

SOUTH AUSTRALIA

PARLIAMENTARY DEBATES

(HANSARD)

Third Session of the Forty-Sixth Parliament (1987)

Parliament, which adjourned on 14 April, was prorogued by proclamation dated 7 May. By proclamation dated 2 July, it was summoned to meet on Thursday 6 August, and the third session began on that date.

LEGISLATIVE COUNCIL

Thursday 6 August 1987

The **PRESIDENT (Hon. Anne Levy)** took the Chair at 12 noon.

OPENING OF PARLIAMENT

The Clerk (Mr C.H. Mertin) read the proclamation by His Excellency the Governor (Sir Donald Dunstan) summoning Parliament.

GOVERNOR'S SPEECH

His Excellency the Governor, having been announced by Black Rod, was received by the President at the bar of the Council Chamber and by her conducted to the Chair. The Speaker and members of the House of Assembly having entered the Chamber in obedience to his summons, His Excellency read his opening speech as follows:

Honourable members of the Legislative Council and members of the House of Assembly:

1. I have called you together for the dispatch of business.

2. It is with regret I record the death on 28 August 1986 of the Hon. Donald Williams Simmons, A.M., D.F.C., and on 17 January 1987 of the Hon. Ronald Redvers Loveday.

Mr Simmons entered the House of Assembly in 1970 as the Member for Peake and was a member until his retirement in 1979. He was Minister of the Environment from 1975 to 1977, Chief Secretary from 1977 to 1979, and also Minister Assisting the Premier from 1976 to 1979.

Mr Loveday was Member for Whyalla from 1956 to 1970, Minister of Education from 1965 to 1967, and Minister of Education and Aboriginal Affairs from 1967 to 1968. I know that you will join me in expressing sympathy to the members of their families in their sad loss.

3. The economic situation facing our nation and this State is again the most important issue before my Government. The Commonwealth Government continues to pursue policies designed to stabilise our economy through restraint in public spending and tight budgetary controls,

and my Government is prepared to play its part in achieving the longer term prosperity this country so greatly needs.

As a result of significant reductions in Federal funding, there inevitably will be difficult and sometimes unpopular decisions in the allocation of State funding, but this is a challenge my Government has accepted, and will address in its deliberations leading to the framing of the forthcoming State Budget.

4. My Government is cognisant of its responsibility to ensure a balanced approach to economic management, recognising that services as well as spending restrictions should properly reflect community need while protecting those least able to cope with budgetary restraints.

5. Despite the general tightening of economic conditions, this State has gained significant regional strength with the awarding of the Federal Government's submarine construction contract to Port Adelaide.

The importance of South Australia's successful participation in this \$4 billion program cannot be overstated. It has taken four years of careful planning to convince the contracting authorities of South Australia's suitability and competence to be a major contributor in the overall program.

My Government, through its negotiations with the business community and the trade union movement, is working to ensure that the promise of such an exciting and long-term development is fully realised, to the benefit of all South Australians.

6. In the rural sector, my Government continues to acknowledge the importance of farm income in our economy, and recognises difficulties posed by export market fluctuations. However, most areas of the State have now received adequate rains to allow seeding of this year's crops to be completed, other than on a small strip of coastal land on eastern Eyre Peninsula.

Crops sown following the good May rains show promise of above average yields. The potential for average yields is shown in crops sown after May, provided we experience consistent follow-up rains through to the end of October.

7. As my Government continues to initiate and assist in programs to best utilise our State's natural resources, I am pleased to note that the Olympic Dam copper, gold and

uranium project is moving rapidly towards production by mid 1988.

Almost 1 000 construction workers are currently involved in the Roxby Downs development, and this number will increase to approximately 3 000 next year as the Joint Venturers enter the second stage of developing the Roxby Downs township.

8. My Government in this session will introduce legislation to facilitate the merger of the South Australian Oil and Gas Corporation and the South Australian Gas Company.

Combining the resources of these major enterprises should help secure our State's energy needs well into the next century by creating a stronger, more flexible company based and controlled in South Australia.

The freeing up of SAGASCO's commercial operations, and the introduction of SAOG to market sources of capital will enable my Government to maximise the use of its assets in the oil and gas sector.

9. My Government will continue its strong commitment to ensure all South Australians have access to a wide range of housing services. Some 2 500 families will be helped by the Home Ownership Made Easier program conducted through the State Bank, while the South Australian Housing Trust will continue its valuable building program.

For those in most need, the Emergency Housing Office will provide rent assistance, emergency accommodation, and other services.

10. In the Department of Technical and Further Education, my Government will, by the end of this financial year, have spent some \$17 million in completing the redevelopment of the colleges at Port Augusta and Port Lincoln.

The proposals of the Mills report on restructuring the department will be considered.

11. The decline in student enrolments in our State secondary schools continues to be a matter of concern for my Government. It has been estimated that by 1990, more than 40 000 fewer students will be attending all State schools compared with enrolment numbers at the beginning of this decade.

While established areas show signs of declining enrolments, the Government is faced with the need to provide new school facilities in areas such as Roxby Downs and in some sections of the outer metropolitan area.

In the area of primary education, the Education Department is committed to offering all primary school children an education in a language other than English.

It is particularly important in this changing environment that parents be involved in the education of their children. Amendments to the education regulations concerning the powers and responsibilities of school councils will enable these councils to broaden their participation in school planning and decision-making.

12. A further seventeen child-care centres will be established in this State by the end of next year as a result of co-operation between my Government and the Commonwealth. The Children's Services Office will strengthen its involvement with local communities while giving a high priority to developing services to assist those children from other cultures. Bilingual support staff and activities to help newly arrived migrant and refugee children will be emphasised.

13. My Government recognises the increasing importance of providing to all those in the workforce the opportunity to consolidate a portion of their income through properly managed and appropriately controlled superannuation funds. To this end, legislation will be introduced to make significant changes to the existing Government super-

annuation scheme. The new scheme will greatly reduce the Government's costs, while providing a level of benefits more in line with those provided through private sector schemes.

14. On 30 September this year, my Government will bring into operation the new occupational health and safety legislation to make those responsible in the workplace accountable for providing a safe and healthy work environment. The new rehabilitation and compensation laws will also operate from that date, ensuring fair treatment to injured workers at a cost which the community can afford.

15. To assist consumers, amendments will be introduced to the Trade Standards Act to encompass the interim ban provisions and product recall clause of the Trade Practices Act. Such changes are considered necessary to promote uniformity and maintain effectiveness of a properly balanced control in the market place.

16. The community's concern about the perceived increase in the level of criminal activity, and the consequences for victims, bystanders, and ultimately all taxpayers, is being addressed by my Government in a number of positive ways.

The Department of Correctional Services is pursuing the need for improved procedures to manage offenders, with the aim of increasing the social competence of those who find themselves persistently before the courts.

My Government is encouraged by the support given the Community Service Order Scheme, now operating throughout the State, and an expansion of this scheme is being examined to include offenders who have been fined but whose financial situation makes payment unlikely.

Construction of the Mobilong Prison to house medium security prisoners is nearing completion, while the Capital Works program has provided for redevelopment at Yatala Labour Prison, the Northfield Prison complex and at country institutions.

17. The frustrating and complex fight against organised crime, on a local and national level, has seen my Government's law enforcement agencies become increasingly involved with the Australian Bureau of Criminal Intelligence and the National Crime Authority. A tangible result of this co-operation will be the development of an Australian Drug Data Base.

At our State level, new case management systems are being introduced to help assess how to best conduct major criminal investigations.

To this end, legislation will be introduced to empower the South Australian Police to intercept telecommunications under the Commonwealth Telecommunications (Interception) Act, 1979.

18. South Australia has been a leader in providing rights and services for victims of crime. This has been further recognised with the establishment of a special branch within our Police Department, and will be further helped by a program of initiatives aimed at alleviating the trauma suffered by the innocents. This branch will focus its activities on child protection and domestic violence, and the principles relating to the rights of victims of crime within the criminal justice system.

19. My Government continues to take specific and co-ordinated action to help gauge the level of child abuse in our community, and to combat what is surely one of the more devastating offences, often resulting in a lifetime of trauma to haunt the defenceless victim.

Positive steps include the establishment of assessment units for suspected victims at the Adelaide Children's Hospital and the Flinders Medical Centre.

To help minimise the stress on a child giving evidence, but also to ensure a balanced approach to sex abuse cases,

my Government will introduce legislative amendments based on recommendations of the Task Force on Child Sex Abuse. These amendments will cover aspects of the mandatory reporting of child abuse, the competency of children to give evidence, and the modification of procedures in the giving of evidence by alleged victims.

In tandem with this action, legislation will also aim at improving the methods used in dealing with applications to the Children's Court for those children considered to be in need of the Court's care for protection.

20. Within the area of health care, my Government will continue with a program of capital works which will see the completion of two major redevelopments at Wallaroo and Modbury Hospitals. Design work will be finalised and construction commenced on the relocation of Magill Home to Elizabeth Vale, at a cost of some \$5 million.

21. My Government's combination of the Health and Community Welfare portfolios will be highlighted by the establishment of four Health and Social Welfare Councils in a pilot scheme.

Sixty per cent of their membership will be made up of the local community, with the balance split between service providers and Local Government representatives. These councils will be encouraged to take an active interest in their local hospitals, health centres and other health and welfare agencies, to monitor the quality of services and to help ensure resources are used efficiently. Wide consultation is being undertaken before the Councils are established. Three will be located in the metropolitan area and one in the country.

22. In this driest of States in the driest of continents, my Government continues to explore and, where possible, develop ongoing provisions for water supply and water storage management. The Blanchetown Water Supply Scheme, the second in the program to improve specific country town water supplies, will be completed late this year.

My Government will introduce a Bill to amend the River Murray Waters Agreement. This new initiative will establish a Murray-Darling Basin Commission to undertake the responsibilities of the River Murray Waters Agreement while advising on land, water and environmental matters not currently covered by the Agreement.

23. Subject to favourable recommendation by the Parliamentary Standing Committee on Public Works, construction of the Finger Point Sewage Treatment Plant is expected to begin in the near future. The Port Noarlunga Sewerage Scheme will be completed late this year at an estimated cost of some \$10.22 million.

24. Increases in the costs of providing adequate public transport for all South Australians is of great concern to my Government.

There is no easy solution to this problem, which faces the providers of all capital city transport. A proper solution must reflect a balanced and reasonable view of just how far any Government can go in attempting to cater for the wishes of every community group.

25. My Government's concern for the senseless and tragic level of road deaths and injuries is expressed through further efforts to improve road safety and driver education.

The Police will initiate a number of moves to apprehend those drivers determined to do themselves and others harm. These measures include the introduction of red light cameras, an expansion of highway patrols, and portable speed detection units in country areas. Linked to a continuing program of positive deterrents, there will be again increased emphasis on random breath testing.

26. My Government continues its strong commitment to protecting and preserving the fragile heritage of our country's first civilisation.

To this end a Bill is being prepared to provide for the effective protection of Aboriginal sites, objects and remains in this State. This Bill will replace the outdated Aboriginal and Historic Relics Preservation Act, 1965 and the Aboriginal Heritage Act, 1979, which was not proclaimed because of perceived inadequacies in its provisions.

The new legislation is the result of formal and detailed consultation with Aboriginal communities, and takes account of mining and pastoral land use requirements. Under the Act a new Aboriginal Heritage Committee comprised entirely of Aboriginal people will advise the Government on developing means of preserving the history of their culture.

27. Amendments to the National Parks and Wildlife Act and Regulations are planned this session to update the legislation where it concerns management of concession developments run by private operators. There will also be provision for a new classification of reserve, to be known as a 'regional reserve' to allow for multiple use of natural resources within such areas.

28. In the area of sport and recreation, tenders have been called for the construction of a hockey and lacrosse complex at the Gepps Cross Sports Park. This facility will be of international standard, in keeping with my Government's determination to establish sporting venues which should attract world-class competition. Its funding is being substantially assisted by the Commonwealth.

My Government hopes to contribute to a program with the Commonwealth Government and the Athletics Association of South Australia to resurface the athletics track at Olympic Sports Field.

A committee inquiring into the need for a Racing Commission in South Australia will report during this session of Parliament, and a working party investigating the desirability of instant lotteries in hotels and other commercial outlets will also lodge its findings.

29. My Government's commitment to the development of tourism in this State will be reflected in new marketing strategies over the next two years. These programs foreshadow increasing growth and profitability in this most important industry, which this year will again be highlighted by the Australian Formula One Grand Prix in November.

This year has already seen the opening of the Adelaide Convention Centre as part of the important ASER site development, with its 369-room Hyatt Regency Hotel. South Australians will also have the pleasure in March next year of seeing Adelaide host its Festival of Arts, attracting thousands of visitors from other States and overseas.

30. As we approach Australia's Bicentennial year, my Government faces new and demanding challenges to strengthen the economic base which is so important in the development of this State as a balanced and caring community, where all citizens are treated with respect and understanding.

31. I now declare this session open and trust that your deliberations will be guided by Divine Providence to the advancement of the welfare of the people of this State.

The Governor retired from the Chamber, and the Speaker and members of the House of Assembly withdrew.

The President again took the Chair.

The Clerk (Mr C.H. Mertin) read prayers.

[Sitting suspended from 12.50 to 2.32 p.m.]

STANDING ORDERS

The **PRESIDENT**: I have to inform the Council that I have received a memorandum from His Excellency the Governor with a copy of amendments to Standing Orders of the Legislative Council adopted by the Council on 14 April this year and approved in Executive Council on 7 May. I understand that the amendments to the Standing Orders have been circulated to all members.

PETITION: BOTANIC PARK

A petition signed by 275 residents of South Australia praying that the Council would request the immediate return of the area designated for a car park, located in the south-east corner of the Botanic Gardens, and would urge the Government to introduce legislation to protect the parklands and ensure that no further alienation would occur before the enactment of this legislation was presented by the Hon. I. Gilfillan.

Petition received.

PUBLIC WORKS COMMITTEE REPORTS

The **PRESIDENT** laid on the table the following reports by the Parliamentary Standing Committee on Public Works, together with minutes of evidence:

- Gepps Cross International Standard Hockey/Lacrosse Facility—Interim report and final report.
- Kingston College of Technical and Further Education Redevelopment—Report.
- Lyell McEwin Health Service Stage II—Report.
- Northfield Security Hospital Conversion ('E' Division)—Interim report and final report.
- River Murray Interpretive Centre, Goolwa—Interim report and final report.
- Riverland College of Technical and Further Education (Berri Branch)—Report.
- South Australian Institute of Technology School of Nursing—Interim report and final report.
- Yatala Labour Prison 'S' Division (Segregation Unit)—Interim report and final report.

PAPERS TABLED

The following papers were laid on the table:

By the Attorney-General (Hon. C.J. Sumner):

Pursuant to Statute—

- Rules of Court—Supreme Court—Administration and Probate Act 1919—Disclosure of Assets and Liabilities.
- Rules of Court—Local Court—Local and District Criminal Courts Act 1926—Masters, Disability, Exhibits.
- Rules of Court—Supreme Court—Supreme Court Act 1935

- Commercial Arbitration.
- Companies.
- Listing Cases.

- Writs, Appearances, Pleadings and Bailee's Charges.

- Acts Republication Act 1967—Schedules of Alterations—

- Acts Interpretation Act 1915.

- Land Tax Act 1936.

- Remuneration Tribunal—Reports relating to Determinations Nos. 2, 3, 4 and 5 of 1987.

- Industrial and Commercial Training Commission—Report, 1985-86.

- Police Regulation Act 1952—Directions to the Commissioner of Police.

- Supreme Court Act 1935—Report of Judges of Supreme Court of South Australia 1986.

- Regulations under the following Acts—

- Bail Act 1985—Forms and Pamphlet.

- Boilers and Pressure Vessels Act 1968—Fees.

- Classification of Publications Act 1974—Exemption.

- Commercial Arbitration Act 1986—Prescribed Amount.

- Correctional Services Act 1982—Prison Admission Hours.

- Criminal Injuries Compensation Act 1978—Levy Exemption.

- Dangerous Substances Act 1979—Fees.

- Daylight Saving Act 1971—Standard Time.

- Explosives Act 1936—Fees.

- Government Management and Employment Act 1985—Vacancies.

- Industrial and Commercial Training Act 1981—Locksmithing.

- Industrial Safety, Health and Welfare Act 1972—Commercial Safety Code—Fork Lift Training.

- Construction Safety Code—

- Fees.

- Fork Lift Training.

- Industrial Safety Code—

- Fees.

- Fork Lift Training.

- Registration of Premises.

- Land Tax Act 1936—

- Exempt Body and Associations.

- Exemption Revocation.

- Lifts and Cranes Act 1960—Fees.

- Public Finance and Audit Act 1987—Prescribed Public Authorities.

- Superannuation Act 1974—Eligibility to Fund and Voting.

- Unclaimed Goods Act 1987—Collection of Goods.

- Department of the Public Service Board—Report, 1985-86.

By the Minister of Consumer Affairs (Hon. C.J. Sumner):

Pursuant to Statute—

- Regulations under the following Acts—

- Births, Deaths and Marriages Registration Act 1966—Fees.

- Builders Licensing Act 1986—Licensing and Insurance.

- Commercial and Private Agents Act 1972—Fees.

- Commercial Tribunal Act 1982—Fees.

- Consumer Credit Act 1972—

- Contract Ceilings.

- Credit Provider Registration Fee.

- Fees.

- Consumer Transactions Act 1972—Fees.

- Fees Regulation Act 1927—

- Cremation Permit.

- Places of Public Entertainment—Fees.

- Stock Medicine Fees.

- Liquor Licensing Act 1985—

- Fees.

- Liquor Consumption at Glenelg.

- Places of Public Entertainment Act 1913—Fees.

- Second-hand Motor Vehicles Act 1983—Fees.

- Trade Measurements Act 1971—Fees.

- Trade Standards Act 1979—

- Flammable Clothing and Footwear.

- Motor Fuel Price and Signs.

- Travel Agents Act 1986—Licence Exemption.

By the Minister of Corporate Affairs (Hon. C.J. Sumner):

Pursuant to Statute—

- Regulations under the following Acts—

- Associations Incorporation Act 1985—Fees.

- Business Names Act 1963—Fees.

- Co-operatives Act 1983—Fees.

- Credit Unions Act 1976—Certificate of Incorporation.

- Futures Industry (Application of Laws) Act 1986—Exemptions.

- National Companies and Securities Commission (State Provisions) Act 1981—Prescribed Acts.

Retirement Villages Act 1987—Contracts, Disputes and Forms.

By the Attorney-General on behalf of the Minister of Health (Hon. J.R. Cornwall):

By Command—

Australian Agricultural Council and Australian Soil Conservation Council—Resolutions of Meetings, 6 February 1987.

Report of the Lyell McEwin Health Service Superannuation Fund, 1985-86.

Pest Plants Commission—Report, 1986.

Planning Act 1982—Crown Development Reports—

Glenside Hospital Holiday House, Carrickalinga.

Office for Western Domiciliary Care (Q.E.H.).

Scrimber Production Plant, Mount Gambier.

Constructions by Engineering and Water Supply

Department at Normanville Heights.

Racing Act 1976—Rules of Trotting—

Complaints.

Fines.

Fees.

Regulations under the following Acts—

Agricultural Chemicals Act 1955—Registration of

Chemicals—Fees.

Animal and Plant Control (Agricultural Protection

and Other Purposes) Act 1986—Committees, Animal

Control and Poisons.

Apiaries Act 1931—Registration Fees.

Bills of Sale Act 1886—Fees.

Cigarettes (Labelling) Act 1971—Health Warning.

Clean Air Act 1984—

Licence Fees.

Mining and Quarrying Premises.

Controlled Substances Act 1984—

Expiation Notice for Simple Cannabis Offence.

Expiation of Simple Cannabis Offences.

Declared Drugs of Dependence.

Declared Poisons.

Declared Prescription Drugs.

Declared Prohibited Substances.

Crown Lands Act 1929—Fees.

Fees Regulation Act 1927—

Cremation Permit.

Places of Public Entertainment—Fee.

Stock Medicine Fees.

Fisheries Act 1982—

American River—Eastern Cove.

Gulf St. Vincent Experimental Crab Fishery—

Licence Tenure.

Lakes and Coorong Fishery—Southern Bluefin

Tuna.

Marine Scale Fishery—Southern Bluefin Tuna.

Power Heads, Spears and Set Lines.

Registration of Fish Farms and Returns.

Restricted Marine Scale Fishery—Southern

Bluefin Tuna.

Seal Bay/Bales Beach.

Southern Zone Rock Lobster Fishery—

Southern Bluefin Tuna.

Transfer of Licences.

Spencer Gulf Experimental Crab Fishery—Licence

Tenure.

Tuna Fishery—Revocation.

West Coast Experimental Crab Fishery—Licence

Tenure.

West Coast Prawn Fishery—Licences (Amend-

ment).

Food Act 1985—Unpasteurised Milk.

Goods Securities Act 1986—Vehicle Securities Reg-

ister—Fees.

Mental Health Act 1977—

Consent to Medical and Dental Procedures.

Legal Representation.

Metropolitan Milk Supply Act 1946.

Metropolitan Taxi-Cab Act 1956—

Motor Vehicles Act 1959—

Licence Classifications.

Registration and Licence Fees, Sundry Charges.

Towtruck Fees.

National Parks and Wildlife Act 1972—

Entrance Fees.

Para Wirra Recreation Park.

Pastoral Act 1936—Fees.

Planning Act 1982—

Definitions, Advertising, Displays and Hoard-

ings.

Existing Use Rights.

Prescribed Authorities.

Poultry Meat Hygiene Act 1986—General Regula-

tions.

Real Property Act 1886—

Land Division Fees.

Registration, Lodgment and Examination Fees.

Requisitions Fee.

Strata Titles Fees.

Registration of Deeds Act 1935—Registration and

Deposit Fees.

Road Traffic Act 1961—

Seat Belts and Braking Systems.

Traffic Prohibition—

Adelaide.

Coober Pedy.

Gawler.

Hindmarsh.

Light.

Prospect.

Roads (Opening and Closing) Act 1932—Survey Plan

Fees.

Sewerage Act 1929—

Fees for Examination and Registration.

Planting of Trees in Streets.

Scale of Charges.

South Australian Health Commission Act 1976—

Compensable Patient Charges.

Health Development Foundation.

Incorporated Hospital and Health Centres Fees.

Tobacco Products Control Act 1986—Health Warn-

ings.

Veterinary Surgeons Act 1985—Registration and

Conduct.

Water Resources Act 1976—Meter Rent, Mainte-

nance, Tests, Transfers and Licences.

Waterworks Act 1932—

Fees for Examination and Registration.

Scale of Charges.

By the Minister of Tourism (Hon. Barbara Wiese):

Pursuant to Statute—

Director-General of Further Education—Report, 1986.

Senior Secondary Assessment Board of South Aus-

tralia—Report, 1986.

Education Act 1972—Regulations—School Accounting

Provisions.

Forestry Act 1950—Proclamation: Hundred of Kongo-

rong, County of Grey.

Pitjantjatjara Land Rights Act 1981—By-laws—

Control of Alcoholic Liquor.

Control of Gambling.

Control of Petrol.

South Australian Museum Board—Report, 1985-86.

By the Minister of Local Government (Hon. Barbara Wiese):

Pursuant to Statute—

Local Government Finance Authority of South Aus-

tralia—Report, 1986.

Regulations under the following Acts—

Building Act 1971—Fees, Damp Proofing and Bush-

fire Areas.

Dog Control Act 1979—

Fees.

Roxby Downs Dog District Number.

Libraries Act 1982—Conduct, Traffic and Author-

ised Officers.

South Australian Waste Management Commission

Act 1979—Liquid Waste Fee.

Corporation By-laws—

Burnside—

1—Permits.

2—Vehicle Movement.

3—Street Conduct.

4—Street Traders.

5—Garbage Removal.

6—Obstructions to Vision Near Intersections.

7—Drains.

8—Park Lands.

9—Caravans.

11—Animals and Birds.

12—Bees.

13—Library Services.

- 14—Burnside Swimming Centre.
- 15—Repeal and Renumbering of By-laws.
- Mount Gambier—
 - 1—Permits and Penalties.
 - 2—Vehicle Movement.
 - 3—Taxis.
 - 4—Obstructions to Vision Near Intersections.
 - 5—Council Land.
 - 6—Animals and Birds.
 - 8—Fire Prevention.
 - 9—Repeal and Renumbering of By-laws.
- District Council By-laws—
 - Mannum—No. 10—Dogs.
 - Port Elliot and Goolwa—No. 42—Public Health.
 - Warooka—No. 23—Caravans.

QUESTIONS

RSPCA

The Hon. M.B. CAMERON: I seek leave to make an explanation prior to directing a question to the Minister of Local Government about the RSPCA.

Leave granted.

The Hon. M.B. CAMERON: Madam President, I wish to make my position quite clear before commencing my explanation. I am a member of the general committee of the RSPCA and have been for some years. The RSPCA is an excellent organisation. There is no doubt that it performs a role that is greatly appreciated by the community and the Government, and the Government provides it with effective financial support in the area of animal protection legislation. However, the RSPCA's animal shelter at Lonsdale, and also the Animal Welfare League, which rely on local government funding, are experiencing severe financial hardship. In fact, the Lonsdale shelter could well face closure after four months if the deficits continue. This would not only mean disaster for the animals in need of refuge, but for the local councils which would find themselves with stray dogs and cats at the door and nowhere to put them. The RSPCA relies almost entirely on donations from the public and a very important part of the money received comes through legacies. Nearly \$548 000 was received this year, an indication of considerable community support. That sum is from legacies alone.

The Lonsdale shelter provides for the collection, holding and disposal of stray animals for the majority of local councils in the southern metropolitan area, and its counterpart, the Animal Welfare League's Wingfield shelter, provides a similar service for the northern metropolitan area. These two organisations had received from councils until very recently \$10 for each stray dog they took. A working party considering shelter funding has recommended the funding should be \$50 a dog, and the two organisations have been negotiating with local government for three years in an attempt to achieve realistic funding for the service they provide.

The net operating deficit for the Lonsdale shelter for the year ended 30 April 1987 is \$74 862, and it has a bank overdraft of \$146 926. A decision has now been made to increase the local government subsidy from \$10 to \$30, which is still inadequate. The Chairman's address in the latest *RSPCA Journal* states:

Discussion with a working party established by the Dog Advisory Committee resulted in a report to the Minister of Local Government which said that, without increased funding for the shelter, the society would be forced to close its operations in support of the administration of the Dog Control Act by local councils, as we are unable to subsidise local government any longer in this task.

To summarise, the RSPCA has been asked for the past three years to provide a service to local government for stray

dogs, but has been receiving only one-fifth of the actual cost, as determined by the working party. Since 1 July it has received three-fifths of the actual cost, which is still inadequate. The present serious overdraft is a direct result of the failure of either local government or the State Government to correct this unfair situation. The result is that bequests given to the RSPCA by citizens of South Australia have been used, and will continue to be used, to offset the overdraft—in effect, to subsidise local government because of its failure to pay a fair price. This ridiculous situation is simply not on. The RSPCA is seeking—

The PRESIDENT: Order! Opinions are not permitted in a question.

The Hon. M.B. CAMERON: The RSPCA is seeking an interest-free loan of \$150 000 from the Government, to be repaid over seven years, to clear the shelter overdraft. This is necessary because it is not receiving enough money to cover the cost of the very important service it provides. The Animal Welfare League is suffering financially for the same reason, and both organisations would appreciate an opportunity to discuss the matter with representatives of local government and the State Government. My questions are as follows:

(1) Will the Minister consider granting some sort of interim assistance to the RSPCA shelter to enable the very valuable service to continue?

(2) Will the Minister attend a meeting at the Lonsdale Shelter and the Animal Welfare League with representatives of local government, RSPCA and the Animal Welfare League in order to (a) examine the facilities provided by the organisations, and (b) discuss on site the services provided, the need for them and the inadequate funding from local government?

The Hon. BARBARA WIESE: I am aware of the problems facing the RSPCA and the Animal Welfare League shelters or dog pounds; and I know about the shortfall in funding that has occurred recently. I am also aware that a committee with representation from the two pounds, local government and people from my department looked at this question and made the recommendations referred to by the honourable member. When those recommendations were put to the Dog Advisory Committee (which advises me on matters relating to dogs), I think they received almost total endorsement, and subsequently recommendations were made to me.

When I considered those recommendations I was certainly happy to endorse most of them, but I considered that one recommendation was not equitable to some councils in the State, and I did not accept it; instead, I agreed to increase the dog registration fee and the expiation fee for offences under the Dog Control Act. In addition, I approved an increase from \$10 to \$30 to be paid by councils to pounds to cover the cost of keeping dogs. Under the Act, pounds must keep dogs for three days prior to destruction. It has been estimated that the cost of keeping a dog for three days is something like \$10 a day. Therefore, the increase to \$30 is designed to cover the funding which the pounds have indicated they need to keep dogs for the statutory period.

In fact, I think that most pounds keep dogs for longer than the statutory period—for obvious reasons. In many cases owners will call at a pound to collect their dogs after the statutory three-day period—so it is considered reasonable to keep the dogs for a longer period. I have already implemented what I consider to be interim measures and I have asked the Dog Advisory Committee to go back and consider the broader question of how we can address the deficit which has built up. The measures that have been taken will ease the problems being experienced by the pounds.

However, I recognise that other steps will need to be taken to fix the problem. The suggestion that was made by the committee and the Dog Advisory Committee with which I did not agree would have had a percentage of the money that is currently paid into the Dogs Statutory Fund paid to the pounds for their purposes. However, it would have required a percentage of dog registration fees to be paid by all councils in South Australia.

As some councils in South Australia, namely, rural councils, do not use the services of these two pounds, it seemed to me to be inappropriate to then ask them to pay a percentage of their registration fees to keep those pounds going, and certainly it was not appropriate to make that decision without consultation with those councils. That consultation had not taken place to that point. For that reason, I have asked the Dog Advisory Committee to look at that issue again and to think of other alternatives which may be available and which would allow us to solve the problem that the pounds are currently experiencing.

As to my preparedness to meet with representatives of those two organisations, I can say that I have recently received invitations from both the Animal Welfare League and the RSPCA to visit their pounds, and I hope to be able to do so in the near future.

SIGNPOSTING

The Hon. L.H. DAVIS: I seek leave to make a statement before asking the Minister of Tourism a question about signposting.

Leave granted.

The Hon. L.H. DAVIS: The Minister of Tourism would be aware that for the past three years I have been campaigning for better signposting in the Adelaide Hills and on routes leading to important tourist attractions in South Australia. I have highlighted the absurdity of Cleland, which has been called six different names in the past two years. It is now called Cleland Fauna Centre, despite the fact that a survey that I conducted indicated that 50 per cent of the people did not know what fauna was. The same survey showed overwhelming approval for Cleland Wildlife Park.

A visitor to the Clare Valley or Burra is confronted with a range of new signs at the Gawler bypass saying 'Tarlee' and 'Kapunda'. Although the Minister has assured concerned tourist operators in the Mid North that this extraordinary omission will be rectified soon, those operators not surprisingly are asking how the error was made in the first place. A visitor driving through Burra wishing to go to either Morgan or Broken Hill gets hopelessly lost. The forest of signposts in Burra's Market Square has a sign pointing to Hallett, but there is no mention of Broken Hill or Morgan. Not surprisingly, people drive off over the bridge and pass Paxton Square, and then drive sometimes for miles before they realise that they are on the wrong road.

Tourist operators around the State and, particularly in my experience, in the Mid North have been increasingly concerned at the apparent lack of communication and cooperation between Government departments on the matter of signposting and also at the apparent inconsistency that exists with respect to signposting. Two months ago, I raised this matter again publicly, and the Minister in response said that a committee was being established to examine signposting. I understand that this suggestion was made to her by frustrated tourist operators rather than as a result of any initiative of the Government, which has now been in power for nearly five years.

I understand, too, that representatives of the Highways Department, the Department of Local Government and the

Department of Tourism will make up the committee, presumably along with representatives from the private sector. My questions to the Minister are as follows:

1. Can the Minister of Tourism advise whether the Minister of Transport and the Minister of Local Government have received advice from her about the committee?
2. Has it been established?
3. If so, how many meetings of the committee have been held?

The Hon. BARBARA WIESE: The Ministers to whom the honourable member referred have been contacted with a view to establishing a committee to review signposting in South Australia. They have been asked to nominate suitable representatives to that committee, as has the South Australian Tourism Council. I understand that that organisation has nominated a suitable representative, as has the Department of Environment and Planning. Although I have not checked on the progress of this matter in the past few weeks, I understand that the committee has been established. I am not sure whether it has conducted meetings at this point, but I will make inquiries.

I am very concerned that there should be a rational approach to signposting in this State. It is important that the various agencies that are responsible for signposting are aware of the interests and needs of the other organisations in this matter and of the needs and interests of the tourism industry. For that reason I established the committee in the first place.

An honourable member interjecting:

The PRESIDENT: Order!

The Hon. BARBARA WIESE: It certainly came about from discussions that I had with representatives of the tourism industry. During the two years that I have been Minister, I have become aware of a number of occasions on which signposting, for one reason or another, has been slow in coming or has been inappropriate for tourism purposes because other considerations have been taken into account in preference to tourism considerations. It is important to get these agencies together. That is what is being done, and I hope that the whole State will be reviewed during the course of the deliberations of the committee and that recommendations will be made about the better organisation of the process of applications for signposting in the interests of better tourism in this State.

MINISTERIAL STATEMENT: THEBARTON DEVELOPMENT CORPORATION

The Hon. BARBARA WIESE (Minister of Local Government): I seek leave to make a statement about the Thebarton Development Corporation.

Leave granted.

The Hon. BARBARA WIESE: Further to my statement of 7 April 1987, I wish to inform the Council of further developments and to publicly resolve those issues which were outstanding at that time. Honourable members will recall that substantial public debate and concern was expressed in this place at the establishment of the Thebarton Development Corporation by the Corporation of the Town of Thebarton. The Thebarton Development Corporation was established as a wholly owned company of the town of Thebarton purportedly pursuant to my approval of a scheme of activity by the council under section 383a of the Local Government Act. In response to several questions in this place on the matter, I referred to the legal advice which I had sought and undertook to make a public statement on the issues raised both in this place and publicly. This is that statement.

Section 383a of the Local Government Act allows the Minister of Local Government to approve a council to undertake schemes for carrying out an activity for the benefit of its area not otherwise permitted under the Local Government Act. Councils are increasingly considering such schemes, as the restrictions on activities empowered by the present Act constrain councils to a set of functions now considered inadequate. In particular, activities for the economic development of council areas are the subject of much debate both here and interstate. Economic development projects by councils are important as they have the potential not only to benefit the area directly through the increased economic activity and employment but also indirectly by reducing council's reliance on rate revenue to maintain their services.

Thebarton council's application was for permission to establish an incorporated body to assist in the economic development of the area. In particular, the incorporated body was envisaged as assisting the council itself to carry out schemes for the development and redevelopment of land. On the advice of my officers I approved the Thebarton council engaging in a scheme of activity under section 383a. The terms of this approval were:

The Corporation of the Town of Thebarton (the corporation) will subject to the provisions of the Associations Incorporation Act or the Companies (South Australia) Code constitute a body corporate which subject to the general direction and control of the Corporation of the Town of Thebarton will have the following objectives:

- (a) to undertake in relation to the redevelopment of the town, the preparation of schemes under section 382d of the Local Government Act 1934 and the subsequent implementation and management of such schemes;
- (b) to undertake such activities as are required to stimulate the social, economic and environmental redevelopment of the town;
- (c) to actively seek the establishment of organisations that foster and promote the economic development of the town;
- (d) to facilitate the establishment or relocation to the town of employment intensive enterprises;
- (e) to provide, or participate in arrangements for provision of, services and facilities in the town;
- (f) to foster and undertake development of the built form as part of a continuing program to enhance the image of Thebarton.

The scheme will benefit the residents of the area of the corporation by encouraging the economic development of the area, thereby improving its social, physical and commercial environment.

The scheme will be financed from the revenue of the corporation, grants and subsidies received and income earned from undertakings entered into by the proposed body corporate.

The approval verified a set of development activities which the council would be empowered to carry out through its chosen vehicle—either a company or an incorporated association. I have now received legal advice that there is some doubt as to whether the set of objectives contained in the approval was sufficiently discrete and identifiable for approval to be given under section 383a; that is, the Crown Solicitor has raised the question of whether the approval sufficiently defined the activity to be approved. I believe that the previous advice of my officers may have been deficient in that the activities which the company was to be empowered to undertake were perhaps too broadly defined. However, I understand that the council was concerned lest the scheme unduly constrained the development that could be carried out. Obviously, these issues are matters for judgment and the lack of previous approvals prevented any reference to precedent.

I believe that the legislation requires clarification, and the growing interest of councils in undertaking activities beyond those presently authorised by the Local Government Act requires a better mechanism to facilitate and evaluate such

proposals. The review of the rating and finance provisions of the Local Government Act will provide the opportunity for the legislation to be reviewed later in this session of Parliament. These matters are very important to local government, and I look forward to constructive consideration of the Government's proposals which have been developed in conjunction with local government.

There were, however, more serious problems in the implementation of the approved scheme for Thebarton. Once the approval was gazetted the council was empowered to implement the scheme, and the Mayor and Town Clerk formed themselves into a company called the Thebarton Development Corporation Pty Ltd. The single objective of that company was:

to implement and manage redevelopment schemes for and on behalf of the Corporation of the Town of Thebarton either alone or jointly with any other person natural or otherwise and in so doing the company shall have the rights powers and privileges conferred by the Companies (South Australia) Code in a company.

It is obvious that there is a difference between this objective and the objectives approved for the scheme.

The power of the company to implement and manage redevelopment schemes for and on behalf of the council is not, like objective (a) of the scheme, limited to assisting the council to undertake redevelopment schemes under section 382d of the Local Government Act. Objectives (b) and (f) inclusive of the scheme do not appear in the memorandum of Thebarton Development Corporation Pty Ltd. I have received legal advice that these variations from the terms of my approval are significant, and there is some doubt whether the council has, by incorporating Thebarton Development Corporation Pty Ltd, given effect to the approved scheme. I should at this point state that I have no reason to believe that this apparent breach of the terms of my approval was anything other than inadvertent.

A second issue raised has been a concern that the directors of the company would not be subject to the provisions of the Local Government Act. The proposed constitution referred to in the council's public advertisement of the proposed scheme, as required under the Local Government Act, had conflict of interest provisions for directors similar to those for council members under the Local Government Act. For example, the proposed constitution required members of the corporation to disclose their interest in contracts to be considered by the corporation and not to take part in any decision of the corporation in a matter in which she or he had an interest. A member who failed to comply with these provisions was subject to dismissal by the Minister of Local Government. The same power to dismiss applied to a member of the corporation participating in the profits as director of another company contracting with the corporation.

The company which was eventually incorporated under the approved scheme did not reflect the constitution as it was originally proposed and publicly notified. In particular, directors were not disqualified from contracting with the Thebarton Development Corporation, nor were they disqualified from voting in respect of contracts in which they were interested. Unlike the proposed constitution, the Minister has no powers to remove directors of the corporation. These changes are significant, and I am advised that the means by which they were amended are also significant.

The changes to the Minister's role were in part attributable to the suggestion of my officers. It has been the Government's consistent position that councils should be responsible for their own affairs within the provisions of the Local Government Act. It was therefore considered more appropriate for the council which appoints the direc-

tors to exercise the disciplinary powers over the company and its directors, and the approval of the scheme was based on this understanding. These changes were made in accordance with the Minister's power to vary schemes under section 383a (10). Other changes, particularly to the conflict of interest provisions, were made by the council in drawing up the articles of association of the Thebarton corporation.

In particular, the changes to the directors' responsibilities are important, as the provisions of the Companies Code in relation to the duties of directors, while continuing the apparent freedom of the directors under the existing articles, are not as stringent as the Local Government Act in relation to personal interest. I do not believe that the provisions of section 383a of the Local Government Act should be used to provide for a lower standard of responsibility for elected members and officers of councils than required elsewhere in the Act.

I am advised that these differences in the conflict of interest provisions between the proposed scheme as advertised and the constitution of the Thebarton Development Corporation are significant enough to cast some doubt as to whether section 383a has been complied with in relation to the approved scheme. That is, the changes to the constitution of the company may be large enough to have warranted readvertising of the scheme to ensure the community was properly informed of the council's intentions.

One should note, however, that the whole intention of section 383a is to provide a way for councils to engage in activities that the Act does not otherwise allow. Therefore, in one sense that section is there to allow councils to 'get around the provisions of the Local Government Act', but I do not believe this should apply to the standards required of councils and their members in matters such as disclosure of personal interest and financial accountability.

On the basis of these legal questions as to whether the approved scheme had been complied with, my officers commenced discussions with the council. One option which was considered was to alter the Memorandum and Articles of Thebarton Development Corporation Pty Limited in an attempt to comply with the approved scheme. Changes to the company's Articles of Association to ensure that a director of the company would be liable to account to the company for any profit from any contract with it in which the director had an interest were examined as were changes to ensure directors did not vote on matters in which they were interested.

There was also consideration given to changing the objects of the company to make it clear that the company was to act as an agent of the council. However, the Thebarton council decided not to pursue this option as there were doubts that the amendments proposed would meet the terms of the approval of the scheme. Instead, the Thebarton council at its meeting of 16 June 1987 unanimously decided that the original aims of the Thebarton Development Corporation could best be met by the establishment of a joint development committee between the council and the State Government.

The council resolved to dissolve the Thebarton Development Corporation Pty Limited subject to agreement being reached between the State Government and the council. This committee would be similar to the existing Hindmarsh Development Committee established under section 63 of the Planning Act. Draft terms of reference and proposed membership of the development committee have been provided by the council and are under consideration by my colleague, the Minister for Environment and Planning.

I believe this proposal to be a most suitable resolution to the problems incurred in establishing the Thebarton Development Corporation.

Despite the legal questions and the issues raised publicly and in this place regarding this particular proposal, I believe councils have a major role to play in the economic development of their areas. I look forward to the amendment of the Local Government Act to provide a clearer set of criteria and a streamlined mechanism to permit councils to better engage in the economic and social development of their areas.

GRAND PRIX

The Hon. K.T. GRIFFIN: My question is directed to the Attorney-General. As the chief law officer of the Crown and in the light of statements this week that a Government agency is proposing that it have power to compulsorily acquire hotel and motel accommodation for a major international event in Australia, does the Attorney-General support such a proposal or does he believe, as a matter of principle, that such a proposal is offensive and draconian and would be a gross breach of civil liberties?

The Hon. C.J. SUMNER: I have only seen the report of this particular matter in the media. It was part of a speech, I understand, that the Director of the Grand Prix, Dr Hemmerling, made to a conference of travel agents in the context of dealing with the problems of accommodation for people in Adelaide during the Grand Prix period. I understand that he pointed out that in other cities where the Grand Prix is held—for instance, Monaco for the Monte Carlo Grand Prix—the organisation running the Grand Prix in effect controls the bookings in hotel and other accommodation in that city for the period of the Grand Prix. He was, as I understand it from media reports, merely raising that as an example of how this situation is dealt with in other places. There is no question that it is a major difficulty to ensure that people are accommodated during the period of the Grand Prix, but I do not wish to make any comment about the matter as the only thing I have seen is the press report on it.

The Hon. K.T. GRIFFIN: I have a supplementary question. Does the Attorney-General agree that such a proposal does raise important questions of principle and, if so, does he support the proposal which was being aired by the director of a Government agency?

The Hon. C.J. SUMNER: Madam President, the honourable member seems to have a fixation about the Grand Prix. He never liked it; he did not want it. He fought it every inch of the way through this Chamber. Every time it comes up, the Hon. Mr Griffin has to find something about the Grand Prix to knock it. He has been doing it ever since the legislation was introduced into the Parliament.

The Hon. K.T. Griffin: You are afraid to answer the question.

The Hon. C.J. SUMNER: I am not afraid to answer the question.

The PRESIDENT: Order!

The Hon. C.J. SUMNER: It just astonishes me. The only thing the honourable member can do in this Chamber, as he has in the past, is to knock the Grand Prix. He did it when the legislation was introduced. He took it to a conference and battled it all the way through the conference.

The Hon. K.T. Griffin interjecting:

The Hon. C.J. SUMNER: Well, he does not like it when his actions with respect to the Grand Prix are gone over.

The Hon. K.T. Griffin: It is just distorting—

The Hon. C.J. SUMNER: Well, you know what you have done with the Grand Prix—

The PRESIDENT: Order!

The Hon. C.J. SUMNER:—and you have fought it all the way. That is the fact of the matter.

Members interjecting:

The PRESIDENT: Order!

The Hon. C.J. SUMNER: You attempted in this Chamber—

The PRESIDENT: Any answer will be addressed through the Chair, please, Mr Minister.

The Hon. C.J. SUMNER: Absolutely. I agree, Madam President. You will have to stop the honourable member from interjecting.

The PRESIDENT: I very nearly disallowed the question as supplementary questions are supposed to arise from the answer which has been previously given.

The Hon. C.J. SUMNER: In any event, the Hon. Mr Griffin has never been particularly enthusiastic about the Grand Prix. We have him again asking a question about it in a negative sort of carping way. I answered it initially and he comes back again. He is not satisfied with his first lot of carping but comes back with a second lot. I have said that I will not comment on the—

The Hon. K.T. Griffin: It is too difficult for you.

The Hon. C.J. SUMNER: It is not difficult at all. I am not going to comment on what Dr Hemmerling said. I have not seen in detail what he said except the press report of it. I have indicated that that sort of thing apparently occurs in other cities where the Grand Prix is held. I imagine if Dr Hemmerling wished to take this matter any further, he would approach the Government with a proposal but that has not happened as far as I am aware, so I have no intention of commenting on a hypothetical situation.

SOUTH AUSTRALIAN GOVERNMENT TRAVEL CENTRE

The Hon. CAROLYN PICKLES: I seek leave to make a brief statement before directing a question to the Minister of Tourism regarding the South Australian Government Travel Centre.

Leave granted.

The Hon. CAROLYN PICKLES: In the *News* of 3 August 1987, the Opposition spokesperson on tourism, Ms Jennifer Cashmore, has yet again taken another swipe at the South Australian Tourism Centre. Her carping continues, and I hope that today we can finally put a rest to it.

Members interjecting:

The Hon. CAROLYN PICKLES: It is a fact. She is carping.

Members interjecting:

The PRESIDENT: Order!

The Hon. CAROLYN PICKLES: I have used the services of the South Australian Tourism Centre on a number of occasions. I am not known to the staff of that centre and I have always found them to be courteous, helpful and extremely informative, and I have had no hesitation whatsoever in directing my many visitors and friends from interstate and overseas to use those services. Quite frankly, I am appalled at this latest allegation about inefficiencies and that they are messing about there.

The Hon. M.J. ELLIOTT: A point of order, Ms President, I do not believe that one can give opinions when one is asking questions.

The PRESIDENT: I agree. No opinions shall be expressed when asking a question.

The Hon. CAROLYN PICKLES: Yes, Ms President. I hope that other members will take notice of your ruling on this. I will go straight to the question. Will the Minister of

Tourism comment on the number of complaints that allegedly have been received about the Travel Centre in the past few months, particularly the letter in the paper that was criticised by Ms Cashmore? Will the Minister comment on the statement by the Opposition tourism spokesperson that the review of the Department of Tourism had been in train for months and that it was time to stop messing around (as the spokesperson puts it) with reviews and get down to a whole new look for the South Australian Travel Centre, starting with the shopfront?

The Hon. BARBARA WIESE: I will be very happy to comment on this because I, too, share the Hon. Ms Pickles' contempt for the statements that have been made yet again regurgitating allegations that were made during the last session of Parliament about the work of the people in the South Australian Travel Centre. The people who work in that place are very dedicated public servants who do a very good job for a very large number of people who pass through their doors. The sort of allegations and criticisms that come constantly from the shadow Minister of Tourism are not only unwarranted and unfair but are very destructive to the atmosphere in which these people work and the morale of the people in the Travel Centre.

It is quite outrageous that she has done these things during the past few months when they were unwarranted and when there were attacks being made on public servants who cannot answer for themselves. These attacks were not really designed to make a point about the individuals in that place and the things that they were doing but were used as a method of getting at the Minister and of scoring political points, whether that be inside or outside the Parliament. It is outrageous that this sort of attack should continue on these people who are doing a good job. As a measure of the anger—

The Hon. L.H. Davis interjecting:

The PRESIDENT: Order!

The Hon. BARBARA WIESE: As a measure—

The Hon. L.H. Davis interjecting:

The PRESIDENT: Order, Mr Davis.

The Hon. BARBARA WIESE: As a measure of the anger and frustration that some of these people feel about these things honourable members might be interested to know that this morning I received a petition from the ground floor staff of the South Australian Travel Centre who have no other way of voicing their frustration about what is going on than to write to me. All members here should have access to this, and I will read the petition to honourable members because it indicates how the staff in the Department of Tourism feel about the criticisms that have been made of them. This petition, signed by 17 staff who work in the ground floor office, states:

We, the undersigned, are members of the South Australian Government Travel Centre who strongly object to the comments raised by the member for Coles, the Hon. J.L. Cashmore, as printed in the *News* on Monday 3 August 1987. To choose a time when Adelaide is hosting hundreds of travel and tourism delegates here for the AFTA Convention to gain political mileage is irresponsible and detrimental to tourism in South Australia.

The complaint referred to in the *News* was in fact resolved to the satisfaction of the client and did not involve a member of the staff. To publicly condemn and embarrass a trainee work experience student is unwarranted and unnecessary. To have such articles released through the media does not enhance staff morale and seriously affects both their personality and performance.

We consider it offensive that a person in such a responsible public position as a shadow Minister should propagate allegations of 'inefficiency and rudeness', particularly as we take personal pride in maintaining high standards of service and information accuracy. The claim that our office has received 'repeated public complaints' is unwarranted in light of the high volume of inquiry in the Travel Centre. In this financial year (from 1 July) we have attended to 18 669 clients, made 502 new bookings and sold 1 242 day tour seats. In the same period we have received only one

letter of complaint, which did not even involve a member of our staff.

We protest at the unfair attack on the staff, to which we, as public servants, have no right of reply. We are also the only office in Australia that provides a visitor information and booking service 364 days a year. We implore the shadow Minister 'to give us a fair go' as further 'media bashing' will destroy the excellent reputation that we have established. After all we, like politicians, are only human.

I ask members opposite to heed that because it is very important that these people be given a fair go. Members opposite and members of another place should take heed of the message from the staff that is given to them through me.

The Hon. Diana Laidlaw: Were you aware that it was being prepared—

The Hon. BARBARA WIESE: No, I was not. I certainly had nothing to do with it and I was not—

Members interjecting:

The PRESIDENT: Order!

The Hon. BARBARA WIESE: Ms President, I certainly had nothing to do with the preparation of—

The Hon. L.H. Davis interjecting:

The PRESIDENT: Order, Mr Davis.

The Hon. BARBARA WIESE: I was not aware of the preparation of the petition and I certainly had nothing to do with it.

The Hon. Diana Laidlaw interjecting:

The Hon. L.H. Davis interjecting:

The PRESIDENT: Order! Mr Davis, I warn you. If you interject again I will be forced to name you.

The Hon. Diana Laidlaw interjecting:

The Hon. BARBARA WIESE: That is just the way that they decided to present it. I cannot help that.

The Hon. Diana Laidlaw interjecting:

The Hon. L.H. Davis interjecting:

The PRESIDENT: Order! Mr Davis, I have warned you twice. You now have a formal warning.

The Hon. Diana Laidlaw interjecting:

The Hon. BARBARA WIESE: What are you suggesting?

The PRESIDENT: Order, Ms Laidlaw.

The Hon. BARBARA WIESE: Are you suggesting that the 17 people who signed this have not been genuine in the things that they are doing? If you are—

The Hon. Diana Laidlaw interjecting:

The PRESIDENT: Order, Ms Laidlaw.

The Hon. BARBARA WIESE: If you are, then I am sure that they would like to know about it.

The Hon. C.J. Sumner interjecting:

The PRESIDENT: Order, the Attorney.

The Hon. BARBARA WIESE: I would like to reiterate that I think that this headline grabbing that has been pursued by the member for Coles at the expense of public servants who cannot reply for themselves is outrageous. I would like to add to the information that is included in that petition from those people about the work that they were doing during the month of July, which was the month during which the allegation was made about poor service. In July, which is traditionally a quiet month in South Australia, the Travel Centre had 18 680 visitors and 1 307 visitors on the busiest day of that month. As has already been indicated, only one complaint was received during that time and that complaint was about a work experience student who was working in the department.

I think that this is an important opportunity that we provide for young people who are interested in pursuing a career in tourism, to give them a chance to come into the Travel Centre, to become more familiar with the tourism product and to give them an opportunity to speak with visitors to South Australia. It just so happens that on that

occasion that work experience student did not perform as well as one might have hoped.

However, for the member for Coles to bash that young person at a very vulnerable time in his career is also quite despicable and should be condemned by all members in this place. During that period of time where that one complaint was received we also received three letters and two telephone calls of commendation about individuals in the Travel Centre, complimenting them on the work that they do. Concerning the second point that was raised by the Hon. Ms Pickles about the review of the Department of Tourism, it seems that here again the member for Coles is a bit schizophrenic about these things. Some months ago she agreed with me that a review of the Department of Tourism was a good thing.

Now, a couple of months down the track, she seems to have changed her mind about that. Ms President, I am not as scatty as that, and I like to follow things through. Certainly, I believed that early this year a review of the department was necessary because we needed to be sure that our services were being provided in a way that would maximise the benefit to this State of the tourism growth currently taking place in Australia.

The review that I established has been working diligently since then and, in fact, has produced a number of recommendations already that have been acted on. For the member for Coles to talk about the inordinate length of time that has been taken is quite outrageous when one considers that the last review of the Department of Tourism took place when she was the Minister of Tourism. It was established in May 1980, and it finished in October—it took five months. There was no action in the meantime and all we had at the end of five months was a big fat report. It took ages for the recommendations to be implemented.

What is happening with the review that I have established is that so far it has taken four months. I hope that the final report of the review committee will be with me some time next week but, in the meantime, the committee has already made a number of recommendations to me which have been progressively implemented. Changes are already being made within the organisation to improve the development of services.

So, the claims that have been made by the member for Coles are quite unwarranted and unreasonable, and I would call on her and other members of her Party to be much more responsible about the way in which they deal with tourism issues in this State. It is an important industry to this State, and for these people to be constantly putting down people who are doing the best job that they can, and very efficiently, I might say, in the interests of tourism in South Australia is quite outrageous. It is very destructive and the people of this State will not put up with that much longer.

The Hon. L.H. DAVIS: Ms President, I ask the Minister to table the document from which she quoted, together with figures.

The PRESIDENT: The call is to the Hon. Mr Elliott.

KINDERGARTENS AND CHILD-PARENT CENTRES

The Hon. M.J. ELLIOTT: I seek leave to make a brief explanation before asking the Minister of Tourism, representing the Minister of Education, a question about the staffing of kindergartens and child-parent centres.

Leave granted.

The Hon. M.J. ELLIOTT: According to the 1985 election documents from the Labor Party, it promised to maintain

and develop equality of preschool education and to work towards an optimum staff child ratio of 1:10 by 1989. The documents note that the Labor Party made progress towards that in its first term of office. On 8 April this year I asked some questions of the Minister of Education to which I subsequently received a reply in terms of staff levels and the number of four year olds in South Australia.

What has happened from 1986 to 1987 is that the number of four year olds in South Australia has increased by 700, while the number of full-time equivalent teachers has dropped by 11. In real terms that is a decline in staff of about 40. That appears to be a drift away from policy. I have also observed first hand as a parent of young children that kindergartens now are taking children much later than they used to. Even when they do get in, instead of getting the four days to which they are entitled, they get less than that. Therefore, I ask the following questions: first, is this late admission, and cutting down the number of days on entitlement, an attempt to produce an artificially favourable ratio? Secondly, will the forthcoming budget rectify the trend away from stated policy? Thirdly, will the practice of delayed enrolment and less than entitlement days cease?

The Hon. BARBARA WIESE: I will refer those questions to my colleague in another place and bring back a reply.

BANKRUPTCIES

The Hon. DIANA LAIDLAW: I seek leave to make a short explanation before asking the Attorney-General a question about bankruptcies.

Leave granted.

The Hon. DIANA LAIDLAW: Last financial year South Australia recorded 1 354 bankruptcies which, as the Hon. Legh Davis indicated in press comment, is a 47 per cent increase compared with last year and double the figure in 1984-85. Banks, financial institutions, credit unions and retail outlets that have spoken to me on this subject are alarmed by the rising level of bad debts and bankruptcies. However, with bad debts all of these funding and lending sources have claimed that they face a further problem: for an increasing number of people bankruptcy has become an easy option. Most lending sources are critical of the role of counsellors and have also highlighted to me information which is contained in the Legal Services Commission booklet on bankruptcy and which has a large section giving examples of people who might benefit from bankruptcy.

The claims of these lending and financial institutions may be well founded considering the large and increasing number of people who are going bankrupt owing a relatively small sum of \$1 000 or \$2 000. This is unusual in terms of the history of bankruptcies in this State. I understand that about three months ago leading lending institutions in this State drew their concerns to the attention of the Premier who, as a consequence, asked the Attorney-General to look into the matter.

Is it correct that the Premier has asked the Attorney to investigate the concerns of lending institutions in this State? If that is so, what is the state of that report? Have the investigators considered proclaiming the Debts Repayment Bill, which passed this Parliament in 1978? I ask that question because it has been suggested to me that this is one course of action that the Attorney-General's Department may have been looking at. Finally, if such an investigation has not been undertaken, when will the Government deign to recognise and respond to the severity of the bad debt problem in this State?

The Hon. C.J. SUMNER: As the honourable member would know, bankruptcy law is a law of the Federal Parlia-

ment and in that sense it is not a matter over which this Parliament has jurisdiction. I think that some approaches have been made to the Premier by lending institutions. Also, there have been approaches by representatives of debtors who are concerned about the policies of lending institutions. With the deregulated financial markets and the current increased competition to lend money to people, it has been put to me that some of the policies of lending institutions are too easy with respect to the giving of credit. Therefore, it is not just a matter of individuals going bankrupt and, as the honourable member has suggested, it being the responsibility of those individuals exclusively. Lending institutions, too, have some responsibility to ensure that their policies do not lead people into situations where they ultimately have to seek bankruptcy.

So, two queries came forward. One was on behalf of debtors for an examination of the situation, and it was suggested that there should be a meeting between debtor organisations and lending institutions to try to examine the issue. I am not sure whether the other request came specifically from lending institutions, but it was referred to me by the Premier and it related to some of the difficulties in this area which are being put together with a view to organising a meeting of debtor organisations and lending institutions.

With respect to the debts repayment legislation, the main problem has been the cost of its implementation. It may be possible to implement some of it but it will not be possible to implement the important part which requires additional staff. In any event, the Federal Government is currently looking at the whole question of insolvency and the payment of small debts, based on a national Law Reform Commission report. So it is probably not wise to proceed with our debts repayment legislation in view of possible action by the Federal Government. Apart from budgetary difficulties the Federal Attorney-General has indicated that he is studying the report on small debts at national level given that, as I said, bankruptcy is a matter for Federal Parliament.

ORDER OF AUSTRALIA AWARDS

The Hon. M.S. FELEPPA: I seek leave to make a statement before asking the Minister of Ethnic Affairs a question about Order of Australia awards.

Leave granted.

The Hon. M.S. FELEPPA: My question relates particularly to ethnic men and women of non-Anglo Saxon origin. An examination of the Order of Australia honours lists from 1983 onwards indicates that both the State and Federal Governments have come a long way over the past few years in their recognition of the ability and tremendous contribution that ethnic people have made to this country and will continue to make in helping to build Australia into a great nation. In the Order of Australia honours list published on 11 June 1983, of a total of 158 recipients Australia-wide only 13 were ethnic people and none of that number came from South Australia.

A similar list was published just 12 months later on 11 June 1984, and of the 207 recipients 22 were of ethnic origin and two of this number came from South Australia. I could go through all honours lists from 1983 until now but in the interest of brevity, which I am sure that you would appreciate, Madam President, I will confine my remarks to the most recent lists of 9 June 1986, 26 January 1987 and 8 June 1987. On 9 June 1986, 325 people Australia-wide received an award of one type or another. Of

this total 44 were of ethnic origin but, disappointingly from my point of view and I am sure from the point of view of many of my associates, only three of that number were from South Australia. The Australian honours list published on 26 January 1987 recognised 265 people Australia-wide, but only four people of ethnic origin from South Australia received recognition. Similarly, on 8 June 1987, of a total of 309 recipients only 29 could be considered to be of ethnic origin, and of that number only three were from South Australia.

Therefore, in view of the number of ethnic people who reside in this State and the tremendous contribution that many of them make in the fields of sport, community service, education and many other areas and given what must be considered the very small number of ethnic people who have received an Australian honour, would the Minister of Ethnic Affairs please tell me how many persons of ethnic origin had their names forwarded to the Government in 1986 and 1987 for consideration for this honour and on whose advice the Government decided who would be nominated for an Australian honour?

An honourable member interjecting:

The Hon. M.S. Feleppa: It is a fair question and I am sure the Minister does not mind.

The PRESIDENT: Order!

Members interjecting:

The PRESIDENT: Order!

The Hon. R.I. Lucas interjecting:

The PRESIDENT: Order! Mr Lucas, I have twice called for order.

The Hon. C.J. SUMNER: Recommendations for Order of Australia awards are not made by the South Australian Government or indeed by anyone in South Australia; they are made by the Order of Australia Council, which is chaired by the Chief Justice of the High Court of Australia and has membership from a number of walks of life in the Australian community. Obviously some people from South Australia participate on that council, including the Deputy Director of the Premier's Department in South Australia. However, the South Australian Government does not make appointments to awards in the Order of Australia—that is done by the Order of Australia Council. Anyone in the community is entitled to nominate a person for such an order, and many people in the community do that. No doubt members of Parliament are occasionally asked to endorse a recommendation to the Order of Australia Council. On the whole, these nominations do not come from the South Australian Government, but from time to time individual Ministers or members of Parliament may put forward people for nomination. I think that needs to be clarified.

I certainly agree with the honourable member that there should be proper recognition, through the Order of Australia awards, of the work done by all sections of the community. If we are to have such an award system, the people who receive the awards should come from the whole community irrespective of their background. Unfortunately, with any award system there is always criticism of the decisions that are made.

The Hon. Diana Laidlaw: Like the President's criticism after the last awards were made.

The Hon. C.J. SUMNER: The President decided that an insufficient number of women were receiving awards. The Hon. Mr Feleppa has said that an insufficient number of people of ethnic origin receive these awards.

The Hon. R.J. Ritson: And an insufficient number of South Australians.

The Hon. C.J. SUMNER: That is right—of ethnic minority origin. There has always been criticism in relation to

people receiving awards, either because some people get them when others in the community do not think they should have them or because some people in the community have had their names put forward but have not received an award. The South Australian Government has no right of veto over who receives an award. South Australia has one person through Mr Holland on the Order of Australia Council, but he is only one person amongst many. Obviously even if he directly represented the South Australian Government he could not veto recommendations made by the Order of Australia Council.

I think the best thing that I can do is refer the honourable member's question to the Order of Australia Council for comment or any action that it thinks is appropriate. I should say to the honourable member that I agree that the Orders ought to be representative in the sense that they are given to people throughout the whole of the South Australian community and that many people of ethnic minority origin have done sufficient community work to receive recognition by way of one of these awards. As the honourable member knows, a number of people from ethnic minority background, including the honourable member himself, have received an award from the Order of Australia Council. Certainly, these awards should be available to all people in the community. That is the first point I make.

The second point is that it is up to anyone in the community to nominate someone for such an order, including anyone in the Parliament. So, to some extent the awards that are made, as I understand it, are based on the nominations that are received.

The Hon. L.H. DAVIS: I move:

That all documents, including the petition referred to by the Minister of Tourism in response to the question by the Hon. Ms Pickles, be tabled.

The Hon. C.J. Sumner: It's a bit late.

The Hon. L.H. Davis: It is a procedural point and I was ignored by the Chair.

The Hon. C.J. Sumner: You were out of order.

The Hon. L.H. Davis: I was not.

The Hon. BARBARA WIESE: Madam President, I want to solve this problem that we seem to have here. I indicate that I am very happy to table the documents if the Hon. Mr Davis would like to withdraw his motion. Then you, Madam President, will not have the problem of deciding whether or not it is out of order.

Members interjecting:

The PRESIDENT: We are now having questions without notice and notices of motion. A notice of motion could of course be given, or alternatively the Minister could be asked to table certain documents. Either procedure would be in order under the order of business which we are following. I understand that the Minister is happy to table the documents. Perhaps she could seek leave of the Council to table the petition, which leave presumably the Council would be happy to give her.

The Hon. BARBARA WIESE: I seek leave of the Council to table the petition. I must say that, in doing so, I am rather concerned about the names of the individuals who have signed that petition. As I understand it, they have no concern about the contents of the petition being made public because they feel very strongly about the issue. As to whether or not individuals' names should be tabled in this place, I am not convinced—

Members interjecting:

The PRESIDENT: Order! Is the honourable Minister seeking leave to table the document without the signatures, or does she seek leave to table the entire document? The Minister can seek leave to do what she likes. The Council can grant leave or not grant it.

The Hon. BARBARA WIESE: I seek leave to table the document.

Leave granted.

PRIVATE PARKING AREAS

The Hon. J.C. BURDETT: I seek leave to make a brief explanation prior to directing a question to the Minister of Local Government on the subject of private parking areas.

Leave granted.

The Hon. J.C. BURDETT: The Private Parking Areas Act 1986 was assented to on 18 December 1986. In terms of the Act, it comes into operation on a date to be proclaimed. However, it has not yet been proclaimed, unless it was proclaimed today, because I have not been able to check on that.

The Bill for the Act was obviously introduced because the Government perceived a need to provide adequate control over private parking areas. No doubt it was lobbied by persons who owned or had access to the areas in question. The need was simple. It was a need to provide protection for people who owned, lived in or used such premises and who found that their own parking areas were abused by people who had no legitimate cause to do so.

I have no doubt that the reason why the Act has not yet been brought into operation is that the regulations have not yet been prepared. I have perused the regulation making power. It appears to me that the regulations would not be of a very complex or voluminous nature and would not require a great deal of time or consultation in drafting. Constituents involved in this situation have brought to my notice problems which they are experiencing and which could be overcome by the Act. Can the Minister say what are the reasons for the delay and when the proclamation of the Act and the requisite regulations can be expected?

The Hon. BARBARA WIESE: I am not absolutely certain what the delay has been caused by, but I presume that it has to do with the workload of Parliamentary Counsel in being able to draft the regulations. I will certainly make inquiries about that and see whether the process can be hastened, because I assure the honourable members concerned that the Act and regulations should be proclaimed as soon as possible.

MINIMUM RATE

The Hon. J.C. IRWIN: I seek leave to make a brief explanation before asking the Minister of Tourism a question relating to the minimum rate.

Leave granted.

The Hon. J.C. IRWIN: I do not relish asking another question in this place on minimum rates, but in mid June I attended a Spencer Gulf cities meeting in Port Pirie. The meeting was also attended by two senior Government Ministers, namely, the Hon. Gavin Keneally and the Hon. Frank Blevins. Both Ministers attacked local government on the issue of the minimum rate. Both Ministers were obviously well prepared. I was sitting beside them and I could see that they had been well prepared.

The Minister of Transport, Mr Keneally, for instance, told the meeting that 'a legal challenge might overthrow the minimum rate at any time'. Mr Keneally pointed to a 1976 court challenge and, I might add, some other challenges to the minimum rate which was upheld in Victoria, and said 'The same result was highly probable in South Australia.' When I commented publicly on the remarks made by these

Ministers, or by Mr Keneally, the Minister of Local Government described my remarks as 'repetitious rhetoric'. She said:

It is the sort of attack that the Opposition indulges in when it knows that its allegations lack credibility.

I remind the Minister and the Council that any remarks about the legality of the minimum rate were made not by me but by the Minister's senior colleagues, and not once did the Minister of Transport or the Minister of Labour differentiate between the minimum rate and its size. That is important to an understanding of this issue. My questions are:

1. Has the Minister ever told the Local Government Association that the minimum rate may be illegal?

2. Was she aware that the Minister of Transport and the Minister of Labour were to make remarks in Port Pirie about the possible illegality of the minimum rate, given that such statements could be highly misleading?

3. Will the Minister dissociate herself from the public remarks made by her two senior colleagues and let people in the Spencer Gulf cities area and in the Local Government Association know that the minimum rate is not illegal?

The Hon. BARBARA WIESE: I will not dissociate myself from any remarks made by my colleagues at meetings in Spencer Gulf cities because I do not know what remarks were made. I am certain that, because they are both very responsible Ministers, they would not have said anything that should not have been said on the issue of the minimum rate or, for that matter, on any other issue to which they might have addressed remarks.

I have addressed the question of the legality or otherwise of the minimum rate with members of the Local Government Association on a number of occasions, including regional meetings, when I indicated to those members present that there was a question about the legality of the minimum rate. In view of—

The Hon. J.C. Irwin: The rate itself or the amount of the rate? Do you know the difference?

The Hon. BARBARA WIESE: Yes. There is some question about the use of the minimum rate by some councils, in view of a number of decisions of Australian courts, the most recent of which was handed down by a Victorian court some months ago. So, I have certainly drawn the attention of members of the Local Government Association, at regional meetings and at the regular monthly meetings that I have with senior members of that association, to that possibility. The question whether the use of the minimum rate by some councils in South Australia is legal has not been tested. Certainly, however, a conclusion could be drawn from the cases that have been tested (the most recent of which was in Victoria) that it may be possible for an action to be successful in a South Australian court. I understand that the Local Government Association at its own meetings has discussed the issue and that there is some concern about the status of the minimum rate and the way in which it has been applied in some areas.

I do not think that the minimum rate itself can be called into question legally, but it appears that a judgment is to be made about the size of the minimum rate coupled with the number of assessments to which it might apply and that this raises the doubt about its legality. I know that some sections of the Local Government Association are concerned about this matter, and I hope that it will be addressed in further discussions.

WORKERS COMPENSATION

The Hon. R.J. RITSON: I seek leave to make a brief explanation before directing a question to the Attorney-

General, representing the Minister of Labour, on the subject of workers compensation.

Leave granted.

The Hon. R.J. RITSON: In his opening speech, His Excellency the Governor today referred to 30 September as the commencing date of the operation of new laws relating to workers compensation. The business community, through discussion and by word of mouth, is aware that that is so. I have been approached by constituents who are small employers in low risk businesses and who are aware that, when the WorkCare scheme came into effect in Victoria, large numbers of employers were required to pay a great deal more in premiums than they had previously paid, despite Government assurances in that State, by the divisive classification of the type of employment and the degree of risk. Without seeking to argue the issue—

The PRESIDENT: Order! The honourable member will not argue anything in a question.

The Hon. R.J. RITSON: I did not invite that comment; I did not express any opinion. I said that, without seeking to argue that issue, it is a fact that constituents are concerned to know what their premiums will be. Can the Government state when businesses will know at what level they are to be levied to cover their workers so that appropriate budgetary calculations can be made in the conduct of those businesses?

The Hon. C.J. SUMNER: I will refer the question to the Minister of Labour and bring back a reply.

REPLIES TO QUESTIONS

The Hon. C.J. SUMNER: I seek leave to incorporate in *Hansard* the following answers to questions already answered by letter.

Leave granted.

CRIMINAL CONVICTIONS

In reply to the **Hon. K.T. GRIFFIN** (31 March).

The Hon. C.J. SUMNER: I refer to your question on the above topic on 31 March 1987 in the Legislative Council. I undertook to provide you with details of the police administrative system of expunction.

The Police Department's current procedures are contained in the enclosed M. 3 Division policy statement No. 14. This statement is a refinement of the procedures which have existed for a number of years. There has been a need to refine current record keeping practices to facilitate the change to automated record keeping under the Justice Information System.

Essentially the current system works in this way. Offences have been grouped into three categories. These categories correspond roughly to the classifications given in the investigation process, i.e., serious crimes category 'A', less serious category 'B' and other offences category 'C'. Category 'A' offences are held on file until the offender dies or reaches the age of 80 years. Category 'B' are held for 10 years after the finding of guilt. Category 'C' are held for five years after the finding of guilt. If there are no subsequent court proceedings the record for such offence is said to be expunged. That is to say it is held for police investigations or if necessary released for court proceedings. An expunged record is not released for any other purpose. At this stage no record cards have been destroyed. Record cards which contain only culled or expunged records have been removed from the main file.

In those cases where an individual seeks information from the Police Department on what record is held, records which relate to expunged convictions are not released. If the expunged record has been reactivated through subsequent re-offending, the full record is disclosed. Individuals who have previously sought information about their records, which have now been expunged under the current policy, are being advised that the Police Department no longer maintains a criminal record on them.

ON-THE-SPOT TOBACCO FINES

In reply to the **Hon. K.T. GRIFFIN** (16 June).

The Hon. C.J. SUMNER: While the liability to be sued for the recovery of the \$200 expiation fee arises two months from the date of the notice, the Commissioner of Stamps, after consultation with the Crown Solicitor's Office, and in view of relevant High Court action, has deferred civil proceedings to recover these amounts in respect of those persons who have received an expiation notice but have not continued to breach the legislation.

This action would seem to be a practical approach bearing in mind that in the recent action against BHBS Pty Ltd, the court, in response to an application by the defendant to defer proceedings pending a High Court ruling in a Victorian tobacco case, deferred the matter for three months.

The Commissioner of Stamps has received a number of submissions seeking that the expiation fee be waived. It is evident that before any expiation fee can be waived, substantiation of these claims will be necessary as the incidence of the number of purchases for interstate use, as gifts (although 'to consume' includes 'to give away') for long-term storage, is quite unrealistic.

Purchasers of tobacco products are required to sign a statement containing two relevant paragraphs clearly printed in normal size type:

2. I understand that South Australian law prohibits me from consuming these tobacco products without a Consumption Licence.

3. I understand that if . . . or any person acting with my consent consumes these tobacco products contrary to the Tobacco Products (Licensing) Act 1986, I will pay to the State of South Australia the sum of \$200 by way of a civil penalty.

It is to be assumed from the representations made that a large number of purchasers are prepared to sign this statement without reading it and then claim ignorance of the legislative requirements.

To date, only in a few instances where substantiating evidence has been produced, or where it can be shown clearly that the information on which the State Taxation Office has acted is false or incorrect, has the expiation fee been waived. In such cases, the person has been advised.

Those persons who have purchased tobacco products only on a single occasion and have therefore received only one expiation notice will have no further action taken against them at the present time. However, action in cases where repeated offences are detected or in matters other than those arising from the issue of expiation notices, e.g., offences by tobacco traders or by consumers who fail to answer questions they are lawfully required to answer, will be processed and the Crown Solicitor will be requested to take legal action. It is not yet known whether the Crown Solicitor's advise will be to delay these individual actions until the outstanding action against BHBS Pty Ltd has been heard.

Despite the deferrals referred to above, it is possible that issues surrounding the validity of the legislation may be clarified when judgment is handed down on cases which were heard by the High Court at the commencement of

June. Given this possibility, action has not been taken to formally notify or advise people that civil proceedings are being deferred.

OPTICIANS ACT AMENDMENT BILL (No. 2) (1987)

The Hon. G.L. BRUCE: I move:

That the Select Committee on the Bill have power to sit during the present session and that the time for bringing up the report be extended until Tuesday 6 October 1987.

Motion carried.

ABALONE LICENCE FEES

The Hon. PETER DUNN: I seek leave to make a brief explanation before asking the Attorney-General, representing the Treasurer, a question on abalone licence fees.

Leave granted.

The Hon. PETER DUNN: A couple of years ago the Government said that it wanted to control the harvesting of abalone stocks, and it introduced a method of licensing abalone divers. There are about 36 abalone divers in South Australia, and their licences are graduated in relation to their catch. At the moment it costs several hundred dollars per year. However, I recently read with some concern in the paper that the fee was likely to rise to between \$20 000 and \$30 000. With this in mind, my questions are:

1. Is the increase to cover the reduction in Federal grants to this State?

2. How will it preserve the abalone stocks?

The Hon. C.J. SUMNER: I will refer the question to the appropriate Minister and bring back a reply.

SELECT COMMITTEE ON SALE OF LAND BY CARRICK HILL TRUST

The Hon. CAROLYN PICKLES: I move:

That the select committee have power to sit during the present session and that the time for bringing up the report be extended until Tuesday 6 October 1987.

Motion carried.

SELECT COMMITTEE ON ENERGY NEEDS IN SOUTH AUSTRALIA

The Hon. I. GILFILLAN: I move:

That the select committee have power to sit during the present session and that the time for bringing up the report be extended until Wednesday 25 November 1987.

Motion carried.

SESSIONAL COMMITTEES

Sessional committees were appointed as follows:

Standing Orders: The President and the Hons G.L. Bruce, M.B. Cameron, K.T. Griffin, and C.J. Sumner.

Printing: The Hons Peter Dunn, M.S. Feleppa, Carolyn Pickles, R.J. Ritson, and T.G. Roberts.

The Hon. C.J. SUMNER (Attorney-General): I move:

That for this session a library committee not be appointed.

Motion carried.

ADDRESS IN REPLY

The PRESIDENT having laid on the table a copy of the Governor's speech, the Hon C.J. Sumner (Attorney-General) moved:

That a committee consisting of the Hons M.B. Cameron, T. Crothers, J.C. Irwin, G. Weatherill, and C.J. Sumner be appointed to prepare a draft Address in Reply to the speech delivered this day by His Excellency the Governor and to report on the next day of sitting.

Motion carried.

ADJOURNMENT

At 4.8 p.m. the Council adjourned until Tuesday 11 August at 2.15 p.m.