecting a vehicle and the driver having to have the defect attended to. The authorising officer can give a time to have the defect lifted. That takes into account the problem experienced by commercial operators and by people living in the country who do not have ready access to a service station or some other agency to have the repairs done and to a vehicle inspection centre or police station to have the defect lifted. That might go some way to deal with the problems that the honourable member feels his constituents have.

When the honourable member previously expressed his views about highways inspectors, I pointed out that they are given a job under the legislation of the Parliament. They are required by the Government, through the Highways Department, to exercise the powers vested in them as a result of our decisions. Rarely have I run into anybody who can smile about being pulled over by a police officer, an inspector or some other authority. They are nearly always upset and relate the circumstance from their own perspective; that is, they have a biased attitude to what occurred. The honourable member has expressed his concerns before, but I have had referred to me a number of complaints which I have investigated. On most occasions it is shown that once the matter has been tested, the complaints are not valid. I will not defend in any circumstance any public servant who breaches or abuses the authority or responsibility vested in him. I do not believe that anyone could

defend or justify such actions, but there is another side to the story put by the member for Eyre. He would lead us to believe that all inspectors and police officers, particularly inspectors—

*Mr Gunn interjecting:*

**The Hon. G.F. KENEALLY:** I do not recall his saying that this might apply to a few inspectors. The honourable member's comments canvass all inspectors, so they all feel offended by what he says. I will read from a letter that has been written to me by an inspector, because it is well for the Committee and the honourable member to listen to it. This gentleman, whose name I will not mention for obvious reasons, said:

I am currently employed by the Highways Department as a traffic inspector. The reason that I feel the need to write to you is due to Mr Gunn's comments in the *News* of 20 October 1987. I feel greatly offended at his comments, so does every other member of our section. It is about time that he was told the truth about the transport industry. Ninety-nine per cent of these people are hard working business people. The other 1 per cent are greedy, selfish and criminal in the way they carry out their work.

We have a magnificent road system in this State and I take pride in my job and revel in responsibility that has been placed on myself and my fellow inspectors. I am never rude or arrogant in my duties and sympathise with small-time operators who get reported for what quite often is a genuine mistake. How can a person mistakenly put an extra 10 to 20, even 30, tonnes extra, over and above the legal limit? We are in the front line, Sir, and we know what goes on. I have waited hours upon hours for operators to move only to have them refuse to weigh. Many of these people are well known 'overloaders' and they are laughing up their sleeves at this State's road laws. If you were being paid \$190 to \$200 per tonne and had an excess of 15 tonnes would you weigh? You would probably get a \$200 or \$300 fine and still make a profit if you refused.

I work any hour of the night or day, any day of the week, spend days away from my wife, my four children, to enforce the laws of this State, laws that were decreed by the Parliament that this man is a member of. He hides behind his privilege and makes unfounded statements about a group of people he knows little about. It is about time he was told to put up or shut up . . .

I have been abused, threatened with violence, called names that I would not repeat, had mysterious phone calls, had my wife harassed, and there is not a thing I can do in reply. They hold all the aces, Sir. I do not think even you truly understand what we go through but we keep going. We lack power and authority, but we still keep trying, and for all the hard work we put in we get abused in Parliament . . .

It is terribly frustrating work, Sir, but one that I consider well worth doing and to do it we need more than hand-held stop signs to enforce the law. The police that I often speak to when on the road are amazed that we can carry out our work with so little authority, so are we. Compare the authority that we have with the DMR or RTA inspectors in the east. It's a joke, a sad joke at that, and only Parliament can change that and they have to be convinced. We are not trying to establish a second police force, just give us the tools to do our job.

That is a true reflection of the people who are employed by the State Government to do a job and to enforce the law that we pass in this place. Quite clearly they are not going to be loved by the industry or anybody they pull over on the side of the road. That is the nature of the human being. They feel that they ought to have the support of Parliament, which makes the laws under which they operate.

I have also received a letter from Jim Otte, upon whom the honourable member for Eyre has reflected today. I will read into *Hansard* the views of the General Secretary of the Public Service Association because he makes the point that inspectors are not in a position to defend themselves and that this is 'Cowards Castle': we can say what we like about public servants, but they are not in a position to defend themselves, so, as General Secretary of their association, Mr Otte feels compelled to do so. His letter states:

We have written separately to Mr Gunn complaining at the intemperance of his remarks which seem to have been made under the protection of parliamentary privilege. Since it is possible that Mr Gunn may not be persuaded to withdraw the remarks

we complain of, we seek your recognition of the outrage this report has caused amongst our members.

It will readily be appreciated that the traffic inspectors, being employed under the Government Management and Employment Act, are prohibited from defending themselves against attack of this nature, and have to rely upon their association to come to their defence. There have been occasions when the association has had to deal with issues of this nature, but Mr Gunn's attack surpasses in downright spitefulness and viciousness anything of this sort of experience. It is serious enough that Mr Gunn's abusive tirade was delivered within the Parliament and therefore must remain imprinted in *Hansard*, quite apart from the consciousness of those who were present during such an extraordinary performance. But the fact that the *News* reported some of what Mr Gunn said in its own columns gives the affair another dimension. We ask you therefore to note the following matters which serve to make nonsense of Mr Gunn's indignation.

1. The National Association of Australian State Road Authorities has estimated the annual damage caused to the nation's roads from overloading as worth \$400 000 000.

2. Transport operators who exceed statutory limits cause danger to other road users, quite apart from the destruction they cause to roads, bridges, etc.

3. Traffic inspectors are employed under the direction of the Commissioner of Highways expressly to carry out defined duties which are designed to enforce statutory limits on the loads permitted to be carried by the nation's roads. Criticism of those statutes should be directed at the Parliament which enacted the statutes and not at the individuals whose duty it is to carry them out.

4. The efforts of traffic inspectors result regularly in annual court awards against offenders of those statutes of almost a million dollars annually (\$964 000 for the year to 30 June 1987).

5. Such awards are made by courts, not by traffic inspectors; offenders have every right to defend themselves in the courts.

6. Words like 'leeches', 'wasting taxpayers' money', 'bloody minded', 'aggressive', 'unreasonable', 'outrageous behaviour', 'absolute disgrace' reported by the *News* as Mr Gunn's words are found by this association to be thoroughly outrageous.

7. If Mr Gunn has been accurately reported we have to say that Mr Gunn's behaviour in the Parliament is what is actually outrageous.

8. It would seem from the *News* report that Mr Gunn has used the Parliament to promote ill feeling, not only towards the statutory fabric but more importantly towards individuals who are conscientiously doing their duty.

We feel it would be appropriate in these circumstances for the Parliament to be apprised of just how outrageous is the performance of Mr Gunn.

The member for Eyre has clearly indicated to the House that it is his intention in future not only to bring these matters to the attention of the Parliament but also to name the people involved. I counsel the honourable member because, frankly, I have always had a deal of respect for him. He understands that and I acknowledge that he is an honest and forthright fellow. However, I would counsel him to understand that there are two sides to every story. He listens to the complaints of those aggrieved people who come to him, having been detected by some inspector for overloading, having a defective vehicle or speeding, etc. I recognise that he fights for those constituents. They may consider it a minor breach, but it may not be the case in the eyes of the inspector.

Therefore, attempts should be made to get the other side of the story. The honourable member reflects the view of an aggrieved constituent in this case. I reflect the views of aggrieved inspectors. The honourable member acknowledges that some people abuse the roads and, quite rightly, should be pulled over to the side by inspectors.

*Mr Gunn interjecting:*

**The Hon. G.F. KENEALLY:** The honourable member, by way of interjection, says that he was reflecting not on all inspectors but on some. I am happy to look at cases where he has legitimate complaint. I put strongly on the record that it is my view that the people who work for the Highways Department are charged with a very difficult job indeed and do it in a way that makes them a credit to the organisation to which they belong and also a credit in the

way they carry out the wishes of the Parliament and the Government. If there are examples where people abuse the system, I will take up the matter. Inspectors would want such abuses to be dealt with, as would the union. However, I totally reject this reflection on all the people concerned because of some concerns the honourable member has. I repeat that, whenever a complaint is brought to me, I have it investigated and have no reason to believe that such investigations are not thorough or fair. When I was the Minister in charge of police matters the same situation applied.

I realise the difficulty in fighting the bureaucracy: I understand that; but the fact is that, unless much clearer evidence is given to me (some of the complaints I have had previously have proven to be unfounded), I will defend as I should, and as is quite proper for me to do, the performance of people who see me as their Minister and spokesperson in this place and for whom I have a great deal of respect in the way that they perform a very difficult task.

**Mr S.G. EVANS:** I support the amendment of the other place because we are dealing with a very trivial matter. I say that quite seriously in light of legislation we passed recently in this place with the sort of penalties the Government wishes to apply. This is obviously a trivial offence of failing to stop at the request of an inspector. Under the Road Traffic Act we find that, if a person fails to stop after being involved in an accident, the maximum penalty they receive is \$300, unless they kill or severely injure a person, in which case they receive a fine of \$500 or six months gaol. That puts this offence in a more serious category as the fine is \$1 000. It is more serious than failing to stop after an accident—in fact, three times more serious. However, if someone walks into the bush with a lover and picks a native flower that happens to be an endangered species, we passed a law in this place yesterday—

**The CHAIRMAN:** Order! Notwithstanding that the honourable member is drawing a comparison, he has been in this place long enough to know that he ought not to refer to a previous debate in this place.

**Mr S.G. EVANS:** I accept that, Sir. The Government has promoted the view that a person who walks in the bush with a loved one and happens to pick an endangered species of flower or shrub is liable to a penalty of \$10 000 or two years gaol. I do not think most people see that as a very serious offence, but failing to stop a semi-trailer, according to the Government's intention, will receive a fine of only \$1 000 and, under the maximum penalty, loss of licence. There is no provision for imprisonment, and the penalty is only one tenth of that to which I have just referred, involving a fine of \$10 000 and two years gaol. They are the sorts of laws we are passing and promoting in the community.

**Ms Gayler:** They are protected species.

**Mr S.G. EVANS:** I thought that human beings also were protected species. I may be wrong, but the member for Newland tends to suggest that human beings are not protected species. Under the Road Traffic Act, if you skittle and kill somebody and fail to stop, the maximum fine is a third—

**Ms Gayler:** They are not just any old flower.

**Mr S.G. EVANS:** The honourable member gets excited, but I draw a comparison regarding the stupidity of some of the promotions of the present Government. The Minister said that the inspectors have no way of protecting themselves. I accept that. However, many present-day drivers cannot protect themselves because the law is beyond the means of the middle class of our society. The law is for the poor who can get legal aid and it is for the rich, but it is not for the middle income earners. They simply cannot



afford to use the legal system, so do not let us get carried away with the idea that it is only the inspectors who cannot protect themselves. How many times have overloaded vehicles been involved in an accident, especially on the open road? Surely it is seldom.

**The Hon. G.F. Keneally:** They may be the cause.

**Mr S.G. EVANS:** In saying that, the Minister is hanging his hat on an hypothesis that cannot be proved. The Minister says that a semi-trailer driver going faster than the prescribed speed limit is committing a serious offence, but what about the private vehicle? More police should be employed on the roads. Give them back their motor cycles and they will slow down the traffic because the police will be seen on our roads. I realise that truck drivers use their CB radios to warn others about the presence of police, but that is the human element. On the one hand, the Government brags about how it keeps down costs by having an efficient road transport system but, if each and every driver who could not get to a weighbridge when loading had to load in a way that would ensure that his load was below the limit, he would be underloading in comparison with the payload and this would cause costs to rise. Likewise, if semi-trailer drivers drive within the speed limits, the cost of delivery will be higher.

We should not be hypocrites and say on the one hand that we have an efficient road transport system that keeps costs down while on the other hand we condemn the drivers. I realise that there is a counter argument that the overloaded vehicle damages our roads, but that is because we did not build roads of a sufficiently high standard in the first place. When Mr Virgo was Minister, we enacted legislation that required more powerful vehicles to carry the same weight. In Europe, semi-trailers are allowed to carry greater weights because better roads have been built, but here, with roads that are not as good as those, we have encouraged the operators to buy huge vehicles with tremendous power, speed and braking qualities.

When Mr Virgo was Minister, semi-trailers, both laden and unladen, were tested as to their braking power, and it was found that their braking power was better than that of the average light commercial vehicle, so there is no risk there. The Upper House has increased the fine to \$5 000, but that is only half the sum suggested by another Minister as the fine for picking a wildflower, and no prison sentence attaches in this case. For these reasons I support the amendment from another place.

If there are not enough police on the roads, there should be a sufficient number to use the powers that they possess at present. If they persevere with their task they will catch up with any semi-trailer drivers transgressing the law and also catch many motorists who are driving above the prescribed speed limit. I hope that the Minister will give the amendment a try before ripping vehicles off people on private property.

**Mr GUNN:** One of the things that I have learned since becoming a member of Parliament is that, unfortunately, being reasonable does not often achieve the aim of getting justice for people who have been mistreated. If a person comes to a member with a problem, the member checks out the information and writes a letter to the Minister setting out the complaint. Unfortunately, however, the people who prepare the answer for the Minister are usually the same people who have been dealing with the constituent previously. Therefore, that poses an immediate problem.

We have an Ombudsman who does an excellent job, but it is often beyond his capacity to see that justice is done. As an individual, I consider myself to be not vindictive or aggressive, and the longer I have been in public life the

more concerned I have become for the rights of the underprivileged and the less fortunate in our community—those people who often do not know how to defend themselves. In many cases my attitude to this sort of problem has been galvanised by the unfortunate needs of many of my constituents.

If these matters are not raised in Parliament it is unlikely that anything will be done about them and the problems will remain unsolved. The farther one lives from the General Post Office the more difficult it is to get anything done or to get justice, because of the sheer distance and the problems of communication. It gives me no pleasure to criticise some of the people that I criticise, but I should be failing in my obligations to my constituents if I did not do so. At election time I do not promise my constituents anything but my best efforts to give them a strong informed voice in Parliament. I have made that clear on each of the seven times that I have stood for Parliament. I do not want to character assassinate these inspectors. Indeed, I should be happy to talk with the Minister and his senior officers. Many of them know me, but there are two sides to this story. I have been intimidated in hotels, and I have been abused. When I have walked into the Highways Department at Port Augusta—

*Members interjecting:*

**Mr GUNN:** The Minister comes to my electorate all the time, and he breaks all the conventions when he does not advise people. I have gone to that flash new building on the west side to talk to the Highways Department engineers, for whom I have nothing but praise. I have had the best relationship with them over a very long period of time and, from the Commissioner down, I have had no problems—with the exception of perhaps one Assistant Commissioner, but that is another matter. If I transgress I take the full consequences. But when I have gone into those buildings people have said to me, 'Your mates are keen to see you in there.' I do not go there for those comments; I go there to do my job. I could relate one or two other stories, but I will not go that far. If the Minister makes the arrangements I would be very happy to talk to them because I never run away from a fight or a difficult problem. However, let me say—

*The Hon. G.F. Keneally interjecting:*

**Mr GUNN:** I am happy to face up to my responsibilities, because that is what a member of Parliament should do. Let me mention what the Minister said about my naming people. I have never said that I would. I said that I would raise the issue in Parliament every time, in my judgment, the power was misused. Unfortunately, that is the only way to ensure that the power is not abused.

It is a bad situation when we have passed so many laws, we are restricting people so much, that a member of Parliament must do this. That is why we have grievance debates. When I first became a member of Parliament there was no problem in asking a question at Question Time. That exercise has long since gone. We are allowed an hour, we have dorothea dix questions, Ministers give long answers, we have a more aggressive style in the Parliament, and it takes a long time to get responses to questions on notice. That is why these comments have to be made in relation to Bills of this nature. I remind those who administer these Acts that a great deal of responsibility rests with them about whether these difficulties will arise. The greatest thing in this world is a bit of commonsense, and I say to them, 'Use some commonsense and you will not have any more problems.'

I can hardly go up to my office without another telephone call—people ringing from Burra, one from Quorn today,



people ringing from the rest of the State, because they have known me for a long time. A large group of people only yesterday wanted to see me. What they tell me is just unbelievable. What would happen to those officers in private enterprise? There is not even an acceptance of facts.

The Minister and that person in the Highways Department no doubt think I am the worst person on two legs. They are entitled to think that, and I have no personal ill will towards them. I read Mr Otte's letter with interest and considered reading it into *Hansard* myself, but on reflection I thought that the Minister or someone else would do that. Mr Otte is doing his job, and I am doing mine. If that means we have to hit head on, that has to happen, but I will not take one step back from these issues, because to do so would be failing in my obligations. I am a reasonable person, happy to talk to the Minister and to these people at any time to resolve the issue. I do not want more telephone calls or letters. I really want people to be able to make a living free of hassle, humbug and nonsense.

A great deal of responsibility rests back on those people who in many cases deliberately wait for hours to catch some poor fellow coming from the north with a load of cattle. What great benefit to the people of the State is there in grabbing some poor fellow with a few extra cattle? There are no weighbridges in the area. No-one benefits. Anyone can read the statutes just the same as I can. Why do they not get the Queensland legislation and modify it for South Australia and recommend to the Minister to bring a Bill before the House. Certainly, I would be happy to introduce a private member's Bill, but we would not get that through. Anyway, it is the Minister's responsibility. The Federal Minister for Primary Industry (Mr Kerin) made a recommendation after investigations and suggested what should take place. It has been recommended. We can introduce all those suggestions and amend the Act *ad infinitum*. However, I do not even know how anyone can make an index of the present law, because it has been changed so often.

What about the complaint I made last week to a Government officer? Why, when officers weigh trucks and cannot prosecute drivers for overloading, do they check the little dogs behind the vehicles in regard to a road train? What is the need to book them? These are administrative matters, and this is the sort of humbug and nonsense that brings inspectors and people in the field into conflict with people like me and others. Certainly, the responsibility rests fairly and squarely on senior officers.

If they allow these circumstances to continue, then the solution is in their court, because this is not commonsense. No reasonable person would carry on like that. Why is it that, if some fellow does not have his permit exactly right, the officer books him for 38 tonnes overweight going up the track and he is fined \$10 000? What difference does the bit of paper make? Does that bit of paper make him any safer? Of course it does not, and only a fool would say that it does. I could go on with this litany of complaint. I am sick of the whole thing, but I am not going to give in because it would be wrong if I did. I hope that in a reasonable and logical manner I have raised with the Minister some of these matters. Again, I make the offer that the Minister should organise a meeting with his senior officers and inspectors, because I would be happy to sit and talk to them at length about these problems.

As to people who come to me with complaints, I say that, 'If you have been crazy, I cannot get you out of it if commonsense is not applied. It is only in rare instances that I ever have to interfere with the police because in 98 per cent of matters they are right.' No-one likes getting a ticket, as members know, but if one is speeding at 130

km/h and gets hit with the amphotometer, there is no-one else to blame, and we all know that. However, where pedantic nonsense takes place, that is where police and other law enforcement agencies do themselves great harm because, at the end of the day, commonsense has to be the guiding line. I have said enough. We do not want to keep the Committee longer than necessary, but the unfortunate thing is that these matters have to be raised here.

**The Hon. G.F. KENEALLY:** Mr Chairman, I draw your attention to the state of the Committee.

*A quorum having been formed:*

The Committee divided on the motion:

Ayes (26)—Mr Abbott, Mrs Appleby, Messrs L.M.F. Arnold, Bannon, Blevins, De Laine, Duigan, and M.J. Evans, Ms Gayler, Messrs Gregory, Groom, Hamilton, Hemmings, Keneally (teller), and Klunder, Ms Lenehan, Messrs McRae, Mayes, Payne, Peterson, Plunkett, Rann, Robertson, Slater, Trainer, and Tyler.

Noes (16)—Messrs Allison, P.B. Arnold, S.J. Baker, Becker, and Blacker, Ms Cashmore, Messrs Chapman, Eastick, S.G. Evans, Goldsworthy, Gunn, Ingerson (teller), Lewis, Meier, Oswald, and Wotton.

Pairs—Ayes—Messrs Crafter and Hopgood. Noes—Messrs D.S. Baker and Olsen.

Majority of 10 for the Ayes.

Motion thus carried.

The following reason for disagreement was adopted:

Because the amendment will not provide the necessary powers to prevent overloading on our roads.

#### MOTOR VEHICLES ACT AMENDMENT BILL (No. 2)

Adjourned debate on second reading.

(Continued from 22 October. Page 1521.)

**Mr INGERSON (Bragg):** The Opposition supports both parts of this Bill. The first part deals with the ability of the Motor Registration Division to supply replacement or new number plates to owners of vehicles. Obviously, it takes time to replace number plates and can take anywhere between one and two weeks to get to the owner. The Liberal Party recognises that problem, and will support the Government in its attempt to enable owners to drive those vehicles on the roads without plates.

The second part of the Bill ensures that the division is able to backdate to their original due date licences renewed within 90 days. We do not see any difficulty with that and can understand that it makes it simpler from an administration point of view. However, we point out that it is revenue positive for the Government, even though that might be very slight. Again, we do not object to that.

The Minister highlighted several areas that he was unhappy with. First, people being able to drive a vehicle without a licence. The Opposition supports his concerns about that. It is also noted that this situation is the same in all other States, and we see no reason why South Australia should be out of kilter. The other point mentioned by the Minister related to a person, after 90 days, failing to renew the licence, and the new due date of the licence being the date when it is paid for. On top of that there is to be an administrative penalty of \$11. We do not believe that that administrative charge should apply, although we have no intention of opposing it. We do not believe that the cost of a new licence is of the order of \$11.

The Liberal Party has concerns about people who have legitimate reasons for not renewing their licences within 90 days. Will the Minister, either in reply or during the Com-

mittee sage, explain whether or not there will be any leniency or administrative opportunities for people who were on holidays, study tours, or away for some reason and were unable to renew their licences? We ask that they be given the opportunity of expanding their licence period within that 90 day time frame.

While this Bill is before us I will take up the problem of permits in the heavy vehicle industry. In the previous Bill the member for Eyre mentioned problems that his constituents were experiencing. As shadow Minister, I think that it is probably the one single area in which I get the most comment and criticism. Only yesterday I received a telephone call from a company that had applied (on Friday last week) for a traditional overweight/overwidth permit. As late as yesterday morning the permit had still not arrived. While I have taken this matter up with the person in charge of the division and he has assured me that he will look into it, it is a problem that continually occurs. It seems to me that, with all the difficulties we have with the administration of Government, this is one area that should be able to be simply and administratively fixed. As the member for Eyre rightly said, we could set up a facsimile facility in that division of the Highways Department. I have been told by members of that division that the problem is legal, that Crown Law is looking at it and, hopefully, it will be able to fix it up. It is staggering that one can fax something into the division and that it can be accepted as being quite suitable (and members of the public involved in the permit area are encouraged to fax in), yet it is impossible to fax a permit back. I ask the Minister to look at this because it is of concern to the Earthmoving Contractors Association, the Road Transport Association, and to people living in the country and city. It seems to me that this matter can be simply fixed.

**Mr GUNN (Eyre):** I am pleased that this legislation is before the House because people have great difficulty from time to time with number plates. When Governments try to implement changes such as this they deserve praise. It should be commonsense to officers in the department who made these recommendations. It is a pity that it took so long. What the member for Bragg said about fax machines is of concern. I have been told that Victoria and New South Wales are happy to fax through, and that Victoria will fax back a copy and send the permit to the first port of call. It tries to help. In Victoria you can ring up and say that you have a problem with a truck and will swap it with another truck, and the department will say that you can write the time in and change the number. That does not occur in South Australia.

Fax machines are an accepted part of modern communications. I think that they are better than telephone messages and telexes. It must be quicker to put the permit on a machine and receive it back again. It would make life easier for permits concerning heavy and wide loads. Will the Minister, if there are problems, have his officers investigate how they have overcome them in New South Wales and Victoria?

**Mr S.G. EVANS (Davenport):** At present there is a problem with people not getting notices about their vehicle registrations expiring. I think that in this day and age, with computers, the department should be able to see from the computer who has failed to renew and, a week after they were supposed to register and have not, it would not be a costly exercise to notify them. Two people in the Hills last week and another at Springfield, about four months ago suffered penalties in relation to this.

I think it is depressing for them. I know that it is an oversight. We all make mistakes, but I hope that the Minister will talk to the Registrar, not about sending out notices to everybody when they have to renew, but advising them, if they are a week overdue and before the third party insurance runs out (because that is where the biggest risk is, that the registration has not been renewed).

**The Hon. G.F. KENEALLY (Minister of Transport):** To members who sought an assurance as to whether or not the Registrar would consider the points raised in this debate, I can give that assurance. The Registrar is very well aware of what has taken place in the past few minutes and, when he returns to his office and obtains copies of *Hansard* I am certain that he will look at the comments made and see what may be able to be done to satisfy members' concerns. I should say that some of the concerns expressed in this debate are nothing to do with the Registrar, but more to do with the Highways Department, and I will look at those. As acting Leader of the House, I must be the most generous Leader we have had here for some time because, in my recollection, there would have been four points of order and members' attention would have been drawn to the contents of the Bill and not to the issues of the debate.

Very simply, one request by the member for Bragg was whether or not the Registrar, in exercising his authority with regard to the 90 day limit on renewal of driving licences, would consider exceptions such as the case where somebody was overseas, in hospital or studying. The answer is 'Yes'. The Registrar has the statutory power to do so, and would do so, and he would treat each case on its merits. I would suggest that anyone who for any one of a number of good reasons wishes to be absolved from the responsibility of renewing their licence when it becomes due ought to let the Registrar know prior to the licence running out so that he can make that decision. It is a little hard for the Registrar to apply a discretion after he has applied a penalty if the licence renewal is more than 90 days overdue or if the renewal date is changed to the due date if it is less than 90 days overdue. That does not mean, however, that he would not do it if the circumstances warranted it. I thank members for their support of this measure.

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

#### WEST BEACH RECREATION RESERVE BILL

Adjourned debate on second reading.  
(Continued from 15 October. Page 1243.)

**The Hon. B.C. EASTICK (Light):** The Opposition supports the Bill currently before the House. In the form in which it is presented here, it is entirely better than was the case of the original Bill presented by the Minister to the Upper House. One of the reasons that I pick up that point is that the legislation was introduced into another place without final and necessary consultation with local government. It is all very well to say that there had been discussions some 18 months previously but, when the Bill was introduced into the Upper House, the first knowledge that the three councils had that it was a matter before the Parliament was the delivery by me to those councils of a copy of the Bill and the Minister's third reading. One council was able to indicate that the nomination of that council in the Bill did not correctly identify it in relation to its corporate being. A number of other aspects of the Bill were at variance with the discussions that the individual councils

had had in the preparation of the background papers relative to this matter.

For example, the councils had no indication that they were to become a minority of the commission. They had no indication that their representation was to decrease from two persons per council to one person per council. I indicate that at that point only two of the three councils had been members of the body prior to this arrangement taking place. The Henley and Grange council had been an original signatory to the discussions but had not taken up its option when it was first introduced in the 1940s. However, after some discussion, it indicated its preparedness to become today a member of that organisation.

In relation to discussions regarding the preparation of an attitude to this Bill, I want to thank very positively the representatives of the three councils who made themselves available and made their thoughts known. I want also to mention the Chairman of the trust, the Hon. Geoff Virgo, who personally gave audience to the Hon. Miss Laidlaw, of another place (who had the passage of the Bill in that place) and myself. He, along with his executive officer, was most frank in the discussion relative to the various aspects of the trust's activities at the present moment. If we look at pages 470 to 473 inclusive of the Auditor-General's Report of 30 June 1987, we find that the trust has come a long way since it was first brought into being by the late Thomas Playford back in the 1940s. A number of facets of the activities of the West Beach Trust today were possibly never contemplated at the time the original Bill passed the Parliament.

One of the features of the West Beach Trust until a year or two ago was Marineland, which had been a major entertainment attraction but which has for a variety of reasons fallen into some disrepute and is not functioning as well as it might, incurring for the year ended 30 June 1987 a deficit of \$113 000. You, Madam Acting Speaker, when wearing your other hat as Chairperson of the Industries Development Committee, would be aware as I am as a member of that committee that, without revealing any issue, the new administration of Marineland has presented a very worthwhile project to the Government and has been accepted as a satisfactory group to take it over, completely rebuilding it and providing an educational feature that will draw people to the area and operate as a worthwhile entertainment centre in the true spirit of what was originally intended.

As demonstrated by the capacity of the operators in other parts of the world, it is expected that their handling of the species that will be on show will be exemplary and that the associated activities, including a restaurant and facilities for children to obtain first-hand educational material on marine species, will be *par excellence*.

Recently I had the opportunity of seeing the aquarium at Monterey in California, and I now realise the drawback that a top class feature of this kind can be and the educational value it has for adults and children. I look forward to that development of the West Beach Trust through the entrepreneurial spirit and endeavour of the new operators as something worthy of South Australia.

The Minister indicated in his second reading explanation other entrepreneurial developments that may well take place in the West Beach area in the near future which will benefit the State. Questions will be raised as to whether the opportunity will be given to other interested entrepreneurs to trade on an equal basis. A great deal of the debate that occurred in another place sought to guarantee that where it was a private entrepreneurial activity, not a direct Government activity, the trading relationships of that activity would be on a par with those of other undertakings operating within close proximity. I do not believe that the Govern-

ment should contemplate providing facilities in competition with private enterprise operating outside the West Beach Trust and trading at a disadvantage because of a fees differential. However, I genuinely believe from the discussions that have been held that that will not occur.

We have some record of difficulties experienced by the trust in recent times in necessarily providing value for money for the State as a whole. The cottages, which have a very high occupancy rate, were developed with CEP funds. It was subsequently indicated that the amount of money spent on their construction was considerably greater than the value of the end product. Quite apart from that, the units receive a lot of favourable comment from visitors, and with the capital appreciation of those units there has been a marked improvement in the operations of the caravan park. The sporting facilities—the two golf courses, the softball field and other facilities—are highly regarded by the groups that use them. The golf courses make a worthwhile return into the accounts of the West Beach Trust and I notice from the Auditor-General's Report that the accumulated surplus as at 1 July 1987 was \$1.288 million, with most of the funds raised on behalf of the organisation going back into further development of the West Beach Trust.

Having made those general comments about the trust, I point out that other colleagues with electorates in proximity with the trust may wish to have some input in this debate. The three councils—West Torrens, Henley and Grange, and Glenelg—have been very supportive of continuing a trust of about the same dimensions as have existed in the past. They have readily accepted a changed format, which places the combined councils in a supreme position in relation to membership of the trust in that they will have four of the seven trust members. Notwithstanding that, I am informed by members who have served on behalf of the Glenelg and West Torrens councils that, in the past, most of the decisions were made on the merits of the case and were not necessarily associated with a particular council's interest. I trust that that will be the case in the future.

The extent to which the trust can develop and continue to provide such facilities depends on a right attitude to the development prospects that exist, and I look forward to that continuing. The councils will each nominate one person and one further person will make up the contingent of four. It has been accepted that the fourth member will be appointed on a rotational basis so that the West Torrens council will have two representatives in the first instance, the Glenelg council will have two in the second and, in the third instance, the Johnny-come-lately council—I will explain that later—Henley and Grange, will have the second member.

The Henley and Grange council makes no bones about the fact that it found some aspects of the original trust operating against its own best interests from a financial point of view and, although it was given the opportunity, it stood away from membership of the trust. In the interim, moves have been made to re-establish the council's case for membership and, although many years have gone by, it is something of a feather in the cap of everybody concerned that a tripartite council approach has been agreed upon and that Henley and Grange is taking its place on the trust.

Discussions between the councils regarding some adjustment of boundaries may have a slight impact upon the extent of the trust's holding in that area, but that matter is not of any great consequence. I am led to believe that further discussions on other aspects of this matter do not necessarily involve the West Beach Trust, and that is as it should be.

Opportunity was also taken to incorporate into this legislation recent amendments to the private parking legislation whereby, an agreement having been reached by both

Houses, local government can be advised of details of the driver of a vehicle rather than taking proceedings against the vehicle's owner (and the Minister very graciously accepted that as one of the amendments inserted in another place). The Bill now comes to us with money provisions, involving clauses in erased type, and the Minister in due course will seek to insert the two clauses in question (20 and 21). That is essential for the Bill to become a working Act and no problem exists about that with members on this side.

I reiterate that regrettably the degree of consultation with a key element, that is, local government, on the introduction of this matter was wanting. However, the end result has been satisfactory, and I look forward to the trust proceeding on a very satisfactory basis. However, I leave one major question mark over the entrepreneurial activity that may be contemplated by the West Beach Trust. Its future does lie in that area but, because it is associated with local government and also involves Government funds, it will be extremely important to ensure that any decision to undertake entrepreneurial activity is based on proper feasibility studies and practical assessment of the projects that are to be entered into.

I was very heartened at the Local Government Finance Authority meeting, following the Local Government Association annual general meeting last Friday, to find that directors and the General Manager of the Local Government Finance Authority have made it very clear to local government that, in undertaking an entrepreneurial role (as local government is now in its own right being asked to do), the authority will not be making funds available just because it is a local government organisation: it will be making decisions based on hard, cold business facts and on likely returns. I take heart at that decision, which has already been signalled to local government. The entrepreneurial role of local government is causing concern to some people, whilst others are wanting to embrace it perhaps too quickly.

With the type of information that has been made available to local government, generally and to the membership of the trust in the same way, proper regard must be given to the end result. I believe that a very desirable and worthwhile future exists for these three local governing bodies operating in association with the trust to achieve additional entrepreneurial support for tourism and general entertainment for the people of this State. I support the Bill.

**Mr BECKER (Hanson):** I support the legislation, although it is a pity this House did not support my private member's Bill earlier this year in which I presented a proposition that the membership of the West Beach Trust be increased by two to incorporate the Henley and Grange council. It is almost 33 years to the day that this legislation was first brought to the Parliament to establish the West Beach Reserve Act. At the time, mention was made that it was a pity that the Henley and Grange council was not going to participate in the proposal to establish the trust and contribute £20 000 over a six year period, as did the West Torrens and Glenelg councils. For that £20 000 those two councils were able to deposit their waste collection and rubbish on land owned by the West Beach Trust. Some of that land, which has been filled over, is located near the German Shepherd Dog Club.

The councils which contributed the initial \$40 000 between them certainly got value for their money. I am quite sure that, even though Henley and Grange council did not contribute under that original proposal, nobody will object now to its coming in: indeed, provision was made in the original Act for it to do so. The original legislation was referred to a select committee on 1 December 1954, and on 8 December

at page 1809 of *Hansard*, in dealing with the West Beach Recreation Reserve Bill, Mr Stott asked the then Premier (Hon. Sir Thomas Playford):

If the Henley and Grange Corporation becomes a party to the agreement entered into with the West Torrens and Glenelg Corporations what will be the representation of the Henley and Grange Corporation on the trust?

The Premier replied:

The original proposal placed before the Henley and Grange Corporation was that it would be a constituent member of the trust, with membership rights. If that corporation signifies a desire to join the trust at any time I am sure the Government will immediately take steps if they are not already provided for to enlarge the trust to give that corporation full representation.

That provision existed and, at any time, the Henley and Grange council could have come in as a member of the West Beach Trust. I am disappointed that it took over 12 months to prepare the legislation before us now. Negotiations have been going on for a long time—for the last two years that I know of—for the Henley and Grange council to join the trust. No excuse exists for this sort of delay and incompetence in Government and I do not need to go into great length and detail on what has been presented to us.

The Bill has been in another place for quite some time. It could have been dealt with easily and simplified from that viewpoint. We know of the efforts of the Chairman of the trust (the Hon. G.F. Virgo), when Minister, in amending the Act and its name. He has a long history of involvement, and to some degree interference, with the West Beach Trust and with what some were trying to achieve for that trust. My views of his efforts are well recorded in *Hansard* both on 22 November 1973 and again earlier this year. As Minister he tried to dictate to the trust what should be done and what its role should be. Yet, in the formative years Frank Lewis, the Town Clerk of Glenelg, and trust members in those days did a tremendous job in establishing this swampy area, originally owned by the South Australian Housing Trust, to bring it up to what was perceived to be an ideal playground for people in the metropolitan area, particularly in the western suburbs.

They did well. They have provided the State headquarters for the softball association, as well as international diamond facilities for softball. Within a couple of years a junior world championship will be played at West Beach. The Glenelg Baseball Club, which is well and truly established in another part of the West Beach Trust area, has four diamonds. On Saturday morning, one can hardly see the grass because of the many young people playing baseball. The Pee-wee league has several hundred young people playing baseball. There are also golfing facilities there and the area contains some of the finest golf course greens in the metropolitan area.

The recreational facilities have been well developed and there are caravan park facilities which, according to people from other States, are first class. The member for Light referred to the log cabin facilities, which, being practical and functional, enjoy a high occupancy rate, although from an aesthetic and design point of view they are terrible. Someone has said that they remind one of Stalag 17. I have not seen Stalag 17, so I would not know, but with the little air-conditioners popped on the top they look atrocious. For years I have been promised that trees will be placed around the facilities and there are trees that would be suitable for the purpose, but no-one has planted even a stick and it is about time that it was done. Perhaps a service club will plant a few trees there to improve the appearance.

An excellent standard of accommodation is provided in on-site caravans and they will be full from just before the Grand Prix week and throughout the summer period. Those facilities are popular and serve their purpose, although their presence and the rates charged upset the local hotel and

motel owners. Much work has been done in the area, much money has been spent, and much voluntary time has been given by local council representatives to provide a first-class facility. The most disappointing feature has been the lack of support by the Government in providing sufficient funds for the care and management of the foreshore. To say that we have lost 100 metres of the last stretch of decent sand-dunes in the metropolitan area would be putting it mildly, as we have lost much more.

When the shacks were established at West Beach 40 years ago we did not have the beach erosion, the impact of the Patawalonga outlet on the sea grasses, or the impact of the Glenelg sewage treatment works, all of which have added to the problems of the foreshore. If the Government does not spend a few dollars there, the last sand-dunes in the western suburbs will disappear. The only sand-dunes left will be at West Lakes, and there are not many there either. It is a crying shame that the sand-dune area has eroded because of lack of protection.

One cannot expect the West Beach Trust to pay for or even contribute to coast protection; the cost would be too great. Income has been generated from the various facilities of the trust to provide recreational facilities for the people in the area and that has been done very well. Regarding Marineland, I well remember begging Geoff Virgo, as Minister, to buy Marineland and develop it. If I remember correctly, the trust paid about \$190 000 for Marineland and I was disappointed to see the condition it was in a few months ago. It was run down and in a terrible state. The animals never looked more skinny or poorly treated. I was amazed to think that Marineland had been let go so much but, unfortunately, the show became stale, the facilities unattractive, and attendances fell by 50 per cent. Indeed, in two years Marineland had run up losses of \$220 000. In other words, it lost more money in two years than the trust originally paid for it.

So, leasing Marineland to a private company to develop it and bring it back into a condition that will attract people to the area and keep them there makes sense to me and shows good judgment. Tribond Development Pty Ltd will spend \$10 million. I have had several discussions with officers of the company who have been involved in a similar development in Hong Kong. The whole emphasis will not be on the performing animals such as the dolphins and the whales but rather on human performances such as those by high diving experts. Therefore, it will be an entirely different type of show from what we have been accustomed to at Marineland.

I get irate when I read local press reports by upstart councillors protesting about the use of dolphins at Marineland. The presence of the dolphins has been approved by this Government, as was the acquisition of three extra dolphins to supplement their numbers. No-one can do anything about it and local residents will not tolerate any interference in that regard. Let that warning be clear.

We are proud of Marineland and its contribution, both past and present, to tourism in South Australia, especially its contribution over the next few years, and we should give the proprietors all the encouragement that they need. The support of the Henley and Grange council for this area is most important. The area has experienced tremendous traffic problems involving the Patawalonga frontage and the Glenelg council. That part has nothing to do with the West Beach Trust development. It is one of those situations that occurs in a busy metropolitan district but, with the support of the Henley and Grange council, there will be some alteration to the road design in the area as land now associated with the Glenelg sewage treatment works can be acquired.

No doubt there will be a trade-off in land between the trust and the treatment works so that some roads may be redesigned and made far safer for local residents and some of the undesirable people who want to use them as a speed track.

Basically, this Bill is a Committee Bill, although I wanted to express on second reading my disappointment that the membership of the trust was being so savagely altered. However, local government at least retains the majority membership, even if by just one. I still think that the original concept of the trust should always be preserved so that local government has the controlling point of view. Governments should keep out of these organisations. Indeed, if we get into government, I shall push that so that the area can revert to local government and be run effectively and efficiently.

Clause 14 of the Bill deals with the control of the foreshore and I hope that the Government takes on board its responsibility to preserve the foreshore and sand-dune area and does not sit back and wait for what conservationists tell me will happen when the sea returns the sand to the area and blows it up into the high mountains. However, none of us will live long enough to see that, and I regard it as stupid nonsense. In the past three years the West Beach Trust has not been required to publish an annual report, but this Bill requires the trust to do so and Parliament will have the opportunity in the future to vet the actions of the trust. That is an important aspect of the revamped legislation.

I want to pay a tribute at this stage to the late Bob Porter, who was the General Manager of the West Beach Trust. I well remember when he came in to take over the reins of managing and trying to promote the area. This was a critical period. His appointment was criticised, but Bob Porter worked his heart out. He believed in the aims and objectives of the trust and he believed in what the trust was trying to achieve. He brought along a flair and expertise that the trust membership had not seen before, and he worked very hard.

It was just tragic that his health was not good enough and that he could not remain to see the end product of what he tried to achieve. Of the many colourful characters who have served on the trust, there was the founding secretary, Frank Lewis, who will be remembered for what he did in the early formative days and, in recent times, Bob Porter's contribution stands out above everyone else's for what he did in this area. Therefore, we hope that the trust will now get on with the job of finishing the area and that the only unmade road will be completed to the sea rescue squadron and Holdfast Bay yacht headquarters. That, too, will cost about \$200 000. It should be a Government expense in the case of the emergency area—it is an emergency services road. Once the area is fully developed, I hope we see the country club that has been promised and suggested. I totally support the concept and suggested it some years ago. It would be a valuable adjunct to what the area presents.

Shortly the fisheries research station which I called for in 1977 and which was promised by us at elections will be completed and that, too, will provide added benefit to the whole concept of Marineland Park. That research station will be beneficial to fisheries management in this State, especially in relation to the education of people in dealing with this valuable resource in this State. With all that in mind, I hope that the trust can settle down and get on with the job that it was given 33 years ago—to provide an enjoyable recreation area for the citizens of this State.

**The Hon. G.F. KENEALLY (Minister of Transport):** I thank Opposition speakers who have contributed to the

debate for their support of the legislation, and I acknowledge their interest in the West Beach Trust over a number of years. I want to make two brief points. First, I am sorry that the member for Hanson is not in tune with the aesthetic values of the West Beach Trust units. As the Minister who declared the units open, I felt quite proud of the standard of the facility.

*Mr Becker interjecting:*

**The Hon. G.F. KENEALLY:** As the member for Hanson acknowledges, they are nice inside. They are utilitarian and they are certainly comfortable. I am certain that the Chairman and the members of the trust will read the second reading debate speeches and so the honourable member's comments will be available to them to consider. The lead speaker for the Opposition, the shadow Minister (the member for Light), was concerned to point out that the trust in its entrepreneurial role should have consideration for its position within the private sector and that it should not be given undue advantage over the private sector. It seemed to me that the facilities provided by the trust—and the honourable member acknowledged this—are of a unique nature. The trust would be adding to rather than competing with the tourist facilities in the region, and in the hospitality area as well. I will draw the honourable member's comments to the attention of the Minister, especially those comments about the entrepreneurial role that the trust will have to play. I thank the House for its support of the legislation.

Bill read a second time.

In Committee.

Clause 1 passed.

Clause 2—'Commencement.'

**The Hon. B.C. EASTICK:** I take this opportunity to indicate that the Committee work on this measure has been undertaken in another place. The results were totally satisfactory to members on this side. The other place took heed of considered argument and fact, and it is not my intention to question any of the clauses but to give support to the two amendments that the Minister will move that ratify the financial aspects.

Clause passed.

Clauses 3 to 8 passed.

Clause 9—'Allowances and expenses.'

**Mr BECKER:** Can the Minister advise the Committee how much the Chairman and members of the trust receive in allowances and expenses? When the trust was first established in 1954 the Chairman was paid the princely sum of £100 (\$200) and members were paid £50 (\$100).

**The Hon. G.F. KENEALLY:** It is considerably more than the £100 paid at the time of the trust's establishment and is more of the order of \$2 000 for the Chairman. As the sum has been varied within the last week or so, for the benefit of the honourable member and the Committee, I will obtain that information, which I do not have at the moment.

Clause passed.

Clauses 10 to 19 passed.

Clause 20—'Stamp duty not payable on instruments of conveyance to the trust.'

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

Page 7, line 13—Insert clause 20 as follows:

20. No stamp duty is payable on any instrument by virtue of which real or personal property is vested in the trust.

The Committee will appreciate that clauses 20 and 21 are money clauses in erased type in the Bill which comes from the other place. As they are money clauses, they must be moved by the Minister in this House. I am happy to do so, as they are necessary to the Bill.

Clause inserted.

Clause 21—'Exemption from certain taxes.'

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

Page 7, line 15—Insert clause 21 as follows:

21. The trust and all property of the trust is exempt from—
- (a) any tax payable under the Land Tax Act 1936;
  - (b) any rates or taxes payable under the Local Government Act 1934;
  - (c) payroll tax payable under the Pay-roll Tax Act 1971;
  - (d) any rates payable under the Waterworks Act 1932 or the Sewerage Act 1929;
- and
- (e) any other prescribed rate, tax, charge, levy or impost.

The comments that I made concerning clause 20 apply to this clause as well.

**Mr BECKER:** I seek information about the rates payable under water and sewerage legislation. No rates are payable, and this has been of tremendous benefit to the trust. However, I understand that the trust uses effluent from the treatment works. What rate does the trust pay for the effluent water and what rate does it pay for water, because there are some water and sewerage connections.

**The Hon. G.F. KENEALLY:** I will obtain that information for the honourable member. While the trust is exempt from rates payable under the Waterworks Act 1932, it does pay for mains water used and there is a levy on toilet pans. Separate sections of the trust (that is, the caravan park and Marineland) have separate water meters. The trust also pays for effluent water from the sewage plant at Glenelg. This water is used extensively on the golf course and the reserves. The cost of this water is lower than mains water, and I will obtain information about the respective costs, as I do not have it available at the moment.

Clause inserted.

Remaining clauses (22 to 25), schedules and title passed.

Bill read a third time and passed.

## ADJOURNMENT

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

That the House do now adjourn.

**Mr TYLER (Fisher):** In 1986 radio station SA.FM instituted an annual rock and roll eisteddfod involving high school students throughout South Australia. The aim of the eisteddfod is to promote youth in South Australia by giving the opportunity to use self-expression in time with rock music. That this event has become popular with high school students and is successful in its stated aims should have been clear to anyone who witnessed the SA.FM/Channel 10 simulcast of the finals last Friday evening.

This year SA.FM and the State Bank of South Australia jointly sponsored the eisteddfod. I congratulate these sponsors for their involvement in this now important annual event. They have shown themselves to be truly South Australian and interested in the promotion of our youth. They have put their money, time and energy where their mouths are. They have played and will continue to play a great role in nurturing and encouraging the talents of young South Australians.

This year the State Bank contributed \$200 000 in sponsorship. Some of these funds were spent in providing professional advice to the students in choreography, make-up, props and lighting. SA.FM made an outright financial contribution of \$80 000 as well as contributing towards the cost of the television production. There was also considerable sponsorship and valuable publicity by way of more than \$150 000 worth of air-time. Our best applause, however, should be saved for the students themselves. One thousand two hundred students from 47 public and private high



schools from throughout South Australia relished the opportunity to express themselves through original theatrical productions.

The overall standard achieved was extremely high. I am told that it had been stressed to the students that the competition was of secondary consideration, and that the emphasis was clearly placed on the theatrical production. This certainly showed in the final television presentation. At times one would have thought one was watching a professionally produced video clip. The heats involving all the participants were held in August in the Scott Theatre. From these heats the panel of specialist judges chose 10 schools for the finals. The performances by the 10 finalists were professional and showed a high degree of creative skill, not the least of which was the choreography. Although most of the students had the support of a teacher, plus the training provided by the sponsors, the work was their own in a very real sense. Most impressive, also, was the level of social comment portrayed, giving us 'oldies' some valuable insight into the way that young adults in 1987 see the present and the future. It must have been an extremely difficult task for the judges to select the overall winner and the two runners-up.

It was with great pride that I learnt that for the second consecutive year dancers at the Reynella East High School had won the eisteddfod. After the heats an article in the *Advertiser* of 22 August 1987 stated:

Reynella East High School was the obvious heat winner, with an extraordinary piece performed to *The Politics of Dancing*.

Having watched the performance on television it was obvious to me that there was considerable self-confidence and a skill level that one would expect from first-class artists.

Although I confess to having been a biased and parochial spectator, for which I do not apologise (and I am sure that members of the House will understand this), I believe it was little wonder that the team of about 50 students from the Reynella East High School clinched victory in the final at the Festival Theatre on 22 October 1987. It is often not stated, but to perform at this level requires dedication and commitment from the students and just as much from their families and teachers. I believe that it is important to inform the House of just what these students went through during the last eight months.

The dancers from Reynella East High School started work in the first term of this year. One third of the curriculum for the year 11 drama course involved the early stages of developing the basic concepts and ideas for the school's participation in the rock and roll eisteddfod. The dancers were chosen by audition towards the end of the first term. From the beginning of the second term the group started a weekly after-school rehearsal session lasting two to three hours. They also spent within that time at least 12 Sundays rehearsing. In addition, extra sessions outside normal lessons were essential as the heats and finals approached.

These were not the only students from the Reynella East High School involved in the project. Students from the art department were also heavily involved with essential input. For example, one class made the sophisticated mirror masks which were an integral part of the final performance. If members had watched the performance on Channel 10 last Friday night they would have seen these mirror masks. Other students were involved in making props and costumes. At least six staff members were regularly involved in assisting the students, and three were involved on a day-to-day basis. The main teacher contributions were from David McVicar and Jenny Sommer, who were the directors of the production.

It is important to stress that this was a team effort. To varying degrees, a large proportion of the school's arts community was involved in this production. The arts faculty involves the specific curriculum areas of drama, art, music, home economics and technical studies. This was by no means just an after school pastime. It is also true to say that the eisteddfod was more than a secondary school competition but, rather, it was a vital part of the students' curriculum activity.

To emphasise this further, students attended a workshop, organised by the sponsors, which was given by the Artistic Director of the Australian Dance Theatre. I am told that this workshop was a great insight into the professionalism of artistic dance and expression and was obviously of great benefit to all who participated. One student of Reynella East High School, Sue Howlett, completely choreographed both this year's winning performance and last year's winning performance. Surely, this young woman has used this opportunity to develop a sound basis for an outstanding career in the performing arts.

Other performers, also, used their contribution to this project as part of their assessment for the PES year 12 drama course. I have no doubt that all students, not just those from Reynella East, have gained a great deal from a year of hard work and from the opportunity to work with professionals and in professional venues.

**Mr Rann:** Great school!

**Mr TYLER:** It most certainly is a great school. As the local member, I endorse those remarks of the member for Briggs. I cannot emphasise enough my pride in the achievements of this school and the high calibre of its students. The winning of this event is a great achievement for the school community, but it is not an isolated achievement. It is one of a number of outstanding successes by this school in the arts, the academic field and sports.

The Reynella East High School and surrounding communities are justifiably proud of these achievements and of the reputation and standing of the school. These achievements were made in circumstances which are not always considered advantageous. The Reynella East High School is part of the Reynella East campus which encompasses reception to year 12. It is the largest campus in the State, with approximately 2 000 students, with over 1 000 at the high school alone. It also has 250 dedicated staff members. Historically, it unfortunately has been the case that schools of this size tend to produce headaches for teachers, parents and the surrounding community. However, the opposite is true of the Reynella East campus, which has quickly established a reputation for excellence that has now been enhanced by the performance of this group of dedicated students and the opportunity offered to them by two outstanding South Australian enterprises, SA.FM and the State Bank. I would like to publicly congratulate the Principal, Mr Ed Smallwood, staff and students of the Reynella East High School on this outstanding achievement. The community of my area is justifiably proud.

**Mr BECKER (Hanson):** I do not visit hospitals very often. I stay away from them as much as I can, but I have been most concerned recently about parking facilities at the Flinders Medical Centre. There has always been a parking problem at the Queen Elizabeth Hospital but, having been an outpatient at the Flinders Medical Centre, I can now understand and sympathise with those members of the public who are required to attend that hospital on a regular basis. I sympathise even more with the staff. The parking facilities at the Flinders Medical Centre are absolutely atrocious. In my opinion, they border on the ridiculous. For



the life of me, I do not know how we have allowed a hospital to be developed with such poor parking facilities.

The Children's Hospital is another example of virtually no parking facilities for motorists. The Queen Elizabeth Hospital does have some facilities, but they are totally inadequate, and, as I said, Flinders Medical Centre facilities are just non-existent. During the budget estimates, I asked the Minister of Health on 23 September 1987 (at page 404 of *Hansard*, Estimates Committee A):

When will the Flinders Medical Centre car parking be extended by another 278 parking spots? In 1985 the Flinders Medical Centre's Report of the Chairman, Board of Management, made the following statement:

In November, the Minister of Health visited the centre to announce some approval initiatives at Flinders Medical Centre for 1984-85. The developments announced were—

and this is but one—

provision of an additional 278 car parking spaces. The implementation of these projects proceeded according to the schedule with the exception of the car park, which is to be sited on land which is part of the Flinders University playing fields. This project requires the provision of a temporary oval and alternative land in lieu in the Sturt Road triangle which is still being negotiated.

Minister Cornwall replied:

A splendid question, and I wish I knew the exact answer.

He went on to say:

The Sturt triangle, for many public servants and Ministers, has been a greater trap than the Bermuda Triangle... I have given up.

He continued:

Presently we have before us a proposal for a multistorey car park at the Flinders Medical Centre and it has been the subject of ongoing negotiations with the unions.

He is trying to come to some arrangement with the unions on behalf of the staff to establish a 'user pays' car park. The Minister also said:

It is important to us, because we also will be looking to some form of partial self-funding for a car park at the Royal Adelaide Hospital and, ultimately, at the women's and children's hospital on the Adelaide Children's site.

I have had some questions on the Notice Paper for some time dealing with the shortage of stock lost, stolen or missing from each department and authority under the various Ministers' control for the past two financial years, and I wanted to know the value of goods recovered during that period and whether internal auditing and improved stock controls had helped reduce stock deficiency and theft. I am a little disturbed that I have yet to receive any replies from the Minister of Health. These questions have been on the Notice Paper for some weeks now, and this seems to be par for the course. The Minister of Employment and Further Education has had some answers to questions since 23 September but has yet to bring those answers to this House.

Attached to a note sent to me by an anonymous person dealing with security at the Royal Adelaide Hospital is a memo about question on notice 258. This mysterious report on security states:

I believe that the present security service at this hospital is nothing more than a door opening and locking service carried out by our patrols. The patrols are inadequate and have very little, if any, control over this hospital. Furthermore, they only operate on a 16 hour day. Locking the doors at night does not prevent loss or damage to property as anyone who has been to the hospital as a patient, visitor or employee could pilfer equipment or vandalize rooms for hours without being noticed by the present security staff.

Cars are being stolen and vandalised almost on a daily basis and hospital drugs and equipment, along with personal belongings, are being stolen from the hospital. Two surveillance cameras are in use at present. These show the entrance of east wing and the basement of the north wing adjacent to the nurses changing rooms. I am sure these two areas are prone to little or no problems.

As it stands at present, I feel the department is running in an inefficient manner and this is costing the taxpayer thousands of dollars per annum. Over the past few years, I personally have seen and heard about thefts in and around the hospital complex. These range from bread, milk and other food items to large and more expensive items and I am disgusted that this type of activity can occur without detection.

What annoys me is I am still waiting for the answers to these questions, questions that I have placed before Parliament in previous years, hoping that some of our Government departments would take a more responsible attitude in protecting taxpayers' property. This report has the following proposals:

1. That the security service operates on a 24 hours a day basis.
2. That more cameras be situated in areas that are prone to theft and vandalism (i.e. north car park).
3. The use of a trained guard dog and handler to patrol the grounds at night and weekends.
4. That more power be given to staff to evict unwanted trouble-makers (including children playing in ice machines and riding in the lifts without reason).
5. Closer liaison with the police (i.e. a direct line).
6. Improved morale of security personnel, which should in turn increase the observance of problems and reduce incidents.
7. Security to be run as an independent department answering only to senior management.
8. Personnel to be fully trained in security and to be re-evaluated six monthly.
9. Random checks on cars leaving the hospital grounds.
10. Tighter security in all areas—i.e. all staff to wear ID photos.

The associated costings are as follows:

1. An increase of staff by two would be required to cover day shift—estimated cost \$60 000 per annum.
2. The cost of training a guard dog/purchasing a trained dog
 

Initial cost for first year:	\$5 000
Cost thereafter:	\$1 500

 Cost of handler included in additional staff (see above).
3. Purchasing and installation of extra surveillance cameras—\$15 000-\$20 000 per unit.
4. Training programmes—two days training six monthly—\$500 per person per annum.

These proposals would have the following benefits:

1. Reduce theft of hospital assets, ranging from every day items, to drugs, tools and other larger equipment within the grounds.
2. Reduction in vandalism.
3. Reduction in vandalism and theft of cars parked within the hospital grounds (both staff and visitors).
4. Reduction in theft of staff's personal belongings.
5. Monetary saving of possibly thousands of dollars per year from loss and vandalism.
6. A more organised department, carrying out the job which it is designed for.

The report continues:

An independent department operating under more stringent and efficient control with a slightly higher annual budget would make the Royal Adelaide Hospital a safer and happier place for its employees to work, knowing that cars and personal belongings are safe from theft and vandalism. Management would gain in a financial manner by not having to repair or replace valuable equipment as security was able to thwart thefts and vandalism. Ultimately this would lead to more money being spent on other sections of the hospital. The initial outlay of money in setting up the system will, in the long run, be a saving. The Royal Adelaide Hospital has been likened to the country town of Renmark with the size of staff and patients daily within its complex. However, where Renmark has its own Police Department, the Royal Adelaide Hospital relies on a few security employees carrying out a part time 'door locking' service, which, in my opinion is inadequate.

The writer went on to highlight other benefits. The day after I received that information I received the newsletter from the Flinders Medical Centre, dated October 1987, which is published for the benefit of the staff, carrying an article with the headline 'Car thefts worsen—vehicle security problem at Flinders Medical Centre' and stating:

There has again been a dramatic increase in vehicle break-ins and thefts from the centre's car parks and along adjacent Flinders Drive: 10 incidents of break-ins and eight vehicle thefts were

reported during the first three weeks of September, compared with a normal three incidents per month. Holdens appear to be prime targets. Inquiries with the local police have revealed that the problem is not just confined to the Flinders Medical Centre but is evident throughout this district. Other large organisations near the Flinders campus are also experiencing vehicle thefts, break-ins and vandalism.

People using motor vehicles to visit and work at the hospitals are experiencing a high incidence of theft, vandalism and loss of property, and that should not be tolerated. We should provide ourselves with 'user pays' car parks at our hospitals as occurs in major cities overseas.

**Mr INGERSON (Bragg):** I will speak about the new ticketing system and some of the mechanical problems that are still being experienced. In addition, I will refer to the problems encountered by intellectually retarded people and to advice from the Government about where consumers can purchase tickets.

My first point relates to the operation of the validating machines. The problems that arose in the first week are still occurring. Last week I travelled into the city from my home and paid the required \$1.50, received my ticket, which was validated at \$1.50, and all was well. Yesterday morning I decided to come in by bus and after I had put up the same sum of money—\$1.50—my ticket was validated, but at 30c. How can the same machine push out two different results for the same trip?

That is the first time that this has happened to me, and I understand that it is a problem not of the machine but of the driver who programs the system. If at the time of programming the machine another individual validates his or her ticket, neither the system that is being programmed nor that ticket is validated. The person behind someone buying a ticket, hoping to get on the bus as quickly as possible and being encouraged to do so by the use of the multi-trip ticket, throws the whole program into chaos when validating that ticket. I hope that the Minister will look at that problem and remedy the system fairly quickly.

Although I am receiving fewer telephone calls now than I received in the first three or four weeks of operation, it appears that many people are still receiving a number of free trips. Given that the system has been introduced to control fraud, it does not seem to be working. The problem seems to be caused by multi-trip tickets, which were made in France. I have been advised by some chemists that the oxides used in the Northern Hemisphere are different from those usually used in the southern hemisphere, and that affects the magnetic tape. It is to be hoped that the problem will be solved when the tickets are made in Australia.

The other day a member of the public complained to me that the service received from the drivers was excellent but, if the ticket did not work, the passenger had to pay up straight away and take the old ticket to the STA office and claim for the number of trips that were not validated. In the early stages of the scheme, the consumer should be able to transfer the ticket on the bus and not pay for a new ticket and return the old one. Most problems seem to be occurring at off-peak times, with pensioners still having considerable difficulty with the system. Although, as I have said, the bus, train and tram drivers are doing their best, there is no doubt that more money needs to be spent on advising consumers, particularly pensioners, about the problems that can occur in the system. Of course, those things should not go wrong, but they occur because of a lack of understanding of the system.

I turn now to the question of advising the public of South Australia where they can purchase their tickets. A brochure is available at all railway stations, bus stops and the STA office, and on the back is advice where tickets can be bought. It is interesting to note that three of the stations where it states that tickets can be purchased have been closed, and were closed long before the brochure was printed. Last Friday, when I telephoned STA headquarters to check this out, I was told that the Marion station, which has been closed for well over a month, is open on Monday mornings between 6 and 12 o'clock.

The Alberton station, which was shown on television last week being knocked down, is open between 7 a.m. and 3 p.m. The Elizabeth South station, which has been closed for nearly six weeks, we were advised yesterday is open between 8 a.m. and 12 p.m. It seems that the STA head office ought to be getting its facts right for the consumer and, in the printing of any future brochures, ought to ensure that it does not have listed on the back thereof stations which are no longer in existence or manned.

The next issue, which is most important, relates to intellectually retarded people, both adults and children. As a result of discussions with several of the associations, it seems that there has been very little consultation between the STA and the associations. One of their major concerns is the difficulty for people obtaining a monthly pass. As members opposite would know, one can get a monthly pass only if one cannot use the system; in other words, it is absolutely black and white. Those people who are intellectually retarded do not have any problem working the system, provided that they are given an opportunity and time to understand it.

I have received some complaints, the first of which is that, because they cannot read, they do not know the difference between peak and interpeak tickets. I suggest to the STA that, as these people can understand colour, we ought to colour code the peak and interpeak tickets so that it is easier for them to understand. Because these people cannot read, they do not know or understand, when the multitrip ticket runs out, what is going on. My understanding is that the associations, particularly the one at Glenelg, are quite concerned about this problem. They believe that it is due purely and simply to a lack of communication between the STA and the associations concerned.

Another matter of major concern to the disadvantaged is the cost increase. Under the old system the cost per month was \$12, or \$144 per year. Under the new system, a person working in a sheltered workshop, playing sport three nights a week, and making four trips on the weekend pays \$7 a week or \$28 a month—involving a massive increase of 133 per cent over the old system. It seems to me that, if this new system is to cater for persons in a concession sense, the intellectually disabled have not been looked after as well as they should have been by the STA.

The other matter to which I refer briefly is 5AA. Two stations in the country have been sold for \$2.6 million, and that means that 5AA can cover only a 120 km radius from the city. We therefore do not have total State coverage for 5AA, as the trotting, racing and greyhound people would like to have.

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

Motion carried.

At 5.57 p.m. the House adjourned until Thursday 5 November at 11 a.m.