

HOUSE OF ASSEMBLY

Tuesday 1 November 1988

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

ASSENT TO BILLS

His Excellency the Governor, by message, intimated his assent to the following Bills:
Land Tax Act Amendment,
Pay-roll Tax Act Amendment,
Unauthorised Documents Act Amendment.

QUESTIONS

The **SPEAKER**: I direct that written answers to the following questions on the Notice Paper, as detailed in the schedule that I now table, be distributed and printed in *Hansard*: Nos 52, 57, 59 to 65, 67, 68, 71, 72, 78, 82, 85, 94, 97 to 100, 103, 109, 113, 114, 117 to 119, 121, 122, 124, 125, 128, 129, 133, and 136 to 139; and I direct that the following answers to questions without notice be distributed and printed in *Hansard*.

BEACHED WHALES

In reply to **Hon. T. CHAPMAN** (Alexandra) 10 February.

The **Hon. D.J. HOPGOOD**: The definition of 'foreshore' in relation to administration purposes has considerable overlap into several Government agencies as well as local government. As a consequence an informal and interdepartmental working group supported a management development project which considered matters associated with coastal management. This report, 'Coastal Land Management', highlights the overlap of various legislation concerning 'the foreshore' and in particular its definition and ownership under the Crown Lands and Harbors Acts. It also recommended rationalisation of these issues. It is clear, however, that care, control and management of the foreshore under the Harbors Act is the responsibility of councils. What needs to be reviewed is the limits of this responsibility, i.e. seaward of low water mark for activities such as boating control, aquaculture, marinas etc.

The Department of Environment and Planning's intention is that, on reviewing the Coast Protection Act, recommendations will be made on changes to other associated Acts, and in particular to the Crown Lands Conservation and Management Act, and Harbors Act in respect to care, control and management of the foreshore, particularly as regards those areas that need to be defined as harbors, out of council areas, and limits offshore. The honourable member will be pleased to know that the Minister of Local Government has arranged a reimbursement to the District Council of Dudley in its attempt to dispose of the beached whale from Hog Bay Beach, Penneshaw.

WORLD EXPO

In reply to **Mr HAMILTON** (Albert Park) 17 August.

The **Hon. G.F. KENEALLY**: On 17 August 1988, in reply to a question from the member for Albert Park, I gave an undertaking that I would refer to my colleague the Minister

of Tourism certain aspects of his question to me relating to the South Australian Stand at World Expo. The Minister has advised me that more than 800 000 people have visited the South Australian stand to date, and the travel consultants serving on the stand have averaged in excess of 200 committed travel inquiries per week. Those making bookings have been principally international visitors and local Queenslanders, and they have principally been for holiday day tours, accommodation, Kangaroo Island packages, and express coach travel. Over 150 Grand Prix tickets have been sold from the South Australian stand.

Unlike the adverse publicity which has been attempted by members of the Opposition, visitors to the stand have reacted positively to our display with recorded comments such as:

We enjoyed the personal approach.

It is a pleasure to be able to talk to people as against being spoken to by videos, computers, etc.

It is great to be able to obtain the information required. Others have commented on the relaxed, friendly atmosphere which contrasts with other stands and pavilions at Expo.

PETITION: RARE AND ENDANGERED BIRDS

A petition signed by 108 residents of South Australia praying that the House urge the Government to review the schedules under the National Parks and Wildlife Act pertaining to rare and endangered birds and not proceed with prosecutions under these schedules where birds are not rare or endangered was presented by the Hon. P.B. Arnold.

Petition received.

PETITION: ADMINISTRATIVE APPEALS

A petition signed by 74 residents of South Australia praying that the House take the necessary action to reverse the decision made by the Government to pay costs for the Hon. J.R. Cornwall and consider legislation that would permit citizens of this State to appeal against such administrative decisions was presented by Mr Becker.

Petition received.

PETITION: HOUSING TRUST RENTS

A petition signed by 49 residents of South Australia praying that the House urge the Government to limit South Australian Housing Trust rental increases to once a year, in line with inflation, and not consider the family allowance supplement and the war veterans disability allowances as income was presented by Mr Becker.

Petition received.

PETITION: NURSING HOME FUNDING

A petition signed by 220 residents of South Australia praying that the House urge the Government to raise the level of nursing home funding to maintain nursing staff hours was presented by the Hon. J. L. Cashmore.

Petition received.

PETITION: WILPENA TOURIST COMPLEX

A petition signed by 835 residents of South Australia praying that the House urge the Government to reject the

proposal to build a tourist complex at Wilpena and give a commitment that national parks be dedicated primarily for nature conservation was presented by the Hon. J. L. Cashmore.

Petition received.

PETITION: OLD GRANGE RAILWAY STATION

A petition signed by 188 residents of South Australia praying that the House urge the Government to provide street parking on the site of the Old Grange Railway Station; that a bus-rail interchange be incorporated in the new station complex; and that a pedestrian crossing be installed at the Military Road-Jetty Street intersection was presented by Mr Ferguson.

Petition received.

PAPERS TABLED

The following papers were laid on the table:

By the Treasurer (Hon. J.C. Bannon)—

Casino Supervisory Authority—Report, 1987-88.
Lotteries Commission of South Australia—Report, 1987-88.

By the Minister for Environment and Planning (Hon. D.J. Hopgood)—

North Haven Trust—Report, 1987-88.
Planning Appeal Tribunal—Report, 1987-88.

By the Minister of Emergency Services (Hon. D.J. Hopgood)—

Country Fire Services—Report, 1987-88.

By the Minister of State Development and Technology (Hon. L.M.F. Arnold)—

Department of State Development and Technology—Report, 1987-88.

By the Minister of Employment and Further Education (Hon. L.M.F. Arnold)—

Office of Employment and Training—Report, 1987-88.
University of Adelaide—
Report, 1987.
Statutes.

By the Minister of Transport (Hon. G.F. Keneally)—

Local Government Finance Authority of South Australia—Report, 1987-88.
South Australian Local Government Grants Commission—Report, 1987-88.
Metropolitan Taxi-Cab Act 1956—Regulations—Hire Cars.
Corporation of Port Lincoln By-laws—No. 6—News-papers and Merchandise.
District Council By-laws—
Berri—No. 2—Garbage Containers.
Lower Eyre Peninsula—
No. 1—Permits and Penalties.
No. 2—Streets and Public Places.
Yorketown—No. 28—Animals and Birds.
Municipal By-laws—Roxby Downs—
No. 1—Taxis.
No. 2—Street Traders.
No. 3—Garbage.
No. 4—Caravans.
No. 5—Reserves, Ovals and Public Places.
No. 6—Permits and Penalties.

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

Corporate Affairs Commission—Report, 1987-88.
Department of Public and Consumer Affairs—Report, 1987-88.
Legal Services Commission of South Australia—Report, 1987-88.
Director-General of Education—Report, 1987.
Evidence Act 1929—Report relating to Suppression Orders, 1987-88.

Landlord and Tenant Act 1936—Regulation—South Australian Brewing Co. Exemption.
Liquor Licensing Act 1985—Regulation—Liquor Consumption—Thebarton Oval.
South Australian Friendly Societies' Association—Rules.
Supreme Court Act 1935—Supreme Court Rules—Injunctions.

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

Pitjantjatjara Land Rights Act 1981—Regulations—Min-table Notice of Entry.
Pitjantjatjara Lands Parliamentary Committee—
Report, 1988.
Minutes of Proceedings and Evidence.

By the Minister of Public Works (Hon. T.H. Hemmings)—

Parliamentary Standing Committee on Public Works—
61st General Report.

By the Minister of Health (Hon. F.T. Blevins)—

Chiropractors Board of South Australia—Report, 1987-88.
Occupational Therapists Registration Board of South Australia—Report, 1987-88.
South Australian Psychological Board—Report, 1987-88.
Glenside Hospital—By-laws—Trespass, Conduct and Parking.

By the Minister of Correctional Services (Hon. F.T. Blevins)—

Correctional Services Advisory Council—Report, 1987-88.

By the Minister of Agriculture (Hon. M.K. Mayes)—

Australian Agricultural Council—Resolutions of the 130th Meeting, 14 July 1988.
Citrus Board of South Australia—Report for the year ended 30 April 1988.
South Australian Egg Board—Report, 1987-88.
Seeds Act 1979—Regulations—Seed Testing Fees.
Veterinary Surgeons Act 1985—Regulations—Fees.

By the Minister of Recreation and Sport (Hon. M.K. Mayes)—

Department of Recreation and Sport—Report, 1987-88.

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

Department of Labour—Report, 1987-88.
Long Service Leave (Building Industry) Board—Report, 1987-88.
Workers Compensation Appeal Tribunal—Rules—General.

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

South-Eastern Drainage Board—Report, 1987-88.

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

Department for Community Welfare—Report, 1987-88.

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

Electricity Trust of South Australia Act 1946—Regulations—Vegetation Clearance.

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

Woods and Forests Department—Report, 1987-88.
Forestry Act 1950—Variation of Proclamations (7).

MINISTERIAL STATEMENT: NATIONAL CRIME AUTHORITY

The Hon D.J. HOPGOOD (Deputy Premier): I seek leave to make a statement.

Leave granted.

The Hon. D.J. HOPGOOD: On 16 August 1988 I delivered a detailed statement to the House in relation to a report received from the National Crime Authority on certain South Australian investigations during 1986 and 1987. Further to that statement I am now able to advise the House

that the South Australian Government has formally agreed to commit State funds for the establishment of a National Crime Authority (NCA) office in the State. The Government has obtained the support of both the Commonwealth Government and the NCA to grant an additional reference to the authority to enable it to investigate allegations of criminal activity and corruption in South Australia. This clears the way for the establishment of an NCA office in South Australia to investigate these matters.

The Government is confident that the inter-governmental committee which oversees the activities of the NCA will support the new reference at its next scheduled meeting later this month. The Government has formally approved funds for the establishment and the running costs of an NCA office. We have agreed to provide the funds based on NCA estimates of the running costs, estimated in this financial year to be \$1.1 million, subject to operational requirements.

The Government is also seeking the urgent amendment of the National Crime Authority Act 1984 (Commonwealth) to enable the appointment of additional members to the authority for specific investigations. Such an amendment will allow the appointment of an additional member to conduct investigations in South Australia and to hold hearings. Provisions in the NCA Act for additional members will be useful for the future should special inquiries be needed. The Commonwealth and the NCA have agreed to support the amendments and the Attorney-General will be seeking the support of other members of the inter-governmental committee as a matter of urgency.

Let me restate the Government's clear commitment to investigate thoroughly all allegations of corruption in South Australia. The NCA is independent and, on a reference, has coercive powers. As such, it provides the best avenue to tackle any corruption investigations. The Government's decision has been taken after initial consideration was given to the establishment of an anti-corruption unit. The ministerial committee, after considering this option—which had been recommended by the recent NCA report—decided however to pursue the establishment of an NCA presence in South Australia. The advantages of an NCA office includes utilising the authority's existing expertise and intelligence in investigations. The authority has available to it extensive powers of inquiry and, because the authority operates on a national level, it can pursue investigations across State borders.

MINISTERIAL STATEMENT: 5AA BOARD

The Hon. M.K. MAYES (Minister of Recreation and Sport): I seek leave to make a statement.

Leave granted.

The Hon. M.K. MAYES: On 6 October 1988 the member for Bragg asked me whether I had received a report from the Chairman of the TAB regarding a request by the board of 5AA for the resignation of Mr Des Corcoran and I replied that I had not received a report at that time. On 12 October the member for Bragg asked me whether the Government had sought advice on the potential for conflict of interest or possible breaches of the Broadcasting Act in the case of Mr Harry Krantz, who is a member of both the board of the Festival City Broadcasters (FCB) and the board of SGIC Nominees Pty Ltd (which has a 30 per cent interest in the new 5DN holding company, First Radio Limited), and in the case of Mr Allan Scott, also a member of the FCB board and owner of South East Telecasters which owns 60 per cent of 5DN.

I have followed every course of action available to me as Minister by seeking a report from the Chairman of the TAB in relation to the first question and advice from the Crown Solicitor in relation to the second. I have now received these reports and are able to advise the House accordingly. With regard to Mr Corcoran, I am advised by the Chairman of the TAB that a board meeting of Festival City Broadcasters has considered Mr Corcoran's response to its request either to resign or explain why he should not resign. The FCB board accepted Mr Corcoran's explanation that he did not breach board confidentiality in any way as alleged, and decided that no further action would be taken against Mr Corcoran.

In relation to the question of potential conflict of interest and breaches of the Broadcasting Act by Mr Scott, I have previously been advised by the Crown Solicitor that there would have been a contravention of the Broadcasting Act 1942, had he remained a Director of the Board of Festival City Broadcasters. Subsequently, Mr Scott resigned as a Director of FCB and hence a conflict of interest no longer exists in relation to him. In relation to Mr Krantz, I have received advice from the Crown Solicitor. I am still considering that advice and will report further to the House as soon as I am able.

MINISTERIAL STATEMENT: VEGETATION CLEARANCE REGULATIONS

The Hon. J.H.C. KLUNDER (Minister of Mines and Energy): I seek leave to make a statement.

Leave granted.

The Hon. J.H.C. KLUNDER: The proclamation today of the Electricity Trust Act Amendment Act of 1988 and the vegetation clearance regulations provide me with an appropriate opportunity to put a number of matters before the House. All members would be aware of the public debate that has developed about the regulations and, while public debate is a healthy process, there are occasions when the passions it generates tend to obscure the real issues. Let me remind—

Members interjecting:

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

The Hon. J.L. CASHMORE: On a point of order, Mr Speaker, it has been agreed by the House that whenever a Minister makes a ministerial statement a copy should be made available to the Opposition simultaneously with the reading of it, but no such copy has been made available.

The SPEAKER: Order! I cannot uphold the point of order because it is not a requirement of Standing Orders that that be done. However, I point out that that courtesy is normally extended by Ministers.

The Hon. J.H.C. KLUNDER: I am quite happy to make the statement at the end of Question Time. There has obviously been some confusion and it would be reasonable of me to make sure that I supply a copy to the Leader.

PUBLIC WORKS COMMITTEE REPORTS

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

Goodwood Orphanage—Educational Services Centre,
Royal Adelaide Hospital—Theatres/Admission/Discharges Redevelopment.

Ordered that reports be printed.

QUESTION TIME

DRUG AND CORRUPTION ALLEGATIONS

Mr OLSEN (Leader of the Opposition): I direct a question to the Premier. Was the immunity from prosecution given by the Government to Mr X in the Moyse case conditional on Mr X's not making false allegations; does it extend to all crimes he has confessed to in interviews with the National Crime Authority and a journalist, Mr Dick Wordley, including his part in supplying heroin which may have killed at least three people in Adelaide in August and September 1985; and, if the immunity is this wide, does it indicate that the Government believes Mr X is an important informant on organised crime and corruption whose allegations must be taken seriously and fully investigated?

The Hon. J.C. BANNON: I do not know these details. I certainly do not know what conditions of immunity have been fixed. As I understand it, this individual is in the hands or under the investigation of the NCA, not the South Australian Police Force or the Government.

Members interjecting:

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

The Hon. J.L. Cashmore interjecting:

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

LANGUAGE EDUCATION

Mr DUGAN (Adelaide): Will the Minister of Employment and Further Education advise whether the Government has a coherent policy for the encouragement, development and co-ordination of language education in South Australia? A number of separate initiatives have been taken in recent years dealing with language education at primary, secondary and tertiary levels, but some parents are anxious to be assured that language education begun at primary level can be continued in later years.

The Hon. L.M.F. ARNOLD: I thank the honourable member for his question. It is certainly true that the State Government has a coherent policy with respect to language education, having established a number of organisations and having proposed and implemented a number of initiatives in this regard. I remind members that South Australia was the second State in Australia to indicate that by 1995 every primary school child would be learning a language other than English in their primary school curricula. That program is already under way and being pursued successfully by my colleague the Minister of Education.

At the same time, prior to the 1985 election the South Australian Secondary School of Languages offered increased language opportunities to those students not able to achieve them within their established secondary schools. Alongside that, the Government has established the South Australian Institute of Languages, responsible to me as Minister, and that body is examining ways in which the language offerings in tertiary education to South Australian students from all sources—both South Australia and interstate—can be greatly enhanced.

I am pleased to announce that, in the recent round of funding under the Australian second language learning program of the Federal Government, South Australia has succeeded very well. A total of \$229 000 has been approved for South Australia. That program includes the mapping of

provision of languages other than English in South Australia to provide a detailed information base for the formation of a five year language development plan, which will lead to all children having access to a language other than English by 1995, and which will cost \$45 000. Secondly, a language inservice program for teachers, a teacher oriented professional development program to improve teaching practices, will be instituted.

Thirdly, for language courses for teachers of target languages—Indonesian, Japanese and Greek—and for programs in Indonesian, an amount of \$26 000 has been allocated. Community education, the informing of parents and children via brochures, and information booklets on the work of the language other than English programs have been allocated an amount of \$54 000. That is testimony to the work being done by this Government in promoting languages other than English in all sectors of education—primary through tertiary—and this Government remains committed to those programs.

DRUG AND CORRUPTION ALLEGATIONS

Mr INGERSON (Bragg): My question is to the Premier. Will he confirm that the Government is taking seriously an allegation by Mr X that a former member of the New South Wales Parliament is involved in laundering money paid for illicit drugs in South Australia? Is the person named by Mr X Mr Neville Wran? Has Mr X also named Mr Al Grassby as being involved in the drug scene, and have Mr Grassby, Mr Wran—

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order! The honourable member for Bragg.

Mr INGERSON: Have Mr Grassby, Mr Wran and an Adelaide businessman, said by Mr X to have knowledge of these activities, been questioned about them? If so, what was the outcome and, if not, why, and when will they be questioned?

The Hon. J.C. BANNON: Again, the question has been addressed to me and not to the responsible Minister, although in this instance I am not sure what particular off the cuff information could be provided. I will certainly refer the question to my colleague. I must say that I find it pretty disgraceful to see parliamentary privilege in this jurisdiction in this State—

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order!

The Hon. J.C. BANNON: —used in this way. It has not been a tradition in South Australia, by and large. Yes, it has occurred, but by and large it has not been, and as to the source of the question, I really think that the questioner should not lend himself to this kind of Opposition tactic.

HOUSE AUCTIONS

Mr PLUNKETT (Peake): I address my question to the Minister of Education, representing the Minister of Consumer Affairs. Is the Minister aware of allegations that some auctioneers are artificially inflating house prices? Can the Minister advise the House whether this practice is illegal as well as unethical? Constituents have drawn my attention to a practice which seems to be growing at house auctions, where mysterious bids appear to be placed either by auctioneers or by persons who are not necessarily genuine bidders for the house. Such practices have the effect of raising the price of a property beyond that which would reasonably be expected.

The Hon. G.J. CRAFTER: I thank the honourable member for raising in the House a concern of his constituents. From time to time, I have heard similar allegations about practices of that nature occurring at auctions. I will be pleased to have the matter referred to my colleague for an investigation and reply in due course.

DRUG AND CORRUPTION ALLEGATIONS

The Hon. B.C. EASTICK (Light): I direct my question to the Minister of Emergency Services. Were all the serious allegations of drug dealing and corruption made by Mr X in the dossier provided to the police on 14 October known previously to the South Australian police as a result of interviews between Mr X and the National Crime Authority which began in June 1987, 15 months ago? If so, why did the South Australian police appoint a special task force to investigate those allegations only after they were published in the *Advertiser*? If not, why did it require a journalist to extract these allegations from Mr X? Is not the failure to either obtain or fully investigate this information before now further evidence of a lack of resolve to deal with allegations of corruption?

The Hon. D.J. HOPGOOD: We can discount the second part of the question, because it does not follow at all from my answer: the answer is that substantially what is in the allegations made by Mr X has been known to the National Crime Authority and the South Australian police for some considerable time and has been subject to some considerable investigation. That investigation has not got very far, because of the nature of the allegations. However, the police have decided that obviously there is an argument for continuing with the investigations and for trying to get the best that they possibly can out of them. My information is that most of what has come out of Mr Wordley's investigations in this matter is by no means new information. It is not necessarily new information, but certainly new allegations.

I think that the reporters who worked on this are to be congratulated on making sense out of a whole background of material that was extraordinarily garbled and mixed up. At least those two reporters were able to provide a coherent account. In fact, one might argue that the *Advertiser* has made too much of a coherent account from it, because the people of South Australia have been left with an impression that there is an allegation against the CSIRO by Mr X—the CSIRO and drugs. That is the impression left by these articles, whereas the fact of the matter is that Mr X referred to an ex-employee of the CSIRO who it, is alleged, provided some sort of technical services to those wanting to grow marijuana. That is different from the impression given by the headlining and the text of the articles. So, while one can congratulate people for making some sort of coherent account out of it, sometimes they have made too much of it.

DEPARTMENT OF LANDS

Mr HAMILTON (Albert Park): Can the Minister of Lands say whether the Department of Lands is forcing the early retirement of one of two of its Naracoorte office staff? The front page of the Naracoorte *Herald* of 13 October 1988 stated that the Mayor (Mr Neil Smith) and the State member of Parliament, the member for Victoria, were battling against time to prevent the Department of Lands from forcing the early retirement of one of its two Naracoorte staff. Then, on 17 October, in the same paper the member

for Victoria vowed to keep the pressure on the South Australian Government over the so-called disgraceful forced early retirement of a Lands Department officer.

The Hon. S.M. LENEHAN: The short answer to the question is 'Absolutely no'. The department is not forcing the early retirement of an officer stationed at the Naracoorte office. I think it is appropriate that I place on record exactly what the situation is. Two issues are involved in this matter: first, the future of the Naracoorte office; and, secondly, the early retirement of an officer of the department. My Director of Lands has in fact provided to the newspaper concerned (Naracoorte *Herald*) full details which I understand were published on Thursday 27 October. However, for the benefit of those members who have not seen that reply, I shall outline the facts.

In 1986 the officer concerned was considered for reassignment to another position when his job in Adelaide became surplus to requirements. Later that year, a position became vacant in the Naracoorte office and, as he had indicated that he wished to retire in two years time in Naracoorte, he was transferred there with his approval and his removal expenses were paid by the department. As the Naracoorte position was at a lower salary level, the officer was paid at the higher rate for the two years he has been at Naracoorte. This arrangement, which was confirmed in writing with the officer in October 1986, fitted in with his retirement plans. The Director wrote to the officer in August this year to remind him that the two-year arrangement expired on 21 October and to seek his intentions beyond that date. I understand that the officer had hoped to gain some monetary incentive to retire. However, he has in fact reached retirement age and is eligible for a State Government superannuation pension.

I am extremely disappointed that the member for Victoria did not contact either me or the Director on this matter. As to the proposed closure, I have both verbally and in writing indicated to the honourable member that no action will be taken until a report on cost savings is prepared and given to both the member and the two councils concerned.

I am concerned that the mayor has indicated in the article that I have broken the commitment given by the previous Minister that no action would be taken until the proposal had been commented on by the two councils. Although the member for Victoria has made his comments on the report—and made them publicly—I am still awaiting the councils' response. I repeat that no decision will be taken until the councils concerned have put their response to me and it has been received and assessed in conjunction with a thorough financial analysis and the advice of my department. I think it is regrettable that the member for Victoria having been given that information by me sought to completely distort it because I understand that his preselection is under threat.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order!

DRUG AND CORRUPTION ALLEGATIONS

The Hon. B.C. EASTICK (Light): Further to my question to the Minister of Emergency Services, can we assume from his answer that he has had access to all or a substantial part of the original Mr X information, and that in fact he has read it, and can he confirm that the names of Mr Wran and Mr Grassby appear in those original documents?

The Hon. D.J. HOPGOOD: Here we go again.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order!

The Hon. D.J. HOPGOOD: I have to repeat the strictures of the Premier in relation to this matter of throwing up names of people just because it happens to suit the political bias of the honourable member opposite. Let me come to the gravamen of the honourable member's question. He may not be aware of the fact that for the past two weeks the Minister of Labour has been Acting Minister of Emergency Services. That is because I was to go to Nagoya, Japan, to attend the biennial conference of a group known as EAROPH of which I have been President for the past two years. In the event, I did not go to Nagoya because my wife was taken seriously ill and had to have a quite major operation in Flinders Medical Centre. So, for the past two weeks I have been a full time husband and Minister of nothing at all. Therefore, having resumed my duties only this morning I have not at this stage seen the document and can neither confirm nor deny anything that the honourable member says about it.

The Hon. B.C. Eastick interjecting:

The Hon. D.J. HOPGOOD: I have said nothing of the sort. The honourable member is interjecting on me, Sir.

The SPEAKER: Order! The Minister must try to resist the temptation to respond to interjections, and the member for Light knows that he should not interject. The honourable Deputy Premier.

The Hon. D.J. HOPGOOD: What I said in answer to a previous question—and this related to a briefing that I had this morning when I returned to duty—was that I had been told that the content of the Mr X allegations was largely known to the NCA and the police, and had been for some time. That is the briefing that was made available for me this morning. I have not yet had a chance to do other than what practically every other South Australian has done, and that is to read the *Advertiser* articles published during the week in question. Let me conclude on this point—

An honourable member interjecting.

The SPEAKER: Order! I call the member for Murray-Mallee to order.

The Hon. D.J. HOPGOOD: Let me conclude on this point: while I can neither confirm nor deny that certain individuals have been named in this matter, even had I read the report I am not sure that it would be proper for me to confirm or deny it.

Mr Olsen: How come you congratulated the *Advertiser* journalist?

The SPEAKER: Order! I again call the Leader of the Opposition to order. The honourable Deputy Premier.

The Hon. D.J. HOPGOOD: I have to ignore that interjection, but I would be only too happy to respond to it if that was possible under Standing Orders. On a previous occasion the Opposition has tried to play this funny game of 20 questions: is X named in the unpublished reports of the NCA? What was mentioned in the report to the NCA that has not been revealed? The best course of action for a person in my position, where I am not fully in possession of the facts, is that in a lot of those cases of criminal investigation I should simply not respond, because where does that lead us? Eventually it leads us at the end of the 20 questions to a full divulgence of material which, on the advice of the NCA and/or the police, may be regarded as undesirable to be divulged in the interests of criminal investigation and prosecution. Surely all members have that as their prime consideration—that the best conditions possible should be established for getting a result out of this matter, and that is proper investigation and prosecution. For those reasons, even if I was in possession of the facts, I might not be in a position to say 'Yes' or 'No'.

TAFE STUDENT HOURS

Mr FERGUSON (Henley Beach): I direct my question to the Minister of Employment and Further Education. What number of student hours does the Government expect TAFE to deliver in 1988-89 and how does this compare with the previous performance of TAFE? Pre-budget media reports suggested that there would be serious cuts in course deliveries at TAFE colleges. These reports created concern among many people who are anxious to know the actual situation.

The Hon. L.M.F. ARNOLD: I thank the honourable member for his question. We expect that in 1989 the number of student hours offered in South Australian TAFE will reach nearly 14 million student hours, which will exceed the figures achieved this year which, in turn, exceeded those of 1987 and likewise for every year back to 1981. The press reports to which the honourable member referred (and that was a very discreet reference to the scuttlebutt that the Hon. Rob Lucas in another place circulated earlier this year where he indicated that there would be major cuts in TAFE hours) were entirely incorrect.

The reality is that next year TAFE colleges will offer total hours exceeding those of this year and will again follow the trend of constant growth under this Government. From time to time cutbacks are necessary in some areas in order to liberate resources for other areas of high priority or high demand, so that some courses are always cut within TAFE. The relevant question to ask is: what are the total number of student hours on offer?

Last week I visited the new facilities at Port Augusta which I know my colleague, the Minister of Transport, has supported and has been very excited about. I also visited the facilities at Port Lincoln, which I know the member for Flinders has also supported. In those two establishments we can see the enormous improvement in facilities available for South Australian TAFE students. To emphasise this point, I seek leave to incorporate in *Hansard* a purely statistical table which indicates the actual TAFE student hours for the years 1979 to 1987.

Leave granted.

ACTUAL STUDENTS HOURS (000's)

Year	1979-87	
	Student Hours ('000)	Actual
1987	13 645	13 096
1986	12 114	11 180
1984	10 906	10 810
1983	10 810	11 175
1981	10 612	10 612
1979	10 279	

The Hon. L.M.F. ARNOLD: Members will note that during the period 1983 to 1987 there has been a 30 per cent growth in TAFE student hours, and that has happened while this Government has been in office. That growth can be compared with the very marginal growth of less than .5 per cent that took place during the period 1979 to 1982. The growth which occurred between 1983 and 1987 has continued and has led to the 1987 figure, which has already been bettered in 1988 and will continue to be bettered in 1989 as we approach close to 14 million hours, compared with 10.2 million in 1979.

DRUG AND CORRUPTION ALLEGATIONS

The Hon. B.C. EASTICK (Light): Can the Minister of Labour confirm whether he read the document which the

Minister of Emergency Services indicated he received from the police and which he held for two weeks? Further, has he informed any of his colleagues as to the nature of its contents?

The Hon. R.J. GREGORY: I thank the member for Light for his question. I was briefed by the police about their investigations. Because I believe it would jeopardise their investigations, I am not prepared to divulge the nature of that work. I trust that, when the police have concluded those investigations and if there is enough evidence, the police will prosecute.

CAR STEALING

Ms GAYLER (Newland): What, if anything, can the Minister of Transport do about motor vehicle registration laws to deter car theft and the alleged interstate stolen vehicles racket? A report in the *Sunday Mail* of 23 October this year stated that car thieves were exploiting loopholes in the registration laws of the various States. The article states that insurers believe that there needs to be more control over registration procedures, particularly where vehicles are written-off, in order to overcome the problem of people buying identification plates. In addition, the Tea Tree Gully police in my own area are concerned about a significant rise in motor vehicle theft in recent weeks, particularly from the Tea Tree Plaza car park and from homes in the local area.

The Hon. G.F. KENEALLY: The Government is very concerned about car theft particularly as it applies here in South Australia. The Motor Registration Division is working with the Motor Traders Association, insurers, the police and interstate agencies (that is, other motor registration divisions interstate) in attacking the problem of car theft. It is likely that, as a result of discussions, both administrative and legislative changes will be recommended to various Governments. The disposal of 'written-off' vehicles and the obtaining of identification plates by people for illegal purposes are matters for concern and are the subject of these discussions.

The South Australian Motor Registration Division anticipates that it will be able to link in with a national computing identification record, that is, vehicle inspection numbers (VIN) as from 1 January 1989. All States of Australia will be linked into this computing system, which could mean a higher inspection rate of registration applications. I point out that the allegation that it is easy to register a vehicle by post in South Australia is not strictly correct. Where information about a vehicle is on file, re-registration can occur by post and, if a legitimate and responsible car dealer applies for registration of a new vehicle and the appropriate identification stamp accompanies the application, a postal application can be accepted. However, interstate vehicles are physically inspected, and, where an application is made in writing or in such other way as may cause some concern to the Registrar, the vehicle is also physically inspected.

I will obtain a more detailed reply for the honourable member, but I can assure her and the House that the South Australian Government is cooperating with all agencies and other State Governments in Australia to try to achieve a system that will address what is a very serious crime. I will be happy to obtain that further information for the honourable member.

DRUG AND CORRUPTION ALLEGATIONS

The Hon. J.L. CASHMORE (Coles): Will the Minister of Emergency Services confirm that police first investigated

allegations of corruption against the former head of the drug squad, Moyse, at least five months before Moyse was charged in May last year; were Moyse and Mr X the only people questioned in relation to these initial allegations; how long did the investigations take; was their outcome reported either to the South Australian Government or to the NCA, which was already investigating allegations of corruption in South Australia at the time; and, will the Government table the report prepared as a result of these investigations so that the Parliament and the public can make their own assessment about whether they were adequate in the circumstances?

The Hon. D.J. HOPGOOD: I will obtain a considered response for the honourable member.

NORTHERN TERRITORY PATIENTS

Mr ROBERTSON (Bright): Is the Minister of Health aware of an article in the *Advertiser* of Saturday 29 October regarding intellectually disabled patients from the Northern Territory currently being cared for in South Australia and being prevented from returning to their own communities? Will the Minister explain what negotiations have taken place with the Northern Territory in an attempt to allow these people to return to their rightful homes?

The Hon. F.T. BLEVINS: I thank the member for Bright for his question. Yes, I am aware of the article in Saturday's *Advertiser* and inform the House that as recently as 6 October I wrote the following letter to the Northern Territory Minister of Health and Community Services:

Dear Minister,

I was distressed to receive today a copy of the letter that you would have received from Ms Betty Nabangardi, a Northern Territory citizen who currently resides at Strathmont Centre. For some years Betty has been making her wishes about her living arrangements extremely clear. She wishes to go back to the Northern Territory. Officers of my department have been in constant touch with Northern Territory officers since 1985 to look at ways in which people from the Northern Territory, including Ms Nabangardi, can be repatriated. As Mr Stephen Browne of Self Advocacy for the Intellectually Disadvantaged has pointed out in his letter, the Northern Territory Government already pays a considerable amount of money for Betty Nabangardi to live in Strathmont Centre.

It is considered that a much lesser amount of money would support her living in or close to her own community. I believe that in the name of humanity we have a responsibility to make arrangements whereby we can honour Ms Nabangardi's wishes, and I would offer again the support of my department in making that happen.

There are currently 25 Northern Territory citizens living at either Strathmont Centre or Ru Rua under an agreement between the South Australian Government and the Northern Territory Government. The Northern Territory Government bears the full cost of services provided to their citizens at these institutions.

In January 1985, the Director of Ru Rua at Estcourt House reported on the agreement and recommended that negotiations commence to repatriate these citizens back to the Northern Territory. This was supported by the previous Minister of Health who, in August 1985, wrote to the Northern Territory Government seeking to review the arrangements. The Minister offered to make available senior officers from both the South Australian Health Commission and the Intellectually Disabled Services Council to assist in the process.

Since then there has been considerable negotiation with officers of the Northern Territory Government, including a proposal developed in mid-1987 by the Director of Strathmont Centre for a resident repatriation project. This was discussed with officers of the Northern Territory Govern-

ment but they apparently gave no commitment to its implementation. At a more personal level, it grieves me that Ms Nabangardi, a woman of considerable grace, personality and ability, has to continue to live at Strathmont Centre when she so strongly wishes to return home. I have asked the Intellectually Disabled Services Council to investigate how she might be repatriated even if the Northern Territory Government is unable to assist. It is sad that, when people want to go home and are quite capable of doing so with a minimum amount of support, the Northern Territory Government to date has refused to provide any assistance to them.

We will not abandon our responsibilities in this area. We will take care of those people. I have asked the Health Commission to be creative and work out ways whereby these people can go back to their communities, with some assistance from either the Northern Territory Government or the South Australian Government.

DRUG AND CORRUPTION ALLEGATIONS

The Hon. J.L. CASHMORE (Coles): My question is to the Premier. Following the Premier's reply to the member for Bragg and following the refusal of the Minister of Labour to deny that he had informed the Premier of his briefing concerning the naming by Mr X of Mr Neville Wran and Mr Al Grassby, will the Premier confirm that he was aware of allegations of the involvement of Neville Wran in the laundering of money and of Al Grassby in the drug scene?

The Hon. J.C. BANNON: That is an extraordinary question. I am not sure what the point of it is. As the honourable member might know, I arrived back yesterday morning. I had been overseas for two weeks, and I am sure that the honourable member would have been aware of it.

The Hon. J.L. Cashmore: You have been back for 24 hours.

The SPEAKER: Order!

The Hon. J.C. BANNON: Obviously, in that time I have not been able to attend to more than some of the things that directly affect my portfolio responsibility. The Acting Minister, as he then was, would not have been in a position to give me any such briefing. As I have already said in answer to an earlier question, I do not know the details of these allegations. I have not even had the time to read the extensive articles about Mr X in the paper. So, I can say no more than that. As to whether two individuals have been named in this connection, I have absolutely no idea. The only reference that I have heard to Mr Grassby in relation to the National Crime Authority related to the matters that were widely reported in the press, and apparently in relation to Mr Grassby prosecution did not proceed and he was in fact exonerated, if that is the word—certainly, there were no proceedings. So, I am not clear as to the motives of the Opposition. One might well ask, Mr Speaker, why should we worry about the motives: the Opposition is genuinely seeking information. I really wish that was true.

Mr Olsen interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order!

The Hon. J.C. BANNON: Well, the Leader who interjects is the same person who in 1982, as the responsible Minister, said that the police had been totally exonerated, that there was nothing to investigate, and that the idea of a royal commission was dreadful, for reason of the fact that it would impede the police in the carrying out of their duties. So, I find it extraordinary—

Mr Olsen interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order!

The Hon. J.C. BANNON: Well, a number of these matters—

Mr Olsen interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order! Will the Premier resume his seat. I again call the Leader of the Opposition to order, for the fourth time. The honourable the Premier.

Mr Lewis: You can count!

The Hon. J.C. BANNON: Thank you, Mr Speaker—

The SPEAKER: Order! Will the Premier resume his seat. I ask the honourable member for Victoria not to reflect on the Chair. A repetition of an interjection of that nature would lead to his being named.

Mr D.S. BAKER: On a point of order, Mr Speaker, can you tell me what words I used? I did not utter any word whatsoever—none whatsoever.

The SPEAKER: Order! Will the honourable member resume his seat.

Mr D.S. BAKER: What are we going to do? Will we have another scene?

The SPEAKER: Order! Will the honourable member resume his seat. The Chair quite clearly heard the interjection, coming from the vicinity of the member for Murray-Mallee and the member for Victoria, comprising the words 'Oh, so you can count', when the Chair was pointing out that on four occasions the Leader of the Opposition had been called to order. The remark was clearly reflective on the Chair. If the Chair made an error in attributing the remark to the honourable member for Victoria, the Chair is capable of having the good grace to apologise. If that is so, the Chair, accordingly, apologises. The honourable member for Murray-Mallee.

Mr LEWIS: I can confirm that an out of order interjection from me to the effect of 'You can count'—

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order! I ask other members to contribute to maintaining order in the Chamber. The honourable member for Murray-Mallee.

Mr LEWIS: That facetious remark was made by me, Mr Speaker, and I apologise to you for it.

The SPEAKER: The honourable the Premier.

The Hon. J.C. BANNON: Thank you, Mr Speaker. I will conclude on this point, because I think it is relevant to the type of questioning that has been going on: it is not just a question of events that happened six or seven years ago—some of these are the subject of the current inquiries and the things that we have set in motion in order to try to deal with them. It is worth the House remembering—

Members interjecting:

The Hon. J.C. BANNON: Well, the honourable member was not here at that time, so he was not privy to these statements. I do not know what the Leader has been telling his colleagues, but he clearly said:

It has been proved after intensive and serious investigation that the Police Force has been exonerated.

That investigation was carried out by the Police Force itself—a situation that we are now told is absolutely and totally unacceptable. So, apparently when you are not the Minister it is unacceptable.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order! I again call the Leader of the Opposition to order, and I call, I think for the third time, the honourable member for Coles to order. The honourable Premier.

The Hon. J.C. BANNON: I refer to two further quotes. First, on the matter of a royal commission:

A royal commission would serve no valuable purpose [according to the then Chief Secretary, Mr Olsen] but would result only in the Police Force being forced to work under further clouds of suspicion.

That is a reasonable statement and one that has been made in the current debate. Then the following statement appears:

My concern is to ensure that the force is never again subjected to such intense speculation.

In the name of political opportunism (and that is all it is) we have seen just that sort of speculation and the Opposition attacking the police in just that way recently.

The Hon. B.C. EASTICK: Will you, Mr Speaker, confirm that the Standing Orders prevent a member from imputing a base reason upon the actions of another member?

The SPEAKER: If I have correctly understood the point of order of the honourable member for Light and the Premier specifically referred to the Leader of the Opposition, imputing improper motives, the honourable member's point of order is upheld, and I ask the Premier to withdraw any such imputation.

The Hon. J.C. BANNON: I withdraw any personal imputation, Mr Speaker. My purpose was simply to remind the Opposition what the then Minister in the Liberal Government, now the Leader of the Opposition, said at that time. If the cap fits let them wear it. I make no imputation personally.

SEA GRASSES

Mr De LAINE (Price): Can the Minister for Environment and Planning say whether there are plans to arrest the dieback and re-establish ecologically important sea grasses in St Vincent Gulf? Over the past 40 years there has been an accelerating rate of dieback of gulf sea grasses, caused mainly by the flow of nutrient rich stormwater and clean sewage effluent into the gulf.

The Hon. D.J. HOPGOOD: I assume that this matter has come into the public arena as a result of rather interesting article by a well respected journalist (Mr Bill Reschke) in the *Sunday Mail* over the past weekend. It is fairly important that I place certain facts on the record, because even the honourable member in his question refers to the 'accelerating dieback' of sea grasses in the gulf, whereas that is yet to be demonstrated. What can be demonstrated and has been demonstrated by two reports, one in 1970 and the other in 1985, is that in the area immediately adjacent to the outfall from at least two sewage treatment plants, one at Port Adelaide and one at Bolivar, there has been some dieback of sea grasses. However, there is no clear evidence at this stage to indicate that that dieback is continuing. In fact, I think that the marine biologist in the Engineering and Water Supply Department (and my colleague the Minister of Water Resources is now better informed than I on these matters) would want to say that this matter has stabilised. However, further investigations are proceeding. That was one of the matters that was misleading in the article: it simply assumed as received truth that degradation was proceeding.

The second thing that was most misleading was the suggestion that the reports had somehow been concealed. Not so. My understanding was that the 1970 report was one that Jack or Joan South Australia could buy across the counter. It is clear that the 1975 report was restricted for a time but was then released and the copy that I have in my room has 'Restricted' stamped on it. I am assured that that restriction was released later. Regarding the 1985 report, I gave to a television channel a press conference on the front steps of Parliament House, and a seminar was held at which an officer of the Minister of Water Resources reported on the findings. So much for that.

The third point on which the article in the weekend press was most misleading was the suggestion that one can solve

the problem simply by using up all the effluent around Virginia for the farmers out there. Of course (and the local member would probably be able to confirm this), those people use only about one-third annually of the total allocation available to them for irrigation, so the present allocation is simply not used to the full.

The final matter that was really misleading—and this is most important, because it is a diversion—was the suggestion that any dieback of sea grasses was impacting on the erosion processes along the coast and the reason why we had to run a sand replenishment program was the dieback of the sea grasses. I do not think that it is sufficient for a journalist just to get a report from someone and write it up as received truth simply because that person claimed to be a marine biologist. Would not one think that that journalist would telephone someone like Bob Culver at the university and say, 'Look, Bob, we have this report; can you confirm this? You've been involved with the Coast Protection Board for 20 years and have researched this matter for much longer. What is your attitude towards it?' Dr Culver would have given an entirely different answer because they are two separate processes.

I shall not bore the House, because all members should know what is going on concerning littoral drift and what we have done to accelerate coastal erosion through sterilisation of sand resources in the sand dunes. That is a separate matter. So, let us forget about having to build sea walls, and so on. Indeed, if we have to build sea walls, it will be because of the greenhouse effect and will have nothing to do with dieback of—

Mr Becker interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order! The honourable member for Hanson is out of order.

Mr Becker interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order! I call the honourable member for Hanson to order for the second time.

The Hon. D.J. HOPGOOD: Thank you, Mr Speaker. The honourable member has also represented West Beach for a long time and one would have thought that he would know more about these processes.

Mr Becker interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order! I again call the honourable member for Hanson to order. The honourable Deputy Premier.

The Hon. D.J. HOPGOOD: Studies are proceeding to determine whether or not further dieback is taking place. If it is, the people of South Australia have the difficult choice before them as to whether their Government should spend tens of millions of dollars on tertiary treatment of sewage outfalls to prevent any of it from getting into the marine environment, or, if the whole thing has stabilised, whether the present sewage treatment processes should proceed as they have proceeded for many years.

Mr Becker interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order! The honourable member for Hanson is highly out of order, and if he persists with that conduct he will be named. The honourable member for Chaffey.

ABALONE POACHING

The Hon. P.B. ARNOLD (Chaffey): Concerning allegations of drug running by abalone poachers which the Minister of Fisheries made on the *7.30 Report* last Thursday, has he provided names or any other specific information that would allow police to identify and investigate the alleged participants? Further, was the Minister told by local police on Yorke Peninsula that they first made police headquarters

in Adelaide aware of these allegations two years ago, but nothing was done?

The Hon. M.K. MAYES: This matter is of great concern not only to the Department of Fisheries but to the Police Department and the Ministers responsible. This information was provided to me through various sources during my activities as Minister of Fisheries and also in my other portfolio responsibilities. Information has been supplied to me by members of the Police Force from various locations in South Australia over a period of about a year. As that general information has become available my department has passed it to the appropriate officers and no doubt it will be given to the task force or investigators when this matter is addressed as part of the investigations.

NOISE CONTROL

Mr M.J. EVANS (Elizabeth): My question is to the Minister for Environment and Planning. When does the Government expect to bring amending legislation before Parliament to strengthen the Noise Control Act, and will the Deputy Premier give specific consideration to the problem of bird scaring devices in semi urban environments? Some time ago, the Government indicated that it would review the Noise Control Act with a view to strengthening its provisions with respect to interaction between industry and immediately adjacent residential areas. However, more recently Hillbank residents have drawn my attention to a serious loophole in the Act with respect to explosive bird scaring devices used by non resident hobby farmers in an almond orchard in that area. This device, used constantly during the day, generates a loud, sharp, explosive sound at intervals as short as every 30 seconds. This form of noise pollution is extremely distressing for nearby residents, but I am advised that no action against the device—which is mostly ineffective for its task—is possible under the present Act.

The Hon. D.J. HOPGOOD: I will have that information checked for the honourable member to make sure that no right of action is possible under the present legislation. As to any amendments to the legislation, I can confirm that work is being done in that area but it is unlikely that they will be ready before we break at Christmas.

RURAL DEBT MORATORIUM

Mr BLACKER (Flinders): Will the Premier immediately call for a moratorium on foreclosures on rural properties until a restructuring program can be implemented, and will he receive a delegation from representatives of the affected areas to further develop a restructuring program which will include some, if not all, of the measures which I put to this House on 6 September? I refer to an article in today's *Advertiser* entitled, 'Farmers to seek debt moratorium' in which it is stated:

Far West Coast farmers are tired of waiting for the State Government leadership in helping them overcome drought and financial problems in their troubled regions.

They will meet at Chandada about 50 kilometres east of Streaky Bay tonight to draft a course of action which will include seeking support for a debt moratorium.

The meeting, closed to the media, is being convened by the Eyre Peninsula Farmers' Action Group under the chairmanship of Chandada farmer Mr Bill Carey.

The article continues:

'There has been a total rejection of everything that has been offered up to now. It just doesn't meet our needs at all,' he said. Farmers did not want to buy more land, nor did they want

speculators coming in with cheap overseas money to buy their farms.

Tonight's meeting would seek support for a moratorium on all debts for a given time to allow an acceptable restructuring policy to be formed. A call also will be made for a moratorium on foreclosures by financial institutions.

The meeting also will seek support for a delegation to meet the Premier, Mr Bannon. 'He is the only one who can help us,' Mr Cronin said.

The Hon. J.C. BANNON: I saw the article referred to by the honourable member and I can assure him that not only me but the Government is very concerned about the situation. That was well demonstrated by the Minister of Agriculture's recent visit to that area and comprehensive discussions—

Mr Gunn interjecting:

The Hon. J.C. BANNON: The member for Eyre has also been very active in representation and attempts to work through this major problem—and it is a massive problem. Some people are in desperate trouble—we realise that. The proposals that have been put forward so far have not in all cases proved to be the answer. The most devastating development has been the further bad season in that area, and that has been a vital blow against some major steps towards some sort of reconstruction.

We would have to agree that continuing to prop up people on the land in some situations where they get more and more into debt, despite moratoriums and restructuring programs, can be very cruel indeed. We all try to live in hope. In saying that I am not expressing my own view. Many farmers have said that to me and I know that members opposite experienced in rural areas—those who have not forgotten what it is like out there—are also aware of that. There is a point at which to maintain people on their properties by any means possible will lead to further and larger problems down the track.

I am not sure what sort of decisions should be made at this stage. A number of measures have been proposed by my colleagues and I know that many members opposite who believe in free market forces would reject that sort of help. They say—and I have heard other farmers say—'Let the market forces work. If you cannot make a go of it, you should not be there, and you should not be propped up.' I know that in urban industrial situations that is often the case: companies close and large numbers of people are put out of work.

It is sometimes impossible to have a package of areas. I do not accept that argument, and nor does my Government. I believe that we as a community have certain responsibilities and a number of measures have been proposed to try to assist these people. The fact that they are not adequate in all cases is something that we must consider. I have read the report of this meeting and both the Minister of Agriculture and I will be very interested in any constructive suggestions that come out of it. The possibility of a delegation is something that we will have to look at if that is what the people decide, because they have a right to a hearing. That is where the situation rests at the moment.

COMMUNITY WELFARE OFFICE

Mr DUGAN (Adelaide): Can the Minister of Community Welfare assure the House and thereby the residents of the Adelaide City Council area—in particular those living in the square mile of Adelaide—that they will continue to have access to a local office of the Department for Community Welfare? A notice issued by the Adelaide office of the Department for Community Welfare is circulating at the moment. It states that as from 7 November 1988 the

Adelaide office will be closed and a new office, called the Norwood and Adelaide office of the Department for Community Welfare, will be opened. A number of people within the Adelaide City Council area wish to be assured that they will continue to have access to community welfare services.

The Hon. S.M. LENEHAN: I assure the honourable member that as part of the move into the Town Acre 86 property a shop front presence of the Department for Community Welfare will be available for people in the Adelaide city area. It will be centrally located just off Rundle Mall. It is the intention of the department to establish an office at Norwood as well and to expand the facilities of that office to provide access for people who, for example, require car parking, which is not readily available in the city. Those people will have access to the expanded office at Norwood. I am therefore happy to assure the residents of Adelaide that the department's move into Town Acre 86 will ensure that community welfare services and facilities will continue to be available through that office.

INDUSTRIAL CONCILIATION AND ARBITRATION ACT

Mr LEWIS (Murray-Mallee): Can the Minister of Labour confirm statements made on ABC radio yesterday morning by the secretary of the Metal Workers Union, Mr Tumbers, that the Government will not now proceed with major changes to the Industrial Conciliation and Arbitration Act?

The SPEAKER: Order! The honourable member cannot ask that a statement from the press or the media be verified.

Mr LEWIS: Can the Minister say whether or not the Government will proceed with major changes to the Industrial Conciliation and Arbitration Act which have been strongly opposed by employer representatives, and does the Government agree with Mr Tumbers that certain reports and editorial opinions published by the *Advertiser* dissuaded the Government from proceeding with those changes?

The Hon. R.J. GREGORY: I must apologise to the member for Murray-Mallee. I did not hear the radio report, so I do not know about this matter. However, I will ascertain what it is about and, if possible, I will bring down a reply at a later date.

Mr S.J. Baker: Stay awake.

The SPEAKER: Order!

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order! I call the House to order.

MINISTERIAL STATEMENT: VEGETATION CLEARANCE REGULATIONS

The Hon. J.H.C. KLUNDER (Minister of Mines and Energy): I seek leave to make a statement.

Leave granted.

The Hon. J.H.C. KLUNDER: First, I apologise to the Leader of the Opposition, because my not passing on a copy of my statement to him was not a deliberate act. I erroneously assumed that that matter had been attended to. The proclamation today of the Electricity Trust Act Amendment Act 1988 and the vegetation clearance regulations provides me with an appropriate opportunity to put a number of matters before the House. All members would be aware of the public debate that has developed about the regulations and, while public debate is a healthy process, there are occasions when the passions it generates tend to obscure the real issues.

Let me remind the House of events during the past 11 months. The ETSA Act Amendment Bill was introduced in

this Chamber on 1 December 1987 and the then Minister indicated at the outset that the legislation would be referred to a select committee. This was done on 2 December. The select committee met on 13 occasions and took evidence from 31 individuals and organisations. It reported to the House on 22 March 1988 and recommended many changes to the legislation. The only substantial point of disagreement concerned provisions to limit ETSA's liability and the legislation was passed with these provisions omitted.

Members will recall that among those who gave evidence to the select committee was a representative of the Local Government Association. While the association had views on a number of aspects of the legislation, I believe it is fair to say that the situation in non-bushfire risk areas was not a major concern.

Following the passage of the legislation, a working group was established in May to begin formulating the necessary regulations. This group comprised representatives of ETSA, the Local Government Association, the Department of Environment and Planning, the Department of Lands, the United Farmers and Stockowners of South Australia, the CFS, the Highways Department and the Department of Local Government, with a secretary from my office. The group had a deadline—1 November, the start of the bushfire season—by which time the regulations needed to be in place. The working group met on six occasions and the first formal draft of the regulations was produced on 31 August.

The first sign of concern with the application of the regulations in urban areas did not emerge until 17 July—7½ months after the introduction of the Bill—when the Unley council aired its concerns in an article in the *Sunday Mail*. This article was emotive (referring among other things to chainsaw massacres) and it has unfortunately set the tone of the debate since that time.

As the debate became increasingly vociferous, efforts were made by the working group to accommodate the concerns of metropolitan councils. This led to an offer from me on 29 September for what was, in effect, a moratorium on tree trimming in non-bushfire risk areas for a period of six months around low voltage lines, except in the event of an emergency. At the end of the six months there was to be a review of the regulations for non-bushfire areas. The offer was not acceptable to local government, which wanted the so-called moratorium incorporated in the regulations.

On 17 October a further revision of the vegetation clearance regulations for non-bushfire risk areas was begun in an effort to address the concerns of councils. Very briefly, the revised regulations provide for the following:

- (1) ETSA to prepare and submit to councils within the next 12 months a vegetation clearance proposal for each council area;
- (2) Councils to be given four months to review and respond to the proposal and to negotiate a clearance agreement with the trust;
- (3) Failure to reach agreement to be resolved by an arbitrator whose decision will be final, and
- (4) Until an agreement is in place for a particular location, the trust to have a duty to clear in accordance with past practice in that location.

The Act and these revised regulations are operational from today and I ask all members to consider the following matters. This Parliament gave ETSA a duty to maintain safe clearances between trees and power lines in both urban and bushfire risk areas. It did not give the trust a choice in the matter. Parliament required the trust to take the responsibility for carrying out this work and to meet the cost of the clearance work around public supply lines. Parliament approved restrictions on the nurturing of vegetation in the

proximity of public lines and Parliament also defined the responsibilities of landholders to keep safe clearances between trees and private supply lines.

With these parliamentary requirements in mind, we need to consider how effectively the revised regulations address the concerns of metropolitan councils. First, there is a belief among some urban councils that the current problems can be resolved by splitting the regulations into a set covering the bushfire risk areas, with another set to be drafted later covering the non-bushfire areas. This could indeed be done but, because of the way the Act has been constructed by Parliament, it could have the quite undesirable consequence of leaving the non-bushfire risk areas in a legal limbo.

Parliament chose to pass the amending Act containing general principles for vegetation clearance with specific directions to be included in accompanying regulations. The Act also absolves ETSA from common law duties. If only bushfire risk area regulations are in place, ETSA would have a duty to clear in non-bushfire risk areas with no specific directions on how to do so and without any responsibility at common law for failure to comply with its obligations. Resolution of claims under these circumstances would have to be left to the courts to settle.

Let me now move to the questions of 'vegetation clearance agreements' and 'past practice'. I have already explained the vegetation clearance agreements. The process provides ample time for councils to review the proposal and guarantees each council the opportunity to sit down with the trust and negotiate an agreement. Such agreements are not set in concrete forever and can be re-negotiated to meet changed circumstances. In addition, the regulations provide a disputes settling process through arbitration in the event that agreement cannot be reached.

The concept of 'past practice' was introduced to the regulations both to enable ETSA to meet its obligations under the Act while agreements were being negotiated and in response to the concern of councils at the five yearly clearance cycles proposed in the first draft of the regulations for non-bushfire risk areas. Councils were concerned that clearance at five yearly intervals would lead either to excessive cutting or councils having to bear the cost of more frequent trimming. I want to lay those fears to rest.

If ETSA has trimmed a group of fast growing trees twice a year in the past, then the reference to 'past practice' will mean that ETSA will continue to trim twice a year in the future, until such time as a change in growth rate, as for instance when the trees get older, makes a less frequent trimming acceptable. It should also be noted that, where 'established practice' is to be followed in the interim period while a vegetation clearance scheme is agreed, the regulations require consultation between ETSA and councils. In addition, there is a specific provision in the regulations which gives the Minister the power, during this interim period, to direct a modification of established practices where they are inappropriate.

The sum total of all this is that the regulations now ensure that, in exercising its responsibilities under the Act, ETSA will be required to consult with urban councils at every stage—either under the past practice provision or in the formulation of vegetation clearance schemes.

For reasons which I explained earlier, it has not been possible to defer making regulations to give councils time to consider the revisions. However, as a further demonstration of the Government's good faith, I have given instructions to reconstitute the working group which helped develop the regulations. The working group will be required to examine the various council concerns which have been raised, particularly relating to the non-bushfire risk areas, and to

prepare draft amendments as appropriate for my consideration. I have asked that this be completed in February 1989, and I will be inviting a second local government representative to participate in the exercise.

I will conclude with just a few words on the question of undergrounding power lines which, in recent days, appears to have been elevated to the status of a quick and viable alternative to tree trimming. However, I ask the House to consider the following. No matter what decisions may be made on the scale of undergrounding to be undertaken—and regardless of how it might be funded—there is a need to recognise that significant results will take considerable time to achieve. Given that fact, we will still need a workable system of maintaining safe clearances between trees and power lines in urban as well as bushfire risk areas. I believe that the revised clearance regulations provide that workable system.

MINISTERIAL STATEMENT: DRUG AND CORRUPTION ALLEGATIONS

The Hon. D.J. HOPGOOD (Deputy Premier): I seek leave to make a statement.

Leave granted.

The Hon. D.J. HOPGOOD: In reply to a question earlier in the day I adverted to the *Advertiser* articles which were based on interviews by a so-called Mr X, and I mentioned that one of the unfortunate impressions that have been left with people reading those articles was that the CSIRO had somehow been involved in corruption involving drugs. That claim by me of a misapprehension was greeted with some scepticism by honourable members opposite. They obviously felt that any reasonable person reading those articles would not have come to that conclusion but they in fact had drawn the correct conclusion.

I want to place on record that at least one very prominent South Australian did come to that conclusion as a result, I guess, of reading the *Advertiser* articles. I have before me a news release issued on 15 October which stated, amongst other things:

However, there are other allegations which, if substantiating evidence has been produced, require a wider ranging and independent inquiry.

And there was a list of them, including one which reads 'Corruption within the CSIRO in the growing of cannabis'. That is a news release which was issued under the name of the Liberal Leader, John Olsen.

PUBLIC ACCOUNTS COMMITTEE

The Hon. D.J. HOPGOOD (Deputy Premier): I move:

That pursuant to section 15 of the Public Accounts Committee Act 1972 the members of this House appointed to that committee have leave to sit on that committee during the sittings of the House today.

Motion carried.

SITTINGS AND BUSINESS

The Hon. D.J. HOPGOOD (Deputy Premier): I move:

That the time allowed for all stages of the following Bills—

- Firearms Act Amendment (No. 2),
- Adoption,
- State Transport Authority Act Amendment, and
- Boating Act Amendment

be until 6 p.m. on Thursday.

Motion carried.

FIREARMS ACT AMENDMENT BILL (No. 2)

Adjourned debate on second reading.

(Continued from 23 August. Page 459.)

The Hon. B.C. EASTICK (Light): I do not believe that anyone in this Parliament on either side of the House is opposed to the existence of a Firearms Act, and I say that because there has been a view abroad that the Firearms Act should be thrown out. It was very clearly indicated at the time that the select committee most recently sat on this matter that there are a number of deficiencies in the existing Act that need attention, and indeed members on this side of the House are in complete accord with adjusting the existing Act in relation to a number of deficiencies and a number of matters which were canvassed before the select committee and which have been represented to members of the Government and the Opposition over an extended period of time.

However, having indicated that and our belief in a proper and well managed Firearms Act, might I go on to say that we recognise that the method of bringing this matter before the House was long on emotion but rather short on fact in a number of vital areas. That has been clearly identified by the fact that the first two Bills brought in by the Government had to be withdrawn because, in a number of cases, they were based on beliefs relative to firearms legislation which could not be sustained, and they were, in some part, a reaction to a move which was undertaken by the Prime Minister following problems that existed in Melbourne and almost certainly in England.

The fact that the Commonwealth has gone very quiet on the matter since the hype of the special Premiers' Conference in December last year, as have a number of States that had given qualified, or a degree of, support to the proposals put forward by the Prime Minister on that occasion, is a clear indication that there have been a number of rethinks and quite serious analyses of the whole issue of firearms legislation. I welcome the fact that those other States, and indeed the Government of this State, have heeded reality in respect of a number of issues directly associated with firearms legislation.

The situation that we have been addressing since December last year bears comment. First, the Bill introduced by the Minister in December last year created a tremendous amount of community and gun lobby resistance. I say 'gun lobby resistance' because it embraced a large number of individual organisations directly associated with guns both for the purposes of recreation and sport and also in the execution of people's normal duties, such as those directly associated with farming pursuits. As a result of meetings across the State and the representations made, it was ably demonstrated, to the satisfaction of the Government, that a number of the moves in train at that stage were not sustainable and could not be effectively encompassed by the actions of the Parliament.

Subsequently, the original Bill was withdrawn and replaced by another, which again had a number of deficiencies. They were demonstrated in public comment and were discussed to some degree in this House. That Bill was then referred to a select committee. It has been introduced to the House with a copy of the proposed regulations that would apply. I believe that there is a tremendous advantage in legislation of this nature being accompanied by the proposed regula-

tions, because so much of the argument that is abroad in respect of these matters is based on the unknown as to what the regulations may contain. That can put an entirely different connotation or different understanding by individuals in the community on the provisions of the Bill. I would not hesitate to support, at any later stage, the inclusion of proposed regulations when Bills of this nature are introduced so that the totality of the effect of the legislation can be properly understood by the people who will be most affected.

As a result of those proposed regulations accompanying the Bill, I believe we were able to extract from a number of people who appeared before the select committee a better understanding and a better input relative to the areas of difficulty. Whilst it is not proper to deal directly with regulations in this particular forum, it is only right that the value of the existence of those proposed regulations be given due regard, and I do so without hesitation.

The other issue I would pick up in relation to the matter having proceeded to a select committee is that yet again the Parliament can demonstrate not only to members but also to those in the community who welcome the opportunity to follow debate that there is a better understanding by the public, the Parliament, administrators of the legislation and those who helped design it of the likely consequences or results of the legislation. The member for Mitchell will recall (and has indeed indicated on an earlier occasion) the distinct advantage he saw some years ago in the Health Commission legislation being referred to a select committee: the changes effected proved worthwhile and certainly presented to the public of South Australia a better piece of legislation than would otherwise have been the case. There have been a number of other examples. I go on record as saying that I believe that the Bill we are now considering is a better piece of legislation as a result of those deliberations.

It has already been indicated that, when the report of the select committee was brought before the House, not all of the recommendations of the committee were in accord with the views of members on this side. There was certainly an acceptance of the improvements which had been effected, but also a concern that some matters had not been given all the attention they required. Our fears then (and they continue) was that, unless there is a major increase in the number of persons available to resource the activities of the firearms department, all the virtues that might be projected by the Government in respect of this legislation will fall in a heap. It is not difficult for people either in the parliamentary scene or outside to make that assertion having regard to the management of the current Firearms Act.

I make no reflection at all on those persons who work in the firearms department—I have always found them most courteous. In giving evidence to the select committee and in discussions from time to time, their attitude to members of Parliament has been cordial and direct. Certainly, a wealth of evidence would suggest that the effectiveness of that department or, more particularly, of its Deputy Registrar (whoever the Deputy Registrar may be from time to time) has been less than understandable on a number of occasions. Select committee evidence will clearly show that on a number of occasions a Deputy Registrar has provided an interpretation of certain sections of the Act or regulations and said that that is the manner in which matters will proceed; however, there has been no consultation or promulgation of the determination that the Deputy Registrar made to those people most vitally involved in the gun industry. That, I trust, is a piece of evidence that has been heeded and in due course the Deputy Registrar, whoever he or she may be in the future, will ensure that there is

consultation and circulation of a varying or variable interpretation if it is the intention to apply that interpretation to the legislation.

We indicated that we were concerned that the availability of resources for the firearms branch will determine the effectiveness of the Government's proposals. Although we have an assurance from the Minister that the Government will make available further resources, one has to ask very seriously, 'From where will those resources come?' Will they be found within the existing resources of the Police Department and, if so, will the redeployment be from other vital areas of the Police Department in relation to which people in the community are screaming out for assistance in the belief that full assistance is not available? This is not a reflection on individual members of the Police Force: it is a matter of fact that the size of the budget determines the number of police that can be employed and, therefore, deployed. If we are working to a budget and not providing efficient service when it is identified that a greater degree of efficiency is needed within a department, effectively we are denying the new legislation or the department the opportunity to provide the service envisaged.

That is a difficulty to which members on this side of the House referred to frequently, more so because of the extremely large number of additional form-filling exercises that are a major feature of the new legislation. The fact that it will now be necessary to apply a use to an individual gun, that an individual must obtain a permit to obtain a gun and that in respect of ammunition a series of forms or requisitions must be filled out all adds to the load of the Police Department if gun ownership is to be monitored effectively. I use the word 'monitored' seriously rather than the word 'policed'. Whilst the two are virtually the same, the important issue is not that we will go out chasing people and checking on guns but that we will ensure that the information contained in the records cross references correctly and that a proper statistical record is kept of what is out in the community if the Government has its way.

Members on this side are opposed to an extension of the registration program in relation to longarms and will move in due course to eliminate that program. We have no problem at all with the continued registration of pistols and shortarms, to use the term in that sense. We recognise the importance of the protection afforded the community by proper recognition of concealability or the likelihood of pistols being used for purposes other than sport or for due intent, but we do feel, given the evidence not only across Australia but also overseas, a very serious concern relative to the extension of matters directly related to longarms.

For example, it is well known that the registration of longarms has been done away with in New Zealand, apparently with no problem. Further, it is a fact that in Sweden, in Switzerland and I believe in parts of Norway there is a gun in every home, and everyone is expected to use those guns. There is no evidence of some of the difficulties referred to from time to time in relation to our approach to firearms legislation.

Finally, before dealing with some particular aspects of the legislation, I repeat that members on this side of the House do not believe that any manner of measure provided in legislation will diminish the availability of guns or control of them if people are determined to get them. Evidence shows that, both here and overseas registered guns or guns obtained legitimately—whatever 'legitimately' means in the total sense—are rarely involved in criminal activity. The statistics available indicate that frequently it is unregistered guns, or guns which have been tampered with or altered, which are found when a person is apprehended.

In relation to the obtaining and movement of guns around the community, I draw attention to the complementary legislation that our colleagues in another place are currently considering. This legislation, introduced by the Attorney-General, is capable of standing on its own and with the legislation that is already in place. It is not specifically directed towards complementing the legislation we are currently considering, although it does dovetail in with it. Action will be taken in relation to that matter at another time.

The Firearms Act Amendment Bill (1988) was debated at some length in April of this year. My contribution to that debate, which I was privileged to be able to make on behalf of the Opposition, is on pages 3819-22 of *Hansard* of 6 April 1988. In my contribution I utilised material from a book that had been published some years before by Superintendent Colin Greenwood of the United Kingdom. Since the select committee reported to the House and certainly since that April contribution, I have had the good fortune to meet at Parliament House with former Superintendent Greenwood and to discuss with him, and with others, at some length the nature of the material in his book.

Superintendent Greenwood still stands by today the conclusions to which he came in his book—which material I referred to at considerable length in my earlier contribution. He has indicated that he has not changed his beliefs since the 1970s and nor have other criminologists and other persons who have been called in to provide Governments direct information on these matters. Indeed, the information available from J.D. Fine from the Western Australian University, both in evidence presented to the select committee and in the publication which was widely circulated prior to and during the previous debate on firearms legislation, indicated that the controls proposed by the Government have never worked anywhere and have no genuine value. If it makes someone warmer inside to have sought to do these things and to convince the public that it is right, so be it, but the end result is that the impost of voluminous documentation will make no difference.

A number of organisations have responded to the introduction of this third Bill, and I want to draw attention to some of its features. In respect of the registration provisions, as I have previously said, there is a very real concern and disappointment that the Government has not taken this opportunity to completely do away with the registration of longarms, as has occurred in New Zealand. It has been pointed out that it is costly for Government and that in relation to available resources it has proven to be inefficient. We know that the shortarm or pistol registration procedure is inefficient but, even so, we continue to embrace it for a number of reasons.

I add also that the information that was solidly on record in 1978, at the time when the 1977 Act came into being, has not been totally utilised in the new system of registration in South Australia, with the effect that in relation to many thousands of pistols in the community the provisions have not been followed through by the police because they do not have the time or the overall resources. No attempt has been made by Governments—and that relates to Government's of both political persuasions—to put into effect the information in the original documentation in order to make the registration of pistols more efficient. It is now so far down the track that there is some question whether it would be cost efficient to try to do it at present, because so many people who appeared on the original hard copy records would now be deceased or would have moved—and so it goes on, and I do not need to spell out to the House the reality of the matter.

The third point made in relation to registration was that it becomes extremely costly for shooters. Governments should not impose such constraints on people who gain enjoyment from various sporting pursuits or who require firearms in undertaking their day-to-day occupation, particularly people in the agricultural and horticultural areas. It should not be costly, but due to the number of intrusions made by the legislation, clearly it will become more costly.

In considering views that have been expressed by a number of people in relation to the most recent escalation in the cost of pistol licences and C-class licences, one suspects that the Government has tended to use this as a revenue raising measure rather than for the purpose originally intended, namely, to give some clear indication of where guns are located. It was not originally intended to raise large sums of money through this system. However, I will not further debate that matter at this time. The matter has already had some airing and I have no doubt that it will be paid further attention on a number of occasions in the future.

One point of view which was placed before those interested and which I accept is that, if the Government really believes that the community will benefit from an extended registration system, surely the community as a whole should pay for that rather than it become a burden on those individuals who enjoy the sport or the ownership.

The requirement of permits to purchase is considered by certain people to be a further intrusion. It begs the following questions: where will the form filling stop; and how long will it take to obtain a permit? Problems are frequently associated with delays in getting a permit, not only to the individual who may be visiting the city from afar, but also to the persons who are selling the gun and who must hold it for a longer time, thus causing a genuine holding back of normal trade and commerce. In Committee, the Opposition will not seek to defeat the provision requiring a permit to purchase, but I draw attention to the difficulties associated with it.

The Government says that that provision is important and that it wants the provision. It says that the provision will enable resources to flow properly. However, when this legislation falls apart at the seams, as I genuinely believe it will, be it on the Government's head. Even so, the Opposition will not obstruct the desire and the activities of the Government, but will draw to the attention of the Government the folly of some of its activities.

Many questions arise. What sort of cross-checking of records is intended to be carried out or will be possible within the available resources? How many extra staff will be required in relation to this permit structure alone? As Colin Greenwood pointed out, increasingly harsh regulations often have the effect of causing people to opt out of the system, and that has occurred the world over. That has been a factor which has been demonstrated and on which books and reports have been written. Indeed, it can be clearly identified that, if one intrudes too much, one causes people to act illegally. In saying that, I do not suggest that people believe they are acting illegally, but they do not respect regulations that become so time consuming and inefficient.

A number of clauses concerning firearms have also been introduced by the select committee. That was a deliberate action of the select committee and I do not resile from having accepted, along with my colleagues, the need to increase the number of classes so that certain problems known to exist could be solved. However, it is wise of us to recognise that the whole position is being made more complicated and that, as soon as one complicates the issue,

one brings it into disrepute and causes difficulties for those charged with the responsibility of monitoring rather than policing the whole exercise. Those who have responded have asked what is the intention of so many classes. I refer them to the stated view in the report tabled as being the combined views of select committee members based on the evidence available and made after those members had had the opportunity to obtain a contra view to the matters contained in the evidence available.

The endorsement required on the documents directly associated with the firearm will indicate the use to which it may be put. Those classes or purposes will fall into category A, B, C, D, E, F, or G. Then, superimposed on that series is another series (1) to (7) concerning the varying degrees of security of the firearm. This leads to further confusion.

As demonstrated to the select committee, the effectiveness of the current computer system must be suspect. Certainly it has not produced the detail regarding the firearms as was intended. In only a few cases has the information concerning firearms been transcribed correctly, one figure or one letter usually being wrong. Thus, traders can identify in documentation covering between 15 and 20 pages that up to 40 per cent of the guns covered by that documentation were not in their possession and had not been in their possession for months. They were also able to identify, in cases where they had provided the information, where those guns had gone, but the guns still remained on the departmental check list for that company.

I do not intend to seek leave to have inserted in *Hansard* documentation of those cases, but the details are available for members to read in the minutes of proceedings of the select committee already tabled in the House. It is yet another practical indication of the sort of problem that arises when one compounds or increases the number of factors to be considered in relation to the ownership of firearms.

Security provisions have frequently been referred to. The Opposition believes that, notwithstanding a marked change by the Government as evidenced in the Bill before the House, a great problem is still associated with the effectiveness of the security of firearms and that this matter will continue to cause problems for a long time to come. The original Bill was defended publicly by Government members, including the Minister of Transport, at a rally at Port Augusta. On that occasion the statement was made from the platform that a provision of the original Bill would require any person who owned a gun to spend between \$9 000 and \$12 000 on a properly constructed vault, and subsequently it was clearly demonstrated that that interpretation was correct. The Minister had denied the interpretation.

So many aspects of the legislation originally before the House show a lack of recognition of some of the realities of life. As that attitude is perpetuated in the current legislation, the Opposition believes that it should place on record the problems that it foresees will be experienced by those who are called on to manage this whole activity.

The legislation contains some very positive aspects with which members and witnesses had no difficulty, although at times there is some difficulty with their finer interpretation. On the positive side, there is a clear method of recognition of firearms clubs which has not existed in the past, and that will give an element of status and benefit to those clubs. There is also provision for the improved supervision of young shooters so that, unlike under the original Bill, they will not be denied the opportunity to involve themselves at a young age, it having been clearly demonstrated that a feel for guns and training over a long period

has been the hallmark of those who have made it to the top in competitive shooting at, say, the Olympic or Commonwealth Games. Many of those who have the runs on the board progressed through the ranks having had the opportunity to learn at a young age.

The committee also believes that formal gun education is wise. I would like to believe that moves are already afoot for TAFE to provide some of the education which will be forthcoming in this area. Not only will TAFE be to the fore in that area with lecturers who are competent in gun knowledge but the major gun clubs will extend the formal education that they presently provide to their members.

The committee also draws attention to the increase in penalties for transgressions. I make no apology for having been party to the fairly massive increase in penalties, because those people who fail to act responsibly to their fellow man or are negligent in their handling of guns deserve to be made an example of. In this regard the committee was more than happy with the attitude of all the official organisations. They showed clearly that they require a code of ethics and discipline of their membership and that they have a proper attitude towards transgressions.

Transitional provisions are entered into, but not all are clearly understood at the moment. I believe that there needs to be clear consultation with regard to their effectiveness. It is suggested in a note which has come my way that there is clear recognition of the need for such provisions, but it is not quite clear as to how they will be imposed upon owners. The question is: is it intended to phase out certain firearms? Obviously it will not be possible to pass on some firearms to other family members, and that is also unclear in the transitional provisions. The committee is concerned that a person who has legitimate ownership of a gun at present or who over a long period has been the custodian of a gun which is a family heirloom ought to be able to enjoy that ownership in the future with no suggestion that the gun could be removed unless the owner complied with stringent registration requirements and massive costs.

The Government has been very touchy about the term 'compulsory acquisition' and has gone to some lengths to indicate that that was never the intention, although legal advice placed before the committee indicated that aspects of the legislation and regulations would have led to confiscation. The fear still exists that those heirlooms at present in the hands of a family member cannot be carried through to the next generation or the generation thereafter without a great deal of difficulty. This matter needs a lot of consultation so that there can be no misunderstanding. There is a major problem with the transitional provisions with regard to handing down semi-automatic weapons within a family. Even somebody who uses such a weapon legitimately for farming or vermin control may not be able to hand it down within a family to be used for exactly the same purpose.

The acquisition of ammunition remains a contentious issue. It has been defused somewhat, but I have no doubt that others of my colleagues will refer to that issue. The problem of onus of proof has surfaced from time to time. It was addressed by the committee, but it still causes concern to those who have read the proposed Bill and regulations. They believe that not all the circumstances have been adequately sorted out by what is offered in this legislation.

We note that consultation remains an important part of several aspects of the legislation. That is so in relation to antique collections, an area in which the committee obtained a lot of useful information. The committee was provided with a very well presented piece of information complete

with pictorial evidence of the nature of the guns and other materials which make up those collections.

I would like the Minister, when he closes the debate, to take on notice a reinforcement of the commitment given by all members of the committee that, in relation to antique collections, the consultation process will continue to reasonable finality and that we will not see these important collections dissipated because the consultative process was not taken to its full extent. The Minister has given that assurance, but I think it is important that it be repeated in relation to this matter.

Members of the select committee were unable to come up with a form of wording to introduce this matter into the legislation at this time. I appreciate that what is not in the legislation is not justifiable under the law, and that is where the danger lies. These people express the opinion that they could find themselves in some difficulty. The committee wants to be quite clear on behalf of those people that their position will be sorted out and that the Government, certainly with the support of members on this side of the House, will take action that may be necessary to finalise the proper wording or requirements within the legislation which will protect their collections and, more particularly, protect individual items for the future, whether they be in the hands of the current owners or otherwise.

I have spoken in general terms about the issues which still cause concern within the community. I have indicated that we will seek to remove one aspect of this legislation but, in so doing, and by not seeking to remove other provisions, that should not be taken to mean that we agree with what the Government is doing. The Government has committed itself to a course of action which it has been unable to defend completely, but we do not see any opportunity to change to any degree the provisions contained in the Bill. The Government should urgently consider my proposed amendments relating to the registration of long-guns. I support the second reading of this Bill.

Mr LEWIS (Murray-Mallee): From time to time a lot of nonsense is spoken about the responsibility of legislators to protect the public from the irresponsible acts of individuals. Accordingly, at the outset, I say that the Government's motives are based on the hysteria of the moment. In a fairly short period, here and overseas a number of mass murders were committed that were reported on television in such a way as to create hysteria in the minds of people who otherwise had no contact with firearms or the consequences of the criminal use of firearms. They queried how an individual could be allowed to own such a lethal weapon and do such great damage with it.

However, when one examines the number of deaths caused by, say, motor vehicles, one can gain some idea of the even more horrific consequences of the misuse of vehicles. I think it is unfortunate that the Government used regrettable incidents to pursue the commitment of a large number of left wing members of the ALP to disarm the population. Members of the Government who were appointed to the select committee which heard evidence on this matter were enlightened about the nature of firearms and the majority of people who own and use them.

Firearms are not sinister things, nor are they the source of evil. Like so many other things to which we have access, they can be a great servant or a terrible tyrant. If mentally ill people are determined to commit offences, they will find the means to do so regardless of whether or not they have access to firearms. Further, the number of suicides will not be reduced by disarming the community. I have always believed that, when the Government introduced this legis-

lation, it was motivated by more sinister intentions and that it decided to use the opportunity created by the unfortunate recent incidents, which were reported in such sensational fashion on television, to disarm the public.

However, the Government did not realise that a large number of quiet and introspective people enjoy unstructured recreational activity using a wide variety of firearms. Those people were outraged by the stupidity of the Government's draconian program. In their hundreds of thousands in New South Wales and other States they made their views known to the respective State Governments. Those protests made the kneejerk reaction of the Prime Minister and the Labor Premiers of calling the ill advised so-called summit last December seem as stupid as it really was.

I do not believe that irresponsible people should possess and use firearms and my remarks should not be construed as endorsing such a course of action. However, I do not think that the Government will achieve anything with this legislation. The attempt by the Government to require registration of longarms is an utter waste of resources, an exercise in complete futility and an unnecessary burden on individuals. I even doubt the necessity to register shortarms, because I do not think that it will reduce, or has reduced, the number of crimes committed. Members will realise, as did members of the select committee, that firearms, shortarms in particular, can be purchased as such and modified in order to be used to commit an offence. Both 'hot' and 'clean' shortarms can be used in the commission of a criminal act, and the registration of the other 999 999 will not prevent that firearm being used in the commission of that offence.

As you would know, Mr Deputy Speaker, once the end of a longarm is sliced in order to make a shortarm, the ballistics are changed and any record of the ballistics pattern of the projectile is useless. This expenditure of public money, in an attempt to allay mistaken concerns based on ignorance, is ill advised, unnecessary and, in my opinion, should be opposed. We have better things to do with our money and better ways to use our police and other people involved in law enforcement. However, I do not argue with legislation requiring people to use and store firearms in a responsible fashion.

But this measure goes to much greater lengths than I would consider wise or necessary. Let me illustrate that point. From time to time we see reports on those items of furniture or equipment called safes which have been removed from the premises in which they were installed, either levered off the wall or maybe blown *in situ*. If someone wants something badly enough and they know where they can get it, they will get it by whatever means, and putting honest citizens to the enormous expense and horrendous responsibility of not only providing themselves with lockups of the type that are referred to in this legislation but also compelling them to ensure that they store their firearms and ammunition in those lockups is not a legitimate use of their personal resources, nor is it a legitimate exercise of Government power. God damn it, we would nearly have to compel people to register horseshoes if the horse was likely to kick someone to death. I just do not see the good sense of it either way and I see greater risk to public health and safety, frankly, from people who own and train dogs which can savage others than from people who own firearms.

Having dealt with those general matters, let me say that this issue has generated for me a great deal of correspondence with people not only in my own electorate but right across South Australia, indeed across State boundaries, even to the point where I have had letters from folk overseas

about what they consider to be actions taken by a Government with left wing sympathies in concert with an international conspiracy. I must say that, from my experience of life, I give some credence to that view. I see that the actions being taken in this case are pretty much a part of the same pattern of actions taken by socialist Governments elsewhere in the world, and they have achieved nothing, just as this will fail to achieve what the public imagined it would and what the Government said it could and would deliver.

I want to refer to some of those people who wrote to me and the help they have given me and, I am sure, other members of Parliament, to come to a clearer understanding of the problems with which we are confronted as a society that has generated the technology for manufacture of firearms. Once we have invented something, we really cannot make it disappear: we need to simply ensure that people who have access to it and use it do so responsibly. This legislation does not do that, and all my correspondents have pointed that out to me. One of the most prolific is a man who has become a personal friend in the course of dealing with this and other matters, having first made contact with me over this matter. He is Mr Mathison of Murray Bridge, who has never failed to make sense in any of the letters he has written to me about any of the ill advised measures which the Government has brought in over these past couple of years. This is the fourth go at trying to get it right, and every time the Government has retreated from the original position it took to try and sort out the problem which existed more in its imagination than in reality.

I would also like to acknowledge the contribution to public awareness of the issues and the way in which the problems can be dealt with by people who are office bearers in the various organisations representing other people who enjoy shooting in all its various forms. It is a very relaxing pastime, something which I have done myself, whether shooting for the sake of being accurate and skilled or shooting for the sake of hunting. That is an urge with which we have evolved, an urge which one cannot simply stamp out of the genre of human endeavour in a generation or two.

The entire species *homo sapiens* has come to its present state because of its success at hunting and otherwise gathering its food to sustain individuals with the necessary nutrition to ensure their continuing survival. Other species similar to *homo sapiens*, it may be contended, were not created as competently or, indeed, evolved to the point where they failed through incompetence at hunting. We have that capacity, and I enjoy it (I make no secret of it): I think most people do. Candidly, most ball games involving team efforts of one kind or another are a ritualisation in symbolic form, in my opinion, of hunting on the one hand (we hunt the ball) and, if you like, intertribal fights on the other hand, where the rules of conflict are nonetheless defined. I will not develop that theme further, because I do not have sufficient time to do so.

Those office bearers such as Mr Keith Tidswell and others who have written to me, along with hundreds of citizens, have made clear to me that this issue is one which will not go away, and it will not surprise me in the least to find that it is very much a part of the next State election in South Australia. We in the Liberal Party, as our very capable leading spokesman, the member for Light, has pointed out, have now reached the full extent of our tether in compelling the Government to realise the good sense of what must be done rather than what its inclinations might have been at the time it set out on this course.

We accept that the Government has the numbers and we will not waste the time of the Parliament, but we will compel

the Government to think again about this issue of registration, because it will waste resources which could be better used in dealing with other problems and in providing people with an education about firearms and their use. That may overcome a lot of hysteria which always accompanies ignorance. Where people are ignorant on a subject, an object or an instrument and when they are confronted with information about that subject or by the object itself, fear is generated and it is only by providing them with information that they are able to come to terms with the reality and accept that, just because they previously did not understand why the sun rises in the morning, it is nonetheless a wholly explicable phenomenon, that there is nothing mysterious about it at all, nor is it to be feared in any way: it is to be accepted as a legitimate part of the total environment in which we live.

So, with those remarks and further commendation of the kinds of people who wrote to me at length about the topic, I put to the House that I am concerned at the futility of a number of the provisions contained in the legislation, one being the way in which it deals with ammunition. One is not allowed to give it to anyone: they may not receive it as a gift unless there has already been some authority provided for them to possess it for the duration of the time one has it. Loading apparatus for ammunition is now a grey area; it is uncertain who will be allowed to use it. Is it an offence to help someone reload their cartridges? I find the perplexity of the problems the Government is creating for itself by pursuing this legislation quite amusing at times.

The Hon. P.B. Arnold interjecting:

Mr LEWIS: Exactly, that is the case. As the member for Chaffey points out, if we put gun ownership outside the law, the only people who own guns will be outlaws. How regrettable!

Mr S.G. EVANS (Davenport): I can understand that section of society that is fearful of guns. I can understand that section of society that is fearful of many of the sprays we use, whether they be weedicides, pesticides or whatever. I can understand the fears of people like me who do not understand electricity, as we cannot see the confounded stuff and it can take your life. I can understand all of those fears. I can understand that people are frightened of poisons. We have rules, regulations and advisory schemes that tell parents and others that they should store poisons out of reach of children. I know, of course, that at times children are able to get around that because those who have a bit of drive in them will find those poisons, sometimes bringing about a catastrophe. Sometimes it is the fault of parents who do not take the right precautions.

Again, poison is sometimes used as a method of deliberately killing people, as is the knife, the axe, a piece of wood or whatever, even a firearm or gun. I can understand those people who have no need for a gun and obtain no thrill from it. In fact, many people have a fear of guns and therefore have no desire to use one, whether in sport or with the thought of having some security in their home. A couple came to see me recently, having just moved from Elizabeth to the Hills. Their home had been broken into and entered three times in a fortnight. The lady's comment was that she now felt a prisoner in her own home, that she can no longer go home by herself because she is frightened. She works some flexitime and different hours from her husband, but she has to wait to make sure that her husband is at home at the same time. They asked about the attitude, under the new law, to anyone applying for a permit to own a gun for self-protection in their own home against those who break and enter. I had to say that I would have grave

doubts; I do not think a gun licence would be issued under these rules.

In fact, we can compare our law with the laws of other lands. I do not say that our law is all bad—that would be foolish—but there are some difficulties. For example, if a person, strong or otherwise, was at home and someone broke in to rob them of their possessions, under our law that person could not attack the intruder with a cricket bat, a knife, an axe or whatever and injure them in an attempt to protect their own property, or, if they did, they would be charged with assault. It has been shown that they will be found guilty, even though they are trying to protect what is their own. Our law states that we should sit in the corner (the intruder has probably disconnected the phone), wait for the intruder to go and then contact the police to tell them that we have been robbed. In my area, because of the lack of equipment and personnel in the Police Force, the police will probably turn up one or two hours later.

Some people in the community are now looking to protect their own possessions with some sort of weapon. I do not say that that is good or that I accept the practice. The member for Murray-Mallee referred to dogs. I suppose that a big dog, savage and trained, could achieve the same result as a gun, although it may be more painful. It is a complex issue. One of my own family members does not like the sight of guns and has a fear of them. That is the attitude of a certain section of our community.

I have six or seven registered guns at home. They are not mine and do not belong to me but to a lady whose husband was killed by a person who broke the law driving a motor car, not giving way at a stop sign. Her husband was killed and that person is not in gaol. She used a weapon, in a sense. That woman has a 15-year old son and she does not wish to have the firearms in the home while he is growing to adulthood. It was the father's wish that those possessions go to the lad later in life. In the meantime they have been registered and stored in my home. I use one or two of them as I have a small primary producing property and several foxes like to eat my poultry. We have a competition going, but they are winning at the moment: I have got only four of them and they have got about 30 of my poultry.

Under the law we are debating now, if I want to purchase a gun I must obtain a permit. It does not say anything about a gun being given to me. I do not know whether or not the same permit would apply. It is ludicrous and, as much as I might oppose it in this place, I cannot win. It is ludicrous to impose a situation where, before we can buy something, we have to go to the police or registrar and ask for a piece of paper that tells us we can own something we want to buy at auction. How often at an auction do you get to buy the article you want? How much humbug does one have to go through with Government departments? The member for Light said that we would wait and see. We know what it will be. There has never been a quick process with a Government department yet, unless we owe money, whether it be for land tax, income tax or whatever.

That is when the penalty applies and it is where Government departments act speedily. It does not occur when they are providing a service to the public. Under the present provisions, a person can walk into a police station to register a gun or to get a licence to possess a firearm. One can get a licence to shoot from another department. That is a reasonably speedy process.

Another aspect involves auction, where one has to make application and describe the type of gun that one wants to buy at the auction and it is then determined whether it is possible to provide a permit. Anyone not given a permit has to go through an appeal process and wait for someone

to give a decision on the matter. However, by that time the auction would be over and a gun of any value would be in Canada, or somewhere. That is the sort of ludicrous situation that the Government is trying to put into practice—although we are told that we should have less regulation.

It has been maintained that the main reason for change to firearms laws is to place controls on people in the community, in the main due to the fact that guns are used for holdups, assaults and the destruction of life. One sees and hears of this throughout one's life. One always reads that guns are being used for that purpose—as have many other weapons. I have said before in this place that in most cases this sort of violence is perpetrated by males. It is true that most violence in the community is caused by males. No Parliament in Australia has the guts to tackle the problem or admit what the problem is.

Right back to tribal times, the male of the species was expected to run, hunt and exploit things and to bring back the spoils, whereas the females, who bore the children, stayed in the family situation and undertook those responsibilities and backed up the males. This has extended right through to the lifestyle that we have now. So, many books, poems, and even nursery rhymes carry this theme. This also extends to films, plays, videos and television TV programs. It is the male who is depicted as perpetrating violent acts, whether using a gun, knife, poison, electricity, motor car or wooden object, etc.

We are not prepared to tackle this matter. If we tackle the cause of violence, the thing that starts it within a human being, we will upset a lot of other people. The whole of the entertainment field would be affected. The whole of the arts community would rebel and deny that it was the truth. Of course, though, it is the truth. Through everything we are taught, starting from kindergarten or primary school, the role model of the male is that he should be the violent one. That has been implanted in people's minds. It has been shown in every form of entertainment, including since 1956 on television. We all know that on any given night on television, whether it be on channel 2 or any other channel, many acts of violence can be seen on the programs shown.

Those connected with the arts, drama, theatre and film will tell us that people should have the strength of mind to view such programs and not be affected. Of course, a large percentage of people will not be affected, but a small percentage of people will be. Such people use weapons in either domestic or organised violence. This is one side of the question. The other side relates to the professional criminal, the person who sets out to hold up a bank, a payroll or someone in their own home, or to kidnap someone or hold up a person for cash or whatever can be used to obtain drugs.

People can make all the noise they like but, if all guns were banned, those who wanted to do so would simply make the confounded things. Unbeknown to us, in the 1970s a high school in the south of this State was making breaches for standard guns. We were not informed of this in Parliament. A teacher in the technical studies area was involved in doing it. If these can be made in a school, criminals and big money dealers will make them anywhere. The New Zealand Government was not able to buy the automatic weapons that it wanted in the first part of the last war so it converted conventional weapons to automatics. It can be done as simply as that, especially nowadays, with computerised machinery. It is much easier to do it now than it was previously.

We can make all the laws we like and we can make it as difficult as possible to get a gun and as difficult as possible for individuals to be assessed as to whether they are fit and

proper persons to possess a gun, but just as many people will be killed by weapons, whether deliberately or accidentally. The law was tightened in 1977, but the number of acts of violence against individuals did not fall. We did not reduce the number of crimes, house breakings, thefts or holdups.

Within certain sections of the community there is not just a fear of guns but a philosophy that the community would be better off if guns were not allowed in the community at all. Some members of the ALP believe that. I do not say that it is a terrible philosophy, but I am arguing that it is not practical. In Switzerland, for example, virtually everyone is compelled to own a gun, of a military style, and yet Switzerland's crime rate is lower than ours: the aggression of people against individuals is less than it is here. There is better community discipline—and this is because people are brought up to be more closely aware of the dangers.

Here we have an easygoing style, and in recent years governments have not believed in severe penalties. Governments are now starting to change in this attitude because the community is making them do so. In this State, after 18 years of socialist government, out of 23, people are starting to realise that the penalties have not been harsh enough for modern lifestyles. I can understand the viewpoint of a person who has had a rough trot in life and who suddenly thinks that perhaps it is not too bad up at Mobilong, where there is a gym, a swimming pool and good accommodation, perhaps better than at home. The drawback, of course, is incarceration and loss of total freedom, but some people due to their lifestyle do not have freedom and are restricted by the amount of money that they have.

I can understand their problems and I have sympathy for them, although I am not sure that the Federal Government is sympathetic at the moment. However, these people are restricted in how they can move around, compared perhaps with their yuppie neighbours who, for instance, might have two motor cars and a lot of money. So, what is the difference? In seeking to pull off a crime by stealing grog or dope they risk going to Mobilong.

It is sheer hypocrisy and stupidity that we are asked to put all shotguns into one classification. Show me where we pull the 410 out in the regulations that I have read. Indeed, I have seen no indication that the 410 would not be separated. At about 50 metres, using a certain type of shotgun one could catch the pellet and throw it back. That is how useless that gun really is when its power is compared with that of other guns. True, it will still kill at 20 metres, but so will a decent shanghai, bow and arrow, or tomahawk, I suppose. So, in Australian Parliaments we are not prepared to tackle the problem of the aggressive male. We will condemn him and say that he is bad, but the real reason for his aggression is the modern technology that is readily available in the home. In the olden days not many young people read newspapers, but television today is different.

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

Mr BLACKER (Flinders): This is the fourth time in 12 months we have been presented with a Bill to amend the Firearms Act. I often wonder what is going on when legislation must be introduced, then withdrawn, rehashed, brought back and Parliament given another whack at it. This has been a piecemeal operation with no one really knowing where we are going. The Deputy Premier has put the Bills before Parliament, sought the reactions of the community, and then either withdrawn or amended them. I do not know

that I have ever seen such an *ad hoc* piece of legislation put before Parliament in my time as a member. As many as four times in 11 months it has been found necessary to bring before Parliament this type of legislation.

There is probably one pleasing part of the Bill before the House: it has come from a select committee, so there has been greater public involvement and many firearms organisations have had a chance to give evidence before that committee. However, underlying that process was a Government philosophy to identify and locate every firearm in the community. Indeed, the Government hoped that that would be possible. However, the handling of this Bill has done more damage to the chance of identifying firearms in the community than anything else that the Government could have dreamed up. Indeed, I am told that every time this legislation has been debated more and more firearms have gone underground. That worries me because, even if the Government's intention in introducing the Bill was honourable it will have many fewer firearms to monitor and control, as the Deputy Premier would have to admit that many firearms have effectively gone underground where they cannot be identified.

Many firearms have not been identified and many more will be lost for the purpose of identification and therefore not considered. The purpose of the original Bill, when introduced, was allegedly to control the misuse of firearms and therefore to prevent the sort of massacre that has occurred. However, that result may not be realised because over the past 12 months, although I have not followed every report on the misuse of firearms, I have noted only one instance where a registered firearm was used in a criminal activity involving the misuse of firearms, whether a massacre or other shooting.

Obviously, there would be other cases where registered firearms would have been used, but in the vast majority of cases unregistered firearms would have been used. People wanting to commit a criminal offence would do their level best to see that the firearm would not be traced and therefore would use an unregistered firearm. Indeed, basic common-sense tells us that that is the case.

One issue that I raised from the very start concerns *de facto* confiscation, a matter on which the Government is touchy. We have been unable to get a satisfactory answer from the Government on this matter. Indeed, Inspector Tate admitted that my interpretation of *de facto* confiscation was correct. In Victoria, people wanting firearms re-endorsed for the shooting of dingoes, while they possess other firearms for the shooting of foxes, are refused, and a similar principle could apply here. If the Minister is concerned about my sensitivity and the sensitivity of many other firearm owners, he must consider the practical application in regard to these issues.

The select committee helped sort out some problems. It tried to tackle some problems that were pointed out in relation to under-age shooters. There are still problems in that regard, but at least it went further down the track towards making it possible for junior shooters to participate. Any problems concerning the junior ownership of firearms could be considered in Committee.

I question whether anything in this legislation will help police administer the Act. Indeed, we are asking all officers at police stations to become authorities on firearms. More classifications, requirements, and storage standards are being provided for. All those things go to make a complicated piece of legislation that will be more difficult to police. Members of the select committee know full well that difficulties have been experienced when an individual has gone

to a police station and got a wrong interpretation as to the classification or reporting of a firearm.

This type of problem seemed to be one of the most serious problems brought to the attention of the select committee and with the increasing number of classifications and criteria that confusion must be compounded. So, it will be even more difficult to administer the legislation, and I feel sorry for the police because I do not believe that Parliament should expect all police to be an authority on firearms.

It does not matter how much detailed information is sent out to the police on identifying firearms: the problem will be complicated and it will get down to a matter of one man's interpretation of whether or not a firearm complies with a classification. My knowledge of firearms is limited to their use on the farm and, since our family partnership was dissolved, I have not owned a firearm, although perhaps, for security reasons, I should not admit that in Parliament. However, for that very reason I give notice that I intend to use a firearm.

I believe that the ownership of firearms needs to be looked at. The Swiss example has been raised on many occasions. I do not believe that this Parliament can overlook that, because in Switzerland every able-bodied man—and I believe in some cases women—is not only obliged to have a military style firearm in his home but is also trained to use it. I do not think that it is any coincidence that the level of criminal misuse of firearms in Switzerland is considerably less than it is in our society. I think that the Government should look at some of the reasons why we have this criminal misuse. The member for Davenport referred to the attitude of society in general. I think that the Government would be wise to look at some of the causes instead of trying to shut the door after the horse has bolted.

I refer to the Queen Street massacre. On 21 December last year the Premier and the Deputy Premier made great play about the need for changes in firearms legislation. Some 18 days previously the Deputy Premier tabled before Parliament amendments to the firearms legislation. That is the piece of legislation that we and the community were considering. Yet 18 days later, following the massacre that occurred in Victoria, there was another public announcement about proposed changes to firearms legislation. So the parliamentarians who were to consider the legislation then before Parliament were effectively told to disregard it—'We are not interested in what we have already put to Parliament; we are starting again.'

I refer members to extracts from the diary of the mass murderer, Frank Vitkovic, published in the *Advertiser* of 4 October this year. Nothing in that incident could have been controlled by any amendment that we could make to firearms legislation, but that incident was one of the key reasons for the proposed changes put before Parliament and the public. Therefore, one must question the Government's motivation. When one reads the diary of the mass murderer, published on page 17 of the *Advertiser* of 4 October, one can see that his problems were of a psychiatric nature. He had been exposed to violence and all the wrong things in life and eventually he resorted to the use of a firearm to commit murder. There is nothing in this legislation that could have prevented that sort of massacre. I think that it is wishful thinking on the part of the Government and I again question its motivation because it is using the hysteria created by that type of incident to get in and hopefully identify every firearm in South Australia. In fact, the sadly mistaken objective which has been expressed by some is to disarm the community.

I hoped when this debate started that I could approach it in a fair and open-minded way but, given the things that have happened and the avenues that this Government has taken, I must return to the original allegation that it is an attempt to disarm the community. I do not think that anything that has occurred so far indicates that that was not the original intention of the Government. If the Government intended to disown that sort of philosophy, it has failed dismally.

I turn now to a letter I received from Mr Raymond Dennis of Cleve. I have received numerous letters and phone calls from firearm owners, landowners and people who do not own firearms but who feel that the Government is being quite ridiculous with respect to its approach to this matter. I believe that the letter sums up the thoughts of some of those people. It states:

It is with much distaste that I take pen to paper to write this letter to you concerning the proposed firearms management policies of our present elected South Australian Government. I am a business man in Cleve who runs a number of business ventures. One of them is directly related to the outcome of the firearms policies being formulated by the present Labor Government in South Australia. A second is effected in a much broader sense by what happens nationwide with firearms legislation.

I classify myself as a well-educated and rational person able to make judgments and decisions in a logical manner and, right from the onset of New South Wales Labor laws proposals in 1987, I could clearly see politicians simply using emotional arguments to tap the anticipated mood of the electorate and reap the political gains as a result. Fortunately in New South Wales emotional decision making was rejected by the voting public in the election which followed. The Labor Party was defeated. The rest is history.

What disappoints me the most is the subtle way the South Australian Labor Party is continuing with their personal form of firearms restrictions when all sensible, logical and informed members of the public realise that firearms control has very little direct correlation with crime control. Because the Labor Government is committed to proceeding with legislation despite the lack of hard clear evidence to support their case, it makes me wonder just what is the true aim of this current legislation.

It does not take an intelligent person to work out that banning firearms will not diminish crime! Why can't politicians tackle the real issues and immediately:

(a) Return heavy penalties for all forms of violence.

(b) Employ judges who will enforce those penalties (N.B. this month's *Time* magazine article).

A responsible government needs to work towards:

(a) Encouraging true family life and stability.

(b) Discourage all activities that break up the family, e.g. alcoholism, gambling, encouragement of free sex, drugs and irresponsibility etc.

(c) Reduce direct and indirect taxation which is destroying business and causing unemployment and destruction of the family.

(d) Reinstatement of educative process at all levels that present the moral values of the Judeo-Christian ethic.

Peter, I would write much more, all based on fact but I have become disillusioned with the politicians ability to place fact above emotionally based political vote play in their decision making process. What does it take for good commonsense laws to be instituted? Why can't they learn from the experiences of our past and from other states (New South Wales and countries (Switzerland etc.)). Is the true aim the slow, methodical but nevertheless progressive 'disarming' of the law abiding members of the community. I have included a pamphlet I have recently received in the mail, which summarises reasonably well my thoughts on the proposals.

I employ 12 people in Cleve, a country town beset by a rural crisis and their wages comes from the profit made in:

(1) Firearms sales in a sports shop.

(2) Spotlight sales throughout Australia (these are manufactured and distributed from Cleve).

Try telling these people that their jobs may be lost directly as a political decisions based on the emotional arguments of the anti-gun lobby.

Peter we are relying on you objectively to analyse the data and statistics and thereby bring some commonsense to the proposed legislation with your sensible input.

I believe that that is an accurate assessment of the majority of people's views, certainly in country areas. I do not believe

that one can be critical of the contents of that letter. I was very pleased when I received it because I believe that it sums up the situation in a rational way.

I had the opportunity of meeting with Mr Colin Greenwood, a well-known and world renowned authority on firearms. He has given a considerable amount of evidence to various authorities throughout the world and is currently a freelance consultant on firearms matters, and he regularly acts as a forensic expert in criminal and civil trials. Everything that was put to him in that short interview—I say short, but it lasted for 90 minutes—got back to the old story of basic commonsense. As I said, this Government has done nothing so far that tends to go down that line. I believe that the Government has not justified the continued use of registration of longarms. I also believe that there is a very strong case—certainly an economic case—to be made for longarms registration to cease.

I do not believe that a case has been presented to justify longarm registration. Other countries have amended longarm registration legislation because its cost benefit has been questioned. I received a complaint about a statement made to the select committee by a witness (Inspector Tate) who stated:

It is a well known fact that one northern collector has often made statements that he has illegal machine guns and working Bren guns stored hoping that the South Australian legislation will allow him to legitimately bring them on to his own property. Members from the same society have stated they have working model 50 calibre machine guns. The same people want a change in legislation to allow 50 calibre working ammunition to be made available in South Australia. The same groups want actual field days where they can fire the 50 calibre and Brens and bazookas. A presentation by the association wants to legitimise the possession of bazookas. The greater majority of the people do not want these things.

Obviously that evidence was targeted towards one gentleman and it inferred that he is a gun happy Rambo-type person when nothing could be further from the truth. He collects historical firearms and, as such, needs to be recognised and respected.

Ms GAYLER (Newland): In my initial speech on this matter when the firearms select committee reported in August, I dealt with the committee's findings and recommendations. I also tried to set down the facts as we know them about the misuse of firearms by criminals and the mentally deranged. I considered the importance to the community as a whole and to the police of adequate firearms controls. I also said that the controls needed to be 'responsible, rational, workable and reasonable'.

On this occasion, I will not repeat the matters I canvassed then but, instead, I want to put very plainly my own position regarding legitimate law-abiding gun owners, who remain the vast majority. I will deal with their views and responses to the Bill, their concerns about law and order generally, and how the Bill will and will not affect them. In doing so, I would say that every gun owner in my electorate who rang or wrote to me about this issue has had their individual views and concerns heard and taken into account. I have kept them informed as the proposals have been changed to accommodate their reasonable suggestions.

I have represented their worries to the Minister, individually and on his committee. Most, though not all, tell me they can 'wear' the proposals in this revised Bill in the interests of the broader community. They may not welcome every aspect of the Bill, but they say that it will not unduly affect their sporting shooting. I should add that I have never tried to make cheap political capital out of this issue. I have tried to stick to facts rather than emotion. I have never attacked the legitimate law-abiding gun owner.

In spite of that, it is claimed by a few that I am anti-gun, anti-sporting shooter, and anti-firearms clubs. As they say in the modern classics, some people do not let the facts get in the way of a good story. So, what are the facts? Being brought up in a country town until my late teens, naturally I was part of a firearm-owning family. I was occasionally allowed to go hunting for rabbits and hares—spotlighting we called it—with my father and brothers. My father has been a keen shooter all his life—beginning on the farm. He continues to gain great pleasure from his recreational shooting in and around the South-East, and occasionally along the Darling and Coopers Creek.

As a youngster I witnessed the consequences of an awful firearms accident which occurred on the Murray River. A family friend lost his eye in an accident involving firearms and a moving speed boat. At times like that you realise that having a loaded firearm in a moving vehicle demands great care, but we do not ban guns as a result. We still went spotlighting, always with parents supervising, and never stupidly. My father still takes pride in his sport, although he tells me that he is not as good as he was, because his eyesight and reaction time get worse. I must confess that I still eat the proceeds of his legal hunting. He sticks to the legal limits in terms of species, numbers and the like, and he gets very angry about people he calls 'hoons' who do not play by the rules. He tells me that most legitimate shooters feel the same way.

I kept my father in mind as the firearms debate progressed. As an ordinary sporting shooter, how would he be affected, how would law-abiding owners in my electorate be affected after the select committee reported and when the final Bill was introduced? I was able to assure him on Fathers Day that he would be able to continue doing what he had been doing, virtually unaffected. It was not aimed at harming the interests of the vast majority of responsible gunowners.

Of course, some zealots say that guns should be banned. They forget that farmers and vets need guns, as do the armed forces, police and security personnel. They also misunderstand the legitimate needs of sporting shooters on the range and in the field. To those people, shooting is a hobby, a sport and their recreation. Through it they develop skill, fitness, professionalism, concentration and discipline, excellence, competition and comradeship. To them, their guns are something like a good golfer's favourite golf club—treasured for its craftsmanship, enormously valuable and practical. Perhaps it is like a much loved dog.

In the debate about appropriate firearms controls, many who fit into the category of legitimate law-abiding gunowners have emerged feeling rather bruised. They have been lumped with gun-wielding criminals or lunatics by some politicians and sections of the media and have been labelled as potential criminals or potentially insane, about to run amok. The responsible shooters are sick and tired of feeling like scapegoats. They feel that their right to engage in the lawful recreation of their choice is threatened. Whether or not that was ever intended, that is the reality or, at least, the perception. However, it is clear that the vast majority of sporting shooters should not be tarred with the same brush as criminals and cranks. Rather, law-abiding shooters are entitled to the reassurance that their rights will be protected. Before and after this Bill, they are entitled to be assured of this fact: under our system of rights, based on British common law, individuals have the right or the freedom to own and use firearms within the boundaries set by the law, that is, subject to criminal laws, wildlife protection laws, etc.

The October 1988 edition of *Australian Shooters Journal* states;

This is not to say that a right is absolute. It may be necessary to regulate our rights so that everyone has a fair go. We accept firearms regulations which have such a purpose, but we reject prohibitionist laws. We also recognise that there is a link between our rights and our responsibilities in which we have generally not defaulted.

I think that the Bill now before Parliament maintains the right to private gun ownership with the sorts of limits and responsibilities which that editorial contemplates.

Apart from feeling that the public debate has been an attack on them as legitimate law-abiding gun owners, the firearms community genuinely worries about gun control as a diversion from the main game, which is to attack crime in the community. They are absolutely right in thinking that firearms control is not the single answer to society's crime problems. They rightly expect tough action by Governments and courts in the broader social problems and especially on criminal conduct including drug running and robbery motivated by drug addiction, and on violence against innocent people.

On this score they are getting just such tough action. We have funded the largest number of police officers per head of population of any Australian State. We have boosted their budget by \$83 million in six years. We have raised the penalties for serious crime, and that is getting results, with record sentences being handed down for crooks like von Einem (who received a sentence of 36 years) and Moyses.

Attorney-General Chris Sumner has appealed against more than 100 lenient sentences handed out by judges, and he has been more and more successful as the courts appreciate the concern in the community. Ordinary families rightly demand that the penalty fits the crime. Neighbourhood Watch has been introduced as a positive move against community based crime, and now its program has been doubled. Child abuse and domestic violence are being tackled. Discipline in schools is getting fresh emphasis and an inquiry into television and video violence is under way.

Now, at the suggestion of sporting shooters and farmer organisations, the penalties for criminal use of firearms are being boosted and new offences created. Possession of a gun or imitation firearm with intent to commit a serious offence such as an armed hold-up will mean 10 years for the possession offence alone. Threatening a person with a gun will become a criminal offence, and I must say I am surprised that that has not been the case before now. Carrying a loaded gun in a public place without lawful reason, such as having a hunting permit, will be a crime.

Those new offences and stiff penalties are in line with police proposals and calls by gun clubs during the select committee hearings for tough measures against criminal misuse of firearms. The measures in the Firearms Act Amendment Bill now being considered are one small element of a range of steps the Government is taking to crack down on crime generally and minority misuse of firearms in particular. Even so, the steps in this Bill are necessary if we are to cut down on the so-called crimes of opportunity—the crimes that rely on ready access to a firearm in the heat of the moment, and at the same time to arm the police with the essential tools they need for crime prevention, detection and law enforcement. These changes also make very clear to the community the line between the rights and enjoyment of law-abiding sporting shooters and the minority who misuse firearms. A clear dividing line will be of benefit to sporting shooters and give the wider community added confidence that criminals and cranks do not have easy legal access to guns under South Australian law.

It is also interesting to note that Margaret Thatcher's Conservative Government in Britain has just finalised much stricter firearms controls and cemented into place rifle and shotgun registration firmly within the British system, I might add contrary to the recommendation of Mr Greenwood who hails from Britain and who I notice has not been successful in his approach there. I believe what the British experience demonstrates is that firearms controls are essentially not the fetish of any one political Party, as some commentators suggest.

I think it is also fair to say that even here in South Australia all political Parties support gun controls and we will probably see all four Parties in the Parliament supporting much of this Bill, though there will be some manoeuvring and amendments suggested. The fundamental support will be because the Bill is necessary and at the same time fair.

How will it affect the vast majority of law-abiding sporting shooters, farmers, and the like? First, it will not confiscate their guns: that was never proposed in South Australia. It will, however, be of some inconvenience to legitimate shooters, a pain in the proverbial butt some would say. The permit to purchase will be a nuisance and a delay when people want to buy another gun. The firearms security requirements will be an added expense and an extra obligation. The licence conditions and endorsements will mean added bureaucracy for them. The restriction on high powered, military style self-loading firearms will offend some, but then they are not widely used. Most regular shooters do not have much time for close assault, rapid-fire weapons, night-sighting devices, image intensifiers or armour piercing bullets.

At my suggestion the Bill caters for sporting and recreational shooters to use a range of commonly used, commercially available self-loading firearms apart from the military style high-powered variety. Also at my suggestion, the original controls over ammunition have been dropped in favour of a simple offence of purchasing ammunition without a firearms licence or a collectors permit. It turned out, from the evidence given by the select committee, that the records of ammunition purchase were not to be used by the police in any event, and the only result would have been a wasteful paperwork burden on both purchasers and dealers and of course, problems for farmers and others in isolated locations.

The overall effect of the Bill on the law-abiding firearms fraternity will be a certain amount of inconvenience. In the words of an experienced South Australian police officer who gave evidence, 'A bit of a bother' but as he and a number of others concluded with advantages far outweighing the drawbacks in these measures. I trust that that bother will be broadly acceptable to the vast majority of legitimate shooters in the overall interests of the community and in the interests of the police in their crime prevention and criminal detection work on our behalf. I conclude by supporting the measures in this final Bill which has emerged from the select committee.

Mr MEIER (Goyder): It is my recollection that this is the third attempt by the Government to have a Bill of this type before the Parliament. I have heard two previous speakers say that it is the fourth attempt but the Minister acknowledges that it is the third attempt. That shows that this legislation certainly has been controversial and that the Government has not been wise in the way it introduced it in the first place. To have to continually change legislation must be embarrassing for the Government and it is to some

extent surprising that it has continued to persevere with this legislation.

Most of us would recall that the first piece of legislation was introduced last year; it was put before the House so that we could think about it during the Christmas break. During that break the Adelaide by-election was held and the gun issue was a significant item at that time. When I was doorknocking a number of people spoke to me regarding the Liberal Party's view on the gun legislation. It was not long after that that the second Bill was introduced. We have since seen the New South Wales election in which the gun question was a major issue; in fact, the gun lobby accepted much of the reason for the defeat of the Labor Government. I believe that the gun lobby certainly must take a considerable amount of credit.

Here in South Australia a select committee was set up to consider the previous Bill. I believe it is wrong to say that this Bill before us was considered by a select committee. It certainly has not; the previous Bill was considered. This Bill was drawn up with some of the select committee's recommendations in mind.

I have mixed feelings on this Bill. I recognise that there must be balance between what certain people in the community want over and against others. I doubt whether any piece of legislation will provide totally for the rights of all people, because some people want to see guns outlawed altogether and others do not want to see any restrictions at all. Whether or not this is the appropriate compromise will become more apparent as the debate progresses. However, I do not think that it is; it lacks too much to be seen as the ideal piece of legislation. I will discuss that point later.

I will briefly trace my own experience in the use of guns. I was fortunate in being born and raised on a farm. I went shooting and had access to firearms from an early age. At the same time I was fortunate to have a father who educated me on the rights and wrongs of holding a firearm, how to use it, to always have on at least the safety catch and preferably not to have a round in the breech unless I was about to stalk an item of prey or shoot at something. It was always emphasised that when going through fences, one should unload the gun or, at the very least, have the safety catch engaged. I was always instructed to hold the weapon pointing to the ground. Another line of thought is that, if you are holding it upright it is quite safe, although I disagree with that.

I and my neighbours all held to those safety factors and, if there was ever a case in the newspapers illustrating that a person had been shot as a result of a shooting accident, it was hammered home all the more to us as young people. Gun education was reinforced when I had the opportunity to serve in the reserve forces for seven years, during which time I learnt a lot more about handling rifles and guns. In that situation orders were barked at the troops and, if you did not do the right thing, you were soon told in no uncertain terms. I have a clear memory of a young private who was on Dean Range aiming his M16 machine gun down the range, having just completed firing. He was a strong young fellow, but did not know what to do next. He picked up the machine-gun and pointed it in the direction of the corporal asking, 'What do I do now?' The corporal almost went insane trying to get the fellow to point the machine-gun in the direction it was supposed to be facing. Thankfully, no accident occurred.

It amazed me that so many people who went into the military forces had no idea how to use a firearm. Certainly, if nothing else, such training must have been of great benefit to them, because we all knew what to do and what not to do by the time our training was finished. It seems that

education is an important part of the firearms legislation, yet I do not notice any reference to it in the Bill. That is a great shame.

We have seen the registration of firearms for many years. Licensing of firearms was introduced in the past few years. What effect has the licensing of firearms had in South Australia? We recall that when it was brought in it was argued that it would help reduce crime as the police would know where all firearms were, that each firearm would be identified clearly and that the police could trace more easily the owner of any weapon used in a crime. Have we seen a decrease in gun related crimes? The answer, of course, is 'No, we have not'. In fact, we have seen a major increase in gun related crimes. The legislation has failed in trying to control firearms use.

This Government scared the rural community at large when, in one of the previous Bills (either the last one or the one before that), it suggested the introduction of safes to store firearms and indicated that automatic weapons would almost certainly be confiscated. It was to be a similar situation to that in New South Wales where confiscation of firearms proceeded prior to the defeat of the Unsworth Government. It is not surprising that certain constituents of mine said to me earlier this year, 'I made a big mistake several years ago, John, when they asked us to register all our firearms and to clearly state what firearms we had. I should never have disclosed the weapons that I had.' It is a great tragedy when the Government does not instil confidence into the community at large so that law abiding citizens decide that, as they are likely to lose their weapons some time in the future, to protect their possessions they will not disclose them.

The Government earlier this year said that that was not its intention, yet we know that that was the case. So, we still do not have an answer to my earlier question: 'What is the use of licensing firearms?' One result has been more income for the Government. Members would recall that last November I moved a motion that this House deplore the duplicity of the Government in raising firearm licence fees by up to 150 per cent. There was considerable debate at that time and it was clear to all members on this side of the House that the Government was keen to raise extra revenue. Members might recall that that regulation came in only a short time after the Hoddle Street killings in Melbourne when a gunman, who I think is on trial at present, went berserk with an automatic weapon. However, we should remember that the weapon was not registered; he did not have a licence for it. Therefore any previous legislation in that State would not have stopped such a gun maniac.

Other members have referred to the Switzerland experience, which we can all consider. Because of its national service requirements most if not all householders have a gun. Yet it appears that the number of gun related crimes is lower in that country compared with any other equivalent western country. The argument 'Let us take away guns from people and therefore reduce crime' does not hold when we look at the statistics and facts in relation to Switzerland. I believe other countries have a similar situation.

As to matters of concern in this Bill, first of all, how will it affect me? At present I do not own a firearm, although I used to. I do not have any use for a firearm any more, but from time to time I have been asked to go spotlighting, and invariably the request comes at very short notice. A farmer might telephone me and ask 'John, how would you like to come out spotlighting tonight? One of the fellows who was going to go is not available.' Previously I have been able to accept, but, from the way I read this Bill, I will not be able to accept those invitations any more, because, at the very

least, I will need a permit, if not a firearms licence, to allow me to shoot.

I guess one could say that this could be overcome by making sure that any of the people who invite me to go out do so at least a week before so that I can make application for a permit to use a firearm for spotlighting. I would perhaps be prepared to accept that, although a couple of comments that have come back to me from people to whom I have spoken about this have indicated that it is highly likely that it will take more than a week to get such a permit through. Therefore, in future it appears that for me spotlighting evenings will be out of the question, as they will be for many other people who are not interested in owning rifles or guns but who would like to go out for a shot every now and again. I suppose one way out of it for me would be to seek a licence to possess a rifle or a shotgun, but I question whether I have sufficient cause to own one, anyway. Leading on from that, I suppose one could question whether I am in the category of people that the Registrar would accept as being suitable applicants. Would I fit the various criteria? I will seek more information on that during the Committee stage.

As to the matter of the loading of cartridges, proposed new section 21b of the Bill provides specific restrictions on people who purchase ammunition or who accept ammunition as a gift, although they have to be appropriately registered. I know many people who load their own cartridges—and, from my reading of the Bill, I do not believe that that is covered. Certainly, I can understand that the sale would automatically require them to have an appropriate licence, but what if they make ammunition for themselves? It would seem to me that this is a further example of poorly drafted legislation. It does not cover all cases, and I wonder whether this will lead to a further Bill. We will see what further eventuates in debate.

I want to draw attention to some letters that I have received on this issue. I received a fairly lengthy letter from a Mr Andrew Offe. He covered many points, and on the concept of registering firearms he stated:

Registering firearms (currently law and maintained by this Bill) has been repeatedly demonstrated to be a total failure in either reducing crime or saving lives . . . That money would be far better used in educating youth and maintaining our law enforcement system . . .

I think I commented on that earlier, and I believe that he has made a very relevant point, and it relates to an issue that has not been addressed in this Bill. As to restricting firearms, Mr Offe stated:

Criminals do not generally use legitimate sources. Any type of gun is readily available illegally. So-called crimes of passion and massacres do not require the availability of guns. Canadian gun controls possibly were responsible for a slightly decreased use of guns but no reduction in the actual crime rate.

He then makes further points about restricting semiautomatics and owner licensing. Mr Offe further stated:

In 1979, when the current law was debated, the Government was told that further restrictions would not reduce crime and that further restrictions would as a result be forced upon us. This has happened and it will not stop here, because this legislation will be totally ineffectual—neither decreasing violent crime or gun misuse in any way.

In his letter, Mr Offe has highlighted other matters which, unfortunately, the Government has not addressed more closely. I now refer to a letter that I received from Mr Peek, of Port Lincoln. He states, in the second paragraph:

As a firearms owner for some 20 years, a representative on the Conservation Council of South Australia, and also having the honour of representing Australia in international competition in rifle shooting, I object strongly to being treated like a criminal due to my chosen lifestyle.

I think that is a very relevant point. Why should these people be treated like criminals when they are law abiding citizens? I know that many people in the rural areas, the farmers and other rural producers, resent having added restrictions placed on them. I intend to support the second reading of the Bill so that further debate can ensue, as I think it is very important to fully debate this matter. I will be interested to see what sort of compromising mood the Government is in come the Committee stage of the Bill, and we will see what happens at the third reading stage.

Mr INGERSON (Bragg): I support the majority of clauses in the Bill. I was a member of the select committee and, in principle, we were able to encourage Government members to amend the Bill. We now have before us a significantly improved Bill. I think it is important to put on record that Government members on the select committee were willing to recognise the need for significant changes. I was very concerned about several parts of the Bill. I strongly supported the need to recognise that certain weapons—and I use the word ‘weapons’ because that is how I saw them—some of the longarms, were the sort of weapons that needed to be controlled. The Government, through regulations, has recognised that group of firearms and it has categorised them accordingly. I support that very strongly, and I think that the majority of the community does so as well.

I support the need to increase control as it relates to access to firearms. This Bill has now recognised certain controls, which will eventually become law. These controls are very important, and I believe that the community will accept them. I support the recognition by the Government of the need to change the licensing age. There is no doubt that there were some problems in this area in the old Act. The Government has now made changes and I support those very strongly. An area that I have been concerned about involves the coaching of young children who are interested in the shooting of firearms as a sport.

[Sitting suspended from 6 to 7.30 p.m.]

LOANS TO PRODUCERS ACT AMENDMENT BILL

Returned from the Legislative Council without amendment.

STATUTES REPEAL (AGRICULTURE) BILL

Returned from the Legislative Council without amendment.

CHILDREN'S PROTECTION AND YOUNG OFFENDERS ACT AMENDMENT BILL (No. 3)

Received from the Legislative Council and read a first time.

The Hon. G.J. CRAFTER (Minister of Education): I move:

That this Bill be now read a second time.

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

Leave granted.

Explanation of Bill

It seeks to amend the Children's Protection and Young Offenders Act 1979. It is to be read in conjunction with the

Criminal Law (Sentencing) Act Amendment Bill, 1988, as its provisions are mirrored in that other Bill.

An appeal is to lie to the Full Court of the Supreme Court against a decision of that court, on an application by a child (who has been sentenced to imprisonment for life) to be released from detention on licence.

An additional basis of appeal is to be conferred where the Supreme Court has made a decision, pursuant to S. 58a (12) of the principal Act, regarding an application by a child who has been released on licence to be discharged absolutely from a sentence of life imprisonment. The right of appeal will vest in either the Crown or the child who, is the subject of the Supreme Court's decision. The Bill also spells out the consequential powers of the Full Court when it has heard and determined any such appeal.

Clause 1 is formal. Clause 2 amends section 58a of the principal Act to provide a right of appeal to the Full Court of the Supreme Court against a decision of the Supreme Court or an application to release a child on licence, or to discharge a child released on licence from a sentence of life imprisonment. An appeal must (subject to any other order) be commenced within ten days of the date of the relevant decision. The operation of a decision to release a child may be suspended pending the determination of an appeal (if the Crown indicates at the time that the decision is given that an appeal is to be instituted).

The Hon. B.C. EASTICK secured the adjournment of the debate.

CRIMINAL LAW CONSOLIDATION ACT AMENDMENT BILL

Received from the Legislative Council and read a first time.

The Hon. G.J. CRAFTER (Minister of Education): I move:

That this Bill be now read a second time.

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

Leave granted.

Explanation of Bill

It is designed to rectify an anomaly in relation to the way the Parole Board can deal with a person, who has been found not guilty of an offence on the ground of insanity and who may abscond interstate while at liberty on Governor's licence. Where the Parole Board has reasonable cause to suspect that such a person has contravened or failed to comply with any term or condition on which he or she was released, any two members of the Board may issue a warrant for the person's apprehension and return the person to custody (S. 293a(3) CLCA). If the person absconds interstate, the usual manner of dealing with the matter is by extradition proceedings pursuant to Part III of the Commonwealth Service and Execution of Process Act 1901. However, S. 18 (1) of that Act expressly contemplates that any warrant for (interstate) apprehension has been issued, in accordance with the law of South Australia, by anyone who acts in the capacity of 'a court, a judge, or police, stipendiary or special magistrate, a coroner, a justice of the peace or an officer of a court'. Clearly, at present, a warrant issued by the Parole Board is not issued by any such designated functionary.

This amendment to the Criminal Law Consolidation Act 1935 is calculated to overcome this defect. Process will be

issued by a designated functionary (within the terms of S. 18 (1) of the Commonwealth Service and Execution of Process Act 1901) for the interstate apprehension and extradition of an absconder. I commend this Bill to members.

Clause 1 is formal. Clause 2 amends section 293a of the Act by providing that the members of the Parole Board have no power themselves to issue a warrant under this section, but may apply to a justice for a warrant when necessary.

The Hon. B.C. EASTICK secured the adjournment of the debate.

CHILDREN'S PROTECTION AND YOUNG OFFENDERS ACT AMENDMENT BILL (No. 2)

Received from the Legislative Council and read a first time.

The Hon. G.J. CRAFTER (Minister of Education): I move:

That this Bill be now read a second time.

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

Leave granted.

Explanation of Bill

This small Bill to amend the Children's Protection and Young Offenders Act 1978 should be regarded as a companion to the Criminal Law Consolidation Act Amendment Bill 1988. It seeks to effect, in relation to warrants issued by the Training Centre Review Board, a similar amendment to the one that the latter Bill seeks to effect in relation to warrants issued by the Parole Board in respect of adults. In other words, process will be issued by a functionary who is recognised under the Service and Execution of Process Act 1901 (Cth), for the interstate apprehension and extradition of a young absconder.

Clause 1 is formal. Clauses 2 and 3 provide that members of the Training Centre Review Board may apply to a justice for the issue of a warrant where necessary.

The Hon. B.C. EASTICK secured the adjournment of the debate.

CRIMINAL LAW (SENTENCING) ACT AMENDMENT BILL

Received from the Legislative Council and read a first time.

The Hon. G.J. CRAFTER (Minister of Education): I move:

That this Bill be now read a second time.

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

Leave granted.

Explanation of Bill

It seeks to amend the Criminal Law (Sentencing) Act 1988 in order to confer certain rights of appeal to the Full Court of the Supreme Court on either the Crown or defendants who may themselves be subject to sentences of indeterminate duration.

The Act was assented to on 5 May 1988; the provisions dealing with indeterminate sentences (e.g. for offenders

incapable of controlling their sexual instincts) came into operation on 12 May 1988.

Since then, both the Crown Prosecutor and the Solicitor-General have advised that the Act does not confer a right of appeal against a decision made under S. 24 i.e. a decision of the Supreme Court that authorises the release on licence of a person detained in custody pursuant to a sentence of indeterminate duration. Nor is such a right of appeal conferred by any other Act.

It is desirable that both the applicant for release on licence and the Crown have a right of appeal. The matter is to be put beyond doubt by an express provision conferring rights of appeal.

There are other provisions in the Act (in Part II Division III which deals with Sentences of Indeterminate Duration) where certain decisions of the Supreme Court ought also to be the subject of a right of appeal, viz:

by either the Crown (or the defendant) against a decision of the Court discharging (or not discharging) an habitual criminal from an order for detention (S. 22 (7));

by either the Crown (or the defendant) against a decision of the Court discharging (or not discharging) from an order of detention a person declared to be incapable of controlling his or her sexual instincts declared (S. 23 (11));

by a defendant against a decision of the Supreme Court, made on application by the Crown, to order that a discharge not be granted, where a person has been subject to a licence for a continuous period of 3 years, on the expiration of that period.

These additional grounds are therefore included in the right of appeal to be conferred by the provisions of this Bill. The Bill also spells out the consequential powers of the Full Court when it has heard and determined any such appeal.

Clause 1 is formal. Clause 2 provides for a new section 27a to the principal Act. This section will provide a right of appeal to the Full Court of the Supreme Court against a decision of the Supreme Court on an application to discharge an order for detention, to release a person on licence, or to extend the period of release on licence. An appeal must (subject to any other order) be commenced within ten days of the date of the relevant decision. The operation of a decision to release a person may be suspended pending the determination of an appeal (if the Crown indicates at the time that the decision is given that an appeal is to be instituted).

The Hon. B.C. EASTICK secured the adjournment of the debate.

SUMMARY OFFENCES ACT AMENDMENT BILL

Received from the Legislative Council and read a first time.

FIREARMS ACT AMENDMENT BILL (No. 2)

Adjourned debate on second reading (resumed).
(Continued from page 1091.)

Mr INGERSON (Bragg): Before the dinner adjournment, I was expressing concern about the difficulty experienced in the coaching of young people wishing to take up the sport of shooting. As I said when reporting on the select committee, the Government should consider this matter

further so that we do not have young people unable to take up a sport in which they wish to participate for the rest of their life.

The recommendation to introduce training and planning schemes to teach new applicants the safe use of guns is a very positive move. A similar scheme has been very successful in the training of motorcyclists. It has been proven in many skills areas that training is an essential part of any program, and the fact that the Government has been prepared to accept that clubs and associations should become part of this training system is an excellent move. The recognition in the Bill that the clubs have special requirements and should have some dispensations is very important. It is also very important that the Government is prepared to encourage and recognise those who wish to be involved in the sporting arena. They can belong to a club and develop friendships and receive training in relation to both safety and skills, and also participate in very important competitions.

Penalties have been significantly increased, which is something that the Opposition has called for. We believe that this will go a long way towards discouraging the misuse of firearms. However, there are two significant areas of the Bill which I believe are to the detriment of the use and control of firearms. There is no doubt that during the select committee ample evidence was provided to show that the existing registration system is a farce, and that registration systems around the world where the firearm itself is registered have failed. That is the situation here in South Australia, yet the Government proposes to expand a system based on the same fundamentals that have failed both here and elsewhere around the world. That is a pity, because almost every association and individual without exception appearing before the select committee made the very strong submission that the existing registration system did not work and would not work under the current guidelines. Yet within this Bill there is a continuation of that system. That is a tragedy.

Excellent submissions from Dr Fine and other individuals from interstate, as well as papers from people overseas, clearly showed that our registration system, which the Government proposes to continue, is not in the best interests of those who own firearms, particularly longarms. I believe that we should have made a very distinct change in this area. There is ample proof in other parts of the world that, if individuals are licensed instead of the firearms, that is the best way to go. Unfortunately, we have extended the registration system and we have made it more bureaucratic. We have now added to it the requirement to obtain a permit before a firearm can be purchased. To make the bureaucratic process even worse, a person must have a licence for a month before a permit can be obtained. So, we have a ridiculous situation where the Registrar must accept that a person is responsible before they are issued with a licence, but they still have to wait an extra month, having obtained that licence, before they can obtain a permit to purchase a firearm.

I believe that that is bureaucracy gone mad and it is a tragedy that we have allowed that sort of bureaucratic process to remain in the system. That is the problem with the registration system: the fact that we will now require an increased number of bureaucrats to administer a system which has been shown to not work, not only in this State but also overseas. That is a pity and something which the Opposition opposes. As the lead speaker, the member for Light, has said, we will be moving in the Committee stage to do something about that.

Another area in which bureaucracy has gone mad is the requirement to have a permit to purchase ammunition. I cannot believe that people will be required to have a permit to purchase ammunition. There will be no follow-up with respect to the permit, so what is its purpose? There seems to be no point whatsoever in asking people to obtain a permit to purchase ammunition for a specific firearm when no further check will be involved. It is quite ridiculous, it should not be in the Bill and it is quite unnecessary.

The final area, with which I have had a fair amount to do in the pharmaceutical area, is the requirement to provide a storage system for firearms. I use the pharmaceutical example because when I was in pharmacy it was decided that all dangerous drugs should be stored in safes. That simply guaranteed that every time we were broken into the first and the only place that individuals went to was the safe. All they did was look for the safe and say, 'That is where the dangerous drugs are.' When someone breaks into a house they will do exactly the same thing: they will look for the safe and the closed steel cupboard to find the firearms that they have gone in search of. I think it is a pity that we have gone down that track. It is a cost to the community which will not demonstrate any safety advantage. We could have provided for the safe storage of firearms in ways other than the requirement that is currently in the Bill.

Mr GUNN (Eyre): I want to briefly take part in this debate because I have been involved in most of the firearms debates that have taken place in this Parliament over the past few years. Unfortunately it appears that Governments still fail to properly understand or appreciate what is commonsense when dealing with this emotive subject. Unfortunately, most of the people who comment about the illegal or improper use of firearms do so from lack of knowledge. The classic example of this is the campaign launched by the Unsworth Government in New South Wales when it attempted to take away from legitimate firearm owners the right to own and use firearms. It was a foolish exercise which helped to unseat that Government.

Having had the opportunity to look at firearms control all around the world I am amazed that, after the lengthy debate and consideration which has taken place in relation to this measure, we still have registration. When I was in New Zealand about 2½ years ago I took the trouble to visit the police firearms division. The inspector in charge of that section for the whole of New Zealand told me how unnecessary, time-consuming and ineffective it is to have registration, and he pointed out that New Zealand had abolished it. He impressed upon me that the way to control the improper and illegal use of firearms was to license the individual. The New Zealand firearms division had a classic situation where it was about to send out to the former Prime Minister (Sir Keith Holyoak), who had been deceased for two years, a renewal of his registration. When somebody picked it up in the system it suddenly dawned upon them how stupid the whole arrangement was and they got rid of it because it had not worked anywhere in the world.

I have looked at the situation in the United States where in some States there is very tight control and in other States you can walk into a supermarket and buy a .38 over the counter. So they go from one extreme to the other. Most reasonable people in this country accept that there is a need for the limited control of firearms. However, lawabiding citizens should not be prevented from owning firearms, nor should people who are involved in legitimate gun clubs have their lives made more difficult because of this legislation. From my experience over the years I have noted

that the people who are involved in these gun clubs are not only law abiding but also are very responsible and insist on the most stringent safeguards. I believe that any action to restrict their use of firearms would not only be unnecessary but also quite foolish and costly.

I wonder whether this large computer based operation at Police Headquarters will be cost effective and, at the end of the day, will prevent crime? How many illegal firearms will it bring in? I doubt whether it will bring many in. The police do not have enough staff to knock on every second door and search homes to see whether people have illegal firearms.

People who know about the firearms trade know that if one wants an illegal handgun it is easy, if one has the cash, to get it. I believe that we should be concentrating on educating people and helping the clubs to become stronger. I am disappointed that there is nothing in the second reading explanation or the Bill to provide for some of the money collected from registration or licensing fees to be returned to the clubs. I think that the time has come when some of that money should go back into the clubs to help them improve their facilities, training and prize money—generally to allow them to improve their conditions. This would be in the interests of all South Australians.

Many people in my electorate have expressed grave concerns about this legislation, and they are concerned about the restrictions in relation to ammunition. What happens if a person phones the stock and station agent in a country town seeking 500 bullets or a couple of packets of shotgun cartridges and asks that they be sent out? Will that be possible? Certainly, that agent would not be in possession of the person's licence. Or if someone who does not have a licence goes to buy ammunition, what will occur?

I now turn to the question of locking up firearms. Who will provide these particular cupboards or safes? I keep a firearm in the wardrobe, and I think that most people are the same. I also normally keep one in the Toyota. I do not see why it is necessary to keep them in safes. As the member for Bragg rightly pointed out, people with ill intent will know exactly where they are stored. I know of many people who keep firearms in their sheds. I have a number of firearms and I do not want to lock them away in a safe, where there is the chance they may be damaged. Most people value their firearms, and many are particularly expensive.

I hope that during the Committee stage the Government will properly consider the amendments to be moved and comments that were made by the member for Light who has, in his usual fashion, gone into great detail in examining this legislation and pointing out some of its anomalies and inefficiencies. There is concern in the community about how this legislation will operate.

Unfortunately, sections of the media and others put forward these emotive stories which, in many cases, bear little resemblance to the facts. Most of those people have little or no knowledge of firearms and their use, or of the people who have a genuine need to own them, such as those who participate in sporting clubs and those who live in farming and grazing communities who need them for their daily activities. I hope that by the time this legislation passes the parliamentary process it will be improved. Certainly, this Bill is an improvement on the first Bill. As usual, the select committee did a reasonable job. Select committees always improve legislation. Why are Governments hesitant about having select committees? They normally have to be bludgeoned into it by threats of the other place setting up such a committee. That is normally the only reason why Governments eventually agree to it. In my time in this place

every piece of legislation that has been referred to a select committee has been greatly improved through that process, and most of the anomalies and nonsense in those Bills have been ironed out.

I look forward to the Committee stage and I hope that the Minister will accept the reasonable amendments proposed by the member for Light. I sincerely hope that this legislation will be administered with commonsense in mind and that, because people have more powers, they will not race around the country and try to over-police this legislation. The overwhelming majority of firearm owners are not only law-abiding citizens but also they possess a great deal of commonsense. They do not want to be harassed by little petty officials who suddenly acquire more powers. If Government officials try to over-police this legislation, the legislation will have the opposite effect and people will hide their firearms. People will not come forward and the Government will not know who does own firearms. With those reservations, I support the second reading of this Bill.

The Hon. D.J. HOPGOOD (Deputy Premier): One gains the distinct impression that the Opposition does not know where to pitch its tent in relation to this legislation. We have gleaned from the second reading debate that one substantial amendment will be moved and that relates to something which is not really canvassed in a direct way in the legislation. It was not something that of necessity had to be canvassed by the select committee (and I refer to registration), because the Government does not propose, in this legislation or any other legislation, to alter, except in a very peripheral way, the system which was introduced in a 1977 Bill and which was proclaimed into law by the Tonkin Liberal Government in 1980. Of all the things that we have canvassed since public debate began on gun control in this State, that is one thing that we have not really addressed, because we have seen it as being not a perfect system, but a satisfactory system that therefore did not have to be addressed by legislation.

All the other matters, modified as they have been by the select committee, apparently draw some degree of support from the Opposition, at least to the extent that it does not propose to use the forums of this Chamber to alter, oppose or amend them. One Opposition member suggested that that was because the Government has the numbers and, therefore, why bother, but then that same logic could equally apply to the amendments which I understand the member for Light intends to urge upon us in a few minutes.

We have a spectrum of opinion between one or two young Turks on the back bench who really want to try to make this a full-blooded political issue and, on the other hand, the wiser heads on the front bench, who know that to do so will court a great deal of unpopularity in the Police Department which supports this legislation and which believes that the controls should be maintained and, in certain areas, intensified. Members from the Police Department were eloquent in giving their evidence before the select committee. Members opposite neglected to mention that police officers involved in operations were prepared to come before the select committee and to testify as to the usefulness of the very system which members opposite have criticised in this debate.

Some of the things which were claimed in this debate were placed before the select committee. It is true that some jurisdictions around the world do not have our system of registration. It is also true that some jurisdictions once had one sort of system of registration, but they have abandoned that legislation. However, as the member for Newland indicated in her remarks, those jurisdictions have other features

which we do not have and, if one quotes the British legislation, one cannot simply extract from it those things which one wants to extract from it.

If one wants to praise the British legislation because of the lack of our form of registration, one also has to accept that in many respects it goes much further than this legislation does, or further than I or anyone on this side of the House would regard as desirable. I found that all a little peculiar: on the one hand members opposite have been reasonably strident in their criticism of features in the Bill other than that which is apparently addressed by the amendment of the member for Light (which I cannot really fully canvass under Standing Orders at this stage) and on the other hand they are not prepared to go to the extent of opposing these aspects in the House.

I guess that I should be grateful for small mercies. Why should I be arguing that we may have a slightly more limited debate than would otherwise have been the case? All I need to do at this stage is to place on the public record the fact that there does seem to be a little bit of an anomaly between protestation on the one hand and what indeed will specifically be placed before this House on the other hand.

It is necessary that I correct the record in relation to the various attempts of the Government to amend this legislation, because in a sense the Opposition has been playing the game of 'Hoppy is damned if he does and damned if he does not.' There have been three Bills. I think the member for Flinders was wrong in saying that there have been four Bills. I believe that three Bills have been placed before this Assembly in the last 12 months, and I would have been roundly criticised if there had been fewer than those three Bills in the circumstances in which all this was carried out.

First, there was an extremely limited piece of legislation that grew out of what has become known as the Hill committee, which dealt with endorsements on licences. No-one pretended at that time that that committee was dealing with more than that. No-one pretended that the legislation was to deal with more than that. If other things had not transpired, that Bill would have been debated in the House, and this House and another place would have dealt with it as either Chamber felt proper; we would have had some amendments or we would not have had some amendments for His Excellency to affirm.

However, before the House had an opportunity to debate those matters a couple of things happened. First, there was a national debate about the adequacy of legislation around the country and, secondly, and somewhat contemporaneously, the Police Department came up with a series of proposals upon which it had been working for some time and about which it required some decision by the Government as to whether they were appropriate for legislative activity. Most of those proposals remain in the Bill before us.

The Government could have decided to reject the proposals of the Commissioner or, for that matter, the proposals canvassed in the meetings convened by the Prime Minister, to which members opposite have referred. We could have done that but, as we found merit in some proposals, it seemed to be reasonable to withdraw the earlier Bill and incorporate the substance of that Bill into a second piece of legislation, so that the whole thing could be considered as one.

It seems to me that, if I had not done that, there would have been a good deal of criticism by members opposite, and I think valid criticism, that the Government only a short time ago put the Opposition to the effort of having to put through a Bill but suddenly it has another amendment to the Firearms Act; the Opposition would ask, 'Why

did you not amalgamate the two?' That is why I say that some members opposite are running the game that 'Hoppy is damned if he does or damned if he does not.'

Why have we a third Bill? We have a third Bill because members of the Opposition called for a select committee and I was good natured enough to agree to it. If members of the Opposition are opposed to the concept of our having a third Bill, we could have got around that beautifully. I could have said, 'We will not have a select committee. We will proceed with a second Bill because, if I bring in a third Bill as a result of select committee activity, I could be criticised for three attempted legislative adventures.' In fact, I agreed to the select committee; it has done its work and it decided that the best way to deal with the matter, to simplify what this House would be doing between about 8.5 and 9 or 10 o'clock on the evening of 1 November in the year of grace 1988, was to in fact to come up with a new Bill rather than a clumsy set of amendments to the Bill that was currently before the House.

Mr Ingerson interjecting:

The Hon. D.J. HOPGOOD: I am well aware of the fact that the Government had the numbers, but at no stage did the member for Bragg or his colleagues argue about the concept of bringing in a new Bill.

Mr Ingerson: Don't blame us, you—

The Hon. D.J. HOPGOOD: I am being blamed now, or I was being blamed until I gave this perfectly logical explanation which I believe honourable members are now accepting, for my inconsistency in having three attempts to bring the legislation before the House. I have done it in order to maximise the convenience of members and the South Australian community in dealing with this matter, to simplify the issues which are before us and in the interests of public consultation. Of course, there was a good deal of public consultation under the Standing Orders as a result of the select committee deliberations. So let us have no more criticism about the way the Government has handled this purely because three Bills have been before us. There may be other grounds, valid or otherwise, upon which members opposite may want to criticise the way in which this has been handled, but I would have to reject any suggestion that the very fact that we have had three Bills in any way suggests that the whole matter has been poorly handled.

As I say, the matter which has particularly raised the attention of members opposite is not one in respect of which the Government had any intention of changing the rules at all. It is something that has sort of dropped from heaven or arisen from hell, whichever way you like to regard it, and it is now being urged upon us in respect, as I say, of a matter which was brought into law by the Tonkin Liberal Government in 1980. I am sorry that I have not been able to convince members opposite in relation to the efficacy of the transitional provisions. I do not know how often I have to say it or how often I had to give the explanation in the select committee, but members opposite have still chosen not to really accept my assurances here. I do not know whether they are suggesting that I am specious in this or that I have just got it wrong, that I somehow do not understand the legislation that I have before the House. In any event, there may be an opportunity a little later in the Committee stage for these matters to be completely laid to rest by a further Government amendment out of an abundance of caution and not because I think that any real defects exist in the transitional provisions.

I believe it was the member for Light who asked me to give some assurances about further and full consultation with people who have antique collections and the organisations which represent them, and I am more than happy

to give that assurance. Again, I must make the point that the evidence we had from the operational police during the select committee was very much in favour of a continuation of the registration system. If anything, it seems to me that there was rather more controversy in relation to some of these matters in respect of which the Opposition has apparently decided this evening in Committee not to make substantial objection. In any event, I thank members for their consideration of the Bill to this stage and I look forward to a fruitful Committee stage.

Bill read a second time.

The Hon. B.C. EASTICK (Light): Mr Deputy Speaker, I draw your attention to the state of the House.

A quorum having been formed:

The Hon. D.J. HOPGOOD (Minister of Emergency Services): I move:

That Standing Orders be so far suspended as to enable it to be an instruction to the Committee of the whole House on the Bill that it consider each proposed new section contained in clause 5 as separate questions.

Motion carried.

In Committee.

Clauses 1 to 3 passed.

Clause 4—'Interpretation.'

The Hon. B.C. EASTICK: I move:

Page 2, after line 15—Insert the following definition:

'pistol' means a firearm that is designed to be used with one hand:

I thank the Government for its assistance in the proper consideration of the various clauses of this Bill which has been advanced by the most recent suspension of Standing Orders. The first amendment which I put forward is really part of one total amendment, all others being consequential to it. In summing up in the second reading stage, the Minister drew attention to what he believed was an anomalous circumstance being perpetrated by the Opposition on this occasion, more specifically because, although it was a Labor Government which had passed the original Bill, it was a Liberal Government which eventually put into place the regulations which allowed the provisions to proceed.

The passage of time and the evidence available clearly indicates that, notwithstanding the views which were expressed for a specific purpose by police who appeared before the committee, the system of registration for longarms has not worked satisfactorily anywhere in the world. We do not believe it works satisfactorily now in South Australia, or that it is likely to in the future. I know that that is dependent upon a number of other issues which were raised during the course of the debate, more specifically, the resources available to the police and the particular department responsible for registration and all the follow-up activity. The reason for the insertion of this definition in the interpretation clause is purely and simply to provide that a pistol is a separate entity from a firearm generally. Members will note from the other amendments on offer that the term 'pistol' will replace 'firearm' in a considerable number of provisions throughout the Bill.

In fact, the term 'pistol' will be inserted in one or two places to give credence to the proposition which is being put forward. The ultimate effect will be to remove the registration mechanism as it applies to longarms. There is a distinct advantage in the Government accepting this course of action, albeit that it is against the other principles it has projected from time to time and the extension of the registration system inherent in the promulgation of the Bill which went to the select committee and which is contained in essence in the Bill now before us. There is no intention

on the part of the Opposition to disturb the registration and all of the activity which embraces pistols or shortarms, as we believe a chance exists to undertake a meaningful monitoring of the possession. It is not 100 per cent at present, for a variety of reasons, which I will not canvass further on this occasion. However, I request that the Government give serious consideration to the altered course of events that will be undertaken by this proposal.

The Hon. D.J. HOPGOOD: On the face of it, of course, if the specific amendment before us were to be regarded in isolation, it would be totally unexceptional. To urge the Committee to vote against an amendment which says, "'pistol" means a firearm that is designed to be used with one hand' would seem to be rather ridiculous, but, as the member for Light points out, this is the first of a series of amendments that he intends to press upon the Committee, which would have the effect of removing from the legislation one of the key components which has been in existence since 1980.

I have already indicated, obviously, that this is not acceptable to the Government and simply raise another point, something which is often raised by Oppositions and which is quite pertinent in this case. Whilst I cannot say that this has not been canvassed publicly, I can say that it has not been canvassed as a Government initiative or suggestion. In other words, to the extent that the idea that registration might be removed from the Act has been in the public arena, it has been in the form of one or two vague proposals that people may have heard that have come out of some of the reports which have been placed before the select committee. At no stage has a Minister—the Attorney, the Premier or I—gone out to the public and said that we are seriously considering gutting the legislation of registration.

It seems that, in those circumstances, for the Government to accept this amendment would be irresponsible. Many people in the community would say, 'We would like to have known that you had this in mind because we might have wanted to place certain evidence, certain submissions before the Government. We have always been of the opinion that the Government was of a mind to retain registration and therefore we did not come forward because we did not think registration was at risk because the Government has the numbers in the Parliament.'

I recall—and I remember praising him for it—the member for Mount Gambier, when he was Minister of Education, getting himself in a little bit of hot water because he accepted without notice an amendment that I moved in this Chamber. In some ways I hesitate to raise it because I thought it was very far-sighted of him at that particular time to accept it on the floor of the Chamber. It was about the registration of non-government schools. There was hell to pay outside because some people said that they wished the Minister had consulted with them on that matter before accepting the amendment. To be fair, I was also under some criticism for having moved the amendment without consultation with people outside.

Quite apart from the merits of the thing, it is one thing to say that this has been in the public domain. It certainly has not been in the public domain as something which has Government support and therefore has a very high probability of being accepted by Parliament. I do not think that it would be well received without a good deal of consultation against that background which, of course, I am not of a mind to give at this stage.

The Hon. B.C. EASTICK: If the Minister were to analyse the documentation that was presented to the committee, specifically by the larger organisations, he would find that this was a feature of the presentations received. The matter

was not canvassed at great length within the committee other than in the deliberation process and I will not divulge the details of that process, other than to say that this was the point that prevented members on this side of the Chamber from agreeing with the overall thrust of the select committee report. We sought to make changes in a couple of minor matters.

I question the suggestion that it has not been critically considered by a number of major bodies in this State. The matter was canvassed with the Government on a number of occasions well in advance of the Bill and before there was an opportunity of expressing those views to a select committee. In 1980 there was considerable criticism of the regulations concerning the registration scheme both before and after the regulations were promulgated. I suggest that the matter has been before those interested in this particular piece of legislation for some time.

In respect of another statement that was made by the Deputy Premier relative to advice given to the select committee by the police, I point out that in the first instance the police submission was made by the Deputy Registrar, who gave an overview of all aspects of the conduct of the department and the department's attitude. Quite late in the piece, two inspectors with current field experience were invited to attend the committee. They indicated that, in their view, there was a distinct advantage in the police being able to dial up the information service, which is related to registration, to find out that, when they arrive at a particular destination, it is possible that the occupant of that address may be in possession of a .22 rifle or a pistol. In other words, in answering a problem call at that address, the police would have the knowledge that they might be confronted with a person with access to a firearm.

Further questioning of those police officers indicated very clearly that, although it would be nice to have that information, they would not necessarily walk through the front gate believing that that was all that would meet them. History and experience have shown that people who create public mischief have acquired other guns of a different calibre or nature. In fact, on close examination, it is not uncommon for some of these people to have virtual arsenals at their disposal. Not one of the guns may be registered or, if any are registered, it involves one or two minor pieces in the arsenal. I suggest that, if one reads the evidence given by the two police inspectors, one will see that they were guarded as regards the degree of safety they would feel concerning the presence of registered guns at the destination to which they had been called.

In talking to police on the beat and elsewhere, it would appear that the cardinal sin is to take for granted that nothing will happen when one knocks on a door. Indeed, it is being instilled into police in the field today that they should be aware of any eventuality that might arise and take every precaution. In my professional career, I quickly learned that, if one has to stick a pin or a hypodermic syringe into an elephant, one should position oneself so as to avoid being trampled on, hit by the trunk, knocked over by the tusks, or flicked in the eye by the tail.

The Hon. D.J. HOPGOOD: I do not desire to labour the point but, even though the terms of reference of the select committee did not canvass the possibility of doing away with registration, we got evidence from the Police Force, whatever the member for Light may have thought about that evidence. We also had evidence from the Australian Institute of Criminology and certain gun clubs that they favoured the continuation of the registration system. If, in fact, the Bill laid before the select committee had provided for the removal of registration, we would have had quite a

few submissions on that subject, but the Bill did not canvass that. It is something that fell in as a result of submissions from some people in the gun fraternity.

Indeed, it is in the nature of politics that people approving of a Government's action are less likely to speak up than those opposing it. So, the form of the Bill really dictated the nature of the response received by the select committee and a different Bill may well have produced a different response. The Opposition is apparently arguing that we now have a different Bill without there being an opportunity to test the water in relation to that difference.

Mr BLACKER: The Minister corrected me (technically quite rightly) by saying that there were only three Bills, whereas I had said there were four. A draft Bill was circulated by the Government on 3 March. Although subsequently altered, that draft Bill provided that steel and concrete strong rooms were required for the storage of semi-automatic 22s. That provision created much controversy.

The Hon. D.J. Hopgood: That was a regulation: it was not in the Bill.

Mr BLACKER: It was a regulation to be read in conjunction with the Bill. Although I may have been technically incorrect in saying that there were four Bills, I suppose that we might even say that there were five Bills, but we are really talking about three major pieces of legislation that this House has debated.

The CHAIRMAN: I point out to the member for Flinders that we are discussing the amendment to clause 4, page 2, after line 15, and I cannot quite connect up his remarks to the amendment that is before the Chair.

Mr BLACKER: Thank you, Mr Chairman, I do apologise for that. I take up the Minister's point that the select committee was not charged with the responsibility to look at the registration of longarms. If that is the case, I believe the Chairman of the select committee was rather remiss in allowing the debate to go that far and in allowing such evidence to be received. I believe that every member of the select committee was of the opinion that the whole Act was up for review and discussion, and there is no doubt that the advertisements seeking submissions from the general public were accepted in those terms. There were 71 written submissions and 45 verbal submissions presented to the select committee, and the vast majority made some reference to the fact that the registration of longarms does not serve a useful purpose and should therefore be done away with.

Mr INGERSON: I refer to the Deputy Premier's comment that the coverage of the select committee did not take in registration. Perhaps that was the case in the public arena and consequently we should not discuss it. However, the reality is that during the select committee's hearings, almost every association and individual (that is, over 90 per cent) made specific reference to registration of some type. More than 90 per cent supported the change and 10 per cent did not support it. At no stage was there any attempt by the Chairman or the Government to close up the debate or question the integrity of those putting the proposition. To go one step further, I would have thought that one of the major processes of this Parliament is to accept amendments to Government legislation. I would have thought that we would encourage that process. The minority group on the select committee was concerned about the registration process and, in fact, it was heralded some two months ago that there would be possible amendments to this Bill.

We also need to look at the people who support the existing system. The Deputy Premier stated that the police were very much in favour of the existing system, and that is very accurate. However, when questioned they made

several comments to the effect that they were not up to date with the registration system and that a very significant number of firearms were not registered, in fact, well over 150 000. They also said that the system being used was not necessarily the best. I do not remember—and I stand corrected—whether we actually questioned the police as to an alternative. That is a question that we should have asked. The other group in favour of maintaining a registration system was comprised of academics who strongly argued for its retention.

The 90 per cent who argued for change comprised those people who are practically affected, that is, the people involved directly with the system on a day-by-day basis. They were the people who had concerns and they strongly expressed the view to the select committee that there ought to be a dramatic change. In particular, the shooters council went to the trouble of encouraging Dr Fine to put forward an excellent presentation to the committee and at no stage did the Chairman or the Government say that they were opposed to it. During general committee discussions I remember Dr Fine being encouraged to extend his presentation to look at the sort of process that he was talking about. However, the Deputy Premier now says that that should not have been part of the whole process. I think that that is a pity because this Parliament ought to throw up amendments before the Government. There is a strong representation from the Opposition that, on evidence placed before the select committee—and, as far as we are concerned, it will improve the process—it would be better if we did away with the registration of longarms and had a strong licensing system in its place.

The Hon. D.J. HOPGOOD: Let me make one point absolutely clear: at no stage have I suggested that it was improper of the select committee to talk about registration. Had I thought that, as Chairman I was in a position to do something about it. As the honourable member is fully aware, I allowed as much free ranging debate as was possible. Nobody could have been more democratic in the chair than I was at those meetings. I have never suggested that it was improper for the select committee to consider this matter. I am saying that the form of consideration was largely predetermined by the content of the Bill which I placed before Parliament. A different sort of Bill, such as that now being urged by the Opposition, may well have provided for a different sort of consideration by the select committee.

The honourable member talks about 90 per cent of the witnesses being involved in gun organisations. I make it absolutely clear that this Bill is not simply about the 10 per cent of South Australians who happen to be registered gun owners; it is about the 90 per cent who are not registered gun owners and have no intention of ever being one. In fact, we received submissions from some people in that category. My guess is that if the Bill had been about a substantial weakening of the legislation there would have been a jolly sight more witnesses, but the nature of the legislation clearly predetermined the sort of people who came before the committee.

The other point I make is that there is nothing improper about our Opposition moving amendments without notice in this place. But, when Governments do that, the first thing that the Opposition says is, 'Have you consulted on this matter; have you taken your proposition outside and talked to those people who are likely to be affected by the legislation?' All I am saying is that as a Government proposition this has never been in the public domain.

The Opposition's real objections with respect to this matter are unclear. I point out that registration is a once and

for all process: it is not something that you have to go through every year. It is like getting a licence to drive a motor boat—once you have it, that is it, save for any sort of misbehaviour that might result in its being suspended. So, registration is a once and for all proposition. It therefore requires very little bureaucracy, as far as I can see, and I do not understand why the Opposition is so uptight about it.

The CHAIRMAN: Before I call the member for Davenport I point out to the Committee that we are not debating whether the select committee report should be noted; we are debating the amendment. The Chair has been fairly tolerant, but I ask the Committee to come back to the amendment that is before it. The member for Davenport.

Mr S.G. EVANS: Mr Chairman, I had taken it for granted that the Chair was allowing some leniency in letting the mover of this amendment establish the purpose of that first amendment of many. That has been a practice of this place. I believe that the Deputy Premier replied on that basis. If you, Mr Chairman, are saying that I can only speak on that very fine aspect, I accept that. However, I take the point that the Deputy Premier raised, that is, the suggestion that it would be inappropriate for this Committee to accept such an amendment, or perhaps to even consider it, because there might be some public protest from a particular section of the community. If that is the Deputy Premier's approach to such a small amendment then I am amazed, because when a Bill comes before this place amendments are considered for the first time, and it then goes to the other House.

After the Bill and its amendments pass this place it takes time to be considered by the other place. If people have a point they wish to make they can make it to members of the other place, and that is the right and proper process. I support the amendment for the reasons that have been stated by other members. This amendment is the first of a group of amendments to do away with the registration of longarms. If the argument is that because a Bill went before a select committee it is inappropriate for this place to consider any amendments, in that a Bill having gone through the select committee process is different from any other Bill that is introduced in Parliament, we should change Standing Orders. That is the argument that the Deputy Premier used, and I believe that it is wrong.

The purpose of a select committee is to take evidence and to make a decision. Then, each House at its own time has to consider the select committee report and the Bill that came from it. If any individual member thinks it appropriate, any member can move an amendment. Then, the vote is in the hands of the majority of members in that Chamber. I reject what the Deputy Premier said, that we should not consider amendments before the other amendments are accepted, even if it makes a major change in that it does away with the registration of longarms. I strongly support the amendment and the principle that it is appropriate for us to consider amendments and support them if we think they are good amendments. I believe that this amendment is an excellent proposition. It takes away some of the humbug of Government. We all talk about deregulation, fewer laws, and making it easier for the public—this is the first step to do that with this legislation.

The Committee divided on the amendment:

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

Noes (23)—Mrs Appleby, Messrs L.M.F. Arnold, Blevins, Crafter, De Laine, Duigan, and M.J. Evans, Ms Gay-

ler, Messrs Gregory, Groom, Hamilton, Hemmings, Hopgood (teller), and Klunder, Ms Lenehan, Messrs McRae, Mayes, Payne, Plunkett, Rann, Slater, Trainer, and Tyler.

Pair—Aye—The Hon. T. Chapman. No—The Hon. J.C. Bannon.

Majority of 7 for the Noes.

Amendment thus negatived.

The Hon. R.G. PAYNE: Paragraph (g) provides that to purchase includes to acquire by barter or exchange. That provision seems to be fairly limiting and it might well benefit from the inclusion—

The CHAIRMAN: Order! I cannot hear the honourable member.

The Hon. R.G. PAYNE:—of the words 'or gift' to cover the eventuality where a weapon can change hands without any consideration being involved. In my electorate there is a gun dealer who could be approached by a person who has a weapon and who wishes to dispose of it. It could be argued that the police are there for that purpose. Not everyone likes to go to the police. Some people would prefer to place a weapon in the hands of people they consider to be reasonably safe, for example, a person licensed as a dealer. I have not even talked of moving an amendment, but will the Minister consider that point?

Mr S.G. Evans: I raised that point in the second reading.

The Hon. D.J. HOPGOOD: I apologise to the member for Davenport that I did not respond at that time. If members look at the Bill they will see that, where it is necessary to cover this matter, the word 'gift' is used. It was not thought necessary to include it in the definition. I should take further advice on that and, if it seems appropriate to include it in the definition, that can be done in another place.

The Hon. B.C. EASTICK: I draw attention to the definitions on page 2 of the Bill. First, paragraph (h) strikes out the definition of 'recognised rifle, pistol or gun club' and substitutes:

'recognised firearms club' means a firearms club declared to be a recognised firearms club by the Minister pursuant to this Act.

I refer to proposed regulation 10 (a), which provides a series of requirements for a gun club to obtain recognition. There is no clear indication in the regulation of the possibility of an appeal by a club if it is not accepted by the Minister. It goes against the spirit of the whole arrangement, which could allow a decision to be taken and which might be against the best interests of a group of people who, if they were given the opportunity of an interview, could advise the Minister that consideration should be given to their claim. Paragraph (j) relates to silencers. The original definition is as follows:

'silencer' means a device attached to a firearm and designed to muffle the report of the firearm upon discharge of a bullet or other missile.

The new definition is as follows:

'silencer' means a device designed to be attached to a firearm to muffle the report when the firearm is fired.

We had a previous anomalous situation where one could own a silencer and it was not regarded as a no-no, unless it was attached to a gun. Dealers were able to sell silencers, but no-one was allowed to attach them to a gun. We have this deliberate move made with the concurrence of the committee in providing the new definition, but can the Minister indicate whether it is his intention to seek some educative role in order to explain to the community at large these small order but important changes so that people who are not members of a club will not find themselves at variance with the law through ignorance (I am fully aware

that ignorance of the law is no defence if a case was taken against a person). Is it the Government's intention to pick up some of these changes and give them profile so that the community at large is aware of the changed circumstances that will exist if the Bill comes into being?

The Hon. D.J. HOPGOOD: Yes, I can certainly give that assurance that we will do all we can to ensure that the interested public at this point are fully instructed and educated on this particular matter. The honourable member also raised the issue of recognised firearms clubs and he would be aware of course that this is further addressed at page 11 of the Bill, where it talks about what has to happen and the requirements on the Minister where 'a recognised firearms club has failed to comply with this Act and no longer conducts its affairs or activities in a responsible manner'. Two months written notice of the proposed revocation has to be given, setting out the Minister's reasons for the proposed revocation and there must be power to give the club a reasonable opportunity to make written or oral submissions to the Minister in relation to the proposed revocation. The club must, upon receiving notice of the proposed revocation inform its members in writing of the proposal. So it seems to me that that is reasonably well covered in the legislation and I am not aware of this matter having arisen under the existing legislation to date. It has not really been a problem and there is no reason why it need be a problem in the future.

The Hon. B.C. EASTICK: I appreciate what the honourable Minister has just drawn to our attention, but it really does not cover the position that I sought to put. What about the club which is not recognised in the first instance, that is, a new organisation or an existing club that has not been recognised under the old Act? Is there any means whereby they can press their chances with the Minister or with some tribunal? It would appear that it may be a minor blemish which was left in the Act not by design but because there had not been a problem previously. We can certainly revoke a declaration once they are registered, but I want to make sure that they get the chance to be considered for registration, and that appears to be deficient in the documentation before us.

The Hon. D.J. HOPGOOD: I give a commitment that the mechanism which seeks to give them some sort of protection in relation to revocation will also be applied in relation to where the Minister may have doubts as to whether it is appropriate to give them recognition in the first place.

Clause passed.

Clause 5—'Substitution of Part III.'

New section 11 inserted.

New section 12—'Application for firearms licence.'

The Hon. B.C. EASTICK: I take this opportunity to pick up the point which has been adverted to a number of times this afternoon and earlier this evening about the turnaround time in all these matters of application, registration and documentation. It comes back to the understanding which the Committee has from the Minister that there is to be an improvement in the physical resources of the department. Has the Minister considered the projected time delays which might be expected under normal circumstances in the conduct of the office?

I appreciate that it is a hypothetical question or a question in advance in many ways but, having given the assurance that there will be additional resources, has that been adjudged against any model or suggested arrangement within the department, which would allay the fears of a number of people, as expressed in the debate here today, that they may wait forever for the turnaround of the documentation? I could extend the comment and say that at the present

moment in some offices of the Motor Registration Division one is lucky to obtain a turnaround of correspondence in three weeks, while in other places the turnaround is very quick.

It is a matter of management and of the actual physical resources available to a particular office. There is a fear that there may be overloading of an already busy office, and I believe that now is the opportunity for the Minister to give some indication of how he would overcome these problems.

The Hon. D.J. HOPGOOD: As the honourable member has indicated, the select committee was conscious of the fact that it would be necessary for the Police Department to address the whole question of the resources which would be necessary in this whole matter. I know that the Commissioner and his officers have done a good deal of work on this in very recent times, although, of course, they cannot presume as to the form in which the legislation will finally pass the Parliament. There are funds in the present budget for a consultancy to be let for a complete review of the data processing requirements of the Police Department in relation to this Bill in the form in which it most probably will emerge from the Parliament, and that will proceed just as quickly as possible, as the Police Department is not in the position of presuming how the legislature will speak. I can certainly give an indication to the honourable member that a good deal of work has been done to try to ensure that the turnaround time is as brief as can be reasonably expected.

Mr INGERSON: Under this particular section, I mentioned in my second reading speech the possible problem for juniors and people under the age of 15, particularly as it relates to their involvement in the sport. How will they be recognised in this area of having a firearms licence? During the select committee we had a presentation by Mr Papps, who is a coach, who said that he continually goes to schools and trains people under the age of 15 in the use of firearms. How will we cater for that situation of coaches going to schools and, more importantly, what are the provisions for someone under the age of 15 if they are in the hands of a coach? How will that be handled?

The Hon. D.J. HOPGOOD: The head powers for all of that are covered under the proposed section which the Committee has just passed over without debate: I refer to section 11 on the previous page, and also there is further reference to it in the regulations. In this matter we have faithfully transposed into the legislation the wishes of the select committee, following the specific evidence placed before us on this matter. The select committee did not desire to interfere with properly conducted coaching through the schools. The committee also accepted that for these activities to be conducted through the schools there had to be proper minimum facilities. The necessary openings are there, through the supervision of a recognised coach or parents, for people who would not otherwise have access to firearms because they are juniors training as part of an international and Olympic recognised sport.

Mr BLACKER: I refer to new section 12 (4) which refers to an under-aged person who happens to be the child of a person who is a licensed employee. It may seem to be nitpicking, but what is the position where the employee may be a junior of a company that operates the farm? I raise that point because in the last two or three days it has been drawn to my attention that a person is ineligible for unemployment benefits because he has a family company. The company in fact has phenomenal debts. The shareholder of the company cannot recoup those debts, but on paper he has an amount of several hundred thousand dollars owing to him—which he can never recover. So, he is automatically wiped out because of that intermediary farm set up arrange-

ment. The Minister will probably not be able to answer that now, but it has proved to be a problem in some areas. Is there some way around it?

The Hon. D.J. HOPGOOD: I will take advice on that matter. Probably the model that the select committee had in mind was the sort of primary producer that the honourable member is, and in those circumstances it would be appropriate that a spouse, child, brother, sister or employee of the primary producer be treated in this way. As to the rather more involved circumstances the honourable member has raised, I will obtain advice on the matter. If it seems necessary, it can be addressed during the passage of the legislation.

New section inserted.

New section 13—'Incidents of firearms licence.'

The Hon. R.G. PAYNE: The heading 'Incidents of firearms licence' here might well be better presented to the general public—which is required to understand legislation that we pass—as any one of the following: 'Make-up of firearms licence', 'Endorsement of firearms licence', 'Format of firearms licence', 'Conditions of firearms licence', or 'Provisions of firearms licence'. The latter one, 'Provisions of firearms licence' was considered perfectly satisfactory as late as 1986. Why do we need to change?

The Hon. D.J. HOPGOOD: I suppose that to the lay person the wording is a little obscure. It is a term that is recognised in the dictionary—and I have checked it. It is specifically tagged as a legal term and it means 'attaching to'. I point out to the honourable member that in fact a heading such as this really has only the status of marginal notes, and is not really part of the legal principles within the Bill. However, the honourable member's concern is that the lay person should be able to understand the legislation. I undertake to instruct that there should be a change, along the lines of 'Provisions relating to firearms licences'. Because it is not technically part of the Bill it does not require an amendment by this Committee for it to be incorporated in the final form. I thank the honourable member for his consideration of this matter.

New section inserted.

New section 14—'Purchase of firearms.'

The Hon. B.C. EASTICK: The committee in its deliberations sought to provide for all contingencies drawn to its notice, from either organisations which appeared or the deliberations of the committee itself. In relation to the purchase of firearms, right over to where it refers to 'Application for dealer's licence' and how they may apply in relation to auctions and so forth, I believe we have broken new ground. We have given a direction which is commendable, albeit that some of the provisions may need some fine tuning a little way down the track when they are actually put to the test. The clear intent of the committee is contained in these particular passages and I commend to the gun fraternity the endeavours that were made on its behalf.

New section inserted.

New section 15—'Application for permit.'

Mr S.G. EVANS: As I mentioned in my second reading speech, I am not happy with this new section. Under new section 21c, which makes provision for giving, lending, etc., of firearms, it is an offence to give a firearm unless the person receiving it has the prescribed credentials. However, under new section 15, to buy a particular class of firearm, a person must apply for a permit to the Registrar in the prescribed manner and form and must furnish the prescribed information. If that person buys a 12-gauge double-barrelled shotgun and subsequently someone else who owns an identical weapon wants to give that person that gun,

must he or she apply for another permit in order to receive the gun?

The Hon. D.J. HOPGOOD: The answer is 'No', because it is clear under 21c that such a person would be legally entitled to have possession of firearms of that class.

Mr S.G. EVANS: My query concerns the first part of new section 15 (1). I am talking about people who are not members of this place and who are not lawyers but who must try to understand the law. This new section provides that an application must be made for a permit to purchase a firearm or to sell a firearm at auction. The section also provides that a permit to purchase a firearm can only be granted if the applicant holds a firearm licence that authorises possession of the relevant firearm. One is acquired at auction and the other is a gift. Is there any difference?

The Hon. D.J. HOPGOOD: I think I have answered that.

New section inserted.

New sections 16 to 18 inserted.

New section 19—'Term and renewal of licence.'

The Hon. B.C. EASTICK: Regarding the renewal of a licence for a term not exceeding three years, I have in mind the case of a motorist who may lose his or her driving licence. Even a relatively minor traffic breach can lead to the suspension of a licence involving not only the penalty associated with the offence and the loss of the licence, but also the value of the unexpired part of the licence fee. So, if \$75 is paid for a licence and that licence is used only for a month, almost all of the \$75 will be lost if the licence is cancelled because an offence has been committed.

This seems to be a travesty of justice, especially when the possibility of an extension of the licence period to five years is considered. In such circumstances, a fairly sizeable sum would be involved. If there is to be a penalty upon a penalty, will every endeavour be made in the framing of such legislation to reduce the double jeopardy circumstance that has occurred in the other area to which I have referred?

The Hon. D.J. HOPGOOD: We are talking about \$60 for a three-year licence and whole years are refunded in the event of voluntary cancellation or death, but not in the case of loss because of a breach. Certain rights that are available to the individual in those circumstances are spelt out in the legislation. In the light of what the honourable member has said about the loss of a driving licence, his suggestion may require further consideration, and perhaps I could ask the Attorney-General to consider it at an appropriate time.

New section inserted.

New sections 20 to 21d inserted; clause passed.

Clauses 6 to 14 passed.

Clause 15—'Forfeiture of firearms by court.'

The Hon. B.C. EASTICK: This clause introduces the forfeiture of a firearm at the direction of a court. This area received a considerable degree of consideration by the select committee because of public fears that had been expressed of a general confiscation cum forfeiture proposal which had been promulgated interstate. In fact, in New South Wales prior to the recent State election, that had been entered into in some circumstances. Following the change of Government or the change of attitude by the existing Government, some of the guns which had been forfeited or confiscated could not be found for a variety of reasons. I raise this question at this stage only to highlight the continuing sensitivity of a large number of people, particularly those who view a gun as an heirloom. Many of the descendants of the first German settlers in my electorate have firearms that are magnificent pieces of workmanship, and they have been handed down through several generations of the one family. Because of experiences many years ago, these people have

an inherent fear that a Government at some time in the future may move to provide for the confiscation or forfeiture of these firearms.

I know that the Minister has spoken on this matter previously, and I do not require that he should rise on this occasion, but I highlight to the Committee the fact that this clause will be a festering sore in the minds of a large number of people who see it at its worst rather than the way that it is expressed or the way in which it will necessarily be applied.

The Hon. D.J. HOPGOOD: I should rise on this occasion because I would have thought that it was more appropriate that the honourable member raise these concerns in relation to clause 18 rather than clause 15. To put the best possible construction on some of the things that were said publicly during this debate—and I do that for the purposes of the argument because I have not always found it in my heart to put the best possible construction on some of those statements—as I see it, those people are saying that law-abiding citizens are concerned that Governments should be able to confiscate firearms. This clause is not about law-abiding citizens: it is about people who come before the courts which make certain orders in relation to the firearms that those people used in the commission of the offence which brought them before the notice of the courts.

I do not think that one person who gave evidence before the select committee would argue that in these circumstances a firearm should not be confiscated or forfeited. Their concern was about some sort of administrative arrangement whereby guns which had been legally held in the community would somehow overnight no longer be able to be held, so the debate in the select committee was about the appropriateness of the mechanisms which are involved in the transitional provisions. I fully appreciate what the honourable member is saying, but it is important that we realise that that is really where the nub of the matter is addressed, rather than in clause 15.

Mr S.G. EVANS: I do not have any argument with what the Minister has just said. However, one aspect of the clause worries me. I have no hesitation in saying that guns should be confiscated if people use them in the commission of a crime. I am concerned that, where a gun might be valuable, one partner in a relationship may suffer. Quite often it is the wife who suffers the consequences if the husband is the owner of the weapon and he commits a crime. He has probably paid a lot of money for the gun which the Crown would confiscate, and the money would be lost. I do not seek to amend this provision now, but I ask the Minister to look at it. I am not sure whether we can cover this matter in legislation.

There is the second option of cancelling the firearm's licence held by a convicted person, but the person would still own the gun. There is some merit in the suggestion that the Crown should be able to confiscate a gun and then sell it. The person who originally had the gun could be slightly mentally unstable and he could be put away and the family—it could be a wife with a couple of children, a *de facto* or a close relative—could suffer a significant financial loss which might be critical to a family that does not have a lot of money.

The male in the home might be the sort of person who puts great pride in owning and perhaps using a weapon. It concerns me that family members could suffer unnecessary and perhaps crippling financial loss. Can the courts be given that option, if it is possible to provide legislatively for the situation that I have described?

The Hon. D.J. HOPGOOD: We will examine it, but I am not sure that the fears of the honourable member are

borne out by the document before us. It is necessary to compare proposed new subsection (1) with proposed new subsection (2), which is not technically about forfeiture, but disposal. In those circumstances it would be perfectly proper for the court to determine whether a weapon should be transferred to an innocent party. That matter can be further examined.

Mr S.G. EVANS: I am grateful to the Minister. I raise this matter because we have now started saying to the courts that we want them to look at what is said in Parliament and at what is intended. If Parliament discusses the matter, somebody may be able to direct the court's attention to the fact that the matter was considered and at times this action could be considered appropriate.

Clause passed.

Clause 16—'Penalties.'

Mr BLACKER: Can the Minister explain, so that it is on the public record during this debate, the levels of fines in the various divisions?

The Hon. D.J. HOPGOOD: I am advised that a division 9 fine is \$500; division 8 is \$1 000; division 7 is \$2 000; and division 6 is \$4 000.

Clause passed.

Clause 17—'Regulations.'

Ms GAYLER: This clause provides a regulation making power which covers, amongst other things, the safe custody of firearms; that is, the security provisions envisaged in the draft regulations which have been circulated and which were part of the select committee's consideration. I have received correspondence from the Mount Gambier Gun Club dealing with this matter and I want to raise it at this point. In its letter the club says:

We note with great concern that nowhere in the proposed Act or regulations is there any indication of minimum security requirements for firearms when travelling.

The club goes on to say:

We ask: what is the minimum security requirement of a firearm for a person who is travelling, when:

1. Staying in motel/hotel/caravan accommodation?
2. Whilst the firearm is in the motor vehicle or other transport, i.e., aircraft, bus, etc.?

That is an appropriate question for the club to ask. How do the proposals in relation to the security of firearms apply in those sorts of circumstances?

The Hon. D.J. HOPGOOD: The honourable member has difficulty breaking free from the city of her origin, I notice; I guess that she still barracks for one of the footy teams down there. I am advised that if the individual is permanently domiciled in a caravan park then the position is no different than if the individual was living in a house, be it a farmhouse, a cottage in the metropolitan area, or whatever. Despite some of the difficulties that might be faced, nonetheless it is necessary for that individual to comply with the regulations, and no particular exemption is made.

On the other hand, if the person is moving around the firearm is regarded as being technically in use, and it cannot really practically be covered. We would expect that there would be a duty of care on the part of the individual. I would imagine, if we are talking about a longarm and so on, that the bolt would be removed (where that is appropriate) and that it would not be kept loaded when it is not technically in use, as opposed to this broader legal sense of being 'in use'. The regulations could not practically apply at that point. People who are permanently domiciled in caravan parks would be expected to comply with the legislation.

The Hon. B.C. EASTICK: The report of the select committee had an appendix D, which are the proposed regula-

tions for this Bill. I recognise that no regulations will be promulgated until the Bill passes in one form or another, but because this debate concerns both the Bill and the regulations I seek an indication whether late inquiries or recommendations will in any way affect the document that is presently seen by the community to be the most probable form of words for the regulations.

The Hon. D.J. HOPGOOD: The only circumstances in which I would envisage that there might be any change to the regulations are matters which have either been canvassed on the select committee as requiring further consultation or have been canvassed in this Committee. I think that the matter that was just raised by the member for Newland should perhaps receive more consideration to see whether the regulations can be further clarified, particularly in relation to the matter of permanent domicile. There was an undertaking in the select committee that there would be further consultation with people about the gazettal of certain classes of self-loading firearms, and that has to take place.

Earlier one matter was raised in the Committee stage and, as I recall, I said that further consultation would be needed. I do not think that there has been a change in circumstances, but the select committee always envisaged that certain matters would require some additional consultation before we could say that the regulations had found their final form.

Mr S.G. EVANS: Earlier the Minister referred to a person who had a firearm and who was not domiciled in a particular caravan park but was moving around. I take it that six weeks is the accepted time limit that a person can stay in a caravan park before they are considered to be permanently domiciled, as accepted by most local governments. I assume that the same applies to someone who owns a farm and regularly uses a vehicle to check stock, foxes, vermin or whatever, even at night with a spotlight. Those people often leave firearms in their vehicles, even when they are not in them. By the same token, a person is not always present in a caravan, and the ability to break in would be nearly identical. It is more likely for a nomadic type person travelling in a caravan to take wrong action in relation to the law than it would be for a farmer (and I use the case of a farmer although it could be another profession, maybe a veterinary surgeon). Does that interpretation follow through, or does it only apply to caravans?

The Hon. D.J. HOPGOOD: I have indicated that I am prepared to take further advice on this matter, but we are saying that, where it is possible to identify a permanent domicile for an individual (and for the vast majority that is possible), if a person is in possession of firearms, that person has to comply with the regulations. I have indicated also that there is a particular problem in relation to the itinerant but, in the specific case to which the honourable member referred, a person, in moving around a property, may have their firearm with them for most of the time, but nonetheless that person will have to comply with the regulations in respect of those times when the firearm is not in use. I will take further advice about those who are, as it were, permanent itinerants. Obviously, it is a very difficult matter to cover but, if we can, obviously we should cover it.

Clause passed.

Clause 18—'Insertion of schedule.'

The Hon. D.J. HOPGOOD: I move:

Page 13, line 42—Insert after '1988' 'and subsequent renewals of the licence must carry the same endorsement'.

This amendment inserts a passage at the end of clause 2 of the transitional provisions of the schedule at the end of the Bill. Clause 2 allows owners of existing firearms to keep and use those firearms. The purpose of the amendment is

to make absolutely clear that, no matter how often the licence is renewed, that right continues. This is the matter to which I referred earlier in debate when I said that, out of abundance of caution, I would try to make the matter as far beyond doubt as I possibly could.

Mr S.G. EVANS: It does not matter what the Minister of the day promises or what we as a Parliament think may be the case: new section 34a would still apply in relation to confiscation of guns. A future Government could amend the legislation, so we cannot protect them for all time.

The Hon. D.J. HOPGOOD: That is always the case. As a Parliament, all we can do is to set the limits of the statutory powers of the Minister and the Government of the day. I believe that the limits that we set here are sufficient to restrain me or any future Minister, save for an amendment of the legislation, from acting in the way that some people outside have accused me of really wanting to act. Of course there can be changes to the legislation, but that would be subject to further public debate, debate in Parliament and the vote of either House. There is nothing remarkable about that. If some future Parliament wants to pass a one-line Bill which abolishes all right of ownership in firearms, it can attempt to do that. I do not see how that is any more or less pertinent to the present debate than the point made by the honourable member.

Amendment carried.

The Hon. B.C. EASTICK: I draw attention to a set of circumstances which became apparent as debate proceeded in the select committee. Indeed, it was well known before the event that there are a large number of guns of all types out in the wide world that are not legitimate in the sense that they have not been registered in recent times, although they might have been registered at an earlier time. Also, there are a large number of guns that come into the hand-me-down, antique, family heirloom category that have not been registered, if ever. There was a clear indication that the spirit of the select committee was that a period of time would be made available—a form of amnesty—whereby persons in possession of those guns would have the opportunity of making them legitimate prior to the new Act's becoming operative.

For the legislation to be effective, obviously the Government or other interested parties in the community must embark upon an education program. In essence, it is a form of transitional activity, albeit not directly associated with the transitional phases. What is the schedule for that process to be put in place? When might we expect to see it promulgated?

The Hon. D.J. HOPGOOD: The conclusion of the select committee report states:

The committee recommends the Government declare an amnesty of three months from the date of assent to this Bill to further expedite the registration of firearms under the present Act.

That was to pick up the specific point that the honourable member has raised. The Government is saying not only that firearms which have been legitimately held under the present legislation can continue to be held under the new legislation but also that those people who are illegitimately holding firearms will have a three month period from the date of assent (not proclamation) to take advantage of those same transitional provisions.

We cannot be any fairer than that. I cannot indicate exactly when that will start, because I cannot indicate when another place will complete its deliberations on this Bill and when the legislation will be available for assent. I can indicate that the Government accepts fully the recommendation of the committee that I have just quoted.

Clause as amended passed.

Clause 19, schedule and title passed.

The Hon. D.J. HOPGOOD (Deputy Premier): I move:
That this Bill be now read a third time.

In commending the Bill as it comes out of Committee, I believe it is moderate and good legislation. In my earlier remarks on the legislation there was perhaps one point that I could have made, and it was one that was touched on in debate, that is, the amount of resource which goes into the sport itself from the public coffers. For example, it is important to place on record that the Virginia International Sport Shooting Park attracted \$500 000 in capital funds from this Government, and about \$100 000 plus annually is a further commitment by the Government as a result of that.

About \$350 000 is to be spent on a new facility for small bore rifle shooting and indeed the operations of the firearms branch have to be regarded as a further contribution by the taxpayers of this State to the sport. That has been running at something like \$700 000 per annum. It is important that we place on record that there is already considerable support from the Government of South Australia for those who regard their approach to the use of firearms as a sporting or recreational approach, and of course that support will continue. Despite that, we do not renege from our position that there has to be strong and effective legislation and I believe that is what this House by majority vote has arrived at at this point in the passage of the legislation. I commend the legislation to the House.

The Hon. B.C. EASTICK (Light): I regret that the members of this side of the House are unable to support the third reading of the debate, notwithstanding that the measure now before the House is a far better proposition than that which was originally introduced. We have given a very clear indication that there are a number of problems with the overall and longer-term management procedures that we perceive. We have sought to have the Government accept that the Bill could be a better piece of legislation by the removal of the registration process of longarms. That remains our point of view and, because the Government was unable to accept that offer from the Opposition, we will call for a division on the third reading.

Mr S.G. EVANS (Davenport): As the member for Light has said, the legislation will not be supported by members on this side of the House; I do not support it either. I think if it is fitting that the Minister state what public support goes into shooting and that this House recognise the amount of voluntary work that has gone into the building of clubs and ranges, the amount of private money that has been put into those investments for the benefit of the State and for international, interstate and State shoots and competitions, the amount of employment created, and the retail sales of equipment and firearms. It is the type of sport of which we are always very proud to be a part when an Olympic competitor from our State wins a gold, silver or bronze medal and we as Parliamentarians are very quick to shake hands and have our faces on television and in newspapers because of the publicity that brings to this State. But when we look at the public expenditure we should also look at the private commitment in terms of money as well as the physical and mental commitment by so many people for so many years in this State and recognise that it has not been one of the important sports, according to the Government, over the years, but one of the lesser sports and has not received as substantial a contribution as some of the other Olympic sports have received in the past. So, in opposing the Bill, I hope that we also look at the private commitment as well as the public.

Mr BLACKER (Flinders): I too oppose the third reading. I believe the measure of support for the sport of shooting is well displayed on a newsstand when one sees the number of magazines and newspapers that report on this industry. I do not believe that this legislation is warranted to the extent of the registration of longarms. Evidence was given by a large number of people and I believe that, if the Government wants to take the line it takes now, much more evidence could have been brought before the committee. I do not believe the Government is justified in proceeding in this way.

Ms GAYLER: I am rather disappointed and a little surprised that the Opposition should decide to oppose the third reading of this Bill when, in fact, members of the Opposition proposed not a single substantive amendment to the final Bill as it emerged from the select committee. The Opposition amendments were designed exclusively to amend the original Firearms Act, which has been in operation in this State since about 1980 and which has worked moderately well—although it could do with some improvements. For members of the Opposition to oppose the third reading of this Bill without having proposed amendments of substance to what is actually proposed in the Bill makes one wonder about their motives.

The Hon. D.J. HOPGOOD: It is unusual, of course, for a Minister to speak in closing the third reading debate, but I really must enter this debate at this point. Let us just keep in mind that the so-called controversial aspects of this legislation when it was debated in the public domain were matters in respect of which no amendments at all have come from the Opposition this evening. No amendments have been brought forward in respect of the new controls on the purchase of ammunition. No amendments have been proffered in respect of the new provisions—widely heralded—about the necessity for someone to be able to demonstrate competence in handling a firearm before being adjudged as a fit and proper person to use a firearm.

No amendments have been proffered in relation to what before the select committee was seen as the somewhat controversial matter of permits to purchase. So, on the one hand, we have those matters, which were regarded in the public domain as controversial—all of which have been acquiesced in by members opposite by the way in which they have conducted themselves in the Committee debate. Other matters received very wide public support, such as the matter of being able to show proficiency in the use of a firearm, and the increase in the penalties, which apparently has drawn support from members opposite.

In the face of all of that, because a matter, which was not canvassed in the previous Bill and was not really canvassed in the public debates which preceded the introduction of legislation in the House, has not been accepted by the Government, members opposite seek to throw the baby out with the bath water. It is not good enough to say 'We are in Opposition so we can do what we like and the Government will vote it out.' People must be responsible for the votes they will cast in this House. What members opposite are now saying is that they oppose the whole of the Bill. They do not like the concept of people being asked to demonstrate competence in the handling of a firearm before they are able to use one. They do not like the increase in the penalties. They have suddenly decided that they do not like all those other matters in respect of which they were silent by way of attempting any sort of change in the Committee stage. They will throw the baby out with the bath water.

I must agree with the member for Newland: I really think that at this point they are playing games, and they are

attempting to appeal to some other constituency outside. I think that that constituency needs to look very closely at the way in which the Opposition failed to oppose some of the measures in the Committee, which was the only appropriate place where those measures could have been changed.

The House divided on the third reading:

Ayes (23)—Mrs Appleby, Messrs L.M.F. Arnold, Blevins, Crafter, De Laine, Duigan, M.J. Evans, and Ferguson, Ms Gayler, Messrs Gregory, Groom, Hamilton, Hemmings, Hopgood (teller), and Klunder, Ms Lenehan, Messrs McRae, Mayes, Payne, Plunkett, Rann, Slater, and Tyler.

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

Pair—Aye—The Hon. J.C. Bannon. No—The Hon. T. Chapman.

Majority of 7 for the Ayes.

Third reading thus carried.

ADJOURNMENT

The Hon. D.J. HOPGOOD (Deputy Premier): I move: That the House do now adjourn.

The SPEAKER: Before calling on the member for Henley Beach, I draw to the attention of persons present that the Speaker's gallery is not an appropriate place to conduct a journalistic interview.

Mr FERGUSON (Henley Beach): On 5 October this year an horrific accident occurred in my electorate which claimed the lives of two young people and resulted in the infliction of serious injuries to an innocent bystander. The accident was particularly noteworthy as it was the first time that a driving instructor was killed on the job in South Australia. While I am sure that many members will recall the circumstances of this appalling incident, and may recall my earlier question in relation to this accident, which involved a 17-year-old learner driver and his driving instructor, I would like to take this opportunity to briefly recount the details.

The accident happened at 8.30 in the morning at the corner of Tapleys Hill Road and Marlborough Street, opposite the Target Shopping Centre at Fulham Gardens. The collision involved a car driven by the learner driver, under the supervision of his instructor, and a Highways Department truck carrying 40 tonnes of bitumen. The car was turning right from Tapleys Hill Road into Marlborough Street on an amber light when when it collided with the truck, which was heading north along Tapleys Hill Road.

A 19-year-old woman pedestrian was badly injured when the truck skidded onto the pavement after the collision, knocked down a traffic light, and came to rest on the front lawn of a neighbouring medical clinic. The pedestrian was knocked unconscious and trapped for several minutes by the wreckage. The two occupants of the car were killed when the car was wedged under the front wheels of the truck and was crushed beyond recognition.

Peak hour traffic was brought to a standstill by the accident as police closed Tapleys Hill Road for a radius of about 100 metres. Traffic was delayed for around half an hour as vehicles were diverted along neighbouring streets. The intersection in question is a busy one which forms the junction of Tapleys Hill Road, Marlborough Street and Valetta Road. Over the past three years there have been at least 19 accidents of a similar nature at this intersection which involved negotiation of a right hand turn.

A major Target shopping complex is located on the south-eastern corner of the intersection of Valetta Road and Tapleys Hill Road, and a smaller shopping centre is located directly across Valetta Road in the north-eastern corner. A medical clinic is also situated on the corner of Marlborough Street and Tapleys Hill Road. Both shopping centres have access points onto Valetta Road near the intersection and Target also has access onto Tapleys Hill Road. The medical clinic also has an entrance off Tapleys Hill Road. The existence of these facilities, with their combined points of access, not only contributes to the levels of vehicular traffic in the locality but also impedes the otherwise uninterrupted flow of traffic, particularly when negotiating the traffic lights. The situation at the intersection is further exacerbated by the problem of buses turning right as they follow the bus route from Tapleys Hill Road into Valetta Road.

Because of the volume of traffic on Tapleys Hill Road—I understand that 25 000 vehicles travel along this road each day—vehicles attempting to negotiate right hand turns at the lights frequently experience considerable delays. This undoubtedly contributes to driver frustration, with the result that drivers may attempt dangerous manoeuvres. Furthermore, given the volume of traffic, drivers often are only able to make a right hand turn once the light has turned amber, or even red, which may also create potentially dangerous situations.

My constituents, who were understandably shocked by the recent fatalities, have pointed out to me that the introduction of right turn arrows into the existing traffic signal sequence would help to prevent such incidents recurring. The Minister of Transport has passed on information from the Highways Department that the introduction of a right turning sequence could cost in the vicinity of \$50 000 to \$70 000. While recognising that such cost must be taken into account, I must ask the question whether, in the circumstances, financial cost should be the only consideration.

After all, how can we measure the cost of human life in monetary terms. The loss of life of one so young and full of such promise is inestimable. Also, we have to consider the pain and suffering of those who are left behind whose lives will never be the same again. Accidents such as these, by their very nature, attract considerable media attention. Other accidents which are not so newsworthy obviously do not receive the same attention.

In focusing on deaths resulting from accidents, we should not forget the many injuries also sustained in such accidents. Severe injury can result in permanent damage to people's lives. Statistical data recorded by the police on which traffic accident statistics are based do not take into account the more frequent minor traffic accidents which do not involve personal injuries. Nevertheless, such accidents can result in emotional trauma and significant property damage. They are therefore no less worthy of consideration when determining the need for the alteration of traffic signal sequences at this intersection.

The problem of heavy vehicles in built-up areas is also significant. Major thoroughfares which are known to carry heavy vehicles should be given particular consideration. Given that the area in which this intersection is located is the site of a major shopping centre with associated amenities, it should also receive special attention. While the existing traffic lights may well have been quite adequate when they were first installed, it may well be that, in light of the ongoing traffic problems and recent circumstances, it is now time for further improvement. After all, this area has recently been developed from market gardens into a suburban residential area.

Following the recent disturbing accident which highlighted just how dangerous this intersection can be, we should heed the warning and do everything in our power to prevent such tragedies recurring in the future. We must not wait for somebody else to die before we act. I would make an appeal to the Highways Department to give very serious consideration to what has occurred at this intersection and to its associated problems. As the local member, I have received a petition from over 1 000 residents from the surrounding area who are most anxious that right-hand turn lights be installed at this intersection. Although the cost has been estimated at between \$50 000 and \$70 000, that should not be an impediment to the changes that ought to occur. There are problems at this intersection because of the volume of traffic along Tapleys Hill Road, but I am sure that proper traffic engineering can solve the problems. I believe that this matter ought to receive immediate attention.

Mr GUNN (Eyre): I wish to raise a concern about the conduct of certain people who claim to have the best interests of the Aboriginal community at heart. At the weekend, I had the pleasure, along with a number of my colleagues, to visit the northern Ernabella station in company with the Hon. John Howard, Leader of the Federal Opposition and Federal Leader of the Liberal Party. In his usual caring and concerned manner, he went to the north of South Australia to see at first hand the difficulties under which people live in those areas. He tried to ascertain their needs and had dialogue with these people because he is a caring, concerned and understanding person who has their interests at heart. Like all Liberals, he is concerned to see that the underprivileged and those less well off in the community are given the opportunity to avail themselves of Government services and to make sure that those services are directed to the people who need them, that they are not squandered, spent or controlled by people only interested in maintaining their own power base or in manipulating people who do not have the ability to communicate or represent themselves, such as most European communities.

It was interesting to note that during the planning which led to that visit, the Leader's staff and members of the Liberal Party made many contacts with people in the Pitjantjatjara office in Alice Springs, including Mr Lester. On not one occasion were any concerns raised nor was there any indication that there was concern about the policy. They were invited to put forward any suggestions that they wanted to discuss with Mr Howard. However, it was brought to our attention prior to our visit that there were Europeans going around Ernabella making untruthful statements and bad-mouthing the Leader. For example, the Community Development Officer, Alex Henry, was going around telling deliberate untruths stating that the Leader was going to take away the people's pensions.

The interesting thing was that the very day before Mr Howard's visit, Gerry Hand and his media machine suddenly arrived out of the blue. Obviously, with the pressure that the Federal Government is under in relation to Aboriginal affairs, it is doing everything possible to divert attention. A press statement had been prepared some days before on an Anangu Pitjantjatjara letterhead. The contact person was not an Aboriginal but was Mr Brian Doolan who I understand has just returned from a visit to Russia. So, he is getting proper education there.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order! I call the House to order. The member for Eyre has the floor and no-one else.

Mr GUNN: Thank you, Mr Speaker. Those people who are attempting to misinform and mislead are concerned

about their own power base. These people live in their cosy little castles in Alice Springs. They do not live on the land among the people who administer. They are concerned about their own power base, the power which they have to manipulate and misinform those decent Australian people whose demands upon society are limited and who are pleasant people, not aggressive or objectionable.

The real interest came after this speech was made. It was not characteristic of Mr Lester because I have seen him speak on many occasions. He has never needed prompting or to be coached. He has always been very articulate and precise, but on this occasion he had to have a European lawyer standing alongside him to advise and prompt him all the way through. When we arrived, Mr Lester and those people greeted us most warmly. After the speech when Mr Howard and I spoke to the people, some Aborigines said to me that Mr Lester never discussed that speech with them and they were very disappointed because they did not agree with it. I have the names of those people.

The people who sat there and talked to Mr Howard were not talking about treaties; they were not talking about the ABC or the power base of Charlie Perkins and Gerry Hand; they were interested in real local issues which affect them. I think that Gavin Easom should be congratulated because his press report was accurate and gave a true picture. I quote from an article in the *News* of today:

The gross and exploitative politicisation of Aboriginal affairs in Australia was highlighted at a remote creekbed in far north-western South Australia on the weekend.

The accounts by television and some newspapers of what took place did not resemble what I saw.

The Federal Opposition Leader, Mr Howard, ended a visit to South Australia's arid north at a cordial encounter with Pitjantjatjara people near Ernabella... but the meeting turned sour.

On a dusty airstrip, Mr Howard's party and a handful of media representatives were warmly greeted by Ernabella residents, white and black.

We were taken in a convoy of four-wheel-drive vehicles to Itjinpiri, the creekbed where, in 1981, former South Australia Premier David Tonkin formally handed over the freehold rights of the Pitjantjatjara homelands.

However, a cluster of about 70 Aborigines seemed almost unmoved by our arrival. They hardly bothered to lift their gaze from the circle of campfires, and their conversation continued without interruption.

Even the handful of pet dogs roaming the site did not check us out.

They had been there and done that—just the day before, when the Federal Aboriginal Affairs Minister, Mr Hand, and a further white-fella party had made a surprise flying visit to Ernabella.

What a coincidence—the day before John Howard's long-awaited and planned visit.

Mr and Mrs Howard, with their Liberal Party associates, including State Member Graham Gunn and Senator Robert Hill, chatted amiably with Anunga Pitjantjatjara chairman Yami Lester for several minutes as wisps of smoke coiled around Mr Lester's billy.

Watching over the gathering were four strongly-built South Australian police aides, all full-blood Pitjantjatjara.

But the only violence at Sunday's meeting came with Mr Lester's vitriolic attack on the Liberal Party's Aboriginal affairs policy.

The pleasant, informative discussion on arrival vanished when Mr Lester launched into a pre-written speech.

But like every impartial observer at Itjinpiri, and many of the blacks squatting in the creekbed, I have strong doubts that Mr Lester was solely responsible for his words. For Mr Lester is blind (he blames Maralinga fallout more than 30 years ago).

And throughout his speech, he stumbled and muffed his lines—as they were fed to him by the white 'legal adviser' at his side.

His performance was in marked contrast to the gentle, informed, and articulate conversation he had in private with Mr Howard only moments earlier.

This distinguished community leader, held in the highest esteem by all who have crossed his path, seemed ill at ease during his scathing attack.

Mr Howard, to his enormous credit, remained calm in the face of such blunt criticism.

He reiterated publicly what he had already told Mr Lester privately that he was at Ernabella, at long last, to listen and learn.

Instead of rising to the bait, he responded to the Aboriginal leader with serenity. 'I'm not here to attack the Government,' he said. 'When political Parties attack each other, Aborigines lose.'

He repeated his commitment to practical and sensitive help to all Aborigines when his Party assumed Government.

He emphasised his concerns lay with improved housing, health, education, and employment—not to a burgeoning Canberra-based bureaucracy which soaks up much of the available funding.

Mr Howard was received keenly by many of the blacks into their campfire huddles.

Tribal elders... with the lines of a thousand years etched deep in their faces, welcomed him.

With the help of interpreters, they responded to him compassionately after Mr Lester's derisive remarks.

And minutes later, when it was time to leave, Yami Lester was once again the delightful and natural diplomat as Mr and Mrs Howard were presented with gifts to honour their visit.

In the shadow of the Aboriginal flag, standing under one of Namatjira's towering ghost gums, they were given a meticulously hand-carved metre-long goanna and a length of exquisite Ernabella batik cloth.

Tribal artisans Walter and Yipati had worked many hours to produce these superb tokens.

So the before-and-after of Mr Howard's visit made everyone comfortable.

But for a few awkward minutes in between, it seemed as if the string-pullers were at work. Further proof was near.

When we returned to the airstrip, a prepared press release, headed Federal Coalition's 'Rubbish Policy', was thrust into our hands by a white adviser. This wasn't Yami Lester speaking...

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

Mr D.S. Baker interjecting:

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

Mr HAMILTON (Albert Park): Some time ago—

Mr D.S. Baker interjecting:

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

Mr HAMILTON: —I had occasion to request the Department of Public and Consumer Affairs to make its caravan available at the West Lakes Mall to service my constituents and those in the surrounding suburbs and electorates. Last week I was advised that the caravan was there and I visited the officer in it, made myself known to him and looked at the wealth of information that was available to constituents by, as my ministerial colleague says, a good Government.

As a consequence of the caravan being located there, I received a number of representations, one of which came from a pregnant woman. She informed me that a friend bought her a bottle of non-alcoholic champers and orange, which she enjoyed so much that she decided to buy another bottle from the local bottle shop. However, after she drank this champers and orange, she eventually became a little tipsy. She was most upset because, as she was pregnant, for health reasons she did not want to drink alcohol which could have an impact on the foetus.

She informed me that the two bottles in question were almost identical, the only distinguishing feature between the alcoholic beverage and the non-alcoholic beverage being either black or silver foil on the top of the bottle. The de-alcoholised white wine and orange juice had an alcohol content of .5 per cent compared to 8.5 per cent for the alcoholic beverage. For various reasons, people (like this pregnant woman) do not want to consume alcoholic beverages. That raises very serious questions.

A photograph of these bottles was supplied by the woman and she raises a very important question as to why the manufacturers of these two beverages do not highlight in large figures the alcohol content. The photograph supplied to me demonstrates that the alcohol content is written on

the bottle in very small letters. I share the concern of this woman not only in relation to the health of her child but also in relation to people who have a drinking problem and perhaps belong to Alcoholics Anonymous. I believe that it is incumbent on the manufacturers of these beverages to ensure that the alcohol content is clearly displayed in figures large enough for people with normal or perhaps failing eyesight to readily identify.

I believe that, if we are to protect those people who have an allergy to alcohol or members of Alcoholics Anonymous who do not want unknowingly to consume alcoholic beverages, not only should our Minister of Consumer Affairs look at the question but also, on a national basis, Ministers of Consumer Affairs and Ministers of Health in each State should address this question.

The woman further reported to my office that she rang the company concerned to complain. I am advised that the company was not concerned. Certainly, I intend to take up the matter with that company. I am reluctant to name the company at this stage but, if it is a responsible company, it should at least favourably consider this woman's request. It is a serious matter and a serious request. I refer to the impact such a situation could have on a person, especially if they drive a motor vehicle.

A person might believe that they were drinking a non-alcoholic beverage. They might drink a couple of bottles of what they believed to be a non-alcoholic beverage but which contained 8.5 per cent alcohol content. They might drive their vehicle and then through no fault of their own be involved in an accident with another vehicle or a pedestrian. The police might be called and naturally they would ask that person to submit to a breathalyser test.

Certainly, it would be distressing for such a person to find out that he or she had consumed a beverage which they believed was non-alcoholic when that was not the case. The trauma associated with that situation, particularly for

a person who did not drink, would be great. They might have an insurance policy in respect of which they might have declared that they would not consume alcohol and then find, through no fault of their own, that they had consumed alcohol. Such a person could end up paying many thousands of dollars. Their insurance company might not even address their claim in the case of damage to either of the vehicles involved.

The implications are numerous, and I have no doubt that there are many other implications in respect of the labelling of alcoholic beverages. I refer to the situation interstate, especially in respect of beer, where the alcoholic content is shown in large figures three or four inches high. That is another area that our national people should look at, both in consumer affairs and in the health arena. Uniformity is very important if it can be achieved. If a person goes interstate—

The Hon. H. Allison: You can be caught.

Mr HAMILTON: Indeed, as the member for Mount Gambier points out, it is easy to be caught. I hope that my parliamentary colleagues, irrespective of what their political persuasion might be, will give strong support to this proposition on a national basis. I come back to the constituent concerned and I thank her for raising this matter with me. Above all else, I thank the Minister of Consumer Affairs for the manner in which he has acceded to my request. I know that the public in my district was pleased with the caravan and the opportunity to direct questions to the employee, Bob, who was most helpful not only in respect of the queries raised but also with a lot of the other information that he supplied to me.

Motion carried.

At 10.24 p.m. the House adjourned until Wednesday 2 November at 2 p.m.

HOUSE OF ASSEMBLY

Tuesday 1 November 1988

QUESTIONS ON NOTICE

HON. D.A. DUNSTAN

52. Mr LEWIS (Mallee), on notice, asked the Premier:

1. Does the Hon. D.A. Dunstan usually do only one day's work per week in relation to his Aboriginal self-determination consultancy?

2. Upon what other matters is he advising the Government in return for a fee for service, whether related to this consultancy or not?

The Hon. J.C. BANNON: The replies are as follows:

1. No. The number of days per week worked by Mr Dunstan is variable, depending on the requirements of this consultancy and Mr Dunstan's other commitments not related to this consultancy.

2. None.

SAND CARTING

57. Mr BECKER (Hanson), on notice, asked the Minister for Environment and Planning:

1. When will the seasonal sand carting program commence for the replenishment of the beach in front of the Glenelg North treatment works?

2. How much sand will be carted to this area this year and at what cost?

3. What action is being taken to protect the water caisson serving Marineland and at what cost?

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

1. 1 February 1989.

2. 100 000 m³ sand at approximately \$1.4 million.

3. The seawater pump caisson is not in danger of being undermined.

BUILDING SALES

59. The Hon. P.B. ARNOLD (Chaffey), on notice, asked the Minister of Marine: How many land or building sales were made by the Department of Marine and Harbors in the past financial year and what was the location of the property, sale price, name of the buyer and method of sale (i.e. auction, advertised sale or private negotiations) in each case?

The Hon. R.J. GREGORY: The replies are as follows:

1. \$46 500 (deposit only) paid by Port Adelaide Wool Company Pty Limited to purchase land abutting the Grand Trunkway, Gillman. Negotiations conducted by Department of Marine and Harbors. Purchase price of property is \$202 907.

2. \$500 000 (deposit only) paid by Central Wool Facilities Pty Limited to purchase land abutting the Grand Trunkway, Gillman. Negotiations conducted by Department of Marine and Harbors. Purchase price of property is \$200 000.

3. \$210 000 received from Minister of Employment and Further Education for the purchase of an office building at 131 Lipson Street, Port Adelaide. Negotiations conducted by Department of Marine and Harbors.

4. Residence at lot 15, Railway Terrace, Beachport auctioned by Department of Lands. Purchased by Mr K. Smith. Department of Marine and Harbors received \$36 000.

5. Residence at 19 Cruickshank Avenue, Whyalla auctioned by Department of Lands. Purchased by Mr A. Vorman. Department of Marine and Harbors received \$53 800.

6. Residence at 5 Marchant Street, Ceduna auctioned by Department of Lands. Purchased by Mr D. Shipard. Department of Marine and Harbors received \$31 800.

MARINE AND HARBORS DEPARTMENT

60. The Hon. P.B. ARNOLD (Chaffey), on notice, asked the Minister of Marine: During the past financial year, what was the total amount of sick leave taken by Department of Marine and Harbors employees, how many of those days were not covered by a medical certificate, and how many of the days not covered by a certificate were taken on a Friday, a Monday or the day immediately before or after a public holiday?

The Hon. R.J. GREGORY: During the past financial year the total number of days sick leave taken by Department of Marine and Harbors employees was 6 087. The number of days not covered by a medical certificate was 2 739, consisting of 605 taken on a Friday, 534 on a Monday and 22 taken immediately before or after a public holiday.

61. The Hon. P.B. ARNOLD (Chaffey), on notice, asked the Minister of Marine: How many cars permanently or regularly available to Department of Marine and Harbors employees for travel between work and home have been or are to be fitted with private registration plates?

The Hon. R.J. GREGORY: The Chief Executive Officer is the only officer in the Department of Marine and Harbors with private registration plates.

FISHERIES DEPARTMENT

62. The Hon. P.B. ARNOLD (Chaffey), on notice, asked the Minister of Fisheries: During the past financial year, what was the total amount of sick leave taken by Department of Fisheries employees, how many of those days were not covered by a medical certificate and how many of the days not covered by a certificate were taken on a Friday, a Monday or the day immediately before or after a public holiday?

The Hon. M.K. MAYES: The replies are as follows:

1. The total number of sick days taken by the employees of the Department of Fisheries in 1987-88 was 364. This included a total of 76 days for two employees who underwent major surgery.

2. Of these, 181 were not covered by a medical certificate.

3. Of the days not covered by a certificate, 93 were taken on a Friday, a Monday or a day before or after a public holiday.

63. The Hon. P.B. ARNOLD (Chaffey), on notice, asked the Minister of Fisheries: How many cars permanently or regularly available to Department of Fisheries employees for travel between work and home have been or are to be fitted with private registration plates?

The Hon. M.K. MAYES: Six.

64. The Hon. P.B. ARNOLD (Chaffey), on notice, asked the Minister of Fisheries: How many land or building sales were made by the Department of Fisheries in the past financial year and what was the location of the property, sale price, name of the buyer and method of sale (that is auction, advertised sale or private negotiation) in each case?

The Hon. M.K. MAYES: The Department of Fisheries made no land or building sales in the 1987-88 financial year.

TRANSCRIPT CHARGES

65. **Mr. S.J. BAKER (Mitcham)**, on notice, asked the Minister of Labour: What is the estimate of revenue to be derived from transcript charges for the South Australian Industrial Court and Commission for 1988-89?

The Hon. R.J. GREGORY: The total estimated gross revenue from the sale of transcripts in 1988-89 is \$210 000, based on 70 per cent of the current production. However, as 20 per cent of this relates to Government departments (DPIR) together with factors such as implementation costs offset by savings on production, the estimated net return in 1988-89 is \$163 000, made up as follows:

	\$
Estimated gross revenue	210 000
Less Government departments	-40 000
	170 000
Less implementation costs	-55 000
	115 000
Add savings in transcript production ...	+48 000
Estimated net return 1988-89	\$163 000

BUS SCHEME

67. **Mr S.J. BAKER (Mitcham)**, on notice, asked the Minister of Labour: How many complaints were received

Date	Organisation	\$	Reason
Nov. 87	Master Builders Association	10 000	In conjunction with the Building Industry Bipartite Consultative Committee to fund a panel of independent arbitrators in the South Australia building industry on a six month trial basis.
April 88	UTLC	2 400	State Government contribution to the Anna Stewart Project to provide 4 additional places for disadvantaged women in the workforce.
May 88	South Australian Touring Exhibitions Program	500	Modern Trade Union Banner exhibition in four country regional centres.
June 88	UTLC	3 000	Purchase of screens to display occupational health and safety material.
	Total	15 900	

The recipients of grants in 1988-89 are yet to be decided. Allocations are determined by request and distributed on a needs basis. All payments are approved by the Minister.

DANGEROUS GOODS

72. **Mr S.J. BAKER (Mitcham)**, on notice, asked the Minister of Labour: From what areas will the Department of Labour receive an additional \$225 000 during 1988-89 under 'Regulation and Handling of Dangerous Goods and Substances'?

The Hon. R. J. GREGORY: The additional receipts estimated comprise:

\$77 000 from an increase in the fees for storage and testing of explosives at the Government Magazine, Dry Creek, as part of changes necessary to achieve full cost recovery for the magazine, including a return on capital value of land and buildings;

\$153 000 resulting from an increase in fees and new registration of premises storing class 6 and class 8 dan-

gerous substances (the increase in fees again is part of a move towards full cost recovery).

YATALA RECREATION HALL

78. **Mr BECKER (Hanson)**, on notice, asked the Minister of Correctional Services: Is the recreation hall at Yatala still out of bounds to prisoners and, if so, why and for how much longer will it be so?

The Hon. F.T. BLEVINS: The recreation hall at Yatala is not out of bounds to prisoners.

ADELAIDE REMAND CENTRE

82. **Mr BECKER (Hanson)**, on notice, asked the Minister of Correctional Services:

STATE AWARDS

68. **Mr S.J. BAKER (Mitcham)**, on notice, asked the Minister of Labour: What was the estimated number of State awards in existence at 30 June 1988 and how is that expected to vary by June 1989?

The Hon. R.J. GREGORY: At 30 June 1988, there were 219 State awards. Of these 10 were specifically related to superannuation. It is estimated that there could be a further 20 to 30 new superannuation awards and 10 new State awards by June 1989.

GRANTS TO ORGANISATIONS

71. **Mr S.J. BAKER (Mitcham)**, on notice, asked the Minister of Labour: Which organisations by amount and reason, received grants under the heading 'various organisations' under Program 5 of the Estimates of Payments in 1987-88, and which will receive payments in 1988-89?

The Hon. R.J. GREGORY: The following organisations received grants under the heading 'various organisations' in 1987-88:

1. What undercover secure car parking is provided for staff at the Adelaide Remand Centre, particularly those on the evening shift and, if none, why not?

2. Since the centre opened, how many staff have been assaulted returning to their motor cars after finishing work?

3. How many staff of the centre have complained of damage to their motor vehicles because of lack of secure car parking?

The Hon. F.T. BLEVINS: The replies are as follows:

1. The department provides 63 car parking spaces in an open car park in Gray Street, Adelaide, for staff of the Adelaide Remand Centre. This park is approximately 200 metres from the centre. Undercover secure car parking was not provided at the Adelaide Remand Centre due to the estimated cost of the facility. It was considered that such a proposal would introduce extra security risks into the building and costs would escalate as a result of the need to provide additional security and detection services.

2. The manager of the Adelaide Remand Centre has received no reports of staff being assaulted whilst returning to their motor cars after finishing work.

3. The manager of the Adelaide Remand Centre has received five complaints from staff.

ABORIGINAL OFFENDERS

85. **Mr BECKER (Hanson)**, on notice, asked the Minister of Correctional Services: What are the special needs of Aboriginal offenders in prison and has a survey of needs been done in the past 12 months and, if not, why not?

The Hon. F.T. BLEVINS: Over the past 12 months there have been several methods used to ascertain the special needs of Aboriginal offenders in prison, including a small survey of Aboriginal prisoners from the North West communities and Yalata at Port Augusta Gaol, consultation with Aboriginal elders at Davenport, and with other members of the Aboriginal community at Port Augusta in particular. The Aboriginal Liaison Officer with the department has also been active in fostering consultation between departmental staff and members of Aboriginal communities. A report on Priorities for Program Initiatives 1988—Aboriginal Offenders was submitted to the departmental executive in May 1988. A range of special needs for Aboriginal prisoners has been identified through these means and include:

Release Prisoner Support Scheme—The problems of traditional Aboriginal people on release from Port Augusta Gaol were identified by consultation between DCS staff, the Aboriginal Community Affairs Panel, WOMA Society and Pika Wiya staff. A scheme, whereby a 'consultant' contacts the prisoner prior to release, liaises with the parole officer, relatives and friends of the prisoner in the home area, and assists the prisoner immediately upon release has been established.

Drug and Alcohol Abuse Linked with Offending—Concerns about the willingness of Aboriginal prisoners to request the Prison Drug Unit or other professional staff for assistance has led the Department of Correctional Services to raise this issue with the Drug and Alcohol Services Council. The recent appointment of an Aboriginal staff member at a senior level within DASC will begin to address these problems and preliminary discussions have already been held between the two Departments.

Aboriginal Programs—Special needs budgets in the past two years have requested that institutional staff give special attention to the needs of Aboriginal prisoners in the development of prisoner programs. The appointment of an Ab-

original Liaison Officer (Programs) in the near future should further assist in this process and enable the needs of Aboriginal prisoners to be more clearly identified.

Examples of recent program initiatives developed at institutions include the establishment of an Aboriginal Unit at Cadell Training Centre. Aboriginal prisoners at Cadell have initially concentrated on silk screen printing assisted by a TAFE lecturer and have recently produced a poster that is now being used to publicise the risk of AIDS in prisons.

Another example of institutional staff and Aboriginal prisoners identifying needs has been at Port Augusta Gaol where prisoners have been successful in obtaining a grant of \$8 000 from the Aboriginal Arts Board to provide materials for Aboriginal prisoners wanting to develop their skills in art and crafts and to express their culture creatively.

Home Detention—The low number of Aboriginal prisoners who have at this stage participated in this program has been identified. An Aboriginal correctional officer, employed under Commonwealth funding at Port Augusta, is currently researching the reasons for this so that problems can be addressed.

Port Augusta Gaol—The high numbers of Aboriginal prisoners held at Port Augusta Gaol, together with the language and cultural problems experienced particularly by traditional Aboriginal prisoners, has led to a focus on programs for Aboriginal prisoners at this institution. An Aboriginal correctional officer has, under Commonwealth funding, been released to enable problems to be more clearly identified and appropriate programs developed.

Education—The Review of Prisoner Education and the Priorities for Program Initiatives—1988, both identified concerns about Aboriginal education. The appointment of an education officer to coordinate the provision of services by TAFE on behalf of the Department of Correctional Services should assist in addressing this area, which has already been a focus of concern in interdepartmental discussions.

Community Liaison—Currently negotiations are under way with the Aboriginal community in Port Augusta regarding the appointment of Aboriginal visiting inspectors, an Aboriginal Visiting Tribunal, and community based prison visitors.

REAL ESTATE ASSETS

94. **Mr BECKER (Hanson)**, on notice, asked the Minister of Housing and Construction: What were the findings of the comprehensive examination of real estate assets, which were found to be under-utilised or surplus, and how will the surplus assets be disposed of, when and at what estimated value (Program Estimates and Information, page 316)?

The Hon. T.H. HEMMINGS: The first phase of Sacon's property audit has been completed. This phase involved a sample audit of properties held in the name of the Minister of Public Works and associated titles located in several metropolitan and country areas. Initial results indicated that some 30 assets valued in the order of \$9 million were potentially under-utilised or inappropriately used.

It is of particular importance that the current use of several strategically placed improved properties does not maximise these sites in terms of current zoning criteria. In consultation with the relevant agencies, relocation initiatives have already been taken in several instances with the view to exploiting these particular assets to their maximum potential.

Properties which possess no immediate identifiable physical or financial benefits to Government are being disposed of under normal arrangements with the Department of Lands. Critical assets which may be of long term benefit to the State will be retained and put to contemporary uses which reflect returns based on current market values in accordance with current zoning potential.

DEVELOPMENT SERVICES

97. **Mr BECKER (Hanson)**, on notice, asked the Minister of Housing and Construction: How did the Department of Housing and Construction improve its organisational effectiveness in relation to the function of development services (Program Estimates and Information, page 317)?

The Hon. T.H. HEMMINGS: The Department of Housing and Construction has been able to improve its organisational effectiveness in the Professional Services Division by the introduction of computer-aided terminals and drafting training using personal computers to assist with the development of project design; and the Fees and Resources Management System (FARMS), which will provide an improved cost monitoring system.

HERITAGE RESTORATION

98. **Mr BECKER (Hanson)**, on notice, asked the Minister of Housing and Construction: How many staff and daily paid workers are involved in specialised heritage restoration and what work has been obtained to keep this work force fully employed so their skills will not be lost (Program Estimates and Information, page 320)?

The Hon. T.H. HEMMINGS: Sacon has established a heritage unit within its architectural office to work on research documentation and supervise historic building conservation. Staffing of this unit comprises one Senior Architect (Heritage) and three technical officers. Currently, 14 personnel from Sacon's Construction Branch are engaged on this type of work. Additional resources are drawn from the Construction Branch as and when required. While an approved program of work will provide gainful employment in 1990, other projects are under investigation to ensure an ongoing commitment.

CROUZET

99. **Mr BECKER (Hanson)**, on notice, asked the Minister of Transport:

1. Is the Minister aware that two employees were dismissed by STA for defrauding the Crouzet ticketing system and were subsequently reinstated following union representation and, if so, did the Minister approve either action and, if so, why?

2. How many staff have been detected defrauding the Crouzet system and what action has been taken in each case?

The Hon. G.F. KENEALLY: The replies are as follows:

1. Two employees were dismissed for allegedly defrauding the State Transport Authority—the dismissals involved ticketing.

2. Both employees appealed against their dismissal, as is their right. They also had union representation, as is their right.

3. They were both reinstated.

4. The Minister of Transport was not consulted.

5. No staff have been detected defrauding the Crouzet system.

SACON

100. **Mr BECKER (Hanson)**, on notice, asked the Minister of Housing and Construction:

1. When tendering for contracts, does the Department of Housing and Construction (Sacon) include all on-going costs normally paid for by private enterprise companies?

2. Did the department add on such costs when tendering for the Office of Government Employees Housing maintenance contract worth \$3 million per annum over the next two years and, if so, what percentages were used by Sacon to cover such costs as payroll tax, sales tax, and income tax?

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

1. Operating expenses and overheads are reflected in Sacon's labour charge-out rate on projects. These include payroll tax, leave on-costs, superannuation contributions, workers compensation premiums, motor vehicle running costs, plant depreciation, and a substantial proportion of administrative overheads.

2. Sacon did not tender for the maintenance contract for Government Employee Housing as such. A package was put together by Sacon's Maintenance and Construction Division offering a range of services to the Office of Government Employee Housing on property inspection and management services. The package did not necessarily allow for Sacon to undertake the work using its own resources. Instead, Sacon would determine the most appropriate means of undertaking the work either by utilising its own resources or those of private contractors. Where work is undertaken using its own work force then the operating costs as outlined above would apply.

GOVERNMENT VEHICLES

103. **Mr BECKER (Hanson)**, on notice, asked the Minister of Transport:

1. To which Government department does the white Toyota Corolla, UQP 349 belong?

2. Was the driver on Government business when the car was parked at the Recreation Centre, Candys Road, O'Halloran Hill at 8.00 p.m. on Monday 26 September?

The Hon. G.F. KENEALLY: The replies are as follows:

1. Highways Department.

2. The officer concerned is subject to work out of hours call out to attend to emergencies and is therefore authorised to garage the vehicle at his private residence. He was not on Government business when the vehicle was parked at the O'Halloran Hill Recreation Centre on 26 September 1988, and use of the vehicle at that time was a breach of departmental instructions. The officer has been disciplined as a result of the incident.

SOUTH AUSTRALIAN HOUSING TRUST

109. **Mr BECKER (Hanson)**, on notice, asked the Minister of Housing and Construction: What action is being taken by the South Australian Housing Trust to assist people previously living in institutions?

The Hon. T.H. HEMMINGS: People formerly confined to institutions are assisted in a number of ways by the trust. These people can, of course, apply for trust wait/turn rental

housing. However, recognising that many have particular needs the trust operates various priority procedures for those in the most urgent and desperate need of housing. In this aspect of its work, the trust works closely with Government and non-government welfare agencies which can refer individual clients to the trust for consideration. Officers of the Department for Community Welfare, South Australian Health Commission, Department of Social Security and a range of community-based organisations are major users of the priority referral scheme.

The trust also operates the Community Tenancy Scheme, under which it leases accommodation to Government and non-government organisations providing short to medium-term accommodation services to special needs groups, including those with various forms of disability. Examples of organisations assisted under this program include Hillcrest and Glenside Hospitals, Intellectually Disabled Services Council, Minda, Crippled Children's Association, Orana and so on. Assistance is also provided to Offenders Aid and Rehabilitation Services, which assists ex-prisoners and their families.

The trust also assists several housing associations which provide long-term housing for people with disabilities. These associations operate under the Cooperative Housing Program and receive subsidies from the trust to help them meet mortgage repayments on properties purchased or constructed for their members. Bedford Industries Housing Association (intellectually disabled), J.H. Angas Housing Association (deaf people), and PARQUA Housing Association (physically disabled) are three such organisations.

WORK SCHEDULES

113. **Mr BECKER (Hanson)**, on notice, asked the Minister of Housing and Construction: Which client departments have complained that their work schedules were not receiving high priority and what were the reasons in each case (Program Estimates and Information, page 317)?

The Hon. T.H. HEMMINGS: The development and prioritisation of work schedules (or programs) is the result of a consultative process between the client departments, Sacon, the Capital Works Budget Committee and Treasury. The final works program for each financial year is approved in Cabinet.

GOVERNMENT BUILDINGS

114. **Mr BECKER (Hanson)**, on notice, asked the Minister of Housing and Construction: What reduction in proposed works for other agencies is envisaged to allow increased work on Government buildings such as the Festival Centre Plaza and the Aboriginal Heritage and Resource Centre (Program Estimates and Information, page 317)?

The Hon. T.H. HEMMINGS: No specific projects are being delayed or rejected to accommodate the two works referred to in the question. As explained in my answer to Question on Notice No. 113 the overall priority of works is determined through a consultative approach. Once these priorities have been established the work is implemented within budgetary constraints.

GILLMAN LAND

117. **Mr BECKER (Hanson)**, on notice, asked the Premier:

1. What plans does the Government have for the land recently acquired from the Federal Government for approximately \$7 million at Gillman?

2. Will any development include provision for Motocross and Speedway and, if not, why not?

3. What drainage works are envisaged for the area?

The Hon. J.C. BANNON: The replies are as follows:

1. The Government has agreed to the Adelaide City Council acquiring joint ownership of the Dean Rifle Range land recently acquired from the Federal Government.

Studies have been commissioned to establish the development options for the whole of the Gillman area including the Dean Rifle Range land. No specific plans will be formulated until investigations of the area have been completed.

2. Provision for Motocross and Speedway will depend on plans which emerge for the Gillman area. Discussions have been held with representatives of the Motorcycle Association and other sporting groups.

3. One of the key parameters in the studies currently in progress is the need to manage storm water run off, which is the responsibility of the Torrens Road Drainage Authority. Close consultation is being carried out with the Torrens Road Drainage Authority.

ACCESS CABS

118. **Mr BECKER (Hanson)**, on notice, asked the Minister of Transport:

1. Has Access Cab Licence No. UQL 261 been designated for the exclusive use of the Premier's Disability Adviser and, if so, why?

2. When will additional cabs be made available?

3. Is Access Cabs unable to accept up to 30 people a day because of the shortage of suitable vehicles and, if so, what action is being taken?

The Hon. G.F. KENEALLY: The replies are as follows:

1. Licence No. UQL 261 is a normal South Australian Government motor vehicle registration issue number. Neither this registration number nor the stretched Falcon itself has anything to do with Access Cabs.

The stretched Falcon UQL 261 is leased from the Transport Services Branch, Department of Services and Supply on a long-term hire agreement and is used by the Disability Adviser to the Premier on official business. This vehicle replaces the Toyota van purchased in 1984 which had travelled some 80 000 kilometres.

The vehicle was used, however, as a trial vehicle for the fitting of improved ramp and floor systems developed in South Australia to improve wheelchair loading for the additional Access Cabs vehicles.

2. An additional 10 special vehicles for Access Cabs are currently being fitted with radios and other equipment by non-government contractors. Unexpected delays on the part of these contractors have held up delivery. Access Cabs has been given a delivery date of 2 November 1988.

3. The Access Cabs Scheme has been an outstanding success. It is true that up to 30 demand calls per day are being refused for the use of the special vehicle component of the scheme. It has been assessed that the additional 10 vehicles will reduce delays for special vehicles to a par with normal taxi practices.

ISLAND SEAWAY

119. **Mr BECKER (Hanson)**, on notice, asked the Minister of Transport: Does the *Island Seaway* carry life boats

or life rafts and, if so, what types and what is the carrying capacity of each?

The Hon. G.F. KENEALLY: Safety equipment carried on the *M V Island Seaway* complies with shipping code requirements. The vessel currently carries 1 × 4.9 m rescue boat and 5 × 25 person life rafts, with the latter in the process of being replaced by 6 × 20 person life rafts able to be launched from davits.

DEPARTMENT OF MARINE AND HARBORS VESSELS

121. **Mr BECKER (Hanson)**, on notice, asked the Minister of Marine: Are pilot boats and mooring launches owned by the Department of Marine and Harbors registered and, if so, do they carry registration identification numbers and, if not, why not?

The Hon. R.J. GREGORY: It is assumed that the reference to registration means registration pursuant to the provisions of the Boating Act. If so then the answer is no, these vessels are not required to be registered under that Act. However, pilot vessels and mooring launches comply with the provisions of the Marine Act and are subject to the survey requirements of that Act. There is no requirement for these and similar commercial trading vessels to exhibit numbers but they are required to have the vessel's name displayed.

JAPAN-ADELAIDE FLIGHTS

122. **Mr BECKER (Hanson)**, on notice, asked the Minister of Transport, representing the Minister of Tourism:

1. What action is the Government taking to arrange direct flights to Adelaide from Japan?

2. Has the Government had discussions with the Federal Minister for Aviation and Qantas demanding approval for such flights be granted forthwith and, if not, why not?

The Hon. G.F. KENEALLY: The reply is as follows:

Both the Premier and the Minister of Tourism have held discussions with Japan Airlines and All Nippon Airlines in Tokyo seeking commitment of those airlines to provide direct flights into Adelaide. Similar discussions have been held, and are continuing, with the Chief Executive Officer of Qantas and the Federal Minister of Transport and Communications.

HEART OPERATIONS

124. **Mr BECKER (Hanson)**, on notice, asked the Minister of Health: How many heart bypass operations were carried out at the Royal Adelaide Hospital in the year ended 30 June 1988 on male and female patients, respectively; what is the reason for the statistical difference, if any, and how do the figures compare with those of the previous year?

The Hon. F.T. BLEVINS: The Cardio-Thoracic Surgical Unit maintains statistics on a calendar year basis. In 1987, 1 094 coronary artery vein grafts were performed, 18 per cent of which were on female patients. In 1986, 1 014 coronary artery vein graft procedures were performed, of which females again accounted for 18 per cent. More men than women require this procedure because of the higher incidence of coronary artery disease amongst males.

HEALTH COMMISSION

125. **Mr BECKER (Hanson)**, on notice, asked the Minister of Health:

1. What research has the South Australian Health Commission undertaken into the effects of video display terminals, particularly in relation to—

- (a) eye damage;
- (b) eye irritation;
- (c) fatigue;
- (d) headaches;
- (e) radiation;
- (f) miscarriage of pregnancy;
- (g) birth defects;
- (h) stiff necks and crippling hand and wrist pain, and if none, why not?

2. Has consideration been given to recommending to the Department of Labour that employers subsidise annual eye examinations and spectacles or contact lenses if needed for VDT workers and, if not, why not?

The Hon. F.T. BLEVINS: The replies are as follows:

1. Through its Occupational Health and Radiation Control Branch the South Australian Health Commission is involved in research on occupational health issues. A number of other Government organisations and bodies such as the National Health and Medical Research Council, the Australian Radiation Laboratory of the Commonwealth Department of Community Services and Health, and South Australian Council on Technological Change have performed detailed research in the occupational health field. The South Australian Health Commission does not consider there is any need to duplicate the research performed by these institutions. Moreover, it is active in the utilisation and dissemination of this information including preventative measures that can be taken in the workplace to eliminate or reduce health hazards.

In relation to video display terminals work has been done in both research and provision of information on occupational health hazards, in particular:

- (a) Eye Damage; and
- (b) Eye Irritation. The National Health and Medical Research Council states that 'there is no scientifically acceptable evidence that the use of VDUs damages the eyes or eyesight or imposes any risk from radiation';
- (c) Fatigue;
- (d) Headaches; and
- (e) Radiation. The Australian Radiation Laboratory of the Commonwealth Department of Community Services and Health has made measurements of the emission of ultraviolet, visible and microwave/radio frequency radiation from a number of VDTs and states, 'Emission of non-ionising electromagnetic radiation by VDTs poses no threat to the health of operators';
- (f) Miscarriage of pregnancy; and
- (g) Birth defects. Research on adverse birth outcomes published in *Community Health Studies* 1982 by South Australian Health Commission 'A Survey of the Health Consequences to Females of Operating Visual Display Units'. Results of the case-control analysis provided little evidence that the operation of VDUs during pregnancy is associated with an increased risk of spontaneous abortion.
- (h) Stiff necks and crippling hand and wrist pain. A report on the program of prevention of overuse injury among keyboard workers in the South Aus-

tralian Public Service was published in December 1986. This survey addressed the areas of fatigue, headaches, posture and overuse injury.

2. The South Australian Health Commission has not considered recommending to the Department of Labour that employers subsidise annual eye examinations and spectacles or contact lenses for VDU workers. In line with the South Australian Council on Technological Change, the South Australian Health Commission considers that most visual problems can be eliminated by good ergonomic design of the work station and its environment, by selecting a well designed VDU and by appropriate training.

It is therefore considered appropriate to promote preventative strategies to eliminate or reduce the problem. The National Health and Medical Research Council states that 'there is no scientifically acceptable evidence that the use of VDUs damages the eyes or eyesight or imposes any risk from radiation'.

LAKE EYRE SPEED RECORDS

128. Mr BECKER (Hanson), on notice, asked the Minister of Recreation and Sport: Has the Government been approached by Mr Glen Davis of Mister Blue Engineering or representatives of the Down Under Timing Association, or any other motoring body or agency to conduct land speed records at Lake Eyre; particularly in an attempt vehicle 12 metres in length, 1 metre high with a tailfin of 2.2 m which will have two Rolls Royce Merlin Meteor MKIV engines, each being a 27 litre V12 with twin turbos and, if so, what discussions and negotiations have taken place to date? If not, will the Government support an application for an attempt to break the world wheel-driven land speed record, and has Lake Eyre been evaluated to determine if it is a suitable location, providing a course not less than 25 miles in length?

The Hon. M.K. MAYES: I am not aware of an approach to the Government from Mr Glen Davis of Mister Blue Engineering or representatives of the Down Under Timing Association, or any other motoring body or agency to conduct land speed records at Lake Eyre; particularly in an attempt vehicle 12 metres in length, 1 metre high with a tailfin of 2.2 metres which will have two Rolls Royce Merlin Meteor MKIV engines, each being a 27 litre V12 with twin turbos; and Lake Eyre has not been evaluated to determine if it is a suitable location providing a course not less than 25 miles in length. However, this Government will be pleased to consider such request.

CORRECTIONAL SERVICES EMPLOYEES

129. Mr BECKER (Hanson), on notice, asked the Minister of Correctional Services: Does the Department of Correctional Services support employees going to Sydney to compete in the bicentennial event Law Enforcement Olympics, to be held in the second week of October 1988 and, if not, why not and, if so, what level of support will be offered?

The Hon. F.T. BLEVINS: The Department of Correctional Services has supported in principle the participation of its employees in the Bicentennial Law Enforcement Olympics during October. Several team sports and numerous individuals entered in the competition. The department offered the following assistance:

1. support in the establishment of the Correctional Officers Pistol Club. This club has sent participants;

2. purchase of a flag and banner for the Opening Ceremony of the games;

3. supply of public relations assistance in the form of badges, etc., for sports uniforms, and coverage through the internal communication media used within the department. It is not possible to offer special leave for international sporting events to officers as this event was not being organised by a recognised national or State sporting association. Further, it was not accessible to the general public, and as such this leave was precluded on this ground as well.

LOCAL GOVERNMENT REMISSIONS

133. Mr M.J. EVANS (Elizabeth), on notice, asked the Minister of Water Resources: In respect to how many dwellings owned by aged persons was a full or part local government rate rebate paid in the past financial year and what is the estimated cost of this rebate for 1988-89?

The Hon. D.J. HOPGOOD: Separate figures on aged remission recipients are not available, however local government remissions were paid to 79 600 pensioners during the past financial year. The majority of these remission recipients are aged persons. The budget provided in respect of local government remissions for the 1988-89 financial year is \$12 811 000.

STATE AQUATIC CENTRE

136. Mr M.J. EVANS (Elizabeth), on notice, asked the Minister of Recreation and Sport:

1. What payment has been made in respect to the operating deficit of the State Aquatic Centre in respect of each previous year for which a contribution has been made and to what actual operating deficit did this payment relate in each case?

2. What amount has been set aside for the 1988-89 year and what is the corresponding estimated total operating deficit of the centre for this year?

3. If any payment is in excess of that anticipated in the Estimates Committee hearing held on 2 October 1985 (*Hansard*, page 367) by the then Minister who stated that the Government did not expect to have make any payment to the council as it did not expect the deficit to exceed \$100 000, what are the circumstances which have resulted in such payment now becoming necessary?

The Hon. M.K. MAYES: The replies are as follows:

1. 1985-86—\$78 943.

1986-87—still subject to negotiation with the Adelaide City Council under the terms of the agreement.

1987-88—have not received notification from the Adelaide City Council on the operating deficit for the 1987-88 financial year.

2. \$175 000.

3. 1985-86 deficit payment by the South Australian Government of \$78 943 was necessary due to the following:

Staff commenced work at centre before opening in mid-October;

Manager commenced work at centre before opening in mid-October;

Reduced income from kiosk because being refurbished, necessary maintenance work undertaken.

PROPERTY SALES

137. Mr GUNN (Eyre), on notice, asked the Minister of Agriculture: How many land or building sales were made

by the Department of Agriculture in the past financial year and what was the location of the property, sale price, name of the buyer and method of sale (that is, auction, advertised sale or private negotiation) in each case?

The Hon. M.K. MAYES: The Department of Agriculture disposed of only one property during 1987-88. This was a house on Flaxley Research Centre known as 'The Old Homestead'. It was purchased by its long-standing tenant, Mr R. Sidler for \$84 000 the current market value. Sale was arranged by the Lands Department and Mr Sidler was given the option to purchase as prescribed by section 9 of Premier and Cabinet Circular No. 114.

SICK LEAVE

138. **Mr GUNN (Eyre)**, on notice, asked the Minister of Agriculture: During the past financial year, what was the total amount of sick leave taken by Department of Agriculture employees, how many of those days were not covered by a medical certificate and how many days not covered by a certificate were taken on a Friday, Monday or the day immediately before or after a public holiday?

The Hon. M.K. MAYES: The replies are as follows:

1. Total amount of sick leave taken by Department of Agriculture employees, 1987-88:

Salaried Staff	Weekly Paid	Total
4 170	706	4 876

The number of staff at June 1988 was 864 salaried staff (859 FTE) and 322 weekly paid staff (187 FTE) with a total sick leave entitlement of 12 178 days for 1987-88. The average sick days per person per annum equals 4.11.

2. Sick days taken not covered by a medical certificate:

Salaried Staff	Weekly Paid	Total
2 314	223	2 537

3. Sick days not covered by a medical certificate taken on a Friday:

Salaried Staff	Weekly Paid	Total
404	45	449

4. Sick days not covered by a medical certificate taken on a Monday:

Salaried Staff	Weekly Paid	Total
517	42	559

5. Sick days not covered by a medical certificate taken immediately before a public holiday:

Salaried Staff	Weekly Paid	Total
17	6	23

6. Sick days not covered by a medical certificate taken immediately following a public holiday:

Salaried Staff	Weekly Paid	Total
46	1	47

GOVERNMENT VEHICLES

139. **Mr GUNN (Eyre)**, on notice, asked the Minister of Agriculture: How many cars permanently or regularly available to Department of Agriculture employees for travel between work and home have been or are to be fitted with private registration plates?

The Hon. M.K. MAYES: The Department of Agriculture has one car permanently available on long-term hire from the Government Car Pool which is fitted with private registration plates. This vehicle is allocated to the Chief Executive Officer. It is not proposed to extend this provision to other departmental vehicles.