HOUSE OF ASSEMBLY

Tuesday 22 October 1991

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

PETITIONS: COIN OPERATED GAMING MACHINES

Petitions signed by 400 residents of South Australia requesting that the House urge the Government to provide for the administration of coin operated gaming machines in licensed clubs and hotels by the Liquor Licensing Commission and the Independent Gaming Corporation were presented by Messrs Blevins and De Laine.

Petitions received.

A petition signed by 98 residents of South Australia requesting that the House urge the Government not to introduce gaming machines into hotels and clubs was presented by Mr Matthew.

Petition received.

PETITION: PETROL TAX

A petition signed by 37 residents of South Australia requesting that the House urge the Government to reduce the tax on petrol and devote a larger proportion of the revenue to road funding was presented by Mrs Kotz.

Petition received.

PETITIONS: PROSTITUTION

Petitions signed by 287 residents of South Australia requesting that the House urge the Government not to decriminalise prostitution were presented by Mrs Kotz and Mr Lewis.

Petitions received.

PETITION: HALLETT COVE POLICE STATION

A petition signed by 190 residents of South Australia requesting that the House urge the Government to establish a police station at the Hallett Cove shopping centre was presented by Mr Matthew.

Petition received.

PETITION: PUBLIC LIBRARIES BRANCH

A petition signed by 352 residents of South Australia requesting that the House urge the Government to continue the operation of the Public Libraries Branch was presented by Mr Matthew.

Petition received.

PETITION: WATER RATING SYSTEM

A petition signed by 19 residents of South Australia requesting that the House urge the Government to revert to the previous water rating system was presented by Dr Armitage.

Petition received.

PETITION: CHILD ABUSE PENALTIES

A petition signed by 184 residents of South Australia requesting that the House urge the Government to increase the penalties for offenders convicted of child abuse was presented by Mrs Kotz.

Petition received.

PETITION: BRIGHTON POLICE STATION

A petition signed by 165 residents of South Australia requesting that the House urge the Government to establish a police station at Brighton was presented by Mr Matthew.

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 34, 41, 106 and 131; and I direct that the following answers to questions without notice be distributed and printed in *Hansard*.

SAGRIC INTERNATIONAL

In reply to **Mr MEIER (Goyder)** 15 August.

The Hon. LYNN ARNOLD: As I told Parliament on 15 August, SAGRIC International had no direct involvement in the production of wheat from Saudi Arabia that may be sold at heavily subsidised prices to New Zealand. SAGRIC International provided a total of 78 man months of technical wheat farming assistance in Saudi Arabia between December 1985 and September 1987. It has provided no additional assistance for the purposes of wheat production since September 1987. In 1989-90, South Australia exported 149 601 tonnes of bulk wheat to New Zealand, valued at $33.6 million. This represented 79 per cent of Australian bulk wheat sales to New Zealand that year.

In the 11 months to May 1991, South Australia exported 56 530 tonnes of bulk wheat to New Zealand valued at $9 million. The potential economic losses to South Australian wheat farmers from the loss of any of the New Zealand market to Saudi Arabia are uncertain, but clearly depend on the price that would be received for any displaced wheat in alternative markets relative to the price that would have been received from the New Zealand market. Press reports indicate that the proposed sale of Saudi Arabian wheat to New Zealand will not proceed. The trading company involved, Louis Dreyfus Pty Ltd, is reported to have sought alternative markets for the shipment in Malaysia and Singapore.

ORGAN DONATION

In reply to **Mr QUIRKE (Playford)** 10 September.

The Hon. FRANK BLEVINS: It is clear that the question of organ donation needs to be asked sensitively and the Registrar of Motor Vehicles will remind his staff of the need for sensitivity when referring to the organ donor facility on a driver's licence. I am advised that the Registrar's officers are currently engaged in discussions with the Australian Kidney Foundation in an attempt to develop alternative means by which persons can acknowledge their

consent, which hopefully will simplify the process and encourage more to take up the organ donor options.

OAKLANDS PARK PRIMARY SCHOOL

In reply to **Mr BRINDAL (Hayward)** 9 October.

The Hon. J.C. BANNON: The answer to the honourable member's question is contained in my response to his letter of 26 September covering these and one or two other related questions.

PAPERS TABLED

The following papers were laid on the table:

By the Minister of Industry, Trade and Technology (Hon. Lynn Arnold)—

Small Business Corporation of South Australia—Report, 1990-91.

By the Minister of Agriculture (Hon. Lynn Arnold)—

Dried Fruits Board of South Australia—Report, year ended 28 February 1991.

By the Minister of Education (Hon. G.J. Crafter)—

Government Adviser on Deregulation—Report, 1990-91.
Legal Services Commission—Report, 1990-91.
Evidence Act 1929—Report of the Attorney-General Relating to Suppression Orders, 1990-91.
Supreme Court Act 1935—Rules of Court—Pleadings and Appeals.

By the Minister of Transport (Hon. Frank Blevins)—

Metropolitan Taxi-Cab Act 1956—Applications to Lease, 9 October 1991.

By the Minister of Housing and Construction (Hon. M.K. Mayes)—

State Clothing Corporation—Report, 1990-91.

By the Minister for Environment and Planning (Hon. S.M. Lenehan)—

Art Gallery of South Australia—Report, 1990-91.
Department of Environment and Planning—Report, 1990-91.
South Australian Film Corporation—Report, 1990-91.
Urban Land Trust Act 1981—Regulation—Northfield.

By the Minister of Lands (Hon. S.M. Lenehan)—

Department of Lands—Report, 1990-91.

By the Minister of Emergency Services (Hon. J.H.C. Klunder)—

South Australian Metropolitan Fire Service—Report, 1990-91.
South Australian State Emergency Service—Report, 1990-91.

By the Minister of Mines and Energy (Hon. J.H.C. Klunder)—

Office of Energy Planning—Report, 1990-91.
Department of Mines and Energy—Report, 1990-91.

By the Minister of Marine (Hon. R.J. Gregory)—

Marine Act 1936—Regulation—Speed Exemption.

By the Minister of Employment and Further Education (Hon. M.D. Rann)—

South Australian Institute of Languages—Report, 1990-91.
Report, September 1991.

WILPENA STATION TOURIST FACILITY

The Hon. S.M. LENEHAN (Minister for Environment and Planning): I seek leave to make a statement.

Leave granted.

The Hon. S.M. LENEHAN: The House will recall that the Wilpena Station Tourist Facility Act was passed last year and assented to on 6 December 1990. The Act was enabling legislation that removed impediments to the development of the facilities. Unfortunately, the project implementation continues to be delayed, having been caught up in the national climate of recession and very low levels of project investment. This delay regrettably also presents problems for the management of the Flinders Ranges National Park in that the unsatisfactory visitor facilities and adverse environmental impacts on the Wilpena Pound area remain and, in fact, worsen with the increasing number of visitors to the area.

The enabling legislation, amongst other things, placed an obligation on me to report to Parliament on or before 30 September in each year on the lessee's compliance with public information and environmental maintenance plans. These plans have not yet been finalised and adopted and, accordingly, the issue of compliance does not yet apply. I however wish to approach the matter in the spirit of the legislation and bring the House up to date on the planning matters involved. The preparation of these plans is a lease requirement and the extensive compilation task was interrupted by the protracted litigation associated with the project. Following the passing of enabling legislation I extended the plans preparation period under the lease by 12 months to December 1991.

I wish to report to the House that these plans are being prepared as required by the revised schedule. Interim deadlines for drafts have been complied with and final documentation is expected by the due date. Adoption will not be immediate as departmental officers wish to carefully ensure the plans are satisfactory in every way. However, adoption is expected well in advance of 30 September 1992, and a report, as required by the enabling legislation, will then be tabled.

QUESTION TIME

PRIME MINISTER'S REMARKS

Mr D.S. BAKER (Leader of the Opposition): Does the Premier agree that the Prime Minister's public remarks in Harare were ill-considered and have jeopardised Adelaide's chances of hosting the 1998 Commonwealth Games, and has he communicated this view to Mr Hawke? This morning I have faxed a letter to the Prime Minister through his Canberra office expressing the Liberal Party's concern that his remarks have torpedoed Adelaide's strong bid for the 1998 games. Mr Hawke was reported by AAP as telling a news conference that 'there was a widespread feeling that developed countries had had a fair turn and there was a preference for giving the games to a developing country'.

The Hon. J.P. TRAINER: On a point of order, Mr Speaker, in view of the fact that Standing Orders now provide for grievance speeches in which members can make contributions of that nature—

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order! What is the point of order?

The Hon. J.P. TRAINER: Will you give a ruling, Mr Speaker, that comment of that nature should not be introduced in questions?

The SPEAKER: The ruling I will give is that the question related to South Australia's chances for the Commonwealth Games: I think it is a valid question to the Premier. I take the point regarding the new system we are to embark on today, and I draw members' attention to those six lots of

five minutes, which will open the doors for many points to be made. However, in this case I rule the question in order. The honourable Premier.

The Hon. J.C. BANNON: No, Mr Speaker, I do not. In Harare the Prime Minister has, in fact, been very vigorously and actively supporting Adelaide's bid to host the Commonwealth Games. He has been very well briefed and has been doing much to ensure that our interests are advanced—as, indeed, one would expect from the Prime Minister of Australia, because the nation also has a great deal to gain. I believe that the Prime Minister's high standing in the Commonwealth, his seniority and his long association with a number of the national leaders will ensure that his representations are listened to.

It is true that the Prime Minister is reported as having said that there was a widespread feeling that developed countries had had a fair turn and there was preference for giving the games to a developing country, in response to those questions at a news conference. Indeed, we have known that right from the beginning. There is a great deal of sympathy for developing countries.

At a recent CHOGM meeting, it was agreed that this particular issue should be studied, and it was in the context of presenting a report on that study that the Prime Minister of Papua New Guinea made his comments. When that sort of thing is put to him, is the Prime Minister of Australia to stand up and say to a press conference, 'No, that's not true. There is absolutely no substance in that. No-one has such sympathy.' In other words, is the Leader of the Opposition demanding that the Prime Minister totally sacrifice any credibility he may have by making such a ridiculous statement? He would have no credibility if he said that, and the Leader knows that very well. It is a fact of life, and one of the things that we are grappling with.

Members interjecting:

The Hon. J.C. BANNON: It is amazing: members of the Opposition are not interested in Adelaide's bid for the games. Indeed, given the extremely constructive role that has been played by the member for Hanson as the Leader's representative, I am amazed that this matter is raised in this way. Since it has been raised, I am even more amazed that as I explain the situation my response is treated with derision.

An honourable member: We're just looking for a bit of support.

The Hon. J.C. BANNON: The Opposition is just looking for a means of undermining what should be done at the national level. Let me get back to the point. The Prime Minister has said that there is sympathy and a desire to see the games staged in what is called a developing country. No-one denies it; that is a fact. We have said that ourselves. But what is important in this argument is capacity. What the Prime Minister said, but was not reported as saying, was unequivocably that Adelaide is the best place to present the games. That is what he told the conference; that is what he has been saying. In fact, that ties in totally with the strategy that has been developed by my colleague and the committee that is promoting our bid for the games. If the Leader of the Opposition does not understand that, it is a wilful misunderstanding on his part, I would suggest.

If we went around the world saying, 'No-one's interested in the developing country argument', we would be laughed out of any area in which we made representation. It is important that we make clear that we understand and have sympathy for that point. But the next stage is to say that what is much more important in the current climate is the staging of a successful games. Adelaide is the best place to do that; Adelaide has a demonstrated capacity; and Adelaide therefore, should be nominated. That is exactly what the Prime Minister said. The fact that it was chosen to be reported in the negative way, which suggested that he was conceding, is, in fact, a great pity but typical of the Australian knocking attitude to anything we try to do. I am sorry the Leader is joining that.

I repeat again: the Prime Minister said that Adelaide is the best place to present the games. That is the fact, and it is on that basis we are making our bid. I make the further point that, at the end of the day, the decision will be made by the representatives of the sports of their countries and, whilst certainly there will be some measure of political influence in that decision—greater or lesser, depending on the structure of the nation concerned—nonetheless, that is where the decision will be and that is where we will continue to direct our efforts.

POLICE FORCE

Mr QUIRKE (Playford): Does the Minister of Emergency Services agree with the claim made by the Leader of the Opposition last week that there has not been an increase in the Police Force in the past few years and that something has to be done about it? The Leader's claim was run on Channels 10 and 2 and was apparently made in an interview after the tabling of the Police Commissioner's annual report.

The Hon. J.H.C. KLUNDER: I will quote exactly what the Leader said:

> There has not been an increase in the Police Force in the last few years, and something has to be done about it.

I do not agree with that claim. What is more, if the Leader himself believes that claim, I can assume only that he spends most of his time in the mushroom mode—hearing nothing and reading even less.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order!

Mr Venning interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order! The member for Custance is out of order. The Chair cannot hear the response.

The Hon. J.H.C. KLUNDER: They don't like it when the tables are being turned on them. For example, did the Leader read any part of the Commissioner's report last Thursday before making his comment about police numbers? Did he read the part which gave the total strength of the Police Department as 4 353 at the end of June, made up of 3 755 police personnel and 597 Public Service and weekly paid personnel? Does he really claim there has been no change in this figure in the last few years?

What is his excuse for having failed to notice the provisions made in the last three budgets for a total increase of more than 200 police officers in the total strength of the Police Force? Given all the information provided in successive Estimates Committees and in Parliament generally, how can he be unaware that since 1982 the Government has approved a grand total of 574 additional positions in the Police Department? When that figure is broken down, it comprises an approved increase of 420 in police personnel, the appointment of 18 police aides and an increase of 137 in Public Service staffing.

An honourable member interjecting:

The Hon. J.H.C. KLUNDER: And no clerics. It is a little difficult to judge whether the leader has deliberately chosen to ignore the facts or is genuinely ignorant of them. Either way, it does not do much for his credibility or the credibility of his recent commitments on additional police numbers.

The SPEAKER: Before calling on the next question, I draw the attention of Ministers to their ability to use min-

isterial statements instead of replies to questions in this place.

SAMIC

Mr S.J. BAKER (Deputy Leader of the Opposition): Did the Treasurer authorise or was he advised of the recent large sale of SAMIC shares by SGIC and the State Bank Group which have led to SAMIC's suspension by the Stock Exchange and an investigation by the Australian Securities Corporation? Is he satisfied that there was no impropriety or illegality in those transactions? Did SGIC's new Commissioner, Mr Stephen Chapman, declare his interest as an adviser to SAMIC before SGIC sold its shares and, at the time of SGIC's sale, was SGIC Chief Executive Denis Gerschwitz still a director and shareholder in SAMIC with a potential conflict?

The Hon. J.C. BANNON: SAMIC was established in 1984 at the time that the whole question of investment in start-up, hi-tech or new sunrise industries was under active discussion.

Mr Lewis: SA Inc.

The Hon. J.C. BANNON: Not SA Inc. as was interjected: on the contrary, this was a national scheme, because it was identified that within Australia there was little investment of this kind. The Commonwealth established a scheme. In fact, the report that led to the establishment of the management investment companies legislation was commissioned by the Fraser Government, a Liberal Government. It was called the Espie committee, chaired by Sir Frank Espie, and established in 1981 to report on problems facing hi-tech enterprises through the lack of venture capital. It saw the need for a program to be developed by the Federal Government to encourage it. As a result, in 1984 these recommendations were picked up by the Hawke Government and a Management Investment Companies Act was passed through the Federal Parliament.

The MIC program, which was something that all Parties widely applauded at the time, was to promote and develop an Australian venture capital industry to encourage management and financial support for young Australian enterprises which had the potential for fast growth and export oriented and innovative technology users. At the same time, the State Government in South Australia embarked on the creation of Enterprise Investments Limited to try to do the same sort of thing from a State perspective. This was in advance of the creation of the MIC program which, under the Act, allowed generous tax advantages to be gained for investment in these areas. Licences were needed. A number of Adelaide businessmen decided that it would be very important for South Australia that they have a share of this program; these were the very things that should be developed here in South Australia. We were well geared for this: with the development of Enterprise Investments, Technology Park and the drive in this area, we would indeed be part of the program.

Members interjecting:

The Hon. J.C. BANNON: This is all a vital part of the information in response.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order!

The Hon. J.C. BANNON: A number of Adelaide businessmen joined together—Bruce Hundermark and Tim Hartley were the chief proponents of SAMIC at that time—and asked if Adelaide businesses would be prepared to invest and be involved in such a company. They formed SAMIC which applied for a licence in the first round of issue. Seven licences were issued. I am not sure how many were issued in the first round, but SAMIC missed out and did not gain a licence. The South Australian Government was very concerned about this, because we believed that it fulfilled the criteria in every way and we made active representation to the licensing board and elsewhere to try to assist it in gaining a licence. But that was not because it was a Government-owned or sponsored company: it was not, and at no stage has it been. We had our own operation under the enterprise investment banner. In fact, SAMIC obtained a licence in that second round and proceeded to operate. It was listed on the Stock Exchange. Its main investors included not only SGIC—and I was very happy for SGIC to be part of investment in that company—

The Hon. Jennifer Cashmore interjecting:

The Hon. J.C. BANNON: Yes, in the interests of South Australia having a role in this particular area. Fauldings, Farmers Union and SA Brewing also were part of this investment, as were a number of private individuals including, I might say, a very prominent former Liberal Party member of this House who is (or certainly has been) a current shareholder, as I understand it. So, there were a wide range of investors in this company.

An honourable member interjecting:

The Hon. J.C. BANNON: Well, Mr Speaker, I now bring it up to date. The Federal Government program has not worked. SAMIC is, effectively, simply a cash box operation at the moment. The MIC program is being wound down, and it is possible that SAMIC itself might be wound down, or certainly change its *modus operandi*, and in that instance there is no justification for SGIC's remaining an active shareholder in it. Equally, the State Bank, under its new charter of operations, has no particular interest in being part of it and has sought independently to divest its shares. It has proceeded to do that and, as I understand it, has indeed done so successfully. The bank did not have to ask the Government for its consent to do that: it was within its own discretion and in its own commercial interests to take that procedure.

CHRISTMAS TRADING HOURS

The Hon. J.P. TRAINER (Walsh): Can the Minister of Labour advise the House of trading arrangements in the city and suburbs for the upcoming Christmas season, doing so earlier this year than in previous years in order to give the stores and their employees more time to plan for this retail period?

The Hon. R.J. GREGORY: This year during the Christmas trading period, shops in the city and suburbs will be able to open if they wish on the two Sundays prior to Christmas, 15 and 22 December, trading between the hours of 11 a.m. and 5 p.m. City and suburban stores will be open for late trading on Monday 23 December until 9 p.m. Because Thursday 26 December will be a public holiday following the transfer of the Proclamation Day holiday, there will be late night shopping in both the city and suburbs on Friday 27 December.

These arrangements were determined after consultation with the retail employers and employee organisations. This shopping pattern should allow an adequate spread of shopping hours prior to Christmas, and the two public holidays over the Christmas period will also provide a reasonable and welcome break for the thousands of workers in the retail industry and their families. We have also contacted country shopping districts and, after consultation with those organisations, we will be making announcements about arrangements for Christmas shopping in those areas.

EAST END MARKET

The Hon. D.C. WOTTON (Heysen): Does the Treasurer agree with the Lord Mayor and his deputy that Beneficial Finance should cut its losses on the East End Market site and enable a predominantly residential development to proceed based on a sale price for the land of about $20 million?

The Hon. J.C. BANNON: I have always supported two things in relation to the East End site: first, as much as possible that it be developed as an entity and, that even if whatever is done is done in stages, that it be done in the consequence of an overall plan for that site; secondly, that there should be a substantial residential component, if at all possible, in any development that takes place there. Detailed discussions are taking place. I am awaiting a report on the outcome of those discussions to see whether and to what extent the Government can have a role in assisting in the development of that site.

I am not suggesting that the Government should be the developer—it must be private sector driven—but I have noted with interest comments by members of the city council. I agree with them completely in terms of something needing to be done to that very important site, and I am very open to suggestions that council may have and, indeed, to participation that council may suggest. If, in fact, the acquisition of the site is considered appropriate, perhaps the council will be prepared to contribute to that in some way. Those sorts of issues have to be discussed, and until they have been properly explored I cannot add any further comment.

TAFE FUNDING

Mr FERGUSON (Henley Beach): Will the Minister of Employment and Further Education advise what progress was made regarding the funding of TAFE at last Friday's meeting of Education and Training Ministers? Last week the Minister said that the question of who runs TAFE becomes vitally important in meeting the challenges of the Finn review. He said that a move by the Commonwealth to take over TAFE could be a disaster for South Australian students and local industry, and that the Ministers' meeting on Friday would address these issues.

The Hon. M.D. RANN: I thank the member for Henley Beach for his continued interest in our TAFE system. I know that all members of the House would be interested in follow-up information in respect of what happened at that very important meeting, because I am sure that all members recognise that we have what is widely regarded in the nation as the best TAFE system in Australia, and any attempt by the Commonwealth to highjack TAFE can only damage our position of leadership.

As I predicted last week in the House, the Federal Minister for Employment, Education and Training (John Dawkins) used the excuse of the Finn report to push his own agenda, which is a complete or partial Commonwealth takeover of TAFE. At last Friday's meeting of Ministers, Mr Dawkins pushed that line and, I think to the surprise of no-one, the States pushed in the opposite direction. Confronted by such a united front, Mr Dawkins had no option but to back down and agree to further talks in the period leading up to the Special Premiers Conference.

The States and the Commonwealth have, of course, endorsed the thrust of the Finn report (chaired by IBM Chairman, Brian Finn) which calls for a massive expansion of training effort around Australia. In fact, we should be concentrating on providing better choices and chances for our young people. The Finn report is a comprehensive blueprint to massively reduce youth unemployment and to help ensure that Australia is a capable as well as a clever country.

However, at the meeting, the Ministers did not endorse a plan by the Commonwealth that would, I believe, have strangled our TAFE system with Canberra's red tape. TAFE is vitally important to our regional economy. It must be relevant, dynamic and able to respond quickly to South Australian industry, community needs and the needs of students. It must not become a colonial outpost under the control of Canberra bureaucrats.

The State Government of South Australia provides for well over 80 per cent of TAFE's recurrent budget and has boosted funding to TAFE in successive budgets whilst the Commonwealth's share of TAFE funding has fallen to a token effort. We are certainly happy to work with the Commonwealth and to accept additional funds to provide for an increased number of TAFE places in South Australia.

State and Commonwealth Education and Training Ministers will meet again early next month to work out the costing implications of the Finn report and its training targets, and will also narrow down the options in terms of how extra TAFE places around Australia can be funded. However, decisions on those options for funding responsibility will then, of course, be made appropriately at the special Premiers conference to be held later in November. I was disappointed that Canberra's promise of extra funds to TAFE for 1992 seems illusory. Instead of bureaucratic power plays, it is vitally important that the Commonwealth sharpens its focus on the key issue of rising levels of unemployment in this country.

STATE GOVERNMENT INSURANCE COMMISSION

Mr INGERSON (Bragg): Can the Treasurer assure the House that the opinion of the review into SGIC is correct, namely, that 'SGIC has not acted in concert with the State Bank in considering its investments'?

The Hon. J.C. BANNON: I can only be guided by, first, my own knowledge of the way that these two entities have operated and, secondly, the findings of the review. Indeed, in many instances SGIC and the State Bank were in competition, and there was concern about that aspect. In fact, the State Bank undertook separate business when I and others felt that it was probably more appropriate to use the services of SGIC, but that commercial decision was up to the bank.

OFFICE OF HOUSING

Mr HAMILTON (Albert Park): Will the Minister of Housing and Construction say whether there have been efficiency gains and cost savings as a result of the integration of the Office of Housing with the South Australian Housing Trust?

The Hon. M.K. MAYES: I thank the honourable member for his question which I think is important in terms of the delivery of policy services to the Government and the community. Traditionally the Office of Housing was located under the banner of SACON and provided a service directly to the Minister of Housing and Construction. As a consequence of a review that we conducted earlier this year, it was recommended that as from May the Office of Housing come under the Housing Trust banner to provide strength-

ened and improved policy services to both the Housing Trust and the Government.

The Office of Housing is now called the Housing Strategy Unit, and it is actively involved in the review of Commonwealth/State housing relations and in the analysis of the recent proposals from the Commonwealth Minister with respect to housing assistance, which obviously has been an issue of importance to the whole housing community. The unit is coordinating development of the State housing strategy, which of course is very important to community sectors of housing, and is involved in recognising some substantial cost savings in the process of putting those policy recommendations into place. I am very pleased with the result. I think there was some degree of anxiety within the community about the move of the Office of Housing and to it becoming the Housing Strategy Unit. However, I think that it has worked out well. I am sure the policy advice that is being provided is very valuable.

Other members of the House, including the member for Mount Gambier, have raised with me the fact that last night Mr Jim Crichton, who has been a long-serving member of the public sector of this State and has serviced the community of South Australia for many years in the housing sector, passed away. I pass on my condolences to his family and friends. Mr Crichton is well known to most members and to many South Australians for the work that he did in the Housing Trust and in the community as a whole. His advice and support, going back to the days when the former General Manager, Mr Ramsay, was head of the Housing Trust in South Australia, are well recorded and acknowledged. I pay my respects to Mr Crichton's widow. I am sure that I am joined by other members of the House in acknowledging his work and passing on our best wishes to his family and friends.

STATE GOVERNMENT INSURANCE COMMISSION

Mr MATTHEW (Bright): On whose recommendations and why did the Treasurer approve a $45 million loan from SAFA to SGIC in June 1989 to allow SGIC to provide bridging finance to Beneficial Finance for the East End Market site?

The Hon. J.C. BANNON: I would have to take that question on notice. It is asking for detail that is readily obtainable, but not without notice.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order! The honourable member for Spence.

MANUFACTURING INVESTMENT

Mr ATKINSON (Spence): Can the—

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order! The Deputy Leader is out of order.

Mr ATKINSON: —Minister of Industry, Trade and Technology advise the House whether there is any evidence of the withholding of medium to long-term investment for manufacturing? Some manufacturers tell me that they are finding it difficult to obtain medium to long-term investment from their parent companies. They say that this is partly caused by uncertainty about the level of tariff protection for manufacturing.

The Hon. LYNN ARNOLD: Evidence is now coming through that some manufacturers in this State are finding it difficult to obtain investment funds to renovate their plant or to expand their activities. The reason for that is uncertainty about the tariff regime that will exist in this country in the next few years. In the first instance, of course, we have the industry statement which was delivered on 12 March and which, quite clearly, gave the Federal Government's views on that matter, some areas of which we expressed our concern about, particularly with the TCF and automotive areas. Both of those are areas of some investment concern.

It needs to be noted that in the investment community there is some fear that the Federal Liberal Party might win the next election and, if it does, will follow the policy of Ian McLachlan and others who would go to a zero per cent tariff base. With that spectre around, we have the situation that a number of people who might have made investment decisions that would help manufacturing in this country are simply saying that they will put them on hold until the situation is clarified. That is an appalling prospect, because it means that we lose the momentum of the necessary investment for manufacturing in this country as well as in this State.

What we really want is to find out what should be happening in this country and what the various political Parties in this country want. I want to give credit to members of the Opposition in Victoria, because they, at least, have had the guts to stand up and take issue with their Federal colleagues, because they know that the Federal Liberal policy will be devastating for manufacturing in this country.

Mr Ingerson interjecting:

The Hon. LYNN ARNOLD: The shadow Minister of Industry, Trade and Technology says that that is utter nonsense; in other words, he is saying that anyone who wants to criticise his or her Federal colleagues is speaking utter nonsense. Clearly, the time is overdue for members of the Opposition in this State to say where they stand with respect to tariffs for manufacturing industry. Do they support a zero per cent tariff, like their Federal colleagues, or do they support something more reasonable in terms of a tariff regime when most other countries in the world are putting in either tariff or non-tariff barriers for their manufacturing industry?

The lead has been given today by a statement from the Engineering Employers Association, which has indicated that the Federal Opposition policy on protectionism would decimate South Australia's manufacturing industry. The choice, therefore, is before members of the Opposition in this State. Do they support that sort of policy, in other words, do they want to decimate manufacturing industry in this State, or do they want a policy that seeks to maintain the importance of manufacturing for this economy? The choice is simple.

The members of the Victorian Liberal Opposition have made that choice, and I congratulate them for the choice they have made in following the leadership shown by Joan Kirner in Victoria, and what the Liberal Party in this State should do is to follow the leadership shown by this Government in arguing as strongly as we have to help manufacturing in the State.

Mr D.S. Baker interjecting:

The Hon. LYNN ARNOLD: The Leader of the Opposition asks how much unemployment do we have. How much would we have if tariffs were to be reduced to zero? It is a very simple question. If tariffs are reduced to zero while there are high barriers for protection in some of our competing countries that are manufacturing goods for export into Australia—in other words, in a protected environment—there will be massive unemployment, and it will rest upon the shoulders of those who support the policy of a

zero tariff base. I do not think that members of the Opposition have any choice but to come clean as to where they stand on this matter, because the electorate deserves to know.

PENALTY FOR GRAFFITI

Mr OSWALD (Morphett): Does the Minister of Family and Community Services agree with the statements attributed to Mr Ken Teo, Manager of the Juvenile Justice Unit, by members of the staff of FACS that the department is not to recommend detention orders for graffiti under any circumstances? I have been contacted by FACS staff, and it has been put to me that youths who are known to have had up to 24 detected offences for graffiti have received only community service orders, which failed to act as a deterrent, and that executives within FACS are adamant that detention for this offence must never be used.

The Hon. D.J. HOPGOOD: I am being asked to comment on something that somebody is alleged to have said. I do not think that is good enough. If the honourable member is prepared to come up with chapter and verse, I will comment on it. Otherwise, all I am content to say is, first, that Mr Teo is not on the bench and he does not determine what sentences are handed out and, secondly, we have a very effective community work order scheme for graffiti-ists at present, and we want to extend that scheme. But no-one rules out the possibility of detention for repeat offences: indeed, it happens.

MARALINGA CONTAMINATION

The Hon. T.H. HEMMINGS (Napier): Will the Minister of Aboriginal Affairs inform the House of any action being taken by the Maralinga Tjarutja people to ensure that the British Government is aware of the legacy of contamination of Maralinga and the consequences on the lifestyle of the Aboriginal people in that area?

The Hon. M.D. RANN: I thank the former Minister of Aboriginal Affairs for his continued support for the Maralinga people. A delegation from Maralinga Tjarutja will be leaving Adelaide this Thursday for London to highlight to the British public and to the British Parliament the existence of the radioactive contamination which remains on the ground and near the British nuclear test sites at both Maralinga and Emu. Members will recall that in March the Maralinga elders decided that the best solution for the contamination was a combination of a partial clean-up of the area, with the secure fencing of other, more seriously contaminated areas.

The elders recognised that a total clean-up of the vast area of contamination by removing and cleaning the top soil and replanting the vegetation would incur both environmental damage and massive expenditure. I think their decision was responsible, sensible and practical. However, the elders are quite right in insisting on bringing this matter to the attention of the British Parliament and of the British people. It is quite true that the British Government still does not acknowledge its clear moral as well as legal responsibilities determined by the McLelland Royal Commission in 1984. The Federal Government is continuing its negotiations. I understand that the Prime Minister recently wrote to the British Prime Minister, Mr Major, on this matter. I also understand that shortly negotiations on the clean-up and compensation matters will begin between the British and Australian Governments.

I applaud the traditional owners of the now contaminated land for their determination not to let this matter lie but to ensure that the British public is aware of the contamination, which far exceeds anything that has been seen at Windscale and the Irish Sea, despite the massive attention given to that issue in Britain and Europe. The delegation, which will be led by the Chairman of Maralinga Tjarutja, Archie Barton, coincides with the BBC's nature documentary entitled *Secrets in the Sand*, which will detail the effects of the radioactive contamination at Maralinga and its effects on the Aboriginal community. The BBC team was in Adelaide and at Maralinga a few months ago to shoot the documentary, which will be seen by an audience of millions on Monday, 28 October.

The delegation will also meet with representatives of Commonwealth countries, journalists, scientists and, as I said before, British parliamentarians from both sides of the House. I have just written to the Agent-General at South Australia House requesting any assistance that he can provide to this delegation in terms of making appointments. I know that the Maralinga Tjarutja people are impressed and delighted at the assistance given to them by the member for Eyre, who has been able to use his considerable influence and contacts in the United Kingdom to obtain appointments for this delegation. I also understand that a former Premier, the Hon. David Tonkin, in his capacity as Secretary-General of the Commonwealth Parliamentary Association, has been of invaluable assistance in terms of helping this delegation on a very historic and important mission.

HOSPITAL ACCOMMODATION

Dr ARMITAGE (Adelaide): Does the Minister of Health consider it appropriate that patients in public hospitals are treated in the corridors and, if not, what action will he take to remedy the situation that is reported to exist at the Flinders Medical Centre?

The Hon. D.J. HOPGOOD: From time to time there can be a run-on in accident and emergency and people have to rest for some time in situations which may be regarded as less than absolutely ideal. Nonetheless, they receive proper attention and are either appropriately placed into a ward or, alternatively, are discharged where no further treatment is necessary. True, we are planning for a considerable upgrade of accident emergency at Flinders Medical Centre, and I imagine that that will proceed in the next financial year, as was announced at the time of bringing down the budget, and I can see no reason why we should deviate from that program.

We had a concern at this time about whether we should further delay the physical amalgamation of the Children's Hospital and the Queen Victoria Hospital, given that they are now the one institution in order to squeeze out some money for this purpose, or whether we should proceed in this financial year with the beginnings of that AMCWC upgrade. We decided on the latter because the situation at Flinders Medical Centre (and I say this, having on two occasions had to take someone very close to me to the accident and emergency area there) is indeed tolerable. On Saturday afternoon in winter, when the busted ankles and noses from football and hockey come in, naturally there is a rush on.

Dr Armitage interjecting:

The Hon. D.J. HOPGOOD: What I find interesting about the member for Adelaide is this: I have always assumed that, for the most part, doctors are innumerate, otherwise they would be involved in less demanding occupations such

as lecturing in mathematics at the university or making a book at Morphettville. I am beginning to think that perhaps the member for Adelaide is in that interesting club. This is what he said—and it is germane to this matter: he told someone in the media that there were something like 8 900 patients on the booking list but only 2 827 beds in our metropolitan hospitals. That is the sort of statement that I call a pachyderm—it is irrelevant—because, quite obviously, it is not the number of beds but how long people occupy those beds that matters. The honourable member still does not realise the new atmosphere that surrounds hospitals. He does not know what productivity is all about, and it is time he did. Maybe he should talk to some of his former colleagues who are right into productivity and are giving us performances way beyond what our hospitals gave.

Whilst on the capital budget—and I conclude on this point—let us not forget that the last time people from his side of the House occupied the Treasury benches the capital budget of the South Australian Health Commission hovered around the $15 million mark. It will cost $44 million to redevelop AMCWC. This is hypocrisy!

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order! The member for Adelaide is out of order. The member for Stuart.

NATIVE VEGETATION ACT

Mrs HUTCHISON (Stuart): Will the Minister for Environment and Planning advise how many applications for clearance have been received under the Native Vegetation Act in 1991 since its proclamation in April of this year and has there been general acceptance of the new legislation?

The Hon. S.M. LENEHAN: I thank the honourable member for her ongoing interest in this very important matter. The Native Vegetation Management Branch has received 28 applications for clearance under the new Act. However, only one application was for broadacre, the balance being for single trees, minor management clearance or brush cutting. I believe, therefore, that these figures would support that the landowners certainly accept the cessation of broadacre clearance in South Australia.

Mr Lewis interjecting:

The Hon. S.M. LENEHAN: It will be interesting to hear what the member for Murray-Mallee has to say about that. Since April, 13 applications have been received for assistance with vegetation management by way of a heritage agreement. Clearance applications and consequent financial assistance packages lodged under the now repealed Native Vegetation Management Act 1985 continue to be considered by the Native Vegetation Authority, which will exist for the balance of the financial year.

Some 340 applications received before 12 February 1991, before the cut-out date, must still be considered; top priority has been given to the task, and a completion target date for clearance applications is still 30 June 1992. It is interesting that the member for Murray-Mallee interjected, because it highlights the fact that the honourable member gives absolutely no support for the protection of the environment. Every member of this Parliament knows, as indeed every thinking member of this community knows, that the greatest degradation to our environment has come about because of wholesale clearing of native vegetation.

Mr Lewis interjecting:

The Hon. S.M. LENEHAN: Methinks the honourable member again exposes the fact that he is totally opposed to any environmental protection in this State. It is interesting to note that everyone else acknowledges that we have had soil degradation and erosion; we have had the destruction of native species of animals and birds because of habitat destruction, yet every time this Government moves to do something positive and constructive about preventing the clearance of native vegetation, we have interjections and we have opposition from the member for Murray-Mallee. Let the community judge where the member stands on this vital issue of conservation, because I suspect that he is an embarrassment to members of his own Party. Certainly, he displays an attitude that is totally out of keeping with that of the rest of the community.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order! The member for Albert Park is out of order.

SOUTH AUSTRALIAN FINANCING AUTHORITY

Mr LEWIS (Murray-Mallee): Will the Treasurer explain why the South Australian Financing Authority purchased land, sections 271 and 272 in the hundred of Monarto, for $355 000 in August 1989 and why it allowed the land to be run down before reselling it for $202 000 on 20 February this year? Will he provide full details of all the land bought and sold by SAFA under the native vegetation management scheme?

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order! The Leader is out of order. The Deputy Leader is out of order.

The Hon. J.C. BANNON: I will seek a report on that matter.

THIRD PARTY INSURANCE CLAIMS

Mr HAMILTON (Albert Park): Will the Minister of Health investigate allegations that 'some private doctors' will not operate on patients whose injuries are subject to insurance claims? On 20 September—

An honourable member: Speak up.

Mr HAMILTON: If you would like to get some of the dirt out of your ears, you might hear. On 20 September I was approached by a Seaton resident who claims that his son, Terry, was involved in a car accident three years ago. He further claims that his son had three crushed vertebrae and may have to have a pin or plate inserted. He states that Terry may have to have an operation but that no doctor will perform it, because it involves a third party insurance claim. Will the Minister investigate these allegations?

The Hon. D.J. HOPGOOD: This information would not normally come before me unless the doctors concerned were working in public hospitals. If they were, I am not quite sure why it should be of concern to them how, when or whether the money was paid across by the insurance company. So, I can only assume that the claim, if it has any substance, must be in relation to doctors who operate in either a private clinic or a private hospital. I will obtain what information I can for the honourable member and the House and report back.

CORRECTIONAL SERVICES OFFICERS

Mrs KOTZ (Newland): How does the Minister of Correctional Services define what is a 'substantial offence free period' before his department employs someone with a conviction as a correctional services officer? The Minister's

written reply to a question I asked in Estimates Committee states:

> In each case where a person who has a conviction seeks employment with the Department of Correctional Services, the decision as to whether that person will be employed is made by the Chief Executive Officer on the basis of a submission in which the person must give some indication of his or her feelings about the offence when it occurred . . . the department always requires that a substantial offence free period has occurred before appointment.

The Hon. FRANK BLEVINS: I do not know that I can add a lot to that, as it seems to me to be a very good and clear answer.

Mrs Kotz interjecting:

The Hon. FRANK BLEVINS: If the honourable member wants to know the meaning of the word 'substantial', I suggest that she look in a dictionary.

Mrs Kotz interjecting:

The Hon. FRANK BLEVINS: 'Substantial' is plain English: I cannot see any problem with it at all. I just want to draw a comparison.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order!

The Hon. FRANK BLEVINS: I refer to the attitude of members opposite to those police officers who appeared before the court having been dismissed or having resigned from the Police Force in respect of offences which, generally speaking, are very minor, and some of which occurred up to 15 years ago. What have we seen? We have seen crocodile tears from some members opposite—I would not call them hypocrites—who have said, 'Isn't it awful? Those poor police officers. All they did was pinch a packet of seeds and they have lost their job and their career.'

What have we seen since the Estimates Committees—an attack on prison officers who, perhaps 15 years ago, as a rule as young men, made a mistake. They have approached the department for employment and have admitted that they committed an offence maybe 15 or 20 years ago. The Executive Director of the Department of Correctional Services—not a lowly committee—looks at each case to see whether it is appropriate for that person to work in the prison system after all those years.

I would have thought that anyone who could cry crocodile tears over police officers losing their career as a result of pinching a handful of plants 15 years ago would think, 'That seems to me to be fair enough. That seems to be a very sensible and humanitarian way of dealing with people who may have committed an offence a long time ago.' We are talking about a handful of people. The member for Newland, for some reason which escapes me, has a real down on prison officers and attacks them at every possible opportunity. If the member for Newland has a prurient interest and wants to see the record of any of these people to determine whether the Executive Director's judgment is correct, I am prepared to make these files available if that procedure is consistent with the Government's policy on privacy. I will have to check that out.

People know that as far as I am concerned any information that is available to me in correctional services is available for the genuine or prurient interests of members opposite, and it will be there. They can then make their judgment as to whether or not the Executive Director is doing the right thing. I am very happy in the knowledge that the Executive Director, whom I am very happy with and supportive of, is quite capable of making those decisions. If the member for Newland wants to query it, I will give her every assistance. I am very happy with the policy, and that policy was very clearly outlined in the answer that was given to the question during the Estimates Committee—a very clear answer in plain English. I think it is an excellent policy. If the honourable member has any queries, I will help her to investigate the matter.

COMMONWEALTH GAMES BID

Mr De LAINE (Price): Can the Minister of Recreation and Sport provide the House with details of the visit to Adelaide at the weekend of Mr Sam Ramsamy, the Chairman of the National Olympic Committee of South Africa?

The Hon. M.K. MAYES: I had the privilege, along with the member for Hanson, of hosting Mr Ramsamy when he visited Adelaide on Sunday. He was in Sydney attending the General Assembly of International Sports Federation's conference, and he gave us his very valuable time for the day. Mr Ramsamy is the Chairman of the South African National Olympic Committee. He is now a very significant member of the international sporting community and has fought very strongly for non-racial sport to be established in South Africa. He spent the afternoon with members of the bid staff and toured our facilities.

As a consequence of that his comments, which were made public, were that he felt there was no doubt that Adelaide has first-class facilities and all the attributes needed to stage a very successful and friendly games. It was very important, from our point of view, to have Mr Ramsamy visit our city, even though it was only for a day, because he has a very significant part to play in events that are occurring on an international level in sport and is also a senior sporting representative of South African non-racial sport and now the South African National Olympic Committee. His comments and time were most appreciated. He also clearly made the point that he thanked Australia for its support and sponsorship of South African non-racial sporting bodies in their aim to achieve non-racial sport. I think that that is very significant as well.

In view of the situation that has developed with regard to the bid and the comments of the Prime Minister, the AAP report has been very selective. We have now received the full text of what the Prime Minister said, and it is worth advising the House and the community of his comments with regard to the bid. He was asked what commitment of support he had received from any Commonwealth leader for the 1998 games. The AAP reported only the first part of the sentence. The second part of the sentence was:

> . . . I think that we are well placed, singularly well placed to get the games. I have supported Adelaide as widely as I can . . .

He then went on to say, and this was not reported:

> I think you have to say that . . . there is a recognition that Adelaide can do the job and they have done very well.

I think that that is important to acknowledge, and that was not put out in the AAP report that we initially received in the early hours of this morning.

The report I received from George Beltchev from Harare—he spoke to the office fairly early this morning—was that the only frenzy occurring was with the Australian media; that very little, if any, attention is being paid to any of these comments by the overseas media. I think we have to put this in its proper context. On many occasions our local media take comments out of context and consequently distort the impact of the statement and mislead the community to an extent where they believe that the Prime Minister has said something that he did not say. I think it is important that we acknowledge that the Prime Minister has been a very strong supporter and has made his comments very openly and carefully, I believe, in support of Adelaide, and has been in contact with all his colleagues, which I think is significant—

Members interjecting:

The Hon. M.K. MAYES: The honourable member might want to wind it up, but this is a very important issue.

Members interjecting:

The Hon. M.K. MAYES: You can have your turn. I am making the situation very clear for the record.

Members interjecting:

The Hon. M.K. MAYES: I know that the member for Hanson joins me in this concern, because, as has been said by the Premier, his contribution has been significant and he has been tireless in his efforts to support this. It is important to put what the Prime Minister said in context. I hope that the media picks it up from my comments and from the earlier comments of the Premier.

SCHOOL ALARMS PROGRAM

Mr SUCH (Fisher): My question is directed to the Minister of Education. Why has the Government allocated only $220 000 this year for its school alarms program when fewer than one-third of its departmental schools have even partial alarm systems and taxpayers are being forced to pay multi-million dollar bills for school arson and vandalism? The Auditor-General's Report (page 55) states that outstanding school fire damage claims admitted by the Public Actuary's office at 30 June 1991 total $8.1 million, almost triple the $3.3 million total in the previous year. Furthermore, I understand that, during the past six weeks, additional fire damage of $1.5 million has occurred to departmental schools.

The Hon. G.J. CRAFTER: I thank the honourable member for his question and call on all members to assist the community in ensuring that our public property, particularly our schools, is provided with all the assistance we can muster during what is a very difficult time. There has been a spate of arson attacks on our properties, and we call upon the community to help us. There is simply not a foolproof system or an allocation that can be provided that will secure each of our schools and our public properties from these attacks.

This is a matter that cannot simply be left to some alarm device or to some system of security: it requires broadly-based community support. That is why it is not simply a matter of alarming our schools in one way or another, but a package of security measures is being applied across the schools. These must be flexible, adaptable and capable of changing quite quickly to meet the changing circumstances of so many of our schools. We have brought into effect a range of measures including a curfew, the alarm process that has been applied in recent years and the physical patrolling of schools. It is not a matter of sitting back and doing nothing: there is an ongoing program.

The honourable member referred to one element only of that program, but a great deal is to be gained by developing programs in conjunction with local communities to provide constant surveillance of our schools by the community. We have been able to deter acts of vandalism and arson in our schools by that commitment—by vigilance on the part of neighbours of schools and of other people in the community who keep an eye on school property. I ask all members to assist us and to encourage the community to participate in this matter, particularly during this most unfortunate period for us in the Education Department.

From time to time, calls are made to provide sprinklers, for example, in all school properties. The cost of doing that would be about $250 million, and I simply do not know where those resources would come from and even, if that were done, whether it would provide the security that is required. Recent attacks on schools have been made in such a way that whole series of fires have been lit simultaneously and, by the time the fire brigade arrived, despite having very effective fire fighting equipment and using other means of combating fire in our schools, the fire simply spread so quickly (with the use of accelerants) that it was impossible to save those buildings. This is a very complex and difficult problem, and I can assure members that we are doing all we possibly can with the resources available to us in any given community to deal with it.

PERSONAL EXPLANATION: MINISTER FOR ENVIRONMENT AND PLANNING

Mr LEWIS (Murray-Mallee): I seek leave to make a personal explanation.

Leave granted.

Mr LEWIS: During Question Time, the Minister for Environment and Planning—

The Hon. S.M. Lenehan: Come in, spinner.

Mr LEWIS: I take exception to that remark also, Mr Speaker. If she can play these games, so can I.

The SPEAKER: Order! The Speaker is on his feet. I would have appreciated the courtesy of the honourable member telling the Chair that he wished to make a personal explanation, because I could have provided for it. Secondly, interjections are out of order. Leave has been granted.

Mr LEWIS: The Minister for Environment and Planning deliberately set out to misrepresent me in replying to a question in Question Time today. She deliberately misled the House in so doing, that is, by vilifying and berating me. She said that I was totally opposed to vegetation control.

The SPEAKER: Order! There is a point of order; the member for Murray-Mallee will resume his seat.

The Hon. J.P. TRAINER: On a point of order, Mr Speaker, it is completely out of order for an honourable member, in the course of a personal explanation, to simply make allegations about another member.

The SPEAKER: The member for Walsh is correct. I have not picked up what the honourable member is explaining but, if that is correct, it will be out of order.

The Hon. S.M. LENEHAN: On a point of order, Mr Speaker, the honourable member suggested that I had deliberately misled the House. His exact words were, 'The Minister had deliberately misled the House.' I ask that the honourable member withdraw those comments.

The SPEAKER: In that case, the honourable member was completely out of order, and I ask him to withdraw those remarks.

Mr LEWIS: I withdraw. The Minister for Environment and Planning inadvertently misled the House and has never listened to what I have said in this place. She said that I am totally opposed to native vegetation clearance controls. That is not true. It is a matter of fact that I have always supported the retention of so much of the remaining ecosystem niches of the natural environment as needed to protect, preserve and retain in perpetuity all species that currently live here. I have taken every opportunity available to me in this place, within the constraints of the proceedings and Standing Orders, to make that point.

Further, I have only ever advocated that it be done not at the expense of any individual citizen but at public expense where the public interest is involved. That is where the Minister has misled the House and misrepresented me.

GRIEVANCE DEBATE

The SPEAKER: I remind members that the new Sessional Orders adopted last Thursday are now in operation. Members will find a copy of the new Sessional Orders printed in green paper in the front of their Standing Orders book. I pose the question that the House note grievances.

Mr HAMILTON (Albert Park): This new grievance debate is an important innovation. I refer to the need for air bags in motor vehicles. There is no doubt in my mind that the motor car manufacturers in this country have a lot to answer for. This is not the first time I have castigated our car manufacturing industry, which has not done enough through safety devices to look after motorists. The motor vehicles in this country leave a lot to be desired in terms of Australian design rules. I also criticise my Federal colleagues when I make that statement, because time after time we hear calls for the installation of air bags in motor vehicles in this country.

At the moment, I understand, the Federal Government is calling for a review to consider this issue. In America not only has that practice been introduced but it has been there for many years and has saved thousands of lives. Anyone who watches television will see repeatedly that it has saved many lives. Only last night on the television I saw where, again in America, they are looking at introducing side protection with the use of air bags. The Road Traffic Authority crash lab experts in Sydney are testing what the Americans and others have been using for years, namely, air bags. In every passenger car built in the United States, Chrysler installs a driver's side air bag as standard equipment and was the first American company to do so. It installs over one million air bags a year, yet we cannot get them in this country.

Mr Lewis interjecting:

Mr HAMILTON: Apart from the air bag opposite (and this is a serious matter), we need them in cars now. I do not believe there is any reason why we cannot have them. If it is good enough to build cars in this country and export them overseas, as currently takes place, it is good enough for all Australians to have the same advantage. There is no good reason not to have that advantage and it would take a great deal to convince the average Australian there was.

Members interjecting:

Mr HAMILTON: Inane interjections from the catfish farmer opposite do no justice to the seriousness of the debate. We are talking not only about saving lives and avoiding trauma and tragedy but also about the cost of running hospitals and the cost of third party compulsory insurance and about injured, maimed and quadraplegic people in this country whose suffering has resulted from the absence of air bags in vehicles. Anyone who looks at the demonstrations on television will clearly understand that air bags save lives. Those of us who take an interest in this area are aware of the tragedy suffered by people who become vegetables and are left in hospitals and nursing homes throughout this country. Only by reducing inertia at the time of a collision can more lives be saved. We all know that the major injuries resulting from a lack of air bags are head and chest injuries.

Members interjecting:

Mr HAMILTON: I am not frightened to criticise my Federal colleagues; I do not kowtow to them as members opposite do to their Federal colleagues. If there is a message to my Federal colleagues, I will get up and give it. The Federal Government should move—and move quickly. We have had enough reports. Let us look at what happens in the United States and in parts of Europe. I hope to see air bags introduced quickly in Australia and to see an Australian design rule that will help protect tens of thousands of people in this country.

Mr D.S. BAKER (Leader of the Opposition): It is appropriate, under the new Sessional Orders, that the member for Albert Park has started off talking about air bags. That matter should be noted by this House. I will speak for a few moments on the public safety document that we released on Sunday. I was disturbed to hear the Premier and the Attorney-General say that they gave it bipartisan support as it only reiterated what the Government would do and was doing already. That is far from the truth. Public safety in the past nine years under this Government has escalated out of all proportion; everyone, irrespective of his or her political views, says that something must be done about it, but this Government has done nothing.

Starting with juvenile offenders, we have said that we will restructure the Children's Court to give judges and magistrates greater control over the enforcement of their court orders. We have said that we will make officers of the Department for Family and Community Services more accountable to the courts and to judges and magistrates. Already, Judge Newman has been very critical of the system. That has been going on now for some two years, and nothing so far has been done about it. The Liberal Party will do something about it.

Juvenile offenders 16 years and over who re-offend or who are repeat offenders will be treated as adults and face adult sentences in an adult court. I think that is appropriate, and I think the public demands that. Those juveniles who have become chronic re-offenders will be targeted for secure detention. I think it is about time that that hard core who are causing all the damage in the community are brought to book, and the community demands that something be done about it. We will also introduce the day in gaol program as a deterrent for those people who re-offend and who may be potential hard core re-offenders, going from their present re-offences into a life of crime as they get older.

We have already said in our education discussion paper that we will get back to basics and start with some proper and adequate discipline in schools in the education system, that there is a connection between truancy and low literacy and numeracy skills, and that a lot of those people in that category go on to become re-offenders, involved in a life of crime when they become adults. So we will attack it at that level, unlike the Minister of Education, who carries on as he does at present, not allowing appropriate discipline in the schools as the schools choose. It is a blanket order for discipline and, of course, anyone from whichever side of politics realises that it is not working. We will start with the education system and make sure that it is tackled at the appropriate level, and then work through the system.

We have said that we will expand neighbourhood policing. We have said that we will open police stations in the suburbs. Many police stations have been closed down in the past eight or nine years, and not only will we reopen them but they will also be in shopping centres, so there will be more policemen on the beat. They will be visible in the community, and they will work not only with the public around them but with community leaders to make sure that we tackle crime where it should be tackled. Of course, that means more police, and we do not shirk from that: we will provide them and, irrespective of this Government's irresponsibility in financial management, we will find that money, because I believe that the public demands that this should happen.

We will introduce truth in sentencing. Far too often, people sentenced for serious crimes to a term of 20 years, have a non-parole period of 18 years; then with some facade of good behaviour they are released after 10 years. We will put every criminal under the jurisdiction of the judge who sentenced them, and that judge will determine whether that criminal is ready to be released from gaol at the appropriate time. This automatic release from prison is a facade in this community, and the community demands that we do something about it. We have already said that we will appoint more judges and magistrates to catch up with the backlog. Nothing has been done by this Government in the past nine years.

The SPEAKER: The honourable Leader's time has expired. The honourable member for Henley Beach.

Mr FERGUSON (Henley Beach): I wish to refer to the housing problems existing in my electorate in respect of pensioners and the Commonwealth Bank. I was recently approached by pensioner constituents who wished to pay their Housing Trust rents by having the rents deducted from their pensions and then paid to the Housing Trust by their banks. A problem has occurred where FID charges have been made against the amounts deducted by the Commonwealth Bank and then transferred to the Housing Trust. I contacted the Commonwealth Bank about this matter and it was suggested to me that the bank's interpretation of the FID tax legislation made it obligatory for the bank to deduct FID. On 16 June, I sent a letter to the Premier asking him to investigate this matter in regard to the interpretation being made by the Commonwealth Bank on the need to deduct FID from pensioners' accounts when they were paying Housing Trust rents.

On 29 July I received a reply from the Premier informing me that the transactions that had been undertaken would now be considered to be a non-dutiable receipt and that, in fact, FID payments would not be deducted. I informed my constituents, who made a claim for back payment for FID amounts deducted from their accounts. Similarly, I suggested to all my pensioner constituents by way of a press release in the Messenger *Weekly Times* that they make a claim for the amount of money that had been deducted for FID from their accounts and that back payments be paid by the bank for these deductions.

Several problems arise from this that I think need to be righted. First, the Commonwealth Bank has not been prepared to return FID payments to pensioners unless they actually make a personal application for them. Secondly, one of my pensioner constituents, after seeking to have all of the payments made to her, was told that she could have FID payments only up to a certain time, that all bank tapes had now been taken from branch offices to the central office and that, if she wished the tapes to be returned to the branch office so that appropriate calculations and deductions could be made, a charge of $20 would be made.

I find this attitude absolutely disgraceful. I have written to the banking ombudsman seeking his cooperation to have all the money that has been deducted returned to the pensioners concerned. I received an angry letter from the Deputy General Manager of the Commonwealth Bank of South Australia in the following terms:

Dear Mr Ferguson,

I refer to your letter dated 21 August 1991, addressed to Mr E. Biganovsky, Ombudsman, regarding your constituent, Mrs Wright. Mr Biganovsky has referred the matter to Mr G. McDonald the Australian Banking Industry Ombudsman who, in turn, has referred the matter back to me for further investigation. The results of our inquiries will be relayed to Mrs Wright, the Ombudsman and yourself when completed. However, in the interim, I notice in your letter to Mr Biganovsky you refer to 'FID tax that had been mistakenly deducted' and that 'FID payments were wrongly deducted by the bank from pensioners' accounts'. I also note that similar comments were attributed to you in the Messenger of 14 August 1991.

By way of background, as you would know, the relevant regulations under the Financial Institutions Duty Act 1983 were promulgated in April 1984. Because of the lack of clarity therein the bank sought legal advice as to the impact these amendments would have on our operation. The legal advice to us was that for the various types of pension payments covered under the regulations to qualify as non-dutiable they would need to be remitted via direct credit 'made by the Director-General of Social Security or the Repatriation Commission'. 'Direct credits', lodged by the South Australian Housing Trust (SAHT) or any other body, were not covered.

Time does not permit me to include the whole of the letter from the Commonwealth Bank; suffice to say that I wrote back to the Commonwealth Bank's Deputy General Manager saying that I disagreed with him, that this was not a legal argument, but a moral one, that pensioners were the least likely of all people to have money held back from them, and that the Commonwealth Bank ought to return as soon as possible all the money that had been wrongly deducted as far as FID payments were concerned. I find it difficult to understand, first, why a big, powerful and elephantine organisation, such as the Commonwealth Bank, would be prepared to keep back from pensioners, those people in our community who can least afford it, deductions that have been wrongly made from their account. Secondly, I cannot understand why the Deputy General Manager of the Commonwealth Bank should take exception to a local member trying to do his job.

The Hon. TED CHAPMAN (Alexandra): On Friday of this week, the Minister for Environment and Planning will pay a visit to the western end of Kangaroo Island to attend the Cape du Couedic celebrations, which promise to be quite an historic event in that community. I am grateful for the invitation extended to my wife and I by the department on the Minister's behalf to attend that function. However, I learned this morning that for other reasons over which I have no control I am unable to be in attendance next Friday. I wish the Minister well during that visit. It is hoped that the opportunity arises for her to hold some discussions with the local people about the management of national parks generally and about those parks in the wet western end of the island in particular.

The Hon. E.R. Goldsworthy: They are a menace.

The Hon. TED CHAPMAN: My colleague says that they are a menace. I am not too sure whether he is talking about the management, the parks or Ministers who seek to visit those areas. Whether it is a bit of each really does not matter at the moment. The management of national parks in South Australia has been a problem for a very long time, and we in that delightful community on the island do not escape the problems that go with such vast areas being locked up.

I cite, in the short period available to me, but one example of policy that disturbs me. I hope that the Minister for Environment and Planning, if she is available, will return to the House because the matter I raise is really quite important. It involves the issue of parklands management and fire control measures that ought to be taken and, invariably, are not. In recent years there seems to have been adopted, a policy against burning off in broad acre areas. Despite our pleas, time and again we find that large sums of money are spent—indeed, wasted—on action after the event rather than on periodical management practices. Strategic burning in that region is a traditional tool of good management.

Last Saturday evening a thunderstorm occurred—which is pretty common at this time of the year in that region of the State—and as a result of a lightning strike a fire started in Flinders Chase in an area known as the Ravine in the north-western end of that reserve. It was a fairly modest fire in pretty high rainfall habitat conditions. Another strike occurred over the Playford Highway to the north in a private property. Local CFS volunteers put out the private property fire, thereby preventing it from spreading into the adjacent Mount Torrens National Park.

However, the site of the first lightning strike continued to burn in the Flinders Chase scrub, and this is a natural practice and a damn good idea anyway. I understand that the national parks officers panicked, as usual, and sought the assistance of the local CFS people. The local CFS people have enough to do at this time of the year with shearing and other seasonal work without running around putting out a fire in a national park, especially when the fire is doing a good job. So, they would not go there. Indeed, as a result of certain unfortunate experiences it is now policy on Kangaroo Island for the local CFS not to attend a fire in a national park unless human life or property is in danger. As I say, in these circumstances the fire was doing a great job.

I am led to believe that on Sunday, when the smoke was pretty well lulled and the fire was not out of control or anything as endangering as that, some 40-odd departmental personnel, including a number taken from the mainland to Kangaroo Island, were taken to the west end to put the fire out. As well as that, some planes were sent over with what they call 'water bombs' (a while ago we were talking about air bags; this time it was a bombing job). I was told on the telephone a few minutes ago by one of my constituents that a plane went round and round the western end of the island and, because there was not enough smoke to find out where the fire was, it had to return to its base. I do not know where all this money is coming from. In that community people are worried stiff about where their next feed will come from and about getting a bit of money for essential services, yet we have a Government department that is absolutely wasting money hand over fist. I draw that matter to the attention of the Minister.

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

The Hon. T.H. HEMMINGS (Napier): Before I make my contribution to this debate, I place on record my disgust at the attitude of 15 members opposite who, while their Leader was advocating and outlining the Liberal Party's public safety policy, were totally ignoring what he had to say and were reading the afternoon newspaper. I might not agree with what the Leader has to say about public safety. I might think that what he is saying—

The DEPUTY SPEAKER: Order! The member for Murray-Mallee.

Mr LEWIS: On a point of order, Sir, I most certainly was not ignoring what my Leader was saying.

The DEPUTY SPEAKER: Order! There is no point of order. The honourable member for Napier.

The Hon. T.H. HEMMINGS: I might not agree with what the Leader was saying—in fact, I might think that he was talking a lot of rubbish—but at least I had the decency to sit here and listen.

Mr S.J. BAKER: On a point of order, Sir, the honourable member is deliberately misleading Parliament.

The DEPUTY SPEAKER: Order! What is the point of order?

Mr S.J. BAKER: Everyone was paying attention at the time—

The DEPUTY SPEAKER: Order! I do not uphold the point of order. The member for Napier.

Mr S.J. BAKER: —and he is wasting the time of this Parliament.

The DEPUTY SPEAKER: Order! The Deputy Leader will resume his seat. I caution members against taking frivolous points of order in order to use up time in this debate. The honourable member for Napier.

The Hon. T.H. HEMMINGS: Perhaps the Standing Orders Committee might look at not allowing newspapers in the Chamber until the grievance debate is completed. Perhaps then we would not have a repeat of such bad manners. The Opposition's attitude—

Mr MATTHEW: On a point of order, Sir, Standing Order 127 specifically provides that an honourable member may not make personal reflections on any other honourable member. I believe that, by making the statement that he has, the honourable member has done just that.

The DEPUTY SPEAKER: Order! There is no point of order. The member for Napier.

The Hon. T.H. HEMMINGS: Perhaps today's historic change in Standing Orders, where we have a grievance debate of five minutes each for six members directly after Question Time, has actually highlighted what I am going to say in my remaining three minutes. Over the weekend, I checked all copies of *Hansard* from February 1990 to the present day. I might tell you, Sir, that it was a laborious job but, when I went through all the 10 minutes grievance debates in which I had participated, at least six minutes was spent by the Opposition taking points of order on me.

To me, that is no coincidence. I know that I have a proven record of, time and again, exposing members of the Opposition for what they are. To make matters worse, I had a friendly phone call on Monday of this week from a member of the Opposition, who told me not to get involved in these five minute grievances, because the word had gone out in the Liberal Party room that I was going to be stopped at any cost. And, Sir, look what has happened already! Four points of order have been taken on me and, as you, Sir, correctly adjudicated, there was no point of order whatsoever. Is this fair?

Is it fair that I am to be singled out because of my fearlessness, because I have a record of exposing untruths and hypocrisy? Am I to be the lone member of this 47-member Parliament to be singled out time and again by the Opposition? I know that whilst you, Sir, and the Speaker are sitting in the Chair, I will have all the protection that I need, but I should just like to ask, is it really fair? That friendly Liberal Party member also told me that the only reason members opposite supported these changes in Sessional Orders was to get at me. I am quite prepared to live with that.

An honourable member interjecting:

The Hon. T.H. HEMMINGS: An honourable member opposite interjected and asked me to name that honourable member. I will not, because, as far as I am concerned, what that honourable member said to me was an act of friend-

ship, and I appreciate acts of friendship. History will prove whether I am right or wrong.

Mr Brindal interjecting:

The DEPUTY SPEAKER: Order! The member for Hayward is out of order.

Mr MATTHEW (Bright): I wish to talk about accountability, particularly accountability of government. After the display we have just seen in this House, it would seem that the Government should exercise some control over its members as well. Members in this House would be aware that, in the past fortnight, I have made a number of public statements concerning Government committees. They would also be aware that I have stated that there are at least 550 committees operating under the umbrella of this Government, with a total of at least 4 629 members. Members would also be aware that those committees are costing at least $8 million just to run, and that does not include the cost of the salaries of the public servants who sit on those committees.

Mr Hamilton interjecting:

Mr MATTHEW: The member for Albert Park is saying that I have got the wrong figures. He may be able to provide some higher ones because, if he had listened carefully, he would know that I said 'at least that amount'. There are probably more committees, there are probably more members and it is probably costing more, but that is what I have been able to justify so far, what I have been able to calculate already exists. Members would also be aware that I have given in this House notice of a motion that I will move on Thursday, 31 October, requiring that this Government justify the existence of each of those committees by 31 March next year, and that any committee not so justified be dissolved. Because I am moving that motion at a later stage, obviously it is not my intent to talk on it today or, in fact, to dwell on that aspect: rather, I will talk generally about Government accountability as a whole.

I pose the question: how many Government Ministers really know how many committees their departments have, what they do, how much they cost and what they have actually achieved? I also pose the question: how many Ministers are aware of how many vehicles are used by their departments, the manner in which those vehicles are used and what costs are involved to the taxpayer? I also pose the further question: how many Government Ministers are aware of the volume of stationery used by their departments, the manner in which it is used and how that use compares with past years and, indeed, to usage by other departments?

The Opposition has a responsibility to ensure that government is accountable. As an individual Opposition member, I have been conducting an exercise examining various Government activities in a bid to ensure that accountability occurs. Government committees happen to be one of the areas I have been examining and, believe me, many more areas will be looked at. During my examination, I have been provided with some interesting responses from different Ministers, one of which came from the Minister of Transport who said, in part, in his written response:

> Unfortunately, the member's question is particularly involved to answer in the detail requested, and it is considered that the information obtained could not justify the exercise.

I read that as being that it was probably too hard to answer basic questions about government accountability. I simply asked the Minister: what are the names of each of the committees; what are the terms of reference; when were they formed; when were they expected to achieve their objectives; and to whom did they report? That is quite a simple set of questions, questions that any Minister who controls his department and who knows what his department is doing should be able to answer. The Minister of Family and Community Services has not answered my question, which I posed to him on 12 February this year. However, I do know that that department has been issued with a directive that no new committees are to be formed without the approval of the Chief Executive Officer.

Also, I have some other interesting figures to release. At the top of the list so far is the Department of Agriculture with 109 committees—that we know of to date. A number of other Ministers also take out awards. The Minister for Environment and Planning has created the mighty number of 67 committees in just one year—and that information comes from the budget papers. Others have a smaller record. The Minister of Mines and Energy has added 22 committees to his department.

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

SITTINGS AND BUSINESS

The Hon. R.J. GREGORY (Minister of Labour): I move:

That the time allotted for completion of the following Bills:
- Dangerous Substances (Cost Recovery) Amendment,
- Pollution of Waters by Oil and Noxious Substances (Miscellaneous) Amendment,
- Environment Protection (Sea Dumping) (Coastal Waters and Radioactive Material) Amendment,
- Dried Fruits (Extension of Term of Office) Amendment,
- Criminal Law Consolidation (Abolition of Year-and-a-day Rule) Amendment,
- Evidence Amendment and
- Petroleum (Miscellaneous) Amendment

be until 6 p.m. on Thursday.

Motion carried.

SELECT COMMITTEE ON THE GULF ST VINCENT PRAWN FISHERY

Mr QUIRKE (Playford): I move:

That the time for bringing up the report of the select committee be extended until Tuesday 29 October.

Motion carried.

SELECT COMMITTEE ON THE ABALONE INDUSTRY

Mrs HUTCHISON (Stuart) brought up the report of the select committee.

Report received.

DANGEROUS SUBSTANCES (COST RECOVERY) AMENDMENT BILL

Adjourned debate on second reading.

(Continued from 27 August. Page 484.)

Mr INGERSON (Bragg): The Opposition supports the Bill. However, we do have some concerns, and in Committee we will ask some questions of the Minister. The Dangerous Substances Act provides for the keeping, handling, packaging, conveyance, use, disposal and quality of toxic, corrosive, flammable or otherwise harmful substances. We recognise that this Bill is a very important one in the sense that the Act guarantees that there is a require-

ment of duty of care on persons who undertake these activities, and it authorises certain actions to be taken by persons appointed as inspectors under the Act. Where action taken by an inspector incurs an expense to the Government, the Act empowers cost recovery of that expenditure.

We support that principle, because it is only fair and reasonable that Governments today should be able to fairly and more reasonably recover those costs. It is noted, however, that dangerous substance spillages are subject to the Cabinet approved guideline 'Emergency Response to a Leakage/Spillage of a Dangerous Substance', which allocates control of the site to the Metroplitan Fire Service or Country Fire Service as appropriate in accordance with the legislation governing those bodies. The emergency response plan also involves all relevant Government agencies and allocates responsibility for the provision of specialist services to combat the emergency. Within this activity, an inspector under the Dangerous Substances Act is not able to issue a directive in accordance with the powers currently established by the Act, and accordingly the existing cost recovery powers in the Act cannot be applied.

In the past, cost recovery by Government for actions undertaken to combat a chemical spillage has not been undertaken to any significant extent. Government expenditure occurs every time the emergency response plan is used. The proposed amendment to the Act provides a general power for all State and local government agencies to undertake cost recovery for expenditure resulting from a dangerous substances incident. It is important to understand the allocation of responsibility in this amendment and the deliberate avoidance of the concept of prosecution-based cost recovery. The application of this amendment has been given a broad base in that the owner, person in charge and person who caused the event are jointly and separately responsible for the clean-up cost.

The Government may recover only reasonable costs and may recover them only once. If there is a dispute, the Crown will go to court to obtain a ruling. It is in this area (and I will quote from some letters) that we have concern. The amendment to some extent follows the common law applied to negligence, especially in relation to the application of principles of vicarious liability. However, cost recovery action will not be restricted to damages. All relevent items can be addressed, ranging from the cost of neutralising material, heavy machinery and other equipment that may be purchased or hired, call-out of special advisers, chemical analysis of contaminated areas and ongoing monitoring for public safety or environmental evaluation. It is also in this second area that there has been considerable concern. I will quote from the Engineering Employers Association's letter to me in which the association raises several issues:

1. Whilst accepting that some companies through their own actions or inactions may be responsible for damage and hence should be liable to pay for clean-ups, a number of extenuating circumstances are not allowed for.

2. First, under the Bill the employer remains liable for spillage caused by vandalism or sabotage. We do not believe, in these circumstances, the employer should be liable.

3. Secondly, it is also harsh and unjust that an employer may be liable for clean-up costs in a situation where an employee has caused damage by ignoring set instructions or procedures.

4. There also needs to be some flexibility as to a fair and reasonable cost, where in circumstances such as an exacerbation of the problem by the emergency services, the cost should not be attributed totally to the employer, who may be originally liable.

It is in that area that I will question the Minister in Committee. The Building Owners and Managers Association of Australia states:

The most important aspect of the legislation is that it enables those costs to be recovered from all or any of the following:

(a) The owner of the substance;

(b) Person who is in control of the substance;

(c) Person who is in possession of the substance;

(d) Person who caused the accident.

Although there seems to be a strict liability on these classes of people, in fact specific defences set out later in the amending Bill really mean that any of these parties can escape responsibility for those costs if they can show that the accident did not occur due to any negligence on their part.

A problem with the Act is that the extent of the costs recoverable is not qualified or restricted in any way. A certificate from the relevant department head is *prima facie* proof of the costs. In our view there is also a lot of doubt as to what costs are included—for example, does it extend to fixed costs of any organisation (for example, wages which would have been paid in any case)?

Those concerns were expressed by BOMA. Finally, general concern was expressed by the chamber, which echoes the same concerns but raises another issue:

The other issue raised with the Government was that an employer should not be liable for costs which were incurred by the negligence or other actions of the Government instrumentality. The case has been cited to us where the MFS has taken the incorrect action which has resulted in additional clean-up costs. This may be covered by subsection (4) which refers to costs 'reasonably incurred' but this is not certain.

The Opposition supports the Bill, but in Committee we will seek clarification of those issues from the Minister.

The Hon. R.J. GREGORY (Minister of Labour): I welcome the support of Opposition members.

Bill read a second time.

In Committee.

Clause 1 passed.

Clause 2—'Cost recovery.'

Mr INGERSON: Clause 2 (4) relates to a Government authority incurring costs or expenses. What costs would be included or excluded from the clean-up area?

The Hon. R.J. GREGORY: The costs of the clean up would be those included in the account forwarded to the organisation found to be liable, if indeed it was. In the second reading stage I heard of the peculiar request from BOMA that, as Government employees are paid anyway, companies should not be charged for their labour. If BOMA was working out costs for anything it did and excluded the costs of employing people on the basis that it employs them anyway, it would go broke immediately. That is voodoo economics. The cost to the Government is the cost of having the people, the plant and the equipment available and being used.

Mr INGERSON: The costs are the major concern of associations, and that includes the definition of 'reasonableness'. Whilst I and most people accept that the Government and the Minister intend to charge 'reasonable costs' there have been questions about fault being demonstrated. For instance, the MFS may make a mistake in its general clean-up procedures, using the wrong chemicals, foam or method of treatment. Such costs should not be passed onto the person who created the original problem, and I recognise that they would be liable for it because they had created it. On advice that I have received from some associations, it is my understanding that with chemical spills there may be not a deliberate error but nevertheless an error whereby the incorrect foam or neutraliser is used. We need some clarification.

The Hon. R.J. GREGORY: I am of the view that the correct charging of costs would involve the total costs of the clean up. I will cite an example of what I understand private businesses would do if called in an emergency by somebody who said, 'Go in and fix it up and we will pay the costs'. The first thing they would want is an appropriate hourly hire rate for the plant and equipment used. They would want a recovery on the wages of the people employed

and a small profit for themselves, which I would expect to be reasonable. No private industry organisation keeps at the ready fully-trained, totally knowledgeable employees who could do this in competition with the Government. The Government has set up statutory authorities for this purpose, and the people concerned must rely on the ability and skill of those statutory authorities.

An incident that occurred a while ago was the genesis of this amendment. A metal finisher had a tank used for plating metal which contained 1 500 litres of zinc cyanide, and it was decided to move it elsewhere. Another tank was installed in the workshop and the 1 500 litres of zinc cyanide was put into that tank. When the people concerned returned to work the following morning, they found that the tank was empty and there was 1 500 litres of zinc cyanide on the ground, flowing into the stormwater system in that industrial suburb. They called the emergency fire service, which arrived and began to hose it down, which is the normal thing to do, but somebody else with a little more knowledge who arrived subsequently stopped the hosing down, and other methods were then used to absorb the fluid. When it was all finished a day or so later, checks showed that there was no residue of zinc cyanide anywhere in the area. The total clean-up bill came to $150 000.

One could say that the fire brigade should have been made to bear the costs of supplying that water, because it merely added more fluid to the substance. If the owner of the building had put a bund around the tank as he was supposed to have done, when the spill occurred the fluid would have been contained in the bund and would not have been out in the street. Zinc cyanide has a very high pH factor and, once it falls below neutral, it starts to express cyanide gas. We were fortunate in that situation that that did not happen. I am of the view that, under no circumstances, should public emergency authorities be involved in that sort of clean-up at no cost, and I certainly do not think an employer or business owner should start quibbling and saying, 'You put too much water on it,' or that this or that was done when their own incompetence was responsible in the first place. If the owner or manager of the business in question had been really confident, he would have stopped the emergency fire service from putting the water on the substance, anyway, as he would have known better. I understand that he did not know how to proceed but that someone from the E&WS Department understood the problem.

We are asking people all over our State to first call police officers to the scene, as soon as there is an accident or a catastrophe where dangerous substances are spilled. We saw the situation in Victoria where some chlorine pellets were spilled over a road when a semi-trailer collided with the vehicle carrying them. Four police officers who attended the scene were taken away by ambulance. The emergency services people in attendance donned the appropriate protective equipment and cleaned up as much as they could of the spilled dangerous substance, and they then proceeded to neutralise the situation.

In those circumstances somebody must bear the cost, whether the driver of the semi-trailer was at fault for careering into the back of the trailer carrying the load, or whether the person towing the material was at fault for not displaying the correct warning and moving at the appropriate time. I think that the method of charging requested by the Tonkin Government by the elevator repair companies, with the then Public Buildings Department charging for less maintenance carried out in public buildings, is good enough to be used here, and we should not start subtracting from wages. I think that is the spirit of the system we are going into.

There are defences in there for employers, and there was extensive consultation with employer bodies about this. We made it quite clear that, if they did not take reasonable care and were negligent, they would have to pay. If, on the other hand, there was industrial sabotage and, if an examination of the situation revealed they had taken reasonable care, they would have a defence in this matter. But people should not be able to allow dangerous situations to occur knowing that, if there is a collapse or something goes wrong, the Government will pick it up. What we propose here is necessary; otherwise people can get away without paying for the costs of a clean-up.

Mr INGERSON: I thank the Minister for that very clear and long explanation, removing any doubt as to what expenses will be included. The Minister said that, in the case of sabotage, the employer would not be responsible. As I cannot see any provision concerning vandalism or sabotage, perhaps the Minister can advise the Committee under what particular clauses the employer is exempted from payment in the event of vandalism or sabotage. Further, if an employee for any reason, deliberate or otherwise, ignores a set of instructions or procedures, it seems that the employer would still be responsible. Can the Minister clarify those two positions?

The Hon. R.J. GREGORY: I refer the honourable member to subclause (9). Paragraph *(a)* refers to 'another person': industrial sabotage is an act of another person. If the employer can establish that another person's default through inappropriate care not being taken costs are not recoverable. Paragraph *(b)* refers to reasonable diligence preventing the occurrence of the incident. The honourable member would know from his previous occupation as a pharmacist that, although it would be a rare occurrence today, a manufacturer could supply a product which looked exactly like the chemical required but which was the wrong chemical. In that case not the pharmacist but the people who supplied the chemical would be culpable. The same applies with paragraph *(c)*, and I think there is ample protection there for the employer.

Mr INGERSON: My final question relates to subclause (12). Can the Minister explain to the Committee what he sees happening if a company disputes the actual costs that have been certified by the principal officer as being the relevant cost? Regarding costs, is there any appeal mechanism? Further, as disputes in this area almost certainly will occur, how does the Minister envisage their being resolved?

The Hon. R.J. GREGORY: My understanding of normal business practice is that in such circumstances an account would be rendered and the person who received it would examine it. That person would then pay the account if he agreed with the accountant. If that person disagreed with the accountant he would notify the authority of his reasons, such as certain expenses being included which he felt were unwarranted, and negotiations and discussions would ensue. If the negotiations and discussions were not satisfactory to the person who received the account, that person would have recourse to the legal system with which we have been adequately and bountifully provided in South Australia. We all know that accounts in this area are open to negotiation and that on many occasions they are negotiated. I think the same thing would happen and that is precisely what is intended. However, I make the point that freeloaders will no longer be able to freeload on the State.

Clause passed.

Title passed.

Bill read a third time and passed.

POLLUTION OF WATERS BY OIL AND NOXIOUS SUBSTANCES (MISCELLANEOUS) AMENDMENT BILL

Adjourned debate on second reading.
(Continued from 27 August. Page 485.)

Mr MEIER (Goyder): The Opposition supports this Bill. As members will recall, the Bill has four major objectives: first, to increase penalties for offences under the Act to the same level recently approved by the Federal Parliament; secondly, to provide for the recovery of damages by persons who suffer loss due to a discharge prohibited under the Act; thirdly, to prohibit discharges from ships not being oil tankers of less than 400 gross tonnes; and, fourthly, to consolidate all provisions relating to the adoption of the MARPOL Convention 1973 (the International Maritime Organisation's International Convention for the Prevention of Pollution from Ships) in this Act.

As far as the Opposition is concerned, there is no doubt that we must do everything we possibly can to prevent the pollution of waters in and around this State by oil and noxious substances, and therefore I compliment the Government for bringing in reciprocal State legislation. In July of this year, a major oil spill occurred on the coast of Western Australia when a ship called the *Kirki*, a Greek oil tanker, which began to break up on a Sunday morning, started to leak tens of thousands of tonnes of light crude oil into the sea. Obviously, it was one of the larger spills.

At that stage, the question was asked whether, if an oil spill occurred off the South Australian coastline, we would be prepared. Interviews were held with a variety of people, including the Port Stanvac Oil Refinery's Safety and Environment Manager, Mr Ken Hodgson, who indicated that South Australia was well placed in the provision of equipment, planning and especially expertise to react to an oil spill. Mr Hodgson said that one of his spill specialists had been contacted while on holidays and flown to Western Australia to help fight the spill. He believed that this response indicated not only the expertise existing in South Australia but also the across-the-border assistance by way of manpower and equipment that could be called upon. In fact, Mr Hodgson even referred to manpower that could be called upon at an international level. Mr Hodgson said that equipment was sent from South Australia to Alaska to fight a spill of 40 000 tonnes of heavy crude oil when the *Exxon Valdez* ran aground in 1989. In an article in the *Advertiser*, Mr Hodgson said:

> We are probably the leading exponent in combating oil spills. We have on refinery land an air strip fitted out with pumping equipment, to load and turn around crop-dusters quickly.

He said that an oil spill could be crop-dusted with dispersants within an hour of notification of the spill, a very short time by world standards. It was certainly gratifying to read such remarks and to be given the assurance that South Australia was well prepared. In fact, it was pointed out in the same article that an Australian oil spill response centre had been set up by oil companies at Geelong, that millions of dollars worth of equipment was ready to be flown at short notice to any site needing it, and that the Geelong centre had sent equipment to the Western Australian spill.

There appears to be a divergence of views as to how a spill should be tackled. Mr Hodgson indicated that his group did not like spraying close to land as he believed that a clean-up on the beach was slow and inefficient work. The South Australian Director of Fisheries, Mr Rob Lewis, held a contrary view. He believed that in some cases it was better to let the slick come to the beach, perhaps sacrificing a few animals, rather than treating it at sea where dispersants have a greater impact on marine life. Mr Lewis went on to highlight the fact that the fishing industry in South Australia is a major contributor to the State's economy and its export trade, that we have some 300 000 recreational fishers relying on our fish stock, and that any oil spill would be a major problem to fishing let alone to the spawning and juvenile stages of fish.

All of this was reported in July when Western Australia was reeling from its bad oil spill, but it was not much later that South Australia experienced its first serious oil slick. On Tuesday, 24 September this year, it was reported that the slick was 22 kilometres long and that it had been discovered in the Gulf St Vincent about 50 kilometres south-west of Adelaide and not far from Troubridge Island. The slick was reported by the crew of a yacht, which had left Troubridge Island a short time earlier. The crew was very concerned that the oil slick might finish up around Troubridge Island. I believe that I am still a member of the Friends of Troubridge Island, but I cannot recall whether or not I have paid my dues for this financial year.

The Hon. R.J. Gregory: Shame on you!

Mr MEIER: The Minister says shame on me if I have not, and I would agree. I believe I have, but I would have to check my chequebook to see whether or not the account has been paid. I have been a member of the Friends of Troubridge Island for some time. It is great to see the interest shown by locals and people living outside the area who are very concerned about the wildlife, particularly the fish life that surrounds the island. According to the old-timers, Troubridge Island did not exist 100 or so years ago; there were only some rocky outcrops. I am concerned that, if conditions are reversed in respect of what they have been for the past 50 to 100 years and we started to get a recessional period of wave motion, Troubridge Island could no longer exist. For the sake of the Friends of Troubridge Island, let us hope that that does not occur.

Whether it be Troubridge Island, the coast of Yorke Peninsula or the Adelaide shoreline extending north, an oil spill in Gulf St Vincent poses an enormous threat. I was interested to read in the *News* of Wednesday 25 September that a Department of Marine and Harbors officer indicated that no clean-up operation was planned. However, in an article in the *Advertiser* of Thursday 26 September the following statement was made:

> A spokesman for Marine Minister, Mr Gregory, said last night an aircraft had dropped chemical dispersant on the 22 km slick and 'all that appears to be left is a thin sheen on the water'.

In considering those two conflicting statements, one wonders whether our resources are appropriately skilled and ready for any emergency. It is good that this Bill is before us so that this and other matters can be brought to Parliament's attention. I am sure that the Minister has had a thorough look at the situation in the interim, since September, and that our forces will be more alert than ever before.

That incident in September was the first real oil spill to occur in this State. What would have happened to our beaches and fishing resources if it had been a large spill of some thousands of gallons of oil? Such a spill could mean the ruination of much of our sea life for a long period and could affect our tourist industry. We can be very thankful that this spill was not large and that we have the resources ready to go. Some ship operators seem to show a complete disregard for our State's waters and environment. It is pleasing to note that the Government is increasing penalties to such an extent that ship operators will have to think very carefully before bringing a ship into our waters that does not meet our standards 100 per cent or allowing any discharge into our waters.

At the time of the Gulf St Vincent slick it was reported that it might have been caused by a ship pumping oil or bilge out of its engine-room. If this is occurring I believe that it needs to be stopped at any cost. I would be interested to hear from the Minister whether or not that is a general practice at sea, whether international laws prohibit the pumping of oil or bilge out of engine-rooms close to another nation's waters, and the effect of this occurrence well out to sea.

Last year and earlier this year I visited Murat Bay near Ceduna and looked at the oyster farms. There were many areas of interest and some matters of concern. The biggest concern of the oyster farmers was what would happen if some of the ships that came into the export port of Thevenard on the other side of the bay discharged material from their holds or engine-rooms thereby ruining the livelihood of those farmers. If this oil slick had occurred in Murat Bay and not Gulf St Vincent, the discharge from the ship would have worked its way to the other side of the bay very quickly.

In the *Advertiser* of 26 September this year the Executive Director of the South Australian Fishing Industry Council, Mr Peter Peterson, said:

> We were dead-set lucky about this incident, because the calm weather didn't move the slick too far, and because it wasn't a major spill . . . But the State Government and the fishing industry are still going to have to get serious about controls on ballast pumping in the Gulf St Vincent and other areas, and produce an adequate slick control strategy which everybody knows about.

I endorse those remarks. Obviously, Mr Peterson has the interests of his fishers to the fore and realises that if Gulf St Vincent were ruined as a fishing area this State's fishers would be in a desperate situation and our economy would be worse than it is at present. I will have some questions of the Minister during Committee. As I said earlier, I am pleased that appropriate measures are being taken in an endeavour to prevent any further spillage not only in Gulf St Vincent but also in Spencer Gulf and State waters generally.

The Hon. R.J. GREGORY (Minister of Marine): I welcome the support of members of the Opposition for this Bill.

Bill read a second time.

In Committee.

Clauses 1 and 2 passed.

Clause 3—'Interpretation.'

Mr MEIER: Will the Minister tell the Committee how the penalties in this Bill compare with those in other countries? The Minister would be more aware than anyone else how South Australia is endeavouring to increase its shipping exports, and his department has done much over the past few years to improve the level of shipping. Whilst I have just indicated the Opposition's support for these measures and the need for them, I am interested to know how our provisions compare with those in places such as Singapore, South-East Asia, the United States or other areas of which the Minister may be aware.

The Hon. R.J. GREGORY: I am advised that what we are seeking to do in this Bill is to bring uniformity of penalties to Australia. The Bill arose out of an international agreement that countries of a similar mind to that of Australia would enact legislation as a form of protection against poor shipping practices and unscrupulous masters and owners of vessels so that, if they were to discharge oil into the waters of, say, Australia, they would be prosecuted. The legislation provides for that. This Bill provides what we think is a uniform penalty for around Australia and a fitting penalty for people who discharge oil. The Bill takes into account the need to make it easier to gain a successful prosecution. I have been advised that witnesses have actually seen oil coming over the sides of vessels, and have given evidence in court that the people on the ship said that that was not the case. So, we need quite severe penalties to, first, discourage people who might be inclined to discharge oil and, secondly, to ensure that the penalties are severe enough to cover the costs that may be incurred.

A penalty of significant size would discourage anyone else who might be inclined to infringe the provisions of this legislation. In respect of what is done in America and other countries, we have not sought to do that. In Australia all the States and the Commonwealth will have complementary legislation with complementary penalties. As a result, a ship owner or master will not be able to argue that, because the discharge of oil occurred in South Australian waters, they will get away with a cheaper fine than would be the case with the Commonwealth: the penalty will be the same wherever the offence occurs. That is the whole idea of uniform penalties. I support the idea of uniform laws in this respect, so that we can catch people, as the saying goes, coming and going.

Mr MEIER: Have the other States and the Northern Territory enacted similar legislation to this to date, or is that still coming? Have they all given an indication that they will enact similar legislation?

The Hon. R.J. GREGORY: I am advised that all the States have enacted similar legislation to this, but South Australia is the first State with the higher penalty.

Clause passed.

Clause 4—'Prohibition of discharge of oil or oily mixtures into State waters.'

Mr MEIER: As the penalties in this and the next few clauses have increased significantly (from $50 000 to $200 000 in one instance and from $250 000 to $1 million in another), has the Commonwealth had the opportunity to apply any of these penalties in specific cases since the Commonwealth legislation was proclaimed? If so, was it straightforward or was there any difficulty?

The Hon. R.J. GREGORY: Neither I nor officers of my department have knowledge of successful prosecutions in this matter by the Commonwealth. I point out that in the matter of proof before the courts one would expect the Government, in prosecuting any ship owner for any breach of this legislation, to use the full resources of the department and of Crown Law. Because of the high level of penalty, one would also expect the ship owners to employ the best legal defence they can to question every aspect of the prosecution's case.

That is why, when an oil spill is detected, a sample is obtained as early as possible. If it is collected very late in the piece, it may not be adequate, after being analysed, to prove that the oil came from a ship. All ship movements around Australia are known, and the oil is assessed to determine how long it has been in the water. If a ship fits into that window of opportunity, at its next port an oil sample is taken under very strict control from the ship's bilges and elsewhere and analysed, along with the oil from the slick in the water.

If it can be demonstrated that the oil slick came from a particular vessel, the case will proceed and, if the prosecution's case is proved beyond reasonable doubt that the oil came from that ship and that it was done deliberately, the court will determine the penalty. That is how it goes, although I am not aware of how vigorously it is done. I expect that, if there were a prosecution in this State, the full resources, skill and knowledge of the people of the departments

responsible for the collection of evidence and the prosecution would be used to the utmost.

I regard pollution of our sea very seriously. From my experience as Minister when we have had small oil spills previously, the first time we became aware of them was when the ship's captain himself notified us of the spill, participated in the clean up and paid the costs involved. Where you find the ship's master trying to avoid any responsibility, the full weight of this legislation should be applied very vigorously, and I would be disappointed if the judge did not award a very heavy penalty.

Clause passed.

Clause 5 passed.

Clause 6—'Duty to report certain incidents involving oil or an oily mixture.'

Mr MEIER: Does this clause specifically refer to the captain of a ship or does it also include other persons?

The Hon. R.J. GREGORY: The onus is on the master of the vessel to report it.

Clause passed.

Clauses 7 to 14 passed.

Clause 15—'Insertion of Part IIIA.'

New sections 24a to 24c agreed to.

New section 24d—'Ship construction certificates.'

Mr MEIER: The Bill provides:

> Where, on receipt of declarations of survey in respect of a ship, the Minister is satisfied that the ship is constructed in accordance with the provisions of Annex 1 . . .

Would a ship such as the *Kirki*, the Greek oil tanker which began breaking up on the Western Australian coastline, have been allowed to come up Gulf St Vincent? Does the Minister believe that the ship would not have had appropriate construction certificates to allow it to come up our gulf in the first instant?

The Hon. R.J. GREGORY: My advice is that the certificates are in accordance with the MARPOL Convention. The vessel to which the member for Goyder is referring would have been allowed to come up the gulf because it was constructed in conformance with standards and specifications at the time it was constructed. I might add that I do not know of any reason why it would have wanted to come up Gulf St Vincent.

Mr MEIER: It is obvious that, whilst we can seek to do everything in our power to stop oil spills by imposing significant penalties and so on, we have to rely on international organisations such as MARPOL to provide the certificates in the first instant; in other words, the Minister would simply have to see what certificates had been issued and, if they had been authorised in accordance with the provisions of the international shipping laws, even if the ship were a floating rust bucket, we could do little if it disintegrated in our waters. That is a worry. The Minister may wish to comment on what I have said.

The Hon. R.J. GREGORY: The inspection of these vessels is a Commonwealth matter, and it is carried out by Commonwealth officers of the Maritime Safety Authority. The certificates that are required are construction certificates at the time the vessel is built. It must be constructed within the classification bureau that is chosen by the constructor. On Friday afternoon an aluminium ferry was lifted on to ANRO Adelaide. The owner of the shipyard that built this vessel would say that it was built to the American standard. It could have been built to Lloyds, Bureau Veritas, Norska Veritas or other classification standards. Classification societies have standards for the construction of vessels, and insurance companies accept them as being valid. Many vessels must undergo a periodic survey.

When repair work is done on those vessels, it must conform to those construction society standards. Also, when a vessel is in port and if officers from the Australian Maritime Safety Authority, when inspecting it, do not believe that it conforms with the standards set at the time of construction, they can require that vessel to stay in port until it conforms with the standards. I recall that on one occasion I was on one of the alphabet wharves at Birkenhead, along with the Secretary of the Seamen's Union of Australia; I kicked the side of a vessel and watched my shoe go through it. One of the crew on the vessel asked, 'What are you doing?' and I advised him, in very abusive Australian language, what I thought of his ship, and I kept kicking it. The Secretary of the Seamen's Union said to me, 'I think we'd better leave before two or three of them come and talk to us.' My understanding was that that vessel had a few lumps of concrete around the hole to stop the water coming in. It slipped its moorings one night and disappeared: it did not use pilotage to get out of the port.

I would hope that vessels, when they are like that and when they are taken into our ports, are kept nose in instead of nose out, or with the bow in, so that they cannot just slip their moorings and must stay until they are repaired and are adequate. I agree with the member for Goyder in relation to the vessel that suffered a collapsed bow: if it had been properly inspected, it might not have been allowed to move from its port of origin with a full cargo of oil, thus placing parts of Australia in jeopardy. We need to consider two matters: first, some masters of vessels are careless in the handling of expensive pieces of equipment and expensive cargoes, such as in the case of the vessel that ripped a hole in the hull in Alaska because the master took a punt on where he would move the vessel; secondly, in New Zealand a few years ago a pilot took a punt in moving a cruise liner under pilotage, and a hole was ripped in the bottom and the ship subsequently sunk, with some loss of life.

One could say that both those examples resulted from pilot error. I suggest that the situation that occurred in the Indian Ocean off the shores of Western Australia really involved greed on the part of the owner of the vessel, who did not ensure that that vessel was up to scratch. Consequently, through metal fatigue and other factors, the front fell off. It is very difficult to detect these breaches but, when they are detected relating to the adequacy of construction and the safety of the vessel, I have a simple belief that the vessel should not be allowed to sail until it is safe, because no-one has the right to put the lives of seamen at risk.

New section agreed to.

New section 24e agreed to.

New section 24f—'Ships to be surveyed periodically.'

Mr MEIER: New section 24f provides:

> The owner of a ship in respect of which a ship construction certificate issued under section 24d is in force must, at least once during each period that is a prescribed period in relation to the ship for the purposes of this section, cause the ship to be surveyed for the purpose of ensuring its compliance with the provisions of Annex I.

Does that mean that surveys of such ships could occur in the Port of Adelaide? Does 'the Minister' in this Bill refer to the State or Federal Minister?

The Hon. R.J. GREGORY: It refers to me as the Minister of Marine or to whoever may be my successor. If an oil tanker was built in South Australia, both the member for Goyder and I would be delighted. The vessel would have to be built to certain standards and be surveyed regularly to ensure that its condition was maintained. If that did happen, the revenue of the State would be greatly enhanced as considerable fees would be attached.

New section agreed to.

New sections 24g to 24n agreed to; clause passed.

Clauses 16 to 18 passed.

Clause 19—'Detention of ship, vehicle or apparatus.'

Mr MEIER: Regarding the oil spill in Gulf St Vincent, it was reported in the *Advertiser* of 26 September that the department had its suspicions about the culprit but it was not prepared to name the ship. It said that the results of tests would be known the following day. The department will now be able to detain a ship. Was the ship ever apprehended with regard to the oil spill in Gulf St Vincent and, if so, have court proceedings against it been instituted?

The Hon. R.J. GREGORY: This provision is designed for penalties for masters of vessels who decide to leave before they comply with directions, if the vessel is not safe. Regarding the oil spill, we were unable to get a satisfactory analysis of the oil and consequently we were unable to seek a sample of oil from suspected vessels. It is entirely inappropriate that, when allegations are being made about a number of vessels, responsible officers do not shoot off their mouths and name all the vessels that possibly could be involved because, if five or six are named and only one is guilty, by implication the other four or five are also involved.

I am happy with the conduct of officers of the department in the matter to which the member for Goyder refers. If we are to make statements about culprits, let us make sure we are talking about the people who are the culprits and not about the people who might be. Because we were unable to get a satisfactory analysis of the oil that would enable us to test it against the oil of a number of vessels, on that basis the matter has unfortunately now lapsed. I am disappointed that we could not get an adequate analysis because our marine life, both on shore and in shallow waters, is precious and needs to be preserved against people who are careless and thoughtless.

Clause passed.

Clause 20 passed.

Clause 21—'Powers of inspectors.'

Mr MEIER: How many inspectors are employed? Are they employed only in the Department of Marine and Harbors or does the Department of Fisheries also employ inspectors?

The Hon. R.J. GREGORY: The directors of the departments are empowered as are the director of the section of marine safety, several officers in that department, every harbor master in the out ports and three investigative officers in the Department of the Attorney-General.

Mr MEIER: Does the Minister believe that that is sufficient strength and are there plans to increase the number of inspectors?

The Hon. R.J. GREGORY: We have found that that number of people is adequate to inspect and to enforce this Act. If we get to the stage where there are so many oil spills around the coast of South Australia that all harbor masters are flat out investigating them, the director is down there in his gum boots looking at the problem, the Director of Marine Safety is there and three investigative officers are tied up, I assure the honourable member that we will employ more people to enforce the Act.

Clause passed.

Remaining clauses (22 to 25) and title passed.

The Hon. R.J. GREGORY (Minister of Marine): I move:

That this Bill be now read a third time.

I advise the House that it is possible that 3 500 police officers could also be used to enforce this legislation. We have adequate people in this State to enforce the Act.

Bill read a third time and passed.

ENVIRONMENT PROTECTION (SEA DUMPING) (COASTAL WATERS AND RADIOACTIVE MATERIAL) AMENDMENT BILL

Adjourned debate on second reading.

(Continued from 27 August. Page 486.)

Mr MEIER (Goyder): The Opposition supports the Bill and, as members may be aware, the Act of 1984 incorporates into State legislation the International Convention on the Dumping of Wastes at Sea, commonly referred to as the London Dumping Convention, to which the Commonwealth Government is a signatory. Under this Bill we see three extensions or objectives. First, the Bill extends the application of the Act to waters within the limits of the State of South Australia, namely, Spencer Gulf, St Vincent Gulf and historic bays; secondly, it bans any dumping of low-level radioactive wastes within the limits of the State; and, thirdly, it amends penalties for offences under the Act to a maximum of $1 million for bodies corporate and $200 000 for an individual in the case of the most serious offences. Certainly, graduated penalties are provided for other offences.

In debating the Pollution of Waters by Oil and Noxious Substances (Miscellaneous) Amendment Bill, I made the Opposition position clear on the importance of looking after and protecting our State's waters. Whilst I was referring particularly to the devastating effects of oil spills, the dumping of other materials into our seas can cause, and undoubtedly have caused, adverse effects. I am therefore very pleased that the Government has introduced this reciprocal legislation. I have a few questions to ask in Committee; otherwise, I believe that the Bill is fully self-explanatory, and I would hope that anyone who has any concern and consideration for our waters will support the Bill.

The Hon. R.J. GREGORY (Minister of Marine): Never in my experience as a Minister in this House have I had such support from Opposition members. I welcome it, and I am very pleased to receive it.

Bill read a second time.

In Committee.

Clauses 1 to 3 passed.

Clause 4—'Interpretation.'

Mr MEIER: I seek clarification on the definition of 'coastal waters'. I take it that that refers to the same coastal waters as in the Bill we debated earlier, namely, Gulf St Vincent and Spencer Gulf and any bay adjoining those waters. Are there any other hidden waters of which perhaps I am unaware and which are not included in this Bill?

The Hon. R.J. GREGORY: I am advised that the Crown Solicitor suggested this amendment because the previous Act did not cover certain waters. This is a more extensive coverage and will ensure proper enforcement of the Act.

Clause passed.

Clause 5 passed.

Clause 6—'Dumping of radioactive material prohibited.'

Mr MEIER: This clause provides:

> Where any radioactive material is dumped into coastal waters from any vessel, aircraft or platform, the owner and the person in charge of the vessel, aircraft or platform and the owner of the material are each guilty of an offence.

I have no problems at all with that. Does the Minister know of any dumping of radioactive material that has occurred in the past, either in our coastal waters or in the waters adjacent to the Australian coastline, since we have known of radioactive material?

The Hon. R.J. GREGORY: The Commonwealth legislation prohibits the dumping of radioactive waste anywhere

in the seas off Australia within the purview of the Commonwealth Government. However, the two Gulfs of St Vincent and Spencer come under State jurisdiction. We have complementary legislation so that, if anyone was stupid enough to do that, the powers would be the same. In other words, you would not argue that you dumped it in State waters where you were allowed to do so. I might add that the Commonwealth has total control over what happens with radioactive material, and Australia does not allow it to be dumped in its waters. This is to get to people who might deliberately do that. It creates an offence.

Mr LEWIS: Can the Minister give an indication of the relevant levels of radioactivity in bacquerels per gram for, say, Granite Island or Shark Island granite, of which the walls of his office in the basement are made?

The Hon. R.J. GREGORY: If the member for Murray-Mallee is suggesting that naturally occurring bits of rock may have some background radiation and are not to be dumped in the sea, he can imply that. I suppose one should indicate that, if he was to die, he should not be buried at sea.

Clause passed.

Clauses 7 passed.

Clause 8—'Loading of radioactive material for dumping prohibited.'

Mr MEIER: This clause provides:

> Where any radioactive material is loaded on any vessel or aircraft in the State or in coastal waters . . . for the purpose of being dumped into the sea or being incinerated at sea, the owner and the person in charge of the vessel, aircraft or platform and the owner of the material are each guilty of an offence.

How will the Minister's officers know whether radioactive material that is being loaded onto a ship is being transported to a specific destination? I would hope that it would never even come into one's mind, but how could one ascertain whether some of that material might be taken away to be dumped at sea somewhere?

The Hon. R.J. GREGORY: The provisions in the Bill are to determine that an offence has occurred if you do this with a subsequent design to dump it. All my advice is that no radioactive material is transported from South Australia by sea or air. Because of international conventions, radioactive material is not a commodity that can be bought by anybody anywhere, or at any time without the appropriate authorities knowing about it. One has only to read the popular press from time to time to realise that, occasionally in the accounting processes, radioactive material is found to be missing from certain power stations and research establishments throughout the world. It is tracked down, and people go to great lengths to make sure they know where it is. My understanding is that this clause is in the Bill so that just a process of doing it creates an offence. I would imagine that nobody will dump over the side of vessels yellow cake as it is produced at Roxby Downs and transported from the Port of Adelaide, because it is too expensive and they get a lot of money for it.

Clause passed.

Clauses 9 to 15 passed.

Clause 16—'Identity cards and their production.'

Mr MEIER: I do not quite understand what is meant where the clause provides:

> Section 21 of the principal Act is amended by striking out from subsection (4) 'One thousand dollars' and substituting '$1 000'.

Can I have an explanation please?

The Hon. R.J. GREGORY: That would be a requirement of the Parliamentary Counsel.

Mr MEIER: Do I take it that the second figure of $1 000 should possibly read '$10 000' or higher?

The Hon. R.J. GREGORY: The advice from Parliamentary Counsel is that it is a correct reading. It is really an offence for misuse of identity cards, and the money amount has been expressed in figures instead of words, because people of non-English speaking backgrounds can understand figures as opposed to words. I might add that, when I have been in countries where I do not speak the language, it has taken me about two seconds to work out what things cost by looking at the numbers. When it was written in words I did not have a clue what it meant.

Clause passed.

Remaining clauses (17 to 19) and title passed.

Bill read a third time and passed.

ADJOURNMENT

The Hon. R.J. GREGORY (Minister of Labour): I move:

That the House do now adjourn.

The Hon. P.B. ARNOLD (Chaffey): On 9 October, in view of the response to a previous question by the member for Kavel in relation to the building of a bridge from Goolwa to Hindmarsh Island, I asked the Premier what had become of his promise to the people of the Riverland that the next bridge built over the Murray River would be built at Berri. The Minister replied that the bridge to be built at Goolwa was not a bridge over the Murray River. That was, of course, an absurd answer because the Murray River, the river proper, does flow between Goolwa and Hindmarsh Island. The Premier went on to say that he would be delighted if I was able to provide the same sort of economic case for the erection of a bridge at Berri. Of course, that would not be at all difficult.

The reliability of and the need for a bridge at Berri is many times greater than the need for the one proposed at Hindmarsh Island. In a report by the Highways Department in February 1982 entitled 'Bridge over the River Murray at or near Berri', developed at the request of the Tonkin Government, it was proposed to replace the two ferries at Berri with a bridge. In case the Premier has not got around to reading this report, I will refer to some of the pertinent points. In the summary it is stated:

> The South Australian Government [the Tonkin Government] is committed to the construction of a bridge across the River Murray in South Australia at or near Berri in the Riverland region. To determine the optimum site for a future bridge in the Berri vicinity the Highways Department has conducted a comprehensive planning investigation considering several possible bridge locations adjacent to the Berri town area and upstream at Lyrup.
>
> The investigation follows a public display held in the Riverland showing site alternatives, on which councils, interest groups and residents were invited to comment. Resulting from the investigation and the initial comment received, a preferred scheme for a bridge site and its road connections (scheme 2) has been selected, based on a bridge location (site 2) west of and close to the Berri town centre.

In the background section of the report it is stated:

> Along its course of 642 km in South Australia, the River Murray is spanned by five bridges carrying road traffic. The most recent of these was opened at Swanport in May 1979—

the Premier of South Australia was then the Hon. Des Corcoran—

> and at that time it was foreshadowed that the next bridge built over the river would be located at or near Berri in the State's Riverland region. The South Australian Government—

again referring to the Tonkin Government—

> is committed to the construction of a river bridge at or near Berri and, at the request of the Minister of Transport [the Hon. Michael Wilson], the Highways Department has conducted a planning study to determine the optimum location for a bridge crossing in the Berri vicinity.

I will now refer to some of the statistics in relation to that proposal, because the Premier said in answer to my question that if I could show that this was a viable proposition, as good or better than the proposal at Goolwa, he would be extremely interested. On page 9 of the report it is stated:

> The estimated 1981 annual average daily traffic for the Berri crossing is approximately 1 700 vehicles.

The report states further that it was anticipated that there would be an escalation in the figures between 1981 and 1991 of from 3 to 5 per cent. The report continues:

> The heaviest daily traffic flow generally occurs on a Thursday (15 per cent greater than average) and the lightest on a Sunday (30 per cent below average). The commercial vehicle—or truck—content corresponding to the annual average daily traffic is approximately 10 per cent.

If we apply that figure of 10 per cent and the anticipated growth factor against the growth factor of today, which means that between 2 000 and 2 500 vehicles per day are crossing the Murray River at Berri, we find that in actual fact about 200 heavy road transport vehicles cross at Berri per day.

I discussed this matter with a road transport operator in the Riverland who told me that it costs approximately $50 an hour to operate a road transport vehicle. If we look at the down time in relation to road transports standing and waiting to go from Berri to Loxton, we find a difference in the time factor of 15 minutes with a bridge and between 24 and 27 minutes without a bridge. If we take the down time, the time when heavy transport vehicles are standing and waiting to cross the river, we find, based on 300 working days per year, a down time amounting to about $750 000 in heavy transport vehicles waiting at that crossing. So, it is not difficult to build a case for the need for a bridge at Berri. Under the heading 'Desirability of a bridge' on page 14 of the report, it is stated:

> Factors pointing to the desirability of replacing the existing ferry service at Berri with a bridge include the following:
>
> Although the average delay for trips at the Berri ferry crossing compares favourably with average delays at other ferry crossings on the River Murray, the total delay experienced in terms of vehicle-hours is by far the highest. Traffic volume at the present Berri crossing is of the same order as (although slightly lower than) the present crossing volumes on Blanchetown and Kingston bridges.

That is an indication of the volume of traffic using the two ferries at Berri. The report continues:

> Although average delay at the present crossing is low, the interruption to each trip—delay and crossing time—is a frequent source of irritation, particularly for the high proportion of regular travellers. When encountered, above-average delay at the present crossing is often a significant proportion of total trip time.

The report goes on to identify clearly the cost to the Riverland's commercial and business sector, which is a major contributor to the economy of South Australia. I remind the Premier that in the Riverland there are some 30 000 people—compared with the very small population on Hindmarsh Island—who generate $500 million annually to the benefit of the economy of South Australia. It will be seen from the report that, if the bridge was built without a causeway in 1981, the cost would have been $8.2 million. The existing causeway is quite capable of serving the needs of the Riverland community for many years to come. Today the Premier talks about $6 million, and this is significantly higher than for the proposal at Hindmarsh Island, which will serve very few people indeed.

The ACTING SPEAKER (Mrs Hutchison): Order! The honourable member's time has expired. The honourable member for Price.

Mr De LAINE (Price): In the short time I have available I will speak about the Commonwealth Parliamentary Association conference that I attended in New Delhi, India. I feel very privileged to have represented the South Australian Parliament at the 37th CPA conference. The experience for me was wonderful, both in terms of what I got out of the conference at a personal level and also what I saw while in India.

The conference opened at the Ashok Hotel, New Delhi, on 23 September and closed on 28 September. In my opinion the conference was very well conducted, and much of the praise for that must go to the Secretary-General of the CPA, the Hon. David Tonkin, former Premier of South Australia. (Incidentally, David asked that I extend his best wishes to all members of the House.) I was impressed with the quality of the 357 delegates who represented 112 countries, states and territories. I was heartened and strengthened by the contributions, which addressed a whole range of issues, from many of the delegates from quite diverse countries.

There were four plenary sessions covering the following issues: United Nations collective security, implementation of its resolutions, the Gulf crisis with special reference to Commonwealth countries; reforms in South Africa, the role of Commonwealth Parliaments in accelerating changes towards democracy which will allow South Africa to rejoin the Commonwealth; strengthening democracy, security and economic development of small Commonwealth States; and, violence against women and children. There were six panel discussions covering the following issues: current global refugee problems, protection of refugees' human rights; the role of the press in a democracy; environmental protection in relation to population growth, industrialisation and urbanisation; enhancing health care systems with special reference to developing countries; what Commonwealth Parliaments can do in furthering food production, marketing and consumption; and, drug problems and attendant criminal activity.

While all these topics were very important and relevant, the ones which interested me the most and about which I have always felt strongly were the role of the press in a democracy, environmental protection, drug problems and attendant criminal activity, and violence against women and children. It was very sad, but interesting, to hear that virtually all countries, whether they be large or small and irrespective of their geographical location and type and state of economy, basically have the same problems in the same relative proportions to one another, and that includes Australia and in particular South Australia. In the wide cross-section of countries that were represented, irrespective of their economy and quality of life—which ranged from the terrible, heartbreaking poverty that I saw in the States of India, to the South Pacific islands which, while not affluent, certainly have no poverty and have plenty to eat and shelter, to the more affluent countries like Britain—the problems seemed to be consistent and almost in the same proportion.

Of tremendous interest and benefit to me, on a personal level, were the strategies that are being put in place in various countries in order to combat these problems. I was particularly interested in the way in which the drug problem and its associated criminal activity is being handled. Some countries have had strategies in place for several years, and it was interesting to hear of their experiences, mistakes, areas where they could improve their strategies and the various ways they have gone about trying to combat this problem. Time does not allow me to go into those matters, but I will do so at a later date. After hearing the contributions of some of the excellent speakers from other countries, I was heartened and given confidence to pursue the issues more vigorously than I have before.

Over the years some doubt has been expressed by many people about the value of CPA conferences. However, after attending this conference I am convinced that they are of tremendous value. I think that people get out of them what they want to get out of them. As far as I am concerned, these conferences should continue and are of tremendous value. That view is also shared by many of the other delegates who attended the conference. The pool of money that has been accumulated by the CPA has now reached about one million pounds sterling, and the CPA executive is currently looking at ways of changing the constitution so that it can use the interest earned on this substantial amount of money for the benefit of small countries, some of which have financial problems. Small countries, in this regard, are defined as countries with less than 250 000 people in their entire population.

Security was very tight at the conference. It was very much a case of culture shock when I first reached the Ashok Hotel to find so many security people around the building. I did not think that there were so many armed police, soldiers and security people in the world, let alone in one place. Every passageway in the hotel was guarded by soldiers with machine-guns. Armed guards stood at the doors of delegates' rooms. There seemed to be thousands of plain clothes security people with walkie-talkies everywhere. Clive Griffiths, who is the Chairman of the executive committee and who is a bit of a fitness freak, at the end of the conference made the point that every morning, as he went for his usual jog, he was accompanied by a soldier with a machine-gun. On the first morning the soldier kept up with him but he was able to sprint away and beat the soldier by 100 metres. Over the period of the conference the soldier gradually improved his fitness level and, on the last morning, he pipped him on the line by about one metre.

There was a lot of concern about security for the closing ceremony, which was broadcast live on television. We did not hear about it at the time, but the head of security told me that six terrorists had been arrested trying to break into the conference that afternoon. The President of the CPA, Shri Shivraj Patil, the Speaker of Lok Sabha, which is the Indian Federal Parliament, was a very impressive and stately figure. In fact, the Lok Sabha represents 23 States and seven union territories of India, which is the world's largest democracy. I place on record my congratulations and thanks to the Indian Government for organising a wonderful conference. It organised spouses' activities and post-conference three day tours that we were all able to enjoy. All in all, it was a wonderful experience. I had intended to speak further about India itself and about some of the things that we saw, but time has beaten me so I will do that on another occasion.

Motion carried.

WRONGS AMENDMENT BILL

Returned from the Legislative Council with amendments.

At 5.36 p.m. the House adjourned until Wednesday 23 October at 2 p.m.

HOUSE OF ASSEMBLY

Tuesday 22 October

QUESTIONS ON NOTICE

GOVERNMENT MOTOR VEHICLES

34. **Mr BECKER (Hanson)** asked the Minister of Transport: What Government business was the driver of the vehicle UQY 743 carrying out on Saturday, 30 March 1991 between Gawler and Elizabeth heading towards Adelaide on Main North Road at approximately 11.15 a.m.?

The Hon. FRANK BLEVINS: On Saturday, 30 March 1991 a patient, who was under considerable stress, left his hostel and intended travelling interstate. The patient is under a custody order and it was necessary for a staff member of Hillcrest hospital to intervene and return the patient to the hostel. The vehicle was used for official duties and in accordance with guidelines.

GLENELG SEWAGE TREATMENT WORKS

41. **Mr BRINDAL (Hayward)** asked the Minister of Water Resources:

1. Are workers at the Glenelg sewage treatment works currently working seven days per week with overtime rates for the weekend?

2. Prior to the advertisement in late 1990 for permanent fitters and instrument fitters at Glenelg, were plant operator tradesmen relocated?

3. Have some sections of the E&WS at Ottoway been scheduled for down sizing?

4. What are the reasons for the processes used and the current personnel management at the Glenelg sewage treatment works and are they cost-effective?

The Hon. S.M. LENEHAN: The replies are as follows:

1. The Glenelg sewage treatment works is attended by shift personnel, 24 hours per day, seven days per week. Shift workers, who are in attendance at the plant on weekends, are paid shift penalties and overtime rates in accordance with the Metal Trades Award (South Australian Government and instrumentalities) provisions. Day workers employed at the plant, comprising both trades and non-trades personnel, are required to work on weekends, either on a routine basis, or in order to carry out essential/urgent work associated with the operation, maintenance or rehabilitation and upgrading of the treatment works. Routine work on weekends generally involves one maintenance person attending the plant for three hours on a Saturday and Sunday to carry out operational duties associated with the screening and grit removal processes. Overtime rates are paid in accordance with normal award provisions, and this work is shared amongst a number of personnel on a rostered basis.

In addition to this routine operational weekend work, there has been a need at Glenelg STW, over the past 12 months, for metal trades personnel, particularly mechanical fitters, to work a significant amount of overtime on weekends (Saturdays and/or Sundays) to undertake essential breakdown or backlog maintenance work on plant equipment, and complete a number of important rehabilitation and upgrading projects. This has been necessary to ensure that the treatment plant continues to operate reliably, efficiently and effectively. Except in emergency breakdown situations, the trades maintenance overtime work is offered to fitters on a voluntary basis and has occasionally resulted in certain individuals working seven days per week for extended periods. Recently, the amount of overtime worked by fitters on weekends has been reduced and, where possible, is being restricted to Saturdays only.

2. In November 1989, all shift employees at Glenelg STW (as well as at Bolivar and Port Adelaide STWs) were officially declared surplus to requirements with the Department of Personnel and Industrial Relations. This followed earlier decisions by the EWS Department (during the period 1986-1988) to embark on staged shift elimination programs at Glenelg, Port Adelaide and Bolivar STWs in order to achieve significant reductions in the level of operational attendances at these plants by 1994. The decision to declare shift employees surplus to requirements prior to these employees actually coming off shift was made so as to give these employees a chance to pursue other retraining and redeployment opportunities throughout the South Australian Government. Since 1989, considerable effort and progress has been made in providing shift employees with these opportunities. The transfer or relocation of shift employees for redeployment and retraining purposes has always been, and will continue to be, implemented on a purely voluntary basis. At Glenelg STW, several shift employees are currently participating in redeployment and retraining programs, and the shift vacancies created by the subsequent transfer of these employees have been temporarily filled with mechanical and electrical fitters.

3. The functions of the Ottoway Depot are being reviewed under the Government Agency Review Group (GARG) investigations. Some changes will take place due to GARG workshops rationalisation, which requires that all metals manufacturing for the Government sector is carried out at Ottoway Workshops, plant repair and transport at Northfield and Ottoway and all building maintenance work transferred to SACON. This rationalisation will necessitate relocation of some employees and equipment. The policy at Ottoway has been to match workforce numbers to available workload and this policy has not changed.

4. The Glenelg STW is a conventional activated sludge wastewater treatment plant, which has a nominal design capacity of 250 000 persons, and currently serves a connected population of approximately 200 000 persons. The wastewater treated at the plant is predominantly of domestic origin and the processes used are designed to produce a high quality secondary effluent, which, after chlorination, is discharged to sea through three outfalls extending approximately 300 m off shore. Some of the effluent, or reclaimed water, is re-used both on site for irrigation and other purposes, as well as off site where it is used to supply a number of golf courses and playing fields as well as two caravan parks, public reserves and lawned areas within the Adelaide airport.

Sludge which is collected or produced during the treatment process is digested anaerobically to produce gas which is then used to generate approximately 55 per cent of the electrical requirements for the Sewerage Treatment Works and the Glenelg Pumping Station. Digested sludge is presently discharged to sea via a 150 mm diameter outfall extending 3.9 km off shore; however, the South Australian Government is committed to eliminating sludge disposal to the marine environment by the end of 1993. To achieve this, digested sludge from the Glenelg and Port Adelaide plants will be pumped through a new 37 km long dedicated pipeline to new drying beds at Bolivar STW.

Because of its age and condition, the Glenelg STW is currently undergoing a substantial asset replacement and rehabilitation program. Part of this program involves exten-

sive automation of the treatment processes to enable further unattended operation of the plant. The treatment process employed at Glenelg is widely used in other STWs throughout the world and offers the benefits of compactness (relative to other processes such as biological filters), reliability, ease of control and it produces a good quality effluent. The current organisational arrangements, staffing levels and personnel management practices employed at Glenelg are aimed at achieving a number of objectives, namely:

- to ensure that the treatment plant continues to operate reliably, efficiently and effectively so that all wastewaters received at the plant are adequately and safely treated and disposed of so that there is minimal risk to public health, pollution of the environment and impact on the surrounding community;
- to keep costs associated with the operation and maintenance of the plant to a minimum level consistent with maintaining existing standards of treatment;
- to achieve major rehabilitation and upgrading of this key departmental asset in accordance with the current EWS capital works program;
- to automate the Glenelg STW to the extent that it can be safely and reliably operated in the future with no attendance on afternoon and night shifts, and to achieve this in a way which minimises the financial impact on all shift employees whose positions will become surplus as a result of automation;
- to ensure the ongoing safety, health and welfare of all personnel employed at the Glenelg plant.

These objectives are generally being achieved, and in a manner which is considered to be cost-effective.

ALTERNATIVE CROPS

106. **Mr BECKER (Hanson)** aked the Minister of Agriculture:

1. What investigations have been undertaken by the Department of Agriculture in the past two years into alternative crops in an endeavour to improve viability of South Australians farms and, if none, why not?

2. What alternative crops could be viable for farmers in South Australia?

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

1. Alternative crops are generally considered to be those which fill a different market niche to that of the traditional South Australian major cereal crops (wheat, barley and oats). The identification, development and adoption of alternative crops is a high priority of the Department of Agriculture recognising their potential to:

— spread price risk
— reduce the impact of world over-production of major commodities
— reduce the impact of the highly volatile feed grain market
— enable our grain traders to offer clients a complete portfolio of grain types including cereals, grain legumes, oilseeds and spices
— spread crop loss risk from pests, diseases and climate and edaphic factors

Over the past two years officers of the Department of Agriculture have undertaken a range of investigations, either independently or in collaboration with other with other local research organisations, into alternative crops. These have included:

naked oat cultivar development
oaten hay cultivar development
field pea cultivar development
lentil cultivar development
lupin cultivar selection and evaluation
chickpea, broad bean, faba bean and vetch evaluation
canola cultivar selection and evaluation
linseed and linola cultivar selection
evaluation of coriander, Indian mustard and cumin for the drier regions
development of a drum wheat industry in South Australian in collaboration with farmers and processors
evaluation of triticale and rye cultivars
agronomic investigations into improved alternative crop management techniques
studies on the feed value of a range of alternative crops

An agricultural development and marketing division has been created with the aim of increasing farm diversification, improving the integration of production and marketing of established and particularly new commodities and assisting in the development of "value added" industries for established and new farm commodities.

2. A number of alternative crops have been identified as possibly being viable for South Australian farmers. These include:

Naked oats: The naked oat is hulless, high in energy, oil and certain amino acids and will be sought by the intensive feed industries. Future naked oat varieties are also likely to be actively sought for human food products.

Oaten hay: Oaten hay is an expanding export industry to Japan, Korea and Taiwan.

Field peas: Field peas are a growing industry in South Australia. New cultivars with improved yield, disease resistance and quality types suitable for the feed, split pea, and human comsumption markets will assist the expansion of this industry.

Lentils: The department is soon to release red and yellow lentil cultivars with much improved agronomic potential in South Australia. Very good export market opportunities for these crops exist in Asia minor, Middle East and India.

Lupins: Production of lupins in Western Australia through cultivar improvement has expanded dramatically. Development in South Australia is dependent on the development of cultivars suited to South Australia.

Chickpea, broad beans, faba beans: All these crops have potential in South Australia. The area sown to chickpeas is increasing rapidly as farmers recognise the potential of this crop.

Canola: Canola has a growing use for margarine, cooking oil and industrial purposes. Australia currently imports approximately 1 500 tonnes of canola oil per year. Canola cultivars tolerant of herbicides whihc kill broad leaf weeds are being selected as the control of these weeds in this crop is a major factor limiting its potential growth.

Linseed and linola: Linseed and linola are useful industrial and human consumption oilseed crops. Australia currently imports an average of 2 500 tonnes per year of linseed oil.

Indian mustard: Indian mustard has agronomic potential for the drier for the drier areas of South Australia but requires plant improvement in the area of quality of adoption.

Durum wheat: Durum wheat is used for prime quality pasta products. Previously durum wheat or pasta was imported from overseas or interstate at considerable cost to South Australia.

Rye: Rye currently attracts a premium price as a human food and stock feed grain. In some years South Australia imports rye.

GOVERNMENT VEHICLES

131. **Mr BECKER (Hanson)** asked the Minister of Transport:

1. On Tuesday, 1 October who was the driver of a Government motor vehicle which was involved in a fatal accident at Evanston, just north of the Gawler by-pass?

2. To which agency or department was the vehicle allocated and to whom was the vehicle assigned at the time of the accident?

3. Were the terms of Government Management Board Ciruclar 90/30 being observed by the person assigned the vehicle and if not, why not?

4. What action does the Government propose to take over the use of the vehicle?

5. What was the cost of the damage to the vehicle and who held the comprehensive insurance?

The Hon. FRANK BLEVINS: The replies are as follows:

1. Abigail Kerry.
2. Department of Enviroment and Planning.
   Mr Frederick Warrior.
3. Yes.
4. The alleged illegal users of the vehicle are deceased. After departmental and police investigation it is considered no action is warranted against the departmental employee.
5. $17 500.
   The Government self-insures vehicles.