

## LEGISLATIVE COUNCIL

Tuesday 14 February 1989

The **PRESIDENT (Hon. Anne Levy)** took the Chair at 2.15 p.m.

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

## NEW MEMBER

The **PRESIDENT**: I inform the Council that I have here a commission from His Excellency the Governor authorising me to administer the oath or affirmation to members of the Legislative Council. I also produce a letter from the Clerk of the assembly of members held this morning notifying that the assembly of members of both Houses of Parliament has elected Mr Ronald Roy Roberts to fill the vacancy in the Legislative Council caused by the resignation of the Hon. Dr John Cornwall. I ask the Attorney-General and the Leader of the Opposition to escort Mr Roberts to the table to take the Oath of Allegiance.

Mr Ronald Roy Roberts, to whom the Oath of Allegiance was administered by the President, took his seat in the Council as a member, in place of the Hon. Dr John Cornwall (resigned).

## ASSENT TO BILLS

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

Adoption,  
 Australian Formula One Grand Prix Act Amendment,  
 Births, Deaths and Marriages Registration Act Amendment,  
 Boating Act Amendment,  
 Building Act Amendment,  
 Children's Protection and Young Offenders Act Amendment (No. 2),  
 Children's Protection and Young Offenders Act Amendment (No. 3),  
 Co-operatives Act Amendment,  
 Criminal Law Consolidation Act Amendment,  
 Criminal Law (Sentencing) Act Amendment,  
 Dangerous Substances Act Amendment,  
 Election of Senators Act Amendment,  
 Firearms Act Amendment (No. 2),  
 Fisheries Act Amendment,  
 Hide, Skin and Wool Dealers Act Repeal,  
 Judicial Administration (Auxiliary Appointments and Powers),  
 Justices Act Amendment (No. 2),  
 Lifts and Cranes Act Amendment,  
 Local Public Abattoirs Act Repeal,  
 Mining Act Amendment,  
 Powers of Attorney and Agency Act Amendment,  
 Racing Act Amendment (No. 2),  
 Roseworthy Agricultural College Act Amendment,  
 Statutes Amendment (Companies, Securities Industry and Futures Industry—Penalty Notices),  
 Statutes Amendment (Criminal Law Consolidation and Summary Offences),  
 Statutes Amendment (Local Government),  
 Statutes Amendment (Workers Rehabilitation and Compensation),  
 Summary Offences Act Amendment,

Summary Offences Act Amendment (No. 2),  
 Technology Park Adelaide Act Amendment,  
 Trustee Companies.

PETITION: CHURCH BUILDING—YATALA  
LABOUR PRISON

A petition signed by 39 residents of South Australia concerning the need for a church building to be established at Yatala Labour Prison to accommodate a multi-denominational representation of Christians and praying that the Council would ask the Government as a matter of urgency to provide funds for this building, as well as at Mobilong and Cadell, was presented by the Hon. J.C. Burdett.

Petition received.

## PETITION: WANILLA FOREST

A petition signed by 95 residents of South Australia praying that the Council take whatever action is necessary to maintain Wanilla Forest as a commercial operation supplying hardwood to farmers on Eyre Peninsula was presented by the Hon. Peter Dunn.

Petition received.

## PETITION: HELMETS

A petition signed by five residents of South Australia praying that the Council request the Government to legislate for the compulsory wearing of helmets by all bicycle riders and that helmets be available to the public without sales tax was presented by the Hon. Diana Laidlaw.

Petition received.

## PETITION: ADELAIDE PARKLANDS

A petition signed by 66 residents of South Australia praying that the Council request the immediate return of the area in the parklands designated for car parking and direct the Government to introduce legislation to protect the parklands and ensure that no further alienation will occur before the enactment of this legislation was presented by the Hon. I. Gilfillan.

Petition received.

## NEW MEMBER

The **PRESIDENT**: I lay upon the table the minutes of the assembly of members of both Houses held this day to fill a vacancy in the Legislative Council caused by the resignation of the Hon. J.R. Cornwall.

The **Hon. C.J. SUMNER (Attorney-General)**: I move: That the report be printed.  
 Motion carried.

## QUESTIONS ON NOTICE

The **PRESIDENT**: I direct that the following answers to Questions on Notice, as detailed in the schedule which I now table, be distributed and printed in *Hansard*: Nos. 20 and 23 to 36 inclusive.

### GOVERNMENT VEHICLE LICENCE PLATES

20. **The Hon. DIANA LAIDLAW** (on notice) asked the Minister of Tourism: How many vehicles operated by the Department for Community Welfare have had their number plates changed from Government of South Australia to private plates?

**The Hon. BARBARA WIESE:** The vehicle used by the Chief Executive Officer had its number plate recently changed from a Government of South Australia plate to a private plate, in accordance with Cabinet approval in August 1988. However, there are a number of other cars which carry private plates which were approved by the Minister of Transport on 24 October 1983. These plates are transferred from vehicle to vehicle on replacement.

### SUPREME COURT APPLICATIONS

23. **The Hon. K. T. GRIFFIN** (on notice) asked the Attorney-General: For the years ended 30 June 1985, 1986, 1987 and 1988—

1. How many applications were made by the Crown to the Supreme Court for orders that a criminal was—

- (a) an habitual criminal, or
- (b) unable to control his sexual instincts?

2. How many were granted?

3. In respect of what crimes were the applications and any orders made?

**The Hon. C.J. SUMNER:** The reply is as follows:

#### HABITUAL CRIMINAL DECLARATION:

No applications have been made for at least twelve years and during that time no declarations have been made of the Court's own volition.

#### INABILITY TO CONTROL SEXUAL INSTINCTS:

Year ending 30 June 1985—

No applications made.

Year ending 30 June 1986—

Two applications.

One declaration.

Offender A (rape)—No declaration made.

Offender B (Four counts of rape)—Declaration made.

Year ending 30 June 1987—

Three applications.

One declaration.

Offender A (rape)—Declaration made.

Offender B (indecent assault)—No declaration made.

Offender C (unlawful sexual intercourse)—No declaration made.

Year ending 30 June 1988—

One application in respect of an offender who had committed an act of unlawful sexual intercourse. A declaration was made but was ultimately set aside by the Court of Criminal Appeal.

### URANIUM OXIDE

24. **The Hon. I. GILFILLAN** (on notice) asked the Minister of Tourism:

1. Bearing in mind that several metropolitan councils, including Port Adelaide, are declared nuclear free zones, does the Government agree that residents of Adelaide have the right to know of the passage of a hazardous substance such as uranium oxide through the city and suburbs?

2. Will the Government show its sincerity and openness by releasing relevant information (such as dates, times,

mode of transport and route) on the passage and shipment of uranium oxide from Roxby Downs?

**The Hon. BARBARA WIESE:** Details of the transport departure time of the first yellowcake shipment from Roxby Downs to Port Adelaide was made available to the public by the Olympic Dam joint venturers. Further details will be made available for the next shipment. At some stage shipments will become a routine operation every four to six weeks and no announcements of departure times will be made.

### BUS STOPS

25. **The Hon. I. GILFILLAN** (on notice) asked the Minister of Tourism: Considering that the North-East Busway has not achieved any real success in reducing travelling times from the city to the outer suburbs, why did the State Transport Authority agree to buses making an additional stop outside Hackney Depot last year?

**The Hon. BARBARA WIESE:** The request for busway buses to stop at Hackney Road was made by members of the public and workers employed by the State Transport Authority at Hackney Depot (both traffic and engineering staff).

The State Transport Authority did not agree that a stop should be introduced at Hackney, so in November 1986 a notice of dispute was issued by the Australian Tramway and Motor Omnibus Employees Association. Consequent negotiations resulted in an arbitrator being appointed to resolve the issue. His final decision after an interim trial was that the stop would remain until the Hackney Bus Depot is relocated.

### RAIL SERVICE ELECTRIFICATION

26. **The Hon. I. GILFILLAN** (on notice) asked the Minister of Tourism: Earlier this year the Minister of Transport directed that a study be made into the viability of the electrification of the Noarlunga Centre and Gawler Central passenger rail services—

1. Why was the mid 1970 proposal for the electrification of the Noarlunga line abandoned?

2. Was it due to the incompatibility of traction power supply with the prevailing system of signal circuits?

3. Why is the signal being altered now, and will it be compatible for a future electrification proposal?

4. Are the Outer Harbor, Grange and Belair lines to be equipped with this updated signalling, too?

5. What items of equipment were ordered and actually procured for the mid-1970 electrification proposal?

6. What were the value of these contracts?

7. (a) It is noted that the MTT in Tasmania has introduced a Crouzet ticketing system in Hobart and Launceston. Is this system similar to that used in Adelaide and if so do any royalties accrue to the STA or South Australian Government for its use in Tasmania?

(b) Is the Adelaide type of Crouzet System being marketed elsewhere, and, if so, will royalties be payable to the STA or South Australian Government for its use?

8. Was the recent study for an electrification proposal a 'knee-jerk' reaction by the South Australian Government to the fact that since last year Perth is now committed to the electrification of its three suburban railways and the possible construction of another line leaving Adelaide as the only mainland capital without this modern motive power?

**The Hon. BARBARA WIESE:** The reply is as follows:

1. The electrification was abandoned purely on economic grounds.

2. No.

3. (a) In June 1975 the State Transport Authority called for registration of interest from suitably qualified consultants to prepare a report on the need for upgrading the metropolitan railway signalling and communication system. The report established that the greater part of the metropolitan signalling system was beyond its economic life. The consultants John Connell Mott Hay and Anderson concluded:

It is apparent that, if safety and efficiency of operation is to be maintained, a major upgrading of the signalling system should be commenced within the next two or three years.

Based on the consultants report the Authority recommended to Government a major upgrading of the signalling system. The upgrading improved system safety in addition to having long-term cost benefits.

(b) As part of the consultants brief the resignalling was to take into consideration the effects of future electrification at 25 kV 50 HZ AC.

All signalling installations are immune to AC traction at 25 kV 50 HZ AC.

4. A contract has been awarded to ML Engineering (Plymouth) in joint venture with O'Donnell Griffin for the upgrading of the Outer Harbor, Grange and Belair lines.

5. Equipment procured for the mid 1970 electrification proposal substantially included:

steel work for overhead wiring structures and signalling equipment.

6. The steel work was sold following the cancellation of the project.

The majority of signalling equipment was used with some modification in the current resignalling project.

The full value of the mid 1970 electrification is not known, but equipment re-utilised in the current resignalling project is estimated to be worth \$4.1 million.

7. (a) Both the STA and the MTT Tasmania ticketing systems use common ticketing equipment, that is, validators, control units, cassettes, etc. as supplied by Crouzet Pty. Ltd. The Tasmanian system, however, is operated by different software and computer programs to that from STA due to differences in:

(i) Scale: MTT operates a single transport mode comprising of fleet of 255 buses. The STA network is more complex being both intermoded and much larger.

(ii) Mode of Operation: The MTT and STA each have entirely different zonal and fare structures for their respective systems.

Patent rights for the common ticketing equipment supplied to both the STA and the MTT are held by Crouzet. The STA or South Australian Government is not entitled to royalty payments for the type of ticketing system that is operated by the MTT in Tasmania.

(b) Crouzet holds the sole patent rights for the use of their ticketing systems throughout the world. The STA and South Australian Government have no claim to royalty payments for the use, in whatever form, of the Crouzet ticketing system elsewhere.

Due to the very unique nature of each public transport network, i.e. as regards scale, mode of operation, zonal/fare structures, etc. it is most unlikely that a ticketing system exactly identical with STA's would be marketed elsewhere either by Crouzet or any other manufacturer.

8. This was examined in the 1970s and found to be unwarranted. The matter was recently reassessed in view of

the patronage load on the north and south lines and found to be still not economically warranted.

## SUPER TRAINS

27. **The Hon. I. GILFILLAN** (on notice) asked the Minister of Tourism:

1. Since the displacement of steam haulage of Adelaide's passenger rail services during the 1950s, there has been a history of providing fleets of under-powered diesel railcars. In the light of the controversy over the Bridgewater line, why were the 2000 series 'Super Train' railcars so designed that they were not able to efficiently operate on the Hills Service?

2. Will the new 3000 series railcars be powerful enough to operate as motor-trailer sets?

3. If not, why not?

**The Hon. BARBARA WIESE:**

1. The 2000 series 'Super Train' was designed such that a three car set consisting of one power car and two trailer cars coupled together would perform at least equivalent to a three car Redhen set consisting of two power cars and one trailer car. In addition, the 2000 series were designed to be capable of achieving a top speed of 120 km/hour whereas the Redhens are capable of a top speed of 90 km/hour. Tests conducted showed that up to a speed of 58 km/hour there was less than one second difference in the performance of the two types of train. Above speeds of 58 km/hour the 2000 series Super Train gradually improved on the Redhen train to be approximately ten seconds ahead at a speed of 88 km/hour.

After operating for approximately twelve months engine problems developed in a number of the 2000 series railcars and to overcome this problem the engines on all 2000 power cars were derated in power output. In a three car set the 2000 series fitted with original engines are now unable to match the performance of Redhens on the Hills line. A two car set of 2000 series railcars, consisting of one trailer car, does, however, outperform Redhen railcars even in this derated condition.

The STA has now in place a program of replacing the original engines on the 2000 series railcars with more powerful, reliable and fuel efficient engines. A test railcar fitted has shown that in a three car set the 2000 series will now outperform the Redhen railcars.

2. The 3000 series railcars are all power cars. They have not been designed to have trailer cars included in the sets. Tests have shown that the 3000 series railcars outperform all other railcars in the STA fleet.

3. Not applicable.

## UNDERGROUND RAIL LINK

28. **The Hon. I. GILFILLAN** (on notice) asked the Minister of Tourism: Would the Government admit that in its haste to redevelop the ASER site for other than railway purposes, the opportunity was lost for the installation of a simple underground railway loop along King William Street as advocated by both the 1962 Adelaide Development Plan and the 1968 MATS plan?

**The Hon. BARBARA WIESE:** No. An underground rail link from Adelaide Station to King William Street was proposed in the MATS plan. Investigations carried out during the early 1970s indicated that a substantial proportion of the underground railway would have to be tunnelled under buildings because the tight curve from the Adelaide

Railway Station into King William Street proposed in the MATS plan was impractical. Thus, whether a future underground railway had to tunnel under the ASER complex or tunnel under buildings in another part of the city, similar difficulties would be encountered. The redevelopment of the ASER site has therefore not precluded the eventual construction of an underground rail link under the City of Adelaide.

### BUS FLEETS

29. **The Hon. I. GILFILLAN** (on notice) asked the Minister of Tourism: An announcement was made sometime last year that as an economic measure the State Transport Authority would be expected to prolong the life expiry of its bus fleets from a hitherto 12 year period to 15 years. It has been customary for several decades not to repaint the utilitarian silver livery of STA buses during their lifetime.

1. Is the current repainting of several seven-year-old rigid type MAN buses in the new livery of white with orange and blue stripes related to the intention to prolong their life expiry, or is it simply an exercise in projecting a new corporate image of the STA? (It has been noticed that no discernible refurbishment has been carried out on the bodies of these buses).

2. How many buses are intended to be repainted in this livery?

3. What is the anticipated cost of this proposal?

4. What is the approximate cost per bus?

5. Can this project be justified considering the STA's financial situation?

**The Hon. BARBARA WIESE:** The reply is as follows:

1. It is the Authority's policy to paint all new buses with its corporate colours.

The painting of the MAN rigid buses is not related to any anticipated extension of their operational lives.

The average age of the buses is currently 5.7 years and hence a substantial part of their operational lifespan remains.

2. It is intended to paint any bus of this type which requires major body repair. This repair is normally required as a result of a substantial traffic accident.

3. No anticipated total cost of the work is available as it will depend on the number of vehicles which do suffer major damage.

4. The cost of repainting a bus is in the vicinity of \$2 000. Many of the MAN buses painted to date have been painted by trade school students as part of their tuition program at very small cost to the Authority.

5. The program is in keeping with the Authority's overall aim of providing safe, reliable and attractive public transport to the residents of Adelaide. It also provides training opportunities for trade school students.

### AEC BUSES

30. **The Hon. I. GILFILLAN** (on notice) asked the Minister of Tourism:

1. Why have the 1977-built '700' series AEC buses been prematurely withdrawn from service?

2. What was the average kilometrage achieved by this fleet of 66 vehicles?

3. What is now proposed to be done with these buses?

**The Hon. BARBARA WIESE:** The reply is as follows:

1. Following route and timetable changes in May 1988, the Authority had a surplus of buses. It was decided that a number of Swift buses should be put into storage.

2. The average kilometrage covered by these vehicles is 320 000.

3. The stored vehicles will be held to cater for the increased services being planned for July 1989.

### TICKETING SYSTEMS

31. **The Hon. I. GILFILLAN** (on notice) asked the Minister of Tourism:

1. How many electronic ticket systems such as the Crouzet system were investigated by the STA before choosing this manufacturer?

2. What were the names of the other systems?

3. Is it a fact that the Crouzet system fitted to Adelaide vehicles, etc., was solely developed for STA use and is not employed elsewhere?

4. Does Crouzet have a single system of operation developed for all other clients?

5. Apart from the cost of provision of the basic components of the Crouzet equipment for Adelaide, what were the additional development and design costs?

6. Who met any such costs—SA Government, STA, Crouzet?

7. If Crouzet's Adelaide system can be marketed elsewhere, will royalties be due to the STA or SA Government?

8. Would it be true to say that the main reason for the supposedly unique Crouzet system of electronic ticketing for Adelaide has been to turn every bus driver into a statistician?

9. Is the Minister aware that two private bus companies in New South Wales and a larger, undisclosed transport operator, having installed electronic ticket systems, have since returned to tear-off tickets in view of major problems experienced with the former?

**The Hon. BARBARA WIESE:** The reply is as follows:

1. Thirteen firms registered their interest. After careful analysis and evaluation of the registrants, eight firms were invited to tender.

2. The other firms who tendered and whose ticketing systems were investigated by the STA were:

AEG-Telefunken (Federal Republic of Germany)  
 Associated Electronic Services (Western Australia)  
 Almex Ticket Machine Co. Ltd. (United Kingdom)  
 Autelca AG (Switzerland)  
 CGA Camp Transport (France)  
 Control Systems Ltd. (United Kingdom)  
 Micro Systems (United Kingdom)

3. The ticketing system supplied to the STA by Crouzet Pty Ltd uses equipment such as validators, control units, ticket sales machines, cassettes, etc. that is common to other Crouzet ticketing systems in use throughout the world. The computer software and micro-processor systems that operate this equipment are specifically designed and developed for the operational conditions that are unique to the STA.

4. Individual transport networks each have unique operational requirements involving difference between:

Size/type of networks  
 Sectional/zonal/fare structures  
 Financial and statistical data retrieval requirements  
 etc.

Ticketing systems must be individually designed and developed to take account of these differences. In this respect it is not feasible for a manufacturer of ticketing systems, such as Crouzet, to have a single system of operation that is exactly common to and suitable for all clients.

5. The basic development and design costs were contained within the approved budget of \$9.8 million for the

contract with Crouzet Pty Ltd for the manufacture and supply of a ticketing system to the STA. Since launching the ticketing system in late September 1987 some additional computer software modifications have been carried out to improve operational efficiency. The cost of these additional modifications has been \$109 412.

6. The additional costs referred to in Question 5 have been met by the STA.

7. Crouzet S.A., Valence, France hold the sole patent rights for the use of their ticketing systems throughout the world. The STA and the South Australian Government have no claim to royalty payments for the use, in whatever form, of the Crouzet ticketing system elsewhere.

8. No. Bus operators have no responsibilities for either the collection, the processing or the analysis of statistical data.

9. I am aware that some problems have occurred with other types of ticketing systems in use in NSW. The exact nature of the problems have not been disclosed by the companies concerned.

#### AIR-CONDITIONERS

32. **The Hon. M.B. CAMERON** (on notice) asked the Minister of Tourism:

1. Is there any requirement for air-conditioners used in public places to be cleaned at regular intervals?

2. If so, what is that requirement for annual, half-yearly, monthly and weekly cleaning, and what checks are done by authorities to ensure that cleaning is done?

**The Hon. BARBARA WIESE:** There is no statutory requirement for cleaning air-conditioners used in public places. Generally it is recommended that evaporative air cooling equipment and cooling towers be cleaned twice yearly. The behaviour of this equipment is so variable in practice that maintenance schedules need to be designed for individual installations. Experimental work necessary to provide the basis for any legislative requirement has not been carried out, although the Commonwealth Government is funding a research project in this State to gather more data on which to base more definitive guidelines.

#### AIR-CONDITIONING TOWERS

33. **The Hon. M.B. CAMERON** (on notice) asked the Minister of Tourism:

1. (a) What checking of air-conditioner towers and hot water systems within Government controlled public institutions—including hospitals—is done?

(b) Are diaries kept on cleaning of such systems?

2. (a) Is cleaning done on a weekly basis of air-conditioner towers as recommended by the Federal Government health authorities?

(b) If not, why not?

3. (a) When were spot checks carried out on such public institutions?

(b) Were any such institutions found to be contaminated with legionella bacteria?

(c) If so, what are the institutions?

**The Hon. BARBARA WIESE:** The reply is as follows:

1. (a) Major health care establishments undertake microbiological surveillance of cooling towers and hot water systems.

(b) These tests and other maintenance details are logged by engineering services staff.

2. Testing of cooling towers and hot water systems includes tests for legionella bacteria. There is no need for regular cleaning on a weekly basis unless indicated by the presence of the Legionella bacteria. Advice from Thames Water Authority experts indicate cleaning procedures could be made more efficient and less frequent. Further advice is expected early in 1989.

3. As the systems are regularly tested, and records maintained, there is no system of spot checking.

#### LEGIONNAIRE'S DISEASE

34. **The Hon. M.B. CAMERON** (on notice) asked the Minister of Tourism:

1. (a) Has the SGIC Building in the city been checked as a possible source of the most recent outbreak of legionnaire's disease?

(b) If so, was legionnaire's disease identified in that building, and when?

(c) Was any public announcement made?

2. (a) What cleaning program is carried out on the air-conditioning unit at the SGIC Building?

(b) Is a diary kept of such cleaning?

(c) Do public health officers carry out spot checks on this diary and the unit?

(d) If so, when were checks carried out in the last 12 months and what were the results?

**The Hon. BARBARA WIESE:** The reply is as follows:

1. (a) The SGIC Building was not checked as a possible source of the recent outbreak of legionnaire's disease. It was investigated coincidentally during the period of the investigation.

(b) No cases of legionnaire's disease are known to be associated with that building.

(c) No.

2. The detailed information requested by the honourable member has been supplied by the Adelaide City Council. In particular, on a half yearly basis the following work is carried out:

1. System is drained, scrubbed and cleaned with a high pressure washing machine.

2. A chlorine based sanitiser is added to the water and the unit is run for half an hour.

3. The water is again dumped and the basin refilled using a corrosion inhibitor and biocide.

Maintenance staff of the SGIC carry out a weekly check on the towers which involve operating the dump valve to remove the accumulated sediment from the basin, checking fan belts and the supply of chemicals to the automatic dosing pump.

Levels of chemicals are tested on a monthly basis by Maxwell Chemicals and bacteriological testing is carried out by Houseman-Feedwater on behalf of Maxwell Chemicals, who then report to Carrier Air-Conditioning.

#### AIR-CONDITIONING TOWERS

35. **The Hon. M.B. CAMERON** (on notice) asked the Minister of Tourism:

1. What cleaning regime is undertaken at each of the air-conditioning towers recently given the 'all-clear' by the Health Commission following an outbreak of legionnaire's disease in suburban Adelaide?

2. What monitoring mechanism has been put in place for the continued regular checking of those towers for evidence of legionella bacteria?

**The Hon. BARBARA WIESE:** Two large shopping complexes were examined by Health Commission and local government officers during the recent outbreak of legionnaire's disease. The companies concerned were able to demonstrate that a regular maintenance schedule was adhered to for their plant and visual inspection confirmed the clean state of the equipment. Water samples taken at the time did not reveal any *Legionella longbeachae* type 1. It must be recognised that there may be a number of cooling towers at any one site, serving air-conditioning and refrigeration plants.

At one of these sites a monthly service is undertaken to check on water condition, pH and biocide levels. Every quarter microbiological testing for *Legionella* is undertaken and cleaning, if necessary, is then undertaken. The other plant conducts a weekly test for bacteria levels and cleaning is instituted as required. A regular twice yearly scrubbing is undertaken and legionella testing is also done twice yearly. The Adelaide City Council also inspected a number of city sites and they should be approached for details.

### LEGIONNAIRE'S DISEASE

36. **The Hon. M.B. CAMERON** (on notice) asked the Minister of Tourism:

1. (a) When did the Health Commission and the Minister of Health first become aware of the most recent outbreak of legionnaire's disease in the southern suburbs?

(b) When was an official statement issued to the media?

(c) If there was a difference in the two dates, what was the reason for the difference?

2. (a) Was the media notified of the outbreak of legionnaire's disease at the Flinders Medical Centre before staff who already were treating patients?

(b) If so, why?

**The Hon. BARBARA WIESE:** The reply is as follows:

1. (a) 14 November 1988—(Note: there were apparently isolated cases before 14 November 1988 but it was not until that date that a recognisable outbreak had occurred.)

(b) 16 November 1988.

(c) On 14 November 1988 a committee was formed to investigate the outbreak and met that afternoon; 15 November 1988 was spent gathering data on the case to enable a rational statement to be made to the Minister, the commission and the press conference which was organised for 16 November 1988.

2. (a) & (b) All staff managing the patients who needed to know the diagnosis had access to case notes and would have been informed before the press release. There is no person to person hazard associated with nursing legionnaire's disease patients hence no other general or specific warning needed to be given to staff. It should be noted the outbreak did not occur at Flinders Medical Centre.

### PUBLIC WORKS COMMITTEE REPORTS

**The PRESIDENT** laid on the table the following interim reports by the Parliamentary Standing Committee on Public Works:

Ceduna Police Complex (Revised Proposal).

Tea Tree Gully College of Technical and Further Education (Stage 1).

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

Flaxley Research Centre.

Millicent College of Technical and Further Education.

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

Ceduna Police Complex (Revised Proposal).

Tea Tree Gully College of Technical and Further Education (Stage 1).

Ordered that reports be printed.

### PAPERS TABLED

The following papers were laid on the table:

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

Reports—

Native Vegetation Authority—1987-88.

South Australian Institute of Technology—1987.

South Australian Occupational Health and Safety Commission—1987-88.

Industrial and Commercial Training Commission—1987-88.

South Australian Superannuation Board—1987-88.

Rules of Court—

District Criminal Court—Local and District Criminal Courts Act 1926—Criminal Injuries Compensation.

Local Court—Local and District Criminal Courts Act 1926—Service of Documents and Trial Lists.

Acts Republication Act 1967—Reprints—Schedules of Alterations—

Road Traffic Act 1961.

Prices Act 1948.

Murray-Darling Basin Act 1983.

Local Government Act 1934.

Electricity Trust Act 1946.

Regulations under the following Acts:

Classification of Publications Act 1974—Common Films.

Cremation Act 1891—Permit Fee.

Criminal Injuries Compensation Act 1978—Costs.

Criminal Law (Sentencing) Act 1988—Enforcement of Bonds.

Fees Regulation Act 1927—

Cremation Permit.

Hairdressing Fees.

Harbors Act 1936—Quarantine Waste.

Housing Improvement Act 1940—South Australian Housing Trust Constitution.

Industrial and Commercial Training Act 1981—Hairdressing.

Juries Act 1927—

Attendance Fee.

Remuneration.

Landlord and Tenant Act 1936—

Port Dock Museum Agreement.

Port Dock Railway Museum.

Land Tax Act 1936—General.

Lifts and Cranes Act 1985—Registration and Certificates of Competency.

Loans to Producers Act 1927—Tanks and Catchments.

Marine Act 1936—Survey Fees.

Metropolitan Taxi-Cab Act 1956—

Age Limit on Cabs.

Fees.

Motor Vehicles Act 1959—Number Plate Fees.

Occupational Health, Safety and Welfare Act 1986—Electroplating.

Planning Act 1982—Minor Development.

Road Traffic Act 1961—

Kapunda Hospital and Noarlunga Health Services.

Seat Belts and Restraints.

Subordinate Legislation Act 1978—Exemptions from Expiration.

Summary Offences Act 1953—Expiation Fees.

Unauthorised Documents Act 1916—Commercial Emblems.

Lifts and Cranes Act 1985—Codes of Practice.

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

Hairdressers' Registration Board of South Australia—  
Report, 1987-88.

Regulations under the following Acts—

Fair Trading Act 1987—Hairdressing.

Hairdressers Act 1988—Qualifications.

Land Agents, Brokers and Valuers Act 1972—Prescribed  
Financial Institutions.

Liquor Licensing Act 1985—Liquor Consumption—  
Adelaide and Glenelg.

Thebarton Oval (Amendment).

Trade Standards Act 1979—Toy Safety.

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

Credit Union Stabilization Board—Report, 1987-88.

Regulations under the following Acts—

Companies (Acquisition of Shares) (Application of  
Laws) Act 1981.

Companies (Application of Laws) Act 1982.

Futures Industry (Application of Laws) Act 1986—  
Commonwealth Application.

Offences and Penalties.

Securities Industry (Application of Laws) Act 1981—  
Offences and Penalties.

By the Minister of Ethnic Affairs (Hon. C.J. Sumner):  
South Australian Ethnic Affairs Commission—Report,  
1987-88.

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

Royal Commission into Aboriginal Deaths in Custody—  
Interim Report.

State Clothing Corporation—Report, 1987-88.

South Australian Trotting Control Board—Report, 1987-  
88.

Wallaroo and District Hospital Inc.—By-laws—Parking.  
Racing Act 1976—Rules of Trotting—

Breeding Season.

Post Mortems and Electronic Timing.

Prize Money.

Sire Registration.

Regulations under the following Acts:

Education Act 1972—Trespassing.

Fisheries Act 1982—

Coorong and Lakes Netting.

Exotic Fish, Fish Farming and Fish Diseases—  
Undesirable Species.

Mulloway Fishery.

Noxious Insects Act 1934—Grasshoppers.

South Australian Health Commission Act 1976—

Compensable Patient Fees.

Kalyra Hospital.

Recognised Hospital Fees.

Surveyors Act 1975—LeFevre Peninsula.

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

Building Act 1971—Regulations—Council Fees.

Local Government Act 1934—Regulations—

Assessment Record.

Certificate of Liabilities.

Declarations.

Financial Management.

How-to-Vote Cards.

Members' Allowances.

Parking Expiation Fees.

Prescribed Municipalities.

Qualifications Committee.

Valuations.

Corporation By-laws—

City of Brighton—No. 48—Parks and Reserves.

City of Port Lincoln—No. 16—Flammable Under-  
growth.

District Council By-laws—

District Council of Berri—No. 10—One-Way Streets.

District Council of Mannum—No. 5—Caravans and  
Camping; No. 7—Depasturing and Droving; No.

8—Animals and Birds; No. 9—Bees; No. 10—  
Dogs.

District Council of Morgan—No. 1—Dogs.

## QUESTIONS

### MR TERRY CAMERON

**The Hon. M.B. CAMERON:** I seek leave to make an explanation before asking the Attorney-General a question about Mr Terry Cameron.

Leave granted.

**The Hon. M.B. CAMERON:** Last April, in another place, my colleague the member for Mitcham asked questions relating to allegations of improper practice by the State Secretary of the Australian Labor Party, Mr Terry Cameron. The allegations included a statutory declaration by the State Secretary of the Building Workers Industrial Union, Mr Ben Carslake, detailing action Mr Carslake took on behalf of contractors to have them paid for work. Quoting one contractor who had a problem, Mr Carslake declared:

He stated the bills were paid by a Mr T. Cameron and gave me a number to ring. The number was to my surprise the AWU office.

According to the declaration, Mr Cameron told a contractor seeking payment that 'he could sue him for the money but he wouldn't win because he had the best solicitors in the country and had some very influential friends'. Mr Carslake also revealed, again in a declaration:

I received a call from Cameron where he intimated that if I co-operated with him that he knew the delegates in the brickyards and that his influence could help myself in the housing industry—I declined the invitation.

Another statutory declaration signed by Mr Hans Egtberts, who said he built about 40 houses financed by Mr Cameron, complained:

I constantly had problems in that T. Cameron failed to hold up his side of the agreement in that he continually failed to make payments for materials and money to various subcontractors and suppliers.

At the time of these allegations raised by the member for Mitcham the Premier undertook to have them investigated. My questions are: has the Government received any report on its investigations and, if so, what did the report conclude and will the Attorney-General table it in the Chamber?

**The Hon. C.J. SUMNER:** The matters referred to by the honourable member in his explanation seem to be matters relating to possible civil claims that certain individuals may have. I have no personal knowledge of the matter. If I can add anything further—

**The Hon. M.B. Cameron:** Will you table the report?

**The Hon. C.J. SUMNER:** I am not doing anything at this stage, I am just saying that if I have anything further to add to the matter I will do that in due course.

**The Hon. K.T. GRIFFIN:** I seek leave to make an explanation before asking the Minister of Consumer Affairs and Minister of Corporate Affairs a question about Mr Terry Cameron.

Leave granted.

**The Hon. K.T. GRIFFIN:** I have a copy of a report dated 27 May 1988, in the name of an investigation officer attached to the Department of Public and Consumer Affairs, to the Acting Registrar of the Commercial Tribunal on investigations following allegations made in the House of Assembly in April 1988 with respect to Mr Terry Cameron. In summary, the report says:

1. Mr T.G. Cameron has been heavily involved in the building industry since 1976.

2. That involvement was in at least three council areas.

3. In the Willunga council area alone until 1978 about 50 homes were built by Mr Cameron and/or partnerships and incorporated companies, in which he had an interest.

4. Mr Cameron has never at any time held a builder's licence.



5. The majority of houses built by Mr Cameron or his companies or associates were not built or supervised by the holder of a general builder's licence.

6. Mr Cameron used a builder's name and licence number without that person's consent.

7. Inspectors of the Builders Licensing Board had threats made against them whilst they were monitoring the Builders Licensing Act in the various council areas by persons associated with Mr Cameron.

8. A check with the Corporate Affairs office showed no evidence that the various names and partnerships mentioned on council applications were registered.

This report is nine months old and discloses serious breaches of the law. My questions to the Attorney-General are as follows:

(1) Have any prosecutions been instituted against Mr Cameron for blatant breaches of the Builders Licensing Act and, if not, why not?

(2) Have any prosecutions been instituted against Mr Cameron for breaches of the Companies Code and the Business Names Act and, if not, why not?

**The Hon. C.J. SUMNER:** I am not aware of any prosecutions commenced against Mr Cameron with respect to any of these matters, but I will have inquiries made and bring down a reply for the honourable member.

**The Hon. L.H. DAVIS:** I seek leave to make a brief explanation before asking the Attorney-General a question about Mr Terry Cameron.

Leave granted.

**The Hon. L.H. DAVIS:** A report in this morning's *Advertiser* is further evidence of serious tension within the Labor Party. The report states that a Labor Party member is facing two charges of assault laid by two senior ALP members. The charges arise out of a hotel punch-up in which Mr Cameron was involved. I understand that many key people within the Labor Party believe that the Premier's centre left faction will be unable to resist the left's attack on Mr Cameron's position if the full details of Mr Cameron's improper practices within the building industry are revealed.

*An honourable member interjecting:*

**The Hon. L.H. DAVIS:** See me around the back afterwards, Terry. In view of the fact that there are allegations of improper practices within the building industry by Mr Cameron which stretch back over 12 years, and as detailed by the Hon. Trevor Griffin, will the Attorney-General advise the Council whether, first, the Government is seeking to protect the position of the State Secretary of the Labor Party in the current factional brawl within that Party and, secondly, in view of the serious allegations made against Mr Cameron does the Attorney-General believe that it is appropriate for Mr Cameron to stand aside as State Secretary of the ALP?

**The Hon. C.J. SUMNER:** In response to the first question, I am certainly not seeking to protect anyone from any position, and I would not do so. As to the second question, that is a matter for Mr Cameron to determine.

## MARINELAND

**The Hon. DIANA LAIDLAW:** I seek leave to make a brief explanation before asking the Attorney-General a question about the Marineland project.

Leave granted.

**The Hon. DIANA LAIDLAW:** The Government's guarantee of a \$9 million loan for this project was intended to cover the entire cost of new equipment and buildings at Marineland. However, half of this guarantee is now to be called upon even though there has been no substantial spending on equipment or buildings. There is speculation

that some of this money will have to cover breaches of contract and compensation arising from union bans on the project. The Minister of State Development's statement yesterday also neglected to cover another vital aspect, that is, problems with respect to the viability of the Marineland complex.

The Opposition has documents which demonstrate that union interference with the project was a much greater problem in this respect. For example, correspondence from the Essington group in August last year demonstrated its interest in proceeding with both the Marineland development and a West Beach country club resort hotel, provided that assurances could be given against further union interference over the issue of keeping dolphins in captivity. I understand the Essington group spent \$200 000 on feasibility studies and remained seriously interested in developing both Marineland and a hotel complex until yesterday's announcement.

In letters to the Department of State Development dated 16 and 23 August last year, Tribond rejected a departmental reassessment of the viability of the project and instead listed continuing union bans, uncertainty over ALP policy on keeping dolphins, insurance cover and delays in finalising agreements with the West Beach Trust as the outstanding matters to be resolved.

I also refer the Attorney-General to the reported comments in the *Advertiser* of 3 February when, in response to the Opposition's public prediction that Marineland would be scrapped because of the cost of appeasing union and ALP demands over keeping dolphins in captivity, the Minister of State Development said that statement had no basis.

With yesterday's vindication of the Opposition's prediction of 3 February, I seek from the Attorney-General, on behalf of the taxpaying public of South Australia, a full explanation of why it will cost the Government \$4.5 million to cover the cost of the collapse of the Marineland project, when none of the purposes for which this guarantee originally was given have been fulfilled. It would appear in this whole sad saga that there has either been massive bungling of the project, or possibly that hush money is being paid to prevent a public outcry over the role of certain trade union officials in this fiasco.

Will the Attorney-General say whether commitments amounting to \$4.5 million will have to be met by taxpayers following the collapse of the Marineland project?

**The Hon. C.J. SUMNER:** I will refer the question to my colleague in another place and bring back a reply. Suffice to say that the question of whether dolphins should be allowed to be captured from the wild and used in marine-lands and in other similar activities is a matter of major debate, not just in this community but throughout the world. The honourable member will be aware that a Federal Parliamentary committee recommended against the keeping of dolphins in captivity. That view is shared by a large number of people. If the honourable member wants to make specific allegations against trade union officials, then let her do so.

*Members interjecting:*

**The PRESIDENT:** Order!

**The Hon. C.J. SUMNER:** If any allegations are to be made of any improper or illegal activities, then I suggest the honourable member make them to the proper authorities for their consideration. As to the specific answer, I will obtain information and bring back a reply.



## WASTE MANAGEMENT

**The Hon. M.J. ELLIOTT:** I seek leave to make a brief explanation before asking the Minister of Local Government a question about waste management.

Leave granted.

**The Hon. M.J. ELLIOTT:** Around September last year I was approached by a couple of public servants who were extremely concerned about a proposal of the Waste Management Commission to dispose of unwanted industrial waste into the ponds at the Bolivar Sewage Works. As it has turned out, that plan has now been abandoned, but those people were upset that no public information was made available. In fact, a letter which I wrote to the Minister of Water Resources on 16 December, exploring that in some depth, has still not been answered.

Subsequent to that, a flood of residents from Kanmantoo contacted me and indicated that, once again, the Waste Management Commission proposed to dump in their backyards, as it were, arsenic contaminated soil. They found out only by accident that that would happen. If some very alert reporter from the Mount Barker *Courier* had not picked up something which had passed the desk of the Mount Barker council, the people from Kanmantoo would never have known about this proposal.

People from Kanmantoo are complaining vigorously that they were not informed beforehand and also that, despite a public meeting where officials from the Waste Management Commission appeared, they have not seen sufficient detail to allow them to feel comfortable about this proposal. I have also been alerted to proposals to build a medium temperature incinerator and a number of other works at Wingfield under a company owned by Kerry Packer. Once again, a large amount of detail has not been brought to the notice of the public.

I ask the Minister why, in each of these cases, was a public environmental impact statement process not undertaken, because all proposals involve potentially very dangerous substances. Further, will the Minister make available all reports on those three projects?

**The Hon. BARBARA WIESE:** With respect to the first issue and the question of whether or not the Kanmantoo site would be appropriate for the disposal of waste from numerous building blocks at Albert Park, that matter is still under investigation. No decisions have been made by the Government as to whether or not the Kanmantoo site could or should be used. However, the Waste Management Commission was certainly involved in the process of identifying suitable sites. For a number of reasons the site at Kanmantoo was considered to be a suitable option. However, no decision could be made on that matter until the numerous other Government agencies had had the opportunity to examine the proposal from their perspective. For example, Engineering and Water Supply Department personnel needed to be involved in the assessment of that proposal and, as I understand it, they have still not prepared the necessary report. No conclusion has been reached on the issue and the various Government agencies that need to be involved in it are still examining the proposal.

As the honourable member has pointed out, in the meantime the District Council of Mount Barker has expressed considerable concern about the proposal and has in fact opposed it. My colleague, the Minister of Housing and Construction, has assured the residents of Kanmantoo that the proposal would not be proceeded with if there is any danger to local residents, so the matter is still being investigated. If there are any problems as a result of locating a disposal site at Kanmantoo, the Government would not

proceed with it, but numerous people who have a direct interest in the matter are being invited to participate and are being consulted. That includes the local council, local residents and technical experts within State Government. That process will run its course and appropriate decisions will ultimately be made.

The same situation applies in relation to the question of the incinerators to which the honourable member referred. Before any company can proceed with a proposal to establish an incinerator for appropriate purposes, the proposal must be presented to the Waste Management Commission and any other authorities with an interest in that matter. The proposal will be studied in great depth before any decision is made. If it is considered that, because of the difficulty of the proposal itself, it is appropriate for the proposal to undergo the environmental impact statement process, then that would be undertaken, but there is an established procedure and practice for the examination of applications by waste management companies. That procedure will be followed in all these cases.

**The Hon. M.J. ELLIOTT:** As a supplementary question, does the Minister believe that the public has a right to know about these things in advance, and will all documents be made available for interested members of the public?

**The Hon. BARBARA WIESE:** I have already indicated that the established procedures will be followed in these cases. Where, for example, planning approvals are required for a particular use of land, or where the Waste Management Commission considers an application which has considerable impact on a local community, then information is made available to the public. As and when appropriate, that will be the case in these circumstances also.

## HON. J.R. CORNWALL

**The Hon. R.I. LUCAS:** My question is directed to the Attorney-General. Now that the matter has been finalised in the courts, will the Attorney-General indicate the total cost to the taxpayers of the Cornwall defamation case and, in his answer, will he specify the different components of the costs, that is, Dr Cornwall's legal costs, Dr Humble's costs and the cost of damages?

**The Hon. C.J. SUMNER:** I am not sure that all matters relating to this case have been finalised, but I will seek a report.

## THIRD PARTY PREMIUMS

**The Hon. J.C. BURDETT:** I seek leave to make a brief explanation before asking the Attorney-General a question about third party insurance premiums.

Leave granted.

**The Hon. J.C. BURDETT:** Section 129 of the Motor Vehicles Act sets out the powers of this committee to make recommendations on third party premiums and, specifically, to determine what rates are 'fair and reasonable'. In April last year, the SGIC asked the committee to recommend a rise in premiums. During its deliberations, the committee questioned some of the figures used to justify the application and finally referred the matter back to the SGIC without making a final decision.

The committee then heard nothing more about the matter until it received a letter from the commission last Tuesday formally advising that it did not wish to pursue its application for an increase. However, the commission did not also advise the committee that the following day it would

announce a reduction in premiums. Accordingly, the committee has not had the opportunity so far to fulfil the requirement imposed upon it by the Act to determine whether this reduction is 'fair and reasonable' and particularly to consider whether there is scope for an even greater reduction, given the committee's reluctance to approve the increase sought by the commission last year.

My question is: why was the Third Party Premiums Insurance Committee not consulted about the reduction in premiums that was announced last Wednesday by the State Government Insurance Commission, and will the Attorney-General, as Leader of the Government, now ensure that the matter is referred to the committee so that it can advise on whether the reduction is adequate and whether it is as great as it could have been?

**The Hon. C.J. SUMNER:** I hope that the honourable member is not querying whether or not a reduction in third party premiums should have occurred. Normally, members opposite scream about increases in taxes and charges and the like. The reality is that in this area, as a result of initiatives taken by the Government, there has been not only a levelling off in the rate of increase but also, as announced by the SGIC, there will be a reduction in the third party premiums.

I should have thought that the Hon. Mr Burdett would congratulate the SGIC on the fact that this has been possible and, indeed, congratulate the Government for having introduced the legislation to enable this to happen. However, the Hon. Mr Burdett did not do that. Instead, he has criticised the SGIC for apparently not consulting the committee. I am not aware whether or not the committee was consulted but I will make some inquiries about the matter.

#### EQUITICORP INTERNATIONAL GROUP

**The Hon. J.F. STEFANI:** I seek leave to make a brief explanation before asking the Minister representing the Treasurer a question about State Bank involvement with the Equiticorp International group.

Leave granted.

**The Hon. J.F. STEFANI:** In January this year the Equiticorp International group went into receivership and a liquidator was subsequently appointed to control the assets of the company. It has been reported in financial journals that the collapse of Equiticorp will be amongst the biggest corporate crashes in history and that losses will be substantial. Investors and creditors have more than \$4 billion tied-up in the various members of the group. The State Bank of South Australia is amongst the major investors. I have attempted to obtain information about the State Bank's involvement from the Treasurer's office, the State Bank Investment Manager and General Manager, as well as from the liquidator, all without success. My questions are as follows:

1. How much has the State Bank loaned to the Equiticorp International group?
2. When was the loan made?
3. What advice has the Premier and Treasurer received from the State Bank about the losses it faces following the collapse of Equiticorp?
4. What security has been held against the bank's investment?
5. What is the value of that security?

**The Hon. C.J. SUMNER:** I will refer that question to the Treasurer and bring back a reply. Needless to say, the Government is very pleased and proud of the State Bank and its activities in South Australia since the Government

took the initiative of encouraging the amalgamation of the State Bank and the Savings Bank of South Australia. The reality is that it has been one of the success stories in the financial arena of this State. With respect to Equiticorp, I am aware that the State Bank has some involvement in that matter, but I will refer his question to the Treasurer for a detailed response.

#### STIRLING COUNCIL

**The Hon. J.C. IRWIN:** I seek leave to make a brief explanation before asking the Minister of Local Government a question about Stirling council.

Leave granted.

**The Hon. J.C. IRWIN:** On 15 November last year the Minister announced a plan of action on a package to deal with the funding of liability as a result of the Ash Wednesday bushfires. On 29 November last year, in answer to a question from me, the Minister said that she and the Treasurer (Mr Bannon) intended making a joint submission to the South Australian Grants Commission. It is now three months since the Minister announced her package. My questions are now as follows:

1. Have the Minister and the Treasurer made a submission to the South Australian Grants Commission? If not, why not?
2. What advice does the Minister have from the Commonwealth Minister (Senator Reynolds) and the South Australian Grants Commission that the package announced on 15 November can be met?
3. What other alternatives does the Minister have if the package does not come to fruition?

**The Hon. BARBARA WIESE:** The Government has not yet made a submission to the Local Government Grants Commission concerning the funding of Ash Wednesday bushfire liability for Stirling council. The main reason for that is that discussions are still taking place between the Government, Stirling council and the Local Government Association about that matter, in an endeavour to expedite some conclusion as to the final damages bill.

In addition, it is important to establish the financial capacity of Stirling council both to meet its obligations in the short term as well as to determine what contribution it may be able to make to the final damages payout when that final figure is known. As discussions on these matters are still taking place, the question of how the final amount of money might be found has been put at the bottom of the agenda (if I can put it that way) until those other issues have been dealt with.

Therefore, the Government has not made a submission to the Grants Commission at this time. However, in the absence of any other proposals coming forward, which seems to be a reasonable way of dealing with the financial problem that is likely to arise, it is still the Government's intention to make such a submission to the Grants Commission. In relation to the timing of that, I am not in a position to say because it depends on the outcome of those discussions.

**The Hon. J.C. IRWIN:** As a supplementary question, will the course of action outlined by the Minister (namely, discussions between Stirling council, the Local Government Association and the Government) be established before the local government elections which, as the Minister knows, are not very far off?

**The Hon. BARBARA WIESE:** In the interests of all people concerned, it is certainly the view of the Government that a solution to this problem should be found as quickly as possible. We are working with all haste to find that

solution. It is in the interests not only of the Stirling council and the local government community at large that the matter be resolved but also of the plaintiffs—that is, the victims of the Ash Wednesday fires—who have been waiting for some eight years for a settlement of the matter. Therefore, it is a matter of some concern that we find a way of bringing the matter to a conclusion as quickly as possible. As I have indicated, discussions are taking place. It is not possible to put a timeframe on it but we will find a solution to this problem as quickly as possible. I would certainly hope that that occurs prior to the council elections.

It would seem to me that it would be most unfortunate if the problems that the council faces at the moment became an election issue in the Stirling council area. It is certainly of some concern to me that the residents, or the ratepayers group, in Stirling has recently announced that it will be fielding candidates against the existing council. It is not that I object to their fielding candidates, because I do not. I would encourage all people in the community to be interested and involved in council affairs and to seek office on councils should they so desire. However, I believe it is a dangerous thing for a group of people to be running for council on the basis of a single issue. I do not believe that would be very helpful.

**The Hon. Diana Laidlaw:** Or in State elections.

**The Hon. BARBARA WIESE:** Indeed, nor in State elections. I do not think it would be very helpful for a group of people to be running for election on a platform relating to only one issue. I certainly hope that it is a matter that can be dealt with prior to the local government elections so that a campaign can be fought on the range of issues that may be of interest to Stirling ratepayers.

### ROXBY DOWNS

**The Hon. I. GILFILLAN:** I seek leave to make a brief explanation before asking the Minister of Tourism, representing the Minister of Mines and Energy, a question relating to the tailings dam at Roxby Downs.

Leave granted.

**The Hon. I. GILFILLAN:** I have been told that there has been non-compliance with the requirement to seal the tailings dam, or dams, at Roxby Downs. As members know, sulphuric acid is used in the treatment and preparation of yellow cake and the remnants contain several noxious substances which should be prevented from permeating the subsoil.

The nature of the country around Roxby Downs is porous. One of the requirements is that the tailings dams should have a waterproof membrane and waterproof spraying to ensure no leaching into the subsoil. I understand, from an authority which I took seriously, that those responsible for the sealing have taken the risk that any penalty that they may incur is less onerous than the cost and bother of sealing the tailings dam. Therefore, they have taken a calculated risk. If that is so, it is unacceptable and should be rectified as soon as possible and those responsible should incur the penalty.

I ask the Minister, through the appropriate investigators in the department, to see whether there has been any omission in complying with the requirement to seal the tailings dams. If so, who is responsible, and what do the Minister of Mines and Energy and the department intend to do to rectify the situation and to punish the offenders?

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

### COUNTRY HOSPITALS

**The Hon. M.B. CAMERON:** I seek leave to make a short statement before asking the Minister representing the Minister of Health a question about funding cuts in country hospitals.

Leave granted.

**The Hon. M.B. CAMERON:** Following questions that I put on notice during the Estimates Committee debate, which trickled out to me over the summer, it has become clear that there has been a large cut in the funding of some country hospitals. In the nine hospitals that I have contacted, there is a difference of \$5.23 million between last year and this year. There are some outstanding examples. Port Pirie is not the least with a cut this year of \$205 000. That is a large cut in a budget for a hospital that was already overstressed. That hospital was meant to take over the regional role, but the regional role is obviously not taken seriously by the Government.

The indications are that there is to be an attempt to get hold of the local member, the Hon. Mr Keneally, to try to get him to improve the situation. If the budget is not reinstated, the hospital will have to cut services to the valuable Port Pirie community. I am sure that the new member will agree that it is an extremely valuable community.

What action does the Minister propose to take to reinstate the budgets of the Port Pirie, Angaston, Naracoorte, Penola, Wallaroo and other hospitals on the list? Statements made during the budget debate and in the Estimates Committee were to the effect that there have not been any cuts to the budgets of major hospitals, but I find that cuts have been made. It seems easy to find money for the health system when it entails hiring two more floors of the building now housing the Health Commission costing \$350 000 extra in lease money and \$1 million for furniture. What action will the Minister take to ensure that some of the money is restored for the provision of health services?

**The Hon. BARBARA WIESE:** I will refer those questions to my colleague in another place and bring back a reply. However, I am pleased to hear from my new colleague, the Hon. Ron Roberts, that he has already received some representations from people at Port Pirie about funding for the local hospital. I imagine that he will be making representations to the Minister of Health on behalf of people in his city. I will certainly refer the questions to the Minister and will bring back a reply about the funding.

### EYRE PENINSULA

**The Hon. PETER DUNN:** I seek leave to make a brief explanation before asking the Attorney-General a question about a visit to Eyre Peninsula by the Premier.

Leave granted.

**The Hon. PETER DUNN:** It would appear that the Minister of Agriculture seems to have abrogated his responsibility to look after some of the primary producers on the Eyre Peninsula. According to today's paper:

Mr Mayes yesterday said, 'The Government has gone as far as we can go in terms of offering farmers further subsidies on their bank loan interest rates.'

Indeed, he offers very little else. At the end of last winter the Premier, with a great fanfare of publicity, attended and accepted the hospitality of people in the area. He then said that he would look at the situation that had developed. The situation has got dramatically worse. The season was a disaster. In some areas it is the fourth year in succession that there has been less than average rainfall. That has led

to lack of product, with high costs of production, and added to that there is the insult of having to pay interest rates in excess of 20 per cent in some cases, thanks to the world's greatest Treasurer!

Some 200 farmers now find that they are not viable under the terms laid down by the Rural Assistance Branch. The serious and deteriorating situation on Upper Eyre Peninsula culminated in a rally at Wudinna on Sunday, attended by 1 000 people, and I heard some of the hard and sad cases that were put forward. Indeed, one farmer said that the phosphate-producing factory in Port Lincoln was told not to supply him with super phosphate. I do not know how we can get out of our overseas debt problem if we cannot produce.

Will the Attorney-General ask the Premier to accept the invitation to visit the affected areas so that he can see at first hand the devastating impact of continuing poor seasonal conditions on individuals, families, businesses and local communities; and will the Government reconsider its decision not to have a natural disaster declared, and explain how finance will be available to sow crops for the forthcoming year?

**The Hon. C.J. SUMNER:** The Government is doing all within its power to attempt to provide assistance, where possible, to West Coast farmers. As the Hon. Mr Dunn knows, and as everyone concerned with rural assistance must know, we have to look at the long-term viability of farms to which assistance has been given. The Premier is well aware of the situation on the West Coast, as is the Minister of Agriculture. However, I shall be happy to convey the honourable member's request to the Premier and to the Minister of Agriculture.

However, the Government's policy in this area has been clearly stated: it is designed to put profitable and economically viable farms on the West Coast. The Government does not believe that that can be achieved in a situation, given the marginal nature of the land, where farms in some areas on the West Coast could not be economically viable no matter what assistance is provided. It is a difficult situation and I think that everyone—particularly the Government—would have sympathy for those farmers on the West Coast who have been caught in this situation. The policy of the Government must be to provide economic viability in that area and to the farms of that area. That has been the approach adopted by the Premier and the Minister of Agriculture, but the honourable member has made a request and I will refer it to the Premier for his consideration.

#### SELECT COMMITTEE ON THE ABORIGINAL HEALTH ORGANISATION

**The Hon. CAROLYN PICKLES:** I move:

That the Hon. R.R. Roberts be substituted in the place of the Hon. J.R. Cornwall (resigned) on the select committee.

**The Hon. M.B. CAMERON (Leader of the Opposition):** I second the motion. May I say a few words about the select committee?

**The PRESIDENT:** Yes.

**The Hon. M.B. CAMERON:** I have been concerned to the point that when I heard this motion was to come up I considered whether or not to ask that the select committee be disbanded, not because I do not believe that the committee will not arrive at a reasonable conclusion—I trust that will be the case—but because I am concerned about the operation of the committee and the way in which some

witnesses have been treated. At this stage I do not wish to go into great detail, but I trust that whoever chairs the committee in the future, as well as the Hon. Mr Roberts as a new member of the committee, will see that it treats witnesses properly. I must say that this is one of the worst committees on which I have served in terms of people presenting their evidence. I do not say that lightly, because it is not a subject about which I wish to make a great performance in the Council at this stage.

**The Hon. G.L. Bruce:** You have.

**The Hon. M.B. CAMERON:** No, I have not. I could go into some detail but I am being extremely restrained. The honourable Mr Bruce can be told straight from me that I have been extremely angry at the way in which some witnesses have been treated by this committee—not by myself, I might say, and not by the Hon. Ms Pickles or the majority of the members of the committee.

A select committee is a very powerful organ and a very intimidating group for a witness to face. When an Aboriginal person by the name of Mr Yami Lester, the Chairman of the Anangu Pitjantjatjara Council, a senior Aboriginal person, says to me after appearing before the committee that his knees were shaking because he was so scared by some of the treatment he received, the situation becomes quite serious. I trust that the committee from now on—

**The Hon. G.L. Bruce:** Have you raised this before the committee?

**The Hon. M.B. CAMERON:** You have not been on the committee or you would know. A number of questions have been raised before the committee and I will be saying a little more and in more detail to the committee. I second the motion.

**The PRESIDENT:** I point out to the Council Standing Order 190, which says:

No reference shall be made to any proceedings of a committee of the whole Council or of a select committee until such proceedings have been reported.

I ask members to keep that Standing Order in mind when debating this motion.

**The Hon. M.J. ELLIOTT:** In so far as the Hon. Mr Cameron's remarks were seen as in order, I simply echo those sentiments and agree totally with everything he said.

**The Hon. CAROLYN PICKLES:** In reply to the motion I would like to take up the points made by the Hon. Mr Cameron. I am mindful of the matter that has been raised by you, Ms President. It seems to me that some political point scoring is going on. I can assure the Hon. Mr Cameron that I, as a member of this select committee, intend to treat all witnesses with respect, as I feel the committee has always done. I think that the Hon. Mr Cameron is casting a slur upon people who are no longer in this Chamber and are unable to answer that slur.

Motion carried.

#### INDUSTRIAL AND COMMERCIAL TRAINING ACT AMENDMENT BILL

Adjourned debate on the question:

That the Council do not further insist on its amendment.

(Continued from 1 December 1988. Page 1797.)

**The Hon. I. GILFILLAN:** The Council will recall that we left this matter unresolved before Christmas on the basis that the Opposition's amendment had not been properly debated and considered by other interested parties. The Democrats recognised that it was an issue of some value and should be discussed and considered in this place. We

therefore find ourselves at this stage referring to the consequences of an inconclusive conference between both Houses in an effort to resolve a series of amendments put forward in this Chamber specifically intended to protect trainees from being coerced into joining unions before they could receive the necessary training.

I have had discussions with Mr Graham Mill, the head of the Industrial and Commercial Training Commission, and I received a letter from the relevant Minister, the Hon. Lynn Arnold. I believe that both those communications are significant when considering this debate. However, there are several matters that I want to discuss further with Mr Mill before concluding the Democrats' contribution to this debate. Unfortunately, he is interstate, but I expect to be able to have those discussions before Parliament sits tomorrow, and therefore seek leave to conclude my remarks later.

**The PRESIDENT:** When this matter was last debated you sought leave to conclude your remarks, so you must conclude your remarks now; you cannot adjourn it further.

**The Hon. I. GILFILLAN:** I should have sought advice on Standing Orders. I apologise to the Council. It may well be that we have a second contribution to make, but the points that I raised are still relevant and I will seek to have the Democrats' position put finally tomorrow by my colleague, the Hon. Mike Elliott.

**The Hon. M.J. ELLIOTT** secured the adjournment of the debate.

#### SOUTH AUSTRALIAN METROPOLITAN FIRE SERVICE ACT AMENDMENT BILL

Adjourned debate on second reading.  
(Continued from 30 November 1988. Page 1758.)

**The Hon. J.C. IRWIN:** I take this first opportunity of welcoming our new colleague, the Hon. Ron Roberts, to our fold and I trust that he will enjoy his stay in the Council as much as I have, as a relative newcomer. I understand that I should declare an interest in this legislation in that a member of my family has shares in the Wormald company. So, I will go through what I will describe as the charade of declaring an interest in that firm. It is now two months since my colleague the Hon. Diana Laidlaw spoke on behalf of the Opposition on this piece of legislation, which seeks to expand the functions and powers of the South Australian Metropolitan Fire Service. The Opposition has not changed its mind during the two-month break in this debate; rather, it has strengthened its resolve to oppose this Bill.

The Hon. Ms Laidlaw clearly detailed all the reasons for rejecting this legislation, and they were added to by my other colleague who spoke on this Bill, the Hon. Legh Davis. However, I will quickly go over those points in order to refresh the minds of members. I refer to the Australian Democrats, who have the ultimate responsibility for the course taken with respect to this legislation. They must decide whether this is yet another Government-linked corporation which will seek to compete with private firms, in this case in the already competitive field of fire protection. I am reminded, after reading the preceding debate, that already there are something like 75 competing firms in this industry. So the Democrats must decide whether the playing field is level. The Opposition contends that it is not level.

The South Australian Metropolitan Fire Service has an extremely unfair advantage in the marketplace. Many instances could be cited, but some of the more obvious include exemptions from sales tax, entry to premises by

uniform authority status, the ability to offset staff costs between departments without appropriate expense adjustment and relief from many Government charges. So how can it be described as a level playing field when the Metropolitan Fire Service will be the only body amongst the 75 competing authorities who will supply the inspectors who will defect equipment, because the MFS will then seek to sell upgraded equipment to that same client? The Democrats must decide whether a situation will arise with the MFS similar to that with respect to the Central Linen Service where the interest payments on loans were capitalised and the \$7 million in loans was written off by the financing authority. This Bill contains all the ingredients for a fiasco similar to that which occurred with respect to the Central Linen Service, which makes a mockery of the level playing field approach and the notion of fair competition.

I refer to a recent press release, issued through the Chamber of Commerce and Industry, regarding this legislation. Headed 'SA Inc.—The fire protection industry concerns', it states:

Despite recent denials by the Premier, Mr John Bannon, of the existence of an 'South Australian Inc.', the Government is pressing on with the legislation in State Parliament to empower the SA Metropolitan Fire Service to sell fire equipment in direct competition with the many commercial companies already operating in the marketplace.

The Bill has brought bitter opposition from the Fire Protection Industry Association and is strongly opposed by the Chamber of Commerce and by the Liberal Party which sees the attempt as another example of Government encroachment into a responsible and well served industry. The fire service should concentrate on its legitimate role of fire prevention and control.

A comprehensive accounting exercise would show that the fire department's equipment servicing division, in which it already competes with private enterprise (almost certainly outside of its charter) is uneconomic, and a further Government foray into a retail arena is certain to provide a similar result.

This is clearly a blatant misuse of public facilities and is a further indication of the Government's pursuit of the 'SA Inc.' strategy in which the South Australian public's money will be put at risk.

Of course, to be cynical of the Government's real intention with respect to this foray, its long-term aim would be to eventually eliminate competition so that it can stand proudly alone as a fine example of Government enterprise outperforming the private sector which it hates so much. To achieve this the Government could use a number of blatant devices—one of which is loan write-offs—that I have already mentioned.

A socialist Government always convinces itself—and attempts to convince the people—that, if it is fair for private enterprise to compete, the Government should be out there competing as well and passing on the benefits to the people—which of course it never does. With all the contrived wheeling and dealing of this Government we are no better off in 1989 than we were in 1982. Members have only to go out into the electorate and door knock, particularly in the marginal seats, to find out whether people believe they are any better off in 1989 than they were in 1982. In almost every case in my experience, after knocking on 600 or 700 doors in the past few days, people are saying that they are worse off. In fact, for the first time this year many people are saying that they are really feeling the pinch.

One wonders what has happened to all the contrived wheeling and dealing and activity out there in the central business district of Adelaide where hotels, a casino, a convention centre or whatever are being built. They may be good individually, but they will not make this State any better off than it was seven or eight years ago. It is about time people tested themselves and asked why they are no better off. The Hon. Diana Laidlaw, in response to the

Government's three grounds for proposing this expansion of functions and powers for the MFS, said:

First, the Minister argues that the fire service is presently carrying out additional functions, including marine and Penfield operations and salvage.

The press release from the chamber argues, as we do, that the fire equipment servicing division already competes with private enterprise—almost certainly outside its charter. So we are being asked to amend the Act to provide virtually retrospective endorsement of these additional functions of the corporation.

Nowhere has the Minister outlined why the corporation's fire equipment servicing division must expand beyond its current practice into the field of replacing fire equipment. As I indicated earlier, it is extraordinary for the MFS to be the sole provider of inspectors and then to be on the ground floor offering new equipment to replace the equipment that those inspectors have just condemned. That is an extraordinary situation. Our extensive research and advice has not thrown up any area of dissatisfaction with respect to private companies in the field of fire prevention. This point is further emphasised by the revelation of the relative incompetence of the Minister, or at least the advice he has received, with respect to standards for fire equipment.

The Minister argues that the need to widen the powers and functions of the corporation will be exacerbated by the need to replace fire protection equipment which will be condemned in 1989 as a result of the introduction of new standards. Again, on the evidence we have, as argued by the Hon. Ms Laidlaw and others, this is simply not true. Honourable members would know that all equipment—for whatever use—will be upgraded and improved over time. That is a natural progression. I do not hold anything against that—I accept it. However, to lead Parliament into believing that the Standards Association of Australia will soon enforce new standards, rendering obsolete large numbers of fire extinguishers, is quite misleading and obnoxious.

As one justification for the Government framing this legislation to benefit a Government corporation it falls flat on its face and it should be seen by honourable members of this Council, as distinct from members of the other place, for what it is. The Executive Officer of Committee FP-3 related to fire extinguishers, Mr W.C. Pringle, has advised:

1. Standards Australia have no proposed standards which will obsolete any type of extinguisher.

2. South Australian Metropolitan Fire Brigade will service soda acid type extinguishers and chemical foam type extinguishers as long as parts are available and they meet the requirements of the standard hydrostatic test.

The Government will to have come up with much better arguments to convince the Opposition. The uncertainty should not be allowed to continue as long as it has, affecting the whole industry. It is now nearly two months since this matter was last debated, and we must avoid this uncertainty at all costs.

When researching this legislation, I was confounded to learn that the Government did not bother to inform the association or individual members about the content of this Bill. Again and again we see examples of the Government's arrogance in this respect. Consultation was one of the great

platforms of which the Government was so proud when I first came into this place. The Government has now either forgotten how to consult or wants to get the legislation through by stealth. Here we have another blatant attack on private enterprise by stealth and without any consultation. If that is the real motive behind this Bill, stealth and surprise in battle are always very effective weapons. They are being used here but are being found out.

Treasurer Bannon and his Minister should learn from their colleagues in Western Australia. Only a few months ago in December 1988, the Western Australian Minister, Mr Hill, when announcing a revamp of the Western Australian fire services, said in part:

It was much more cost effective for the private sector to service extinguishers—

that was a marvellous quote from a Labor Minister—as it has been doing since the early 1970s, and for officers of the brigade to use their expertise for training and monitoring.

The Liberal Party certainly supports that statement.

Finally, for reasons outlined by my colleagues and supported by me, the Opposition believes that this Bill is unnecessary. We believe it is based on misleading advice and that the private sector is more than able to provide services to the industry.

**The Hon. Diana Laidlaw:** And it is doing so now.

**The Hon. J.C. IRWIN:** It is certainly doing so now. As I said earlier, it needs more certainty about that and to have this Bill taken off the Notice Paper, voted out or dramatically changed so that it is to the benefit of the industry and not to that of the Government.

There is no need whatever for the Metropolitan Fire Service to enter this field of equipment supply. The Liberal Party supports the second reading of this Bill, but it may well have a different position if the Government does not decide to change its course in the Committee stage and on the third reading.

**The PRESIDENT:** Order! Before calling on anyone to continue the debate, I point out that the honourable member followed Standing Order 225 as he began his speech, and indicated a pecuniary interest in this matter. However, he used the phrase, 'the charade' of declaring his pecuniary interest. I have reflected on whether such a remark counteracts Standing Order 192 or 193, which prevent injurious reflections upon the Parliament of this State and the votes of this Council, the Standing Orders, of course, having been established by the vote of this Council. I will not ask that the member formally withdraw that comment, but I indicate to the Council that I feel it is an undesirable reflection on what I am sure all members feel is a very worthwhile Standing Order.

**The Hon. M.J. ELLIOTT** secured the adjournment of the debate.

#### ADJOURNMENT

At 3.40 p.m. the Council adjourned until Wednesday 15 February at 2.15 p.m.