

HOUSE OF ASSEMBLY

Tuesday 10 November 1987

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

PETITION: RENMARK POLICE STATION

A petition signed by 2 889 residents of the Riverland praying that the House urge the Government to ensure the provision of a 24-hour police service from Renmark Police Station was presented by the Hon. P.B. Arnold.

Petition received.

QUESTIONS

The **SPEAKER**: I direct that written answers to the following questions on the Notice Paper, as detailed in the schedule that I now table, be distributed and printed in *Hansard*: Nos 196, 210 to 220, 222, 223, 225, 226 to 232, 234 to 237, 239 to 246, 248, 250, 291, 292, 297, 307, 319, 329, 334, 336, 340 to 345, 355, 362, 363, 372, 373, 375, 376, 381, 390, 391, 393, 394, 397, 399, and 420; and I direct that the following answers to questions without notice be distributed and printed in *Hansard*.

AMMUNITION STORAGE

In reply to Ms **GAYLER** (7 October).

The **Hon. D.J. HOPGOOD**: The Explosives Act relates to the storage of large amounts of explosive material. However, no statutes cover the household storage of ammunition. Given that no controls exist to enforce the way in which this type of material is stored at home, it would seem prudent for the public to be made aware of the potential hazard in an endeavour to minimise any danger. When the handbook entitled *Before you Shoot* is revised, consideration will be given to including a suitable reference to the hazards involved in storing ammunition.

MOBILONG PRISON

In reply to Mr **LEWIS** (21 October).

The **Hon. J.C. BANNON**: The District Council of Murray Bridge has attempted on a number of occasions to obtain State Government funding for the sealing of Maurice Road. The first of these was in council's submission to the Public Works Standing Committee. Although the committee highlighted the need to upgrade the road, it did not accept that funding should form a component of the prison project. That is also the attitude of the Government. Accordingly, due to the unavailability of funds for special grants, council's approaches to the Government to seal the road have been unsuccessful. Maurice Road is essentially a local road and therefore its maintenance is the responsibility of the local council. The road provides access to many other properties along its length. Considerable traffic is generated by these properties, none of which contribute to the upgrading of the road other than through normal council rate payments. Rate revenue is not provided by the State Government for the prison property. However, the presence of the prison will contribute significantly to the rate revenue and

economy of Murray Bridge through the activities of prison staff and visitors to the institution. The council highlighted this in its submission to the Public Works Standing Committee.

PAPERS TABLED

The following papers were laid on the table:

By the Minister of Transport (Hon. G.F. Keneally):
Highways Act 1926—Regulation—Highways Fund.

By the Minister of Mines and Energy, on behalf of the Minister of Water Resources (Hon. D.J. Hopgood):
South-Eastern Drainage Board—Report, 1986-87.

By the Minister of Education (Hon. G.J. Crafter):
Children's Court Advisory Committee—Report, 1986-87.

Companies (Application of Laws) Act 1982—Regulations—Insurance Superannuation.

Liquor Licensing Act 1985—Regulations—Liquor Consumption at Adelaide.

Children's Services Office—Report, 1986-87.

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

Department of Correctional Services—Report, 1986-87.
Correctional Services Advisory Council—Report, 1986-87.

By the Minister of Labour, on behalf of the Minister of Agriculture (Hon. M.K. Mayes):

Citrus Board of South Australia—Report for year ended 30 April 1987.

Greyhound Racing Control Board—Report, 1986-87.

MINISTERIAL STATEMENT: ADELAIDE GAOL

The **Hon. FRANK BLEVINS (Minister of Correctional Services)**: I seek leave to make a statement.

Leave granted.

The **Hon. FRANK BLEVINS**: Last Thursday during Question Time the member for Hanson made some very serious allegations about the treatment of prisoners in 'A' wing at Adelaide Gaol. In my reply to the member's question I gave an undertaking that, if the member supplied me with specific names and dates, I would have his claims investigated. That offer still stands, but I would point out that I have yet to receive any details from the member for Hanson. However, because of the serious nature of the claims and the sensational manner in which they were presented, I consider it appropriate to outline to the House the standard procedures which are followed when a prisoner is placed in 'A' wing at Adelaide Gaol.

On occasions it is necessary to segregate some prisoners from the rest of the prison population. In the main this occurs when a prisoner becomes violent or disruptive or if a particular prisoner is considered to be at risk of inflicting harm on himself. In accordance with Adelaide Gaol rules, prisoners who are admitted to 'A' wing are strip searched, then issued with new clothing and bedding and placed in the appropriate cell. I am advised that at no time are prisoners left in their cells with no clothes or bedding.

The type of cell in which a prisoner is placed in 'A' wing is determined by the reason he was admitted and his behaviour. For example, if a prisoner becomes violent he is placed in one of two cells in 'A' wing which are commonly referred to as 'the fridges'. I point out, however, that this name is quite misleading. These cells differ from other cells in 'A' wing in that the windows consist of unbreakable glass bricks, each cell has specially designed and medically approved

ventilation and a wooden bed base fixed securely to the wall. These two cells also have two doors: the inner door is a normal cell door while the outer door is of wooden construction with a fridge type handle—hence the nickname. This door is never locked but is, on occasion, closed. This occurs when a prisoner is agitated to the extent that his screaming would disrupt the rest of the cell block. Closing the outer door in such cases serves to reduce the noise and disruption.

There are two other cells in 'A' wing which differ slightly from the rest and they are the two observation cells. These cells are the same as all other cells except that they have wide grille doors which allow officers to keep a constant view of the occupant. These cells are used for inmates who are considered to be at risk of harming themselves. Such prisoners are held in 'A' wing only long enough to be seen by a doctor and, if necessary, for arrangements to be made to transfer them to James Nash House.

Under the rules relating to the operation of 'A' wing, the Manager of the gaol visits 'A' wing every morning (at the weekend this is done by the officer in charge), either a doctor or a nurse visits the wing each day, and a visiting justice visits once a week. Prisoners can also request an interview with the Manager or visiting justice at any time. While in 'A' wing prisoners also have access to a telephone on which they can contact their lawyers, members of Parliament, the Ombudsman, the police, my office and, at times, the media. Clearly, if there was any systematic maltreatment of prisoners, it would become public knowledge very quickly.

I am very proud of the fact that in South Australia we now have a very open, professionally run and fully accountable prison system. There is no doubt that the officers who staff our gaols do a very professional job under difficult conditions. That job is not made any easier when members of Parliament continue to make unsubstantiated and sensational allegations about them just to score some quick publicity. The most responsible and appropriate way of dealing with such allegations is for the member for Hanson, or any other member of Parliament or the public, to provide any information they may have either to myself, the police or any appropriate authority so it can be fairly and fully investigated. Having said that, I hope that, after raising this issue in such a sensational way last week, the member for Hanson is now prepared to act in a responsible manner and provide me with the information he claims to have, so that it can be investigated by the appropriate authorities.

QUESTION TIME

The SPEAKER: Before calling on questions I advise that the Premier will take questions that would otherwise be directed to the Deputy Premier and the Minister of Labour will take questions that would otherwise be directed to the Minister of Agriculture.

GRAND PRIX

The Hon. E.R. GOLDSWORTHY: Can the Premier advise the House of the conditions that have to be satisfied for a telecast of the Grand Prix to the metropolitan area, provincial cities and country areas? Is he prepared to negotiate with the Grand Prix Board so that all South Australians can enjoy this major event which they continue, as taxpayers, to subsidise? In previous years the live coverage of the Grand Prix has been dependent on ticket sales. As many

South Australians are precluded from attending because of financial constraints, because of their isolation in more remote areas or because of their incapacity or ill health, and bearing in mind the Premier's wish that as many South Australians as possible enjoy this event, I urge him to encourage the Grand Prix Board to make the telecast available.

The Hon. J.C. BANNON: The position is the same as last year and the same, I guess, as is the case for any of these major events, namely, that provided we can be assured of getting the appropriate attendance at the event (because, after all, a lot of the success of the event depends so much on getting the crowds in), a direct telecast will take place in the Adelaide metropolitan area and I would hope, as in previous years, in country areas as well. I am not sure of the state of arrangements at the moment, but a decision will not be made until much closer to the event and certainly we will encourage all those who possibly can to make it to the track.

I might say in that context that there is real value for money. In the general admission areas not only have we the race itself, but there will be a spectacular air show and in the evening, after the event, the group that has recently won the award for the most successful new group of the last 12 months—Crowded House, an Australian group—will be performing a rock concert. All of that will be included as part of the \$25 general admission ticket for the Sunday. In fact, the Crowded House concert in itself is the sort of thing that people would pay more than \$25 for, so we have that plus the race, plus the air show, plus everything else. I am pretty confident that we will see enough tickets sold and have enough people attending for there to be no major problems in getting metropolitan telecasting. Certainly, it is desirable that it be shown everywhere.

Incidentally, I might say in that context that I am very pleased that, prompted by the question asked by the member for Fisher the other day, representations were made to channel 9. As the House will recall, the full World Cup cricket match was telecast here in Adelaide. I understand that channel 9 South Australia was the only channel to directly telecast the second half. The network interstate was bombarded with calls of complaint, but here in South Australia our viewers got the advantage of it. So, there should be no question that the channel itself is very keen to pick up these events and beam them. As I say, the final decision will not be taken until we are in a position to judge the ticket sales.

The Hon. E.R. Goldsworthy interjecting:

The Hon. J.C. BANNON: What I would do is lobby the public to buy a ticket and go to the event because, by so doing, it will guarantee that the event will be broadcast live.

BUSHFIRE COMPENSATION

Mr DUGAN: Can the Minister of Mines and Energy outline to the House the current status of the settlement by ETSA of claims arising from the 1983 bushfires at McLaren Flat and Clare? The settlement of these claims has been a protracted business that has been raised in this House on a number of occasions. It has been protracted because of the legal processes which inevitably seem to accompany major insurance cases. I am sure that the House would be grateful for an update on the progress that has been made on the settlement of these outstanding claims.

The Hon. R.G. PAYNE: I thank the member for Adelaide for his question. Today was the day on which I held my regular meeting with the Chairman (Bill Hayes) and the

Acting General Manager of the Electricity Trust. Therefore, I am able to give the House some updated figures on the bushfire claims and settlements. In relation to McLaren Flat, ETSA is aware of 103 possible claims, but to this time only 85 detailed claims have been lodged with the trust. I ask honourable members to keep that in mind. Plenty of criticism is flying around, but it is not based necessarily on accurate information. As at the end of October, first offers had been made in response to 67 of the 85 detailed claims received (that is, 78 per cent) and 55 claims (that is, 64 per cent) had been settled. Claims settled at that time totalled \$4.459 million.

In relation to the Clare fires, members will be aware that the settlement process began much more recently following the outcome of what was regarded as a test case—not that long ago, just months. ETSA is aware of 72 possible claims but to this time the number of detailed claims received is only 32. Five first offers have been made and five claims have been settled. The amount involved totals \$869 000. I have the trust's assurance that it is continuing to do all that is within its power to settle the outstanding claims as quickly as possible. In my responsibility as Minister, I am also requiring that of the trust.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order! The honourable member for Mitcham has the call.

SHOP TRADING HOURS

Mr S.J. BAKER: My question is directed to the Premier. Will the Government instruct the Prices Commissioner (who is also the Commissioner for Consumer Affairs) to undertake an investigation of the likely impact on retail prices of Saturday afternoon trading under an increased wage package for shop assistants?

The Prices Act deals with pricing of goods and services in South Australia, and the recently proclaimed Fair Trading Act provides, in section 8, that one of the functions of the Commissioner is 'to conduct research into matters concerning the interests of consumers generally or a particular class of consumer'. Already, the Retail Traders Association, the Chamber of Commerce and Industry, small business proprietors, and consumers have raised concern about the impact of Government backed union demands for wage rises, time and a half payments and superannuation entitlements.

They have referred specifically to price hikes in the cost of goods and services, and have foreshadowed the possibility of reduced late night shopping in both the city and suburban areas. As the Government has made great play of the relevance to consumers of the Prices Surveillance Authority, I therefore ask the Premier whether he will ask the Prices Commissioner and Commissioner for Consumer Affairs to investigate the likely impact of extended trading hours on prices, as the Act specifically allows for this.

The Hon. J.C. BANNON: I do not think that any such investigation is called for at the moment, because we are talking about a hypothetical situation which will be fully canvassed before the South Australian Industrial Commission. As the honourable member has already pointed out, employer organisations will be placing presumably detailed information before the commission on that very point, and the Government will be very interested to see that. In relation to the Saturday trading issue which has brought this about, this is not something that the Government of itself has initiated, as my colleague the Minister of Labour has made clear throughout. It is a matter for the consumers—the public demand—as assessed by the retailers in

terms of their willingness to respond to it, and the industrial agreement that they can reach with the workers they will require to work on that Saturday afternoon.

While I know that many members of Parliament work very hard and long hours and that we go to many functions, and so on, we would all know that it is a major imposition to be required, even if it is on an occasional rostered basis, to have to work on a Saturday afternoon. One does not expect to do that without getting some kind of special remuneration that recognises that. That is the only reasonable position.

The Government has said that it will not stand in the way of those extended hours in the face of this agreement. However, I find it extraordinarily hard to work out the Opposition's attitude. It depends on whom Opposition members are talking to. If Opposition members want to make big fellows of themselves among consumers or some retailers, they say, 'Let's open the shops.' If, on the other hand, they want to placate the small traders and others who are ringing up and saying that this is the end, Opposition members say, 'Don't worry. It will not happen because the costs will be too great and, if the costs are too great, we will oppose that.' And so it goes on. We have said consistently that we are prepared to facilitate those changes and that is the purpose of the Bill.

DEFENCE CONTRACTING OFFICE

Mr RANN: Can the Premier say what action the Government is taking to convince the Federal Government to rethink its decision to transfer to Melbourne the functions of the Defence Contracting Office in South Australia and to revise its decision to enforce major job losses, including redundancies, at the Defence Research Centre at Salisbury? The Federal Government has announced a major restructuring of the defence, science and technology organisation. It is reported that that restructuring includes the loss of hundreds of blue collar and white collar jobs at the Defence Research Centre, Salisbury. In addition, 47 out of 48 apprentices at DRC have been told that they will not be given employment when their training is completed in January. I have been informed by my constituents that no prior consultation occurred with the workers, the apprentices, or the unions and that this has caused considerable anger in my electorate. I have also been informed that the closure of the Defence Contracting Office in South Australia will severely impede local businesses seeking defence contracts.

The Hon. J.C. BANNON: The honourable member's question is very relevant. I have taken it up with much urgency, as has my colleague the Minister of State Development and Technology, in representations to the Federal Government. Two separate issues are involved here. One comes within the power of Minister Kelly, who is effectively in charge of what was formerly called defence procurement and defence research. The other comes within the direct prerogative of the Minister for Defence (Mr Beazley) relating to the Defence Contracting Office. Concerning the first issue, which relates to the restructuring of the Defence Research Centre and Government defence research capability, I had discussions with the Minister about that last Friday. I have also had telephone communication and have written about the matter. We are indeed concerned about the way in which the restructuring is to take place. In talking to the Minister, it is clear that the full implications have not really been thought through and that, whilst there certainly will be some downsides for Government sector employment in South Australia, there is also an upside by

way of long-term future defence research and development in this State.

Therefore, I do not think that this is a black and white situation. However, it is a matter of great regret that there was not sufficient consultation in our view, with the work force and those affected to work through the various stages and processes that the Federal Government has gone through in its internal defence planning. There is a major job loss involved from the direct Government research capabilities. The Minister and the Federal Government say that the upside will be a much greater participation by the private sector in South Australia, which is well geared to participate in many functions that will not be done in-house. Meanwhile, the Federal Government will strengthen its in-house research function and, if that comes about, well and good. However, we must monitor the situation closely to see how it happens.

That brings us to the second decision, which relates to the Defence Contracting Office. If in fact the idea is that South Australian private industry will get greater access to Government defence work in consequence of the restructuring, then the decision to substantially scale down the South Australian Defence Contracting Office makes no sense whatsoever. That will deny access particularly by a lot of the medium to small scale businesses to the defence contracting process. They need to have immediate access to people who are prepared and able to make decisions. To see that scaled down and transferred off to Melbourne and Sydney—and, incidentally, it does not just affect South Australia but also Queensland and Western Australia—seems to me to work completely against the objects of this defence restructuring. We have protested again most vigorously about that and in that protest have been joined by the Engineering Employees' Association and a number of other people in the field who have set out what I believe to be a very cogent case opposing that move.

I wrote to Minister for Defence Beazley about this at quite some length on 21 October, and I had a response from the acting Minister (Ros Kelly). While attempting to deal with some of the points I had raised (and, indeed, it began by stating that the letter the Minister provided me with ought to satisfy us that the appropriate steps had been taken), she stated, 'I trust that my letter has allayed the bulk of the concerns you have expressed.' As I said to the Minister last Friday, they have not allayed our concerns: on the contrary, our concerns are still very pronounced indeed. I hope that the Commonwealth Government now has a clearer idea of what those concerns are. We were instrumental in setting up a meeting directly with Defence Department officers involved in this scheme and making recommendations to the Minister and representatives of the industry, and I understand that it was a pretty torrid meeting, involving a fairly frank exchange of views.

At this stage there has been no indication that the Commonwealth intends to do other than slightly modify aspects of the decision. I stress 'at this stage', because I hope to be able to speak directly to the Minister, who has just returned from overseas, and draw his attention to the fact that the responses we have had so far do not answer our concerns. So, I can assure the honourable member that both I and the Minister of State Development and Technology are using every effort to try to get some modification, some change and a better understanding of South Australia's segment of the defence industry in the face of these decisions which I think have been taken in a little too much haste and with a little too much insensitivity—indeed, decisions which have not looked at what the end result will be. They are meant to make defence contracting more cost effective

and efficient. I believe that a combination of these measures could in fact result in greater expense to the nation and a good deal less efficiency.

DEFENCE SERVICES

The Hon. B.C. EASTICK: I will be interested in the Premier's answer—

The SPEAKER: Order! No comment, please. The honourable member is aware—

The Hon. B.C. EASTICK:—to my question. Can the Premier explain why South Australia was not represented in a 20-page major supplement on defence services in the national newspaper *The Australian*, given this State's involvement in the submarine replacement project and the threat by the Federal Government to close the Defence Contracting Office in South Australia?

This comprehensive lift-out in *The Australian* was published last Friday and would have attracted considerable interest among industry leaders and defence force personnel. It included lengthy contributions from senior politicians in most States and from the Commonwealth. Writers included Senators John Button, John Stone, and Jocelyn Newman; the Minister for Defence, Kym Beazley; the Minister for Defence Science and Personnel, Ros Kelly; Liberal spokesmen Peter White and Tim Fischer; and New Zealand's defence Minister.

Also prominent were self-congratulatory articles by the Premiers of New South Wales, Victoria and Queensland, and by the Deputy Premier of Western Australia. Inexplicably, South Australia, which prides itself on having won a significant share of the most important defence contract, the submarine project, was noticeably absent from inclusion in this major feature. Further concern has been raised about this situation in the light of the Premier's recent statements that the South Australian Government is making a bid to increase our share of defence and civil offset work, notwithstanding the fact that the Federal Government is considering, as has just been alluded to in the question from the member for Briggs, the closure of the defence contracting office in South Australia with a potential loss of 750 jobs.

The Hon. J.C. BANNON: The Government does quite extensive advertising in key defence journals and publications, and in fact that was part of the reason we were successful in obtaining the submarine contract. Editorial is always supplied for these features as well. In relation to this particular one, I am not aware of the reasons why it was decided that it was not worth our participation. Each of these has to be assessed on its merits: do we get value for money? I know that the Opposition is always very keen to question any kind of promotion expenses.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order!

The Hon. J.C. BANNON: I do not know whether members understand that the normal system that operates here is that if you are prepared to place paid advertising you get your editorial but where you do not, you do not get access to that editorial content. That is all I can comment without knowing why the decision was made not to participate.

COPYRIGHT LAWS

Ms LENEHAN: I direct my question to the Minister of State Development and Technology. Is the Minister aware of the following recent claim made in a local Messenger Press newspaper:

South Australian copyright laws are a bag of worms with as many holes in them as a colander.

Claims have been made recently by a computer software manufacturing company that it is losing \$6 000 profit every three months from computer pirates who are illegally copying software products, particularly printed circuit boards. A spokesperson for the company claims that it would cost the company thousands of dollars to take these computer pirates to court and that they could not afford to reimburse the company if they were found guilty. The company in question has stated:

It is catch 22: they either send us broke with piracy on an unprecedented level or by us taking them to court.

The Hon. LYNN ARNOLD: I thank the honourable member for her question. I did notice the article in the Messenger Press and was certainly concerned about it. I knew that the information industry generally has been very concerned about piracy issues. Indeed, the Australian Information Industry Association (AIIA) has been mounting an anti-piracy campaign for some time to protect software writers in this country.

There are, however, some significant mistakes in the article as printed by Messenger Press. First, the company, Electronic Applications, says that it had legal advice and that basically South Australia's copyright laws are a bag of worms, as noted by the honourable member. The fact is that copyright legislation is not State legislation, it is in fact Federal legislation, and the Copyright Act 1968 was amended in 1984 for the purpose of providing for the copyright of computer software. On that occasion, I understand, the AIIA did make some submissions to the Commonwealth Government on the matter, and I have not had any advice from them recently that in their anti-piracy campaign they are indicating that there are deficiencies in the legislation. There is no evidence that I have from that association—with which I have maintained some contact over the last couple of years, I might say—to support that they believe that there are deficiencies in the legislation.

Another matter that is worth noting is that the copyright issue, as I understand it, does not apply only to computer software but applies also to printed circuit boards, a matter also raised in the article. There is another point that also needs to be understood and I would draw it to the attention of Electronics Applications. If adequate evidence of piracy is given to them, the Commonwealth Police will act quickly to apprehend offenders, and a court injunction can be obtained without much delay. The Commonwealth Police are prepared to assist in this area because it is a breach of legislation, and therefore they will do what they can to assist. What I would ask is that, rather than take the approach that they have done through Messenger Press in inaccurately reporting on the situation, perhaps they ought to provide either myself or the Commonwealth Government with whatever information they have or get in touch with the Commonwealth police directly.

If they believe that there are deficiencies in the Commonwealth legislation, I would appreciate hearing about that as well, and guarantee to draw that to the attention of my Federal colleagues. I can also say that this matter has been drawn to the attention both of my Department of State Development and Technology and of the recently established and State Government supported Software Export Centre of South Australia. I will ask them to enter into discussions with the AIIA to identify what further action, if any, is necessary to address these issues. We do have a very exciting software writing industry in South Australia which we want to protect in whichever way we can, and we will discuss this matter with the industry at large.

RAILCAR FLEET REPLACEMENT

Mr OLSEN: I address my question to the Minister of Transport. Why has the Government failed to act on a recommendation from the State Transport Authority that its ageing 'red hen' railcar fleet must be progressively replaced in order to save South Australian taxpayers some \$40 million: and is the Minister aware that his failure to implement the recommendation will result in the closure of a major South Australian company, affecting many subcontractors and causing the loss of at least 300 jobs?

The Government was informed two months ago that the cost of replacing its ageing 'red hen' fleet progressively when individual trains were due for major body and mechanical overhauls would be \$99.8 million. In comparison, a continuation of the current policy of refurbishing the ageing vehicles would cost \$137.2 million, and was therefore not recommended to the Government as a viable option. The Government announced in 1983 that it would order 20 new railcars from a South Australian firm—Comeng (South Australia)—with an option for a further 80.

The company spent some six months gathering together a team of boilermakers, sheetmetal workers, electrical fitters, mechanical fitters and coachbuilders which it trained to undertake the specialised work necessary for the contract. Comeng estimates that it lost in excess of \$3 million while waiting for the STA railcar contract, and about \$1 million on the first 20 cars of the contract. The company accepts that financial loss in the first stage of such a contract is normal, due to the high cost of training staff and through initial design errors.

An extension contract is required to cover these losses, and current delays by the Government are costing Comeng \$175 000 per month. Furthermore, the specialised tradesmen required for rolling stock assembly are progressively being made redundant and are considered virtually irreplaceable. The company has budgeted for a close-down of its Dry Creek works at the end of June next year if the Government does not immediately place an extension order as recommended by the Engineering Manager of the STA.

Three hundred jobs will be lost. A number of local subcontractors face closure and one has already gone into liquidation. The Government's delay in implementing the recommendation from the STA has already resulted in the loss of specially trained personnel, and any further postponement of the decision will lead to interstate labour and businesses being required to undertake South Australian work at far greater cost. The Opposition has been told that the losses stemming from a single contract could have the capacity to totally outweigh the technological and employment benefits of the submarine project.

The Hon. G.F. KENEALLY: That last statement of the honourable Leader is about as outrageous a statement as we could expect from the Opposition. In comparing any one industry with another, to suggest that the loss of the capacity in South Australia to construct railcars is equivalent to losing the submarine contract is something I would just—

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order!

The Hon. G.F. KENEALLY:—ask members of the House to contemplate, and they will reach their own conclusions as to the validity of such a statement. When the contract was let for the series 3 000—

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order! I ask the honourable Minister to resume his seat for a moment. The rather lengthy question from the Leader of the Opposition was received in silence

by the House. The same courtesy should be extended to the reply from the Minister of Transport. The honourable Minister.

The Hon. G.F. KENEALLY: When the contract was let, it was for 20 railcars and it was clearly part of the contract that the State Transport Authority would evaluate the performance of the series 3000 cars before deciding whether or not additional railcars would be purchased. The company knew that and the STA and the Government were aware of it, and I have written to the company and advised it in the same terms. The losses mentioned by the honourable member have never been put to me by the company, but the company understood when it arranged its work program that there was a firm contract for 20 railcars and that the Government and the STA would make a decision about any additional railcars at the appropriate time. Recommendations from the Engineering Manager of the STA are not necessarily accepted by the Government, because the Government must balance its capital works program against the running costs of the STA. We have been roundly criticised by the Opposition, and here is another example where the Opposition on the one hand wants to criticise the STA—

Members interjecting:

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

Mr D.S. Baker interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order! I call the member for Victoria to order.

The Hon. G.F. KENEALLY: —and the Government for the STA's running a deficit and, on the other hand, demands that there be massive capital expenditure. At the moment the STA and Government officers are looking at the comparison between purchasing additional railcars and upgrading the existing 'red hen' stock. The figures quoted by the Leader of the Opposition are certainly not available to me and I ask him to provide me with this detailed information so that it can be checked, because the figures he mentioned are not the comparable figures that now exist between the purchase of the new series 3000 cars and the upgrading of the 'red hens'.

The number of railcars required will depend on decisions taken by Governments over the next few years, and the Government of the day will make that decision when it is appropriate. In the meantime, the economy—and the company has acknowledged this—is completely different now compared with what it was when the contract for the 20 railcars was entered into. I am in touch with the company, which is negotiating with the Government. That will continue, and I think that is the way to deal with this matter. The Opposition's intrusion in an attempt to make this a political issue will not help the parties to solve what is a sensitive area which is of concern to the Government in relation to employment; on the other hand, the Government has funding priorities which need to be met, and any recommendation that I make to Cabinet will be within those priorities.

PORT RIVER POLLUTION

Mr PETERSON: My question is to—

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order!

Mr PETERSON: —the Premier, representing the Minister for Environment and Planning. Will the Premier obtain an explanation as to why the recent pollution of the Port River and associated waters was considered toxic? The visible indicator of this pollution was the dark red discolour-

ation of the river. This discolouration has been evident on many previous occasions but not considered, or at least not declared, to be dangerous. Indeed, as in previous cases, it has been thought to be industrial pollution. This raises a query about the toxicity of previous 'algal blooms' (as it is known) or the effectiveness and timing of monitoring and testing procedures, especially with the many contaminated outfalls into the Port River, as mentioned in the Department of Environment and Planning's report entitled 'South Australian Land Based Marine Pollution'—pollution which, conceivably, may have contributed to the problem.

The Hon. J.C. BANNON: I am not aware of the details of the matter mentioned by the honourable member, but I am certainly happy to refer the question to my colleague and bring down a reply.

CROUZET TICKETING SYSTEM

Mr INGERSON: Can the Minister of Transport confirm that continuing problems with the new Crouzet ticketing system have resulted in the Government's bringing to Adelaide a computer expert from France to assist in alleviating persistent difficulties, and will he advise what the cost of this will be to taxpayers? The Opposition continues to receive numerous complaints about the Government's ticketing system, purchased after Government officials and trade union representatives flew to France last year to inspect it.

We have been informed in recent days that one of the major difficulties confronting both public transport commuters and bus drivers stems from the fact that the computer programming upon which the entire system operates has been found to be out of date. Our information is that the mass of computer software that underpins the State-wide system which was set up six weeks ago is technologically ancient, and that the Government has found it necessary to call in a computer expert from France to undertake urgent and major upgrading and program modifications.

The Hon. G.F. KENEALLY: It would be much more helpful to the whole debate if the honourable member would check out these matters with either me or the STA before he tries to make political propaganda in this place. We are sick and tired of the furphies that he and a few other vested interest people are putting around about the Crouzet system. The Government is not bringing anyone out from France; the Crouzet company is sending one of its people out.

Members interjecting:

The Hon. G.F. KENEALLY: It is a vastly different proposition, and I will explain why. It is a vastly different proposition, although it might not be to the infantile minds opposite, but it is clear to any rational person who listened to the question asked by the honourable member. He said that we were bringing out someone from Europe because our technology is not functioning. There are some bugs within the software, and Crouzet has been told clearly and strongly by the STA, and by me as Minister (I met with them last week), that it has to make sure that within the shortest time possible the technology is as it should be.

The company is sending one of its people to help overcome the problems. It is common practice in any industry or commercial or industrial undertaking, and it is particularly commonplace when new technology is being introduced. For that to indicate to the Opposition that we are having extensive problems is flying the kite indeed. I just want to put on record here that there seems to be a feeling about—certainly with the Opposition, whose members are trying to project such a feeling—that here is a new piece of technology not tried anywhere else in the world and suddenly we are giving it a trial here in Adelaide.

Crouzet is a major company that has installed public transport ticketing systems all over the world. It is now putting in a system which is about 10 times the size of the one in Adelaide for the Olympic Games in Seoul next year. They have had them in Paris for longer than most members have been in this place and probably longer than some members have been alive. They have them in Marseilles, in Lille, in two places in the United Kingdom and in Mexico City; South African railways use the systems and they are putting them in in Rio de Janeiro. This is the technology that members opposite continually want—

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order!

The Hon. G.F. KENEALLY: —to reflect on. If there are members opposite who have a legitimate cause for complaint about Crouzet, let them tell us what it is instead of some of these furphies that have been put around. The honourable member is party to that in claiming that if one puts the ticket halfway in, people get a ride for nothing. And there is the sort of stuff he said last week, that, while a person is buying a ticket, if someone hops onto the vehicle with a multi-trip ticket and validates the multi-trip ticket, it affects the validation of the other ticket purchased. That is not true; it is not true anywhere in the world where Crouzet tickets are used.

It is this sort of furphy that we have become used to from the Opposition. In a month, when this system is running smoothly—I gave it three months, and I will give it another month—they will have something else to complain about and they will forget about that. They will not want to talk about it; they will not want to know about the criticisms and their efforts to downgrade the technology and to convince people that they should not ride on the STA. They will move on to something else.

The answer to the question is that the computer technology that we have got is technology that is applicable to the systems that have been applied. It has been put in by a company that has wide experience and is very well technologically accepted within the industry throughout the world. We stated from the beginning that we knew that there would be problems, and we accounted and budgeted for that. There are always teething problems when one introduces technology and has to get the community, the work force and everyone else adjusted to it; and that is happening. We have told Crouzet to send somebody out here pretty smartly to fix it up. If the Opposition wants to object to us doing that, it is a strange objection indeed.

ADELAIDE'S CHARM

Mr HAMILTON: Will the Minister of Transport, representing the Minister of Tourism in another place, ask the Minister to respond to the grossly misleading article, attributed to reporter Ian Livingstone, which appeared in the Melbourne *Herald* yesterday (9 November) and which stated:

This column spent the weekend in Adelaide, which has a lovely, easy-going charm that has been all but lost in Melbourne. You can't help admiring some of their quaint habits. For example, you still can't buy petrol on Sundays. And despite the fact that two cars on a road represents a Sunday traffic jam, the people who live there adhere religiously to the speed limit. In other words, it's a nutty joint which sends you mad with frustration.

A quick survey of members from both sides of the Chamber has revealed that petrol is easily obtainable in the metropolitan area on Sundays. The Minister's quick response to this misleading article would seem appropriate. An article such as this can only damage tourism and the hospitality industry in this State.

The Hon. G.F. KENEALLY: If the Melbourne *Herald* journalist, Ms Anne—

Honourable members: Ian.

The Hon. G.F. KENEALLY: What I was going to say is even more valid. I was going to say that if Ms Anne Livingstone—now Ian Livingstone—was frustrated after a visit to Adelaide there is very little I can do about that. That is an even more valid statement now that I know it is Ian Livingstone. I think that the journalist is wrong on every point. Taking the last point first, I would be absolutely delighted if Adelaide motorists would stick religiously to the speed limit. I think that that is something we would all be delighted to see, and I doubt whether we are going to achieve that. One of the problems in Adelaide, I believe, is that too many drivers do not take a great deal of notice of the speed limit.

Two cars on a road is certainly not a traffic problem in South Australia. Compared to Melbourne, Sydney, Brisbane, the Gold Coast, Perth, or any other city in Australia, I would have to say that it is most pleasant to drive in the traffic on roads in Adelaide, and that is one of the attractions of the city. In relation to not being able to buy petrol on weekends, that is a furphy. It seems to me that Mr Livingstone has not been to Adelaide for a very long time. He is typical of some Melbourne journalists who have been envious of our city—probably a bit of sour grapes, as Victorians have shown over the past couple of years, because we continue to beat them at most everything, and so this is a bit of a snide shot at South Australia.

It is certainly not convincing his readers or anyone else in Victoria. Anyone who goes out into metropolitan Adelaide can look at the number plates on the vehicles driving around our city and see how many of them come from Victoria. Obviously, Victorians do not take any notice of the likes of Mr Livingstone, and neither they should. Adelaide remains the most attractive, relaxed, pleasant city in Australia; the one that is going to give you the best holiday and the most convenient time to do it in. You can do more things in a day in Adelaide than in any other city in Australia.

Further, I suggest that, while they are here, they get out of their motor vehicles and ride on our excellent transport system. I should be delighted to have them compare that with what they have in Melbourne, as well. I believe that this little article, which I have not yet seen, will give the Minister of Tourism the opportunity to write to the Melbourne *Herald* authorities pointing out the error of their ways. It should give the Minister a platform whereby she can put matters clearly to those intelligent readers of the Victorian press who would be interested in what is going on in the Queen City of the South—Adelaide. I suggest that my colleague take the opportunity to do so.

CROUZET TICKETING SYSTEM

The Hon. D.C. WOTTON: Can the Minister of Transport say why the State Transport Authority has not implemented its promise to provide special monthly passes direct to intellectually disabled passengers to overcome difficulties that they have with using the new Crouzet ticketing system? I have in my possession a letter dated 24 September from the Public Relations Manager of the STA (Mr Sweet) to the father of an intellectually disabled girl, who had raised with the authority difficulties that she and other handicapped people would face in using the new ticketing system.

In his reply, Mr Sweet said that the STA was aware that some passengers, such as the intellectually disabled, might

not be able to use the new Crouzet equipment and that consequently a monthly ticket, not requiring validation, to be called a 'mobility pass' would be available. However, when an application was made at the STA's city office, staff there knew nothing about the availability of a mobility pass. Apparently, they will be made available only through agents such as sheltered workshops in which handicapped people are employed, and in this case it has now been suggested that the girl can be trained to use the new equipment rather than have the benefit of a mobility pass. What has also angered the father is the fact that under the new charging system it will cost an extra \$160 a year for his daughter to use buses to attend various sporting, recreational and educational activities in which she has been participating to further improve her standing in society. This is because she is a regular user of public transport at nights and weekends and she previously had the benefit of a monthly pass allowing an unlimited number of trips, whereas the multi-trip ticket will now more than double her outlay on fares.

The Hon. G.F. KENEALLY: I ask the member for Heyesen to give me details of the case that he has brought to the attention of the House. As I explained in reply to a question from, I think, the member for Adelaide some weeks if not months ago, it was certainly the intention of the STA and therefore of the Government to ensure that travel on public transport was made as easy and as convenient as possible for people in the community who have difficulty in using public transport.

The Hon. D.C. Wotton interjecting:

The Hon. G.F. KENEALLY: That is exactly the policy and I ask the honourable member to give me the details of the case that he has brought to the House so that I can discuss the matter with the STA. True, the STA has contacted representative bodies of the intellectually and physically handicapped, those people who might be unable to use the Crouzet system. It is not a matter of criticism that the STA would encourage people who have difficulties with the system to learn how to use it: that is a productive and positive suggestion. On the other hand, however, it is necessary, where it is difficult for people because of either physical or intellectual problems to use the system, for the STA to provide help for them. It was intended, and indeed the decision was made, that there be provided a ticket to be hung around the neck. Many people do not like that idea, although such a ticket could be easily shown and would not be lost.

There are degrees of handicap, and in some instances that may well be the most positive way to ensure that tickets are not lost. It is not a matter of criticism: this is a sensitive area that needs to be dealt with sensitively, and as Minister I am prepared to ensure that it is. For the people who travel on concession multi-trip tickets, the trips work out at 20c each. I will have a look at the calculations that the honourable member has used, because the figure involves an enormous number of trips for people who are using 20c trips. However, I accept the *bona fides* of the honourable member and, obviously, of the concerned parent who has written to him. I will have the matter looked at. It is the intention of the STA to ensure that all citizens of Adelaide have ready access to the STA's public transport system.

TEA TREE GULLY TAFE COLLEGE

Ms GAYLER: Will the Minister of Employment and Further Education ensure that the Tea Tree Gully TAFE College will not suffer the suggested 25 per cent cut in its educational programs and staffing as a result of the proposal

to discontinue prevocational business studies, and will the Minister ensure a replacement youth program for the college and the burgeoning youth population of the area? Until the new Tea Tree Gully TAFE College is developed in the period 1989-91, it is offering an extremely limited further education program with the lowest funding of any college per head of population, estimated at \$3.50 compared with \$96.50 per capita per annum. It has the lowest participation rate—2.6 per cent, compared with an average of 12 per cent; and it has the lowest cost per student hour—\$3.35, compared with the highest of \$9.18.

Students, staff and the college council were alarmed at a departmental proposal to discontinue prevocational business studies and thereby cut programs and staff by 25 per cent, eliminating the youth training program. The college which is operating in conditions described as 'spartan', has to make its leisure courses fully self-funding, and has imposed an additional administrative fee per semester. The college has a budget so small that it cannot fund a New Opportunities for Women program for semester 1 in 1988. As a matter of equity for a college serving a fast growing population with a high percentage of young people, the college faces critical problems unless the suggested cuts are reversed and some modest growth is allowed.

The Hon. LYNN ARNOLD: I thank the honourable member for her question. She has raised a number of issues to do with the funding prospects of the Tea Tree College of TAFE which have been raised by our colleague the member for Florey, who is also concerned about these matters. I need to quickly canvass a couple of points. First, she asked if I would ensure there will not be a 25 per cent cut in the study program of the Tea Tree Gully college. I can say that, with respect to the lecturing staff of the college, it is certainly not proposed that there be a 25 per cent cut. Lecturing staff at the college at the beginning of 1987 amounted to 8.6, made up of either permanent or temporary staff. It is anticipated that at the beginning of next year that figure will be a minimum of 7.6 and may even be 8.6, depending on details still being worked through relating to matters that I will canvass more in a few moments.

It is certainly true that the staffing in November this year has been 9.6 lecturing staff as opposed to 8.6 at the beginning of the year. We do not know what the situation might be in November next year, taken on a 12-month basis. As to the business studies area, we do have some issues that need some further work. First, in a number of colleges, there have been prevocational offerings in the area of business studies but, because of constraints on the entire prevocational study area, the Chairman of the Industrial and Commercial Training Commission, upon the consideration of that commission, has recommended that such non-trade based areas should not be high priorities in prevocational programs.

The Chairman has allocated, or is recommending the allocation of, prevocational programs to trade based areas. That automatically puts aside the business studies courses in any college. There is, of course, an alternate argument that business studies will be picked up by means of traineeships. *Prima facie* that appears to offer some possibilities for the Tea Tree Gully college and it is certainly one that would be supported by me and the department.

The one complicating factor is that the actual location of a traineeship program is not determined by me, by the Department of TAFE, or by the ICTC; it is in fact determined by the CES as to where those courses will take place and they have not shown a predisposition to favour location of traineeship courses at smaller colleges. Hence, that would tend to militate against Tea Tree Gully.

Those matters are what we are having to further consider: whether or not we should be discussing with the ICTC a special exception to the rule of there being no non-trade based prevocational courses allowing for a business studies course at Tea Tree Gully, or whether we should be having discussions with the CES, advising of what we believe is the case and, that is, the suitability of Tea Tree Gully as a site for a traineeship program to be offered.

Quite apart from that I can say that a proposal has been put by the college to consolidate some of its business studies work into a certificate in business practice. This certainly has my support and I can advise that we anticipate that it should proceed next year, subject to certain details still to be resolved. They are the matters that are holding up the final determination of what the staffing level will be at the Tea Tree Gully College of TAFE. It will certainly not be a 25 per cent cut, however.

Other points need to be quickly made. The conditions are spartan, and that is why the college is the subject of a major redevelopment, which will in fact provide a very adequate facility, not only for Tea Tree Gully but that entire region of the metropolitan and surrounding areas. It is not unique to that college that their leisure courses be self-funding. That is, in fact, something that many colleges of TAFE within South Australia live with. Some funds are available for gap funding, but they are very limited and we are now expecting colleges, within their own internal programs, to balance out what could be called revenue generating courses to help fund courses that will have high rates of concession application.

I acknowledge the point made by the honourable member about the delegated funding for Tea Tree Gully being a very small budget. I can say, however, that the cuts to that program in real terms are certainly no larger than other colleges in the TAFE system. Indeed, they are quite small reductions in what has been a very difficult financial year. However, the point made about that limiting the capacity of the college to fund the NOW program (as is required of colleges that are in their third year of NOW) is a valid one, and I am certainly taking that matter up further with the department and will keep the honourable member, and other members interested in that matter, further informed. To reiterate my first point; there will not be a 25 per cent cut. The final size of the program next year is still dependent on discussions that are currently taking place.

PLANNING ACT BREACH

The Hon. JENNIFER CASHMORE: I direct my question to the Premier, as Minister representing the Minister for Environment and Planning. Will the Premier explain to the House why the Minister for Environment and Planning and other Ministers have breached section 7 of the Planning Act in failing to lay on the table of both Houses of Parliament the report of the Enfield council opposing the construction by the Department of Housing and Construction, on behalf of the Department for Community Welfare, of a detention centre for youth who have been sentenced by the Children's Court, and why was work allowed to proceed on the site in contravention of the Planning Act?

Residents of Markham Avenue, Watson Street and surrounding streets in Enfield (in the Premier's electorate) are strongly opposed to the detention centre being built in this R2 zoned area. Residents have suffered assaults, theft, harassment and vandalism as a result of youths being held for detention in a building adjacent to the proposed site which is part of the former Enfield Receiving Home. Because the

Planning Act does not bind the Crown, the normal appeals and objections to the Department for Community Welfare's plan for a permanent six bedroom home with adjacent double garage, tool sheds, boat shed and full sized tennis court to serve as a detention centre for youth sentenced by the Children's Court do not apply.

However, the Planning Act requires the Minister to cause any council objections to Government development proposals to be laid on the table of both Houses of Parliament before such developments can proceed. The Enfield council's report dated 28 July 1987 and forwarded to the Planning Commission for consideration by the Minister shortly after that date states:

If this proposal were to proceed, it would be at serious variance with the development plan, detract from the residential character of the area, significantly impair the amenity of the locality and cause a serious non-conforming intrusion in the locality.

Despite this, work proceeded on foundations for the detention centre until the council drew the attention of the Minister's department to the fact that the Minister had not complied with section 7. Work then ceased, but subsequently resumed until a further complaint was laid by the Enfield council. As far as I have been able to ascertain, the council's report has still not been laid on the table, despite the fact that it has been in the Minister's possession since early August.

The Hon. J.C. BANNON: I am aware of some of the detail of this issue because, as the honourable member says, the matter is one that affects residents of my electorate and, indeed, I received a deputation from them in my electorate office some time back. As a consequence of that I have taken an interest in the issue. I cannot comment as to whether or not certain requirements have been complied with. I do not know those details, but I am happy to refer the matter to my colleague. My chief concern was that this issue did not get out of hand. There was, in fact, an existing centre, the use of which, I think, had not been properly explained to residents, nor were the conditions governing the centre.

Certainly, what was needed in terms of its replacement was clear, because the facility was inadequate. But it is a very important facility in the rehabilitation of these youthful offenders. As is always the case, it is very hard to know precisely where one can locate these things. For instance, I think that the residents are blaming just about every incident which occurs on the kids who are in this centre. Some of them might have been so caused: the police have not been able to find evidence in all cases, and it is just one of those things that crop up in a neighbourhood when a particular facility (which is absolutely necessary) is established without, in my view, adequate consultation.

So I was very concerned that the situation did not get out of hand, and that the residents were fully briefed and understood what was going to happen and how it should be done and that they were not just presented with a *fait accompli*. That action has been taking place. I must say that the intervention of the honourable member in what I would regard as just gross political opportunism has not helped at all. The very thing I was hoping could be avoided, that is, the stirring up of people, has occurred. It is very easy: any of us can run around with a petition and strike fear into people and say that these terrible things are happening. It is very easy to do, and I believe that the honourable member is behaving quite despicably in the way in which she has gone out there and actively worked to try to foment this issue.

She probably takes a bit of delight in it. It gets people stirred up: it agitates them about me because I am the local member; that is fine. The other thing is that it is actively

impeding the proper rehabilitation of these kids—which she does not care about at all. It is gross exploitation of a difficult and delicate situation. That is the truth, and I would hope that the honourable member would at least be a little embarrassed about her blundering, elephantine intervention in this case—

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order!

The Hon. J.C. BANNON:—which will make it very difficult for all of us to sort out. We are going to try, whatever stirring is done. The honourable member got a nice front page in the local paper: full tote odds for the publicity. Thank you very much! But what about the residents she has stirred up unnecessarily, and what about the kids who need rehabilitation? That is the last thing the honourable member thought of. It is a pity it got out of hand, but I assure the House that we will try to do something about it.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order!

The Hon. J.C. BANNON: Do not try to condone it.

The SPEAKER: Order! I call the Premier to order and, for the second time today, I call the Leader of the Opposition to order.

SITTINGS AND BUSINESS

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

That the time allotted for—

(a) all stages of the following Bills:

Motor Vehicles Act Amendment (No. 3),
Road Traffic Act Amendment (No. 3),
Barley Marketing Act Amendment
Canned Fruits Marketing Act Amendment
Apiaries Act Amendment, and
Metropolitan Milk Supply Act Amendment;

(b) consideration of the amendments of the Legislative Council in the Public Employees Housing Bill, and consideration of Message No. 31 from the Legislative Council relating to the Road Traffic Act Amendment Bill (No. 2)—

be until 6 p.m. on Thursday 12 November.

Motion carried.

LONG SERVICE LEAVE (BUILDING INDUSTRY) BILL

Returned from the Legislative Council with the following amendments:

No. 1. Page 7, line 30 (clause 14)—After 'disability' insert 'and no right to preservation of the effective service entitlement arises under this Act'.

No. 2. Page 10—After line 30 insert new clause 17a as follows:

17a. *Preservation of entitlements in certain cases—*

(1) Where—

- (a) a person who has an effective service entitlement ceases to be employed as a building worker;
- (b) the person is not entitled to long service leave or a payment for *pro rata* long service leave;
- (c) the person commences work as a self-employed contractor in the building industry within 36 months after cessation of his or her employment as a building worker;

and

- (d) the person provides notice of his or her work as a contractor to the board in accordance with the regulations,

the effective service entitlement is preserved.

(2) Where the person, or his or her personal representative satisfies the board that the aggregate period of work in the building industry (as a building worker and subsequently as a contractor) totals 84 months or more, the board must pay to the person (or his or her personal representative) an amount calculated as follows:

$$A = \frac{OWP \times E \times 13}{120}$$

where

A is the amount payable;

OWP is the ordinary weekly pay for work of the kind last performed by the person as a building worker as at the day of payment;

E is the effective service entitlement.

No. 3. Page 10, line 32 (clause 18)—After 'in' insert 'any other employment in place of his or her'.

No. 4. Page 11 (clause 20)—After line 24 insert new sub-clause as follows:

(3) Subject to considerations of security in investment, money should be invested under this section so as to obtain the highest possible rate of return.

No. 5. Page 13, lines 9 to 11 (clause 26)—Leave out all words in these lines and insert:

(a) an employer fails to furnish a return under subsection (1);

No. 6. Page 13 (clause 26)—After line 13 insert new word and paragraph as follows:

or

(c) an employer fails to comply with a requirement imposed under subsection (3) or (4).

No. 7. Page 14 (clause 29)—After line 30, insert new sub-clause as follows:

(4a) A person is not obliged to answer a question under this section if the answer would tend to incriminate that person of an offence, or to produce a book, document or record if it or its contents would tend to incriminate that person of an offence.

No. 8. Page 16, lines 15 to 23 (clause 37)—Leave out the clause.

No. 9. Page 19—After line 18 insert new clause 44a as follows:

44a. *Expiation of offences—* (1) An offence against any of the following sections is expiable—

Section 18

Section 25

Section 26.

(2) Where it is alleged that a person has committed an expiable offence, the board may cause to be served personally or by post on that person a notice to the effect that he or she may expiate the offence by payment to the board of the expiation fee specified in the notice within 60 days of the date of the notice and, if the offence is so expiated, no proceedings will be commenced in a court with respect to the alleged offence.

(3) The expiation fee payable in respect of an expiable offence is as follows:

Section 18—\$100

Section 25—\$200

Section 26—\$250.

No. 10. Page 19, lines 29 to 35 (clause 45)—Leave out sub-clause (3).

Consideration in Committee.

Amendments Nos 1 to 3:

The Hon. FRANK BLEVINS: I move:

That the Legislative Council's amendments Nos 1 to 3 be agreed to.

Mr S.J. BAKER: I have some difficulty with amendment No. 2 which was put forward by the Australian Democrats. The principle of the Bill, which has been effectively eroded over a period of time, was to cater for those people who moved between various firms within the building industry. This proposition now allows a person who becomes self-employed to reap the benefits of previous service within the industry if he has not served the 84 months required as a minimum before *pro rata* payments can be made. We are now starting to break down further principles on which long service leave is granted. The fact that a person becomes self-employed by definition takes him outside the ambit of long service leave, even though there is a clause in this Bill

which allows for people to opt in, as the Minister said, on a pay-as-you-go basis.

My primary concern is that we are now setting a precedent and saying that, if people serve in the retail industry for six years and then become shop keepers, they get the benefit of that six years within the retail industry. We continue to break down the principles upon which this stands. The more I read this legislation and the more I see of it, the more I think that long service leave has become an irrelevancy as far as principle is concerned in this country. It is no longer as it was perceived when first introduced. It is out of kilter with the rest of the world: no-one else has it.

Members interjecting:

The CHAIRMAN: The Committee will come to order. I assure the Committee that members will conduct themselves appropriately and not as they have been for the past three or four minutes.

Mr S.J. BAKER: As the member for Mawson said, times have changed. I cannot agree more—times have changed and it is about time that Australia changed with them. The Opposition opposes amendment No. 2.

Motion carried.

Amendment No. 4:

The Hon. FRANK BLEVINS: I move:

That the Legislative Council's amendment No. 4 be disagreed to.

This amendment is somewhat contentious, but I believe that negotiations over the next couple of hours will sort out the problem. I appreciate what the Legislative Council is attempting to do, but the amendment amounts to over-kill. There have been no complaints about matters addressed in the amendment. It has been suggested that the fund has been used to subsidise pet Government projects—that is certainly not the case. The fund is used only to control the security of investments. I certainly oppose the amendment. While not wishing to pre-empt the wishes of the other place, I believe that within a couple of hours and after more information is given to individual members in another place they, too, will agree that the amendment is no longer necessary. I urge the Committee to support my motion.

Mr S.J. BAKER: It is not often that I agree with the Minister, but on this occasion I do. The board has kindly provided us with a schedule of its investments. There are no stock market investments to concern us (which would have led to a loss of value for the fund). The Opposition can find no fault with the conduct of the board in relation to its financial investments. While in principle the amendment tends to place an onus on the board to put money invested to its highest and best use, it does cause some conflict in terms of practical application. The board has conducted itself exceptionally well in relation to its investments, so we see no reason to proceed with the amendment.

Motion carried.

Amendments Nos 5 to 10:

The Hon. FRANK BLEVINS: I move:

That the Legislative Council's amendments Nos 5 to 10 be agreed to.

The CHAIRMAN: Order! I ask members of the Committee to resume their seats.

Mr. S.J. BAKER: I do have some objection, but I am not wildly excited about it. The amendments fail to provide a penalty for those persons who do not forward money with their return. However, the board can worry about that later. I have no difficulty with the clauses dealing with incrimination because they are consistent with the Liberal Party's approach. The expiation of offences has been written into the legislation. That is specific and I have no great difficulty with the expiation clauses, or the amounts. Under the expia-

tion of offences legislation (which is still being debated), discretion was placed with the Chief Executive, but similar discretion does not apply under this legislation. Some of the checks and balances contained within the expiation of offences legislation have not been provided under this legislation. When we were dealing with the expiation of offences legislation we were told that all expiations would be controlled by the Attorney.

The CHAIRMAN: Order! The member for Bragg is out of order.

Mr S.J. BAKER: This Bill departs from that practice. The Government said that the Attorney would have total control in relation to expiation to ensure that there was consistency and uniformity, and that we would all live happily ever after. However, these amendments depart from that practice. So our first attempt to implement that approach has failed miserably and, as a result, I note the Government's inconsistency in accepting the amendments.

The Hon. FRANK BLEVINS: Mr Chairman, I—

The CHAIRMAN: Order! I ask the honourable member for Victoria to resume his seat.

Mr D.S. BAKER: On a point of order, Mr Chairman, I do not think the Chairman of Committees can require me to be seated at all times.

The Hon. Frank Blevins: Of course he can.

Mr D.S. Baker: He can try.

The CHAIRMAN: Order! I know that the honourable member for Victoria is comparatively new to this place.

Members interjecting:

The CHAIRMAN: Order! It is apparent that the honourable member is not conversant with all Standing Orders. Standing Order 78 provides:

Every member of the House, when he comes into the House, shall take his place, and shall not stand in any of the passages or gangways.

I have called to order, under this Standing Order, members on both sides of the Committee, including the members for Newland and Bragg and now the member for Victoria. While I am Chairman, the Committee will be conducted in accordance with Standing Orders. As Chairman, I am quite within my rights to ask the honourable member for Victoria to be seated, especially in view of the fact that a member of his Party has the floor. I believe that courtesy should be shown to the member speaking. I hope I have answered the honourable member's point of order.

Mr MEIER: On a point of order, Mr Chairman, I refer to your enforcement of Standing Order 78 and ask whether you would be prepared to indicate how long an honourable member is able to stand in his or her place before being called to order, and how long a member can simply stretch his or her legs before moving out of the Chamber.

The CHAIRMAN: No time limit is mentioned in Standing Orders. If an honourable member wishes to approach the Standing Orders Committee with a view to inserting a time limit, he is at liberty to do so. The Chair will determine how long a member can wander around. The Chair has always been fairly lenient in this regard, but the Committee will be conducted appropriately.

The Hon. FRANK BLEVINS: We believe that the new scheme proposed in the amendment—

Members interjecting:

The CHAIRMAN: Order! I ask the Minister of Labour to resume his seat. I think the honourable member for Victoria is determined to defy the Chair and, if he continues, I will have no alternative but to name him. I extend to the member for Victoria this time—for the first time—a warning.

Mr D.S. BAKER: On a point of order, Mr Chairman, Standing Order 78 provides:

Every member of the House, when he comes into the House, shall take his place—

one syllable words, English—

and shall not stand in any of the passages or gangways.

It does not say, Mr Chairman, that he shall be seated. I am in my place and I am not seated.

The **CHAIRMAN**: Has the honourable member finished his point of order?

Mr D.S. BAKER: Yes.

The **CHAIRMAN**: Please be seated. I do not accept the honourable member's point of order. I expect that, when a member comes into the Chamber, he shall take his place, which I assume means that he will be seated. I do not intend to continue with this question and answer from the Chair. If the honourable member wishes to take it further it is within his province to do so. The honourable Minister.

The **Hon. FRANK BLEVINS**: Again I congratulate you, Mr Chairman, on the clarity of that decision. I could argue that it is the best speech that has been made all day. The purpose of this new clause concerns the expiation of offences and is consistent with the Government's declared intention to limit expiation to these sections. The difference with this scheme is that it now appears in the Bill and is no longer left to the regulations.

Motion carried.

The **Hon. E.R. GOLDSWORTHY**: Mr Chairman, I rise on a point of order. I refer to Standing Order 78. What is the position in the case of the member for Fisher, who is not in his place? How do you interpret—

The **CHAIRMAN**: I ask the Deputy Leader to take his seat. It is not the time, at this point in Committee, for the Chairman to be giving interpretations. If the Deputy Leader would like to take this up at a later stage, I would be only too pleased to accommodate him.

The **Hon. E.R. GOLDSWORTHY**: I just draw your attention to the fact that one member—

The **CHAIRMAN**: Order! I ask the Deputy Leader to take his seat.

The following reason for disagreement was adopted:

Because the amendment derogates from the effectiveness of the Bill.

SHOP TRADING HOURS ACT AMENDMENT BILL

The **Hon. FRANK BLEVINS (Minister of Labour)** obtained leave and introduced a Bill for an Act to amend the Shop Trading Hours Act 1977. Read a first time.

The **Hon. FRANK BLEVINS**: I move:

That this Bill be now read a second time.

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

Leave granted.

Explanation of Bill

The purpose of this Bill is to permit general retail trading until 5 p.m. on Saturday afternoons in the central, metropolitan and all country shopping districts.

Over the past 12 months or so, there has been much public debate on the subject of Saturday afternoon retail trading and I have on a number of occasions indicated that the parties should try to reach agreement on this matter.

From this has emerged a request from the Retail Traders Association that trading be permitted until 5 p.m. on Saturdays and reports indicate that this has the support of the major retailers.

Shop assistants have indicated, through the Shop Distributive and Allied Employees Association, that they also support the change provided that they are compensated for the new work arrangements.

In addition to the views of those directly involved in the industry, the Government is of course concerned with the interests and attitudes of the general public, particularly in their capacity as purchasers and consumers. In this regard, members would be aware of the many polls that have been published over recent times reflecting strong support for Saturday afternoon trading, particularly in the Adelaide metropolitan area.

Those who do not work will also benefit from the extra hours of shopping time. Families will be able to shop together in a more relaxed atmosphere up to 5 o'clock on Saturdays.

I am also conscious that Adelaide competes against Melbourne and Sydney for the tourist dollar. Shops in Sydney have been able to open to 5 p.m. on Saturdays for some time and those in Melbourne will soon be able to open until 5 p.m. on Saturdays.

I am aware that some tour operators arrange their 'packages' with this in mind. Traditionally, in this State separate trading arrangements and hours have been made for butchers shops. This is reflected in the separate provisions in the Act. Due to the special provisions which apply to butchers and the specialised nature of the retail meat industry, no changes are therefore proposed to butchers shop hours in this Bill.

In summary the changes outlined in this Bill will provide extra convenience and service to South Australian shoppers and open up new retailing opportunities, particularly in tourism and leisure areas.

Clauses 1 and 2 are formal.

Clause 3 amends section 13 of the principal Act which is the provision dealing with closing times for shops. The amendment extends the closing time for shops (other than shops the business of which is solely or predominantly the retail sale of meat) on Saturdays to 5 p.m.

Clause 4 amends section 13a of the principal Act which deals with permits for shops the business of which is solely the sale of hardware and building materials by striking out paragraph (d) of subsection (1).

Mr S.J. BAKER secured the adjournment of the debate.

PUBLIC EMPLOYEES HOUSING BILL

Consideration in Committee of the Legislative Council's amendments:

No. 1. Page 2, line 5 (clause 4)—Leave out 'Notwithstanding' and insert 'Subject to the Residential Tenancies Act 1978, but notwithstanding'.

No. 2. Page 2—After line 10 insert new clause as follows:

4a. (1) The Public Employees Housing Advisory Committee is established.

(2) The function of the Committee is to advise the Minister in relation to the administration of this Act.

Amendment No. 1:

The **Hon. T.H. HEMMINGS**: I move:

That the Legislative Council's amendment No. 1 be agreed to.

Mr BECKER: The Opposition opposes the amendment. This is the first time we have been aware even that the Government proposed amending the Bill as it left this House. More importantly, as the Committee would be aware, the Opposition proposed an amendment to place the operations of the authority under the control of the South Australian Housing Trust. We believe that this is a trade-off with the Democrats in another place. We believe that our proposal

would have been the best method, and we are not prepared to accept what is now proposed to the Committee.

Motion carried.

Amendment No. 2:

The Hon. T.H. HEMMINGS: I move:

That the Legislative Council's amendment No. 2 be disagreed to and that the following amendment be inserted in lieu thereof:
New clause:

Page 2, after line 11—Insert new clause as follows:

4a. (1) The Public Employees Housing Advisory Committee is established.

(2) The function of the Committee is to advise the Minister in relation to the administration of this Act.

(3) The Governor may, by regulation, prescribe—

- (a) powers of the Committee;
- (b) provisions for the appointment of members and deputy members of the Committee and any other matters relating to membership of the Committee;
- (c) procedures to be followed at meetings of the Committee;
- (d) any other matters that are necessary or expedient for the establishment or operation of the Committee.

The Hon. E.R. GOLDSWORTHY: Mr Chairman, I rise on a point of order. There is a Government member on the front bench, which is not his place.

The CHAIRMAN: I accept the point of order, and ask members to take their seats.

The Hon. T.H. HEMMINGS: My amendment has been circulated.

The Hon. E.R. GOLDSWORTHY: Mr Chairman, I rise on the same point of order. There is a Government member out of his place.

The CHAIRMAN: Order! There is no point of order.

The Hon. E.R. GOLDSWORTHY: Mr Chairman, it is the same point of order. A Government member is on the front bench, and that is not his place. You ruled earlier that, if an honourable member comes into this Chamber, he has to sit in his place. All I seek is some consistency.

The CHAIRMAN: I do not accept the point of order. The Committee will recall that I said that I expected members to be seated.

The Hon. T.H. HEMMINGS: The Government does not oppose in principle the Legislative Council's amendment. However, in the form in which it reached this House it is unworkable and there is need to allow the Government to make a regulation to prescribe powers of the committee, provisions for appointment and other necessary details associated with its operations. I have given a firm commitment to the South Australian Institute of Teachers and the Public Service Association that details of the committee will be defined by regulation. In order that this commitment can be honoured, it is necessary to make this provision as contained in proposed new clause 4a (3).

Mr BECKER: We are in total disagreement with the Government, and we think that this is totally unfair. This is the first time we have seen the Government's proposal and the first we have heard of contact that the Government has had with the Public Service Association and the South Australian Institute of Teachers. There is no doubt in my mind about the deal that went on between the Government and the Democrats over this issue. I do not see why we need a Public Employees Housing Advisory Committee. Either this will operate in the Minister's department or it will not. A \$54 000-plus position is being advertised to look after the housing side of the Minister's portfolio.

An honourable member interjecting:

Mr BECKER: No guessing who will get the job, if he has not already got it.

Mr Ingerson: Who's that?

Mr BECKER: It will be one of the Minister's little boys. The Minister was adamant, when we first dealt with the

legislation in this House, that he would not accept our suggestion of the South Australian Housing Trust being the body best able to handle Government employee housing. There is no doubt that the Hon. Mr Elliott (of the Democrats), who wanted to bring up some of the old red herrings when he was a teacher, is reflecting on the organisation. The bulk of housing for Government employees is supplied through the South Australian Housing Trust, but the Government will not accept that. I see no need to appoint a committee to oversee this operation. We will be setting up another little bureaucracy to keep someone in another place happy for doing the deed of defeating the Opposition, and it is not on.

Mr M.J. EVANS: When the Minister responds will he relate some information to distinguish proposed new clause 4a (2), which is the single function of the committee (and that is to advise the Minister in relation to the administration of this Act)? If that is the only function of the committee, what powers is it contemplated that the committee would have? To advise a Minister does not require the exercise of any power. A statutory authority that exercises a power is clearly vested with an independent discretion to do something. If the sole and only function of the committee is to advise the Minister, will the Minister indicate what powers he contemplates will be given by regulation?

While I can see the purpose of this proposed new clause, I would have some difficulty with investing the committee, by regulation, with any specific powers that were not previously considered by the House. If that is not intended to have any major significance, I would appreciate an explanation of it. In any other respect, I would also like to know whether, by introducing it in this way, the Minister is giving a commitment to actually implement the proposal in the immediate future—

The Hon. T.H. Hemmings interjecting:

Mr M.J. EVANS:—the regulations—and therefore to constitute the committee. The commitment to bring in the regulations is not necessarily a commitment to appoint and constitute a committee. I would appreciate clarification of those two points.

The Hon. T.H. HEMMINGS: In reply to the member for Elizabeth, as soon as the Bill is assented to the regulations will be made. I have been advised that proposed new clause 4a (1) and (2), as it came into the House, really meant nothing because, unless there was some reference to the regulations, I would not be able to set up the advisory committee. In relation to the powers of the committee—the provisions for the appointment of members, etc—it is there to advise the Minister. There are no sinister powers in proposed new clause 4a (3) (a).

In reply to the member for Hanson, this clause has nothing to do with the South Australian Housing Trust. The amendment concerning the trust was defeated in this Chamber. It was debated in the other House and defeated there. This relates to the advisory committee, and I urge members to support the amendment.

The Hon. E.R. GOLDSWORTHY: How big will the committee be and will the members be paid?

The Hon. T.H. HEMMINGS: They will not be paid. The committee will comprise roughly nine members, representing the South Australian Institute of Teachers, the Public Service Association, the United Trades and Labor Council (two nominees), one nominee from the Minister of Education, one nominee and a chairman appointed by me.

The Hon. E.R. GOLDSWORTHY: I do not ask whether the committee be paid in the sense of a salary, but will members get sitting fees, travelling expenses, or be reimbursed in any other way?

The Hon. T.H. HEMMINGS: I doubt whether the advisory committee will need to travel. I appreciate the Deputy Leader's rather belated interest in this Bill. I do not recall him speaking when it went through the second reading or Committee stages. However, I recognise that, as one of the oldest members of the Opposition, he has a wide range of expertise, and he is obviously bringing that in at this point. The Deputy Leader will know that the second reading explanation mentioned a consultative committee and a consultancy that would be set up to look at several anomalies that were raised not only by the South Australian Institute of Teachers, but the Public Service Association. That consultancy will travel quite extensively to talk to client departments and clients of the Office of Government Employee Housing. It will then report to the consultative committee (and I see that that has now been changed to the Public Employees Housing Advisory Committee), which will report to me. I very much doubt whether extensive travelling will take place. As for sitting fees, that will be in the normal procedures as laid down by the Government, except for those people who represent individual client departments (that is, public servants), and they will not be given a fee at all.

The Hon. E.R. GOLDSWORTHY: Because of the smart alec comments of the Minister, I am prompted to rise again. I was seeking, I thought legitimately, information in Committee about an amendment, which the Minister was further amending, which had come to us from the Upper House. He gets up here, as is his wont, with that smart alec attitude of his, to try to belabour me and suggest that I am not entirely within my rights in seeking information during the Committee stage. Those smart arse comments have prompted me to say a bit more and to show some interest in this Bill which maybe surprises the Minister. I say again to the honourable Whip, who is out of her place, commenting—

Mrs Appleby: I never said a word.

The Hon. E.R. GOLDSWORTHY: Sorry, it must have been the honourable Minister.

Ms LENEHAN: I rise on a point of order.

The CHAIRMAN: The Deputy Leader will resume his seat.

Ms LENEHAN: I ask you, Mr Chairman, to rule whether or not the comments made by the Deputy Leader are parliamentary, and the words were 'smart arse'.

The CHAIRMAN: I do not accept the point of order. The words may be intemperate but they are not unparliamentary. The honourable Deputy Leader.

The Hon. E.R. GOLDSWORTHY: 'Smart arse' is not unparliamentary; it is colloquial. I could not think of a more descriptive phrase to describe the Minister than 'smart arse', because that is what he is. I cannot think of a more apt description of the way in which he addressed the Committee.

The Hon. G.F. KENEALLY: Mr Chairman, I ask for your ruling on whether the honourable member's comment about 'smart arse' is different from his saying that the Minister is a 'smart arse'. If there is a difference (and I contend that there is), I suggest that it is a reflection on the Minister and I do not believe that that is within the Standing Orders.

The CHAIRMAN: Standing Orders say that no member may reflect on a Minister. I ask that the Deputy Leader take cognisance of those Standing Orders, but at this stage I shall not accept the point made by the Minister.

The Hon. E.R. GOLDSWORTHY: Thank you, Mr Chairman. I will not labour the point, but the Minister gets up and answers a question, and his whole demeanour was similar to the superior air that he adopted about my having

the gall, in his judgment, to get up and ask a simple question about an amendment from another place. That prompted me to rise and elaborate further during the quarter of an hour or so that was available to me. The Minister can like it or lump it, but in this place we have rights, even though sometimes we wonder whether the Government believes that we have those rights. At least one feature of our parliamentary democracy is that it is based on free speech and we will not be inhibited by the smart alec comments of the Minister of Housing and Construction.

With quangos proliferating in the Labor Administration, at the drop of a hat this Government has set up bodies to give government by committee, and this clause appears to refer to one such committee. If the Government has a problem, it sets up a committee. If it wants to make a decision, it sets up a committee. The Government does not seem to have the capability or the inclination to make a decision in office without getting advice from someone or other and without having to share the load with another group in order to justify the decision. That is pathetically weak.

The Government is not prepared to make a decision and wear it without relying on a committee. The Minister misled me in his initial answer when he said that the committee would not be paid. Now we find that there is to be a sitting fee, so committee members will be paid. Another trait of this Minister is that it is hard for him to grasp facts. He cannot grasp the fact that there is one secretary servicing 4½ Liberal members and another servicing 3½ Labor members in the Upper House. It is difficult for the Minister to grasp facts.

The Hon. T.H. HEMMINGS: I rise on a point of order, Mr Chairman.

The CHAIRMAN: Order! Before calling on the honourable Minister to take his point of order (and I think that I know what it will be), I point out that honourable members must not refer to debates in another place.

The Hon. E.R. GOLDSWORTHY: I am not doing so, Mr Chairman.

The CHAIRMAN: Order! I ask the honourable Deputy Leader to take his seat. I will take the Minister's point of order.

The Hon. T.H. HEMMINGS: On a point of order, Mr Chairman, the Deputy Leader is referring to an ongoing discussion which is taking place in this House but which is totally irrelevant to the clause before us. The Deputy Leader knows very well what I mean.

The CHAIRMAN: I uphold the point of order. I ask the Deputy Leader to refer to the question before the Chair. Before he resumes his speech, I remind him, although I do not have to because he has been here a long time, that he may not refer to debates in another place.

The Hon. E.R. GOLDSWORTHY: I was referring not to debates in another place but to the inability of the Minister to grasp a simple point. I referred to his answer to me in this Committee which prompted me to make a few more comments. My simple search for information was in the form of the question, 'Will the committee be paid?' and the simple answer was 'No'. Now, however, we find that committee members will be paid a sitting fee. If that does not mean that committee members will be paid, the Minister has a different understanding of 'paid' from mine. Members are paid to sit on a select committee and, if the Minister does not believe that we are paid in those circumstances, he is thick and does not understand the English language. I got misleading information on this matter similar to the misleading information that the Minister has given members previously.

The Minister has prompted me to make a contribution and I intend to elaborate on this point. This is another quango—another advisory committee. The members of that committee will be paid even though the Minister said they will not be, so it may well be jobs for the boys. I suppose that there will be a couple of Trades Hall representatives on the committee. So, in times of financial stringency when the Government says it will fight the Public Service to the death on wage increases, it is setting up these quangos. What does it cost the public of South Australia in sitting fees for these committees? The Leader of the Opposition had a question on notice about the number of committees set up by this Government and the reply was that it would be too difficult and would cost too much to find out.

That question was perfectly legitimate: it covered a range of matters, yet we were told that the time and effort required to provide the answers were not justified. What sort of way is that to run a business (and the biggest business of all is the State)? It is hopeless. This committee is a case in point. This paid committee will be established to help the Government to make up its mind and to make decisions. That is typical of this Administration. If it has a problem it sets up a committee and hides behind it. What is the answer on Jubilee Point? Set up a committee to bear the load and make a decision. In this case, to hell with the expense: let the bureaucracy, via the quangos, get even bigger.

Do not let the Minister tell me my job or give me misleading information in his smart alec way. I will not use the other phrase because apparently it offends the member for Mawson, whose sensitivities I have never been able to pinpoint previously. She is suddenly sensitive if I refer to the Minister's backside. But do not let him get up in his smart alec way and put me down when I seek information on an amendment moved in the Upper House. If the Minister wants me to get up and speak in this place more frequently, let him carry on in that same fashion and seek to score off the Opposition, giving us misleading information as he has done on at least two occasions—if we count the staff for members of the Upper House, on more than two occasions—during the past two or three weeks. I make no apology at all for exercising my rights as a member in this House. I will continue to do so throughout the rest of my career. The fact that I have been here for the time that I have simply reinforces in my mind the inappropriateness of the Minister's treatment of this amendment.

Mr GUNN: I am rather surprised at this amendment. I have read it carefully, but I am not sure of what value or benefit it will be. A considerable amount of my time as a member of Parliament has been spent in discussion with Government employees in relation to the standard of housing and the appropriate rents that they should pay. I find that, on every occasion I return to my electorate after sitting in this House, I am confronted with these problems. Yesterday morning, in the north, I had a number of people expressing grave annoyance at the failure of the existing arrangements to meet their needs adequately and at a reasonable rate. I understand that, unless this matter is resolved very quickly, there will be difficulty in getting certain public sector groups to go and work in country areas if their rents are not adequate.

I believe that the original proposition to allow the Housing Trust to be the operator of Government employee housing has a great deal of benefit. What concerns me about a Government advisory committee is who will make the decision. Will it be the Minister? Will it be the department, or this advisory committee? I do not think that those people living in isolated communities will benefit from this suggestion, and I say to the Minister that what is required is a

sensible approach to the cost of Government employee housing in country areas for the people concerned, including members of the Police Force, teachers, and various other groups. If it is good enough for the Electricity Trust to massively subsidise the rents of its employees, other employees in towns such as Leigh Creek cannot understand why they have to pay three and four times the rents that ETSA employees have to pay. In other areas such as Roxby Downs where large private employers subsidise the rents, people express concern about the same unfairness.

It has been pointed out to me by a number of public sector employees that they believe they are not being fairly treated. I do not believe that the committee has the expertise, but I do believe that all the people in the Housing Trust with whom I have dealt as a member of Parliament are at least sympathetic. They have the experience, and we have just had presented to us the annual report of the Housing Trust with supporting information on how successful it claims to be in solving the housing problems. We all know they are difficult and they are not getting any easier but, if there is a group in the community that has a chance of improving the situation, I believe it is the Housing Trust. I suggest to all concerned that a great deal of heart-break and concern would be alleviated if the Housing Trust administered the Government housing program in country areas.

I suggest to the Minister that this matter is one which will not go away quickly and, while not wanting to be accused of grandstanding but out of concern for the problem, I make these comments because I am concerned that we run the likelihood of having certain sections of the public service who are directed to country areas refusing to go unless they are given a fair go. They do not expect to get housing for nothing, but they expect a reasonable standard at a reasonable rent, and there has to be some incentive to get these people to go. Also, there has to be a reasonable incentive for people with experience and ability to take on some of these difficult tasks in country areas that are essential for those communities. I want to place on record my concerns about the whole aspect of Government housing in country areas and, in particular, my view that the Government's measure will do little or nothing to improve the situation.

Mr BECKER: Mr Chairman, can I have your ruling on the issue before the Committee? As I understand it, we are opposing the second amendment from another place.

The CHAIRMAN: And at the same time we are considering the Minister's amendment that has been circularised.

Mr BECKER: I cannot see how you can do that. Will there be one or two votes?

The CHAIRMAN: There is provision within Standing Orders to do this, and it is quite permissible. I see no problem with going ahead on that basis.

Mr BECKER: The Opposition is totally opposed to the proposal from the other place. We also oppose the Minister's amendment, and so we will simply be voting against the whole issue. Again, we appeal to the Minister because, when he brought this legislation into the House, he did not give the Opposition much time to look at it. The few minutes before the Committee met this afternoon was the first opportunity that we had to even look at the amendment proposed by the Minister, let alone the points that he now raises.

There are many faults within it. First, we are told that it is a better drafted piece of legislation than the one proposed by the Australian Democrats in another place and that may be so. When somebody in another place is having something drafted by the very same draftsmen as we have here, one

wonders why there would be such a difference. Secondly, we do not like an amendment or any proposition being put to this House which says that everything will be done by regulation. The Deputy Leader asked the Minister how many members would be on the committee, and he replied, 'Roughly nine.' That is not good enough. We have no idea how many will be on the committee. Certainly, I did not hear the Chamber of Commerce or the Housing Industry Association nominated.

The Hon. H. Allison interjecting:

Mr BECKER: Very true, it is a powerless committee. Therefore, you wonder why it should be there. You wonder why it is needed at all. If it is to be a representative advisory committee, certainly you would look for representation for all facets of the housing industry in South Australia, be it the Housing Industry Association, the Master Builders Association, or any other section of the housing construction industry. For that reason, we think that the whole thing fails.

The Minister said that the amendment had nothing to do with the Housing Trust, and I agree, but undoubtedly the reason for the proposition is that this was a trade-off to suit the ego of the Democrats in another place, a group that represents 5 per cent of the electorate. In order to gain their support in opposing the proposition put up by the Opposition, this little thing was dreamt up and included to assist their ego. I think it is disgraceful when we get this type of legislation introduced into the House—legislation introduced for convenience and for pragmatic reasons, not for practical reasons.

The Minister did not want this advisory committee when he first proposed the legislation to Parliament. If he had wanted an advisory committee, it would have been included in the original Bill, but it was not. The Bill had to go through the process of being passed by this House and sent on to the Legislative Council, where it was amended. Every member of this House should stop and think. I bet Government members would not even know what it was all about. They probably have not even been consulted. They have not had a Caucus meeting since the Bill left this House to know what is going on. Members in this House did not support the original intention of a Public Employees Housing Advisory Committee. The Minister never asked for it: he never wanted it. All he is doing now is putting it in here because some ego tripping member in another place wanted to amend the legislation for the sake of amending it. That is all it is! It is a game, a very sick game, being played by some people in this Parliament, be it in this House or the other House, and that is what is going on with legislation.

The legislation did stand as the Minister brought it into this House and it can stand on its own. The Minister has the whole framework within his department if he wants to operate public employees' housing. As I said, he has a top position (\$45 000), he has plenty of staff in his department to advise him how to handle it, without having to write it into the legislation. This is the loose way of putting into the statutes the establishment of a committee that really does not have much teeth anyway. I can only urge the members to oppose the proposal from the Legislative Council and oppose the amendment put by the Minister.

The Hon. T.H. HEMMINGS: First, I hope that the Deputy Leader is listening, because I have an apology to make to him. In fact, I have two apologies to make. The first is that I inadvertently raised the Deputy Leader's ire when I raised the question that, because he did not partake in the debate when it first went through this House, he had the temerity to stand up at this time. For that I apologise to the Deputy Leader. On other areas he mentioned we will

have ongoing discussions, I am sure, in future Question Times and other areas of debate.

With regard to the question of payment, I again apologise to the Deputy Leader, in that I was 50 per cent wrong and 50 per cent right, but that does not excuse what I said to the Committee. When I said they would not get paid, I was 50 per cent right, and when I said later that there would be a specific fee I was 50 per cent right again. The real fact (and I have had this checked out) is that the Chairman will receive a fee, as prescribed by the normal fees set out in the GME Act, and other members of the committee will not receive a fee. That clears the matter up.

In relation to the comments of the Deputy Leader regarding advisory committees that the Government sets up time and time again, the quangos that he talks about, the consultative committee existed anyway. I set up the consultative committee so that there could be discussion, not only with the Institute of Teachers, the Public Service Association, and the United Trades and Labor Council, but also with client departments. That consultative committee was already set up. It was the view of this Government that the committee could still operate and advise the Minister on matters regarding not only client departments but those members of the Public Service Association, or Institute of Teachers or other unions who actually lived in those houses.

It was the view of the South Australian Institute of Teachers that, whilst they accepted that I was serious about the consultative committee, it should be enshrined in the legislation. Subsequently, the Democrats in the Upper House moved an amendment accordingly. The amendment provided that the Public Employees Housing Advisory Committee be established, and that its functions would be to advise the Minister on the administration of that Act, and then proceeded to include in the legislation representatives of certain organisations. That was not what the South Australian Institute of Teachers wanted, nor what the Public Service Association wanted, and it was certainly not what this Government wanted, because the consultative committee was to be appointed on a rotational basis.

So far as the client departments are concerned, in the first instance there would be the Engineering and Water Supply Department, the Police Department and, possibly, the Woods and Forests Department but, because there were so many client departments which were customers, in effect, of the Office of Government Employee Housing, we would rotate. Therefore, the Minister acting on my behalf in the other place opposed that but said, 'If you want the thing enshrined in legislation, we will put in the fact that an advisory committee should be established, the function of which is to advise the Minister in relation to the administration of this Act.'

But that is not sufficient, because our advice is that if that goes into the Bill there needs to be some mechanism that the Governor may by regulation prescribe. Consequently, as a result of that shortfall in the amendment which has come from the other place, we now have a regulation. Perhaps the member for Hanson is correct to a certain degree in as much as there was a consultative committee already set up, but the other place has in its wisdom decided that there should be an advisory committee.

I am then to honour my commitment to the South Australian Institute of Teachers. And there is no deal with the Democrats. The story always gets bandied around by the Opposition that, whenever the Government accepts an amendment from the Democrats in the other place, there is a deal, yet when the Government accepts an amendment in the other place from the Liberal Party it is said to be sound legislative amendments which are being carried. I

can assure members of this Committee that there was no deal done. It was the view strongly put by the South Australian Institute of Teachers to the Australian Democrats.

My colleague the Minister of Health, in his usual generous way, the way in which he is prepared to compromise and listen to the views being put not only by the Institute of Teachers but by the Australian Democrats in the other place, accepted that amendment. There was no deal; just, as I say, the usual attitude of my very good friend the Minister of Health who generously accepted this amendment in the Legislative Council. Our advice is that if we are to go down that track, if we want to enshrine it in legislation, there must be power that the Governor may by regulation prescribe, etc. That is what this does.

I suggest that the Liberal Party accept the fact that its effort, ably put by the Hon. Diana Laidlaw in the other place, to incorporate the whole of this Public Employees Housing Act under the South Australian Housing Trust, is a lost cause. It was a lost cause in this House and it was a lost cause in the other place. Members opposite should accept that, and recognise that the amendment that I am putting in lieu of amendment No.2 from the Legislative Council is the correct and proper amendment to make it work. Then we can see whether members in the other place will accept this amendment. I commend it to the Committee, and once again I apologise profusely to the Deputy Leader.

An honourable member interjecting:

The Hon. T.H. HEMMINGS: My colleague the member for Gilles said, 'Don't go overboard' but I apologise profusely to the Deputy Leader for getting him all worked up. It proves once again that he is not the mellow person I thought he was. I urge the Committee to support my amendment.

The Committee divided on the motion:

Ayes—(24)—Mr Abbott, Mrs Appleby, Messrs L.M.F. Arnold, Bannon, De Laine, Duigan, and M.J. Evans, Ms Gayler, Messrs Gregory, Groom, Hamilton, Hemmings (teller), Keneally, and Klunder, Ms Lenehan, Messrs McRae, Payne, Peterson, Plunkett, Rann, Robertson, Slater, Trainer, and Tyler.

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

Pair—Ayes—Messrs Hoppood and Mayes. Noes—Messrs Chapman and Lewis.

Majority of 8 for the Ayes.

Motion thus carried.

The following reason for disagreement was adopted:

Because the amendment does not provide the necessary regulation making powers for the effective operation of the committee.

ROAD TRAFFIC ACT AMENDMENT BILL (No. 2)

The Legislative Council intimated that it insisted on its amendments to which the House of Assembly had disagreed.

Consideration in Committee.

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

That the House of Assembly insist on its disagreement to the Legislative Council's amendments.

Motion carried.

A message was sent to the Legislative Council requesting a conference at which the House of Assembly would be represented by Messrs Hamilton, Ingeron, Keneally, Lewis, and Tyler.

MOTOR VEHICLES ACT AMENDMENT BILL (No. 3)

Adjourned debate on second reading.

(Continued from 3 November. Page 1581.)

Mr INGERSON (Bragg): The Opposition agrees to the Bill and notes that principally it will cover the maintenance of vehicles already covered by such laws. New design and maintenance rules will be introduced for vehicles in the near future, and we support that. I refer to road safety and vehicles that the Minister believes may not have certain specifications but should be dealt with under this legislation. In his second reading explanation the Minister said that there was a problem with bull-bars and anti-glare windows. Are there any other areas of concern? We support the Bill.

Mr GUNN (Eyre): I can find no reason to object to the Bill, but I have one or two questions. Is this Bill really a first step to allowing the Government to get its foot in the door in relation to the compulsory testing of vehicles on an annual, two or three yearly basis? The member for Bragg mentioned the fitting of bull-bars to vehicles. From time to time certain ill-informed people have been reported in the press as suggesting that bull-bars are highly dangerous and should not be fitted to vehicles.

Members interjecting:

Mr GUNN: You cannot save fools from their own folly and, from their interjections, it appears that I am dealing with fools at the moment. I am trying to point out to the House—

Members interjecting:

The DEPUTY SPEAKER: Order!

Mr GUNN: I am trying to obtain information from the Minister about the actions of certain people, many of them Government employees and, for the benefit of Mr Otte, some of them include people that he claims to represent (and incidentally, I have asked Mr Otte to come and have a cup of tea with me but he has not responded). Mr Otte's friends in various Government departments must have the protection of properly constructed bull-bars fitted to the fronts of their vehicles. Anyone who has driven in country areas will know that bull-bars are an important part of any motor vehicle. I hope that regulations are not brought in to cover bull-bars and that well-meaning but misguided departmental officers do not dream up rules about bull-bars to require their use to be by permit only or to make them illegal and other such humbug and nonsense.

I refer to a statement in the second reading explanation that the Registrar of Motor Vehicles will be able to refuse to register a motor vehicle if he feels that it is not properly designed. Who will make that recommendation to the Minister—will it be the Motor Inspection Section of the Department of Transport? I have one or two examples to put to the Minister and perhaps one or two other members who may be interested in the problems that can be created. One of my constituents modified his Toyota vehicle so that it would take diesel instead of petrol. That required an inspection of his vehicle and after great difficulty the modification was approved. I point out to the House that most two-way radios on Toyotas are fitted on the hood of the vehicle between the passenger and the driver, so that one has only to reach up to use it. The inspector said that the two-way radio was in the head danger area and my constituent was required to remove it. When my constituent approached the members of another law enforcement agency they treated that requirement as a joke and told him that he should have told the inspector to go away, because they knew that

it was normal practice to fit two-way radios close to the antenna.

I hope we do not go down that track in relation to the requirements under this legislation because, if we do, we will have a repeat exercise. The last thing I want is my constituents telephoning me on a Saturday or Sunday night because a Government employee is being pedantic. I think I have put enough to the House, although there is much more that I could say about one or two people: I will reserve my judgment for another occasion. If we go down that track—and heaven help the people who must put up with it—there will be more antagonism and ill feeling, and that is quite unnecessary. I repeat the offer I made the other day: I am very happy to sit down and talk to the Minister or the officers whom I have been complaining about. I do not know whether the Minister will accept my offer, but I am quite happy to talk to him, because I can give chapter and verse about the things that concern me.

Mr BLACKER (Flinders): I support the Bill, but I have one or two queries about country areas where motors are changed for genuine reasons and in particular in relation to bull-bars or roo bars (and members have tried to draw a distinction between the two types of bars). It has been suggested that roo bars or bull-bars should not be permitted in the metropolitan area. I think that the Minister would appreciate that in many country areas they are almost an essential part of a vehicle. Going one step further, I believe that an early model Holden had a sharp projection on the side of its headlights, and that was quite dangerous for pedestrians.

Mr D.S. Baker: They were chariots.

Mr BLACKER: Yes, they were chariots. Those vehicles could have been regarded as a danger to pedestrians, yet they were commercially produced. I do not know whether the Minister considers he can force a change in the design of a manufactured vehicle under this legislation. As I understand it, the Minister is looking at modifications or the rebuilding of vehicles to produce dune buggies or beach buggies, which is an area where the department has power to exercise greater discretionary control.

The Hon. G.F. KENEALLY (Minister of Transport): In thanking members for their contributions, I acknowledge the validity of the concerns that they have expressed, but I hope that in replying to the second reading debate I am able to allay some or all of those fears. In response to the member for Bragg, who asked whether I could indicate examples of vehicles that might not qualify to be accepted for registration by the Registrar of Motor Vehicles, I am unable to think of any circumstances apart from the two examples that I mentioned in the second reading explanation.

The vehicle with reflective material obviously would be a danger on the road. It was suggested not so long ago that registration would be sought for such a vehicle. All the other States in Australia are able to refuse to register that vehicle, except South Australia. The Registrar of Motor Vehicles has no power to refuse to register the vehicle, even though it is obviously dangerous. The Registrar would register it and it would be picked up immediately by the police, who would then defect it as a vehicle that was obviously dangerous, and so action needed to be taken. In circumstances like this the Registrar requires the power to refuse to register.

My second example involved bull-bars. The Government acknowledges that bull-bars are very much a protective addition to many vehicles, particularly in country areas

where drivers could possibly run into kangaroos. In my recent travels around South Australian roads, it seems they also run into emus and the odd wombat, although I do not think wombats leap high enough to do a great deal of damage to a vehicle. If a vehicle hits a big solid wombat it can do much damage. In those circumstances, roo-bars or bull-bars would be necessary. It is only in circumstances where there is an outlandish or outrageous bull-bar that action would be taken. In speaking in the debate the member for Eyre referred to a properly constructed bull-bar, and we would accept that as being reasonable. I am not able to give an example of what would be an unreasonable bull-bar, but it would have to be clearly dangerous and it would have to be drawn to the attention of the Registrar.

He is not out there examining every vehicle. If someone draws the matter to the Registrar's attention (the police, for instance), in those circumstances the Registrar—if the bull-bar is obviously dangerous—would decide whether or not to exercise the power vested in him, a power that all other Registrars and Police Commissioners have around Australia. The South Australian Police Commissioner has it, but the Registrar does not.

It is not the first leg in the door for annual compulsory inspections. There is a requirement for some vehicles—buses are one type—to comply with a normal standard of maintenance. That normal standard of maintenance is not a statutory requirement for trucks, farm equipment, ordinary commercial vehicles or private vehicles but, where a standard is established, that standard needs to be met.

The member for Bragg was correct in saying that we have been advised that amendments to the Australian Design Rules will require legislation of this nature. At the moment the Registrar cannot refuse to register a vehicle, whether it is unsafe or whether it does not comply to ADRs. Where the Registrar will be able to refuse is where the vehicle does not conform to the appropriate Act or regulation, or is unsafe. As I pointed out earlier, that would need to be brought to the Registrar's attention: it is not a power that will be used indiscriminately or frequently. It is a power that the Registrar needs to have in those rare examples where such a vehicle is sought to be placed on the road by its owner. It is a power that the Registrar needs to have so that he can act in the best interests of all road users. It is from that perspective that we are seeking this power for the Registrar.

In reply to the member for Flinders, if someone modifies a vehicle to the extent that it brings that vehicle to the attention of the police, and through them to the Vehicle Inspection Centre, it may be that circumstances would arise where it is the judgment of the police and the Vehicle Inspection Centre that the vehicle is unsafe. In those circumstances, that matter would be referred to the Minister and I would pass that information on to the Registrar, who, if this legislation is passed, has the statutory authority not to approve registration.

We are not placing on the Registrar an onerous responsibility, nor are we confronting the motorists of South Australia with an extra bit of bureaucratic constraint that we could well do without. In terms of road safety, this authority is required, and I seek the support of the House for the passage of the Bill.

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

ROAD TRAFFIC ACT AMENDMENT BILL (No. 3)

Adjourned debate on second reading.
(Continued from 4 November. Page 1678.)

Mr INGERSON (Bragg): The Opposition supports the three major thrusts of this Bill. The second of the three relates to increasing police powers and, depending on the replies from the Minister, we may seek some amendments in another place. The first portion of the Bill deals with the opportunity for employees of the STA, when involved in an accident, to report that accident through the relevant authority and, as a consequence, have that information passed on through the authority to the police. We understand that this amendment is purely to legalise a practice that has been going on for a considerable period and, after consultation with a few people at STA, we will support that provision.

I now turn to the third thrust of the Bill and, in supporting this area, which enables more flexibility in driving the defective vehicle before and after repairs, certainly we congratulate the Government on at last putting into practice a means to resolve a major problem in both the metropolitan area and, in particular, in country areas. The Opposition recognises clearly that many minor defects need to be repaired, and vehicles need to be taken off the road for that purpose. It is absolutely essential, in relation to minor defects, that the owner of the vehicle should have some ability to have it fixed and then continue to drive it. We congratulate the Government in noting that in the metropolitan area the period involved is three days, and in country areas it is to be for an extended period.

I also note that this added flexibility will affect the CFS in relation to some of the minor defects of its vehicles. I ask the Minister to comment on this matter, because it has been brought to my attention that some of the defects on CFS vehicles are minor. It is my belief that commonsense needs to be used by inspectors in country areas. I understand that on many occasions inspectors do not go to the offending vehicle or to a town close to the offending vehicle within a fortnight. It seems to me that this flexibility will need to be extended fairly widely so that country people do not have to take their vehicles long distances. The Opposition strongly supports this provision and is glad that the Government has at last seen fit to do something about this problem.

The second area of the Bill concerns increased police powers. As the Minister would be aware, the Opposition strongly opposed any increase in police powers involved in a recent amendment to the Road Traffic Act. Again, we are concerned about this extension of police and inspectors' powers.

After reading the Bill, and after discussing this matter with the Hire Car Operators Association, there seems to be considerable confusion about what is a hire car. The Hire Car Operators Association believes that a hire car is a car that is chauffeur driven. Hire cars that come under the auspices of the association and under the rules and regulations of the Taxi-Cab Board are presently inspected at six monthly intervals. I would assume that the Minister, in the definition of 'hire car', does not mean it to include that group of people. It seems to me that what the Government and the Minister are talking about is rental cars. It is a pity that that was not more specifically defined. If the Minister clarify that and, if an amendment is needed, I hope that it can be moved in another place.

In relation to police powers, several secondhand motor vehicle operators have given me examples of police and inspectors exceeding what we believe is reasonable under the law. Several examples were put to me that police officers and inspectors turned up *en masse* at secondhand dealers' premises, inspected vehicles and placed defect notices on them when members of the public were on the premises.

Obviously, those future buyers would then look at that secondhand dealer and be very concerned about every vehicle he sells. Of course, that is not necessarily the situation. Sometimes, there are vehicles on the premises that should not be sold and need defect notices on them, but it is the way in which it is done.

Mr Gunn interjecting:

Mr INGERSON: As the member for Eyre has said, we need more discretion in the way in which this area is currently policed. It is of concern to me and the Opposition that again we have this increase in police and inspectorial powers. Has the Minister looked at other options? The major option would seem to be the one used in the hire car industry already, with hire car operators coming under the appropriate Act. If the Minister is concerned about this rental area, has he considered the option of placing these operators under some controls requiring their vehicles to be inspected at certain intervals, perhaps every six or 12 months? Will the Minister explain what other alternatives have been looked at before we increase police powers in this area?

As I said earlier, the Opposition has considerable concern about this matter. If we do not get what we believe to be satisfactory answers from the Minister, I signal our intention to move amendments in the other place to remove police and inspectorial powers and replace them with the same sort of inspections that occur within the hire car industry.

Mr GUNN (Eyre): There are some welcome improvements in this legislation. The new arrangements in relation to defect notices are long overdue. I suggest that local police be given the opportunity to remove these defect stickers. Inspectors, probably with the best will in the world, become over-enthusiastic when looking at and defecting vehicles. The problem is then to get someone to come back and remove these stickers. Yesterday I was told that a certain person had to twice take a vehicle 300 kilometres to get a fault remedied. I suggest that it would be easier for all concerned if, after the Highways Department or the Motor Vehicles Department inspector put a defect notice on vehicles, local police officers had authority to remove them.

These provisions are a little like those dreadful on-the-spot fines: 12 months ago in the Estimates Committees I asked about the guidelines involved as to whose discretion it was whether a person got a warning or an on-the-spot fine. I will never vote for them again; I make that quite clear. I look forward to seeing them restructured one day, because they are out of control. They are purely a revenue raising measure. I was told that this discretion was up to the individual and I suppose that it comes down to whether a person gets out of bed in a good mood or a bad mood. That is just not good enough.

What instructions will be given to the officers about whether a person receives 14 days to comply? If this matter is not handled properly, the whole scheme will be absolutely ludicrous and a waste of time, and those members who live in isolated areas will again be receiving telephone calls. My blood pressure will go up, and it will be on in this place. What has occurred in the past couple of weeks is only the beginning of what I could say, or what we will do. What are the guidelines? Will the Minister's department sit down with all sections of the transport industry and have sensible discussions about this? A light may not work and a mudflap can come off very easily on a vehicle. All that is required in these cases is for an officer, with a little commonsense, to say, 'Get that fixed.' The last thing they should do is put a defect sticker on someone's windscreen.

Can the Minister say whether senior officers of the Highways Department issue instructions on the number of tick-

ets to be issued each day or whether the inspectors are given discretion? Alternatively, are the inspectors instructed to book as many people as possible? Can the Minister say whether the inspectors are directed to be pedantic and to defect as many vehicles as possible? I know the answers to some of these questions which are pertinent to this whole issue.

Regarding the other aspects of the Bill, I have no real problem except that mentioned by the member for Bragg concerning the definition of 'hire car'. As someone who uses a rented car regularly, I would not like to be apprehended and my rented vehicle defected over a minor matter. I hope that that does not take place. I am fully aware of some of the problems that can arise, including safety matters involving brakes and gear boxes. I look forward to the Minister responding to my questions.

Mr BLACKER (Flinders): My comments relate to defect notices. The problem experienced by my constituents is basically related to distance and the difficulty in getting a defect notice lifted in the shortest possible time. It has been put to me that, where such a notice is issued over a safety aspect such as steering or faulty brakes, the vehicle should be taken off the road. However, if the defect is merely cosmetic, that is another matter. For instance, it has been put to me that a truck was defected and effectively put off the road purely on the basis that the grip or tread on the rubber of the clutch pedal was worn. The rubber had not worn through, but the pattern had worn off. The operator claimed that it was totally irresponsible to have the vehicle defected.

By all means give the operator 14 days to replace the defective part but, as it turned out, the vehicle was a Volvo and the operator was told that it was impossible to get a rubber pad for that clutch pedal in Australia. There was not one in South Australia or in Melbourne, so it had to be imported. That man was a transport operator and had that vehicle off the road until the clutch pedal was replaced. I do not know whether there were other issues attaching to this case, so I leave some areas of doubt in case there were. However, if what I have stated is correct, there is a good case for allowing the operator 14 days in which to carry on his business and have the defect rectified.

After all, it is not merely the penalty of a few dollars: the operator lost income because he could not use his vehicle for 14 days until he could get the clutch pedal pad replaced. It was a finicky thing and I stress the inability of my constituent to whip around the corner as it were and have the defect lifted quickly. That practical problem may well be a good reason for the Government to consider the classification of defect notices. I have not argued the case where the safety of a vehicle is involved. Indeed, I believe that in such a case the vehicle should be taken off the road. However, where the defect is more cosmetic there should be a grading of defect notices.

The Hon. G.F. KENEALLY (Minister of Transport): I shall try to deal with the queries that have been raised by members in the order in which they have been raised and, if I miss some, I expect that they will be raised at a later stage of the Bill. I thank members for their support of the Bill which is sustainable and, as it applies to defect notices, certainly assists not only people driving commercial vehicles but also private citizens in having defect notices dealt with and lifted in a time span that is more convenient and appropriate while at the same time maintaining safety.

The member for Bragg raised two issues. First, he referred to the definition of 'hired' as against 'rented' and asked

whether this legislation would apply to Country Fire Services vehicles and whether many of the defects of CFS vehicles were only minor in nature. I point out that the Department of Transport would not normally look at CFS vehicles: departmental officers do not normally examine CFS vehicles because they do not examine local government vehicles. They examine CFS vehicles only if asked to do so by local government authorities or by the CFS.

I am advised by the Road Safety Division of the Department of Transport that the vehicles that have been defected have been defected because of serious faults: there have been no minor defects that would put a vehicle off the road. The defects have been serious and have concerned braking, tyres, and serious structural faults. Tyres are not a minor defect if they are in a poor state of repair.

I do not have the statistics with me, but the member for Florey read into *Hansard* late last week certain information concerning the nature of the defect that the Department of Transport found to be necessary before a defect notice was issued. Certainly, nowhere near as many defect notices have been issued to the CFS as one would believe from reading press reports. Indeed, the number is significantly less. It was in the pursuance of safety and at the request of the CFS and the Local Government Association that the Department of Transport became involved in this regard.

In the area of hire cars and on the question of whether a hire car is a rented car, Crown Law advises me that in law there is no difference between 'rented' and 'hired' as regards definition. The shadow Minister suggested that we might examine the legislation to ensure that it did not apply to taxis and buses because it was never intended that it should do so. However, he did not foreshadow an amendment himself. I will ask Crown Law to ensure that that definition is clearly established within the legislation. Nevertheless, as I understand it, it is always the habit of the courts, when called on to interpret legislation, to consider the Minister's second reading explanation of the Bill and, should some future court wish to do so, I can clearly say that this legislation does not refer to taxis and buses as hired vehicles.

In my second reading explanation, I said that it was intended that the police should have the same powers in relation to vehicles for hire as they do with second-hand vehicles on car lots. The member for Bragg said that the Opposition was concerned that inspectors as well as police might be able to go onto these properties. Inspectors do not go onto second-hand car lots: it is only the police who do that. An inspector would not go there unless he was asked to do so by the police and, to the best of my knowledge, that has not happened in the past. I am not saying that it may not happen in the future, but certainly it would be very unusual if it did happen. Inspectors from the vehicle inspection depot would not go onto a second-hand car lot and they would not go onto a hire car lot. It would be the police who do that. The police would do it only in the pursuit of road safety. They have the power to defect second-hand cars which would be unroadworthy and which would be dangerous if driven by a purchaser and automatically draw a defect, when that vehicle ought to be repaired and made roadworthy by the second-hand car dealer.

The same applies with hire cars. The police ought to be able to inspect hire cars to ensure that they are roadworthy. If they detect an unroadworthy hire car on the road, they would defect it. It seems much better that the hirer be responsible to maintain the roadworthiness of these vehicles rather than have some poor innocent customer suffer when the car is defected by the police. It is for that purpose that we want the police to be able to go onto the property to look at hire cars. It is not a new concept; it is a well tried

and, I believe, well accepted practice that currently exists. Neither as Minister nor as a local member have I had a rash of complaints from second-hand car dealers as to the behaviour of police in relation to second-hand car lots. That is my experience, and I believe that generally that experience is common. There may be examples where that is not the case, and, if there are, they ought to be brought to the attention of the Minister or the Police Commissioner. Behaviour that is not within the authority of the police should not take place.

The member for Eyre wanted to know whether or not highways inspectors are charged with the responsibility of pulling over or defecting a certain number of vehicles each day or each working week (and it really is not part of this Bill but I have become accustomed, when dealing with amendments to the Road Traffic Act, to responding to these sorts of queries) and whether or not they are charged to make it difficult for people particularly in the heavy transport industry. I reject the suggestion that any instruction of that nature is given to the inspectors. The inspectors are charged to ensure that unroadworthy vehicles are not on the road and that overloading does not take place, but they are certainly not required to make life difficult for the transport industry. They are certainly not required to get a quota of defects per day.

Both the member for Eyre and the member for Flinders were anxious to ensure that people who had vehicles defected in the country had ample time to have those defects lifted and that they were not put under unreasonable stress in doing so. The amendment provides that. It also applies to the city, but we are leaving it to the commonsense discretion of the inspector. We believe that commonsense will prevail. It is true that, in the country, one needs more time to have defects dealt with and lifted than perhaps might be the case in the city. It is important to point out that in lifting defects, the police currently have the power to determine whether a defect is a minor or major one. If they determine it to be a minor defect, they have the power to lift it. If it is a major defect, the police have the power to decide whether the vehicle inspection centre should be involved through one of its inspectors. That is because the police do not see themselves as motor mechanics. There are a whole number of defects in relation to which the police can determine whether or not a vehicle should be defected and whether or not the defect has been attended to so that it can be lifted. However, there are serious defects that the police, quite rightly, refer to the appropriate authority—the vehicle inspection centre—to have the defect lifted.

At the moment, we try to operate this system in a commonsense way and take into account the special difficulties that some people in more isolated areas face, while at the same time recognising that there are particular circumstances in the city (and the taxi industry is an example) where, if a vehicle has to be off the road for three days while a minor defect is lifted, it would have a very serious impact on the income of its driver. The member for Eyre pointed out that the same applies to an owner-driver of a small or large truck. It is for those reasons that the amendment was introduced, and I ask the House to support the second reading.

Bill read a second time.

In Committee.

Clauses 1 to 3 passed.

Clause 4—'Defect notices.'

Mr INGERSON: The Minister made clear in his second reading reply that it was only the police who had the power to enter premises. On quickly looking through his speech, I note that it clearly states 'the police or the inspector', and

also the second reading explanation specifically mentions 'the police or the inspector'. Will the Minister clarify that point?

The Hon. G.F. KENEALLY: I apologise to the Committee if in fact that is what I said. What I meant to say was certainly the powers are there for the police and the inspectors, but inspectors would never use it unless requested by the police to enter. There have been no cases of which I am aware where inspectors have gone onto a used car lot or a hire car lot unless asked to do so by the police. If they were asked to do that by the police, they would use the power. There is no proposal for the current situation to change at all, and I see no reason why it should.

Mr INGERSON: Could the Minister explain the situation in terms of whether it is a possible alternative to introduce the position of inspector for these hire vehicles, because we are concerned about the extension of powers?

The CHAIRMAN: Order! Will the Minister of Recreation and Sport take his seat. The member for Bragg.

Mr INGERSON: We would like to know whether the alternative, which is similar to that used in the taxi industry where regular inspection takes place, is a possibility.

The Hon. G.F. KENEALLY: Yes, as the honourable member pointed out, taxis are inspected regularly and I think that the honourable member's suggestion is that hire cars might have the same regulation placed upon them. I think it is fair to say that we do not believe that this is a major problem. However, it can be a problem and the Government has not felt that it is necessary, at this stage, to regulate the hire car industry in that way. It might well be that we will get to that point some day, but at present we believe that to give the police the power to look at hire cars to make sure they are roadworthy is sufficient. If in fact the problem escalates and vehicles are defected or are found unroadworthy to such an extent that we would have to apply regulations to hire cars, we will look at that. However, it is my belief that that will not be necessary; the powers the police currently have in the used car area will be sufficient. The honourable member can be assured that, if the problem escalated, certainly we would look at the suggestion he has put to the Committee today but, at this time, we do not feel that it is necessary to regulate the industry to that degree.

Mr GUNN: The member for Bragg said in the second reading stage that it appeared that a number of inspectors arrived at used car lots at what would be classed an inconvenient or inappropriate time. I wonder whether the Minister can give an assurance that in future a little bit of discretion will take place. Secondly, I posed a number of questions to the Minister, who, like me, has been here a long time.

The Hon. G.F. Keneally: The same time.

Mr GUNN: Yes, the same time and we do get rather skilled at answering questions in public. There are two sorts of answers to questions: the factual and the politician's answer. I would suggest to the honourable member (he is a reasonable person and we get on very well) that it was a fairly skillful effort and I give him nine out of 10 for a fairly skillful approach. I could go through and ask all those—

Members interjecting:

Mr GUNN: It was a fairly skilful effort.

Members interjecting:

Mr GUNN: I do not want to unduly create a scene or keep us here any longer, because there is no thrill for me to stay in this place. I could go to the trouble of putting the most detailed questions on notice which will take a lot of people a considerable amount of time to answer.

Members interjecting:

Mr GUNN: There are other methods I could adopt, but I really do not want to do that. I just say to the Minister that I would like to know, very precisely and clearly: what are the discretions given to inspectors in relation to the issuing of these sorts of defect notices and what are the discretions which apply to inspectors under the normal administration of these various Acts? The question is: does the administration of the Highways Department say that, no matter what the circumstances, if the law has been broken then inspectors will ping these people. The Minister knows, as well as I do, that in many cases disputes arise over whether the blasted permit is in the right form or shape and, in some cases, people have had no opportunity to waive it.

I pose those questions, because I do not want to go through the great trial of putting 30 or 40 questions on notice, making sure that I do not miss out on any point, because many years ago I was pursuing a matter and a senior public servant said to me sometime later, 'You were very close but you really did not ask quite the right question.' That made me determined, when pursuing a matter, that I would not leave any stone unturned. That is why in Committee proceedings it is important that a member ask questions in a reasonable fashion.

I do not think I need say more. I do not make suggestions that I am not going to carry out. I do not put a lot of questions on notice these days because I normally get information by talking to people in the departments and writing reasonable letters. I write a lot of letters, but I ask the Minister to respond in more detail. We do not need a great explanation. I have attended many public functions and asked many questions, and I know how to answer questions.

The Hon. G.F. KENEALLY: I thought I had done very well and addressed the question quite seriously. Ninety-nine per cent of all defects issued by authorised people in South Australia are issued by the police. An inspector would need to be authorised by the Minister to issue a defect notice. The officer issuing the defect notice would be required to have regard to the law—that is quite clear, otherwise the law ought not to be there.

As in all cases, commonsense and discretion prevail. The officer who is defecting a vehicle will defect it as that officer feels appropriate. I would not, as Minister—and would not expect any senior officer to be out there daily, or any member of Parliament, for that matter—be checking their actions, because these people must be encouraged to exercise in the most appropriate way the authority placed in them. I believe that overwhelmingly they do so, and I think we agreed on that last week. There may be some examples—and when there are, I am sure they are brought to light—where action taken could be regarded by some as being a bit over the top.

Certainly, people who have the authority must exercise discretion in the use of that authority. They are certainly not instructed by the Highways Commissioner or by me as to how they should behave on a day-to-day basis. They are trained people. They have an authority vested in them by the Government, through the Minister, and they exercise that authority. Overwhelmingly, I think, they exercise it in a most rational and appropriate way in the very difficult job of protecting all road users as well as the road itself. I do not know how I can answer that question more specifically. If there are examples, they can be dealt with as specific examples but, in a general sense, I believe that my answer is accurate.

Mr GUNN: I do not want to unduly delay proceedings, although this is a subject on which we could spend a great

deal of time. It is a bit like a person who goes along to a public meeting, asks a question, gets a very sincere and detailed answer but, when he gets outside, says, 'It sounds really plausible but does not tell me a great deal.' It does not seem that I am going to get what I wanted. I suggest that the Minister make available to me those senior people who are responsible, because I have some genuine inquiries and would like some information.

I do not ask questions of anyone unless I have a very fair idea of the answers, and I do not want to take it further. I do not want to unduly put these people through their paces, but I have one or two matters to raise. If I have to put 30 or 40 questions on notice, I will do so, but I will be happy to talk to them. I am concerned that commonsense should apply, and that is all I want. I also have some questions about various other aspects of wide loads, whether farmers are allowed to have flashing lights on top of their vehicles, and so forth. We can clarify these far better by my talking to people.

I know what discretion police officers are given in relation to speeding offences. Certain discretion is given in matters of overloading. That can depend on the mood of the person. I know various other things: I have been around for a while. I know people who were previously in these departments, and I talked on Friday night to people who were in the traffic section, and they told me a few questions I ought to ask. I will do that, but I am happy to sit down. If the Minister makes those people available, that will satisfy me.

The Hon. G.F. KENEALLY: I am always prepared to make senior officers of departments for which I am responsible available to members of Parliament who want to discuss particular matters with them, and I have already asked Highways Department officers to make themselves available to talk to the member for Eyre about this whole area of permits. I am willing to make that facility available to him. If a number of people want to talk to senior officers of the Highways Department, I do not want a whole series of meetings keeping people occupied and doing nothing else. If matters can be dealt with conjointly, that ought to happen, but I acknowledge the prior claim of the member for Eyre for discussion with the Highways Department on the matter of permits, and I will facilitate that for him.

Mr S.G. EVANS: In relation to inspections and defect notices, I say that if the enthusiasm used on CFS trucks were used on Highways Department, Engineering and Water Supply Department and local government vehicles, many people would have red faces. The power must be there, but one thing which at times causes conflict is personalities—in other words, chemistry. A person driving a vehicle may have had a rough day, and may have more on his mind than inspection of vehicles. It is his business, his livelihood, with all the pressures. Suddenly, someone rocks up and takes him to task, he bites, and that officer decides to take him for something. That happens at times. At times, people are over-zealous in using what is really not commonsense, and I hope that more commonsense will be exercised in future.

Clause passed.

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.

The Hon. E.R. GOLDSWORTHY (Deputy Leader of the Opposition): I wish to raise a matter which is of concern to some of my constituents, and the best way to do it is read a letter which has been received by the Opposition. The letter reads:

I venture to follow up the recent discontent with the Minister of Transport with a continuation of a very unsatisfactory 'brush' with the Highways Department.

In October 1985 a petition signed by a significant number of local residents was sent by me to the Commissioner of Highways requesting that *inter alia*, in the interests of safety, speed restriction to 60 km/h be introduced between the caravan park and the turn-off to Lobethal, currently 'open' at 110 km/h. The Gumeracha Council and police both favour this request.

That is the section of the Gorge Road between the caravan park and the Lobethal turnoff. The letter continues:

To cut a long story short, this proposition was rejected on the basis of 'lack of abutting roadside development'. I fail to see this reasoning: there is, in addition to some housing, a caravan/camping ground, restaurant, local hall, Post Office/shop, CFS station, two nurseries, and numerous drive-ways for dwellings just off the road. Compare this with Ansteys Hill—

I live above Ansteys Hill, and I know that this is factual—no worse as a highway, with buildings apart from the EWS treatment works . . . and 60 km/h all the way! Now we recently had on this stretch of road a head-on collision in which a local resident, driving on the correct side, has been severely injured. Surely this vindicates a further plea for safety measures! If you desire further information, wish to see the area concerned and/or the correspondence, please contact me. My request is that the matter be brought before the House.

That is why I have brought the matter before the House. I do not know in what proximity houses have to be to define a township, but section 49 of the Road Traffic Act provides that there has to be a speed restriction through a township. Whether Cudlee Creek constitutes the legal definition of a township I do not know. There are a number of houses adjacent to this road and, as my constituent points out, shops, caravan parks and so on, and it seemed to me a fairly sensible request when it was brought to me initially some time ago. My letter to the Minister brought a response in due course, but my request was turned down.

I do not know why the Highways Department or the appropriate authorities are loath to erect signs that obviously will reduce traffic hazard without significant inconvenience to motorists. Again, I can speak from personal experience because, on the Paracombe Road, on which I live, there is a sweeping bend around from my house. We made repeated requests to have chevron strips placed on the sweeping bend because, on average, two accidents a year occurred on that stretch of road. Adjacent to the road were some large pine trees, a shed and a fence around the sweep of the road. I own the land and about twice a year a car would mow down some fence posts, hit one of the pine trees and, on one occasion, a car went through the doors of the shed. The Highways Department would not put up signs.

The facilities on the land no longer exist: the shed and pine trees were all burnt in the fire, but nonetheless the department would not erect signs until, I must confess, we were in Government. When the Liberal Government was in office my wife prevailed (I do not know what the threats were) on the then Minister of Highways (Michael Wilson) to use whatever influence he had with the department to install chevron strips. As local residents we believed that that would indicate to oncoming traffic the direction of the bend. (If that is undue influence, I will have to confess to it.) Chevron strips were duly installed. After many conversations, my wife convinced Michael Wilson to have these strips erected. The interesting thing is that we have not had a major accident since. As I said, we had two a year, they would clean up the pine trees—you could see the marks

eight feet up the tree; sheepyards and fences were knocked down. The pine trees were the big danger.

Since the chevron strips were erected—and that is what we as local residents requested—no further accidents have occurred. That seemed to be commonsense. Therefore, I understand my constituent's frustration that the department is not prepared to put in the speed restriction signs. The road is winding anyway. I am not sure of the distance from the caravan park to the kiosk and the turnoff, but there are curves encompassed in that part of the road where one could not drive at more than 60 km/h. If one did, the driver would be travelling dangerously.

I draw to the attention of the House and the Minister the request from my constituent, as spokesman, in terms of the latest letter he has sent. I can tell the Minister that I have written another letter, a year or two since the first approach, and I hope that it will get more sympathetic attention. I do not believe for a moment that it would be a hardship to motorists, and it would certainly reduce the hazard for local people and particularly children.

Another matter that I undertook to raise in Parliament involves a letter that I received from the District Council of Truro. I was asked to raise this matter, and I certainly will. Although it is a Federal issue, nonetheless it has significant implications for this State. The letter from the District Council of Truro states:

Dear Sir,

Following a report received from our Health Surveyor, Mr K. Chapman, at the Truro Local Board of Health meeting held on Tuesday, 13 October 1987 the local board is concerned by the fact that funding from the Federal Government will cease to be available for the 'National Disease Control Program'.

This program was instigated following the 1974 epidemic of Australian Encephalitis (previously known as Murray Valley Encephalitis) when there were 13 deaths of the 58 cases recorded. Over the last 13 years considerable experience, knowledge and expertise has been gained. If Federal funding of the program ceases people brought together in this program will dissipate to other areas and the expertise will be lost.

Obviously, when the next outbreak of Australian Encephalitis does occur, as undoubtedly it will, the same amount of preparedness to mount a campaign will not be available.

The Truro local board of health would bring to your attention a protest in the strongest possible terms to funding from the Federal Government being discontinued for the National Diseases Control Program.

On behalf of our ratepayers we request that you do all in your power to ensure that their decision will be reversed and funding continued.

In raising the matter in the House, I trust that public servants are deputed to read *Hansard* and take up members' requests made in grievance debates and the like. I hope that we do not waste our time raising matters here and that *Hansard* is scanned by appropriate public servants. In this case, I hope that someone in the Health Commission will draw this matter to the Minister's attention, because an approach is needed to the Federal Government to do something about this decision.

The third matter that I wish to raise is dealt with in the letter from a constituent complaining about the new gun charges relating to the possession of a firearm. As I will take up the matter when the member for Goyder moves his motion, I will not read the letter at length now. My constituent is saying that he keeps a shotgun in the country for the sole purpose of killing vermin, feral cats and snakes that are likely to be a hazard to children on the banks of the Murray River. He is not a young constituent and he now has to pay \$60 for three years' permission to own a firearm (to use his words) for the purpose of killing vermin and he is most disconcerted at this charge, as well he might be.

In the concluding part of his letter he says that he will let the feral cats go and they could be a danger to children.

As to where the Government's money is going, he refers to such worthy causes as the Three Day Event, snail paced 12 metre yachts and other Labor Party circuses. He says that in rural areas they get no bread to go with them—and he signs off.

Mr De LAINE (Price): Much has been said in recent times about the shortage of tradespeople in Australia. I would like to take issue with this statement. Around Australia, and particularly in South Australia, while no doubt it is difficult for employers to get tradespeople to fill vacancies, the interpretation that there is a severe shortage of these skilled people is false. There are, especially in South Australia, plenty of skilled tradespeople. The sad truth is that these people are out there in our community but their various talents and skills are not being used at all, and I will explain why. Before entering Parliament I spent some 30 years in the manufacturing industry and saw the problem gradually develop. In my view there are various reasons for this so-called shortage of tradespeople and skilled people. I will cite those reasons, not necessarily in any sort of order, and refer first to low wages.

It is a historical fact that by and large tradespeople are grossly underpaid compared with unskilled or semi-skilled workers. This is especially so for tradespeople in the metal trades industry. When tradespeople commence as apprentices they are on very low wages compared with other young people in lower skilled jobs. Further, they must attend trade schools or colleges and make other sacrifices compared with their young friends who go straight into the unskilled work force.

My second area of concern—and it is one of my pet criticisms—is that the qualifications required to obtain an apprenticeship are too high. Over the years the prerequisite qualification for an apprenticeship has increased. When I commenced my apprenticeship some 35 years ago the vast majority of young apprentices had just completed second year high school or technical school. In 1952, in my own case at General Motors-Holden's, 40 lads commenced their apprenticeships and the vast majority were of second year high school level; several had their intermediate certificates (or third year); and only two or three had their leaving certificates (fourth year). From memory, none of the fourth year students completed their five-year apprenticeship; about half of the third year students completed their apprenticeship, but virtually all of them went on to become draftsmen, and many of them went on further, with additional night studies, to become engineers and, as a result, were lost to the trade.

The situation is far worse now. In order to obtain an apprenticeship these days a young person must have matriculation. Some people are naturally gifted academically and others are gifted with their hands (in other words, they are natural tradespeople). A very few lucky people are good with both their hands and their heads. Those young people who would dearly love to be tradespeople and are good with their hands and not with their heads are quite often unable to achieve the high level of education required to obtain an apprenticeship—that is, matriculation—and become a tradesperson. If these people could obtain an apprenticeship, it is likely that they would remain in their chosen trade for the rest of their lives and make quite a contribution to industry. However, because they are denied the opportunity to become a tradesperson they are lost to the work force.

Nowadays their places are taken by the academics who have matriculated and have gained all the available apprenticeship positions. Because of their qualifications these people

serve the now four-year term of an apprenticeship and go on to bigger and better things. They undertake additional studies because they have the prerequisite qualification of matriculation and they move on fairly quickly to become draftsmen, engineers, and so on and, as a result, they are lost to the trades in various industries. I realise that, with the increasing use of modern technology, there is a need for some tradespeople to have higher qualifications in order to use this modern equipment. Perhaps the answer is to create more than one level of apprentice or tradesperson to meet this need. The vast majority of tradespeople are still employed in a conventional way without modern technical equipment, and young people without higher qualifications could be directed into this area.

Another area that creates a problem is the use by employers of employment consultants. Although it is not really relevant to tradespeople it is relevant to people with other skills. These consultants are employed by companies to obtain people with certain skills. These consultants quite often set themselves up as God. They obtain people with the necessary qualifications but, because of the age of some people (perhaps they are over 40 or 45 years), they are denied the chance of obtaining employment. In many cases they are extremely skilled people with a lot of experience and knowledge, but they are denied the opportunity to use that knowledge because of their age.

This is a classic example of the need for age discrimination to be covered in legislation. There is a serious loss to industry in general, because these people are denied the opportunity to be part of the work force. Another area of loss I have seen over the years, but especially recently, concerns apprentices (and I give credit here to some employers that train apprentices) who are taken on for four years and immediately—in fact, the very day they complete their apprenticeship—are retrenched or sacked. That is part of the conditions of employment in many cases, and sometimes it is not. I personally know of some lads who were apprenticed at GMH (which is now Holden's Motor Company) and who were the State's top apprentices, and the day they finished their apprenticeships they were put off. I have followed these lads' progress: sometimes they have gone on to seek other employment but, from my experience, many of them say, 'To hell with it.' They have been kicked in the teeth, they have left the trade and have gone into other jobs. Once again, these people are lost to the trade and industry.

I have seen retrenchments and many hundreds of early retirements (as they are called) at GMH and other places. Very good tradesmen in their early to mid 50s with another 10 to 15 years to contribute to industry are made to take early retirement. Sometimes these people are lucky enough to get a job, but not often, because they are considered to be too old. Some get other non-skilled jobs, but more likely than not they go through a lot of soul-searching, adjust their circumstances to live on unemployment benefits, and wait for the old age pension. These people are also lost to industry.

Another area I have come across involves league football clubs, which somehow or other are able to get promising young footballers into apprenticeships. These young people do not have the necessary academic qualifications, but the clubs seem to get them in because of strings they can pull. Also, they seem to be able to get these people into Federal Government departments. These people have athletic ability and serve an apprenticeship purely as a job. By the time they have finished their apprenticeships they are probably football stars and go to Victoria on big money, although, once again, they are lost to industry. I do not have time to

canvass all the other areas, but these are some of the reasons why there is or appears to be a serious shortage of skilled tradespeople in Australia. For the sake of Australian industry, these aspects need to be looked at very hard and long in an attempt to overcome the problem of this shortage.

Mr OSWALD (Morphett): South Australia is to have a new tropical conservatory in the Botanic Gardens. This project has been before the Public Works Standing Committee and it was examined during the Estimates Committees. Generally, plans are well in hand. Since the announcement of this project I have received several phone calls from horticulturalists, as I know members have on this side of the Chamber—and I wonder whether members opposite have—expressing some doubt about its long-term viability. I understand that ministerial staff examine grievance debate speeches, and I will put on record many of the queries that have been put to me. I ask that the Minister provide, through his staff, a reply and that he examine the allegations that have been put to me.

The initial cost of the tropical conservatory was quoted at \$7 million, but I am told it could be some \$10 million before it is completed. It has also been put to me that this could be money better spent elsewhere; for example, we could build some 70 to 100 trust homes. It is wasteful; it is egotistical. The junior staff of the Botanic Gardens do not want it.

The Hon. Frank Blevins: The Federal Government wants it.

Mr OSWALD: It is not only the Federal Government. There is State money in it as well—it is a combination.

The SPEAKER: Order!

Mr OSWALD: There is State money in it, so we are entitled to ask these questions. The horticultural industry put to me that the new heating system will not work in the type of conservatory planned; that the type of plants that will be grown will do nothing to help the horticultural industry in South Australia; and that the technology to be used is some 40 years out of date. During the Estimates Committees the member for Coles, asking some questions about the conservatory, said:

Criticism has been voiced to me about the choice of heating method by boiler as distinct from soil heating as a cheaper and better alternative . . .

In reply, Dr Morley stated:

In relation to the first part of the honourable member's question about the choice of heating device for the conservatory, it rests partly with the heating consultants and partly with the Department of Housing and Construction, which has monitored the recommendations of the consultants.

To me that indicates that the academic staff of the Botanic Gardens did not express an opinion. I would be most interested to know whether Botanic Gardens staff agree with this project. Later in the reply, Dr Morley stated:

It was their professional opinion [the consultants] that the proposed heating system is the most effective available and will be adequate for our needs. The possibility of using heat pumps and soil heating, as mentioned by the honourable member, was certainly canvassed and considered, but the consultants believed that a traditional and well proven type of heating system would be preferable—something reliable which can serve the community in the long term.

That considered reply came from the Director of the Botanic Gardens, but at no stage did he say that he was in favour of the consultants' recommendations. That is what has come through to me from the industry, that they are concerned with the consultants' proposals. In fact, one telephone caller stated that it was a proposal for Canberra that was never used there and has just been shifted to South Australia.

That is a serious allegation, and I think that that should be answered. In many cases the junior staff, and possibly the senior staff, are opposed to the project, yet the Government is pressing ahead and spending what could end up being about \$10 million before the project is finished.

The issue of the costs of heating has also been raised with me. Heating will be provided by two boilers. I am told that one is of 1.4 million BTU capacity and the other is of 2.5 million BTU capacity. With running costs at round about 3c a kilowatt, allowing for 20 per cent inefficiency, if those calculations are extended, we find that it equals \$15.40 an hour for the small boiler and \$28.20 an hour for the larger one, which is collectively \$43.60. At six hours a day for 12 months, that works out at about \$95 000 a year or, in round figures, \$100 000 a year to heat this conservatory. So, we have a \$10 million conservatory that will cost us some \$100 000 a year to heat.

I am also advised that, because of technological advances in Europe, hot air heaters are environmentally out, and the Europeans dispensed with this method of heating some years ago. So, overseas, double glazing is used with thermal screens which reduce the heat loss through the glass, and in Holland, the UK and Germany root zone warming is used whereby PVC pipes are laid in the soil up to one metre deep, and heat is put through them. They can be heated to between 25 degrees and 30 degrees, which is within the range of any solar collector. I am also advised that we could reduce the heat load by a third of the present requirements by using the technology which is new to Australia but not new to Europe.

The building was designed by consultants. It appears from the reply, as I said during the budget Estimates Committees, that the academics at the Botanic Gardens have accepted the design of the heating method without any criticism, and I refer members to the *Hansard* record. We really have to find out whether the academic staff support what they are building down there. The experts are concerned. I think we should be concerned. I would appreciate it if the Minister would furnish those replies.

One final point of interest concerns general running costs at the Botanic Gardens. Whenever we read a lawn or gardening magazine, we are advised to water our lawns or gardens at night. The net result is, it is claimed, that we can save about 40 per cent on the cost of watering. However, I am told that in the Botanic Gardens the watering is carried out in the daytime. One wonders why, with this new technology, they cannot water at night. Perhaps the Minister could look into that and his officers could report back to me when he has had a look at the other allegations raised. I have not discussed the allegations with the consultant; I freely admit that. I think that what I have said is sufficient for the departmental officers to re-examine the project and, if there are no worries down there, that is fine. However, I think enough has been put to me and other members to ask for a review of the project before it goes too far.

Motion carried.

LOCAL AND DISTRICT CRIMINAL COURTS ACT AMENDMENT BILL (No. 2)

Returned from the Legislative Council without amendment.

At 5.59 p.m. the House adjourned until Wednesday 11 November at 2 p.m.

HOUSE OF ASSEMBLY

Tuesday 10 November 1987

QUESTIONS ON NOTICE

WAKEFIELD PRESS

196. Mr OLSEN (on notice) asked the Premier: In relation to each of the following titles published by the Wakefield Press—

Barbara Hanrahan: Printmaker—Allison Carroll; *Ceramics in South Australia*—Noris Ioannou; *Long Division*—Pavla Miller; *The Orange Tree*—ed. Pearson and Churches; *Profiles of People and Places*—Gill and Titus; *Rations, Residences, Resources*—Brian Dickey; *Sound of Trumpets*—Jim Moss; *The Adelaide House 1836-1901*—Stefan Pikusa; *A Lost Glitter*—ed. Michael Best; *In Her Own Name*—Helen Jones; *I'm Speaking To You*—Bob Caldicott; *Mapped But Not Known*—ed. Eaden and Mares; *Not only in Stone*—Phyllis Somerville; *William Light's Brief Journal*—ed. David Elder; *Yura and Udrya*—Peggy Brock; *Arcadian Adelaide*—Thistle Anderson; *Biographical Register of SA Parliament*—Coxon, Playford, Reid; *Catherine Helen Spence*—Clara Morison; *Double Destiny*—ed. K.F. Pearson; *Flinders Political History of SA*—ed. Eric Richards; *SA's Foundation: Select Documents*—ed. Dickey and Howell; *East Coast St Vincents Gulf Map, Southern Passages*—Ronald Parsons; *Unsettled Areas*—ed. Andrew Taylor; *Adelaide Oval Test Cricket*—Whimpress and Hart; *Diet Dynamic*—Dr Hugh Meyler; *Geology and Scenery of SA*—David Corbett; *Criminal Law Advocacy*—ed. Tilmouth and Pengelley; *Franz Kempf Graphic Works*—Neville Weston; *The Adelaide City Plan*—Johnson and Langmead; *Art Ruined My Career*—Bernard

Hesling; *Between City and Sea*—Peter Donovan; *Business, Charity and Sentiment*—Susan Marsden; *The Civic Record, Full Circle*—Vera Bockmann; *Godliness and Good Order*—David Hilliard; *People, Places and Buildings*—Faull and Young; *CAS Recollections*—Dean Bruton; *The State as Developer*—Kyoko Sheridan; *150 Years Stained and Painted Glass*—P. and J. Donovan; *The Unquenchable Flame*—Donovan and Kirkham; *Art and Land*—Philip Jones and Peter Sutton; *With Conscious Purpose*—ed. Hutchings and Bunker; *Wildflowers of Mount Lofty Ranges*—Leona Woolcock; *Water South Australia*—Marianne Hammerton; *Walking to Bethongabel*—Robert Clark; *A Welcome to Water*—Colin Thiele; *The New Women*—Alison McKinnon; *Conquest to Conservation*—Derek Whitelock; *Colonial Blue*—SA Police Force—Robert Clyne; *Land of Ideas, Coorong*—

- (a) what was the cost of production to Wakefield Press;
- (b) how many copies were printed;
- (c) how many copies were held in stock by Wakefield Press at the date of sale of the press to *The Adelaide Review*; and
- (d) what return had the Wakefield Press received on sales at the date of sale of the press to *The Adelaide Review*?

The Hon. J.C. BANNON: The former Chairman of Wakefield Press has provided the following answers:

Column A represents—Cost of production to Wakefield Press (direct costs only).

Column B represents—Number of copies printed.

Column C represents—Copies held in stock at Wakefield Press on the date of sale of the Press to *The Adelaide Review*.

Column D represents—Sales received by Wakefield Press at the date of sale of the Press to *The Adelaide Review*.

	A \$	B	C	D \$
<i>Barbara Hanrahan: Printmaker</i> —Alison Carroll	18 593	2 247	1 750	11 537
<i>Ceramics in South Australia</i> —Noris Ioannou	107 708	2 667	1 611	52 650
<i>Long Division</i> —Pavla Miller	26 461	1 505	1 238	5 337
<i>The Orange Tree</i> —ed. Pearson and Churches	13 958	2 012	1 344	7 828
<i>Profiles of People and Places</i> —Gill and Titus	20 020	3 309	1 380	6 930
<i>Rations, Residences, Resources</i> —Brian Dickey	27 833	1 976	1 538	6 738
<i>Sound of Trumpets</i> —Jim Moss	31 304	2 703	2 093	15 642
<i>The Adelaide House 1836-1901</i> —Stefan Pikusa	8 035	1 000	681	4 110
<i>A Lost Glitter</i> —ed. Michael Best	15 780	1 586	1 351	2 421
<i>In Her Own Name</i> —Helen Jones	29 279	1 550	1 024	6 777
<i>I'm Speaking To You</i> —Bob Caldicott	8 935	3 100	1 328	7 391
<i>Mapped But Not Known</i> —ed. Eaden and Mares				Not produced as at 2 February 1987
<i>Not Only in Stone</i> —Phyllis Somerville	12 750	3 000	1 892	20 344
<i>William Light's Brief Journal</i> —ed. David Elder	20 655	3 479	2 070	21 304
<i>Yura and Udrya</i> —Peggy Brock	3 260	1 170	237	7 039
<i>Arcadian Adelaide</i> —Thistle Anderson	12 165	3 025	1 865	6 439
<i>Biographical Register of SA Parliament</i> —Coxon, Playford, Reid	7 483	500	246	4 378
<i>Clara Morison</i> —Catherine Helen Spencer	16 459	2 500	1 520	9 835
<i>Double Destiny</i> —ed. K.F. Pearson	5 452	1 000	855	683
<i>Flinders Social History of SA</i> —ed. Eric Richards	1 505	28 150	1 161	6 942
<i>SA's Foundation: Select Documents</i> —ed. Dickey and Howell				Not produced as at 2 February 1987
<i>East Coast St Vincents Gulf Map</i>	1 460	1 100	871	1 480
<i>Southern Passages</i> —Ronald Parsons	17 050	2 108	1 759	6 114
<i>Unsettled Areas</i> —ed. Andrew Taylor	4 316	1 340	818	4 033
<i>Adelaide Oval Test Cricket</i> —Whimpress and Hart	80 445	6 129	1 970	110 586
<i>Diet Dynamic</i> —Dr Hugh Meyler	3 672	3 024	1 459	7 258
<i>Geology and Scenery of SA</i> —David Corbett				Not produced as at 2 February 1987
<i>Criminal Law Advocacy</i> —ed. Tilmouth and Pengelley				Not produced as at 2 February 1987
<i>Franz Kempf Graphic Works</i> —Neville Weston	9 443	1 150	565	12 938
<i>The Adelaide City Plan</i> —Johnson and Langmead				Not published by Wakefield Press
<i>Art Ruined my Career</i> —Bernard Hesling				Not published by Wakefield Press
<i>Between City and Sea</i> —Peter Donovan	11 118	1 004	833	2 380
<i>Business, Charity and Sentiment</i> —Susan Marsden				Not published by Wakefield Press
<i>The Civic Record</i>	19 125	504	317	6 783
<i>Full Circle</i> —Vera Bockmann	7 194	1 002	480	2 727
<i>Godliness and Good Order</i> —David Hilliard	3 240	400	257	1 372
<i>People, Places and Buildings</i> —Faull and Young				Not published by Wakefield Press
<i>CAS Recollections</i> —Dean Bruton				Not published by Wakefield Press
<i>The State as Developer</i> —Kyoko Sheridan	1 470	13 230	814	312
<i>150 Years Stained and Painted Glass</i> —P. and J. Donovan				Not published by Wakefield Press
<i>The Unquenchable Flame</i> —Donovan and Kirkham	2 010	200	74	1 617
<i>Art and Land</i> —Philip Jones and Peter Sutton				Not a Wakefield Press book
<i>With Conscious Purpose</i> —ed. Hutchings and Bunker	16 508	1 509	351	9 566
<i>Wildflowers of Mount Lofty Ranges</i> —Leona Woolcock	3 106	2 915	1 806	17 371
<i>Water South Australia</i> —Marianne Hammerton	31 259	1 520	1 333	1 533
<i>Walking to Bethongabel</i> —Robert Clark	4 116	1 042	722	966
<i>A Welcome to Water</i> —Colin Thiele	13 833	3 000	2 644	1 091
<i>The New Women</i> —Alison McKinnon	14 496	1 350	581	7 224
<i>Conquest to Conservation</i> —Derek Whitelock	27 290	2 813	2 073	12 845
<i>Colonial Blue</i> —SA Police Force—Robert Clyne				Not published by Wakefield Press
<i>Land of Ideas</i>				Not published by Wakefield Press
<i>Coorong</i>				Not published by Wakefield Press

SACAE

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

1. What current salaries, allowances and benefits are paid or provided to each of the principals and directors of the South Australian College of Advanced Education?

2. What increases in these salaries, allowances and benefits have been granted to each principal and director in each of the previous two years, when were the increases approved and by whom?

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

1. Principal and Directors	Classification	Current salary (from 20.3.87)
Principal	Principal	\$76 908 p.a.
Director: Academic	Deputy Principal 2	\$65 969 p.a.
Director: Finance	Deputy Principal 2	\$65 969 p.a.
Director: Services	Principal 2	\$69 176 p.a.

Salaries paid are in accordance with rates recommended by the Academic Salaries Tribunal.
Specific allowances paid—Nil.
Benefits provided—Garaging of college vehicles at home.

2. Only increases granted in salaries in each of the previous two years have been Academic Salaries Tribunal authorised salary increases and CPI increases.

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

1. What and which credit card facilities are provided, and to whom, by the South Australian College of Advanced Education?

2. When were these facilities first allocated and who authorised them?

3. Why are such facilities necessary?

4. What is the annual cost to SACAE and what fringe benefits tax was paid in relation to the facilities in the year 1986-87?

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

1. No individual employees are currently provided with credit card facilities by the South Australian College of Advanced Education. (The South Australian College of Advanced Education has several business accounts which function through the use of cards, such as cards for petrol for vehicles, hire of Government pool vehicles.)

2. N/A.

3. N/A.

4. N/A.

212. Mr BECKER (on notice) asked the Minister of Employment and Further Education: Why was the site administration at Underdale Campus of SACAE moved to the Gatehouse and who authorised the move?

The Hon. LYNN ARNOLD: Three factors in particular gave rise to the management decision to move site administration functions to the Gatehouse at Underdale:

retirement of the Site Administrator in 1987 and redeployment of the Assistant Site Administrator (with subsequent salary savings);

disestablishment of the position of Senior Security Officer after redeployment of a caretaker to the Magill site to fill a vacancy. Consequently, all staff in security at Underdale now report directly to the Site Administrator;

need for space in F Building, due to relocation of external studies operations from Salisbury site to Underdale.

Benefits flowing from the move of site administration to the Gatehouse include:

(i) a senior staff member is present at the Gatehouse as a focus for all inquiries;

(ii) oversight of parking and traffic control generally has now been tightened;

(iii) efficient use is made of the Gatehouse accommodation.

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

1. What entertainment expenses have been allocated by SACAE to staff on the 12th floor of the Schulz Building, Kintore Avenue, for each year from 1 January 1982 and what was the classification of staff so authorised?

2. What fringe benefits tax was paid on such expenses in the year 1986-87?

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

1. Year	Expenditure \$
1987 (to 31.8.87)	3 266.17
1986	8 124.29
*1985	11 278.74
*1984	16 758.71
*1983	14 092.03
*1982	9 448.52

* some of the expenditure may be in relation to facilities or campuses but allocated against the 12th floor as a cost centre.

The classification of staff authorised to use the funds is mentioned in the answer to question 210 part 1.

2. Total fringe benefits tax paid on 12th floor entertainment expenditure for the financial year 1986-87 was \$1 164.07.

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

1. What evidence, if any, has SACAE received or noticed about unwarranted use or misuse of motor fuel made available to SACAE through the Government contract since 1 January 1982?

2. Can SACAE readily identify all users of motor fuel during the past five years and, if not, why not?

3. How are motor fuel purchases recorded?

4. What audit investigations of motor fuel purchases have been undertaken and, if none, why not and, if so, what were the findings and amounts of fuel and money involved each year since 1 January 1982?

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

1. Fuel under the State Government contract is purchased for:

(a) All vehicles based at the city campus (purchased from the State Government Garage—Gilles Street).

(b) All vehicles on short or long-term hire from the State Government Garage.

(c) Bulk purchases for the tanks at Salisbury.

No evidence of unwarranted use or misuse is known to the College.

2. Yes, from records held by the Finance Secretariat, which are subject to inspection by the Auditor-General.

3. All purchases are signed for at the pump and each transaction is verified by the site administrator prior to the account being paid.

Bulk purchases and individual vehicle purchases are debited to a discrete cost centre code.

4. All college accounts are scrutinised by the State Auditor-General's Department at the close of each financial year. The choice of which accounts receive detailed examination and which do not is entirely a matter for the Auditor-General. To date no notice of any irregularity in this regard has been reported to the college.

215. Mr BECKER (on notice) asked the Minister of Employment and Further Education: How many administrative staff are employed at the Kintore Avenue site of

SACAE in each classification and how do the statistics compare with each of the past three years?

The Hon. LYNN ARNOLD: At the present time there are 124 administrative/clerical staff employed at the city site of the college. This figure does not include Directors (3) and Principal (1).

In the clerical grades (similar to South Australian Public Service structure) there are 22 base grades (CO1), 35 (CO2), 11 (CO3), 13 (CO4), 8 (CO5) and 5 (CO6). In the administrative/managerial classifications there are 12 in total, with 4 (AO1), 2 (AO2), 5 (AO3) and 1 (AO5). There are 3 in Executive Officer levels (2 at EO1 and 1 at EO2).

In addition, during the period 1985-87 the academic and administrative computing services were consolidated at the city site. There are 15 staff employed in the Computer Services Unit consisting of 1 (CM1), 1 (CM3), 1 (CM4), 1 (CM5), 5 (CSO1), 2 (CSO2), 3 (CSO3) and 1 (CSO4).

The relative numbers for 1985 and 1986 are:

1986: Total of 137 consisting of 20 base grade (CO1), 43 (CO2), 12 (CO3), 13 (CO4), 10 (CO5), 8 (CO6). In grades AO1 to AO5 the figures were 5, 4, 6, 1, 1, respectively. There were a total of 4 in Executive Officer levels (3 at EO1 and 1 at EO2).

Computer Services Unit 1 (CM3), 1 (CM4), 1 (CM5), 1 (CSO1), 1 (CSO2), 2 (CSO3) and 1 (CSO4).

1985: Total of 136 consisting of 26 base grade (CO1), 37 (CO2), 16 (CO3), 13 (CO4), 10 (CO5), 7 (CO6). In grades AO1 to AO5 the figures were 6, 3, 3, 2, 1, respectively. There were a total of 4 in Executive Officer levels (3 at EO1 and 1 at EO2).

Computer Services Unit 1 (CM2), 1 (CM3), 1 (CM4), 1 (CM5), 2 (CSO1) and 2 (CSO3).

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

1. What criteria are used to promote SACAE general and academic staff?

2. How are general staff reclassified and/or promoted?

3. How many such reclassifications and promotions have occurred this year and in each of the previous two years at each campus and in what sections of administration or academia?

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

1. (a) Promotions for general staff are by open advertisement as per agreement between SACAE and PSA.

(b) Academic Staff are promoted by open advertisement to positions above the Lecturer III, II, I level. (Senior Lecturer I, II, Principal Lecturer).

Academic staff are also eligible to apply for a limited number of reclassifications according to agreed formulae and conditions, based on the Academic Staff Award.

2. General staff can be reclassified when their positions are altered so significantly as to warrant a review.

The methodology adopted is by use of the Hay Evaluation System.

The steps which occur include assessment by an evaluation committee checking by a classification committee, re-examination by a locally titled 'sore thumb' (which examines obvious anomalies).

The reclassifications are then recommended to staffing committee which in turn recommends adoption by council.

Promotions occur only after due process of application to advertised vacant positions, that is, interview, and report to staffing committee and council.

3. Senior Lecturer positions and above advertised to date in 1987, 1986, 1985 were 7, 5, 12 respectively (excluding Director positions). Senior Lecturer positions as per para 2

of 1 (b) above are 7 for 1987, 11 for 1986 and 8 for 1985.

The total number of general staff positions reclassified since 1983 is 275.* This includes 20 'declassified' by the Hay Evaluation Committee.

*Special Note: Many of these reclassifications are based on the undertaking given in 1982 at the time of amalgamation that all general staff positions within the college would be progressively evaluated. This process is only now being finalised.

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

1. Did the staff of SACAE staffing secretariat promote themselves during the past 12 months without prior approval from the staffing committee or any other committee and, if so, how, why and what action, if any, has SACAE taken on this matter?

2. How many people are members of the staffing secretariat and what are their respective salaries, allowances and classifications?

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

1. No—see also answer to question 216.

2. There are 18 people (15.3 EFT) within the secretariat.

Classification	Step	Current Fraction	Current Salary \$
CO1	2	(0.5)	16 467
CO1	5	(0.5)	18 048
CO1	5		18 048
CO1	7		19 095
CO2	1		19 571
CO2	2		20 063
CO2	3	(0.4)	20 728
CO4	1	(0.8)	22 959
CO4	1	(0.5)	22 959
CO4	2		23 604
CO4	2		23 604
CO4	3		24 249
CO6	2	(0.8)	29 136
CO6	2		29 136
CO6	3		29 729
CO6	2		29 136
			(secondment)
AO1	2		31 430
AO5	5		44 123

18 = people

15.5 = EFT

218. **Mr BECKER** (on notice) asked the Minister of Employment and Further Education: What were the full contents of resolutions passed unanimously by the external chairperson and members of the SACAE staffing committee criticising the college's senior administration for its handling of staffing matters and what action has been taken following the passing of such resolutions?

The Hon. LYNN ARNOLD: The Chairperson of the staffing committee, who is also a member of council, spoke to the resolutions at council which were very specifically directed at matters relating to a period involving non-replacement of vacant positions (locally known as 'the Freeze').

The minutes of staffing committee do not indicate unanimity. The resolutions were forwarded to council as per normal procedures.

The actual resolutions taken at staffing committee were as follows:

(1) That staffing committee, whilst recognising the reality of the financial pressures faced by the college, regrets that the staff freeze announced by a process of consultation and participation, appears to have been implemented in ways which ignored basic personnel and industrial practices, and produced an unnecessary environment of tension and dismay at a time when staff morale is particularly vulnerable.

Council's action is recorded in minutes of council as follows:

(1) Council noted the views expressed in the minutes of staffing committee 4/87.

Staffing committee resolution:

(2) That staffing committee request council to monitor carefully the impact on staff morale and performance of the recent staff freeze and the reductions in staffing levels reflected in the 1988 staffing plan, and seek from senior management details of constructive steps being taken to minimise that impact.

Council action:

(2) Council request the Principal to undertake the monitoring process. Motion carried.

Staffing committee resolution:

(3) That staffing committee calls upon council to be sensitive to possible consequences in human terms of the college re-organisation and the 1988 staffing plan, in particular having regard to possible staff displacements or redundancies, and to seek advice from senior management regarding the personnel and industrial principles which will be followed.

Council action:

(3) Motion carried by council

Staffing committee resolution:

(4) That staffing committee recommend to council that council reaffirm its commitment to a participatory and consultative model of decision-making in the college, most particularly on staffing issues.

Council action:

(4) In debating this motion, it was suggested that council did not need to reaffirm its mode of decision-making in so far as due process had been followed. Other members took the view that it was useful for council to reaffirm its commitment to a participatory and consultative model of decision-making in a time of uncertainty and change.

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

1. Do all SACAE motor vehicles carry log books and, if not, why not?

2. Are all SACAE staff allocated or using college motor vehicles required to complete log books for each journey and, if not, why not and, if so, what checks are made to monitor correct use of log books?

3. What fringe benefits tax has been paid by SACAE on motor vehicle use so far?

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

1. Not all SACAE vehicles carry log books.

These vehicles are divided into various categories as follows:

Vehicles assigned to senior staff at the city site are considered to be pool vehicles between the hours of 9 a.m. and 5 p.m. Mondays to Fridays. These vehicles are controlled by a booking clerk who records daily the person using the vehicles and the time the vehicle has been allocated together with destination details.

Log books, controlled by site administration, are used in all pool vehicles allocated at the various sites, other than those assigned to the Faculty Deans, College Librarian and Head: External Studies. The usage of these latter mentioned vehicles is regulated by the secretaries to these staff.

2. The above procedures control the use of college vehicles without necessity to instigate further controls.

It should be noted that college policy states that vehicles may only be used for official purpose. Log books do not provide the total level of control assumed by the question.

3. The amount of \$10 804 has been paid for fringe benefit tax since the introduction of this tax until 31 March 1987. A further amount of \$3 294 has been estimated as being payable for the quarter ending 30 June 1987. That is a total of \$14 098 from 1 July 1986 to 30 June 1987.

220. **Mr BECKER** (on notice) asked the Minister of Employment and Further Education: Does the Academic Director of SACAE (Ms Denise Bradley) garage two college motor vehicles at her residential address and, if so, how and why?

The Hon. LYNN ARNOLD: The Director, Academic garages one college vehicle at her home address. The Head, External Studies who resides at the same address during the week also garages a college vehicle.

222. **Mr BECKER** (on notice) asked the Minister of Employment and Further Education: What now is the projected deficit of the SACAE budget this year and what are the reasons for any alterations?

The Hon. LYNN ARNOLD: The projected deficit of the South Australian College of Advanced Education 1987 budget is now \$150 000. The reasons for the alterations are:

Grant supplementation for non-salary costs at rates higher than previously budgeted (College budget is based on preliminary cost—supplementation indices. When actual indices are known and supplementation is confirmed, the budget is adjusted accordingly).

Stricter control over the replacement of staff.

Estimate of interest income was adjusted downwards to take account of the new interest rate trend.

Salary budget adjusted to reflect national wage increases effective 19 March 1987.

Non-salary costs were also adjusted to reflect cost increases.

The combined effects of these actions has resulted in a projected budget deficit of \$150 000 in contrast to the previous deficit of \$190 000.

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

1. Has the Milford Industries property at Kenneth Avenue been considered surplus to requirements of the SACAE Sturt campus and, if so, why?

2. What is the recommended future use of the property?

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

1. College Finance Committee at its 19 March 1987 meeting identified these properties as being surplus to college teaching, administrative and research requirements. (These properties are located at the Underdale campus not the Sturt campus).

2. Investigations of future usage of these properties are still being undertaken. Any proposals for their use will be considered by finance committee and college council for approval prior to any action being taken. It should be noted that the SACAE Act requires ministerial approval for disposal of real property, including property titles in the name of SACAE.

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

1. Have the following properties been considered surplus at the SACAE Magill campus: 21 Brougham Street, 30 Bunday Street, 37 Lorne Avenue, 33 Lorne Avenue, 41 Lorne Avenue, 43 Lorne Avenue and, if so, why and will they be disposed of and, if so, when?

2. What is the estimated value of each property?

3. Is the property situated at 10-12 Bunday Street partly used by the language department and, if so, what is the recommendation of the college for its future use?

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

1. The College finance committee at its meeting of 19 March 1987 identified these properties as being surplus to college teaching, administrative and research requirements.

2. Property values where known are estimated to be:

21 Brougham Street: \$50 000

30 Bunday Street: \$85 000

27 Lorne Avenue: owned by Minister of Education

33 Lorne Avenue: \$42 000

41 Lorne Avenue: \$46 000

43 Lorne Avenue: \$70 000

3. The property at 10-12 Bunday Street is used by the School of Languages. Should the disposal of this property be approved by college council, alternative accommodation on the Magill campus would be required by the School of Languages.

Future use of all the properties is uncertain at this time.

226. Mr BECKER (on notice) asked the Minister of Employment and Further Education: Are there five transportable units surplus at the SACAE Salisbury campus and, if so, what is their estimated value and will they be sold to Tyndale Christian School and, if so, when and on what terms?

The Hon. LYNN ARNOLD: Two transportable units were identified as surplus and were accordingly advertised by open tender. These were subsequently sold after consideration by the college contract and tender board to the Tyndale Christian School for \$20 000. The college finance committee at its meeting of 16 July 1987 approved the sale of the transportables for the amount mentioned above.

227. Mr BECKER (on notice) asked the Minister of Employment and Further Education: Does SACAE propose to dispose of its assets on Mackinnon Parade sportsfield to the University of Adelaide and, if so, why, what assets are available for disposal and what are their estimated values?

The Hon. LYNN ARNOLD: The Mackinnon Parade complex is leased by the college from the Adelaide City Council. College council has approved the sub-leasing of the Mackinnon Parade sportsground to Adelaide University Sport's Association for a period of 12 months from 1 September 1987. This decision was taken because present levels of usage by staff and students does not justify staff salaries and maintenance expenditure on these grounds. Adelaide City Council officers have approved of this course of action. This situation is to be reviewed prior to expiration of the sub-lease and thus, at this time, there are no assets available for disposal.

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

1. Have the properties at 8 Joyce Avenue and Kenneth Avenue been declared surplus to the SACAE Underdale campus and, if so, will they be disposed of and, if so, when and how?

2. What are the properties being used for currently?
3. What is their estimated value?

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

1. The College Finance Committee at its meeting of 19 March 1987 identified these properties as being surplus to college teaching, administrative and research requirements. Investigations into future use of these properties are still being carried out and any proposals for their usage will be considered by both the finance committee and the college council for approval, prior to any action being taken. It should be noted that the SACAE Act requires ministerial approval for disposal of real property.

2. The Joyce Avenue property has only a shed which houses college archives. The Kenneth Avenue property is the Underdale campus transport depot.

3. Estimated values are:

	\$
Joyce Avenue	42 000
Kenneth Avenue	80 000

229. Mr BECKER (on notice) asked the Minister of Employment and Further Education: What surplus land has been identified at the SACAE Salisbury campus, what is the estimated value of the land and what is the finance committee's recommendation in relation to it?

The Hon. LYNN ARNOLD: No surplus college land has been identified at the Salisbury campus. The titles to this land are in the name of the Minister of Education and accordingly no part of the land can be sold by the college.

230. Mr BECKER (on notice) asked the Minister of Employment and Further Education: What surplus properties have been disposed of by each campus of SACAE since 1982, what amount was received for each and what happened to the proceeds?

The Hon. LYNN ARNOLD: The following properties have been disposed of since 1982 for the amounts indicated. In March 1984, with the approval of the Minister of Education, 12 Hart Street, North Adelaide was sold by auction for \$76 000 with a net figure of \$72 753 being received. In May 1986 the sale of buildings on Port Road land leased from the Adelaide City Council, again with the approval of the Minister of Education and the college, realised \$85 000.

Proceeds of the above sales of college properties were disbursed as follows:

Hart Street to general college revenue.

Buildings on the Port Road location to a special account which is still intact and earning interest. These funds are to be used for special projects such as a contribution towards the cost of building child-care centres.

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

1. Which private swimming pool is used by the SACAE Underdale campus and why?

2. What is the estimated current year academic use of the pool and cost and how much use and cost was incurred for each of the past two financial years?

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

1. The private swimming pool used by SACAE Underdale campus is Flinders Park Swimming Centre, 77 Barker Avenue, Flinders Park. The Underdale campus is the only campus which offers physical education as a specialist subject. The Bachelor of Applied Science (Exercise and Sports Science) and the specialist Bachelor of Education in Physical Education Teaching courses are offered at the Underdale campus. In addition, students in the Diploma of Teaching (Primary) can specialise in physical education teaching. Students in these courses require access to a heated, indoor, 25 metre pool for academic purposes. The Underdale campus has no swimming pool facility and the Flinders Park Swimming Centre was chosen as it is only 5-10 minutes walk from the campus. Timetabling requirements and costs make it uneconomical to transport large numbers of students to a pool at another site of the college.

2. Academic use—

The estimated academic use of the pool for 1987 and the two previous years is:

110 students × 16 hours
50 students × 64 hours
that is, a total of 4 960 person hours

Estimated costs—

	\$
1985	2 033.25
1986	2 025.00
1987	2 765.00

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

1. Is it proposed to retain the SACAE Magill and Sturt campus swimming pools of SACAE on a care and maintenance basis after 31 March 1988 and, if so, at what estimated cost per year?

2. Are these two pools heated?

3. Will Salisbury campus swimming pool remain open and, if so, why?

4. What is the estimated cost of operating each of these pools this year?

5. What is the estimated capital value of each pool?

6. What were the average hours of academic use of each pool for the past three years?

7. What is the break-even cost for admission to each pool?

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

1. The college has recently undertaken a review of the community use of college facilities and presented recommendations for consideration. At a recent meeting of the college's finance committee it was determined that:

The Sturt and Magill campus swimming pools be closed for use but be managed on a care and maintenance basis from 31 March 1988 unless external funding can be obtained for their continued operation.

A care and maintenance program will require maintenance of water levels, reduced chlorination and the operation of the filter system once per week. The cost of such a care and maintenance program of the Magill and Sturt pools is estimated at \$16 700 per annum.

2. The Magill and Sturt campus swimming pools are gas heated. Costs were in the order of \$36 000 in 1986.

3. The review of community use of college facilities recommends that the Salisbury campus swimming pool be retained for use and that:

The Salisbury campus Dean instigate a detailed examination to maximise the use and management of the Salisbury campus swimming pool in an endeavour to make the operation of this asset financially viable.

Factors taken into account in recommending the retention of Salisbury campus swimming pool include:

the lower cost to the college for continued operation (\$29 900 compared to Magill (\$48 900) and Sturt (\$55 500)—this pool is not heated;

the specialist academic use of the Salisbury campus swimming pool in the Parks and Wildlife, Recreation, Outdoor Education and Diploma in Teaching courses, for example, canoeing, scuba diving, snorkelling and experience in the teaching of swimming; the potential for development as a cost-effective facility; and the average hours for academic use, which have been estimated at 200+ hours for Salisbury and 60 hours for Magill and Sturt.

4. The estimated cost to the college for operating the swimming pools in 1986 was—

Magill	\$ 48 900
Salisbury	29 900
Sturt	55 500
Total	\$134 300

Allowing, say, 10 per cent for inflation, the estimated costs in 1987 for operating pools would be—

Magill	\$ 53 790
Salisbury	32 890
Sturt	61 050
Total	147 730

5. The capital value of each pool, based on a Department of Housing and Construction valuation, plus inflation as aligned to building cost indices, is—

Magill	\$ 250 000
Salisbury	520 000
Sturt	530 000
Total	1 300 000

6. Magill—60 hours per annum for past three years.

Salisbury—1986-87 seasons 223.5 hours per annum for teaching, skill development and training

—previous two seasons, 139.5 hours per annum.

Sturt—60 hours per annum plus time for observation by students during Education Department learn to swim campaign.

7. A detailed analysis of costs and income for the three college pools indicates that break-even costs would require admission charges of approximately—

\$6.00 at Magill
\$3.50 at Salisbury
\$5.00 at Sturt

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

1. Have any SACAE buses been used for commercial ski-trips and, if so, why?

2. What is the SACAE policy in this regard?

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

1. No college bus has been used for commercial ski-trips.

2. College policy forbids the use of vehicles for commercial purposes. They can only be used on official business. Procedures are laid down whereby a Head of School and Dean of Faculty sign appropriate forms stating in writing the purpose for a college bus travelling interstate.

235. Mr BECKER (on notice) asked the Minister of Employment and Further Education: Does SACAE provide free readers to external students and, if so, why and at what annual cost for each of the past three years?

The Hon. LYNN ARNOLD: SACAE does provide course readers to external students free of charge, for two reasons.

First, the term 'reader' is an administrative convenience to meet the requirements of the Copyright Act 1968, which requires that materials copied under the licensing provisions of section 53B be separated from other teaching materials. In fact, a 'reader' comprises substantive instructional content which would otherwise not be accessible to external students and without which they could not meet the requirements of their course. As such, it replicates some of the instructional content of internal classes and constitutes a significant part of the teaching package provided to external students. As institutions of higher education are not permitted to impose fees for tuition it would be inappropriate for a charge to be made for this component of the teaching package.

Secondly, the material in such 'reader' is copied under licence without incurring copyright fee. To impose a charge for materials so copied would breach the provisions of the Act which specifically waive fees in the case of materials copied on behalf of external students. Advice from the Crown Solicitor indicates that to charge for such material would render the institution liable for possibly substantial payments to holders of copyright for the materials in question.

It is not possible to establish precise costs for such 'readers' because:

(a) the major charge derives from the labour of academic staff who prepare the same content for both internal and external students in most instances;

(b) the contribution of word processing, editorial, and graphic art to total expenses varies from course to course; and

(c) 'readers' are not mailed separately to students but are part of the total teaching package dispatched.

236. Mr BECKER (on notice) asked the Minister of Employment and Further Education: How many photocopied pages were produced in the SACAE during the past 12 months and how many of these incurred copyright payments?

The Hon. LYNN ARNOLD: The college produces approximately ten million copy sheets per annum. Although records required by the Copyright Act are maintained there have been no claims made against the college to date.

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

1. Further to the answer to Question on Notice No. 301, Part IV of the past session, was the SACAE motor vehicle being used for private holiday purposes when the accident happened and what was the location of the accident?

2. Was the vehicle damage incurred claimed against SACAE's insurers and, if so, were the insurers informed of the full circumstances of the accident and, if not, why not?

3. What was the total damage cost for the vehicle, third party property and bodily injury?

4. What action has been taken by SACAE against the driver and, if none, why not?

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

1. No. The location of the accident was the corner of Sturt Road and Bradley Grove, Mitchell Park.

2. Yes.

3. \$4 400. The college employee sustained minor bruising. The accident report indicates that there were no injuries to the occupants of the other vehicle.

4. The staff member has been counselled. This should be seen as part of the disciplinary process in instances where there are administrative breaches.

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

1. Did the previous Principal of SACAE, Dr J. Mayling, authorise the purchase of \$200 000 worth of computer equipment without that purchase being authorised by the appropriate committees and, if so, why?

2. Was the equipment used or to be used principally by her husband, Dr Bruce Keepes, in his employment at the college and, if so, why?

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

1. No. Dr Mayling did forward a letter of intent to purchase a VS300 to WANG. The actual purchase of the VS300 was made when authorisation was duly completed in October/November 1986. The letter of intent held the price of the equipment so that substantial savings were made. The procedure for purchase included approval by the following:

- Administrative Users Group
- Finance Executive
- Office of Tertiary Education/CTEC.

2. No. Dr Bruce Keepes until his departure to NSW in March 1986 used an Apple MacIntosh and peripherals (about \$5 000). These were approved by Academic Computing Advisory Committee in the equipment budgetary process used at that time.

240. **Mr BECKER** (on notice) asked the Minister of Employment and Further Education: Have computers and programs worth hundreds of thousand of dollars been purchased by SACAE in the past 20 months without approval by the appropriate committees and, if so, why, what hardware and software have been obtained and at what respective costs?

The Hon. LYNN ARNOLD: Cleveland microcomputers were purchased by the Faculty of Business Communication and Cultural Studies from the Federal Government funds allocated to the faculty for extra student places in business studies. The requisitions for purchase were signed prior to the academic computing committee meeting of December 1986 to facilitate processing before close of the financial systems in November. The purchase was subsequently approved.

	\$
17 Cleveland microcomputers @ \$2 340	39 780
17 Keyboards @ \$71	1 207
	40 987

241. **Mr BECKER** (on notice) asked the Minister of Employment and Further Education: Are over \$40 million of assets at the SACAE Underdale campus not subject to any security staff surveillance after 5.30 p.m. on Saturdays, Sundays and public holidays and, if so, why, who made the decision that surveillance after that time was not required and will it be reconsidered forthwith and, if not, why not?

The Hon. LYNN ARNOLD: For obvious reasons it is not prudent to provide a precise answer to this question. The college has reviewed its security at each of its sites and has concluded that a satisfactory level of physical surveillance exists consistent with the risk. Security alarm systems are being fitted to areas of risk to complement the existing level of security. The college will monitor any infractions and take the appropriate decisions depending on the circumstances.

242. **Mr BECKER** (on notice) asked the Minister of Employment and Further Education: Did a head of school of SACAE use College funded Cabcharge vouchers to provide travel to and from work whilst his motor vehicle driving licence was suspended and, if so, why and what was the total cost?

The Hon. LYNN ARNOLD: No. College Cabcharge records show no use of taxis by any head of school to travel to and from work.

243. **Mr BECKER** (on notice) asked the Minister of Employment and Further Education: Did SACAE provide free aircraft travel for Ms Denise Bradley to attend and become a member of the Australian College of Education and, if so, why and is this privilege available to all staff?

The Hon. LYNN ARNOLD: Ms Bradley has been a Fellow of the Australian College of Education since 1981, not a member. In 1981, the Principal of the then Adelaide College of Arts and Education funded Ms Bradley's travel to the Darwin Conference of the Australian College of Education as a College representative. This is one of only two occasions Ms Bradley has been funded for travel by the college. The second was 26 March 1987 when she was a speaker at the conference 'Improving Teacher Education' in Melbourne.

244. **Mr BECKER** (on notice) asked the Minister of Employment and Further Education: Did a bus owned by an SACAE campus travel interstate when its registration and third party insurance had expired and, if so, from what campus and what action was taken against the campus and driver and, if none, why not?

The Hon. LYNN ARNOLD: Yes, in 1986 a station wagon (not a bus) allocated to the Salisbury campus was found to be unregistered. The driver was not censured as it was that person who discovered the omission and arranged for the renewal of registration. The responsible officer at Salisbury was reprimanded. Responsible officers at each site have been instructed to ensure that all motor vehicle registrations are current. A computerised register for registration renewal of all vehicles is now maintained.

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

1. Was a bus owned by an SACAE campus stopped by a Department of Transport inspector and the driver questioned when its bus safety inspection sticker was noticed to be 12 months out of date and, if so, where, when and from what campus and what action has been taken against the campus and driver and, if none, why not?

2. What action has been taken to ensure such an incident does not occur in future?

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

1. Yes, the safety inspection certificate was out of date (not 12 months). The vehicle was inspected on 1 March 1985 and therefore it was due to be inspected again on 1 March 1986. It was not inspected until 18 September 1986. The bus was stopped by a transport officer on 10 September 1986, the location being Brougham Place, North Adelaide. It was a Salisbury based vehicle being used to transport students from the Magill campus. The driver of the bus, a Magill based site staff member, was directed to make sure that any college vehicle he drove in future was covered by a current safety inspection sticker. The staff member in charge of vehicles at Salisbury was severely reprimanded.

2. A procedure has been put in place at each site to ensure that such incidents do not recur. Inspection expiry dates are diarised and also noted on a date chart by the officer responsible for vehicles at the campus concerned (vehicles must be inspected no later than one month after the inspection expiry date).

246. **Mr BECKER** (on notice) asked the Minister of Employment and Further Education: What safety and mechanical procedures are undertaken by SACAE personnel to ensure that its buses are roadworthy and meet Government registration requirements?

The Hon. LYNN ARNOLD: The college, in its procedures for the maintenance and care of buses, adheres to the State Government Central Inspection Authority schedules. Inspections are carried out in accordance with these schedules. In addition, normal mechanical services between the above inspections are carried out as recommended by the vehicle manufacturers' manual.

STAFF EXPENSES

248. **Mr BECKER** (on notice) asked the Minister of Employment and Further Education: How much money has been spent by senior staff, deans and above, on entertainment and travel expenses in each year since 1 January 1982 and how much fringe benefits tax has been paid?

The Hon. LYNN ARNOLD: Entertainment and travel expenditure allocated for senior staff, that is, the Principal, Directors and Deans, is as follows:

Year	Expenditure	
	Entertainment \$	Travel \$
1987 (to 31.8.87)	5 948.94	5 572.64
1986	14 467.72	5 508.81
1985	17 004.54	8 715.24
1984	22 243.47	6 667.27
1983	18 835.59	6 733.70
1982	20 818.01	*

*Records unavailable

Total fringe benefits tax paid on senior staff entertainment expenditure—\$2 884.05.

Fringe benefits tax is not payable on the travel expenditure as it was all incurred in the course of SACAE business (no private component).

STAFF SALARY CONTRACTS

250. **Mr BECKER** (on notice) asked the Minister of Employment and Further Education: What staff at the level of dean and above, hold a contract with SACAE which would prevent their current salary from being substantially reduced and when was each such contract drawn up and approved?

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

	Contract Commences	Contract Concluded	Substantive level at expiration of Contract
Dean: Faculty of Art Design & Applied Science			
AL6	1.1.82	31.3.88	AL6 Subs
Dean: Faculty of Business Communication & Cultural Studies			
AL6	1.1.83	31.3.88	AL2 Subs
Dean: Faculty of Health Science & Cultural Studies			
AL6	1.1.83	31.3.88	AL3 Subs
DPD1	2.6.86	30.2.86	
Dean: Faculty of Education & Family Studies			
AL4	1.4.86	31.3.88	Subs SL
Dean: Faculty of Education & Community Development			
AL4	27.9.85	31.3.88	Subs PLI
Dean: Faculty of Education & Humanities			
DL5	4.8.86	31.3.88	Subs SLI
<hr/>			
Director: Finance			
DPR4	15.9.86*	31.12.87	Nil
*Secondment from Commonwealth Public Service			
<hr/>			
Director: Academic			
DPR4	2.5.86	31.3.88	AL1
<hr/>			
Director: Services			
PR2	9.5.84	30.6.89	PR2

GOVERNMENT COMPUTING CENTRE

291. **Mr OLSEN** (on notice) asked the Minister of Transport: Following the revelations by the Auditor-General on page 179 of his 1987 report that in November 1986, consultants reported their findings on the role, effectiveness and efficiency of the Government Computing Centre, will the Minister table the consultants' report?

The Hon G.F. KENEALLY: The DMR report was commissioned by the Data Processing Board last year. DMR reported that the Government Computing Centre is providing a satisfactory level of computer processing service and central and common systems service; in addition, DMR reported that the GCC has been very effectively managed so as to maximise profit. This is entirely consistent with its charter established in 1981 during the term of the Tonkin Government.

It became clear after the DMR report was submitted that the client perceptions of value for money needed to be addressed; numerous discussions have been held involving management of the GCC, the Department of Services and Supply and the GMB. Discussions have commenced with the GCC's major users and are continuing.

It is expected that a revised statement of the role of the GCC and its relationship with its clients will be developed over the next two months for implementation early in 1988. I will arrange for the consultants' report to be tabled.

292. **Mr OLSEN** (on notice) asked the Minister of Transport: Following the revelation by the Auditor-General on page 176 of his 1987 report that an audit review of the Government Computing Centre's IBM computing facilities 'revealed departures from laid-down production processing control procedures which represent a serious weakness in internal control', was any written report prepared following this review and, if so, will the Minister table the report?

The Hon. G.F. KENEALLY: A written report was prepared by the Auditor-General's staff which reviewed a range of security and integrity issues. The matters discussed in this report cover a wide area of computing security and, as such, it must remain confidential to the centre. I wish to point out that the Auditor-General found that only one aspect of security was significant enough to raise in the report; and that overall, security measures were satisfactory.

The centre has reinstated the laid-down procedures which the Auditor-General found had lapsed, and has recently commenced a number of security initiatives. The Auditor-General has acknowledged that these initiatives will address the areas of his concern.

COMMISSIONER FOR PUBLIC EMPLOYMENT

297. **Mr OLSEN** (on notice) asked the Minister of Labour: Following the revelation by the Auditor-General at page (xiii) of his 1987 report that on 12 June 1987 he referred to the Commissioner for Public Employment certain matters relating to redeployed and unattached officers, will the Minister table the correspondence from the Auditor-General and the Commissioner's reply?

The Hon. FRANK BLEVINS: Yes.

MOBILONG PRISON

307. **Mr OLSEN** (on notice) asked the Minister of Housing and Construction: In relation to the Mobilong Prison—

- (a) which company was awarded a contract to supply curtains for the prison and what was the cost;
- (b) what was the original estimate of the cost of providing a swimming pool for the prison and what is the estimated completion cost of the pool; and
- (c) are chairs in the cells to be covered by woollen fabric and, if so, at what cost?

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

- (a) Kresta Blinds Projects Pty Ltd was awarded a contract to supply curtains to the Mobilong Prison for the sum of \$11 325.
- (b) At the time the project was submitted to the Parliamentary Standing Committee on Public Works, the estimate included an allowance of \$5 000 for an above-ground swimming pool, similar to the one installed at Yatala Labour Prison. However, due to the high maintenance costs associated with extended use by the prisoners at Yatala, it was considered more appropriate that an in-ground concrete pool be installed at Mobilong. The cost of the completed 12 metre pool was \$45 000.
- (c) No, the chairs in the cells are not covered by woollen fabric but are of 'Integra' one piece moulded polypropylene construction.

SCHOOL FIRES

319. **Mr S.J. BAKER** (on notice) asked the Minister of Labour: Given that \$2 million has been set aside to cover fire losses in Government buildings, from what estimate lines will the cost over-runs associated with school fires be drawn?

The Hon. FRANK BLEVINS: A provision was made, in the 1987-88 budget, for costs associated with claims in respect of fire damaged Government buildings under 'Allowances for Increased Wage and Salary Rates and Other Contingencies'.

The actual expenditure in relation to that provision will be funded from the Treasurer Miscellaneous line 'Insurance and transfer to Government Insurance Fund for the payment of claims in respect of Government buildings etc. . . .' as an over expenditure.

EXECUTIVE OFFICER CONTRACTS

329. **Mr S.J. BAKER** (on notice) asked the Minister of Labour: How many executive officers, by classification, are on five year contracts and how many are not?

The Hon. FRANK BLEVINS: The reply is as follows:

Classification	On 5 Year Contract	Not on 5 Year Contract
Legal Officer, Class 8	1	—
Executive Officer, Class 6	11	4
Executive Officer, Class 5	13	3
Executive Officer, Class 4	1	16
Executive Officer, Class 4Z	—	1
Executive Officer, Class 3	5	38
Executive Officer, Class 2	1	48
Executive Officer, Class 1	2	63
	34	173

CENTRE FOR MANUFACTURING

334. **Mr S.J. BAKER** (on notice) asked the Minister of State Development and Technology: What form will the recently announced \$45 million investment by a United States firm in the Centre for Manufacturing take, and over what time frame will the investment be made?

The Hon. LYNN ARNOLD: The agreement between the SA Centre for Manufacturing Pty Ltd and the General Electric Company, USA, is a technology transfer and support agreement undertaken as part of the Commonwealth Government Offsets scheme. It is the largest and most comprehensive technology transfer agreement achieved to date under the scheme. The agreement provides for a range of advanced manufacturing technology in the form of hardware, software, information, training and support, joint research and development for seven years from the date of signing of the agreement. The agreement was signed on 27 August 1987.

In particular, GE will provide to the centre:

Calma Computer Hardware and Software including Calma workstations for three separate education and training institutions in South Australia.

Machining Centre or Cell.

Technical Support and training in the use of equipment, software and systems furnished by GE.

Technical, information and data base support by linking the Centre into GE's metal Manufacturing Application Centre in Cincinnati.

Seven person years of direct skilled technical support, training and consulting including a GE engineer on-site at the centre for up to two years.

Five years of information and support on the update of equipment and systems following the initial two years of on-site support.

Participation in collaborative programs including Research and Development (R&D), for advanced manufacturing science and technology development.

Ownership of the equipment provided by GE will be transferred to the SA Centre for Manufacturing on entry to Australia. GE is not investing as such in the Centre for Manufacturing but providing the support detailed as part of their offset commitments to the Commonwealth Government.

TENDERING PROCEDURES

336. **Mr S.J. BAKER** (on notice) asked the Minister of State Development and Technology: What changes have been instituted to State Government tendering procedures to allow greater local participation?

The Hon. LYNN ARNOLD: There have been a number of changes made to State Government tendering procedures to allow greater local and Australian industry participation in public tendering. The National Preference Agreement which came into effect on 1 July 1986, abolishes State purchasing preferences and other Government procurement practices which discriminate between suppliers on the basis of State of origin. Moreover, under this agreement, preference is given to Australian manufactured goods in the form of a nominal surcharge, which is applied to the imported content of the goods. The surcharge is 15 per cent for goods imported from New Zealand and 20 per cent for all other countries.

The State Supply Board has also issued the following policy directives:

Specifications prepared for tender calls are not to be biased or restrictive.

Purchasing personnel are required to actively seek out quotes from Australian suppliers.

Positive feedback is to be provided to Australian manufacturers as to why they were unsuccessful against tenders from overseas suppliers.

Purchasing personnel are required to act in a facilitating role to ensure end users in Government agencies have the opportunity to examine goods offered by Australian suppliers.

The State Supply Board also liaises closely with the South Australian Industrial Supplies Office by providing advanced information on purchases which may be sourced from South Australian suppliers.

Recently members and officers of the State Supply Board participated in a Working Group on Government Procurement with representatives from the South Australian Manufacturing Advisory Council. The terms of reference of this Working Group included examination of the use of Government procurement and industry assistance programs as part of a strategic approach to industry development, import replacement and export development.

The Working Group's report included recommendations to ensure that more effective use is made of Government procurement to provide assistance to Australian industry.

PUBLIC SERVICE POLICY

340. **Mr OLSEN** (on notice) asked the Minister of Labour: Has the Government Management Board given any general directions to the Commissioner of Public Employment for the 'proper implementation of any policy that it has established in relation to personnel management or industrial relations in the Public Service' and, if so, what were those directions?

The Hon. FRANK BLEVINS: No.

GOVERNMENT AGENCIES

341. **Mr OLSEN** (on notice) asked the Minister of Labour: Has the Government Management Board investigated 'any matter within or affecting any Government agency' and, if so, in the case of each investigation—

- (a) which agency was involved;
- (b) what was the purpose of the investigation; and
- (c) what was the outcome?

The Hon. FRANK BLEVINS: The Government Management Board has not needed to use its powers under section 17 (2) of the Government Management and Employment Act to conduct investigations of agency activities. It has, however, cooperated with agencies on management improvement activities. Examples include:

investigating the feasibility of using direct purchasing and decentralised stores in the Department of Housing and Construction, and assisting the department to implement proposals.

assisting the State Transport Authority in the development of a business plan as proposed by an external review of STA.

assisting the Motor Registration Division of the Department of Transport with implementation of on-line computer facilities and with restructuring management and reporting arrangements.

assistance to the SA Health Commission and the Department for Community Welfare with coalescence.

PUBLIC SECTOR OPERATIONS

342. **Mr OLSEN** (on notice) asked the Minister of Labour: Has the Government Management Board devised 'in co-operation with Government agencies, programs and initiatives for management and improvement in the public sector' and if so—

- (a) what areas of the public sector have been involved; and,
- (b) how many such programs and initiatives have been implemented?

The Hon. FRANK BLEVINS: The Government Management Board has undertaken a number of management improvement initiatives in the public sector. Examples include:

- improved purchasing and stores handling;
- research into productivity improvement;
- the development of the format for performance agreements between Ministers and Chief Executive Officers;
- assistance to a number of agencies in their efforts to improve service delivery;
- support to Chief Executive Officers, through a series of senior management seminars, in providing observable individual leadership in their agencies;
- improvements to personnel management policy particularly relating to questions of redeployment and workforce planning; and
- implementation in several agencies of 'flatter structures' projects.

343. **Mr OLSEN** (on notice) asked the Minister of Labour: Has the Government Management Board reviewed 'the efficiency and effectiveness of any aspect of public sector operations' and made 'such reports upon the results of the review as may be required' and, if so—

- (a) how many such reviews have been conducted;
- (b) how many of those reviews were conducted at the initiative of the board;
- (c) how many were conducted at the initiative of Ministers; and
- (d) in the case of each review—
 - (i) what aspect of public sector operations was involved,
 - (ii) if a Minister initiated the review, why; and
 - (iii) what was the outcome?

The Hon. FRANK BLEVINS: The Government Management Board considers questions of efficiency and effectiveness of public sector operations in all its work. Major projects in this area have included:

- Government asset management and replacement policy;
- improvements to the Government's telecommunications infrastructure and operations;
- the management of Government workers compensation;

the provision of Government office accommodation; changes to light motor vehicle policy; and improvements in use of computer technology.

344. **Mr OLSEN** (on notice) asked the Minister of Labour: How many recommendations has the Government Management Board made to the Minister 'on structural changes that should, in the opinion of the board, be made in order to improve the efficiency and effectiveness of public sector operations' and what were those recommendations?

The Hon. FRANK BLEVINS: The Government Management Board has given advice on a number of options for structural change in Government operations as well as on specific proposals. The board does not generally see changes in structures as the most effective way of achieving operational improvements. The board has not, however, given formal advice pursuant to the Government Management and Employment Act.

GOVERNMENT MANAGEMENT BOARD

345. **Mr OLSEN** (on notice) asked the Minister of Labour: Were any ministerial directions given to the Government Management Board during the 1986-87 financial year and, if so, what were the directions?

The Hon. FRANK BLEVINS: No.

HOUSING TRUST TENANCY

355. **Mr BECKER** (on notice) asked the Minister of Housing and Construction: What action does the South Australian Housing Trust take to ensure three bedroom houses are not under occupied in view of the waiting list, yet keep tenants within the locality?

The Hon. T.H. HEMMINGS: Where a couple or single person is left in a family house after their own children have grown and moved on to independence, the trust encourages the tenant(s) to move to accommodation which is more appropriate to their needs. Generally, this would involve a transfer to a cottage flat where the tenants are elderly, or alternatively to one or two bedroom medium density housing if they are younger or have some other particular need. The trust counsels tenants on the benefits of relocation, but it will not force elderly tenants to transfer if they are strongly opposed to a move.

The trust, however, takes a more rigorous approach where younger tenants are left underoccupying family housing by ensuring compliance with the condition of tenancy (9(a)) which states 'that if the accommodation provided becomes at any time in the opinion of the trust inappropriate to the requirements of the tenant, the tenant will upon request by the trust transfer to more appropriate trust accommodation.'

In considering transfers from underoccupied family houses, the trust is very conscious of the need to keep long standing tenants, especially the elderly, in surroundings which are familiar to them and close to their friends and relatives. It has therefore sought to increase its stock of cottage flats and other medium density forms of housing on vacant sites in and near its existing rental estates through both the Design and Tender and Design and Construct programs. Recognising that the supply of vacant sites is limited, particularly in the metropolitan area, the trust has also undertaken the selective redevelopment of existing houses; the conversion of existing double units and purchased houses to one and two bedroom units; infill development in the backyard areas of purchased houses and the conversion of

commercial and industrial buildings, into residential accommodation. These programs give the trust a wide range of alternatives to transfer tenants within their existing localities.

PENSIONER ASSISTANCE

362. **Mr BECKER** (on notice) asked the Minister of Mines and Energy:

1. What financial assistance does the State Government offer pensioners to convert oil heaters to natural gas heaters and, if none, why not?

2. From the energy conservation viewpoint, which is the preferred heating fuel and what is being done to encourage usage?

3. As oil heaters are largely located in properties occupied by pensioners, what is proposed to assist with conversion to energy conservation fuels?

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

1. None. Conversion of an existing oil heater to burn natural gas can be undertaken for about \$300 and given the substantially reduced operating costs with natural gas it is considered that further incentives are not necessary. A pay-back period of about five years is possible on such a conversion.

2. The annual operating costs for home heaters in Adelaide are lowest for high efficiency gas heaters, electric heat pumps and slow combustion heaters. However, factors other than operating costs must be considered, including purchase price (which may be high for some high efficiency heaters), different levels of thermal comfort provided by different heating systems, and different heating capacities.

3. Statistics do not support the contention that 'oil heaters are largely located in properties occupied by pensioners'. Data on this subject is available from a domestic energy survey in South Australia undertaken in May 1986 for the working party to review energy pricing and tariff structures. Appendix 5 of Part 2 of the working party's final report details the results of this survey. Table 5 of this appendix (p. 91) shows that use of oil as the main source of space heating is approximately the same for age pensioners as for the total population (9-10% amongst sampled households).

VICE SQUAD

363. **Mr BECKER** (on notice) asked the Minister of Emergency Services:

1. How many members are there in the Vice Squad and what are their classifications?

2. How many people were fined for prostitution last year and how much revenue did the State receive as a result?

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

1. The Vice Squad is comprised of nine police members—

- 1 Senior Sergeant
- 1 Sergeant
- 2 Senior Constables—First Grade
- 4 Senior Constables
- 1 Constable.

2. During 1985-86, 26 people were convicted and fined for prostitution offences. The amount fined, excluding court costs, was \$2 910.

GUN SAFETY

372. **Mr M.J. EVANS** (on notice) asked the Minister of Emergency Services: Is the Police Department familiar with the device known as the 'Master Gunlock' which is a lockable trigger guard and, if so, are these devices regarded as having any contribution to make to gun safety?

The Hon. D.J. HOPGOOD: The 'master gun lock' lockable trigger guard is known to the Police Department and is recognised as a safety device suitable for the majority of handguns, rifles and shotguns. It would be commendable for all firearms owners to trigger lock their firearms to prevent children or inexperienced persons from 'accidental discharges'.

The only area of doubt regarding its total efficiency would be in relation to a firearm which has deteriorated due to age or lack of maintenance. However, if a firearm has been maintained in good working condition, the trigger locking device could prove to be an excellent safety feature and act as a preventative factor against 'accidental discharge'. When the handbook 'Before you Shoot' is revised, consideration will be given to including a suitable reference to this safety device.

SOUTH AUSTRALIAN HOUSING TRUST

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

1. What is the total number of blocks of vacant industrial land owned by the South Australian Housing Trust throughout the State and what is the total valuation of these blocks according to the Valuer-General?

2. What amount has been included in the 1987-88 budget by the SAHT as income from the sale of vacant industrial land and what was the total income for the previous financial year?

3. How many blocks of vacant industrial land are owned by the SAHT in Elizabeth West, Elizabeth South and Elizabeth North, what is the Valuer-General's valuation of each block and the price sought by the SAHT for each block that is currently for sale?

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

1. Currently, the trust owns 156 serviced and vacant industrial sites available for sale throughout the State. The total value of these allotments, according to the Valuer-General, is \$11 228 042.

2. The trust has included an amount of \$1 100 000 in the 1987-88 budget as the estimated income to be derived from the sale of vacant industrial land. Total income received from the sale of industrial land during the 1986-87 financial year amounted to \$2 282 900.

3. The trust owns 25 vacant industrial allotments in Elizabeth West. Addresses and current sale prices of each allotment are shown below:

Address	Sale Price \$
Lot 39 Peachey Road	39 604.00
Lot 43 Hooke Road	48 552.00
Lot 59 Hooke Road	272 400.00
Lot 2 Barfield Crescent	35 532.00
Lot 2 Stebonheath Road	104 400.00
Lot 27 Bellchambers Road	223 680.00
Lot 26 Bellchambers Road	47 880.00
Lot 25 Bellchambers Road	51 000.00
Lot 24 Bellchambers Road	62 940.00
Lot 20 Hartfoot Crescent	70 320.00
Lot 21 Hartfoot Crescent	59 100.00
Lot 22 Hartfoot Crescent	78 300.00
Lot 1 Bellchambers Road	48 600.00
Lot 6 Kingstag Crescent	41 160.00
Lot 4 Stebonheath Road	83 760.00
Lot 3 Stebonheath Road	65 640.00
Lot 2 Stebonheath Road	65 700.00
Lot 10 Womma Road	198 220.00
Part Lot 30 Womma Road	120 240.00
Part Lot 30 Hewittson Road	150 240.00
Lot 10 Kingstag Crescent	50 220.00
Lot 8 Kingstag Crescent	38 120.00
Lot 7 Stebonheath Road	47 880.00
Lot 9 Stebonheath Road	67 980.00
Lot 12 Stebonheath Road	132 600.00

The sale price is based on valuations provided by the Valuer-General ranging from \$5.00 to \$10.00 per square metre.

The trust has one vacant industrial block at Elizabeth South valued at \$71 160. This allotment is intended for use by the trust and is therefore not for sale. The trust does not own any industrial allotments at Elizabeth North.

ARID LANDS BOTANIC GARDEN

375. **The Hon. JENNIFER CASHMORE** (on notice) asked the Minister for Environment and Planning:

1. Have any funds been made available in this year's budget for the Arid Lands Botanic Garden at Port Augusta and, if so, how much and for what purpose will the money be used and, if not, why not?

2. Has planning approval been sought for entrance ways to the site of the garden and, if so, when is it expected that approval will be granted?

3. Does the Government intend to establish a plant nursery in the garden for the propagation of plants suitable for growing in the arid lands and, if not, why not and, if so, what planning is in train to ensure that this occurs?

4. Has the Government any policy for the development of vegetation in arid lands and, if so, what is the policy and its program for implementation?

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

1. No funds have been identified in this years budget for the Arid Lands Botanic Garden at Port Augusta pending careful examination of the resources which would be required from State Government to establish and maintain such a new service. Government acknowledges the value of the service to the rural community, but must be satisfied that proper resources can be found.

2. No planning application has been lodged.

3. If the Government decided to provide resources for the Arid Lands Botanic Garden, there would be a nursery to serve the botanic garden.

4. Unlike the southern agricultural areas of the State there has been very little active clearance of native vegetation in the arid lands. By and large therefore, it is not so much a matter of 'developing' vegetation in the arid lands, but rather conserving the existing vegetation and managing the industries in the region to keep their impact upon the vegetation within acceptable limits. The Government has several relevant policies and programs, including reservation of key areas under the National Parks and Wildlife Act, environmental assessment of mining proposals and management of lands held under pastoral lease.

CAPE JERVIS SHOPPING COMPLEX

376. **The Hon. JENNIFER CASHMORE** (on notice) asked the Minister for Environment and Planning:

1. Has the Coast Protection Board been consulted about the impact on the coastal environment of the proposed hotel/motel/shopping complex at Cape Jervis and, if so, what is the Board's opinion and, if not, why not?

2. Does the Minister intend to obtain an environmental impact statement for the development and, if not, why not?

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

1. Yes. The Coast Protection Board has been consulted on two separate occasions on the proposed development of tourist facilities adjacent to the Cape Jervis foreshore by Cape Jervis Developments Pty Ltd.

At its 6 May 1985 meeting the board considered a proposal for a passenger terminal, tavern, motel and shopping complex. A separate proposal for a private long term parking area with a covered car storage area was also considered.

The board resolved to advise the South Australian Planning Commission that it had no objection on coastal engineering grounds, but expressed its concern over the height and visual impact of the passenger terminal which it believed would be obtrusive.

Furthermore, it advised that if the proposal was approved, a number of conditions should be applied relating to effluent and stormwater disposal, landscaping, carparking and look-out arrangements and water supply requirements. Also, it advised that any works of a prescribed nature under the Coast Protection Act would require the consent of the board.

On 5 October 1987, the board considered a revised proposal for waiting rooms, tavern, shopping and additional motel units. The long term parking area without the covered car storage was included as part of the application.

The board resolved to give similar advice to the commission in addition to a condition that the developer allow for adequate public access to the foreshore by moving the complex south on the lease site.

2. No. An environmental impact statement is not required under the Planning Act because there are no major social, economic or environmental impacts foreseen in the proposed development. The South Australian Planning Commission has adequate resources to ensure that the development is correctly and effectively evaluated.

EFFLUENT DISPOSAL

381. **The Hon. JENNIFER CASHMORE** (on notice) asked the Minister of Water Resources: Has the E&WS Department been consulted about effluent disposal for the proposed hotel/motel/shopping complex at Cape Jervis and, if so, is the department satisfied that effluent disposal arrangements are satisfactory?

The Hon. D.J. HOPGOOD: A land use application, submitted by the South Australian Planning Commission, was considered by the Engineering and Water Supply Department in September 1987. As Cape Jervis is not connected to a departmental sewerage system, no comment on the disposal of effluent was necessary. However, the department did point out, in its reply to the Planning Commission, that it was the Planning Authority's responsibility to ensure that the development was served by an adequate effluent disposal system.

DEPARTMENTAL MARKET RESEARCH

390. **Mr OLSEN** (on notice) asked the Premier: In relation to each of the 29 surveys referred to in the answer to Question on Notice No. 135, who conducted the surveys and will the respective Ministers table the reports received following the surveys?

The Hon. J. C. BANNON: The table below sets out the consultants employed to conduct surveys referred to in

question No. 135. Of the 29 surveys the results of nine have been either released or incorporated in other published material. These are:

1. Perception of tar levels:
The Health Commission prepared an article from the consultant's report. The article titled 'Smokers understanding of cigarette yield tables' was published in the *Medical Journal of Australia* (Volume 145 20 October 1986).
2. Survey of beach users:
A report titled 'Adelaide metropolitan beaches—beach user study' was prepared but because of limited funds it was only generally distributed to relevant departments and local government authorities.
3. Survey of drug use and associated problems in Whyalla:
A report titled 'Survey of drug problems in Whyalla' was prepared by Profile (S.A.). The report was dated December 1985. A summary report titled 'survey of drug problems in Whyalla; conclusions and recommendations' was also published.
4. Survey of alcohol use amongst persons aged 12 to 23:
A report titled 'S.A. survey of alcohol use amongst persons aged 12-23' dated March 1987 was prepared by Peter Steidl and Associates.
5. Research in the general area of children:
The Children's Interest Bureau commissioned a survey. The final report titled 'Research Report—What young teenagers say about decision making, authority and discipline' was released in July 1985.
6. Day trip activity by residents of Adelaide:
A published report in the form of a data card titled 'Day trips from Adelaide, 1985-86, Travel Data Card No. 4' was prepared.
7. Grand Prix visitors survey:
The department published a report titled 'Adelaide Formula 1 Grand Prix, Adelaide 1985, Survey of Visitors'. Data from the survey also was used in a book published by the South Australian Centre for Economic Studies.
8. Survey of attitudes to red light cameras: A report titled 'Red light camera trial attitude survey' was published.
9. Population projections for all non-metropolitan Local Government Areas:
Data from the study was used as input into various reports published by the Interdepartmental Forecasting Committee and the department, for example, Population Projections for non-metropolitan Local Government Areas in South Australia 1981-1996.
The remainder were used for internal purposes and are not in a form which would be appropriate to publish.

Consultant	Dept./Agency	Purpose	Cost
Cam Rungie & Associates	Community Welfare	research in the general area of children	\$ 9 000
Ian McGregor Marketing Pty Ltd	Mines and Energy	to evaluate the promotion and utilisation of the Energy Information Centre	2 450
		to survey public awareness of the Energy Information Centre	2 400
Flinders University—School of Social Sciences	Environment and Planning	to assist in the provision of population projections for all non-metropolitan Local Government Areas	21 000
Ian McGregor Marketing Pty Ltd		surveying community attitudes towards the State's heritage and heritage conservation matters	2 050
Ian McGregor Marketing Pty Ltd		surveying the community attitudes towards the greening of Adelaide	525
Ian McGregor Marketing Pty Ltd		survey seeking knowledge, views on native vegetation clearance	2 450
Ian McGregor Marketing Pty Ltd		survey of the farming community	3 000
McGregor Harrison Marketing Pty Ltd	State Transport Authority	passenger survey on usage of (i) periodical tickets (ii) system wide travel	8 000

Consultant	Dept./Agency	Purpose	Cost
			\$
Ian McGregor Marketing Pty Ltd Peter Steidl	Local Government Department	survey to assess public attitudes to and awareness of public transport and the STA survey was part of a project to increase the opportunities for all groups to participate in local government affairs and in particular to achieve an increase in voter turnout in the May 1985 election	15 000
Ian McGregor Marketing Pty Ltd	Tourism	surveying intentions to holiday in South Australia	25 000
Ian McGregor Marketing Pty Ltd		monthly surveys to measure the level and characteristics of day trip activity by residents of Adelaide	8 750
South Australian Centre for Economic Studies Research International Australia Pty Ltd (incorporated in New South Wales)		Grand Prix visitors survey	8 000
Reark Research Pty Ltd (Melbourne)		surveys of South Australians, interstate and overseas visitors	15 000
Mike Bowden & Associates Profile (SA)	Health Commission	survey of Perth tourism market relating to the awareness of the South Australian Travel Shop in Perth	1 800
Peter Steidl	Transport	motivational research into smoking behaviour	4 450
Peter Steidl		survey of the perception of tar levels of cigarettes	5 580
McGregor Harrison Marketing Pty Ltd Cam Rungie & Associates		surveying motorist attitudes to red light cameras	2 500
(not approved)		evaluation of the Mr Hyde Road Safety Campaign	9 000
Harrison Market Research		evaluation of increased penalties for drink driving offences	6 000
Profile (SA)	Drug and Alcohol Services Council	rural roadside survey of drink driving patterns, occupant restraint use and travel patterns	125 000
Peter Steidl and Associates		survey to determine attitudes to a graduated driver licensing system	20 000
McGregor Harrison; Hassell Planning Consultants	Coast Protection Board	survey to determine the knowledge, attitudes and behaviour of parents to child restraint use	5 000
McGregor Harrison	Engineering and Water Supply Department Transport Department (part funded by STA and Highways)	survey of drug use and associated problems in Whyalla	30 000
		survey of alcohol use amongst persons aged 12 to 23	20 000
		survey of beach users within the metropolitan coast protection district	37 000
		survey on community attitudes on services provided by E&WS	40 000
		survey on travel behaviour in metropolitan area to be used for planning Adelaide's transport system	260 000

STATE DEVELOPMENT DEPARTMENT CONTRACT

391. **Mr OLSEN** (on notice) asked the Minister of State Development and Technology: Following his statement to the Estimates Committee that the Department of State Development had sought Crown Law advice on certain aspects of the department's contract with Dominguez Barry Samuel Montagu Limited:

- (a) was this advice sought before the department finalised the contract;
- (b) for what specific reasons was the advice sought; and
- (c) will the Minister table the advice?

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

- (a) No.
- (b) Whether any impropriety had occurred in relation to share trading in Sagasco by DBSM: the answer was no.

An opinion on which at various entities was the more appropriate to pay DBSM's fees: here the advice was the Government.

- (c) It is not appropriate for this advice to be tabled but arrangements can be made available to the honourable member on a confidential basis if so desired.

TOURISM DEPARTMENT

393. **Mr OLSEN** (on notice) asked the Minister of Transport representing the Minister of Tourism: What is the estimated cost of changing the name of the Department of Tourism?

The Hon. G.F. KENEALLY: The costs of changing the name of the Department of Tourism to Tourism South Australia are not expected to extend beyond required alterations to stationery which will be effected with minimal expense.

394. **Mr OLSEN** (on notice) asked the Minister of Transport representing the Minister of Tourism: Will the Minister table the report by the committee which reviewed the structure of the Department of Tourism and which resulted in the changes announced by the Minister on 29 September?

The Hon. G.F. KENEALLY: A copy of the report of the Organisation Review Team will be made available upon request to my office.

SUPER TRAIN CHARTER

397. **The Hon. D.C. WOTTON** (on notice) asked the Minister of Transport: Was a 2 000 series Supertrain used

under charter to transport a group from Salisbury on the Bridgewater line on Monday, 12 October and, if so, what charges were levied on the group involved?

The Hon. G.F. KENEALLY: No.

AUSTRALIA CARD DISCUSSIONS

399. Mr OLSEN (on notice) asked the Premier: In relation to the participation of the Inter-Government Relations and Advisory Services Division of the Department of Premier and Cabinet in 'discussion on possible introduction of the Australia Card' as revealed on page 8 of the department's 1986-87 report, will the Premier table any correspondence which passed between the South Australian and Commonwealth Governments related to this discussion?

The Hon. J.C. BANNON: The position of the South Australian Government concerning the possible introduction of the Australia Card was set out by the Attorney-General in correspondence to the Chairman of the Joint Select Committee On The Australia Card which was established by the Federal Parliament. A copy of that letter is attached.

Chairman,
Joint Select Committee on Australia Card,
Parliament House,
CANBERRA, A.C.T. 2600

Dear Sir,

Re: Australia Card

I am writing to your Committee on behalf of the Government of South Australia in order to acquaint it with major concerns and issues which this Government wants specifically addressed, both by your Committee and any Commonwealth legislation that may emanate in consequence of its final recommendations. I note that your Committee has invited submissions and representations. The Government of South Australia has opted, in lieu of a formal submission, to traverse the real concerns it perceives in the proposals.

Before proceeding to do so, I should make quite clear that the Government of South Australia has not yet taken any policy decisions in respect of the Commonwealth Government's proposals to implement a national identification system. An officer of my Department attended the presentation, to States and Territories, of those proposals in Canberra on 19 December 1985. But beyond his acquainting Cabinet with the substance of that presentation, nothing has been done and no decision has been made by Cabinet regarding the final position it will, or is likely to, adopt on the matter. Instead, it reserves its final position and will direct its attention to the contemplated legislation as it is being drafted.

The major concerns and issues the Government of South Australia will want specifically addressed, before it makes any final determination, are summarised as follows:

- (i) To what extent will Federal Government Departments (in which expression is to be included Federal statutory and cognate authorities) be permitted to have access to information originally given to other Departments or organisations for specific purposes?
- (ii) What assurances will there be that, when records are created for different purposes (e.g. banking) and they are matched for another purpose (e.g. to detect fraud) the result will not be a loss of data quality?
- (iii) What guarantees will exist that an individual will know, or be advised that, information about him is being fed to another Department for a purpose different from that for which it was originally collected? This problem is particularly important where obsolete or inaccurate information is being fed.
- (iv) What guarantees will there be that Australia Cards will not be issued (or reissued) on the basis of counterfeited, forged or other spurious source identification records (e.g. birth certificates, drivers' licences etc.)?
- (v) What guarantees will exist that data linkage across the private sector will not occur?
- (vi) Will Government itself, and researchers (whether from the private or public sector) use the identification number to gather information gained from harmless transactions and activities to store and correlate it to obtain detailed 'profiles' of individuals? If not, how is this to be prevented?

- (vii) What assurances will there be that the operators of the system will need to justify their intrusion into the system before assessing and searching relevant records to establish that a data subject has acted illegally? In the words of one commentator (*Shattuck*—(1984) 35 *Hastings L. J.* 991, 1001-1003):

'What makes computer-matching so fundamentally different from a traditional investigation is that its purpose is to generate the evidence of wrongdoing that usually is required before a traditional investigation can be initiated . . . Computer-matching can turn the presumption of innocence into a presumption of guilt.'

- (viii) What guarantee will there be that the Australia Card will not become a *de facto* passport, failure to possess which will disentitle a *bona fide* individual to certain privileges or benefits that would presently obtain?
- (ix) Assuming the Australia Card system is implemented, will it be competent for the Governments of the States and Territories to require its possession and production for their authorised users and purposes? If so, will it not be essential to ensure that there is a near-complete uniformity among the laws of the States and Territories so that the act of crossing a border will not, *ipso facto*, lead to discriminatory or unjustifiably varied requirements which, again, could jeopardise the rights and entitlements of a *bona fide* individual? What mechanism does the Commonwealth Government (or Parliament) propose to enable such uniformity to result?
- (x) What criteria will be prescribed and applied to ensure that the mandatory nature of the Australia Card:
 - (a) will not place under suspicion a person who does not possess one; or
 - (b) will not place above reproach a person who does possess one albeit obtained illegally (e.g. by theft)?
- (xi) What assurances will any proposed legislation contain that the use of the Australia Card will be confined strictly to tax collection and Social Security disbursement purposes, given the Canadian experience that its Social Insurance Number was being used extensively in the public and private sectors without legislative warrant?
- (xii) Overseas experience may strongly suggest that the tax collection purpose of identification systems can be vitiated by those who avoid banks and credit cards and others who engage in simple barter for goods and services. Given that a *raison d'être* for the Australia Card is to combat tax evasion, how is resort to the so-called 'black' economy to be circumvented by the proposed legislation?
- (xiii) What effect will the Australia Card have on the extant common law right of a natural person to assume any name he chooses (provided that such assumption is not for the purposes of perpetrating fraud etc.)?
- (xiv) Has your Committee considered the very strong evidence (e.g. as highlighted by the Report of the English (Lindop) Committee on Data Protection Cmnd 7341 at pp. 260-264) that there has been a growing diffidence in a number of jurisdictions (e.g. Sweden, U.S.A.) about the use of universal personal identifiers (of which the Australia Card would be an example)?

The Government of South Australia would want all these concerns adequately met before it proceeded to determine its ultimate position on the proposals to introduce a national identification system.

Yours faithfully,

ATTORNEY-GENERAL

WORKCOVER

420. Mr S.J. BAKER (on notice) asked the Minister of Labour:

1. On what basis will agent fees be paid to SGIC for WorkCover?
2. What will be the total estimated payment to SGIC for 1987-88 (establishment costs and agent's fees separately)

and how much was spent during 1986-87 to set up WorkCover?

The Hon. FRANK BLEVINS: The replies are as follows:

1. Service fees are still being negotiated but will be determined on a reasonable commercial basis.
2. (a) SGIC has estimated that establishment costs are

in the order of \$5 m which includes the cost of computer software. Agents fees cannot be estimated at this stage as service fees are still being negotiated.

(b) \$743 730 was expended by SGIC to 30 June 1987, in the establishment of the WorkCover Agency. This expenditure is a charge against the WorkCover Corporation.