

HOUSE OF ASSEMBLY

Tuesday 21 August 1990

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

**PETITION: PHARMACEUTICAL BENEFITS
SCHEME**

A petition signed by 76 residents of South Australia praying that the House urge the Government to oppose changes to the pharmaceutical benefits scheme was presented by Mr Becker.

Petition received.

PETITION: OYSTER BAY MARINA

A petition signed by 167 residents of Stansbury praying that the House urge the Government to stop the proposed marina development at Oyster Bay was presented by Mr Ferguson.

Petition received.

QUESTIONS

The **SPEAKER**: I direct that written answers to the following questions on the Notice Paper, as detailed in the schedule that I now table, be distributed and printed in *Hansard*: Nos 11, 70, 72, 74, 83, 84, 91, 95, 100, 101, 112, 115, 117, 123, 125 to 128, 135 and 139; and I direct that the following answer to a question without notice be distributed and printed in *Hansard*.

**SOUTH AUSTRALIAN SUPERANNUATION FUND
INVESTMENT TRUST**

In reply to **Mr D.S. BAKER (Leader of the Opposition)** 16 August.

The **Hon. J.C. BANNON**: The South Australian Superannuation Fund Investment Trust has invested \$10 million in Quintex convertible notes on behalf of the State Superannuation Fund (\$9 million) and Police Pensions Fund (\$1 million). That investment is unlikely to be recovered and, accordingly, SASFIT will be marking down the market value of the investment in its accounts for 1989-90 to zero. Problems with Quintex were totally unforeseen and SASFIT shares this unfortunate investment with AMP, Queensland Treasury Corporation and other prominent institutional investors.

The reason that the last SASFIT annual report records a \$2.5 million convertible note holding rather than \$4.5 million more recently recorded in the Quintex share register is that on 30 June 1990 that was SASFIT's holding. The further acquisition since that date was acquired as the result of a put option exercisable against SASFIT after that date. The put option was granted by SASFIT at the time it sold a portion of its Quintex notes prior to 30 June 1989.

It should be noted that SASFIT's equity exposure is proportionately less than other superannuation fund managers. Its equity portfolio provides an appropriate balance to investments it has in CPI-linked investments in secure Government or quasi-Government investments. Such CPI-linked investments provide a guaranteed real rate of return over a

long period to SASFIT and form the bulk of SASFIT's investment portfolio.

PAPERS TABLED

The following papers were laid on the table:

By the Minister of Education (Hon. G.J. Crafter)—
Children's Court Advisory Committee—Report, 1988-89.

By the Minister of Transport (Hon. Frank Blevins)—
Highways Department—Approvals to Lease Departmental Property, 1989-90.

By the Minister of Water Resources (Hon. S.M. Lenehan)—
Waterworks Act 1932—Regulations—Mount Lofty Ranges Watershed.

By the Minister of Employment and Further Education (Hon. M.D. Rann)—
Tertiary Education Act 1986—Regulation—Course Accreditation.

QUESTION TIME

KABANI PROPRIETARY LIMITED

Mr D.S. BAKER (Leader of the Opposition): My question is directed to the Treasurer. For what purpose was the company Kabani Proprietary Limited, whose directors include David Simmons, Timothy Marcus Clark and John Baker, created under trust arrangements on behalf of the State Bank group? What is the extent of Kabani's loans and borrowings, and why is there no mention of such a major subsidiary in the annual reports of the State Bank and Beneficial Finance?

The **Hon. J.C. BANNON**: I thank the honourable Leader for his question. I will certainly obtain that information for him and provide it.

COMMUNICATIONS TOWER

Mr De LAINE (Price): I ask the Minister for Environment and Planning what action has been taken to stop the construction of the communications tower in the hills face zone which has not been approved by the East Torrens council?

The **Hon. S.M. LENEHAN**: Last Friday, my office received a number of reports, including one from the member for Kavel, that further work was being carried out on the construction of the tower to which the honourable member refers. This was in spite of the East Torrens council's obtaining an interim court order the previous day to prevent further work. As I advised the House last week, the South Australian Planning Commission had also moved to obtain a court order but it was decided that, in view of the fact that the council had already done so, the Planning Commission would make application to join that action.

This application is scheduled to be considered on 31 August 1990. However, in view of work continuing last Friday, it was agreed that my department would support the council's legal action against Mr Venning, and I understand that the matter was listed to be heard today in court at 2 o'clock.

FIRST RADIO 5DN

Mr S.J. BAKER (Deputy Leader of the Opposition): Has SGIC provided the finance for First Radio 5DN's move to the FM band and, if so, how much has been provided and what is the estimated return for SGIC's shareholders, the people of South Australia?

The Hon. J.C. BANNON: Again, that is a detailed question requiring specific financial information, and I will obtain that for the honourable member.

SANTOS SHAREHOLDING

Mr FERGUSON (Henley Beach): Will the Minister of Mines and Energy inform the House whether there is any likelihood that the South Australian Government will abolish the 15 per cent maximum limit on shareholdings in Santos? On Thursday 16 August, the *Financial Review* stated that there had been recurring changes at the top of the share register of Santos over the past decade. The article claimed that many of the shareholders had assumed their position in speculation that the South Australian Government would abolish the 15 per cent maximum holding limit.

The Hon. J.H.C. KLUNDER: I thank the honourable member for his question which, of course, can be answered by a very simple 'No'. The *Financial Review* may or may not be accurate in indicating that some companies have made their investments in Santos in the belief that the Government intended abolishing the Act. What is difficult to understand is why they should have come to such conclusions.

Over a number of years the office of the Minister of Mines and Energy (with both myself and my predecessor) has had approaches—usually from interstate—indicating that there is a rumour around the place to this extent and asking whether we would confirm or deny it. We have always denied it. It has always come back again and we have always again denied it. I would have thought that the speculation might have ceased at the end of last year when this Parliament approved amendments to the Santos Regulation of Shareholding Act, which updated and tightened some of the provisions.

BROADCASTING ACT

Mr INGERSON (Bragg): Does the Treasurer believe that Commonwealth media ownership laws should be followed by State Government instrumentalities and, if so, why has SGIC been in breach of the Broadcasting Act for more than 12 months with respect to radio stations 5DN and SAFM, and what does he propose to do about it?

The Hon. J.C. BANNON: I am not aware that SGIC is in breach of the Broadcasting Act as the member alleges. If that is so, no doubt the appropriate and responsible authorities would be taking up that situation and the circumstances of it. I suggest that, if breaches have either wittingly or unwittingly been committed, there are ways and means of redressing that. No doubt the tribunal, if indeed it has an interest in this area, would be saying so.

URBAN CONSOLIDATION

Mr HAMILTON (Albert Park): I direct my question to the Minister for Environment and Planning. What progress has been made since the Government's urban consolidation

policy was introduced in 1987? I am aware that the urban consolidation policy has impacted upon my electorate, but I would be most interested to hear of the impact that it has had throughout South Australia.

The Hon. S.M. LENEHAN: I thank the honourable member for his question and for his ongoing interest in the Government's policy on urban consolidation. Following the amendments to the metropolitan development plan in January 1989, nearly all metropolitan councils in Adelaide have been actively involved in a review of their residential standards. These reviews are currently being assured by a subsidy, which arose out of the 1989 special Premiers Conference held in Canberra. So far in South Australia six councils are being subsidised in this way and, as I understand it, further councils will be involved over the next two years.

A green street executive officer is currently employed in South Australia, through Commonwealth funding, to promote better housing and subdivision design. A medium-density housing exposition is planned for March 1991 in the Hindmarsh area to promote housing and streetscape design to the community. This is part of an Australia-wide program to provide affordable, medium-density housing. While I fully recognise and appreciate that some concern has been expressed about changes in specific council areas, I would like to assure members that, as these councils undertake a review of their residential standards, residents will have ample opportunity to comment on the local planning procedures. A couple of areas where we are moving forward with future development in terms of urban consolidation are Northfield and, as my colleagues on this side of the House would know, the inner-western suburbs.

FESTIVAL CITY BROADCASTERS LIMITED

Mr BECKER (Hanson): I direct my question to the Premier. What was the accumulated loss to 30 June 1990 of Festival City Broadcasters Limited?

The Hon. J.C. BANNON: Festival City Broadcasters Limited is not a company over which this Government has jurisdiction. I would suggest that the honourable member's question would be better directed to that company. If in fact—

Members interjecting:

The Hon. J.C. BANNON: Yes, but it is required to produce its reports and accounts in the normal way. No doubt it will do that as soon as those accounts are finalised. I suggest that, if the honourable member wants some information up front or some special knowledge of what that result might be, he could begin by approaching the company directly.

UNIVERSITY FUNDING

Mr HOLLOWAY (Mitchell): Will the Minister of Employment and Further Education inform the House whether South Australian universities will be disadvantaged in the distribution of Commonwealth funds this year? In a recent article in the *Australian*, Professor Alan Mead, Director of the South Australian Institute of Technology, expressed concerns that the funding model proposed by the Commonwealth will not give new universities the opportunity to develop teaching and research activities in competition with the older established universities.

The Hon. M.D. RANN: I thank the honourable member for his continued interest in higher education matters. I am certainly aware of the concerns of the tertiary institutions

and I share some of those concerns. I will seek to ensure that South Australian tertiary institutions will not be treated unfairly in higher education funding. In terms of capital funding, the Federal Minister, John Dawkins, made an unconditional promise that the State would receive \$37.5 million in a funding package for capital works between 1991 and 1993. Of course, that includes \$25 million for the new university. Certainly, I have not heard anything to the contrary, and I am sure that the Commonwealth would not renege on such a vital matter.

However, I am dismayed at reports that South Australia will receive an unfairly low proportion of new places in higher education under some current proposals. We have seen in South Australia in the past two years higher retention rates at year 12 and greater numbers entering universities and colleges of advanced education. We cannot accept a situation in which South Australia is provided with a proportion of new places, which is around half our population share, especially when our unmet demand—that is, students unable to find places—has been shown to be at least as high as the national average.

Following claims by our tertiary institutions, I will seek assurances from Mr Dawkins that the proposed 'relative funding model' will not disadvantage any institution, particularly the establishment of the new University of South Australia. This university will be offering courses which are critical to South Australia's future, and that was recognised by Mr Dawkins in statements earlier this year. In addition, the proposed funding model may not recognise adequately the considerable differences that presently exist among institutions in the extent to which they take in students from disadvantaged backgrounds. A fair and just funding model will ensure that historical inequities in funding are addressed in both teaching and research areas.

Following recent articles in newspapers, I give an assurance to the new university that, if necessary, I am prepared to take up the cudgels with the Commonwealth to ensure that South Australia's tertiary institutions are resourced adequately.

BLOOD ALCOHOL LIMIT

Mr GUNN (Eyre): My question is to the Minister of Transport. Does the Government still intend to move to reduce the driver blood alcohol limit to .05 and, if so, when will the necessary legislation be introduced?

The Hon. FRANK BLEVINS: I thank the member for Eyre for his question. The Government's position is a very public one. We have made no secret of our position and we are pleased to go through it again.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order!

The Hon. FRANK BLEVINS: I shall be very pleased to go through it again for the benefit of the member for Eyre, who has perhaps missed all the publicity and the numerous interviews that I have done.

Last year the Prime Minister announced a road safety package which consisted of about 10 proposals, including the proposal that all States will go to a .05 blood alcohol content from .08 in Western Australia, the Northern Territory and the ACT. The other States were already on .05. This Government immediately expressed its reservations about that on the basis that we in this State had always considered that .08 was an appropriate level. It combined the necessary road safety requirements but did not unduly inhibit the responsible drinker in enjoying a lifestyle which most of us would applaud.

The arguments that have consistently been put by this Government to the Federal Government have fallen on deaf ears. One of the reasons is that all the other States and the Territories have agreed to the .05 limit. Some of the other States—the eastern States—have had a .05 limit for many years. I think that has been the case in Victoria from 1966, so it is a long-standing provision in Australia.

The argument for a .05 limit is that the least amount of alcohol in the blood when driving, the better and the safer one will be. The experts can argue, and we have one particular group of experts in South Australia who argue for .08. I think they are probably the last in Australia. All the other experts say that they are trying to defend a position that they adopted many years ago and will not see reason.

Members interjecting:

The Hon. FRANK BLEVINS: I would not know. All I can say is that the commonsense approach—that the least amount of alcohol one has in one's blood when driving, the better—is all that is required.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order!

The Hon. FRANK BLEVINS: Just hang on. We have consistently approached the Federal Government, but it will not listen. It has said, 'If you adopt our 10-point package, we will give you an appropriate share of \$110 million to tidy up some black spots.' A very careful assessment has been made that, for every \$500 000 that we spend on cleaning up black spots, we save a life. It is quite a scientific result, so I am told, and I have no reason to disbelieve that. I believe, and I know that some members opposite (perhaps not the member for Eyre) agree, that the level of .05 is inevitable. Indeed, some members opposite, as do some members on this side, believe it is desirable that the change be brought in as soon as possible.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order!

The Hon. FRANK BLEVINS: I am surprised at the member for Adelaide, who is laughing, because in a previous life he was a doctor, and if any legislation on .05 came before this Parliament in the near future I would have expected that honourable member to vote for it. If the member for Adelaide has any consideration—

The SPEAKER: Order! The Minister is not answering the question; he is digressing, and I request that he answer the question.

The Hon. FRANK BLEVINS: I apologise, Mr Speaker, but I was distracted by the member for Adelaide, who was one member I had in my corner, as a responsible medical practitioner.

The SPEAKER: Order! The Minister is digressing.

The Hon. FRANK BLEVINS: Nevertheless, we will see. The issue is still under discussion within the Government and between the South Australian Government and the Federal Government. I know that as soon as a decision is arrived at the whole of South Australia will be informed, but I say this and make a prediction of which I am very confident: South Australia will not forever more be the only State in Australia providing for a limit of .08. At some stage .05 will apply in South Australia, the same as it applies in every other State and Territory. South Australia's position of saying that it is the only State in the right and that every other State and Territory is wrong is unsustainable. The only real question is whether we go to .05 and take the money or whether we go to .05, later, without the money.

INGLE FARM EDUCATION SERVICES

Mr QUIRKE (Playford): Will the Minister of Education assure the House that educational services in the Ingle Farm area will not be reduced but will be increased because of the rationalisation program? The Education Department has announced, following a lengthy period of community consultation, that three Ingle Farm primary schools will be amalgamated on the Ingle Farm High School site and that Ingle Farm High School will amalgamate with Para Vista High School on the Para Vista site. Many constituents have approached my office seeking information and assurances about educational opportunities as a result of these proposed changes.

The Hon. G.J. CRAFTER: I thank the honourable member for his question, and I am pleased to give him the assurance that he seeks. I want to put on record my appreciation of the many people involved over a long period in arriving at the decision announced today by the Education Department. The restructuring of the schools involves the amalgamation of Ingle Farm High School and Para Vista High School to form a new high school on the Para Vista High site, and the amalgamation of Ingle Farm Primary, Ingle Farm Central Primary and Ingle Heights Primary Schools to form a Child Parent Centre to year 7 primary school and located on the vacated Ingle Farm High School site. Students at the CPC to year 7 primary school at Ingle Farm will have access to outstanding facilities, including resource centre, gymnasium, drama and music facilities. Students at the amalgamated high school will have access to highly skilled specialists who will also be relocated to that school site. They will also have access to a wider range of school subjects and courses. Upgrading of the amalgamated high school will include improved facilities for physically disabled students. Construction of a multi-purpose hall at the Para Vista Primary and Junior Primary Schools will also provide students with more opportunities for physical education, indoor sports and recreational pursuits.

This restructuring was necessitated by a prolonged enrolment downturn in the suburbs that serve these schools due to demographic reasons over the past decade. Primary schools have experienced a downturn of over 2 000 enrolments, and the two high schools have fallen by over 600 enrolments. An independent study commissioned by the Education Department shows that the high schools are projected to experience a further downturn of some 400 secondary enrolments by 1995.

The amalgamated high school, with a projected long-term enrolment of 700 to 800 students, will be able to provide a wider range of subjects in a face-to-face teaching environment than the two smaller high schools would have been able to provide. Students at the amalgamated CPC to year 7 primary school will have access to outstanding facilities and to learning in a unique and exciting environment.

The refurbishment of the Para Vista High School site includes an upgrading of technical studies, art, home economics, media studies, resource centre, science laboratories and general classroom, which includes improved access and facilities, as I have said, to the physically disabled. The refurbishment of the Ingle Farm High School site to the specifications of new primary school standards that will occupy a large part of the site will provide access to outstanding facilities, including: a resource centre, gymnasium, drama and music facilities and out-of-school hours facilities, which are now being seen as so important. So, although in the short term some personal difficulties will be experienced by students and families, in the long term these new facilities will serve that community very well.

BLOOD ALCOHOL LIMIT

The Hon. P.B. ARNOLD (Chaffey): Why is the Minister of Transport unable to tell the Parliament when the Government will legislate on the .05 blood alcohol level? Is it because he believes the majority of his Party Caucus is refusing to support the move?

The Hon. FRANK BLEVINS: I would have assumed that any reasonable person would acknowledge that I had answered that question fully when I was answering the question from the member for Eyre. However, that appears not to be the case.

Members interjecting:

The Hon. FRANK BLEVINS: What else can I do? I have to go through it again for the benefit of the member for Chaffey. The honourable member interjected on me last Thursday (although I forget what the question was about) to the effect, 'Don't—'

The SPEAKER: Order! The Minister is not answering the question.

The Hon. FRANK BLEVINS: I am, Sir. He asked, 'Don't you care about road safety?' This is the essence of the debate: road safety is the essence of the .05 debate. I retorted to the honourable member for Chaffey that—

The SPEAKER: Order! The Minister is not answering the question.

The Hon. FRANK BLEVINS: Yes, I am, Sir.

The SPEAKER: I hope you are not reflecting on the Chair.

The Hon. FRANK BLEVINS: No, I wouldn't do that, Sir.

The SPEAKER: I would ask the Minister to respond to the question.

The Hon. FRANK BLEVINS: The Prime Minister put up a road safety package towards the end of last year which included about 10 points, one of which was a reduction across Australia from .08 to .05 for those States that were not providing .05. At the same time, the Prime Minister announced a financial package—

Mr S.J. BAKER: On a point of order, Mr Speaker, the Standing Orders do cover repetition. He has told us the same thing three times.

The SPEAKER: I think the Minister has made a good point; repetition of questions also is in order here. However, the Minister is repeating what he stated a minute ago in a response. I would ask him to be precise in his answer and draw his comments to a close quickly.

The Hon. FRANK BLEVINS: I am happy as always to comply with your ruling, Mr Speaker, but it is very difficult not to be repetitious when the question is word for word the same as the member for Eyre's question. However, as I said in answer to the member for Eyre, the Government has publicised its position very well. It is having discussions with the Federal Government over this issue. We have attempted to persuade the Federal Government that the limit in this State should remain at .08, for reasons—

Mr S.J. BAKER: On a point of order, Mr Speaker, the Minister is repeating the answer to the previous question. The Minister was simply asked when he was going to have the numbers.

The SPEAKER: I ask the Minister very briefly to complete his comments or leave will be withdrawn.

The Hon. FRANK BLEVINS: I am trying to give a little background to the House, in an effort to prevent a third question being asked and in case any honourable member opposite did not hear the answer I gave to the member for Eyre. Negotiations are continuing between the South Australian Government and the Federal Government in an

attempt to see whether we can come to an agreement whereby, say, the two dozen lives that would be saved from the expenditure of the black spots money can still be saved whilst at the same time attempting to maintain the level of .08—which seems to excite members opposite greatly. I was interested to hear—

The SPEAKER: Order! I think the Minister has completed his response. Leave is withdrawn.

CHILD ABUSE

Mr De LAINE (Price): Will the Minister of Family and Community Services indicate the availability of staff to investigate allegations of child abuse and will he also indicate what philosophy underpins the role of the Department for Family and Community Services in the investigation of allegations of child abuse? Recent publicity has stated that in this very difficult area there are simply not enough workers to perform the necessary tasks. I ask the Minister to clarify the situation.

The Hon. D.J. HOPGOOD: It may well be that the honourable member has been partly prompted to ask this question by a statement that was made on behalf of the Public Service Association a little earlier in the week, attendant upon the fact that, of course, this is National Child Protection Week. This is a difficult and emotional area, but I am pleased to indicate that the reports of unallocated cases are greatly exaggerated. It is important to realise that an unallocated case does not mean that it is never dealt with. It means that these cases are dealt with in turn depending upon their priority, and the assignment of priority is a matter of professional judgment for the social worker, taking into account the circumstances in which the allegation has been made.

With respect to the second part of the honourable member's question, I can give a very brief rationale for the involvement of my department in the area of child protection. It is important that I do so because she who was once the spokesperson for the Liberal Party in this area used to accuse this Government of being child-centred in its approach to these matters. I would not have thought that being child-centred was anything to apologise for. Surely, the child must always be the basis of our concern.

The proposition which forms the basis of, if you like, our child-centred approach is that parental rights derive from parental duties and are conditional upon the performance of those duties. I believe that is of prime concern and something that we should repeat in what, after all, is National Child Protection Week. Certainly, the State has the responsibility to advocate and defend the right of the child to receive adequate care and protection and to promote a network of services which enhances and facilitates the capacity of parents to carry out these duties. Thirdly, where this parental duty is not performed or when parental care is, unfortunately, abusive to the child, the State must intervene on behalf of the child.

In summing up, we can say that, where parental obligations are not fulfilled, parental rights must, unfortunately, be forfeited. That is a strong statement, one for which I make no apology and one that we should keep in mind in what is, after all, a week designed to highlight a very important and critical area of concern in our community.

NORTH TERRACE DRY ZONE

Mr BRINDAL (Hayward): My question is directed to the Minister of Emergency Services. Will the Government con-

sider establishing a dry zone along the north side of North Terrace between King William Street and Frome Road? At lunchtime today, with the member for Fisher, I witnessed an assault outside the South Australian Museum. A youth was hit in the head and abdomen, a bottle was smashed over his head and he was left unconscious by his assailant.

On further investigation, we were informed by a number of museum attendants who were present and who had called the police that such incidents are very common in the area and are, in fact, a deterrent to the many families who visit the museum. We were told that they result from large amounts of alcohol being consumed in the vicinity of the museum, and also because of the frequent use of 'hypodermic syringes by young people in the area'.

The Hon. J.H.C. KLUNDER: I will take up this matter with my colleague, the Attorney-General, in another place and with the Commissioner of Police.

TRUSTEE INVESTMENTS

Mr FERGUSON (Henley Beach): I direct my question to the Minister of Education, representing the Attorney-General in another place. Will the Minister inform the House whether there is any intention of changing the State Government's approach to trustee investments? The *Business Review Weekly* of 13 July 1990 (page 27) made reference to a possible change in the approach of the South Australian Government to the list of trust investments. The suggestion was made that South Australia is considering changes to the same practice that is in vogue in New Zealand.

The Hon. G.J. CRAFTER: I can advise the honourable member and the House of the following information that has been provided to me by the Attorney-General.

Section 5 of the Trustee Act sets down requirements which companies must meet in order for securities issued by those companies to be authorised trustee investments. This is described as the list approach, because a list of securities which are authorised trustee investments can be compiled. In recognition of the shortcomings of this approach the Government considered that a review of section 5 was warranted. An inter-departmental committee of representatives of the Corporate Affairs Commission, Treasury and the Attorney-General's Department reviewed section 5 and considered various alternatives. The committee made recommendations for amendments to section 5 to reflect the greater sophistication and complexity of securities being issued in Australia's financial system.

After consideration of these recommendations, the Government caused a draft Bill to be circulated to all interested parties for comments. The draft Bill provides for the list approach in section 5 to be replaced with a prudent person approach. The prudent person approach reflects the common law obligations of trustees to be prudent in their investment of trust funds. The draft Bill contains provisions designed to give trustees guidance as to the sorts of matters they may give consideration to in making investments of trust funds. However, no attempt is made at prescribing or listing particular securities or classes of securities which may be regarded as authorised trustee investments. The Government will consider all comments received on the provisions contained in the draft Bill and determine whether it should proceed to introduce the draft Bill into this House.

MOTOR REGISTRATION DIVISION COMPUTER

Mr MATTHEW (Bright): My question is directed to the Minister of Transport. Has the error which caused the issue

of multiple registrations to more than 400 motorists been rectified, what extra hardware and software has been purchased to upgrade the Motor Registration Division computer, and what has been the cost of the swap-back with the Justice Information System computer?

I have been informed that 428 people were issued with up to five registration notices in this latest computer related bungle within the Motor Registration Division and that this problem was caused by the computer software.

The Registrar of Motor Vehicles, Mr Hutchinson, has been quoted as saying the division's computer has been upgraded at a cost of \$8 000 with the result that it is now the same size as the computer taken from the Justice Information System while the current bungles were investigated. I have been asked that, if this is the case, why has it been necessary to incur the additional cost of a swap-back between the Motor Registration Division and the JIS?

Further, I have been informed that the cost of buying and installing additional software has been substantial, while a contractor who has worked on attempting to rectify these problems has told me that, despite this additional expenditure, management of the project is in an absolute shambles and lacks knowledge and direction, meaning that calls made last year by the Auditor-General for improved management are being totally ignored at considerable extra expense to taxpayers.

The Hon. FRANK BLEVINS: Mr Speaker, the member for Bright has made a large number of assertions, which I am sure you will not mind my going through one at a time. I have been advised by the Registrar of Motor Vehicles that the additional cost was \$8 000. I read that in the newspaper, as did the honourable member. All he has said today is what he read from the newspaper. That is all he has done. We also read that in the newspaper. I think it was in an article in Saturday's *Advertiser*. All the honourable member has done is quote from that article.

I can advise the House that I had some discussions, either last week or the week before, with the manufacturer of the computer. They were amicable discussions and the South Australian manager for the company advised me that he was only too pleased to assist the Motor Registration Division to upgrade its computer. I am not sure what was required to update the system—whether it was a board—but, whatever it was, it is available in Australia.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order!

The Hon. FRANK BLEVINS: I said that it was a very amicable discussion and the decision to upgrade the computer has been, so far, a very inexpensive option. I believe the cost has been, to date, \$8 000. I do not know how much more it will cost; I cannot say.

Mr Matthew: A lot more than \$8 000!

The Hon. FRANK BLEVINS: The member for Bright says smugly that it will cost a lot more. I understand that the member for Bright was, at some stage, on the team working with the JIS. If my information is correct, I would have thought that the honourable member would have the decency to keep quiet and to hide his shame for his association with that project. In relation to any lack of expertise in the public sector as regards computers, there is no question that there is not the degree of expertise available in the public sector to manage these projects as there is in the private sector. One of the reasons for that is very clear: we just do not pay enough money in the public sector. People who have the skills to manage these projects demand a great deal of money; they are in very great demand. Quite frankly, the public sector is not in the race.

However, having said that, and having discussed this problem with a number of people who have been involved in the installation of new computer systems, I have been advised that, in their 20 years of experience and given their knowledge of the installation and programming of computers, none of those to whom I spoke has ever seen a system that operated correctly when the first button was pushed.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order!

The Hon. FRANK BLEVINS: When the first button was pushed, none of the systems worked properly.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order!

The Hon. FRANK BLEVINS: It does not matter whether it is in the public sector or in the private sector. For 15 years I have listened in this House to members opposite complaining about computer installations. I think the member for Coles made a specialty of asking questions in relation to the computer at Flinders University. If it was not the member for Coles, I apologise. However, we have not heard anything about that for a decade because, without a doubt, all of these projects have some teething problems when they commence. It does not matter whether it is in the private sector or the public sector. Unfortunately, this is not an exact science.

However, I am very confident that the Motor Registration Division's computer, once all the bugs have been ironed out, will be a boon to the State. I also point out, although it is incidental, that the decision to go ahead with this project was made by a former Minister of Transport, the Hon. Michael Wilson. It was made at the same time as the decision was taken to have a JIS during the Tonkin Government years. I applaud that Government for what it attempted to achieve. I have said before, in a debate on the JIS, that the intention of that Government was good: it was not just to supply additional services to the public through the public sector but to upgrade the knowledge and competence of the public sector in this area and also to assist South Australian industry as much as it could to a significant degree, particularly the software and programming industry. I think that the objectives were laudable, and I have said that before. However, there is no doubt that there is not the expertise at the rates we pay within the public sector.

Mr Matthew: Yes, there is.

The Hon. FRANK BLEVINS: The member for Bright says, 'Yes, there is.' If there is, why do we not use it? The member for Bright was for a number of years associated with the JIS. I do not think I have to say anything else about the qualifications of the member for Bright.

SOUVENIR GOODS

The Hon. J.P. TRAINER (Walsh): Will the Minister of Industry, Trade and Technology ask his officers to encourage the packaging by local manufacturers and retailers of suitable souvenir goods for Japanese tourists for the 'Omiyage' market?

I should like to quote four short paragraphs from a recent edition of *Packaging Today*, the journal of the Packaging Council of Australia, which, under a caption implying that this is a section of the market that is 'not to be overlooked', states:

According to Austrade, Japanese visitors to Australia represent an annual buying market of at least \$150 million . . . and potentially much more than that if they could find what they want.

In addition to shopping for themselves, they have an obligation to take souvenirs back to their families and friends. For this 'Omiyage' market they are looking for attractively packaged biscuits, confectionery, wine and other non-food products.

One company to capitalise on this 'export' market is Paddington Chocolates. It supplemented its existing square-shaped gift box with a more expensive, rectangular-shaped black and gold box specifically to broaden the product's appeal to gift conscious Japanese tourists.

These tourists are able to take home more than \$2 000 worth of goods duty free, but they will not bother unless the goods are well presented in a premium package.

The Hon. LYNN ARNOLD: I thank the honourable member for his question. I will have officers of the Department of Industry, Trade and Technology make inquiries as to how this area could be promoted among South Australian industry. Indeed, I know that my colleague the Minister of Tourism in another place will likewise want to support such a call.

It is worth noting that if Japanese tourists, when they visit overseas, are able to take home duty free some \$2 000 worth of purchases, the likelihood is that, given the standards of expenditure of Japanese tourists, they are spending that \$2 000. That would mean that, for every 500 tourists, they are spending \$1 million on purchases from overseas. It is important that we ensure that every Japanese tourist who comes to South Australia spends as much of that \$2 000 duty free allowance in this State as opposed to other States.

Part of the problem in the past has been that we have not had enough production or a sufficient range of products dedicated to intending tourists; nor have we been particularly good at picking up characteristics of particular markets. The Japanese tourist market, as has been made clear by the member for Walsh, is quite a distinct market in the kinds of demands that it places on the countries that Japanese tourists visit for the products that they want to buy. The value added that would go into extra packaging and presentation here would certainly bring healthy returns if those efforts were made. I certainly take that point and will have it followed up.

Recently there was a report about the popularity of wombats in Japan. What worried me at the time was that a Tasmanian company was concerned to find that the wombats in Japan were being made in Korea. It was suggesting that maybe Tasmanian industry should pick up the manufacturing of wombats. That also concerned me, because the wombat is more typically South Australian than Tasmanian and was not recognising the fact that we have a very good South Australian company, Soft Touch, which makes a very nice little wombat as well as a whole range of other animals for the tourist market. I would commend companies, such as Soft Touch and other South Australian companies, which are trying to meet the demands of tourists, because there are millions of dollars to be had. Those dollars will be spent, and we want them spent in South Australia, not elsewhere.

POLICE MEDIA LIAISON

The Hon. E.R. GOLDSWORTHY (Kavel): My question is directed to the Minister of Emergency Services. Following Sunday night's shooting incident at Angle Vale, news of which was not relayed to the media for some three hours, will the Minister take up the matter of media liaison with the Commissioner of Police with a view to implementing a computerised feed to link the new Police Communications Centre to newsrooms; and will he also give a guarantee that incident reports will be passed on to the media as they occur

rather than at police discretion unless it is considered necessary to withhold information because lives are at risk?

The Hon. J.H.C. KLUNDER: I do not think that this Parliament can have it both ways. On the one hand, it cannot, under the Police Regulations Act, give the management and control of the Police Force to the Commissioner of Police and then, on the other hand, demand that I take action on matters. The honourable member must be aware that at the moment the control and management of the Police Force is with the Commissioner of Police and not with the Minister.

HEALTH COMMISSION CENTRAL OFFICE

Mrs HUTCHISON (Stuart): Can the Minister of Health say what are the central office work force statistics for the South Australian Health Commission? I wish to know whether the Minister is satisfied that the work force is able to manage the difficult task of coordinating the public hospital and health system in this State because I am aware, as I am sure the Minister is, that there are some people who say that the central office is too large and could shed further positions.

The Hon. D.J. HOPGOOD: The work force statistics for the central office of the Health Commission indicate at present about 380 positions. It varies a little from time to time, but that would be as close to a figure as I can get. It is interesting to know how this figure has moved over the past four years: in 1987 it averaged 501, in 1988 it averaged 472, in 1989 it averaged 456 and now it is down around 380. So, there has been considerable shedding of staff in the past four years by central office. It is difficult to answer that part of the honourable member's question about the adequacy of that staff number to do the coordination function. How many people do we really need for adequate planning, as well as the coordination of function, given the budget of over \$1 billion that the commission now controls?

We cannot expect the Chairman and one or two office staff to perform that sort of function. I can say at this stage that I believe the coordination and planning is being satisfactorily carried out but, of course, people are working under strain, as are most people in Government these days, because of the necessity to shed positions. There is one further point that I would like to make. It came into the arena originally when he who was once the spokesperson for the Liberal Party on health suggested that the Liberal Party in office would be able to solve all the budgetary problems of the hospitals, by simply transferring funds from the central office out to the hospitals.

Mr S.J. Baker interjecting:

The Hon. D.J. HOPGOOD: Here is the Deputy Leader of the Opposition saying that it is an excellent idea. Let me conclude with a little bit of mental arithmetic. To make it easy, let us assume that there are 400 people in central office—

Members interjecting:

The Hon. D.J. HOPGOOD: I doubt whether the honourable member will be able to follow me in these mathematical contortions—

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order!

The Hon. D.J. HOPGOOD: I will go slowly and I will simplify it to make it easy for him. Let us assume that there are 400 people in the Health Commission office, because 380 will be too difficult a number for the maths. Let us also assume that the cost of sustaining each of those salaries is about \$30 000 a year. Let us assume that the total budget

is about \$1 000 million (it is a little more than that, but I am being conservative). That works out at 1.2 per cent.

Members interjecting:

The Hon. D.J. HOPGOOD: I guess that the Leader has almost got there now. The 1.2 per cent of the total budget is expended in central office. That is not a lot of money to spread around the system: it is not a lot of money at all. It never has been a lot of money. In fact, that suggestion from the Liberals was the sort of sham that they have usually come up with in the health area.

GOVERNMENT CARS

Mr OSWALD (Morphett): Why does the Department of Transport allow public servants to block-book Government-owned cars out from country car pools for up to a month at a time for departmental and private use when this results in a depletion of vehicles in those pools to the extent that other Government employees must use their private cars and claim a travel allowance at additional expense to taxpayers?

The Hon. FRANK BLEVINS: The member for Morphett started his question by saying, 'Why does the Department of Transport . . .' First, there is no Department of Transport, but leaving that to one side, I assume—

An honourable member: It's irrelevant. Answer the question.

The Hon. FRANK BLEVINS: Over many years in this place and in another place I have learnt never to take on face value an assumption made by a Liberal. I will have the question closely examined and obtain a reply for the member for Morphett.

DRUG DEALING

Mr McKEE (Gilles): My question is directed to the Minister of Education. Is drug dealing in schools a commonplace activity? Articles in the *News* yesterday and today claim that students are involved in selling drugs.

The Hon. G.J. CRAFTY: From time to time—fortunately infrequently, but it does occur—some elements of the media choose to present graphic stories and pictures which quote unnamed people making broad and unsubstantiated allegations that can cause great harm and embarrassment to our schools. That happened on television last week and in the afternoon newspaper this week. I find it unfortunate that in both cases the media did not initially make any attempt to balance their stories by seeking a comment from responsible authorities such as the police and the Education Department although, fortunately, the television station involved has provided a right of reply.

The issue of the alleged use of illegal drugs by school students requires sensible, balanced consideration and not the kind of half-baked, unsourced and unsubstantiated allegations made in this kind of reporting. Of course, it is typical of the Opposition to immediately jump on the bandwagon by demanding inquiries and reports.

Let me make it quite clear: our schools will not and do not tolerate illegal drugs in or around their establishments. This is a police matter and if the media, the Opposition or anyone else has evidence of illegal activities by students or others in or around our schools those allegations should be of course reported to the police immediately. Schools are clearly required to involve the police when members of the public or students are suspected of selling or using drugs in our schools. Our school principals do not tolerate drugs in

or near their schools. Indeed, as one school principal said in responding to one scurrilous media report on this matter recently:

Your reporters said absolutely nothing about the real concerns of teachers: they said nothing about the strong practices which take place in schools to prohibit drugs being brought in, and said nothing about the fine work done by teachers to keep our schools safe.

The South Australian Education Department has a clear policy about the misuse of drugs. Schools take action and will not ignore or avoid the issues. There is a positive educational role for schools which they carry out; for example, the South Australian Government has a \$1.5 million drug education program called TEACH (Teacher Education and Community Health) to warn children throughout the State on the dangers of drug taking and to develop responsible and healthy lifestyles. Our strong educational and health policies are supported by the State Government. Recent action to provide 'drug free zones' around schools reflects that support. This scheme means that drug dealers using or selling drugs within 500 metres of schoolgrounds will have their prison sentences increased by five years and their fines doubled. It is unfortunate that these and other positive measures being taken by Government in partnership with school communities have not been reported in these so-called investigative stories.

I believe that the overwhelming majority of young people reject illegal drugs and, indeed, are responding to educational programs. That is supported by a recent drug and alcohol survey which indicated that there has been a reduction in alcohol, tobacco and other drug use amongst this cohort in our community. But it must be emphasised that this issue is of community concern and schools should not be used as an easy target by the media or, indeed, an Opposition determined to grab a headline at the expense of students and school staff. It is a community matter that should be discussed and debated in a balanced and fair manner.

The SPEAKER: I suggest that when Ministers have prepared statements a ministerial statement may be a better vehicle by which to deliver them.

IRAQ GRAIN CONTRACTS

Mr MEIER (Goyder): What action has the Minister of Agriculture or his department taken in the past two weeks to ensure South Australia's farmers receive full compensation for outstanding payments of grain contracts with Iraq? What has happened to the 36 000 tonnes of South Australian wheat which the Minister told the House on 7 August was being loaded for Iraq, and does the Minister believe there should now be full export insurance for wheat rather than the current 80 per cent limit?

The Hon. LYNN ARNOLD: I will obtain a detailed update report on the situation with respect to the wheat. I am not able to say at this stage what has happened to the 37 500 tonnes of wheat. I might comment that the sale to Iran reported in the paper—I think Thursday fortnight ago—was, in fact, the culmination of discussions that had already taken place before the outbreak of the Iraqi hostilities. I believe it is important that we examine what will be the full impact on the economy of sales to the Middle East, and the loss of sales or payment for sales. The question of whether or not there should be a 100 per cent recoup will have to be very carefully considered by the Federal Government.

The honourable member quite correctly identifies that, at the moment, under EFIC, the recoup for lost credit sales is

80 per cent, and the figure with respect to the Australian Wheat Board under the guarantees that it receives from the Federal Government is 87.5 per cent. I believe it would be somewhat unrealistic to expect that any of those levels would ever reach 100 per cent, because they would probably have to have major premium increases, which themselves would be a levy upon wheatgrowers in this country.

The other point that needs to be made is that the quantities that we are talking about in terms of dollar values are very significant indeed. EFIC has to farm out a substantial amount of the insurance liability in situations such as this and this would be at a cost which would ultimately come back to the community at large (the taxpayer), or to wheatgrowers, in particular, by way of increased levies. So, the question of 100 per cent is somewhat unrealistic. Nevertheless, I will obtain a detailed report on where we are at the moment. John Kerin has said that when we know further whether there will be promising sales, he will be in a better position to analyse what assistance the Federal Government should give by way of compensation.

RANDOM BREATH TESTING

Mr HAMILTON (Albert Park): Will the Minister of Transport say whether the use of additional random breath testing units is a substitute for reducing the blood alcohol limit from .08 to .05?

The Hon. FRANK BLEVINS: The answer, of course, is that it is not a substitute. During this debate, I have heard some of the most fatuous arguments that I have ever heard in any debate. I suppose the most fatuous was the one I heard this morning on the air from the Leader of the Opposition. He says that we should leave the limit at .08, but increase random breath testing, and this will help solve the problem. Why are the two things mutually exclusive? If we believe that additional random breath testing will solve the problem, we should do that anyway, if we are interested in road safety. If we believe that the lowest possible reasonable level of alcohol in the blood will assist road safety, then we should do that also. There is a whole range of other measures that we can take—none of which are mutually exclusive.

Let me say this about random breath testing: if the Leader of the Opposition is saying that he supports an increase in random breath testing in an attempt to lower the road toll, let us see how fair dinkum he is. The most effective way to operate is to random breath test outside hotels and clubs. That is the way to do it. If the hospitality industry, the hotels and clubs in the honourable member's electorate, support that point of view, I would be very surprised. There is no doubt that drink-driving could be almost eliminated if we applied random breath testing in a fair dinkum manner. Of course, we do not. I would be surprised if any member opposite is suggesting that. Any patrol car in the smallest of our non-metropolitan communities could kill stone dead any hotel or club in that community, and cut out drink-driving in that community. They could do it tomorrow. If we were fair dinkum, that is what we would be advocating.

What I say to the honourable Leader is that when he makes statements about increasing random breath testing he should be careful, because some day someone may take him up on it. That someone may be the police, because the police are sick to death of scraping people off the tarmac, particularly young people in the South-East. The South-East has a particular problem with drink-driving—that is no secret. With increased random breath testing, as advocated

by the honourable Leader, we could make very considerable inroads into those deaths.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order!

The Hon. FRANK BLEVINS: The Leader of the Opposition asks why we do not do it. I suggest that the honourable Leader go and look at the legislation and, in particular read the select committee report. There was very strong opposition within the Liberal Party, which was in Government at the time, to the police targeting the hotels. If the Leader of the Opposition is saying that random breath testing ought to be targeted at hotels and clubs, that is something I will pass on to my colleague the Minister of Emergency Services for the consideration of the police. We will then see who is fair dinkum on random breath testing.

PERSONAL EXPLANATION: MINISTER'S REMARKS

Dr ARMITAGE (Adelaide): I seek leave to make a personal explanation.

Leave granted.

Dr ARMITAGE: Earlier, whilst answering a question from the member for Eyre, the Minister of Transport suggested that my laughter at one stage of his answer indicated that I did not take the problem of road deaths seriously—an allegation which I reject. I wish to explain that my mirth was in direct response to the interjection from the member for Alexandra, who indicated that, before talking about opinions on our side of the House, the Minister should do the numbers on his own side of the House.

FENCES ACT AMENDMENT BILL

Received from the Legislative Council and read a first time.

SOIL CONSERVATION AND LAND CARE ACT AMENDMENT BILL

The Hon. LYNN ARNOLD (Minister of Agriculture) obtained leave and introduced a Bill for an Act to amend the Soil Conservation and Land Care Act 1989. Read a first time.

The Hon. LYNN ARNOLD: 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

The object of this small Bill is to add a further transitional provision to the Soil Conservation and Land Care Act 1989, which came into operation on 15 March 1990. A proposal has been made for the alteration of the areas of several existing soil conservation districts which were established under the old Act by Governor's proclamation. Although the new Act provides that such a district is deemed to be a district under the new Act, it is not absolutely clear that the proclamations under the old Act can still be varied or revoked, as the mechanism for creation, variation or abo-

lition of districts under the new Act is by ministerial notice published in the *Gazette*. This Bill therefore makes special provision for treating the old proclamations as if they were ministerial notices under the new Act.

Clause 1 is formal. Clause 2 inserts a further clause in the schedule of transitional provisions. This clause provides that proclamations constituting soil conservation districts under the repealed Act will be taken to have remained in force and may be varied or revoked by the Minister as if they were notices published by the Minister under section 22. The provisions in section 22 relating to consultation will of course apply to any such variation or revocation.

Mr MEIER secured the adjournment of the debate.

SUPPLY BILL (No. 2)

Adjourned debate on the question:

That the Speaker do now leave the Chair and the House resolve itself into a Committee of the whole for consideration of the Bill.

(Continued from 16 August. Page 381.)

Mr GUNN (Eyre): The opportunity to speak on this Bill arises from the Government's desire to appropriate \$1 140 million for the services of the State. It affords members the opportunity to address matters of concern to them. First, I refer to the reference in the afternoon newspaper this week to the member for Playford's comments on proposals to change the safety regulations relating to light aircraft operating from Parafield. In view of the fact that the Commonwealth Government has decided to deregulate the airline industry, I put to the member for Playford that he is obviously somewhat confused on this matter, because deregulation of the domestic air services has nothing at all to do with the safety requirements for light aircraft operating out of Parafield.

Deregulation of the domestic airlines is a proposal to allow far greater competition in the domestic airline market—a course of action that I support, but with the reservation that I sincerely hope that we will not arrive at a situation where, for a few months, we have a large number of operators and then, because it is not financially viable, we have very few operators. I suppose the Hon. Peter Dunn in another place and I would spend more time in light aircraft than any other member in the Parliament and so I am particularly interested to ensure that aircraft are properly maintained and serviced so that they are safe to fly. Maintenance schedules have a fair bit to do with the actual cost of hiring aircraft.

It is my understanding that there will be no change to the service arrangements for light aircraft. Aircraft will still have to have 100-hourly services; there will still be a life on engines and mainframes; and there are all those other safety requirements that have provided some of the safest aircraft operations in the world in this country. The operations at Parafield airport basically involve light aircraft and charter aircraft. Very few passenger services now operate from there.

The member for Playford should be directing his criticism at the Federal Government because of the way in which light aircraft owners in this State and this nation have been treated. They have been taxed like hell; they have been charged, and very few adequate facilities have been provided at Parafield. It is a disgrace that they are putting brick paving on the footpaths at Parafield but not even sealing the cross-runways. There is only one runway that is sealed—that is, 21 right or 03 left. The other main runway is not

even sealed. There are many times during the year when people cannot use the cross-runways.

I suggest to the member for Playford that he direct his attention to that area. I can assure the honourable member that there was to be no downgrading of safety requirements whatsoever, because had that been the case I would have been one of those voicing criticism in this place. There is a fair bit to criticise in relation to the operation and maintenance of aircraft in this country. I think that the current attitude of the Commonwealth Government in closing down the flight services at places such as Ceduna has left a lot to be desired. It is taking a fair bit out of the industry and putting very little back into it.

There are a number of matters which are of concern to me. It appears that the Government has a policy of using the police and other law enforcement agencies across the State as revenue collectors. It appears that the Police Department is under instructions to issue as many on-the-spot fines as possible. We have highways officers issuing random notices to people for carrying standard bales of hay which are four inches over the allowable height. We have hoteliers who are selling fish and who do not comply with some ludicrous bureaucratic form getting on-the-spot fines.

Where is this Government taking us? My view is that the time has long since arrived when we should have an administrative review tribunal to consider whether this arrogant attitude can be brought to an end. The public are sick and tired of being harassed in relation to this sort of arrogant attitude. Where is the ability for a law enforcement officer to issue a sensible warning to people? Why should someone, for a most minor misdemeanour, be handed one of these dreadful on-the-spot fines? The Government in the future will find it very difficult to get me to support legislation allowing the issuing of on-the-spot fines. It is nonsense. It is a revenue raising measure for the Government.

It is all very well to say that people can go to the courts and get justice, but everybody knows that, unless one is charged with a very serious offence, it is beyond the average person's financial capacity to go to court, because the cost of engaging legal counsel is outrageous. If a person is fighting the Government, the Government has unlimited resources and manpower to fight him. Therefore, the average person is at a great disadvantage. This is an outrageous situation about which something should be done. I look forward to seeing something done about it, because it is grossly unfair. The only way to solve this problem is to have an effective administrative review of some of these decisions so that the average person can go before a body, put forward objections about the way that he or she has been treated and have justice prevail.

This nation is facing a very serious economic situation. What perturbs me is that the Government is bringing in a Supply Bill to obtain sufficient funds to maintain the Public Service and the services that the Government believes the people of this State require. However, there was little or no action to review the operations of the Government, to consider whether many of these facilities are still necessary and whether we can carry out some of these functions in a more efficient way. I believe that the Government should be considering ways in which it can rationalise its services. It should carry out an ongoing review of every statutory authority in this State. On two or three occasions I have introduced legislation which would automatically have brought about that course of action, but unfortunately nothing has happened. I believe that the Government could save millions of dollars.

The Government is a slow learner. On television, the night before last, we saw the Premier at Elizabeth encour-

aging people to buy shares in their own houses. It was only in 1985 that the same Premier and the member for Napier were racing around the State vigorously attacking the then Leader of the Opposition, now Senator Olsen, for having the audacity to say that he would sell Housing Trust homes to the tenants. The member for Napier said that it was illegal, that it could not be done and that it was contrary to the agreement between the Commonwealth and the State. You, Mr Deputy Speaker, were also giving encouragement to it. I just wonder how the Premier reconciles his statement in 1985 with what is taking place now. It has taken him five years to adopt Liberal policies. We can live in hope for this Government, but it is a slow learner. It is amazing that, in a period of economic necessity, it will now adopt that policy. However, there has been no comment to justify its action and no apology to Senator Olsen for having the wisdom five years ago to make that suggestion. Many more houses could have been sold to the tenants, thus releasing more funds to provide more accommodation for the needy and the less well off in this community. That is a course of action which Opposition members support 100 per cent. It is an excellent idea. However, it is interesting to note that it has taken the Government five years to see the error of its ways.

During a debate which will take place later on rural industry assistance, I shall want to go into some detail and explain the difficult situation facing people in rural industry and in industry and commerce in general in this State because of high interest rates, the low returns that people are receiving, and the unnecessary bureaucracy, Government interference and control which has been foisted upon them. They are matters of great concern that affect the welfare of all South Australian citizens. I sincerely hope that this Government and its Federal colleagues, when they bring down their budgets tonight and later this week, will bear those matters in mind when looking at revenue measures and the taxation system, because there is overwhelming evidence that the taxation system is crippling industry. It is far too complicated, involved and high. Therefore, common sense should prevail.

Mr BRINDAL (Hayward): I welcome this opportunity to address the House in the debate on the appropriation of public moneys. I wish to touch on a matter about which I spoke in my Address in Reply speech, namely, the size and extent of our Public Service.

We have many dedicated and good public servants in South Australia. However, I believe that there are too many and that something must be done about it in this time of budgetary constraint. For every Minister there is obviously a department. Sometimes for each Minister there is more than one department. I believe that when a department is created it breathes into itself its own life. We have department heads and people under them, and a reason for existence. I believe that, having created a department, it is difficult, as we go down the track, to 'uncreate' the same department.

In that regard, I advise members of the fine initiative of the Whitlam Government many years before social justice became a concern of this State, and that was the disadvantaged schools program, which was the first program started by the Schools Commission. In every State the disadvantaged schools program was set up and administered through its Education Department in a way determined by that Education Department. For almost a decade I had the privilege of working with that program. I remember my ex-boss telling me one day about an early conference which had been held in the Blue Mountains and which was attended

by coordinators from every State and the Commonwealth Schools Commission and, I believe, the Federal Minister. Having spoken all day and worked on this problem of disadvantaged children, particularly children in poverty, they had a very nice evening meal with French champagne, and, I suppose after they had been drinking a bit, they had the toast of the evening—the disadvantaged child.

I think that anecdote says much of what the Public Service sometimes can unwittingly become. The departments of the Public Service are set up to do very good and useful things, and I am sure that they do those things to the best of their ability, but in doing so they create their own reason for existence. In my Address in Reply speech I referred to the Aborigines in the Northern Territory; I am now speaking about the disadvantaged child. We may also speak about the unemployed, those in education, or any area of Government. I think that it is a matter that requires attention.

I know that, over a number of years, the Government has endeavoured to initiate stringency measures and cut-backs, but I would allude to the last reshuffle of the Education Department, perhaps three years ago, when the Minister announced that 39 senior public servants would go.

I accept that the Minister acted in good faith and that his Government and this Parliament intended that 39 senior positions should go. I believe that the record can be publicly demonstrated to show that in fact only two people went, and as the result of retirement. All the rest went sideways: they were given different titles and were shuffled about. While the Minister told the Parliament in good conscience that 39 positions were gone, nothing happened in fact. That happens time and again: we reach a situation where we have Ministers telling their heads of department, 'You are to slash the budget; you are to cut back.' If the Minister insists, the heads of department will do that, but too often it is done by axing a whole program. The head of department will say, 'We have to save \$100 000.' He will look for a program that costs \$100 000, and he will slash an entire service. He or she will not necessarily look for efficiency in the service.

That is what I would argue today, that what we should be looking for, or what our departmental heads should be looking for, in our Government is efficiency within the Public Service. The number of public servants can be cut back. I do not suggest firing people: I am talking about the natural process of attrition. The number of public servants can be cut back not by axing whole programs but by making what we have more efficient.

I have heard many Ministers talk about the need for multi-skilling, and I support that totally. I can remember not long before I was elected to this place interviewing someone for a job in a position under me. That person came from the Public Service and he could describe categorically and honestly everything that happened from the time a piece of paper came onto the left-hand side of his desk; he could describe every process that was involved in his responsibility for moving that paper or document across his desk until it reached the 'out' box.

I can tell the House honestly that this person was an expert at what he did, but he had little knowledge of what his Minister or his department did. He was highly and specifically skilled; he was competently skilled in one area and one area alone and he was a public servant. I do not know whether he is typical of all public servants. I have many friends who are public servants. I think a great deal of many of those people and I am not talking about them. Rather, I am talking about those who run the Public Service supposedly for this Government and supposedly for our

Ministers. I have suggested in this place before and I do so again that Sir Humphrey is still very much alive and well in South Australia.

I am sure that our Ministers do their best, but Ministers often have several portfolios and must rely increasingly on their heads of department. Frankly, from what I have seen and from 20 years of experience within the public sector, I believe that there is a great deal that can be done. There is a great deal more efficiency that can be achieved and, if Ministers choose not to believe me (as normally they do not believe members on this side of the House), let them go out and ask the middle and lower level public servants—the teachers, the serving police officers and the nurses—whether the Government could do anything. They would hear a resounding ‘Yes’ but, what is more, they would get great support from those people, who are good people and who deserve better than they are getting at the hands of their departmental masters.

In that connection, I refer, quite briefly, to the Oaklands Residents Association, who wrote to the Minister of Transport and said that, if the STA provided paint for the Oaklands railway station, the association members would paint it. The reply received from the STA was that they could not do that; the STA appreciated that those people would paint the station voluntarily, but believed that that would be doing someone out of a job and that, therefore, it could not be done. Last week I asked a question about the Albert Park railway station in respect of a similar problem: It involved a community project that was finally obliterated because it interfered with some working process within the STA. This is not commonsense, it is not democracy and it is not the participation of all people: it is something different.

Finally, I would like to touch on a matter raised in this place a few minutes ago by the Minister of Education. The Minister said that he was tired of half-baked, unsubstantiated allegations concerning drugs in our schools. I spent 12 years directly in schools and about 10 years related to schools, as a principal, a teacher and a person associated with parenting. I would like to advise the House that I do not believe that those allegations are unsubstantiated and half-baked. With my own eyes I have seen direct evidence of drugs in our schools. I have seen the problems that our young children are faced with, and I can say that I believe the Minister is wrong. I support the call of the Leader of the Opposition in another place, who is to speak to the Minister on this matter.

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

The Hon. H. ALLISON (Mount Gambier): It is Supply time again, it is budget time again, and I have to admit to the House that I have not a great deal of confidence in the way State and Federal affairs have been administered.

Members interjecting:

The Hon. H. ALLISON: If members can straighten their faces for a little while, they will learn that I am not going to address myself to the jargon of macro and micro-economics.

Mr Becker: What are they?

The Hon. H. ALLISON: Who knows: macro-economics is when you owe 100 quid and micro-economics is when you owe a pound, in my family. I am not sure what the Federal Treasurer means. He is obviously impaled firmly on the J curve and is struggling to find an appropriate answer for the public of Australia. However, the matters to which I would like to address myself are relatively minor in the whole scale of State and Federal economics, but

extremely important to the people of South Australia and my electorate. The first is an issue that I have raised three times already during this short session of Parliament—to close or not to close the Bluebird rail system from Adelaide to the South-East.

The State Minister, the Prime Minister (Mr Hawke) and the Federal Minister (Bob Brown) have all written to me saying that they have no formal application for closure before them. They have said, ‘I have nothing at all before me,’ yet every man and every woman and their dog between Adelaide and the South-East knows that the service has deteriorated almost to the point of non-existence, to the stage where the Adelaide spokeswoman of AN last Friday advised the South-East that the service was no longer existent in fact, that a train would be put on if there were bookings of 20 or more but that everyone was to be pointed in the direction of Bonds bus.

If people book on Bonds bus through AN, the cost is \$31 but through Bond's depot it is \$27. In what direction is AN pointing people? Obviously away from the station and off to Bonds bus. Bonds would like to provide an adequate service from Adelaide to Mount Gambier, but it is prevented from doing so. A Mrs Kent came in to see me only yesterday and said that her daughter had booked with AN to go to Murray Bridge last week. She was told that, whether she went by train or bus, she would be able to alight at Murray Bridge. However, the Adelaide AN spokeswoman said that that was wrong: from Mount Gambier to Adelaide people can alight at Tailem Bend, but between Tailem Bend and Adelaide or Adelaide and Tailem Bend on the return journey no stop is allowed for on the Bonds bus.

Apparently there are agreements between bus proprietors, according to their licences, that they will be protected, so instead of operating a through service that provides a service which is identical with the rail service, Bonds can provide only an intermittent service between Mount Gambier and Adelaide. So the young woman, having paid \$61 for the return journey to Railways of Australia—and I have the booking here—found that she could not avail herself of the train or the bus because, had she been put down at Tailem Bend, she would have had no transport from Tailem Bend to Murray Bridge, and there she would have been: a young woman isolated. So, she did not make the journey. This is coming from a Government—Australian National—which purports to be looking after the people. The very people who claim to be running the country cannot even run a railway service adequately.

We have an absolute silence from the two Ministers concerned and the Prime Minister, and Australian National is not game to say what it really intends to do. It is appallingly mismanaged. It is a most inglorious way of telling people how they can travel from Mount Gambier to Adelaide and back. I suggest that, if these people think they are in charge of a country and cannot even run a railway service, it is little wonder that citizens such as I hold their activities in question.

What is the State Minister going to do? He has the right to protest and has not done so: he just keeps saying, ‘Look, no application on my desk yet.’ I have been striving, as a member, to keep this service open for the past 15 years, with a degree of success. We still have the service, although I must admit that the trains themselves are almost worn out. They have made the decision for the Federal Government. I would ask the Minister to at least leave his desk for a little while, find out what is happening and make some representation formally to Australian National and the Federal Minister, and to make a statement to the people as to precisely what are their intentions, instead of saying,

'Look, no application on my desk yet.' For all intents and purposes the service is closed down.

So, we come to another issue which is affecting the smaller business people in my electorate. It does not involve the macro-economic people who control about 85 per cent of all the trade. Here is a small transport operator in the South-East who has taken out insurance—as they are compelled to do, of course—with WorkCover, the State insurance corporation. They run most of their business from Mount Gambier to Adelaide and interstate. They asked WorkCover if they were fully covered for all their operations between Mount Gambier, Sydney, Melbourne, Brisbane, Perth and elsewhere, and received various responses. One of them was that they were not covered; if they operate within South Australia they are all right, but once the driver leaves the State boundaries—and surely this is what interstate transport is all about—if the operators are in Victoria they insure with Victoria, and if they are in New South Wales they insure with New South Wales. I understand that the information has been countermanded to some extent by a person in WorkCover who said that under section 6 of the Act, as employees predominantly work in New South Wales, they have to pay their premium in the State where they predominantly work but they would still be covered in South Australia and Victoria.

So, because of that advice this lady (she and her husband operate the trucking company) contacted WorkCover in New South Wales which referred them to insurance companies. They then contacted Mercantile Mutual Insurance, and the advice from that company was that, if they had to have Australia-wide coverage, they had to be a registered New South Wales company. So, where does that leave a South Australian company? I suggest that the complications are such that it is time that the Minister, instead of repeatedly saying, 'Look, I am only the Minister, I am not responsible; WorkCover is a statutory authority,' had a look at WorkCover. If he decided that it was to become fully accountable, he should report properly to Parliament, state exactly what its terms are, and allow these South Australian residents to insure in South Australia for their Australia-wide transport industry.

At the moment, there may be drivers employed in the South-East who are not fully covered. Of course, that is only revealed when a claim is made. It simply is not adequate when WorkCover insurance is compulsory in this State, yet the same company might have to register in several States and pay several premiums thus greatly increasing the cost of operation.

Another case brought before me involves a Federal matter concerning the question of the 3 per cent superannuation scheme, which a lot of employers do not seem to know anything about, because we have had a few adverts in newspapers and not much else; very little formal documentation has crossed anyone's desk. Every employer from 1 January this year is supposed to be insuring or paying superannuation at the rate of 3 per cent of gross income to an insurance company of the employer's choice. Incidentally, quite a few employees have also been contacted by insurers asking them to join—Lord knows why that is happening. In this case a young man wrote to me and said that he was employed at Tumby Bay and that the employer started contributions of \$102 a month paid into the superannuation fund. The policy started on 8 December 1988 and continued until May 1990, and then unfortunately he ceased employment and, therefore, ceased contributions through the employer.

He was unable to start work within two weeks or more and he came down to Mount Gambier (my electorate). His

current employer does not want to continue payment into the scheme and, as yet, he says the employer is not required to under the award. So, this person has a problem: he had \$102 a month that was paid in previously; he has \$1 900 that he personally has paid into this scheme; he has not been in it for two years, so he cannot have a fully paid-up policy; and he stands a very good chance of losing \$1 900. Here is an unemployed person on the lowest level of wage income in Australia who has lost \$1 900 covered compulsorily by the Federal scheme and cannot retrieve his money. The insurer said, 'If you keep on paying your \$102 a month into this scheme, when you have paid in for two years we will make you a fully paid-up person.'

Mr GROOM (Hartley): In this debate I want to deal with the harmful effects of the Liberal Party's consumption tax policy, and in particular describe how it will adversely affect the rural sector as well as low-income earners. We know that the Liberal Party wants to replace the sales tax with a broad-based consumption tax.

Mr Blacker interjecting:

Mr GROOM: I am surprised at the honourable member for Flinders, because his Party, federally, has now gone into agreement with the Liberal Party. Despite the fact that they resisted it for many years, they have now succumbed, abandoned the rural sector and gone into coalition with the Liberal Party on this issue to the detriment of the rural sector.

Sales tax is charged at the wholesale level, that is, on wholesalers: it is at the time of the last trade sale of goods. It is charged principally at four rates, I suppose: a nought rate; 10 per cent on household goods; 30 per cent on luxury goods; and a 20 per cent general rate. There are a number of in-built exemptions from sales tax with regard to the rural sector that the Liberal Party and the National Party have not addressed. In fact, they have abandoned it, other than to say that there will be some rebates on fuel sales to the rural sector, but nothing else has been said about the other exemptions that generally apply under the sales tax legislation.

The reason is that the Liberal and the National Parties want to replace the sales tax with a broad-based consumption tax and, of course, they cannot allow for these exemptions because they do not fit in with a broad-based consumption tax. A broad-based consumption tax is at a different point of sale; it is at the retail end of sale. As informed sources report, there will be a broad-based consumption tax, under the Liberal and National Parties' policy, of between 10 and 15 per cent on goods and services. It is no good saying, 'The general rate is 20 per cent, and we'll drop that down to 10 and 15 per cent,' because it means much the same thing in actual fact.

An honourable member: It will be worse.

Mr GROOM: It will be worse, as I am about to illustrate. It is at a different end. 20 per cent on the general rate at the wholesale level is roughly equivalent to, say, a 10 per cent consumption tax at the retail end, because one is dealing with different amounts, so it will not benefit anyone. It will be a fundamental change, because traditionally sales tax has treated basic necessities, such as food and clothing, as being exempt—apart from some biscuits, confectionery and icecream lines (I know flavoured milk is caught up with the sales tax legislation). Basically there has been an exemption for these necessities and for farming machinery and other implements.

It is quite clear that, because the only mention of the rural sector in relation to the consumption tax is some rebate on fuel sales, all these exemptions will go for the

rural community. The Liberal and National Parties have simply abandoned the rural community in favour of a broad-based consumption tax.

Members interjecting:

Mr GROOM: I will tell the honourable member what will go for consumption tax purposes, because they cannot fit in. Agricultural machinery is one. At the present time, a number of listed agricultural machinery implements and apparatus are exempt. Under this category, chaff cutters will go—there will be no exemption on chaff cutters; there will be no exemption on cultivators; corn, grain and feed grinders will go.

I know that this is painful to the member for Goyder because he represents a rural seat, but he has connived in this consumption tax policy, and it is an embarrassment to him. The rural sector, through the National Party, has for many years resisted the move to a consumption tax, because it knows that it will hit the rural community. I am surprised that the member for Flinders has connived in this policy.

Other items that will no longer be exempt—the consumption tax will apply to them—include fertiliser spreaders, livestock carriers, lucerne bunchers, machines for planting seeds, machine implements and apparatus used for seeding, sheep shearing plants, sickles and scythes, stump and tree extractors and threshing machines. Also no longer exempt will be agricultural equipment, materials and parts used in the industry for combating frost, chemicals for clearing land, manufactured field wire fencing, and, under 'Equipment for the checking and eradication of disease or pests', agricultural spraying and dusting materials. The entire farming community will be hit. Livestock imported solely for breeding purposes will no longer be exempt, as well as goods and parts used in the maintenance of livestock.

The dairy industry has a number of exemptions under sales tax at the present time: cheese presses, churns, cream and milk bottles, cream separators, dairy coolers, machinery, implements and apparatus for use in the manufacture of butter and cheese, just to name a few. Those exemptions will all go. Dr Hewson has said that the consumption tax will be as broad as possible.

The Hon. D.J. Hopgood: Shame!

Mr GROOM: As the Deputy Premier says, shame on the Opposition because in this House it has tried to perpetuate the myth that it has looked after the rural industry. The Opposition has sold out the rural community. I am surprised, and I hope to hear on this matter from the member for Flinders: let him justify why he, too, has sold out the rural sector and why he intends to turn the rural sector over to a broad based consumption tax which will hit them very hard—

Mr Such interjecting:

Mr GROOM: I know that this is painful for the honourable member, because he knows that it is the city dwellers in the Liberal Party—if you like, the John Elliotts of this world—who will benefit from corporate tax reductions at the expense of low income earners and the rural community; and that it is big business that has control over the Liberal Party's—and now the National Party's—agenda. The true beneficiaries will be people such as John Elliott and the companies they represent. Doctor Hewson has said that this will go into tax reductions for the corporate sector. Make no mistake: the rural community and low income earners, pensioners and the like, will suffer as a consequence of this fundamental change in structure.

I will name a few more. Take the fruit growing industry. Fruit picking bags, baskets, trays and buckets will now be taxed, as well as grafting wax and greftex—I am not sure what that is but it is listed as an exemption, and I am sure

that someone from the other side of the House in the wheat growing industry will be able to give me some assistance. In the dried fruit industry, exemptions will no longer apply to dehydrator trays and trolleys; engines and shafting, belting, pulleys and other transmission gear. In the fruit industry, cranes and fruit grading rings are included. I could go through many exemptions that have been built into the sales tax legislation. Something of general interest to the farming community is pumping and other machinery, windmills and windmill towers; pumps, tanks and tank stands, troughing, water sprinklers, machinery implements and apparatus for pumping water are all included in this list.

The rural community will be hard hit, and why? Why have the Liberal and National Parties abandoned the rural industry? I hope to hear from members in this debate. I hope to hear them get up and justify this consumption tax because it will hit food and services. In relation to professional services, it will hit medical supplies, because it will apply where doctors and medicines are concerned. It will hit pensioners and low income earners. It is inflationary, and it will affect savings. The wealthier members of the community will be able to save more, but the lower income earners will have to spend more, so there will be reduced savings. This will be done to subsidise corporate profits and provide a reduction for the large companies in our society.

It will be interesting to hear what the member for Flinders, who is the next speaker, has to say. I know it is painful to the member for Fisher because he has large house building programs in his area and he will have to explain why the cost of building and materials has gone up and why houses are dearer. He will be able to say, 'It is our policy.' He will be able to tell all those vast growing areas in his electorate of Fisher, all those people who are building houses, that the reason for the increase in the cost of their housing programs, the reason it will cost them more each week, is that the building and housing industries will be hit by the Liberal and National Parties' consumption tax.

When members go to their rural constituencies and people ask them, 'Why are you removing the exemptions on farming equipment and machinery?' I would like to hear their reply. You cannot build into a consumption tax these types of exemptions because they are incompatible. So, lower income earners, pensioners and the rural community will suffer as a consequence of this consumption tax. I heard the Leader of the Opposition support this only a few weeks ago. The previous Leader of the Opposition had reservations about this and did not want to be tied down on this subject.

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

Mr BLACKER (Flinders): I wish I had a few more minutes to prepare a response to the honourable member's speech, but I must say that the general principle to which he referred has caused me concern for some considerable time. At this stage, I am not convinced that the way in which the Federal Coalition is going is necessarily the right way. However, there are some anomalies that need to be addressed and unless they are addressed the problem will be further exacerbated.

I will talk a little about that issue and draw a parallel between two persons. For argument's sake, I will call them Mr Kaye, a highly paid executive, and Mr Carpenter, a hard-toiling worker. If we look at these two examples we find that Mr Kaye the executive, who is a designer, has an Italian suit on which he pays no sales tax. On the other hand, Mr Carpenter has a tool box, which holds his tools of trade and on which he pays 20 per cent sales tax. For

lunch, Mr Kaye can have caviar and oysters, on which he pays no sales tax, but if Mr Carpenter has chocolates, biscuits and ice cream he pays 10 per cent sales tax on them. For refreshments, Mr Kaye could have natural mineral water and pay no tax, whereas Mr Carpenter could have a bottle of Coke on which he would pay 10 per cent tax.

As far as personal hygiene is concerned, Mr Kaye, the executive, has gold-plated bathroom fittings on which he pays no sales tax, whereas, on the other hand, Mr Carpenter has a plastic kitchen bowl, on which he pays 10 per cent, and washing up powder on which he pays 20 per cent sales tax. In relation to hobbies, on a work of art, the executive pays no tax, but Mr Carpenter, whose hobby is photography, pays 30 per cent.

As far as holidays are concerned, the executive pays no tax on a flight to Port Douglas or on his hotel room, but Mr Carpenter, who goes on a caravan holiday, pays 20 per cent. For entertainment, the executive pays no tax on books, but Mr Carpenter pays 30 per cent tax if he listens to the football on the radio. For transport, the executive pays no tax on taxis, but if Mr Carpenter requires a bicycle he has to pay 20 per cent.

By that short example, one can easily tell that there are some very real problems in the system as it is. I know that the member for Hartley has made considerable reference to the National Party which has stood very strongly against the proposed consumption tax, and unless there is some concession and unless those sorts of allowances are made, particularly as far as fuel is concerned, I am given to understand that that National Party support will not be forthcoming.

It is imperative that this State and this nation redirect their energies and the incentives they offer to the producing community back to that community. You cannot keep taking from the producing community to give other ancillary services, unless that production keeps coming in, so that that production, in itself, can create money for which the community can then be taxed, which helps Government coffers. While looking at today's Supply Bill, we are looking at a figure of \$1 140 million. I wonder what has been happening during the period I have been in Parliament. If my memory serves me correctly, the first Supply Bill I spoke to related to a figure of \$160 million. If we allow a 10 per cent escalation factor on that \$160 million over the years during which I have been here, we would still only come to a figure of \$735 million. Yet, today we are being asked to approve a Bill for \$1 140 million—far in excess of any CPI or reasonable escalation factor.

In mentioning the need for Government to be the facilitators for production, we must look at our transport system. I was somewhat concerned when seeking the Government's view about the proposals of the Interstate Commission on road user charges earlier this session. I was of the opinion, as a result of some discussions I had had with departmental officers, that there was some opposition within Government ranks. However, my concern is that the Minister, in responding to me, indicated that he had some sympathy with the proposals. I should like the Government to rethink its position, because the estimates that I now have would put a 20 per cent increase in freight costs on commodities for South Australians. Do not let the metropolitan members sit there and think 'We are isolated because we do not have a large freight component.' Anyone who travelled on the Adelaide to Melbourne road would see the hundreds of semitrailers coming through there every night, and should consider the 20 per cent cost per tonne or per article.

Of course, it can be easily explained away by saying, 'If I'm going to buy a light bulb, it will only be half a cent

extra, and nobody will know that.' But when we talk in terms of tonnage and in terms of the major commodities that are necessary, it will add to the cost of living of every South Australian. My constituents are at the other end of the transport spectrum, if you like. The cost to them will not only be an additional cost for consumables, the consumer goods people require, but also for their produce that has to be transported out.

I mentioned in the House a couple of weeks ago that even the additional cost being proposed by the Interstate Commission for a road train to carry one single load of grain from Cowell to Port Lincoln will mean \$147 in registration—and that is for one trip. That cost must be borne by someone, and we all know who it will be—it will be the producer. That cost will have to come off his net returns and, therefore, make him less viable.

Every commodity we talk about will be affected, so do not let any person in this House believe that he is insulated from the effects of this commission. There is no doubt in my mind that South Australians will be the bunnies and will pay the cost of the terrible problems that our eastern States colleagues have with their transport system. Obviously, the Interstate Commission is looking at this proposal to force freight off the roads onto the railways.

That is fine if you have a railway that can be an alternative but, if you have not, why should people in the west of South Australia have to pay for a problem on the eastern seaboard? I do not believe that that is right, and I am concerned that the Government does not appear to be taking it as seriously as it could to ensure that all South Australians are treated better than they are at present.

I do not believe that even our farming community has looked seriously at what is happening. In fact, I believe that many of our transport operators have not really come to grips with what it is all about. A road train operator looks like facing a registration fee of \$60 803 per year. Of course, the great concession presently being offered is that he can pay quarterly. What sort of concession is that?

In any event, whether it is paid on a quarterly or on an annual basis, the money is up front. I know of a road train operator who has a grain haulage contract, whose up-front annual charge will be \$513 000. That is over half a million dollars, and no transport company that I know of in this State can afford to absorb that. I note that the member for Mount Gambier raised a similar concern in this House the other day, and I applaud the comments that he made. However, to my knowledge, he and I are the only people who have mentioned this penalty that will hit all South Australians and, particularly, the producing sector of the community.

Farm trucks need to be looked at. Many people who have a farm truck could be facing a registration bill of \$13 000 to \$14 000. They have not realised that yet. A normal tri-axle semitrailer will cost \$39 800. How can that be absorbed? Who will pay for it? We all know, Mr Acting Speaker, that you and I as consumers in this State are the ones who will have to pay.

Mr SUCH (Fisher): I welcome this opportunity to speak to the Supply Bill. When it comes to the southern area, the question is: where is our share of the money, since it is not readily evident that the south receives its fair share. In the short time that I have, I should like to focus on a few aspects as they affect the south.

On 5 August the Premier issued a publication in which he attacked members for making requests for their electorates. This was a quite irresponsible thing to do, since that is one of our tasks in representing our areas—to put forward

legitimate requests from our constituents. The Premier got many things wrong. For example, he listed me as requesting \$2 million to reduce Stirling's fire debt—yet I have never made any public statement at all on that matter. Apart from those errors, the Premier sought to attack members such as me for putting forward legitimate requests, such as to assist in keeping open Woodcroft College. That school is not in my electorate but many of the children in my electorate attend it. It would be remiss of me not to go in to bat for that school. I was also criticised for seeking an upgrade of the Darlington intersection, which is one of the main trouble spots in the southern area.

The Premier listed a request for an improved public transport system, either an O-Bahn or light rail system. Once again, that is a legitimate request for the people of the south. They do not have an effective public transport system and it is quite appropriate, therefore, for the local member to make that sort of request. I requested crossings at various schools, for instance, one on Shepherds Hill Road to serve Bellevue Heights; an improved crossing on Black Road for the Craighburn Primary School; and a crossing on Flagstaff Road. All those requests are quite legitimate. I totally reject the tenor of the Premier's document which is entitled 'Spending Spree'. The people of the south have for years missed out on getting a fair slice of the cake, and I make no apology for continuing to represent them. I will go on doing that until we get justice for that area.

I have previously mentioned the arterial road situation in the south: it is still unsatisfactory, whether that be for Kenihan's Road (where there have been requests for crossing facilities for children attending the Reynella East High School), for speed control devices or for Flagstaff Road. I know that there are plans to upgrade the southern section of Flagstaff Road at the end of this year or early next year, and I acknowledge that that long overdue action will reduce and eliminate some of the problems associated with an arterial road in the south. As will other members from the south, I will continue to fight for a fair go for the region.

A crossing and a reduced speed limit are badly needed on Flagstaff Road. The local community has put up with inconvenience and road accidents for many years. The least that can be done for them, out of a total expenditure of \$8 million to upgrade that section of road is to provide a safe crossing facility, of which there is none at the moment on the full length of that road. Panalatinga Road, which has seen two deaths this year, is also a very dangerous section of road; it is very dark, and needs urgent attention. It is a source of constant concern to residents in the south. I will keep pressing for its upgrading. It is, of course, the Government's job to determine the priorities; it is the job of members to represent their electorates and ensure that their constituents' requests are put before the Government.

Many residents in the south have raised concerns about aspects of the so-called third arterial road. I am getting more and more inquiries, particularly from residents in Trott Park and Sheidow Park, about the merits of that proposed road. I would like to see the pros and cons of that road laid before the public for thorough analysis, because I do not believe that to this time that has been done.

Many residents down south seek improved road systems but they also seek improved public transport, and strong representation is being made in favour of light rail. We all know of the success of the O-Bahn system, with residents in the south keen to see an improved public transport system in their area. My preference is for light rail, but if we had to settle for an O-Bahn I guess that would receive a lot of support.

In respect of transport generally in the south, I believe we need to put all the options before the public so that they can be looked at independently and comprehensively and so that we can come up with the right strategies for dealing with the matter. As part of that total strategy, I strongly support the move for the decentralisation of workplaces. I believe that by constructing offices and environmentally sensitive industries, and so on, in the south we could minimise the amount of commuter traffic. All options should be looked at and prompt action taken, because soon it will be too late as much of the land is rapidly disappearing. The old Willunga railway line is being filled in at this very moment through Government activity. I believe that if we do not move quickly many of the options for providing improved transport in the south will disappear.

I now come to the question of water rates and charges. I notice that *The Hudson Pricing Review* of July 1990 states that it is intended to impose an additional charge of 78c for every \$1 000 that property value exceeds \$100 000. That is a straightout property tax; it has nothing to do with the supply of water, it is an additional charge for water above the water allowance. That publication states:

The Minister of Water Resources has announced that the Government has accepted the principal recommendations of Mr Hudson's report.

I sought a computer analysis of how that would affect some of the suburbs in my electorate, the result of which would obviously vary according to property value. For example, I discovered that in Bellevue Heights 91.06 per cent of properties would incur that additional property tax. Similarly, Flagstaff Hill is not far behind, with 80.78 per cent of properties incurring that additional tax. In Aberfoyle Park almost half of the properties, 45.81 per cent, are valued in excess of \$100 000. And so the list goes on.

The Hon. H. Allison: Your area will be subsidising the State, by the sound of it.

Mr SUCH: As the member for Mount Gambier says, some of those suburbs will be subsidising other suburbs, and that is grossly unfair because that charge relates not at all to the question of the provision of water. The most galling aspect of the matter is that those suburbs—Flagstaff Hill, Eden Hills, Bellevue Heights, Aberfoyle Park and Happy Valley—do not get filtered water even though they are closest to the Happy Valley filtration plant. Yet, here we have a 'taxation by stealth' suggestion from the Government—in fact, it is more than a suggestion, it is a proposal—to rip a bit more money off residents by imposing a property tax. That is quite outrageous.

There is still a deficiency of hospital beds in the south, in spite of the construction of the much welcomed Noarlunga Hospital. The Minister of Health did a contortionist act the other day in trying to justify the number of beds in the south. However, I think he was confused by the number of beds at Le Cornu and included them in his analysis because, according to the studies done by the Flinders Medical Centre, there is still a deficiency of about 200 beds despite the provision of the Noarlunga Hospital. So, the south misses out once again.

The south has missed out and continues to miss out in terms of sporting facilities. A group called the Southern Sporting Complex Group, under the chairmanship of Mr Marshall, is doing an excellent job in trying to obtain justice for the people of the south by securing a sporting complex at Noarlunga and the provision of land at Colonnades. I commend the group for its efforts in support of this reasonable, legitimate objective for the people of the south. How much longer must the people of the south continue to miss out on facilities such as that?

In conclusion, I think that what we want in addition to an MFP is an MFS—More for the South. The south has a growing population and it needs a fair go; the people are sick of being forgotten. Like my other colleagues from the south, I will keep fighting for them so that they get a fair go.

Mr QUIRKE (Playford): Before I refer to the Supply Bill, I would like to draw the attention of members present to remarks made by the member for Eyre a short while ago. The honourable member referred to media publicity that I obtained in relation to the Parafield aerodrome. I made those comments about two months ago and they related to the convergence of three points, the first being the Lane report, which is currently before the Federal Government and which deals with various aspects of the further deregulation of aviation in Australia. The report outlines 119 recommendations, one of which I think is worthy of close investigation by the Federal Government, that is, the interval servicing of light aircraft.

The second point to which I draw the attention of the House is that Parafield aerodrome has, in many instances, become much busier because of Federal Government policies. Again, I have no problem with that; comments that have been attributed to me in relation to that issue are grossly in error and I reject them totally. The third point that needs to be taken into account before we see the effect of the three points together is the rise in the number of trainee pilots flying out of Parafield and, particularly, those on circuit training.

I made quite clear two months ago in media releases that, if Parafield aerodrome can come home to roost for the Federal Government, I have no problem with that at all—none whatsoever. I understand that Parafield aerodrome is losing \$1.8 million this year and, again, I have no argument with the fact that measures need to be taken to try to solve that problem. However, I believe it is a curious piece of hypocrisy to start saying that light plane operators using Parafield aerodrome are getting a rotten deal and that they want something for their tax money. In fact, they want something with our tax money as well. The point I wish to make is that, given the increasing number of flights from the airfield, given the problems associated with the possible demise of interval servicing and given the fact that many of the pilots are trainees, we need to look at where we are going. A large number of these aircraft are on circuits over the suburbs that I represent, and that is creating considerable noise and inconvenience.

I understand that, in the interests of the State and the airfield, this must continue, so what I suggested was that, as far as possible, the Department of Aviation route those flights over the western side of the airfield where they would cause much less irritation and noise and it would be much safer. I do not wish to say any more other than to put on the public record that that is the position I adopted some two months ago and it is the position by which I still stand.

We are debating the Supply Bill immediately before we consider the State budget on Thursday. The Federal budget is being presented tonight at 7.30 Eastern standard time and I believe that the Federal Treasurer has his work cut out with that budget. Apart from the usual set of problems, many of which have been imposed on us at the Federal level, South Australia will also have to consider, as will the Federal Government, the particularly precarious state of world affairs as they now impinge on the budget process. In fact, I believe that the effect of the Middle East crisis on petrol pricing will worry both State and Federal Governments. I think it has to be made quite clear that over the

next few months it is almost inevitable that petrol prices will increase as a result of the crisis. I believe that we may not see petrol prices drop below 75c a litre, or perhaps some higher figure, for quite some time.

I have worked out some figures in relation to this matter. Currently, Iraq and Kuwait have 40 per cent of the world's known reserves of oil. In fact, if the blockade, for want of a better word (and I believe it is a blockade which is likely to receive United Nations sanction further down the track), is so tight as to deny any of that oil to the world, no doubt there will be a great deal of pressure on Saudi Arabia, Mexico, Venezuela and many other countries to increase their output of oil. There will also, no doubt, be a great increase in the production of North Sea oil. It could be that one million barrels per day will have to be produced to make up the deficit.

For some time it will be possible to run down very large strategic reserves, which the United States in particular holds, but ultimately, if this crisis is not resolved quickly, profiteering will no doubt take place and the cost of petrol and oil products of various types will be such that it will place a very great demand on life here in Australia.

In the early part of any energy crisis such as this, Australia manages reasonably well, because we are a net energy exporter. However, if world oil prices increase at about the same rate as occurred in 1973 and 1979, the long and medium trend will be that the financial system in the Western world will suffer greatly. In fact, many of our manufacturing industries that were lost in those particular years were lost, in part, because of the high cost of energy, which had a very severe impact on Australia's exports in the early 1980s. I believe that South Australia must be extremely mindful of the way in which cost blowouts are likely to develop because of the possibility that the price of oil may double.

I am also very concerned about the possibility of the introduction of consumption tax. I do not have a great deal of time in this debate, and I will return to it later, but I think that the consumption tax debate being conducted on the Opposition benches and in Canberra is extremely important. Australians should be aware that, in years gone by when the adage was the Four Horsemen of the Apocalypse, namely, famine, disease, war and pestilence, we can now add a fifth: the danger of a Liberal Government bringing in policies that will hurt a great many ordinary Australians who will not be compensated to anywhere near the extent of regressive taxation of this type and the amount that it will rip out of taxpayers' pockets.

Finally, I hope that the Liberal Party will look long and hard at the consumption tax because, as I shall say in a more lengthy debate on this issue further down the track, it has the potential to hurt many Australians, it has the potential to hurt pensioners, the battlers, those who are struggling, and in many respects it has the potential to make this a very unfair and inequitable society. I also hold the view that when this debate emerged in the Labor Party five years ago a consumption tax was not on.

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

Mr MATTHEW (Bright): In rising to address the appropriation of moneys in the Supply Bill (No. 2), I wish, first, to commend my colleague the member for Fisher for standing up and defending in such a strong manner the rights of residents in his part of Adelaide and condemning this Government for its disgraceful neglect of southern residents. I wish also to elaborate on some of the statements that I made in my Address in Reply speech concerning expendi-

ture on important capital works projects in the southern and south-western suburbs in my electorate.

I justified bringing forward the construction schedule for the third arterial road to alleviate southern traffic problems, and expenditure on a new primary school at Hallett Cove, complete with pick-up and set-down facilities, this project having been recommended by the Parliamentary Standing Committee on Public Works. I also justified expenditure on providing education to year 12 at Hallett Cove, and expenditure to construct a pedestrian underpass for school-children to cross safely the 100 kilometres per hour Lonsdale road.

The Premier's response was to attack me, along with my colleagues, in that disgraceful document that has now been mentioned many times in this place. The document was a press release from the Premier, dated 5 August 1990, entitled, '\$1.8 billion Liberal spending spree does not add up, says Premier.' The Premier may well even attack me for things that I have requested since this disgraceful press release was distributed.

For his convenience I will summarise them: first, expenditure on sporting facilities in the south of Adelaide; secondly, completion of phase IV of Flinders Medical Centre, including, among other things, an additional 200 beds, a day hospital for psycho-geriatric patients and the introduction of accommodation for a cardiac surgery unit; thirdly, a railway bridge over Brighton Road at Hove; fourthly, three pedestrian overpasses or underpasses on Brighton Road in place of pedestrian lights, subject to feasibility studies; and, fifthly, traffic lights at the junction of Brighton Road and Scholefield Road at Marino.

I do not retract from any of those requests. I know they are numerous and costly, but the point is that they are there because the Government has neglected the southern and south-western suburbs in a most disgraceful way. The population of this area of Adelaide is expected, on Government projections, to reach 324 000 people by 1996. An interesting contrast exists between the State Government's treatment of the southern and south-western suburbs and the development detailed in a Government-produced pamphlet, entitled 'MFP—Adelaide South Australia.'

The pamphlet tells the reader that the multifunction polis project (MFP) will comprise 'new and improved education, community services and leisure facilities'. Further, we are told that the proposal 'involves all of Adelaide'. The Premier criticises me for requesting education facilities in my electorate but hails them in the MFP area. Does he expect children in my area to travel daily to Gillman to attend school? After all, the MFP Adelaide project involves all of Adelaide: that is what the pamphlet tells us.

The hypocrisy of the pamphlet does not end there. The same pamphlet states:

The urban design of the area includes a mosaic of villages or settlements separated by parks, forests, lakes and gardens linked with each other and the metropolis of Adelaide by state of the art communication and transport systems.

I repeat, for the benefit of members opposite 'state of the art transport systems.' The Premier had the gall to criticise me for requesting advancement of the third arterial road construction schedule, a road that will alleviate traffic pressure on Brighton Road and South Road—roads that will service a projected population of 324 000 people by 1996. What population will the MFP have to warrant state of the art transport systems linking it to Adelaide? The Government pamphlet tells us quite clearly that 'it is envisaged that the population of the new development will grow to about 100 000 people over a period of 20 to 30 years'.

Who will be paying for all this wonderful infrastructure? All the Government paraphernalia issued to date has been

very sketchy on this finer detail of cost and payment. Will it be overseas investments? Perhaps local private enterprise? Certainly the residents of the neglected southern and south-western suburbs and I are awaiting with interest the Government's funding proposals. After all, time is on our side while we sit waiting for infrequent public transport or while we sit caught up in a traffic jam on Brighton Road or South Road. But the Government is developing the south. After all, members opposite will no doubt say, 'What about Seaford?' Indeed, what about Seaford? Seaford will provide us with an extra 19 000 people living in that area over the next 10 years using the same choked-to-capacity arterial roads on which to move about.

There is no point in developing new suburbs without first planning infrastructure, particularly public transport and roads. This Government does not seem to understand that point. There is no point in developing more new suburbs without attending to existing areas whose infrastructure it has not yet set in place. We have heard plenty of idle promises but we do not see any action. We simply have to establish the infrastructure! The pamphlet states:

The MFP Adelaide concept provides us with an opportunity to develop, especially in the Gillman region, an international approach to living, cultural pursuits and leisure.

The growing southern suburbs of Adelaide have also offered that opportunity, but this Government has been far too short-sighted to notice and far too deaf to hear and, if the answers were thrust under its nose with flashing red lights on top, it would probably be too slow to grasp them. When sitting in my seat in this place looking at the motley assortment of members opposite, there is little doubt in my mind as to why this State is going nowhere fast. The biggest contribution they have made to this State is the debt they have left behind them, and they are no doubt proud of that, too. After all, the Premier is; he told us so himself in his second reading explanation of Supply Bill (No. 2) where he said that he was 'pleased to be able to report to the House' that the budget deficit on Consolidated Account is now close to \$180 million for 1989-90. How any Treasurer can be pleased to present such an appalling result is beyond me. But, of course, it is not the Premier's fault; it is Canberra's fault—it must be, as the Premier keeps telling us. After all he must know, because he is also the Federal President of the ALP.

The fact of the matter is that at the Premiers Conference grants to South Australia increased by \$258.6 million. So, in real terms the State will get about the same from Canberra as in 1989-90. There has been no cut of \$180 million. I will be sitting back with interest to hear from the Premier what the net financing requirement from the whole public sector was in 1989-90. The Premier's budget estimate was a whopping \$54.5 million but the Australian Bureau of Statistics and Access Economics have suggested that the actual result could be \$600 million or over—the worst per capita on mainland Australia.

Members opposite can bleat, squirm and yell as much as they like. The fact is that we look like returning the worst result per capita in Australia in terms of funding of the public sector. That is not a result to be proud of. They can sit there smiling, but by heck, I would not be if I was in their shoes on that side of the House. What sort of Government do they call this? What a disgraceful record. There is no need to worry, the Premier is happy. After all, he told us so. Still, if we run a little short of cash there is always petrol revenue. One can keep ripping that off the unsuspecting motorist at the rate of knots. With petrol prices sky-high at the moment, who will notice? I have news for Mr Bannon and members opposite: I will notice, my colleagues

here will notice and certainly the people of South Australia will notice.

The Hon. T.H. HEMMINGS: On a point of order, Mr Speaker, I understand that it is against Standing Orders for a member to refer to other members by their name, that they must refer to them using their title or their district.

The SPEAKER: The point of order is upheld. Members must always be referred to by their electorate.

Mr MATTHEW: This State Government has ripped petrol tax from South Australian motorists at an alarming rate since it froze the amount of tax revenue going to roads at \$25.726 million in the 1983-84 financial year. Since 1983, State petrol tax has generated more than \$324 million, with only \$154 million of that sum credited to the Highways Fund. Where has the balance of \$170 million gone—straight to general revenue. Straight into the Government's slush bucket.

Well, this time around, Mr Bannon, South Australians are more likely to notice where their petrol dollar goes. They have experienced increases of up to 6 c a litre in the last three weeks, and there are rumours of increases of a further 9 c a litre on the way. South Australians will be demanding that the Government more effectively control and target spending in the public sector. They want value for money and in many cases they are not getting it.

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

The Hon. E.R. GOLDSWORTHY (Kavel): At the end of my remarks in the Address in Reply I suggested that there was an attempt in recent days to re-write history and to attribute to the Labor Government, and to the Premier in particular, some of the achievements and developments in South Australia in which they played little part and when, in fact, they sought to inhibit those developments. Carrying on from those remarks, I want to say that the activities and the departments which generate wealth for this State, namely, the Department of Mines and Energy and the Department of Agriculture, are those which are now least fashionable by far with this Administration, and those departments are being continually downgraded or squeezed for funds.

The Department of Mines and Energy is an efficient, small department. I would suggest that the bread and butter of this State over the generations has been mining and primary production. All these other mushroom departments depend for their sustenance on the revenue generated by these activities—mining and primary production. Yet, the Department of Mines and Energy and the Department of Agriculture do not loom very large at all in the Government's thinking, it seems to me. Some of those departments did not exist when I was elected to Parliament in 1970; they were not even a gleam in the Labor Party's eye, let alone a Government department. They far outstrip in size those two smaller departments, which really, as I say, are responsible for nurturing our bread and butter. When I rang up to talk to the Minister of Mines, someone on the switchboard said, 'Minister for Emergency Services.' It appears that there is no such person that you can get to as the Minister of Mines.

Likewise, the mining industry is rather perturbed about this. During the life of the Administration of which I was part, we managed to bring the Department of Mines and Energy up to the sort of stature that it should enjoy. We had the head of the department upgraded, and we had the department assuming an important role, as indeed it did in the development of Roxby Downs and the oil scheme in relation to the Cooper Basin. The department was given the sort of priority that we as a Government believed it deserved,

because it was a department which, in cooperation with the mining industry, had the capability of generating wealth for the community at large.

The trend has not gone unnoticed in the industry. The Department of Mines and Energy is now very small beer. So much so that, when members of the mining industry or I seek out the Minister, we find that we are talking to the Minister of Emergency Services. That is how important mining is in the thinking of this Government. The *Mineral Industry Quarterly* has revealed some fairly disturbing figures with respect to one area that we rely on for generating wealth and activity and ensuring our financial health. The mineral exploration activity chart, which appears in the most recent quarterly from the Department of Mines and Energy, shows that expenditure on mineral exploration is at its lowest for the past 10 years.

In 1981, during the life of the Administration of which I was a Minister negotiating the Roxby Downs project against the stiff opposition of the Labor Party and Mr Bannon, \$51.116 million was spent on mineral exploration. In the next year, 1982, \$45.5 million was spent, and then it tapered off. There was a bit of a blip in 1984, but it tapered off each year to the stage at which, in 1989, expenditure on mineral exploration was down to \$9.7 million, the lowest for 10 years. I guess it could be argued that it is as a result of the general economic times in which we live, the economic recession—although the Treasurer tells us that we are not in a recession, that we are going to have a soft landing and that we are just putting on the brakes. It depends who you talk to. The fact is, mineral exploration is at an all-time low. When one rings up to speak to the Minister of Mines and Energy, one cannot get him because he is called something else.

The Hon. D.J. Hopgood: But he's the same person.

The Hon. E.R. GOLDSWORTHY: That is so; it might be a little thing, but it has been noticed by me and by the industry, independently. The industry no longer believes that it has a place in the sun with this Government. The industry feels that it does not even have a Minister. When you ring him up, he is someone else.

Mr Ferguson: Yes they do; Roxby Downs is in the sun.

The Hon. E.R. GOLDSWORTHY: Yes, but that is irrelevant; that's not as smart as the honourable member often is.

The SPEAKER: Order! Interjections are out of order.

The Hon. E.R. GOLDSWORTHY: Another subject that I want to refer to concerns the effect that an ABC proposal will have on schools in my electorate. It will actually affect all schools, particularly those in the country. One of the conscientious headmasters in my district, who runs a good school, is particularly concerned at the way in which the ABC is cutting its funding. The ABC may need the pruning knife in its operations but it intends to cut out its education programs, and that will have a dramatic effect on country education. I hope that the Minister of Education's people have taken this up because it is particularly relevant for country schools.

The Hon. D.C. Wotton: There are problems with our orchestra, too.

The Hon. E.R. GOLDSWORTHY: I know. The ABC should get its pruning knife working on its administration, but it should not cut out what is useful or valuable, particularly in terms of our youngsters and their education programs, and that was put to me forcefully by this headmaster. He claims, rightly, that television brings into the classroom a whole range of world events that youngsters have little hope of experiencing. For example, they can be introduced to Shakespeare, which would not be the case otherwise.

The headmaster mentioned the Dodo Club. I immediately thought of my political opponents, but he was not talking about them. The Dodo Club deals with animal extinction and is run by Gerald Durrell. It is all about conservation of species. Such information is invaluable for youngsters and cannot be dealt with in any other way than visually, via these television programs. Likewise, science programs bring into the classroom all sorts of details and experiences that are most valuable and cannot be taught by any other medium. The schools use these programs, yet they are to be axed.

The people who have the pruning knife out at the ABC should listen to the story of Tom Playford, who was confronted by the head of one of his departments, about a cut in their budget. The departmental head said, 'Well, there will have to be retrenchments. We cannot live on this money.' Sir Thomas said, 'Start at the top, and work down.' That would be pretty good advice for the ABC. If it wants to save money, it should start at the top and work down. It should not start with programs of value and excellence, such as education programs, which are valued by conscientious teachers, particularly those in country areas.

The Hon. Ted Chapman: We did that at Samcor in 1980.

The Hon. E.R. GOLDSWORTHY: Of course, start at the top and work down. Sir Humphrey would not like it, I know, but that is the way to go. Maybe it is a strategy on the part of the ABC: cut out the valuable things to try to make the Government restore its funding. I simply put on record that the teachers in my electorate are concerned, as am I, at some of the cuts that have been proposed in the ABC. We believe that the ABC should reorder its priorities, perhaps starting at the top and working down.

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

Mrs HUTCHISON (Stuart): In speaking to the Supply Bill, I would like to discuss a matter in which South Australia has been one of the leaders and which affects the provision of services throughout this State. For the first time in Australia's history, there are women's units advising every State and Territory Government. Not only that, a coordinating committee will now overview everything that happens with regard to women's issues nationally. The first women's unit office was set up in Tasmania in 1976 but it was disbanded shortly afterwards by the Liberal Government when it came to power. Since May 1976, South Australia has been the only State to have an office that has advised the Premier on a continuous basis on women's issues. We have become a leader in this field.

Now that every State and Territory in the nation has a women's adviser, the provision of women's services will be more uniform across the nation. In Queensland, the women's policy branch is being established in the Department of Premier and Economic Trade Development, so it has a high profile in that State. In addition, there is a new policy coordination division, headed by the Director and Women's Adviser to the Premier, a functions and policy analysis unit and a shopfront, which disseminates information with regard to women's issues. It also has a referral service.

In Tasmania, the Government recently established an Office of the Status of Women, which is located in the Social Justice Unit of the Department of the Premier and Cabinet. Again, that office has a high profile in that State, and its function is to advise the Premier and Cabinet on all matters concerning women. It researches issues affecting women in Tasmania and is developing guidelines for a women's consultative/advisory structure in the State. It has taken over the function of the Women's Information Serv-

ice, which was a Commonwealth function, and it will continue to offer a shopfront women's information and referral service.

The Northern Territory has an Office of Women's Affairs, which is situated in the Department of the Chief Minister. It provides policy advice and comment on the Northern Territory Government issues of importance to women and advises on the implications of current policies for women. It also coordinates initiation policies affecting women and monitors the implementation of those policies. The staff of the Office of Women's Affairs liaises with relevant community groups and statutory agencies and promotes two-way communication. Also, it coordinates the national campaign against domestic violence.

New South Wales has a Women's Coordination Unit, which ensures 'women's full and equal participation in all spheres of society'. It develops and coordinates Government policy and programs for women; provides information; monitors Government policies and programs, and ensures that women's needs are considered fully.

South Australia was the first State to establish a Women's Adviser's Office, which is headed by Carol Treloar. The Women's Information Switchboard was part of that initial set-up and has provided a wonderful service for the women of this State, going from strength to strength. It advises the Minister across the board on all issues which affect women and to advance the social, economic and legal status of women. It coordinates projects, such as the women's budget exercise, the report from which will shortly come down, and which is a special issue which goes through all the matters that can affect women. It also coordinates the Government's two-year environmental and urban planning review and the families and work forum for business. Recently, the Women's Information Switchboard provided an information guide in Greek and Italian, and Indo-Chinese and Yugoslav editions are in the pipeline. So, the services that are offered to women in this State are extremely important. There is a hotline and seminars have recently been provided for women interested in small business.

In Western Australia, under the woman Premier (Dr Carmen Lawrence), in May 1990 the Office of Women's Interests was established. This office brings together the three arms of women's interests: policy, development and coordination of the Women's Interests Branch—

The Hon. Ted Chapman: How is she going over there?

Mrs HUTCHISON: She is doing a lot of good—the Women's Advisory Council and the Women's Information and Referral Exchange. The merger gives permanency and status to the portfolio and ensures more coordinated approaches to women's areas by sharing skills, experiences and resources. I am sure that the member for Alexandra would appreciate that.

The new structure comprises three programs: policy development, coordination and implementation; community consultation—and they might like to consult the member opposite; and community information. Each of those three programs develops strategic plans and programming for the future. The areas being looked at include issues for Aboriginal women (particularly those in remote areas)—and this is one of my special interest areas at which I am sure we will be looking closely—women and environment, and mechanisms to monitor policy across the Government.

In Victoria, where again there is a woman Premier—and I am sure that the member for Alexandra appreciates that—is the Victorian Women's Coordination Unit, which is aligned with the Department of the Premier and Cabinet. Again, this is a high profile unit which monitors and provides advice on women's issues across all portfolios. The

Premier (Joan Kirner) has ministerial responsibility for women's affairs. The unit keeps the Victorian women's register and prepares the women's budget statement in line with what is happening in this State. It coordinates the Government's choice and opportunity plan—initiatives aimed at increasing women's access to education, employment and training.

The ACT Women's Unit is located in the Chief Minister's Department in line with what occurs in the Northern Territory. It has a permanent staff of six and two women advisers who run the Women's Information and Referral Service. It also advises the Government on the status of women's matters, which is a Federal function, and aims to achieve changes to Government services and programs through that body. I believe that the ACT Government recently released a policy on the status of women and is advised by the Women's Consultative Council in that territory. The women's unit initiatives involve mainly the drafting of the women's budget statement 1991 and monitoring the establishment of the Women's Health Centre in Canberra.

I believe that it also will soon be releasing a newsletter called 'Women in the ACT' to keep women informed of current developments in Government, Consultative Council and Government agencies in the ACT and nationally. All these units formulate strategies on issues of mutual concern to Governments and, over the period of time that the South Australian unit has been in operation, it has been the fore-runner of a lot of services that otherwise would not have been provided to women in this State, not the least being the budget statement, which is now being copied by other States.

Now that both Queensland and Tasmania have joined with the other States in establishing specific women's policy and advisory units, there is a very real chance that we will be able to improve conditions for women nationally. The coordinating unit established at national level will be having quarterly national meetings, and there is a chance that it will be able to ensure a consistency of approach across all States, so that the same things will be happening in the same areas in each State. Already we have seen some advances from the Office of the Status of Women nationally, some of which have been of particular relevance to my electorate of Stuart, a country electorate. These have been in the area of rural women's health, involving the cervical Pap smear campaigns and the mammography screening, for which funding was acquired recently. Communication channels have been set up into rural areas with 008 numbers, enabling women to ring the various agencies and departments to obtain information. A domestic violence education program and family planning programs have been implemented.

Notwithstanding that, I believe that there is still much to be done in other areas, for example in education, training, employment and the legal area, but the mechanisms are there and it really shows that there is a promising chance for Australia to lead the way.

Mr LEWIS (Murray-Mallee): I begin my remarks by drawing the attention of the House to a matter about which I was speaking only a couple of weeks ago, that is, the necessity for the Government to come clean with a number of reports which it has commissioned over recent times, which it has promised to provide to the public but which, as yet, it has not released. The report to which I was particularly referring was that commissioned by the Government with three local government bodies (Mannum, Murray Bridge and Meningie) on the Lower Murray and its

management for its multiple users. It is identified and accepted as being a multiple user resource. The gentleman who wrote the report was a Mr Phillip Gray.

I do not know why the Government persists in this policy of holding reports close to its chest. It ought to lay the report in the public domain and allow people to examine and comment upon it. I do not see anything in that report of which I personally am ashamed. There are certain recommendations which, I believe, are embarrassing to the Government. Some of them, in fact, are quite damning.

People living alongside the river do not know what is going on in regard to future funding to address the problems which have been identified by me (prior to Mr Gray's report being commissioned). It was perhaps in response to the concerns I was expressing on behalf of those communities that the Government felt compelled to have Mr Gray make his report. Certainly, local government bodies in the Lower Murray identified and recognised the need for it. The report contains a warning that the Lower Murray faces continued environmental degradation because of the Government's totally inadequate river management programs.

More than that, while the Minister sits pat on the report, a number of copies of it are in circulation amongst members of the local government bodies to which I have referred. So, it is not effectively being obscured from public view: the Government is just making other members of the general public very annoyed that they, not living in the Lower Murray area, cannot obtain access to the report.

It only adds to the Government's embarrassment that it persists in this ridiculous stance of refusing to release the report. I strongly urge the Minister to release it forthwith. He should face up to the inadequacies of his department, and that, in this instance, could be any one of a number of Ministers.

There needs to be a refurbishment and a development program for the Lower Murray that is in line with the recommendations of the Gray report—the sort of recommendations which the Government has picked up and upon which I campaigned during the last election. I instance the removal of improperly treated, if not untreated, sewage from the river which is presently allowed to enter the river in a number of places when it is inconvenient for it to go the full cycle of treatment. The treatment, in those circumstances, is still not complete by the standards that we have come to expect in the metropolitan area of Adelaide in relation to the effluent that is put to sea from any of the treatment works in the western suburbs.

Even though you, Mr Speaker, and I, and other members of this place, have expressed concern about the consequences of releasing that effluent into Gulf St Vincent, and also complained about the sludge that is released from time to time, the Government has only recently given an undertaking to do anything about it. I note that a Bill at present before the House proposes to address that problem, but it does not put a date on it; it does not give a commitment. The Government still does not have the guts to do that; it dodges and attempts to hide behind one formal procedure, that is, the Public Works Standing Committee, as the means by which it justifies giving no commitment. I think that that is disgusting. When it suits the Government, it makes other announcements about public facilities, buildings and the like which it will erect and commission for use within a given time frame, yet in this instance the Minister is unwilling to do that.

I come back to the Gray report. We have to stop—as the Minister has now acknowledged—putting effluent into the river. Also, we have to do something to ensure that we reduce the conflict between people who want to use the

river for one purpose as opposed to those who have another interest and purpose and who go there for recreation, relaxation and enjoyment. It is stupid to contemplate a situation in which somebody wishes to watch birds, while somebody else wishes to fish, and a further party or group wishes to go water-skiing. Of these three categories the only people who will have any enjoyment are those who go water-skiing. That is unless there is a sadist amongst the group of fishermen on the bank who lands an empty stubby in the water floating in front of the hull of the boat behind which the skiers are operating; of course, the stubby will take out the bottom of the boat and the skiing will come to an abrupt halt. That is the kind of confrontation we can do without, but it is the kind of confrontation of which we have seen an increasing amount in recent times.

Until the Government acknowledges that the problem exists and does something about it we will continue to have this unpleasant confrontation during times when people should be allowed to enjoy themselves. All we have to do, as the Gray report suggests, is properly zone the river so that everybody knows where they can go to watch birds and not be disturbed; to ski, and not disturb others, or to fish—and this includes swimming or any other activity.

Another matter of concern to me is the amount of money lost from the State budget each year through the arson of public buildings. Recently I have made some comment about this, and I believe it is appropriate for us again to consider the problem. When I was recently in the United States (and I have said this publicly since my return) I had the good fortune to meet the owner of a patent of a new kind of resin which is shock and fire resistant. What is more, when subjected to great heat, it does not give off toxic fumes. One can stand back and ram it with a chainsaw. Walls of buildings constructed of this material, if hit with a 14 pound sledgehammer, will not crack.

One can light a fire on the floor adjacent to the walls and (as I explained in my Address in Reply contribution but did not have sufficient time to give the consequences of doing so) it will not burn. After 15 minutes of a 30-pound crib of wood being ignited in the corner of the structure, one could simply hose it down, sweep out the ash and repaint it. It had not been significantly damaged. It is the kind of material that is manufactured by the Sioux Indian Corporation, the Manager of which is a Mr Bob Manning. The patent for the material is owned by Mr Aaron Smith. An assurance that it would be available to the people of South Australia was given to me when I had a meeting and discussions about the proposal in Chicago.

I believe that if the Sioux Indians can make an outstanding success of manufacturing the material for transportable buildings, then not only should it be brought to the attention of the people who manufacture such buildings in this State but also, more particularly, it should be pointed out that it is an ideal enterprise for the Aboriginal community to take up, because it would provide that community with the kind of housing that it so desperately needs. Also it would provide the Aborigines with an enterprise from which they could derive profits and which would give them self-esteem as a result of their having made a success of it, as well as having contributed something to our schools—which would be fire-proof and indestructible—and other public buildings, including Aboriginal housing in outback areas.

The material also has very good K-factors and puts to rest the need for such heavy insulation factors to be built into the otherwise transportable material of which their buildings have been constructed in the past. I commend this idea to the Government. I am anxious to ensure that we do something about it for the benefit not only of our-

selves but also of those people who could make that material and sell it under licence here in Australia. Mr Speaker, time is too short—

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

The Hon. TED CHAPMAN (Alexandra): I appreciate the opportunity to speak in this debate. The Bill before us is actually the second of its kind in this Parliament. The first Bill provided the appropriation of some \$800 million to take us through the Public Service expenditure period for the first two months of this financial year. The current Bill provides for some \$1 140 million, which is anticipated to cover Public Service expenditure through to early November. Collectively, that is an enormous amount of money. In fact, the figure in the current Bill is about \$70 million above that provided for the same period last year.

While Governments—Federal, State and, indeed, local—have made provision in recent times, including this year, for additional expenditure in the public arena, most, indeed the greater part, of the private sector is required to cut its expenditure. Of course, that is a matter that we can explore further and in more detail during the budget debate to follow. The opportunity given to members during consideration of the Supply Bill is designed to enable individuals to express personal views about whatever matters they may choose to raise pertaining to their respective districts, or to the State.

You, Mr Speaker, would know, probably better than most members in this House, that I am not one to display parochialism to the extreme, as has been demonstrated in this place from time to time. Often, but not always, I address matters of State significance. This occasion presents no exception to that principle, and the matter on which I wish to address myself, albeit briefly, is that surrounding the national parks and reserves of our State. I do so with just a degree of modest authority in so far as my own situation is concerned. I represent the district of Alexandra, which has, within its boundaries—mostly natural—a larger proportion of national parks and reserves of one kind or another than has any other electoral district in South Australia.

Given the topography that surrounds my attractive electorate of Alexandra, in particular as it applies to those reserves, I consider that I am somewhat of an authority on the subject. It is in that context that I propose to address the matter of care and attention of those parks, because again, as you, Sir, would no doubt recognise but others may not, I am a very sensitive and environmentally conscious person. That remark can be well and truly substantiated by a mere casual let alone detailed inspection of my own properties in the electorate I have just mentioned.

My sensitivity to such matters extends to the point where I have taken some time to study the practices of others who traverse and view those parks. For example, during the 1989-90 financial year, on Kangaroo Island some 40 650 people visited Seal Bay, which is a significant area of national reserve in that community; a further 25 211 people are reported to have visited a State reserve surrounding the Kelly Hill caves; and, although this is only an estimate because it has not been documented and thus cannot be substantiated, approximately 60 000 people visited Flinders Chase, a most popular site in that same community. So, my attention has been drawn quite deliberately to their activities in the respective parks and reserves, and in recent years I have noted the behaviour of those people.

Members should not misconstrue my remarks; those people are welcome and we are delighted to have an increasing number of local, interstate and international visitors to

Kangaroo Island. However, in relation to those areas I have just mentioned, a fair amount of traversing, backpacking, caravanning, camping and lighting of fires has occurred, most of which has been carried out in a responsible fashion, but unfortunately some behaviour has been absolutely irresponsible.

Last year I took the trouble to fly over Flinders Chase to observe the location of these campers. While most of them were in the vicinity of the Flinders Chase homestead, some were located on fire access tracks, fence-lined boundaries, old gum tracks and in the scrub of that reserve. They were far beyond the notice of the local rangers, despite the latter's efforts to keep a tab on the activities of campers. In fact, during the summer months in particular, the campers pose an enormous risk to life and property. It is in that context that I believe the matter should be addressed seriously. Further, in that regard, we should give greater consideration to controlled development within the national parks of our State, and particularly within those national parks that are so popular and visited by so many interested patrons. When I say 'controlled development', I mean to encourage private, not Government, development in those places.

In my view, it is not necessary to have total or even joint venture Government involvement in such development. We need to make the land available on lease in appropriate sites, provide the infrastructure out of State expenditure and encourage private tourist accommodation facilities and the development of such premises as are necessary to contain and fully service these people. We should do this not to dictate what they should or should not do, but simply to ensure that they and their property and the overall property of the reserves are safe from fire and other health risks which must ultimately follow from this *ad hoc* camping without facilities and acting irresponsibly as some people do.

Unless this subject is seriously addressed, and in the short term, in those extensive reserves on Kangaroo Island, the Fleurieu Peninsula and other areas around the State, including the Flinders Ranges, we will invite a very large problem. We will find ourselves, as a State, wasting an enormous amount of taxpayers' money searching for people in those isolated places and trying to repair the damage caused by the fires that they light, and picking up the debris that they litter where bins or other proper facilities are not provided. I think that the best possible facilities, such as back-packer camping, caravan park and fully serviced motel premises at a whole range of sites should be developed by the private sector in those parks, catering for those in the various economic strata levels. In the interests of all concerned, we should be pursuing that subject positively. If any difficulties arise in these private development proposals, we ought to be addressing them positively and finding the answers to assist in their implementation, not negatively knocking them.

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

Mr VENNING (Custance): As this is my first opportunity to speak to the House since my maiden speech, I thought it would be a good opportunity to raise an important issue: soil and land care and its management. I believe that we can and should strengthen land management by land owners and local government through the amalgamation of the Soil Conservation Board system and the Animal and Plant Control Boards.

As a fourth generation farmer on an original holding, I have always been concerned about our most valuable resource—our land. I have become more concerned in recent times as farm practices are becoming more intense, and the

large increases in grain legume production with their subsequent grazing are putting this resource at great risk.

As most members would know, I have had experience in the public arena as a councillor in local government, as a member of the South Australian Advisory Board of Agriculture, and as a member and past Chairman of an Animal and Plant Control Board. I am relatively satisfied that land owners have a good channel of communication and course of action on our proclaimed plant and animal problems without establishing boards via our local district councils. I am concerned, however, that there is no such structure with the soil boards.

I believe that at present there is a unique opportunity to put together at least two functions of land management—soil conservation programs and animal and plant control operations—which would enhance the long-term goal of ensuring ongoing viable land. This opportunity has arisen because the community sees an urgent need to implement better soil care. Expression of this need can be seen through increased Federal funding and the interest of community-based conservation groups. We must take advantage of this new interest.

The board system at local level is associated with soil conservation, and animal and plant control has proved its worth in South Australia and needs to be preserved and strengthened at a time when resources are diminishing.

Mr Groom: You are going to tax this with a consumption tax.

Mr VENNING: This will save money.

The SPEAKER: Order!

Mr Groom interjecting:

Mr VENNING: Wait until I get to the end and you will see. The Pest Plants Act and the Vertebrate Pests Act have already been successfully amalgamated with an improved efficiency. There are diminishing resources in local government and Government to administer legislation. There is less money to run the board system. When the board systems were established in South Australia, there were nearly 30 000 productive land units. Today, there are fewer than 14 000. In less than 15 years it has halved, so it is becoming more difficult to find people to participate in the board systems. Animal and plant control boards maintain in the field control of pest animals and pest plants. These control programs are achieved by employing trained officers who work under the instruction of the board. The boards, in other words, are improving land management.

Animal and plant control boards have a total budget of approximately \$3 million found on a 50/50 basis from local government rate revenue and the State Treasury. That has not risen for about five years. This supports approximately 35 boards in rural areas, 11 in urban areas, 75 full-time authorised officers and 25 part-time officers. The system is controlled by a commission, which has a technical staff of about 24 officers. Soil conservation boards, on the other hand, are largely involved in promoting better land care by using modern technology to protect the soil from wind, water erosion and salinity. Soil boards are charged with enforcing erosion control within the terms of the Act, but this has always been the last resort.

Soil conservation boards are, therefore, involved in land management, as are pest control boards. It may be argued that soil conservation boards are dealing with more basic land management problems—the soil—and, therefore, should be better serviced. Very shortly, the whole State will be covered by soil conservation boards, numbering more than 20, three of which have been operating for more than 30 years. Another five boards are being developed and should be operational soon.

Boards do not—I emphasise ‘do not’—have their own budgets but the animal and plant control boards do. They are serviced by approximately 15 officers in the Department of Agriculture and have access indirectly to project funds provided by State and Federal Governments. These amount to about \$800 000 annually. What advantages would amalgamation give? It would give a more balanced approach to land management as a whole. Less management by chemicals—and that should please members of the Government—will be possible in the future, requiring more management by land care, soil protection and shared resources. Board officers could cover the same ground to deal with more issues.

At the moment we have two boards, the two bodies, doing similar work and travelling in different cars. It is a waste. A strong focus on land management issues would be development at a local level. The amalgamated boards would have a stronger voice in the wider community and be actually involved in planning rather than relying on an advisory role. How would the amalgamation affect Local Government staff? The amalgamation would undoubtedly affect the pest control authorised officers. They, of course, could not be expected to do two jobs. The amalgamated board would have to set down priorities and gradually absorb soil conservation programs. The authorised officers should, therefore, have the opportunity to expand their jobs. They will need training and, in some cases, boards will need additional officers. It will not cost the Government more: it will cost it less because we will have the same officers doing the same jobs, and this will save repetitive work.

Conservation activities will bring money resources. It may mean that in time less effort will be expended on weed killing and more on the construction of soil protection systems: contour banks, tree planting, stubble mulching and revegetation. Much has been happening in the area of land care, but I feel that we can and should go further. Already in outlying areas, especially on the Far West Coast—

Mr Groom: Scrap the consumption tax.

Mr VENNING: That has nothing to do with it—all these boards will act as one—

Mr Groom interjecting:

Mr VENNING: The honourable member cannot be listening—taking on extra soil work under the mantle of land care. This change cannot happen overnight. I think a two to three year period would be needed to let things settle down. It would take that long to implement the scheme anyway. Certainly, it would be a commonsense and natural progression in the land of management strategy. It would provide better management of all resources. I believe that single land management trusts should be entrusted with land care into the 1990s.

The Hon. D.C. WOTTON (Heysen): I indicate my concurrence with what the member for Custance has said about land care. If I have time later, I will refer to that matter in greater detail. In considering the Supply Bill (No. 2), I refer to the Premier’s second reading explanation, when he stated:

It provides \$1 140 million to enable the Public Service to carry out its normal functions until assent is received to the Appropriation Bill. Members will recall that it is usual for the Government to introduce two Supply Bills each year. The earlier Bill was for \$800 million and was designed to cover expenditure for the first two months of the year. This Bill is for \$1 140 million, which is expected to be sufficient to cover expenditure until early November, by which time debate on the Appropriation Bill is expected to be complete and assent received. The amount of this Bill represents an increase of \$70 million on the second Supply Bill for last year to cover wage and salary and other cost increases since that time.

Taking into account those significant increases to which the Premier has referred, I doubt that we are getting much more from the Public Service as a result of that extra expenditure and as a result of the significant increase in the number of people who are now working in the Public Service in this State. I am not being critical of the majority of the people who make up the Public Service. I have had the opportunity to work closely with many of them and I appreciate the commitment that many of those people make and that many of them have made over a period of time. I must say that I am concerned about the situation we find occurring on a number of occasions within different departments, where it seems to be very difficult for new and fresh ideas to come up through the Public Service.

There seems to be a bottleneck towards the top of the structure within the service as we know it at present. I know that there are some excellent young people who have joined the Public Service in recent times. They have shown a lot of initiative, they have good ideas, they are keen and committed, but they become easily frustrated because many of the initiatives that they want to put forward for the betterment of the Government and of South Australia are not taken on board by those who have senior responsibility within the service. I have often wondered about the idea of encouraging public servants (and perhaps making them) to move from department to department. The administration of such a proposition would of course be very difficult.

We would have to keep separate the officers employed in the scientific and economic fields, for example, but it would be a very good idea for public servants to be moved around and given the opportunity to seek new experiences and to contribute in other areas. I am sure that all members recognise that, when people become involved in different portfolio areas or when they have new responsibilities, they can make a fresh commitment in a number of different areas.

I am concerned to learn from this Bill that a significant increase is to be set aside yet again for the administration of the Public Service while at the same time the Government seems to be running down business, particularly small business, in this State. Recently, a young fellow came to see me in my office. He runs a successful business but, of late, he has come into some financial difficulties. Given the figures that he has provided me, it is no wonder that that is the case, that so many small businesses are finding it difficult to survive. He listed five areas of concern that come under Government administration and compared the cost to his business in 1987 with that of today.

The first cost is WorkCover, with a 6.4 per cent levy rate. In July of 1987, WorkCover cost his company \$12 500; it now costs \$25 000. Payroll tax is set at 5 per cent. In July 1987, the figure was nil; he now pays \$20 000. With respect to leave loading at 17.5 per cent, in 1987 he paid \$1 500, and he still pays the same amount. However, it is a disincentive to those who wish to employ others. Government taxes, including such taxes as FID, amounted to \$500 in July 1987. He now pays \$2 000. With superannuation at 3 per cent, in 1987 he paid nothing but he now pays \$13 000.

That represents a situation where, on 1 July 1987, the costs to that small business were \$14 500. However, as at this month the costs are now \$61 500. This is not a large business but, as a result of the figures to which I have referred, there has been an increase of \$47 000, or 324.1 per cent, in three years. That sets out very clearly the difficulties that many small businesses are facing, and it makes it easier for us to understand why some of these people are experiencing these financial problems.

I now want to express my concern about funding allocated to the police of this State. I am concerned because we seem

to be putting more resources into revenue-raising through speeding offences, etc., and fewer resources into dealing with criminal activities in this State. Time after time, I am made aware in my electorate of the continuation and increasing number of break-ins. In fact, recently in the main street of Stirling, for instance, there have been situations where the same business has been broken into twice and, in some cases, three times in a very short period. In many of these instances, we hear it suggested that young people are responsible for the break-ins, but I suggest that professionals who know exactly what they are doing have been responsible for a number that have been brought to my attention.

I believe there is a need for more resources to be put into the Police Force to enable it to carry out some of the more important responsibilities it has been allocated under the statutes rather than just being seen to be there as revenue raisers for the Government and to increase general revenue. That is a particular concern of mine and of those in my electorate.

Mr S.G. EVANS (Davenport): I wish to refer to some correspondence about a matter that causes concern not only to me but to many other people. This letter, written to the Minister of Transport on 27 June 1986, states:

As a concerned citizen, I write to you in the cause of road safety seeking your practical action in correcting an extremely hazardous situation that is apparent on Shepherds Hill Road. I have lived at the junction of this road and Wilpena Street, Eden Hills, since 1949 and have witnessed the road change from a meandering track to a four-lane highway.

I have also witnessed and heard and attended an alarming number of vehicle accidents within the area of concern, far too many. It would appear to me that most would not be known to the authorities. Fortuitously they have, with one exception to my knowledge, involved the one vehicle.

The problem: Drivers travelling from Blackwood down Shepherds Hill Road are required to negotiate a curve in the road adjacent to the Wittunga Botanical Gardens. For reasons best known to the driver, the front wheel of the vehicle touches the median strip which separates the up and the down tracks of this dual road causing the vehicle to go violently out of control. The result is either a sharp deflection to the left, over the footpath and into Wittunga Gardens or, worse, to jump the median strip and continue at 60 km/h, usually faster, totally out of control skidding down the traffic lanes reserved for up traffic.

My area of concern is that a fast double stream of traffic, or indeed any driver proceeding to Blackwood, the schoolchildren attending primary and high schools, the residents of the area, are presently required to face this apparent and real hazard. I ask that a steel guard rail be added along the total length of the median strip to prevent the hazard.

Mr Minister, this letter has not been prompted merely by forebodings. On the road alongside this address a few years ago, a mother and her infant sons were innocent road traffic victims due to circumstances as I have described. You have it in your power to show that I am not the only person who cares.

Subsequently, the Minister wrote to that person on 16 July 1986 and said that the Highways Department would carry out an investigation into that piece of road. On 27 November 1986 the then Minister again wrote to the gentleman, and part of that letter states:

I refer to your letter of 27 June 1986 and my interim reply of 16 July 1986 regarding your request for guard railing along Shepherds Hill Road at Eden Hills.

The Highways Department has now completed its investigation which included an analysis of accident statistics for the past three years, together with a study into the adequacy of the existing traffic controls.

The letter concluded:

Having regard to all of the above it is considered that the existing traffic safety controls are sufficient along this section of road. Thank you for your interest in this road safety issue.

The letter was signed by Gavin Keneally. In that response, the Minister was saying that departmental officers found that very few accidents had occurred at that spot. I now

wish to read the letter which this person then wrote to the Minister, as follows:

I refer to our correspondence, my letter to you dated 27 June 1986 and your replies dated 1 and 16 July and 27 November 1986 concerning guard railing along Shepherds Hill Road at Eden Hills.

The grounds for your decision as in your advice of 27 November are inept. It is simply not true that there were no accidents involving a vehicle losing control and crossing the median strip during 1983 and 1985. It appears so very wrong that the apparent designers of this road should advise you there is no record, therefore there was no accident, therefore no safety problem exists. The second paragraph of my letter to you clearly states: 'It would appear to me that most would not be known to the authorities.' You have now confirmed that my assumption was correct, viz. ignorance by the authorities is a factor, but it also appears that you do not wish to know, and that is of real concern. Neither I nor my neighbours who share my concern have been interviewed by any person of authority on the matter, and I suspect that your advisors have not made an inspection at the site, because even one gouge mark caused by the underside of a road vehicle to a median strip should not be ignored by a responsible investigator intent on safety. Please do not ask me how many marks there are. Spraying with reflective paint regularly removes the tell-tale tyre marks.

Do you really believe that the driver whose vehicle jumps the median strip, spins out of control on the wrong lane, wiping muffler and perhaps tail-pipe off with maybe leaking diff or sump and smashing tail and indicator lights plus wheels out of alignment will immediately drive to the nearest police station and make a report? That driver is fortunate he is still alive and mobile, he invariably does not stop, but keeps moving, still in shock from the trauma of accident or, event happening by chance, or violent mishap, to distance himself from the scene. Did the Highways Department notify you that on 27 June 1986 (the day of my letter to you), that the 55 kph sign to warn motorists travelling to Blackwood was demolished by a vehicle travelling down from Blackwood? The vehicle jumped the median, skidded 100 metres backwards on the up-track over the footpath and collected the sign. The vehicle, quite unroadworthy, was driven away. The department replaced the sign about two days later and I asked the workmen why there was no warning on the kerb-side for drivers coming down-hill from Blackwood on the approach to the corner. The answer was: 'Good question: I'll ask the boss.' Mr Minister, there never has been a warning sign erected, I believe there is still no warning sign—perhaps you would like to 'ask the boss' why?

How can you seriously quote the criteria for the installation of guard railing when the only other major curve on Shepherds Hill Road has a strong steel guard rail down the middle of the median strip? There is no evidence of the presence of the quoted criteria to sanction the erection of this protective barrier installed on a lesser curve, shorter than the corner in dispute.

On Monday 18 May 1987 I regret to record that my predictions came true. I was not witness to the accident, but I have reason to believe vehicle registered number UDY-211 travelling from Blackwood jumped the median strip and entered the up-track in the path of Blackwood bound SYT-952. This horrific accident occurred at or about 6.45 p.m. I tried so hard to draw attention to this most obvious hazard, but you would not act to remove it and, as the senior responsible person, the blame sheets home to you.

I will not read the rest of the letter because of the lack of time available to me, but the writer goes on to make his point. I became involved from that point on and I wrote to the then Minister (Hon. G.F. Keneally) who replied, telling me that there was no need to put in the New Jersey concrete median barriers which exist on the freeway and also at the subway at Goodwood Road. He also said that there was no need to install steel guard railing to deflect vehicles because it would not work—I disbelieve that. The Minister said that yellow and black chevrons would be installed to direct people.

I want to make the point to the present Minister—and I will write to him—that the two young lasses who were killed last Friday night would not have been killed if a guard rail had been erected on this corner, which is long and sweeping. I know that other factors were involved in this accident, including the judgment of young people. We must realise that many young people who have a sense of adventure are

quite often the ones that we lose, but if we get them through this period they are of more benefit to society in the future.

I ask the Minister to ensure that a proper barrier be erected at this corner because there have been many accidents there. The gentleman who wrote the letter—and the Minister will be informed of his name—has lived there for a long while. There are not just a few accidents a year—there are a lot. These three people crossed the road into oncoming traffic. If a family had been coming home from a function in the other direction, a lot more people would have been killed. The vehicle travelled 80 metres before hitting a stobie pole. There was glass 50 metres past the stobie pole and on properties on the other side of the road. So, the vehicle travelled about 60 metres on the wrong side of the road.

The ACTING SPEAKER (Mr Gunn): The honourable member's time has expired. The honourable member for Elizabeth.

Mr M.J. EVANS (Elizabeth): I should like to address the specific problem of the consideration of the budget by this Parliament and, in particular, by this House. As members will be aware, for many years the way in which the Parliament proceeds to debate the provisions of the Appropriation Bill in the Estimate Committees and the way in which statutory authorities, in particular, are treated in this kind of debate has been of concern to me. It is essential that the actual way in which statutory authorities' finances and accountability are examined by the Parliament be strengthened considerably if the Parliament is to retain the initiative in the control of financial accountability in the Government of South Australia.

It is quite clear to me, after six years in this place, that the statutory authority mechanism can, in fact, create many problems for Parliament if it is to retain its pre-eminent role in financial circles. In recent years, the deficit funded statutory authorities have continued to expand their operations and to expand their deficits, I might say, in many cases. They do so in almost all instances where under direct ministerial control and, of course, the State of South Australia guarantees the debt repayment of those authorities.

If we examine those three criteria, we gain a better understanding of the point I seek to make. The statutory authorities about which I am principally concerned are those with substantial deficits or which are deficit funded; those where the Act of Parliament has been amended over the past decade or so to provide for direct day to day ministerial control; and those whose funding is guaranteed by the State of South Australia. Quite clearly, those organisations range from very large and influential groups such as the Housing Trust to relatively small but, certainly, not insignificant organisations such as the West Beach Trust. I do not pick these organisations for any reason other than to illustrate the range of organisations about which I am speaking. Members will be aware, of course, that the State Transport Authority, for example, also falls into those categories.

The Parliament has always treated the budgets of those organisations in many different ways. The Health Commission, for example, has a huge budget, and during the Estimates Committees the Health Commission in many ways has been one of the most forthcoming organisations with respect to providing information to this Parliament. I congratulate it on the standard of information in the material that it publishes, not as part of the Program Estimates but as supplementary material.

The Education Department also provides supplementary material of considerable interest to members to accompany the budget debate. Those documents are very useful and

promote quite an informed and progressive debate in the Estimates Committee before those matters are considered. They have been quite useful to date. If we turn our attention to organisations such as the Housing Trust, for example, we see that in recent years it has not been possible to acquire in advance a budget for the Housing Trust for the coming year. That has made debate during the Estimates Committees somewhat less informed. The Minister of the day, of course, has always attended the Estimates Committee hearing in a spirit of complete cooperation, and to my experience (and I have always attended those debates since I became a member of this House) the Minister has always responded in full to questions which I have put before him or her and, of course, has offered to provide additional information where that has been desirable. The questions, however, have been necessarily limited by the fact that I was not in possession of the range of information which I ought to have had to enable me to exercise my role of holding the executive Government of the State accountable for its financial expenditure.

I have always been pointed to the Auditor-General's Reports and the annual report of the Housing Trust and the like, which provide excellent information on what has been done in the previous year. While that information is historically most informative, it certainly gives me no way of estimating what will happen in the forthcoming year.

The Housing Trust is one of the most prominent organisations in this category. Other organisations, such as the West Beach Trust (to refer back to the previous example I gave), are also in the same position. Whereas the Housing Trust has always been able to present officers and its Minister for full discussion before the Estimates Committees, other organisations, such as the West Beach Trust, have not. I think that these are matters that the Parliament will need to consider very seriously if the Estimates Committee process is to survive in any form at all.

Quite clearly, where an organisation is subject to the day-to-day control of the Minister by direction of the law there is no way in which it can avoid accountability to this Parliament, and that certainly means accountability for its expenditure even if that expenditure is not directly appropriated by this Parliament but is provided by the people of South Australia indirectly, through debt guarantees or through ministerial control. I hope that the Government will take on board those matters.

I have every expectation that Ministers will allow a full examination of those areas, and certainly it would be my view that that should take place. The parliamentary process does not permit of very rapid change. If we are to make this transition it will not occur completely this year. I believe that the House will need to allow time for these mechanisms to be developed properly. I, for one, would not expect that in a couple of weeks the Housing Trust will be able to produce a full, documented budget for public examination. That would be far too much to expect. Even though I am sure a suitable document circulates internally, I doubt that it could be made available here, but certainly by next year I would expect that, with Government cooperation, such things would be possible. I will continue to press the Government to see that that cooperation is forthcoming.

I would also like to refer to program performance budgeting and performance indicators. Members who have been attentive to my speeches over some years now will be aware that this is also one of my favourite topics in the financial area.

Mr Ferguson interjecting:

Mr M.J. EVANS: I thank the member for Henley Beach. The financial documents which accompany the budget, and

I refer specifically to the Program Estimates and Information, in each area of Government administration cite 'Specific Targets/Objectives (Significant Initiatives/Improvements/Results Sought)' for each program area. As members will know, the pages run in the hundreds and hundreds. However, these targets are not exactly as specific as I think all members would like. For example, referring at random to the housing portfolio, one can see that 'Specific Targets' include:

The trust's rent rebates program will be reviewed to achieve long-term viability in the light of Commonwealth-State Housing Agreement changes.

One would expect that. I understand that the Health Commission is also in favour of South Australians enjoying good health, but again one would expect that. And the State Transport Authority is in favour of the increased use of public transport, but again one would expect that from a competently run and administered statutory authority in charge of public transport.

I think it is time that program performance indicators were specifically developed for use by all departments and statutory authorities to show to the public and this Parliament how those funds are being used and what changes in productivity, efficiency and the allocation of resources are occurring in the long term. Then we will be able to see, preferably graphically but with statistical tables where necessary, and with brief, incisive reports to the Parliament, exactly what the long-term trends are in resource utilisation and efficiency of operation, and, in fact public use of these services, the number of kilometers travelled per employee, and so on. We have all seen in company annual reports very neat graphic representations of efficiency and accountability which would be far more useful to this Parliament than the 'Specific Targets/Objectives' which are anything but specific targets and objectives, and which have, for years since the Tonkin Government first introduced the concept, been listed in the program descriptions of each department.

I know that work has been done in Government. For example, the Government Management Board published a report years ago on the use of performance indicators in departments, but that report is gathering dust. I hope that over the next 12 months the Government will find a way of reviving it and introducing it far more uniformly in Government departments and in documents like the program performance budget papers so that the Parliament can easily ascertain that the public's confidence in the Government is justified, that the funds are indeed being wisely spent and that the increased performance that we would all expect over time from our public servants is indeed taking place.

Dr ARMITAGE (Adelaide): I wish to address a number of issues today and major amongst them is funding for hospitals.

Mr Groom interjecting:

The ACTING SPEAKER (Mr Gunn): Order! The member for Hartley has already made his speech. He is constantly interjecting and I ask him to cease.

Dr ARMITAGE: Given my current shadow portfolio, I am very interested in funding for the health area. However, it has also been a long-term interest of mine. To listen to the Government's statements on this issue, it would seem that in the health area all is well. Specifically in answer to questions—mainly dorothy dixers—we hear from the Minister that all is steady as she goes. I remind the House that nothing was said in the Governor's speech about the health budget or the problems. We can only assume from that that the Government is delighted with what is happening in the health arena at the moment.

I remind the House that, if I were to telephone the orthopaedic clinic at the Royal Adelaide Hospital for an appointment, I would get one on 1 March 1991. I also remind the House that, if I were to telephone the Queen Elizabeth Hospital for an ear, nose and throat appointment, I would get that appointment in January 1991.

Members interjecting:

Dr ARMITAGE: I intend to. The interjections from opposite are an indication of the frivolity with which the Government treats people with long-term chronic, debilitating medical problems. The Opposition has had enough of it. What happens when I have attended my appointment on 1 March 1991? I then go on to a waiting list and the Government tells us that it is steady as she goes and that all is well.

I also remind the House that funding problems led to the situation last week where no nurse was present in a post-surgical ward, a situation that has the potential to cause major problems for South Australians. More money may not completely solve all the difficulties, but I can assure members that it would help. I can also assure the House that it will certainly help the situation in relation to waiting lists for surgery. One of the ways in which it will do this is to allow overtime to be paid so that people will be able to get operations performed, no matter at what time they are scheduled.

Frequently I have heard of people who have been in the pre-operative area, having had their pre-operative medication, being told, 'Sorry, your operation is cancelled.' The reason given is that the operation would take two or three hours and the shift would end before that time, so the patient is told to come back at some other time. This is simply not adequate, and I tell the Government that it is on notice—not only from me and my Party (because, after all, that is what we are here for) but also from the public—that it must improve health services. The electors of South Australia have had enough of it.

Having been fairly derogatory, I wish to address hospital funding from a different perspective. I refer to a ceremony which I attended recently at the Adelaide Children's Hospital and which I thoroughly enjoyed because, indeed, it made me feel good about Australia. It made me feel good about Australia because the attributes of caring, sharing, happiness in being here and happiness with opportunities presented in Australia were fully demonstrated. The Lord Mayor of Adelaide attended the ceremony to present a new portable X-ray machine for the Adelaide Children's Hospital.

The X-ray machine which it replaced was 15 years old. I am happy to inform the House that I recall the old machine trundling around the wards of the Adelaide Children's Hospital when I was there as a doctor. The benefit of this machine is that the treatment can be taken to the patient. I refer to the problem in country medicine at the moment: what this Government is trying to do is move the patients to medicine where the major benefits are from doing exactly the reverse.

This machine was the gift of the Wong group of companies and the Director of the company, Mr Wong, donated \$50 000 to the charity of the Lord Mayor's choice. The Lord Mayor indicated to the meeting that first he had to seek clarification that he had heard what he thought he heard. When he realised that that was the case, he thought he would look around for a charity that had the widest application. He believed that at some stage all people, be it personally, through other members of the family or whatever, have some contact with the Adelaide Children's Hospital.

The Lord Mayor therefore offered first bite of this magnificent cherry to the Adelaide Children's Hospital, which of course welcomed the opportunity with open arms. It spent \$45 000 on a state-of-the-art mobile X-ray machine. The Wong group of companies is to be applauded for its generosity. The remaining \$5 000 of this gift will be put towards a very significant initiative which, according to the Lord Mayor, will be announced on 18 October. I assure everyone involved that we are sufficiently titillated that we cannot wait.

The Wong group of companies comes from Hong Kong and, as part of the business migration program, has been here for three years. It is involved in an export and import business, principally in diamonds and pearls but also in Adelaide real estate and in farming. The benefits of this type of program are seen when the group is considering establishing a workshop in Adelaide which obviously will employ Australians. Hong Kong has a low rate of taxation which encourages businesses. According to Mr Wong, a tradition has grown up in Hong Kong whereby successful business people, who are grateful for the low rate of tax, donate money to charity on a regular basis. On coming to Australia, Mr Wong decided to continue that tradition, and he is to be applauded and thanked for this generosity.

Of course, the major benefit of immigration (and, indeed, there are many others) is that Australia is increasingly a global country. We live in a world economy and we are in an information society. We would be putting our head in the sand if we did not embrace the world properly and fully through immigration and other measures such as that. Hong Kong particularly is a special case because of the date of 1 January 1997. I would like to think that we actively encourage more people, who have the values espoused by the Wong group, to come to Australia, because successful Hong Kong companies have proven success rates, have identified enterprise and initiatives and also they have the ability to work hard. In addition, they have the capital to make their schemes work. They also have traditions that are successfully transplanted into the Australian work force.

At the ceremony at which the portable X-ray machine was donated, I spoke to a very successful Adelaide businessman and indicated to him that perhaps the Adelaide business community could embrace a similar tradition and donate to charity. He replied immediately and said, 'We will take up this tradition if you' (meaning us as a Government and a parliamentary organisation) 'stop taxing us.' I believe that we should allow and encourage successful people to continue to be successful rather than equalising them by imposing punitive taxes and charges.

South Australia in particular, and Australia in general, has a fine tradition of allowing successful people to continue to be successful and, indeed, encouraging them to be more successful. These traditions and benefits can be seen in great episodes of philanthropy. I talk particularly of Sir Langdon Bonython, who donated the money for the other half of Parliament House, and of Sir Thomas Elder and the Elder family who donated the Conservatory, Elder Hall, the two rotundas in Elder Park, and the zoo. Other people have also made various donations.

The Wong group of companies has continued this tradition of public philanthropy, and it is to be applauded and congratulated. Further, I believe it should be encouraged to be successful as other companies in Australia are trying to be successful. I remind the House that the Wong group of companies made this outstanding donation because it is happy to be here in Australia and that Australia has presented its family and business with such great opportunities. Let us hope that the policies which our various Govern-

ments will espouse when we gain office and those espoused by the present Governments will see successful companies remain successful.

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

Mr BECKER (Hanson): This afternoon I received an answer to a question on notice. I was surprised that I received the answer so quickly, but I was advised that the Engineering and Water Supply Department paid Mr Hugh Hudson the following amounts relating to his consultancy work. This relates to a review of the water rating system. Mr Hudson claimed 24½ days' work at \$550 per day. On a five-day week, 52-week year, that works out to about \$143 000. I do not care what consultants get paid, what they do or what the value of their work is, but \$550 a day to undertake a review of our water rating system seems to me a little too high. Anyway, that was worth \$13 475. He had a research assistant for one day at \$200 a day; eight return flights to Canberra at \$544 per flight, amounting to \$4 352; accommodation and meals \$1 672.05; and taxi fares \$133.15. That is an all up total of \$19 830.20. That is what it has cost the taxpayers that we know of, apart from the printing of a pamphlet to advise us that the water rating system has been changed, and that there is a new mathematical equation to work out the water rate, and everybody will be on excess water.

If anyone knew Hugh Hudson and the lectures that he used to give us in this House on economics, it was always going to be a complicated system. But he sneaked in a wealth tax, a property tax. For any property worth over \$100 000 one pays \$7.80 for every \$10 000 valuation. Many people in my electorate who have properties in the range \$150 000 to \$200 000 will be paying a considerable amount in wealth tax over and above the basic rate for water, and they will all be on excess water. It is disgraceful to think that we have paid out \$20 000. Some years ago the department went through all sorts of exercises to try to work out a water rating system, yet we have to bring in a former Minister of a Labor Government of South Australia to tell us that everybody will pay for what they use. It simply is not on to employ retired politicians at \$550 a day; I find that very hard to justify.

The new regulations under the Lotteries and Gaming Act, which come into force on 1 September, could mean the end of the traditional hotel sports and social clubs. The sale of instant cash tickets, the largest source of fund raising in hotels, is to be conducted by the licensee of the hotel, who must open a bank account for the lotteries which are conducted. The holder of the licence, the hotel licensee, must take sole responsibility for, and cannot delegate, the allocation and disbursement of the net proceeds. I fear that this could cause considerable problems with social clubs operating at most suburban hotels, where the proceeds of their endeavours are given to local sporting and charitable organisations and major State-wide charities.

One social club in my electorate conducts 20 'meat-tray raffles' each week. This social club would be loath to conduct that type of activity if opposition were to come from the sale of instant cash tickets by the publican in the same bars of that hotel. The future not only of the meat-tray raffles will be in doubt but also 'chook raffles'. That would be a tragedy. The 20c chook raffle in most hotels is a fun thing; it is an easy way of raising money for the local sporting clubs or charities, and nobody minds buying a ticket for that. But at long last the Government is to put an end to that. It is an absolute shame. The new regulations have not achieved what I sought almost three years ago,

and that was to eliminate the middle man in charity fund raising and stamp out fraudulent procedures.

It appears to me that persons conducting instant cash ticket sales on commercial premises can charge up to 10 per cent of the gross proceeds in administrative costs, including rent. I will deal with that later. I am advised that boxes of instant cash tickets are so organised nowadays by the printers that the major winning prizes are located in the bottom right hand corner. In other words, the old practice of handing four \$50 winning tickets in a box of bingo tickets is eliminated. The major prizes are now located in a special corner of the box. The whole small lotteries instant cash ticket fundraising issue still needs to be reviewed properly.

Some years ago I called for a Government review. This was undertaken in 1987, but I am not satisfied that the recommendations of that committee are being followed through; nor are the experiences of that committee of inquiry. I am not satisfied that the committee achieved what we had hoped. Therefore, a parliamentary select committee—as much as I hate parliamentary select committees—may be the only avenue we can use now to get to the bottom of a \$50 million industry that raises funds for charities and sporting organisations.

The working party into instant lotteries, hotels and other commercial outlets in August 1987 recommended that the printers and suppliers of instant lottery tickets should be licensed and subjected to strict standards in accordance with Government criteria. That is being implemented in these regulations, and I am happy to see that included. However, where it is desired to conduct instant lotteries in a hotel, the hotel licensee should be issued with a sole minor lottery licence to do so, and the licensee should assume full responsibility for the conduct of those lotteries in the hotel.

Of course, he risks his liquor licence if he does not abide by the very strict guidelines. Consideration should be given to adopt option A or B on the disbursement of net proceeds from instant lotteries and hotels as outlined in the working party's alternatives with emphasis on the rationalisation of such proceeds, and that financial returns under the Minor Licence Category be prepared by a qualified accountant or auditors should the net proceeds derived in one year exceed \$2 000. Many hotel social clubs raise in excess of \$20 000 a year; some raise \$50 000 or more. They do a wonderful job in raising money and supporting the local organisations, but what worries me is that doubt still exists in relation to the fraud involved in these small instant cash tickets, and also that we have established a middle man who can take 10 per cent of the proceeds. We have that at the major shopping centres.

I raised that matter some three years ago and was castigated by Sargent Enterprises because I dared to make the allegation in this House that Mr Sargent had a monopoly at the Westfield shopping centre. However, I am still convinced that, through the system he uses, if one wants to buy a ticket from that organisation he will sell some at the Westfield shopping centre. However, the cost of those tickets seems to be quite high compared to the price that one pays directly from the printer. But, that is not the problem: the problem is that, in the spirit of the legislation, Sargent Enterprises is ranking space from Westfield shopping centres and also pays staff to sell those tickets. He is not the only one; other organisations are doing it.

Some years ago, when I approached the Lotteries office to raise money for the Epilepsy Association, I was told that it was forbidden: one was not allowed to pay rent and/or employ people to sell these instant cash tickets. Yet, the practice has been going on, and it is not being stamped out. So, these regulations will not achieve what we want to

achieve. In other words, if one buys a ticket from these organisations in the belief that one is supporting a charity, one expects that most of the income goes direct to that charity. The new regulations of the minor lottery spell out very clearly the following in clause 11:

Expenses excluding cost of prizes shall not exceed 10 per cent of the anticipated gross proceeds of tickets sold in any lottery.

Clause 13 states:

No payment of salary or commission shall be made to any person other than a qualified accountant or auditor, in connection with the conduct of any lottery, competition, or spinning wheel.

Clause 16 provides:

Every purchaser or owner of a ticket in a lottery shall be given a fair and equal chance of winning a prize in respect of every ticket in the lottery.

Clause 17 states:

The promoter and the committee of a lottery or licensee of licensed premises shall not use or permit or suffer to be used or derive any profit from the lottery proceeds.

The publican will be paying his bar staff, and they will sell the tickets as they have done in the past. I want to know where the Government stands on this issue and what it is going to do. Will it enforce these regulations or turn a blind eye?

If it is, all charities in South Australia should hop on the bandwaggon. Major shopping centre outlets are very hard to find now. Rental of premises costs between \$900 and \$1 200 a week. Certainly, I take off my hat to West Lakes shopping centre, which allows one charity a week to sell tickets without charge. A charity can make as much as \$3 000 a week. West Lakes deserves to be complimented for this and I hope it never does what Westfield does, that is, charging commercial rents to charity organisations in order to raise funds.

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

Mr OSWALD (Morphett): When the budget comes down this week we are going to be asked in South Australia's Parliament to vote a king's ransom to the Health Commission for the allocation towards the administration of hospitals in this State. I would like to bring to the attention of the House, and particularly to the attention of the Minister of Health, a situation that occurred at Flinders Medical Centre last week. It was absolutely outrageous. I certainly wonder about the administration of hospitals and how money is allocated in this area.

A constituent took his elderly mother aged 89 to Flinders Medical Centre for a 4 p.m. appointment to see a gynaecologist. She had four children at home in a small country town in the 1920s and 1930s and, until recently, she enjoyed extremely good health, being in hospital for the first time at the age of 83, with a heart operation for an aorta valve replacement. Members can see that she is certainly no hypochondriac. My constituents arrived and reported at the outpatients' desk at 3.40 p.m. At 4.20 p.m. her son inquired about the delay and got no satisfactory answer. He again enquired at 4.40 p.m. only to be told by the two receptionists at the desk that, if he had any complaints about the service, he should write a letter and complain to the Director-General of Medical Services. By 5 p.m. this 89 year old lady, who had had a slight stroke two weeks previously, was becoming very agitated and wanted to go home.

At no time while they were waiting did any of the hospital staff approach them and tell them that there was going to be a long delay. Members can see the scenario: this 89 year old lady just sitting there, waiting for something to happen. Other people came and went, and there were two other

couples in the same position. One woman told them that they had had a booking for 3.30 p.m. Another young couple had been waiting as long a time as my constituents. At around 5 p.m. the staff tried to fob off two other people and the young couple, with no luck. The young couple explained that they were off from work, were not being paid and could not afford to return the next day.

By 5 p.m. all the staff had gone. The lights and air-conditioner were turned off and my constituents were left sitting there, after everyone had departed, like sheep in a cattle truck for the Middle East. Can members believe this? My constituents were sitting in the waiting room at Flinders Medical Centre. The staff had left them there, had turned off the lights and airconditioning and they were just left in the hospital. This is absolutely outrageous treatment on behalf of the Bannan Government's medical administration. At 5.25 p.m. a doctor eventually appeared to see my constituent who, by this stage, was feeling most unwell. That is most disgraceful and outrageous treatment of an aged person going to a hospital. It is disgraceful in terms of any South Australian who fronts up in our hospital system. I have certainly not heard a case as bad as that for a long time.

Certainly, I will take this up with the Minister tomorrow morning, but I hope that the Government will take careful note of that case and ensure that a situation like that never happens again. Certainly, I trust that, as a result of raising this matter in Parliament (and doing so again tomorrow with the Minister), the Minister will at least send a letter of apology, and we certainly hope to get something from the Medical Administrator of Flinders Medical Centre. That sort of thing is absolutely outrageous.

The other matter of concern is one that I ventilated in Parliament about 18 months to two years ago and results from my time on the Public Accounts Committee. I spent about seven years on the PAC and thoroughly enjoyed the experience. I think that every member at sometime in his apprenticeship in this place should spend between three and six years on the PAC because it gives one a quick understanding of the functioning of Government departments, it teaches a little about efficiency auditing and it certainly helps in one's parliamentary career.

When I was appointed, I was fortunate that Heini Becker was Chairman of the committee at that time, and he was a real terrier. He sought issues and was not concerned about the Cabinet of the day. He correctly thought that his responsibility was to get out there, make departments accountable and report back to Parliament when public moneys were being expended unwisely. This afternoon I read in the *Hansard* of 16 August 1972, when the PAC Act was before Parliament, the following comments—even in those days, the sentiments were the same:

One can sum up to some extent by saying that one purpose of a public accounts committee is that it be the watchdog of Parliament, following up the leads given by the Auditor-General and, in principle, acting as an efficiency audit to establish that Government departments function efficiently and spend the money allocated to them properly.

There is not a member in this Chamber who would disagree with that; but let us look at what has happened. Four or five years ago I was very critical at the reduced output of the committee. Having served on the committee as a member of the Government and the Opposition, I know that it is possible to wind back the work of a committee. I also know that it is possible for a Premier, a Cabinet and a Government to ask for a report to be slowed down or inhibited, giving instructions that it be delayed, or to make sure that it take on inquiries of a very low key nature only.

The member for Hanson went into it without fear or favour and, if one looks at the reports that were brought down in that period, one will see that he exercised the principle that was enshrined in the second reading explanation of the Bill. Since that time there has been a decline in the voracity of the inquiries, and it is no longer called the 'powerful' PAC in the media. In fact, it is no longer recorded in the media.

In the past four calendar years, 19 reports have been brought down. In 1986, there were nine reports; in 1987, there were six reports; in 1988, there were three reports; and in 1989, there was one report. Since the sixty-first report on the JIS was tabled on 12 April 1989, not one report has been tabled. To put it another way, Parliament has not received a report from the Public Accounts Committee for 16 months. Each year, Parliament allocates over \$200 000 to the staff. It has additional allocations for administrative expenses provided to the members who sit on the committee. In addition, in a couple of weeks time, they will be back here looking for another quarter of a million dollars for another 12 months expenditure; yet, we have not had one report in over 12 months from that committee.

The committee has lost its reputation with the public as a Government watchdog. Without doubt, the Government has told it to lay off Government departments, not to create waves, not to use its efficiency auditing and not to become the terrier that the member for Hanson was. As a reflection of that, I ask members to consider when the last annual report was tabled. Members opposite are looking shocked and concerned. I will tell the House when we last saw an annual report from the Public Accounts Committee. It was two years ago. The committee is meant to be the watchdog. How will we know in a few weeks time when we vote another quarter of a million dollars to the committee that we will not have to wait another year to get an annual report? It is an absolute disgrace that two years have passed and we have not had an annual report.

Members interjecting:

Mr OSWALD: Members opposite can respond later and I will be interested to know why an annual report has not been tabled. No doubt they will say that the election took up some time, and that is certainly true. However, I suggest that because there were nine reports in 1986, six reports in 1987, three reports in 1988, and only one report last year, and it is two years since we have seen an annual report, serious questions must be raised in this Chamber about how committed the present members of the committee are to fulfilling their function.

It is well known that the Government has the numbers on the committee to control the types of inquiries. It is very clear that the message has come down from the Bannan Administration that the Public Accounts Committee of this State is not to make waves and is not to undertake any inquiry that could embarrass the Government or bring it into disrepute in the eyes of the community. I defy any member opposite to stand up and prove that I am wrong.

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

The Hon. T.H. HEMMINGS (Napier): Every now and again, although rarely, we get the germ of a good idea from members opposite and, when we do, we, as a Parliament, should embrace it and run with it. In this case, the member for Fisher, in just the few short months that he has been here, has reached the zenith of his career. He has plateaued in his suggestion of an Australian royal family. It is with due humility that I accept the nomination of the Leader of the Opposition into that exalted position. However, the

words he used in nominating me, will attract a letter from my solicitors in due course. In accepting the nomination, I can assure the House that I will make every effort to ensure my reign will be a glorious one but, at the same time, I will also retain that common touch which is a part of the way I have always lived my life.

At the outset, I must say that my decision to accept the Leader's nomination did not immediately meet with the outright approval of my own family although, in the end, the simple logical argument that some of us have greatness thrust upon us won the day. My offspring have reserved the right, however, to relinquish the line of succession if the need requires it. The people of Elizabeth and Munno Para have wholeheartedly endorsed my decision. Over the weekend, there were many street parties that were very reminiscent of the Coronation parties that I used to attend as a lad when living in England. The warmth of the people in my electorate has been overwhelming and it has touched me deeply.

As to my title, I have no problems with my Christian name of Terence, but I feel that it is somewhat cumbersome and not very regal, so I shall adopt my second name with respect to the dynasty that I will create, and I will be the first member of the House of Henry. I know that all members would agree that the House of Henry has a real ring to it. Let us face it—there have been eight other Henrys before me, and the last Henry was rather wont to get involved with many women. However, you, Sir, know the kind of person I am; I have always stayed faithful to the one woman in my life. Apart from being known as Henry I, it is very probable that I will be called Henry the Pious or Henry the Just, since it picks up exactly the way I am—a compassionate, pious man, one who can see no wrong in others around me.

When I read the Leader's nomination in the *Advertiser*, I wondered how many members in this House believed in the hand of fate. I do now because, way back in 1962, when I lived in England, I was seriously contemplating starting a new life with my family in Canada but, as I was going up to Canada House in London, a voice kept telling me, 'Turn left, Terry, turn left at the Strand. Your destiny and future lie in Australia.' How right that little voice was!

I have also put a lot of thought into the House of Henry coat of arms. That coat of arms will reflect the way I have lived my life and the things I hold dear. For those members interested in heraldry I should like you to picture in your mind—

Mr OSWALD: On a point of order, Mr Speaker: I have great difficulty in linking the honourable member's remarks to the Supply Bill, unless he wants the State to pay for his crown jewels.

The SPEAKER: Order! There is no point of order. This is a grievance debate; remarks do not necessarily relate to the Supply Bill.

The Hon. T.H. HEMMINGS: It was a good try by the member for Morphett, but I will continue. I should like the House to picture the shield of heraldry. On the dexter side, the shield will show a bulldog rampant, depicting the symbol of a great football club—Central Districts—poised to take out the flag. The sinister side will show a hairy-nosed wombat in a sejant position. Its significance is that it reminds me of a certain member of the Opposition—who shall remain nameless.

The crest of the shield will show a circle of glory, or halo, symbolising that I have done nothing wrong at all to anyone in my life. The shield will be split in three. The top part will show an open *Hansard*, signifying the many thousand words of wisdom I have uttered in this place. The middle

portion will show a line of tears, representing the frustration the Libs have given me over the years. The lower part will be two crossed toolmakers' clamps, depicting the trade which I worked in before coming to this place and which is considered to be the elite amongst metal workers.

Royal patronage will be dispensed very wisely, but think of all the businesses that will be able to put on their advertising 'By appointment to the House of Henry'. In appreciation to the Leader of the Opposition for his encouragement and support to me on my elevation to the great office, he will be allowed to say, 'By appointment, purveyor of cut flowers to the House of Henry.'

The member for Fisher will not be forgotten either. He will be appointed as my court jester. Let us face it: the member for Fisher never fails to get a laugh with anything he says in this House. As food taster, I will appoint the member for Bragg. He has a wide experience of people trying to poison him off, and I am sure that he will be able to protect me in my role.

Finally, a word of advice to the member for Fisher. I know that some of his more senior colleagues have poured ridicule and scorn on his suggestion of an Australian Royal connection. That is because they did not think of it first. If they had thought of it first, they would have been saying it. The member for Fisher should not be put off or distracted from making other stupid statements in this House: the member for Fisher has found his niche in the parliamentary arena, and no-one should take it from him.

I should like to remonstrate with a member on this side—the member for Albert Park. I thought he was rather unkind in saying the things he said about the member for Fisher. If you had been in the Chair, Sir, I think that you would have pulled up the member for Albert Park. The member for Albert Park's saying in this House that the member for Fisher reminded him of Screaming Lord Sutch has allowed some of those rather unkind and uncaring journalists in the community to say some rather nasty things about the member for Fisher.

I will just remind the House what the journalist said in the *News*, under the heading of 'The Lord of Ring-ins?' The article stated:

The new nickname for Fisher MP Bob Such is . . . screaming Lord Sutch. This follows his amazing outburst about persuading some members of the Royal family to lend us their genes so Australians can have their very own blue bloods.

That journalist does not understand what the member for Fisher is on about. The article continues:

He is now being seriously compared to Screaming Lord Sutch, a top-hatted English eccentric and former pop star. He runs a political ship known as the Monster Raving Loony Green Teeth Party.

The journalist went on to say:

We look forward to Mr Such's self-severance from the Liberals, to form . . . the Barking Mad King George Blue Genes Disseminator Aussie Plebeian Eliminator Trouser Snake Party.

I think that that is very low and, if the member for Fisher has any guts, he will take action against this journalist.

In closing, I thank the member for Fisher and the Leader of the Opposition for elevating me to this position. As regards my solicitor's letter, if the Leader of the Opposition is prepared to stand up and publicly apologise it will save him at least \$10 000 to \$20 000 but, if he wishes to pursue it, I will be only too prepared to take it through the courts.

Motion carried.

Bill taken through its remaining stages.

SELF-DEFENCE

Adjourned debate on motion of Hon. G.J. Crafter:

That a select committee be appointed to consider the adequacy of the laws and rights of citizens in the area of self-defence and to—

- (a) consider the state of the law in relation to the rights of any citizen to exercise force in the protection of person or property;
- (b) consider whether the current state of the law satisfactorily enables the occupiers of homes to protect themselves or their property against intruders; and
- (c) make recommendations for the reform of the law as considered necessary or desirable.

(Continued from 15 August. Page 317.)

Mr S.J. BAKER (Deputy Leader of the Opposition): This matter will be referred to a select committee which, I believe, is the most appropriate mechanism for a subject of this nature. I will be very brief. This matter is very complex and has taxed my mind and the mind of many members of this House. We have discussed it within our own ranks and in other places with members opposite over a considerable period.

People are becoming very frustrated about the way in which the law provides, or does not provide, for the protection of people. That was brought to my attention most starkly when I considered the case of a farmer down south who had discharged a shotgun to deter people who were robbing and vandalising his farm. This case brought home to me the problem of people adequately protecting their home and property when they, and those involved in the criminal activity, have lost all respect for the law.

I do not know what went through the mind of that farmer who had discharged his shotgun, but I am sure he was feeling greatly frustrated and fearful, and thought that the law and the Government of the day—the Labor Government—had let him down. It might also have involved a whole set of other emotions. It may have been pure anger that he could do nothing about the situation other than fire a gun in the air and hope that those concerned would desist from their criminal activity on his farm.

I am pleased that this matter will go to a select committee. However, one problem we face is that we should never encourage the taking up of arms to protect person or property. Although we can understand the actions of the farmer, we cannot condone them. What is the difference between a bullet being fired into the air or over the head and a bullet being fired into a body? We know that there are often mitigating circumstances, but the moment we condone a deliberate action that could end in loss of life or very serious injury, we no longer function as a durable society.

Where is the answer? I have asked myself this question over a period of time. What happens to the person whose house has been violated and who takes up a piece of wood or a knife from the kitchen drawer and, in fear, hits or stabs someone causing grievous bodily harm? As the law stands today there is a grave doubt about the extent to which that person has used reasonable force to protect their home and family. I believe that this law should be looked at under a microscope so that we can convey to the public that they do count under the law, that their person and property will be protected to the extent that the law can prescribe, and that those who take advantage of the good citizens of this State and country will suffer an appropriate penalty.

It is absolutely farcical that, for example, as the law stands today, a person putting the fear of God into other people should, in some cases, be able to sue if they are injured by someone protecting their home and property. It is absolutely ludicrous. Civil libertarians can talk about the rights of all

individuals, but what about the very precious rights of a person to protect his or her family—their most precious possession—and the property for which they have worked for so long to obtain. A select committee is an appropriate mechanism by which to look at what I think is an extremely vexed question, one that I hope a select committee can consider thoroughly so that we can achieve a solution of which we can all be proud.

Mr MATTHEW (Bright): I support this motion and in so doing I would like to reflect on the reasons why it was moved in the first place. It is my understanding that, to date, petitions containing signatures from some 45 306 people have been presented in the other place. The petitions concern the rights of citizens to defend themselves on their own property and pray that honourable members will support legislation allowing that action taken by a person at home in self defence, or in the apprehension of an intruder, be exempt from prosecution for assault.

I acknowledge that this is a complex and emotive area of law and that it has, in the past, been the subject of considerable public controversy. As I understand it, the petition was started when a Mount Barker resident, Mrs Caroline Pope, decided to act after hearing the issue being discussed on a talk-back radio show. Mrs Pope has been reported as describing herself as 'not one to go waving placards or marching in protest'. However, when she was told that no-one else was willing to take action, she decided to do something about it herself. Mrs Pope enlisted the help of her neighbour, Mrs Betty Ewens, and together they distributed only about 300 petition sheets in their local area. However, since those first sheets were distributed on 20 April this year, thousands of extra petition sheets have been distributed to cope with the flood of concerned South Australians wanting to sign up.

For my part, I have been happy to assist with the printing of extra petition sheets. This evening I wish to commend, in particular, an O'Sullivan Beach resident, Mrs Daisy Charlton, for her tireless efforts in circulating petition sheets in southern metropolitan Adelaide. To many, on first impressions, Daisy Charlton may appear as a frail senior citizen. But, those of us who have the privilege of knowing her well, know her as a strong and tireless community worker who cares about her fellow human kind and about achieving justice.

Caroline Pope had expected only an average response from the public to her petition but, as the result of the endeavours of people like her neighbour, Betty Ewens, and of Daisy Charlton, it is now expected that some 54 000 signatures will be collected. People have virtually lined up to sign these petitions because they have read newspaper reports about cases in South Australia where housebreakers have actually charged home owners with assault, or similar, after being hurt while the home owners were defending themselves. The *Advertiser* editorial of 14 August stated in part:

The petition presented to Parliament with the theme of meeting intruders with violence reflects real feelings that some crime victims feel that they are hampered, and the perpetrators comforted, by a remote legal system.

The editorial goes on to state:

Education Minister Greg Crafter is due this week to ask the Parliament for a select committee to review the laws. We expect no less from a Parliament responsive to community concerns.

The present law provides that a person can use 'reasonable force' and retaliate with 'equal force' in protecting their home and property from intruders. Clearly this is ridiculous. The Liberal Party recognised this and included the following

commitment in our law, order and personal safety policy released prior to the last State election:

To review the law of self defence as it relates to the protection of oneself and one's property from assault in the streets and from intruders in the home.

Our policy also stated that a Liberal Government would:

'develop an education package to assist persons in understanding the law and the limits to which they can go in protecting themselves and their property'.

At the time members opposite may recall that their Government sought to belittle and deflect attention from the issue by accusing the Liberal Party of refusing to name cases where housebreakers had laid charges of assault against home owners.

Clearly, there are such cases, and I have no doubt that members opposite are also aware of some of them. However, most people involved were too afraid to speak out for fear of further reprisals, but at last the Government has been forced to treat this issue seriously as a result of the endeavours of those who have organised the petition that has received such overwhelming support from the public.

My remaining concern lies in the actual creation of a select committee to examine the problem. Does it really take a select committee to review the law? I would not think so but, as I said, I support this motion, for at least a select committee will give citizens a forum for venting their anger to the Government. Let us hope that this committee will be short in duration and that it makes a swift and decisive recommendation for this much needed change to our law.

Mr S.G. EVANS (Davenport): I support the establishment of a select committee. I am concerned because I believe that many problems with the law, especially in this area and some others closely associated with it, arise due to the fact that we have what I call devious lawyers who nowadays set out to try and find a way to protect criminals. They do so because they will receive money; they make a joke of the whole system.

The difficulty in this area is that it is acceptable for people to use reasonable or equal force if they find somebody on their property who is removing a family belonging or looks likely or intent on taking something from the home. Perhaps that person is just on the premises and the owner is unsure of their intent. Let us look at what is 'reasonable force'. According to the law, the only way one can establish whether or not 'reasonable force' was used is to go to court, where the person who has been on the owner's property or in the home will give evidence against the owner saying that the latter did not use reasonable force. One can assume that, if that person had broken into a home or entered a property, they would be unscrupulous; they are unlikely to be a law-abiding and truthful citizen. If the defendant wants to tell a couple of lies and the owner of the property is 100 per cent straight, who ends up winning in the courts? Some of these hardened people are professional liars, and they can tell a lie with confidence and conviction.

I turn now to the question of 'equal force'. If one is hit on the head with a lump of wood and knocked unconscious, one is supposed to use equal force, but how can they? An intruder or whatever may have something in their hand, whether it be a jemmy bar, a screwdriver, a piece of wood or whatever, or they may just be much bigger than the other person, but one must wait until they use some force before anything can be done about protecting property or oneself. It is impossible to do that; that part of the law is a joke. If one is unconscious and injured on the floor, one is not in a position to use equal force. However, if the property owner moves first and uses any sort of force, the court is liable to say, 'They didn't use force; you only thought they would,

so you have used more than equal force.' No-one should tell me that is not the way the matter ends up in the courts, because that is what happens.

A man or woman, who has no knowledge of self-defence, may walk into their home and discover an intruder. If that property owner then takes action to try to protect themselves, or more particularly their property, they can then be charged with assault. Because they tried to protect their own belongings, their own person, or their own family, they then have to face legal costs. We know how the courts work. They do not always find the truth, and we know that. So, the person is in that position. One honourable member opposite has indicated through interjections that he believes that the present law relating to equal force is acceptable. However, it is all right for members opposite, but what happens to a citizen who discovers what they perceive to be a threat in their own home. They have to stop and think that the law says, 'I am allowed to use reasonable or equal force.'

That is what they have to go through in their minds. Some people, who have the ability to look after themselves, would automatically take to the intruder, and I believe they have a right to do that. If they do not act first, or if they wait until they are knocked unconscious, it is too late. If a person is on the property and he should not be there, and if he has some of the family jewels or a video in his hands, it is obvious that he is not there as a visitor who has come for a cup of coffee.

There is no doubt that many people are afraid. They have put up six foot fences around their homes; they have dogs and security alarms which cost them thousands of dollars. They cannot walk the streets, even in daylight. But, to come back to the home, their home is no longer their castle: it is no longer the place where they can feel safe, because they are not safe there. Our Police Force is not given the equipment or the personnel it requires to attack the problem. We know that the system is failing. Therefore, a select committee is critical. We must provide more rights for individuals to protect themselves.

I congratulate Mrs Pope and others who have gone to the trouble of getting people to sign a petition. People sign petitions because they are concerned. They may not understand the law, but how can people understand a law which says that one can only use equal force? As I have said, if someone has been shot, there is not much chance of his shooting the other person because it is too late. I support the proposition to establish a select committee.

The Hon. D.C. WOTTON (Heysen): I, too, support the establishment of a select committee. I share many of the concerns that have been expressed by the member for Davenport in relation to the standing of the legal profession in the community and the worries of people who wish only to protect their own rights. I think there is a considerable amount of concern in the community at present about many issues relating to the legal profession. I think that the first Government that nationalises lawyers will be a fairly popular Government.

Members interjecting:

The Hon. D.C. WOTTON: I say that tongue in cheek, I might add. I particularly commend the two ladies to whom reference has been made by other speakers tonight, namely, Betty Ewens and Carolyn Pope, both of whom are constituents of mine. I find it fascinating how two people, who are totally committed to an objective, can, as a result of hard work, attract so much attention to an issue. They started on this issue as a result of a talk-back program. Mrs Pope had given a considerable amount of thought to the

issue beforehand, and she made up her mind to do something about it in order to bring about a change in the legislation. She and Betty Ewens determined that they would begin with a petition, and, as has been indicated, a petition with 45 000 signatures has been presented. I understand that the figure has now reached just over 50 000. In fact, I have the equivalent of another 8 000 signatures in my office for presentation tomorrow in another place.

I have had regular discussions with both ladies, who have been quite amazed at the amount of support that has come from a very wide section of the community throughout the State. In fact, I think that after they had commenced to circularise the petition they wondered what they had let themselves in for because of the support that had been shown, the requests that had been made by so many people for petition forms and the need to get those forms out and the postage associated with it and so on.

It has been quite an incredible task on the part of these two people, but their hard work has now paid off because I believe it is quite appropriate that a select committee should be established. I am perhaps disappointed that the Attorney-General in another place is not able to be a member of that select committee. I would have thought that it was appropriate for that to be the case.

The Hon. Ted Chapman interjecting:

The Hon. D.C. WOTTON: I agree with the member for Alexandra. It is not always that I do but I agree on this particular issue.

The SPEAKER: Order!

The Hon. D.C. WOTTON: I would have thought that it would be beneficial for the Attorney-General, who I believe has been slow to move in this area, to hear first hand of the concerns of so many people in South Australia. I do not think there is any doubt at all that a considerable number of people will want to come forward and give evidence on this particular matter. Personally, I support a lot of the claims that have been made publicly by those who believe in their rights to protect themselves, their properties and their families.

I have often wondered how I would react to a situation where my family or my property was put at risk as a result of an intruder. I do not think that I would be sitting around discussing the matter with the other person or persons involved. I think particularly if there was any likelihood of an attack on members of my family I would be taking any action that I could in an attempt to protect them. I am sure that the majority of people in the community would support such a move.

I support very strongly the establishment of the select committee. I, too, hope that it just does not ramble on. It is too important an issue for it to be lost in the system. I hope that people treat it with the respect that it should receive, that it should be dealt with quickly and that, as a result of the select committee and the report that will be brought before this House, appropriate action will be taken to amend the legislation so that those 50 000-odd people who have signed the petition so far and the rest of the community in this State will recognise that the work has been worthwhile and has resulted in the amendments to the legislation.

The Hon. TED CHAPMAN (Alexandra): I support the motion. It seems to me to be a pretty good idea. In fact, from my observations so far I think that I would even like to be a member of that select committee if at all possible. I am not quite sure of the procedure or arrangement that occurs nowadays. It is a good many years since I was a member of a select committee. I think the last time might

have been when we looked at local government boundaries, and possibly the time before that was on the Levi Park select committee under the leadership of Hugh Hudson. It is a fair time since I have been involved in one but this one sounds pretty interesting to me. I think it is a pretty serious subject, actually, and I commend the Minister for introducing it.

I am not too sure whether it is picking up a lead taken by the Liberal Party prior to the last State election or whether it is an act of the Government's own initiative. Whatever the case it seems to me to be a pretty good idea. It also seems to me that those who have addressed the Chair on this matter so far appear to have made their decision about the law already. I suppose that, if most or all of the 47 members in this House approached the subject as a few members have done so far, we would not need a select committee at all; we would have a very clear opinion on the record as to what should be done.

Members can even cite examples. I do not know whether that is within the licence available to them on this issue, but I repeat that the system seems to have already tightened into a corner as to what shall occur with the law when, in fact, the motion before the House is only to consider the adequacy of the law. Therefore, in my view we ought not, as members of this place, prejudge the outcome of the select committee. We should simply support the objective of getting as much information as possible so as to determine whether or not the law should be changed. I would subscribe to the view that in the few experiences I have seen we ought to consider seriously changing the law. In that context I agree with my colleagues.

I am reminded of the case of Hurrell on the South Coast at Victor Harbor only a couple of years ago. To the best of my recollection the scenario of events was like this. Hurrell was missing a few tools and chattels out of his shed on a small property near Victor Harbor. He suspected a group of local youngsters were hopping in through the window of a shed at night and grabbing a few tools and flogging them to the local secondhand dealers. He waited up for them on a number of occasions but they were too smart. He did not actually catch them during the first run. However, one night later on he was sleeping in his car or in another building nearby waiting for the intruders and he heard a bit of a rustle. He realised that they were attempting to get into his shed.

They broke a small window at the back of the shed and he heard them bundle the tools and gear into some bags. Next thing they threw the gear out through the window and the group of young boys jumped out through the window onto the gear and went to grab it and run away. With that, he called to them to stop. They did not, but he was pretty well equipped. He had an ex-army rifle and he fired a shot into the ground in front of these boys.

With that they flattened onto the ground. He took their names, addresses and sufficient detail, so he thought, to have them dealt with. He reported the matter to the local police, who were grateful for this information and the extraordinary effort that this old man had taken. The police were a little concerned about the use of the rifle, I understand, but no damage had been done. He scared the daylight out of these young fellows, but certainly caused no injury and he was commended for his bravery and his effort. He waited for the case to occur.

Lo and behold, old Mr Hurrell was charged for having disturbed the peace—in the act of disrupting the boys, he allegedly distressed them and their parents and was fined a substantial amount. As I recall, the boys were let off without

a penalty. Mr Hurrell had to pay a fine that he could not afford. Instead, in default of payment, he went to gaol. He was locked up here in the correctional services system for his apparent misdemeanours and his failure, as a matter of principle to pay the fines.

I took up the case on his behalf. Members may recall some involvement with the media concerning that case ensued. Finally, we got Mr Hurrell on Derryn Hinch's show, and Mr Hurrell was released the day after the program was screened. The matter has since died a natural death. If ever there was an example of the need for the law to give a person some opportunity to properly and responsibly defend himself or his property, that is it. At this stage it is premature to say that the law should be changed, how, specifically why and to what extent. Doubtless there are many other examples that could be raised. There is justification for looking at the law within the ambit of this motion.

In moving this motion, the Minister of Education suggests that we should consider whether the current state of the law satisfactorily enables occupiers of homes to protect themselves or their property against intruders and, further, to make recommendations for the reform of the law as considered necessary or desirable. The latter part of the motion covered by paragraph (c) is pretty broad and I hope that, if it is to be exercised as broadly as the motion suggests, the committee will look at the law as it relates to the protection of oneself in the street, in the public arena.

Members will recall that just today a member on this side of the House raised the subject of an assault in a street quite near Parliament House. I did not see the report on television this evening but I understand that the media picked up that subject and recognised the importance of the need for some protection of persons within the community. If the behaviour of some Aboriginal groups that congregate near the foundations of Parliament House of a night time—not seldom but indeed often—is any example of what is going on out there in the public arena, that, too, ought to be looked at by the select committee.

The committee would not have to go very far after the sun goes down because mobs of them congregate between this building and the old Legislative Council building. The behaviour of those Aboriginal people is absolutely appalling. It would appear that they, in particular, are untouchable because the police drive up and down North Terrace and appear to pay little attention to that behaviour. I suppose that the answer for their apparent reluctance to intervene is best known to them. Perhaps the Minister of Correctional Services can offer a comment about the attitude of the police as it appears to be right here in front of Parliament House.

I have seen it, and I notice a deathly silence over the Chamber at the moment. That suggests to me that other members on both sides of the House have seen the behaviour to which I refer and, by the nods of the head of one or two opposite, that confirms that members of this place on both sides understand what I am saying. Far be it from me to identify those members in person; the message is clear. The behaviour of those people on North Terrace, here on the heritage corridor of the city of Adelaide, is absolutely disgraceful.

The mess that has to be cleaned up by our own Parliament House caretakers the morning after these people have congregated is also disgraceful. The broken bottles, the excreta, the urination on the walls of Parliament House and the old Legislative Council building next door further demonstrates the disgraceful behaviour.

Mr Atkinson: What does that have to do with this motion?

The Hon. TED CHAPMAN: It has a lot to do with this subject. Any responsible citizen who traverses this corridor and the environs of Parliament House after hours where these people congregate runs one hell of a risk if they seek to intervene or even if they seek to walk between them. Members of my family who come through the car park and this building after dark are frightened to go between the two buildings when those people are there. I do not blame those family members or anyone else for being fearful of going out of Parliament House, through that side door and onto North Terrace when the people whom I have described are congregated in that arena.

The honourable member should not challenge to me about what it has to do with this motion. There will come an occasion—if not today, tomorrow, the next day or the near future—when someone, in an attempt to simply traverse that public corridor, will be assaulted by those people. I recognise that the member who interjected is nodding his head in approval of that comment because it is true. It is as obvious as a neon sign that it will happen.

I repeat: if this select committee is set up and its boundaries extend that far, I urge it to take a look outside this place after dark at the behaviour I have just described, because it is about time it was given some attention. It is about time the police in this State were given some support by this Parliament to deal with that sort of behaviour. One can talk about the racism associated with such comments but, for God's sake, when will we front up to the truth? When will we face the cold, hard facts? Members of the South Australian community who walk around Adelaide after dark, not necessarily for leisure but of necessity, need to be able to do so safely and to feel as if they belong to this city and that they have a right to do so without being frightened of repercussions, insult or assault.

Sir, I put to you that, out in this area I have just referred to, it is a frightening experience for ordinary folk to walk past when those people, who are often too drunk to scratch themselves and who smash their empty bottles on the pavement, behave in the way that they do. Furthermore, these people are not only a disgrace to us but are an international disgrace in the eyes of those visiting this city, whether they be tourists, interstate business people, or simply people just passing through. I do not withdraw at all from whatever stigma might apply to my raising the subject, because it has to be raised and, hopefully, as a result of raising it once in here, it might then become the subject of attention by the select committee about to be set up. I support the motion.

Mr GUNN (Eyre): This proposal to set up a select committee is long overdue. The Opposition went to the last election with a clear policy to allow decent law-abiding citizens to protect their personal property against hooligans, louts and others who have ill intent towards them. I am sick and tired of my constituents being harassed and interfered with by individuals who have no regard for the personal rights, integrity or property of other people.

Recently in my electorate a law-abiding citizen was hauled before the courts because he whacked a few louts under the car and kicked them up the backside, which action 98 per cent of the people of this State would fully endorse. That citizen had had to the back teeth the situation of louts going down his street, throwing stones on to his house, getting into his backyard, breaking into adjoining homes and harassing 80-year-old widows, with no action being taken against their behaviour.

However, when he came home at 8.30 one night and caught these louts he did the right thing; he was a fit enough bloke to catch them and when he did he gave them a good

whack under the ear and a kick up the backside. This is the sort of action that the police ought to be taking against these sorts of people. For too long we have been too timid and too frightened in this State to do something to protect law-abiding citizens.

The overwhelming majority of citizens in this State have had enough of their homes being broken into. Every day we read in the newspapers of someone's home being broken into and smashed up, or of a car being vandalised, but what has happened? They are given a packet of lollies and a tap on the head. If they are put into the prison system, the police have hardly got away from delivering them than they are released out the back door in many cases. This sort of nonsense should not be tolerated. Yet, my constituent was dragged before the courts. To make it worse, two legal aid lawyers were defending these people. There are two of them employed in the town. My constituent did not have access to a lawyer, because it would have cost him thousands of dollars.

He is a decent and honest person. When questioned, he said, 'Yes, of course I gave them a whack under the ear.' He was brought before the court, pleaded guilty and was fined, but what happened to those who had perpetrated the offence, who had tossed stones onto his roof and had harassed the community? Nothing! Mobs of them have been going down the street. People like my constituent have had enough of this nonsense.

In that town, people's homes were broken into frequently. On one occasion, people broke into the Mayor's home, went to the refrigerator, took out the eggs and smashed them all around the room. They stole his war medals and his Order of Australia. That is the sort of thing that occurs—and nothing happens. The hands of the police are tied. It is not that they do not want to do something but, the moment that anything happens, legal aid lawyers and community welfare are hassling them.

What about the school? On one night, 45 windows were broken. The police were called and the sergeant wanted to interview the offenders, as he knew who they were, but he said 'Look: I can't interview them. I have to get the legal aid people up here to talk to them.' What happened—nothing! He was wasting his time. What was the Government's response—nothing!

I spoke to the Attorney-General personally, and wrote to him about the case at Ceduna. He did not want to know about it. This sort of behaviour is outrageous! No wonder the public has had enough of it. No wonder thousands of people are signing petitions expressing their concern, when all the average citizen wants to do is be left to his own devices and quietly go about his business. I am one who strongly believes in the rule of law and in the rights of the individual. I have stood in this House on many occasions championing the rights of the individual to be protected against arbitrary or unnecessary force by any Government agency or authority, but there comes a time when someone must have the courage—and the Government must have the courage—to protect the interests of all sections of this community.

What is required in this State is for the police to have the authority to kick a few backsides. Twenty-five or 30 years ago we did not have these problems: we had a sergeant dealing with any of these matters on the spot, dispensing a bit of justice. Some years ago I had the opportunity to visit the Isle of Man and wanted to inquire about how they dealt with criminals. They used to apply the birch to some of these fellows, and the information I received was amazing.

I say to this House that the time is fast approaching when, if these people break into elderly citizens' homes and

physically attack them, they should have the birch applied to them. It is the only way to deal with people, because they must be made examples of, otherwise we will continue to spend thousands of dollars on extra police officers, on facilities and on counselling these people—and they regard it as a joke!

I firmly believe that the Government must accept some responsibility. It is all very well to say that we live in a more enlightened society and must be more reasonable in these things, but we are dealing with groups of people who are not reasonable and who, it would appear to me, have no regard for people's rights or for defenceless people. What about all the motor cars that are smashed and vandalised?

I will give another example of a constituent of mine who nearly got into serious trouble. He lived in one of these country towns, and he had a young son who had a motor car. The lad had had the car stolen twice and vandalised on one occasion. On this evening, he decided to go to a club with a girlfriend, left the motor car in his father's driveway and walked there. On the way back he was accosted by a group of villains. His girlfriend realised that he was in trouble and ran to get his father. The father took one look, realised that he could not handle the situation, grabbed his shotgun and fired it in the air. What happened—the fellow nearly was charged with discharging a firearm in the air.

An honourable member: Nearly?

Mr GUNN: Yes. If strong representations had not been made, he would have been charged. It is all very well for the honourable member to have the audacity to interject. From the way he is interjecting in the House tonight, I guess that he supports these villains, with no regard for the poor fellow who is trying to protect his son's life. No wonder South Australia is in such a state, with that sort of weak, naive, juvenile attitude that the honourable member has displayed. The people in this State have had enough of this nonsense. Now, reluctantly, the Government has brought this motion before the House.

I will get my constituent who was charged with assault to come before the select committee and give chapter and verse. In that one town more than 400 windows were smashed in one year. It was all right for the glazier replacing them, but at one stage they had to get the bloke in the adjoining town to help. This situation is occurring in various parts of the State.

In this city alone one only has to read the newspaper to find that after people's homes are broken into they are installing all sorts of security devices—special doors, windows and lights—to try to protect their property. I believe that firm action is long overdue. When someone transgresses against another person or smashes their property they have to be held accountable for it.

The police have plenty of time to issue these dreadful on-the-spot fines—another case of Government bureaucracy. They issue them as fast as one can hand out lollies; it is far too easy.

Mr Hamilton: Who introduced them?

The DEPUTY SPEAKER: Order!

Mr GUNN: Yes, and you blokes ran a great second. You now have the Department of Fisheries and the Highways Department handing them out, and I can list a number of other departments if you want me to. People thought that on-the-spot fines were a simple way of rectifying the backlog in the courts, but what has happened is that it has now become a revenue raising measure. I would be interested to know what instructions are given to the police. Are they under instruction to issue as many on-the-spot fines as possible?

Mr Hamilton: What a short memory you've got, Graham.

The DEPUTY SPEAKER: Order!

Mr GUNN: I am stating facts. It will be difficult to get me to vote for those provisions again because—

Mr Hamilton interjecting:

The DEPUTY SPEAKER: Order! The member for Albert Park will cease interjecting.

Mr GUNN: —it appears to me that more effort is taken in apprehending people for minor traffic offences because they are far easier to deal with, than trying to deal with these delinquents. That problem should be rectified. I believe that people should be able to take reasonable force to protect their property against those who break into it, vandalise it or threaten them or their family. Otherwise, this unfortunate state of affairs will continue.

I support this matter going to a select committee. I believe that this course of action is long overdue. If action had not been taken by concerned members of the community, I believe that the Government would not have acted and that it would have swept this matter under the carpet. It concerns me that we have all these Government instrumentalities to assist those who perpetrate crimes but very little assistance is given to the victims who have to put up with their homes being broken into or being threatened. Until we show these elements of our society that the community is fair dinkum and that the law enforcement agencies have authority to deal firmly with them then, in my view, nothing will happen; the situation will just get worse. Last week an Opposition member advocated, in the media, an anti-larrikin squad to deal with these trouble spots. I support that. These problems will not be resolved until police are given enough powers to deal with these situations.

One of the success stories in administering the law in recent years has been the establishment of Aboriginal police aides. They have been an outstanding success. I believe that considerable resources should be provided so that this police operation can be extended to a large number of areas of South Australia. When something is working well and when it has a proven record of reducing lawlessness, then such a program should be extended. In many rural South Australian towns there is a need for more Aboriginal police aides. They are well trained and are respected by their own community. They are able to carry out policing functions which European police have not been able to do, not because they have not tried but because certain local knowledge and skill, which these people have, is required.

It has been an outstanding success and a credit to the police department and those officers who have been involved in the administration of and training for the scheme. I would like to see it extended as soon as possible, because it has had a good effect and has created good relations and understanding between the police and those communities. It is an excellent arrangement.

I do not wish to take up any more time, but I believe this is a very important debate and I sincerely hope that a large number of people will come forward to explain to the select committee the difficulties they have had. I have not raised these matters because I have a dislike for any section of the community, but I believe that the community is entitled to be protected against the lawlessness and hooliganism that, unfortunately, certain sections of my electorate have had to tolerate. I support the motion.

Mr MEIER (Goyder): I have much pleasure in supporting this motion to establish a select committee to consider self-defence. It is a great tragedy that we in this State, it would appear, no longer have the right to protect ourselves. I would like to cite several examples and, certainly, to endorse the remarks made by the member for Eyre and other mem-

bers on this side, in particular those made by the member for Alexandra.

Only last week we saw reported in our local newspaper the example of Mr Leon Hutton. Several years ago, on a November evening, Mr Hutton sought to protect his property by confronting seven youths who were attempting to break into a shed on that property. Apparently, the youths screamed abuse at him and attempted to escape, and Mr Hutton fired a shot into the ground behind his back—he did not even fire his gun towards the youths. Mr Hutton was a law-abiding citizen and he dutifully reported the incident to the local police. However, a week later it was Mr Hutton, not the youths who was summonsed, charged with kidnapping and eventually convicted of frightening and annoying. It was Mr Hutton, the victim of theft and abuse, who was fined \$612, which he refused to pay; subsequently, he was sentenced to a gaol term.

It is a tragedy that we live in a State where one can no longer protect oneself with any certainty. Over the years I have had more questions from my rural constituents about the rights of property owners versus the rights of trespassers than about almost any other subject. It has been made clear to me repeatedly that those constituents are very worried about whether they can take any action to protect their property. I will not go into detail and give specific examples, as have other members, but I will say that it is not a new problem.

I note that in 1984 in Victoria a High Court decision was handed down against a farmer who used a rifle to shoot at a car, the driver of which had been stealing petrol from his farm. It was established that there was a passenger in the car and that the farmer had shot that passenger; the farmer had no idea there was anyone else in the car. In that important case it was the farmer who was found to be in the wrong; therefore, the trespasser and the accomplice were in the right. Certainly, that case has worried South Australians ever since. The Chief Executive Officer of the UF&S at the time said the following:

I think everyone has the right to protection and to protect themselves against thieves and intruders.

I fully agree. Surely we must ensure that that is the very least to which we are entitled under the law of trespassing.

My third example relates to the magic mushrooms or the hallucinogenic mushrooms, which several years ago were sought after in the Adelaide Hills. Incidents at the time included a farmer being threatened with a knife; a landowner being knocked to the ground and kicked by a group of youths; two calves being shot in an act of retribution; a farmhouse being broken into and damaged and a stereogram being stolen; and innumerable cases of fences being pushed down or cut with pliers and chains on gates being cut with hacksaws.

The key factor that came out of various meetings and many media reports was that the farmers had no idea whether or not they were protected when seeking to defend their property against these intruders. In fact, it never got to that stage, because no-one took out a suit against one of the farmers. However, it could have been another test case, and I would suggest that it probably would have gone against the land-holder.

The fourth example which I bring to the attention of members is that several years ago in Victoria it was clearly stated that farmers may eventually have to file off the barbs of their barbed wire fence to safeguard themselves against possible legal action from trespassers who may be injured by the barbs. What a crazy situation! A barbed wire fence is erected and then the barbs have to be removed with a file.

In addition, farmers have to be careful of such things as unpredictable animals, unattended buildings, barbed wire fencing, open farm dams and the like. It is little wonder that rural producers in particular are very worried about their current lack of protection. I am sure that much evidence will be presented during the select committee hearings. I believe that changes to our laws are long overdue and I certainly hope that the select committee will clearly establish that the right of a citizen to defend property is first and foremost and that people who abuse those rights not be given any real consideration with respect to the way in which the law looks after them. Surely the person who is in the right—the person who simply defends their property—needs the entire weight of the law behind them, but at present in this State that is not occurring.

Mr LEWIS (Murray-Mallee): Stanley Kubrick accurately foresaw what would happen in a society that allowed too much licentious behaviour when he produced a film called *A Clockwork Orange* over 20 years ago. I sincerely believe that that is exactly what has happened in this State. During the 1970s we were the leaders in this country. At that time the ill-advised attitudes which finally became law under the Dunstan Labor Government resulted in the watering down of defences available to ordinary citizens to protect themselves to the point where those laws were ineffectual and thus invited the behaviour we increasingly now see. That behaviour occurs almost daily and is reported in journals, on radio and on television. Twenty years ago no-one would have dreamt that it would happen. I am sure that Dunstan did not foresee such a situation. However, he behaved emotively and suggested it was necessary to change the law to make it more like it is now than it was then. His behaviour was a definite contributing factor; in fact, it was the single most important factor responsible for the change. I think that he was a twit in that respect.

I commend the actions of those two ladies, Betty and Carolyn, for what they have done in alerting the Government, outside the parameters of partisan politics, to what the general public in South Australia really think. For a long time the Liberal Party has been trying to get the Government and the ALP to understand the stupidity of the direction in which they have taken the law during the past two decades. It is a pity that it has gone that way, because it was taken in the direction of ameliorating the remedies immediately available to a citizen.

An honourable member interjecting:

Mr LEWIS: The honourable member needs to disabuse himself of that. In this State it was legitimate to protect oneself against intruders on one's property. I am not talking about laws relating to loitering; I am talking about the laws relating to the defence of oneself and one's property on one's own land. It was not in the form in which the law is now written where the balance is against the landowner or the householder. We explicitly and specifically amended the Wrongs Act. If members check the recent legislation, they will find that there have been alterations to the Wrongs Act. That is the area of the law that now needs to be amended.

My experience indicates that people now believe that it is legitimate to invade not only the land, but also the dwelling of another to take what they please and do as they please whilst they are there, knowing that they have the protection of the law against any act which might be taken by the householder or landowner to cause them such discomfort as to leave. They stand there and abuse one. I see that as regrettable, in that it has produced greater discomfort, dislocation and physical injury than would otherwise have been the case if the mores of the community, as I

knew them as a child and young man, were written into the law rather than the law going in the direction in which it has gone.

Having grown up in the Hills, gone to school in the metropolitan area and worked in the East End Market before school in the morning and in a market garden, a fruit block or other places in the evenings, I have seen what kind of things can go on and have gone on arguably over the past 30 years. In my judgment, it is not legitimate for citizens to believe that they can invade the property and dwellings of other citizens without their knowledge or permission, intimidate them and then expect the law to support their actions after they have done that. I say this, whether those involved invade a property to steal magic mushrooms, get high and behave in a way for which they then claim diminished responsibility because they are under the influence of a drug, or do anything else such as steal fruit or chestnuts, go around my rabbit traps and steal my rabbits ahead of me in the mornings or, for that matter, steal fuel, whether from drums at my home or in either of the locations in which I did my market gardening. For them to do any of those things, or steal my fruit boxes or produce, and expect the law to protect them against anything that I might do to protect myself is, to my mind, anathema.

It is a distinct disincentive for people to own property, and attempt by their own actions to accept responsibility for themselves, their future and their welfare. The law is protecting the wrong-doer, the thief and the trespasser, against the person who is doing something which is constructive and useful and for which his fellow citizens are prepared to reward him for the services that he renders or the goods that he produces. A society which does that will be in a much poorer state than would otherwise have been the case.

It is especially bad when one tolerates violence in the home, telling the home owner, the occupier, who is legitimately there, that they may not take reasonable action, in my opinion, to defend themselves against the actions of an intruder. It is not legitimate to tell an old aged pensioner that he may not throw a hammer at an intruder who has just a minute or two before told the man, 'Sit down, you silly old bugger, or I'll rape your wife.' However, the intruder may not have used the word 'rape'. Rather, he may have used the magic four-letter word that starts with 'f' and the poor aged pensioner would be told off for throwing a hammer at the intruder who did that. That actually happened. The man who did that was a young man; he was 19 and, having broken through the lounge window, was in there literally stealing the clock, the radio and the television while two old people were in their home.

That is not good enough in my judgment. The law needs amendment, and if the select committee in its deliberations—and I support the formation of that select committee—does not come down with a recommendation of that kind, it ill behoves any of us here who complain about what will happen out there. The community has had enough, and there are plenty of people who now believe it is legitimate that, if they cannot see what is going on at the scene of a crime at night in their dwelling or on their property by any other means than to rely on the flash from the end of a sawn-off Winchester pump action, they will do it.

That is where it has got to and we must prevent that from happening. It will be a sorry state if it does come to pass, and it will be a sad commentary on our indifference to the plight and the fears of those people out there who have otherwise been normal law-abiding, productive and constructive citizens if it does happen. We will deserve the contempt with which the community will treat us as lawmakers if we continue to ignore this matter. It is not good

enough for us to do that. It is not as if it involves only old people who are reactionary to the situation and who are conservative in their values. It is not as if it involves only middle-aged people.

I surveyed all the school-leavers in my electorate five years ago and again last year. One of the most serious crimes that they see (and it is with increasing seriousness in the most recent survey) is that of house breaking and burglary and violence against the individual perpetrated by trespassers, whether on personally owned land or in the home in which the person lives. We need to take care that more and more money is not wasted on breeding bigger, stronger, more vicious dogs to be put behind taller and stronger fences to increase the siege mentality which is abroad in the community at the present time. It is a waste of resources and it is an unfortunate state of affairs where people live in such fear as to be motivated to do such things.

Yet, I see that happening. I must say to the House that if they believe, as I believe, that it is valid to use theory X to reinforce behaviour, that is, use a carrot to encourage people to do the right thing and reward them for doing so, it must be equally valid to use theory Y, that is, the stick. At the present time, for us to use the one strategy and say that the other is irrelevant is a nonsense. If one is valid in psychology, so is the other. Indeed, members opposite recognise that when they support laws and regulations that require individuals who value the fruits of their labour in the form of money to part company with some of that money and, thereby, sustain a hurt in return for having committed some misdemeanour such as a parking offence, traffic infringement or some other minor offence. That is theory Y: using a bit of stick to hit them in the hip pocket.

For those people who have a respect for the property of others and, indeed, value their own, of course, that is a hurt for those people. On the other hand, for those people who take from others what it pleases them to take at a time when it suits them to do so, something more than a fine or a gaol sentence is needed because that will not work. There must be some other kind of hurt to remind them, however uncomfortable it may seem to us who do have different mores and have demonstrated it, that it is unacceptable to the rest of us. So, they need to be hurt in some other way when they are found to be guilty of committing those kinds of offences against their fellow citizens.

If we do not take that action, I fear for the future of our community. One will not be as free and as easy to go where one pleases when you please and enjoy the kind of freedom of movement in which we all believe. In my mind there is no question about that—there is unanimity of purpose in that regard—we believe that is the ideal society. It may be that we differ in the ways we would seek to achieve it.

We have certainly suffered some deterioration of behaviour, both in degree and in the numbers of people involved over the last couple of years. As I said at the outset, and as I say again now, it is a phenomenon that was identified by Kubrick in his film *A Clockwork Orange* and the direct consequence of the kind of social engineering that was started by Dunstan in this State.

That trend has continued over the past two decades and it must now be reversed or we will suffer the consequences of the kind of siege mentality and violence to which I have already adverted. It is inappropriate for people to be wasting their time and resources trying to secure what they have got when they know the law cannot protect them. To my mind, to live in fear is unacceptable. Citizens should not have to spend more time taking care of their property than the time they can spend enjoying themselves after work and at leisure.

I commend the motion to the House and, as I say, changes to the law are essential. If no changes are recommended, it will be a sorry day for South Australia. The attitude mounting against the Government will grow apace, because the Opposition in this place knows that it is necessary to change the existing law.

Mr QUIRKE (Playford): I will not take up a great deal of the House's time on this matter, but I put on the record my support for the creation of a select committee. In support of the motion I need to say that I think the whole area obviously demands public scrutiny through this House and its committee system. There will be an opportunity for members to make further comments either to the select committee or later when the committee's report comes before the House.

I must say that I was impressed by the member for Napier's contribution. I went on from that to get some debating points from the member for Mitcham, who gave what I thought was a reasonable presentation on how this whole matter should be handled. I must say that I did not realise that it was a full moon until the rest of the debate transpired and I started to wonder whether or not that motion was such a good idea after all. The member for Napier made some interesting comments tonight. I had to leave half-way through the Federal budget presentation by Mr Keating to hear the honourable member's contribution, after which I was somewhat deflated by a number of contributions all purporting to support the motion.

I found tonight that a number of matters raised were real chestnuts, and I refer to them not necessarily in any order. *A Clockwork Orange*, Stanley Kubrick's film, I did not necessarily go along with because I do not like seeing that much overt violence on the screen. I remember in 1972 seeing what was at that stage the uncut version of the film and an interview two or three years later on the Michael Parkinson show with Anthony Burgess.

Parkinson asked Burgess what put him in a frame of mind to write the book on which the film was based. He told Parkinson that his medical reports got mixed up. He went to the doctor who said that he had a fatal disease. What happened was that his X-rays got confused with some other bloke's. He was given only six months to live so he wrote *A Clockwork Orange*, which he thought at that stage was where we were all heading. He was extremely depressed, but he is still alive. He went back to the doctor a couple of years later and found out that the whole thing was, sadly for him, a mistake. I do not know that *A Clockwork Orange* tells us very much, because it was supposed to be the world 20 years hence and, as we are almost there, I do not think that scenario has been realined.

I was deeply moved by some of the speeches made by members tonight. I was not aware until tonight that the law protected criminals but did not protect ordinary citizens, householders, and the like. That is really something new to me but I would like to see some more evidence of it. All I have heard is generalisations and comments that such a case exists and we all know that this happens. No detail has been presented. A number of members have made some bold assertions but they have not supported them with evidence.

I must say that I was almost brought to tears by the member for Goyder and the thought of farmers having to file down all the barbed wire. Sadly, I suspect that that is not the case, and that suggestion was not very well thought out. As I said before, the member for Mitcham probably made one of the better contributions. He said that it was a complex area with a lot of perceived problems. The reality

is that a large number of people feel that they and their personal possessions are at risk from a criminal element and that the Government has not taken the necessary steps to protect them from that element.

There is a perception in the community that we can do more about housebreakings, car theft and a number of similar issues. I do not suggest that car theft and housebreakings are not at plague proportions, but the member for Mitcham made it quite clear. There are a number of instances when we would happily cheer if a person apprehended an offender in a number of different circumstances and that offender were presented to the police, dealt with by the courts and punishment ensued. I do not think that there is any argument about that. The argument comes in with simplistic illustrations, such as the three or four given tonight involving firearms.

It may well be the case that we can drag out one or two instances in which a judicious use of force has led to the apprehension of a particular offender. We should also be quite clear that in the United States, where a much more liberal use of force is allowed in the law for the protection of property and self, in 19 cases out of 20 it is the offenders who are armed. If the goal is to allow the person the right to protect himself, his property and his family, such a practice actually puts that person at much greater risk. The member for Mitcham brought that out clearly in his contribution tonight and I do not understand why he is on the skids over there because I thought it was a pretty good contribution.

However, what came afterwards was in the mythical world where things were perfect 20 or 30 years ago. I suggest that we go back a little further to the time when the birch, floggings and hangings were widely used. Perhaps we should go back 150 years to the beginning of this colony. We could go back 200 years. The fact is that when the most draconian penalties were applied there were nevertheless a large number of murders, burglaries and robberies.

It seems that members opposite think that the past 20 years have just slipped them by, that if somehow or other they had been there, they would have been able to stop all these laws which we are supposed to have passed, which allow rape, violence, burglary and so on. They seem to have some sort of illusion that these statutes have come through this House in the past two decades. Many members of this House, including some opposite, have in fact been here for all those years.

I am waiting to see a whole series of examples where these laws have been passed. The reality is that they have not. Those measures and all the rest of it have never come through here. It is probably true that 20 years ago there were less burglaries and car thefts. Certainly, in the case of cars, there are now twice as many to steal, so I suppose that is one explanation. There is no doubt there has been a rise in these figures, and the Government needs to look at that and take serious action. In part, it is doing so through the Neighbourhood Watch scheme and various other legal measures, including the Attorney-General's approach to crime and, in particular, appeals when inappropriate sentences are handed down in the courts.

What is at stake here tonight is something which is quite fundamental. It concerns a select committee that will look at various aspects of an extremely complex problem, namely, the legal rights of citizens to protect themselves and their property, what the policy in that area should be and what the laws should be. The trite contributions made about how in the old days we used to give them a kick up the backside and a flick under the ear, etc., without committing a crime, really do not do a great deal for this argument. I hope the

standard of evidence provided to the select committee will be an awful lot better than the contributions that were made here tonight.

Mr BLACKER (Flinders): I support the motion:

That a Select Committee be appointed to consider the adequacy of the laws and rights of citizens in the area of self defence and to—

- (a) consider the state of the law in relation to the rights of any citizen to exercise force in the protection of person or property;
- (b) consider whether the current state of the law satisfactorily enables the occupiers of homes to protect themselves or their property against intruders; and
- (c) make recommendations for the reform of the law as considered necessary or desirable.

I have read out the entire motion because I would like the Minister to comment on a couple of aspects, in summing up the debate. In particular, I ask him to comment on the explanation of (b) 'consider whether the current state of the law satisfactorily enables the occupiers of homes to protect themselves or their property against intruders'. Will the select committee be able to take into account larger properties, such as hobby farms or broad acre rural land? Many people who own rural properties—with offences probably being more prevalent in nearby areas—often find trespassers either looking for mushrooms or pursuing other activities like picnics, for instance.

I have had 24 people walk across my property on a pleasant Sunday afternoon, obviously looking for mushrooms, with not one having asked for permission to do so. They walked through a mob of lambing ewes, and some concern was expressed at that time. As a property owner, what rights do I have in asking people to leave? The vast majority of them would quite likely do so but, obviously, there could be someone who might not.

I will not quote examples, as has been done tonight, because I think the select committee is the appropriate place to do that. No doubt the Government is aware (through its agreeing to a select committee) that there is a perception in the community that the present laws are inadequate. Every member of this place would have had drawn to their attention an example of where a constituent has questioned the adequacy of the law in relation to people being able to protect their property.

The very principle of Neighbourhood Watch was in itself born out of a perception by householders that their properties were not being adequately protected. Persons were trespassing on and interfering with other people's property, and in some cases causing damage. I applaud the actions taken by the member for Albert Park in this matter—and there have been plenty of others. I think that Port Lincoln had one of the first Neighbourhood Watch schemes in the country. Neighbourhood Watch gave a respectability, if you like, to persons watching out for trespassers.

The other thing that needs to be taken into account involves a television segment that many members would have seen two nights ago. I think that the item was entitled 'Big Jim', and related to a former policeman who was engaged by a number of householders for a fee of, I think, \$2 a week. Approximately 600 residents contributed to that, which almost creates a vigilante situation. That is what we do not want. We do not want other persons taking the law into their own hands. From what I saw on television, this former policeman had a very responsible attitude, but the whole situation was born out of the frustration of householders. That should not be the case and, hopefully, this committee will be able to examine why those programs were instigated and what action can be taken within the

existing structure, with its lack of policing and lack of back-up to police making an arrest.

A resolution similar to this was passed at a recent National Party conference, so I know the feeling of some of the members of the National Party. I believe that similar resolutions have been passed by other political Parties, so the feeling is widespread. The select committee will no doubt be interesting, and I would have liked to be on that committee myself, since it will be of immense interest. Nevertheless, it is a select committee that will need to be very thorough and very responsible in its report to Parliament, since it may well recommend changes to the law.

If the law is considered adequate in its present form, that will not satisfy the perception of the wider public, who believe that there is a shortcoming in the law at the moment. This select committee will be watched very carefully, as it will have to sum up the public perception of the position as it is now, and take into account the very reason why the Neighbourhood Watch schemes and the 'Big Jim' program to which I have just referred have been born. If the committee can do that and come up with some recommended legislation to accommodate that, the committee will have served this State and this Parliament extremely well. I support the motion.

Mr HAMILTON (Albert Park): I welcome the opportunity to speak in this debate. Having listened to the member for Flinders, I agree with a number of matters to which he referred. It is true that there is a perception in some areas of the community about whether they are adequately protected by the law.

I understand that the matter of 'reasonable force' will, amongst other things, be addressed by the select committee. I have discussed this matter with some of my colleagues and they, as have a number of my constituents, have said, 'My home is my castle and I should have the right to defend it against any intruder.'

That opens up a very wide field. For example, it was suggested to me that if one wanted to entrap a neighbour one could say, 'Come in and borrow my television set,' and, when the neighbour came in and picked up the set, that person could say, 'You are in my home. I have been wanting to do this for a long time,' and blow him away. That is an extreme circumstance, but to use any force in one's home is, I think, very dangerous but is, nevertheless, a question that has to be addressed by the select committee.

Anyone who has had their home broken into and has found their personal belongings interfered with, their heirlooms and the things that they treasure (which would probably not mean a cold pie to the person who stole them) stolen, will feel very angry. I have experienced that myself. My property has been broken into not once, but twice. When I was a guard in the railways I had to travel interstate for a union conference. I came home to find that all the money my union had allocated for expenses and so on had been stolen. I could not get money as it was a holiday weekend, and I had to ask friends to help me out.

On that occasion I had to question my own children to see whether they had taken that money. I asked them, 'Did you take that money? If you did, dad will be unhappy and bitterly disappointed but we have to report it to the police.' I am glad to say that my three children came back and said, 'No dad, we didn't take it.'

I, like many other people, would feel very angry if I confronted someone in my home. The Neighbourhood Watch film, if I recall, has the police recommending that you do not confront people when they are rutting through your home because a thief could pull out a knife, could be

high on drugs and hyped up, and could do almost anything. I do not think I am considered to be gutless, but I would not confront a bloke with a knife. However, others in the community would perhaps want to do that. I felt very angry when the cars belonging to people in my family were stolen or interfered with. One Christmas Eve my son's \$1 500 camera and zoom lens were stolen from his locked car which was parked out the front of our house. Imagine the anger he felt.

Another matter to be considered is that of elderly people. Many years ago I called a public meeting which was held at the West Lakes Community Club in order to give support to the police—a proactive campaign to try to make people in the area aware of the problems we had. While door-knocking around the Bartley Tavern and McCutcheon Grove area, I found that many elderly people were very concerned.

Of course, the information I was getting differed from the statistical information being given to the police. As I have related on many occasions, through no fault of the police, in many circumstances people will not report the incidence of crime. However, there was a fear amongst those elderly people that they did not have adequate protection under the law; that they could not use reasonable force.

I also believe that the select committee should be addressing the question of the drug problem in the community. Why do people break into homes? What is reasonable force when one is confronted with someone breaking into one's home or service station, or the like? How do we address that particular problem? The other question that must be addressed is the social problems in the community. Do we address that question in terms of why we have that problem in the community? I am no do-gooder; I can assure the House of that. However, those issues should be addressed. I support the motion and I hope that the Parliament, collectively, can come up with the answer.

Another issue is the question of the judiciary and the adequacy of sentencing and appeal provisions. Does it take too long when the average Joe Bloggs wants to appeal against the severity of a sentence handed down by the court? A number of police officers and a number of my constituents have expressed to me their frustration about that issue. They ask, 'What is the point in going through all that long and belaboured exercise?' I am not saying that I agree with all of those sentiments, but I know that there is frustration out in the community. How many people know the law? I am not the full bottle on the law; I wish I were. But I believe that there is that perception in the community—rightly or wrongly—and perhaps the establishment of a select committee is one way of addressing this issue. However, I must say that I do not believe that it will be the panacea that some people think it may be in terms of finding a resolution for all of these problems. I hope that the select committee addresses many of these problems and I look forward to its report.

The Hon. G.J. CRAFTER (Minister of Education): I thank all members who have contributed to this debate on the motion before us. I thank them all for their indication of support for the Government's intention to establish a select committee on the law with respect to self-defence. The member for Flinders raised the matter of the interpretation of the terms of reference for the select committee. I refer the honourable member to paragraph (a) of those terms of reference, which states:

The work of the select committee is to consider the State of the law in relation to the rights of any citizen to exercise force in the protection of person or property.

I believe that that covers the circumstances to which the honourable member refers with respect to farms and farm

properties. However, I point out to the House that matters relating to trespassing on rural properties and the law relating to that issue has been the subject of legislative reform in recent years and, certainly, the subject of long debate in both Houses of Parliament. Therefore, there is a good body of material for the select committee to consider in the context of the issues to which the honourable member is referring.

I agree with the comments of the member for Alexandra, who said he feared that some members who had spoken had already made up their mind on the matter and had very fixed views on where they wanted the law to head. I hope that is not the case, although it sounded very much like that from the speeches made by a number of members. For other members who want to see the work of this select committee and, presumably, the resulting law reform overcome a wide cross-section of ills in our community, I can only say that, no doubt, they will be most disappointed, because there is a limit on how far one can take the law in one's endeavour to provide different sets of values and parameters relating to the behaviour of people in the community.

So, I believe that we need to have realistic expectations before we enter into this exercise this evening. In recent times a concern has been expressed in the South Australian community about the rights and duties of citizens to defend themselves and their property from unlawful entry. Petitions on the subject have been presented to the Parliament and contain over 39 000 signatures. Some concerns in the community are understandable, although it is regrettable that much of the concern is based on a misunderstanding of the law. Sometimes, police warnings not to tackle intruders in the home are not necessarily based on a proper interpretation of the law but, rather, on sound common-sense, that is, it may be better not to confront an intruder but instead to contact the police.

There can be no doubt that some of the campaign is based on at least a failure to understand or comprehend the current law and, on occasions, inaccurate and indefensible views and opinions that have been put forward. Therefore, it is proper that citizens in the community should be concerned about their rights to self-defence. It is understandable that citizens should be alarmed when they are told as a fact things that are not in reality fact.

In our society we do not, and should not, condone people taking the law into their own hands and using violence to do so. For example, some years ago, a 14-year-old boy was shot dead in New South Wales for the crime of stealing a watermelon. This, I am sure, would not be considered to be acceptable behaviour by the general community.

Some people hold the view that the law in this State is more concerned with protecting the lawbreakers than it is with protecting victims. Anyone who has followed the course of law reform by this Government will know that to be incorrect. The South Australian Government has led Australia in its concern for and protection of the victims of crime.

On occasions it is being reported as if fact that homeowners are being prosecuted for defending themselves. The *News* of 29 June, reporting on this issue, states:

But there have been recent cases in South Australia where housebreakers have actually charged homeowners with assault or similar charges after being hurt while the homeowners were defending themselves.

The Government would wish the select committee to examine any such cases. The Liberal Party at the last election made this claim but was unable to produce any examples. Indeed, the then Leader of the Opposition, Mr Olsen, gave an example of an elderly woman who had been charged

after repelling an intruder. When investigated, this turned out to be totally untrue.

A discussion paper has been prepared by Mr Matthew Goode, Senior Lecturer in Law at the University of Adelaide, now a criminal law consultant in the Attorney-General's Department, for consideration by members of the select committee and the community. I table this paper.

The select committee will consider the law and whether it should be codified, but as a starting point, in addition to the discussion paper, it might be worth placing on the record a statement of the law by former Justice Wells of the Supreme Court in the case of *Morgan v Coleman* as follows:

(1) In this part, I refer, for the sake of convenience, only to self-defence; similar principles govern the situation where the right to defend someone other than oneself, to defend property, or to prevent crime is in issue.

(2) The law relating to self-defence is best applied in practice by first formulating it for the purposes of the particular case under examination in a form that is disengaged from the rules governing onus of proof. The law on onus of proof may be introduced at the stage when an appropriate statement of the law is to be applied to the particular facts.

(3) The law relating to self-defence should always be stated in a form that can be readily understood by men and women in the street, in the home, in the jury box, and in courts of summary jurisdiction. All that should be called for in its application is an understanding of human nature, fairness and commonsense.

(4) It is both good sense and good law that where a person is subjected to, or genuinely fears, an attack (which may take the form of unarmed violence or the use of a weapon) he may use force to defend himself.

(5) It is both good sense and good law that, for the purposes of his defence, that person may do, but he may only do, what is reasonably necessary for the purpose, having regard to all the circumstances as he genuinely believed them to be at the time. If he does no more than is reasonably necessary in those circumstances, then such force as he employs is justifiable and lawful. If, in those circumstances, force by way of defence is not called for, or if, though some measure of force is warranted, he plainly oversteps the mark and uses force that is not reasonably necessary then what he does is unlawful. That is the general rule.

(6) But it is in the nature of things that certain sorts of situations in which violence erupts will tend to recur, and, accordingly, the application of the general principle to those situations has given rise to some practical rules which are worth restating.

(a) Defence means defence; a person who claims to have been acting in justifiable self-defence must have acted, and believed himself to have been acting, in defence. To engage willingly in combat is not acting in self-defence.

(b) Self-defence can never be made a cover for aggression; if a person provokes, or deliberately leads, another to attack him and he then uses that attack as an excuse or pretext for attacking the other person, he cannot cry defence.

(c) Self-defence can never be called in aid to justify retaliation or revenge if the danger is over, and the occasion for self-defence is at an end.

(d) A person who, according to the circumstances as he understands them, genuinely believes that he is threatened with an attack, is not obliged to wait until the attack begins. A person so threatened may use reasonable measures to make the situation safe, and he does not act unlawfully merely because he forestalls or tries to forestall the attack before it has begun.

(e) In all cases, for the purpose of determining whether the person claiming to have acted in self-defence did no more than was reasonably necessary, the possibility of doing something less than using force himself must always be borne in mind, having regard to the circumstances. Thus, the possibility, for example, of parley, of retreat, of evasion, of summoning aid, must always be considered, though the failure to have recourse to any one or more of those alternatives is not, *ipso facto*, decisive.

(f) The force used must not be disproportionate to the necessities of the situation. If a man is threatened with a slap on the face or a kick on the shins, he is plainly not entitled to shoot his tormentor or plunge a knife into him.

(g) In determining what were the circumstances that a person believed to exist, and whether he believed that it was necessary to act in self-defence, regard may be had to the grounds of that person's belief and to whether or not they were reasonable. The reasonableness or the reverse of such grounds is not, of itself, decisive of the existence or non-existence of the belief.

(7) Reference to those everyday precepts does not vary or detract from the general principle abovestated. In the long run,

every case must depend on its own particular facts. Moreover, the principle must be applied fairly; a court or jury is not expected to weigh on a knife edge the exact measure of legitimate defensive action. Account must be taken of all the circumstances as the person claiming to have acted in self-defence genuinely believed them to be, and the question answered whether he used reasonable force, having regard to the trials of the moment, or whether he plainly overstepped the mark.

(8) A person accused of having used unlawful force is not obliged to prove that he was acting in self-defence. If it is reasonably possible that he was acting in lawful self-defence, the prosecution will not have proved that he was acting unlawfully. In short, provided there is evidence relevant to the issue fit for the consideration of the jury or the court (as the case may be), the prosecution must prove beyond reasonable doubt that he was not acting in self-defence in accordance with the foregoing principle.

The work of the select committee should at least seek to dispel some of the more alarmist misconceptions about the law in this area. The select committee will now consider the state of the law which deals with the rights and obligations of citizens to protect themselves and their property from attack and will act as a forum for dispassionate and accurate debate about these issues.

Motion carried.

The House appointed a select committee consisting of Messrs M.J. Evans and Groom, Mrs Hutchison, Mrs Kotz and the Hon. E.R. Goldsworthy; the committee to have power to send for persons, papers and records, and to adjourn from place to place; the committee to report on Thursday 6 December 1990.

WORKCOVER

Adjourned debate on motion of Hon. R.J. Gregory.

(Continued from 16 August. Page 370.)

Mr INGERSON (Bragg): I rise to support the motion and, in doing so, would like to summarise the comments I made last Thursday when moving a similar motion on behalf of the Liberal Party. Some three months ago we clearly put forward the proposition that we needed a select committee to look at WorkCover. We believed at that time—and it has been reinforced over the last three months—that there were very significant problems in the WorkCover Corporation and in the administration of the Act in particular. As I mentioned in my speech to this House last Thursday, several points were made clear in the actuary's report which the Government had in its possession when we discussed the amendments to the Bill back in April. First, the actuarial limit of \$275 million was, if anything, underestimated by some \$50 million. Secondly, whilst South Australia had in the past a superior rehabilitation scheme, there was evidence to show that there had been considerable deterioration in the rehabilitation of injured workers.

Thirdly, the benefits had stabilised at some \$8 million per month in terms of pay-outs, but it was believed that that was only a temporary phenomenon and that, in fact, we could expect that to increase significantly. Fourthly, unless there was an attempt to tightly control the claims handling staff, the consequences for the fund could be disastrous. In other words, there was a very strong comment by the actuaries who looked at WorkCover that the corporation itself had allowed claim handling to get out of control. Finally, if schemes such as this do not serve the workers in industry as intended, obviously they will have to be severely modified. In essence, that is saying that from the experience in New South Wales and Victoria the Government would have to look at the benefits that were currently being paid under the scheme if the cost was to be kept under any sort of control.

Those comments were available to the Government when we discussed the Bill in this House some three months ago and it was at that time, when we requested the select committee, that the Labour Minister (Mr Gregory) said that he would oppose the select committee because no-one in WorkCover believed that they were running a perfect system and that they were putting people back into the work force, even though employers were resisting it. He also said, 'Our average rate is slightly higher, probably for good reasons.' Those statements are quite outrageous, because at that time the Minister and the Government were very much aware that WorkCover was in difficulty.

In both Victoria and New South Wales the Governments of the day recognised that, unless significant changes were made to the benefits and administration of the schemes, massive blow-outs in workers compensation funds would occur. Both those States have made significant changes. In Victoria it was reported only in the past couple of days that its deficit had been slashed significantly. The *Financial Review* of Tuesday 7 August states:

Last year's \$4.2 billion unfunded liability has been turned to something less than \$3 billion.

Because of significant changes in benefits and the way in which the WorkCare organisation was run, Victoria has slashed nearly one-third of its deficit in one year. In New South Wales it was announced only a month ago that all small business levies would be reduced by at least 30 per cent because of the significant reduction in costs of the scheme.

So, we have two schemes from which this one was principally copied and based on, where significant changes have occurred and where benefits to the community and, more importantly, to the funding of the operations have been shown to be desired. There are many reasons why we need this select committee to be established. We need to look at rehabilitation, which is what the whole WorkCover scheme is about, that is, to guarantee to the South Australian community a better rehabilitation scheme in respect of workers.

We should face the fact that that is what workers compensation is all about: to give injured workers a better opportunity to be rehabilitated and put back into the work force as soon as practicable, recognising that there should not be a rush but that it should be done as quickly as possible and in the most economic way. I seek leave to continue my remarks later.

Leave granted; debate adjourned.

ADJOURNMENT

The Hon. R.J. GREGORY (Minister of Labour): I move: That the House do now adjourn.

The Hon. T.H. HEMMINGS (Napier): Since leaving the Ministry in December 1989 and obviously having more available leisure time, I have had the pleasure of indulging in activities that over the past seven years or so I have not had time to follow, as these activities had to take a back seat. One such interest is the reading of good books. As a young lad I was always encouraged to read, especially the great classics. In those days there was no television. My family could not afford that kind of luxury, so we got our pleasure and enjoyment from reading the great classics.

Therefore, it has been a real joy to me to journey back to yesteryear and reread the classics that gave me so much enjoyment many years ago. I have just finished one such classic, which impacted on me this time in just the same way that it did many years ago. I refer to the great tale of

adventure by Baroness Orczy, *The Scarlet Pimpernel*. I am sure that members will recall vividly how this book chronicled the bloody events of the French revolution, the turmoil in France at that time and how the hero, the Scarlet Pimpernel—his identity a secret from his friends and family alike—risked life and limb many times over to snatch to safety hundreds of victims destined for the fond embrace of Madame LaGuillotine.

Members will recall how Sir Percy Blakeney continually fooled the French authorities by portraying himself as a dandy, a foppish gentleman, and he was considered by all to be hopelessly stupid, notoriously dull and had a perpetually inane laugh. All in all, he was a complete and utter buffoon. It is an indication of how, if one wants to confuse people, one goes to the exact opposite of what one really is, and Sir Percy Blakeney did that to perfection. That was his disguise and I suggest to members who have not read the book to take the time to do so. It is in the library. Sir Percy Blakeney's cover was completely opposite to how he portrayed himself in high society in London. In fact, he was a man of high intellect, a brilliant tactician, a man of integrity, and a man of steel.

On finishing that book, it struck me that, so often in contemporary life, we see remarkable similarities to those great fictional characters. Some people wittingly, or perhaps unwittingly, model themselves on an author's creation and, in doing so, they play out a role in society, a role that subsequently dominates their life.

Members interjecting:

The Hon. T.H. HEMMINGS: Mr Speaker, you can be sure that I have had this speech vetted by my legal counsel, so I will not transgress Standing Orders. Over the past few months, with that book fresh in my memory, I have become convinced that within the Parliamentary Liberal Party we have such a person: a man of enormous intellect, a brilliant tactician, and a man of steel. Yet, in the best tradition of Sir Percy Blakeney, he deliberately hides that talent behind the mask of a dandy, a person who is deadly dull, a hopelessly boring buffoon, embarrassing us all with his inane laugh. However, all the time he is waiting in the wings to come to the rescue of the Liberal Party at the opportune moment. I, for one, admire him for his consistency and fortitude in maintaining this stupid exterior, despite the ridicule and scorn that has been poured on him over the years. Sir Percy Blakeney would have been very proud.

The Hon. TED CHAPMAN: I take a point of order. There is no suggestion of guilt in what I am about to say but the point I put to you, Sir, is that the honourable member has transgressed Standing Orders to the extent that he is reflecting on a member on this side of the House, maybe in the other place.

The SPEAKER: Order! The honourable member will resume his seat. The problem is that no-one has been identified. Far be it from me to suggest that any member should take the comments that have been made on his shoulders, and it is difficult for the Chair to make a ruling without a specific indication as to that person to whom the honourable member is referring. If the honourable member does name a member, he will be immediately called to order, because Standing Orders are very clear on that matter. We do not have an identity.

The Hon. TED CHAPMAN: On a further point of order; it has been drawn to my attention that a member on this side of the House has already admitted that he is the member.

The SPEAKER: I do not uphold the point of order. If the member wishes to do so, the Chair cannot protect him. The member for Napier.

The Hon. T.H. HEMMINGS: Thank you for your protection, Mr Speaker. This charade has gone on for far too long. The time has come to unmask Sir Percy. I do not want members to call out any suggestions because that would be going against your ruling, Mr Speaker, but I will give a few clues. Because I have already declared the gender, we can safely assume that Sir Percy is definitely not the member for Coles or the member for Newland. Because we know he is a brilliant tactician, we can safely dispense with the Leader, the Deputy Leader and, of course, the member for Kavel. Because this man possesses an intellect which surpasses most of us mere mortals, it would be safe for me to eliminate almost all the rest of the Opposition, so who then is the Liberal Sir Percy?

If members still have not recognised our Sir Percy, I will give them a tip and I will recap. Let us approach the problem from the other end and go back to the character of Sir Percy and see whether that gives members a clue. Remember the description in the book:

... who is hopelessly stupid, notoriously dull, and who has an inane laugh but is considered by some ladies to be a sartorial dandy.

For those people who wish to hazard a guess, I suggest that they write down the name, place it in an envelope and address it to me, and the first correct envelope that I open after you, Sir, have left the Chair wins the prize of an autographed copy of *The Scarlet Pimpernel* by Baroness Orczy. However, I implore the Scarlet Pimpernel of the Liberal Party to stand up and admit himself that he is the man about whom I am speaking. He is a man with a mission and nowhere to go. Sir, I am finding it very difficult to name this person—

The SPEAKER: I wouldn't!

The Hon. T.H. HEMMINGS: —because you will come down on me like a ton of bricks. Whilst I do not copy the speeches of members of Parliament (all of my speeches are original and I hope to have them published when I retire), in one of his speeches, Clyde Cameron named a particular person whom he despised. Whilst I do not despise this particular person—in fact, I have great admiration for him—I am perhaps prepared, with one minute to go, to incur your wrath, Sir, and I give you the Scarlet Pimpernel, Sir Percy—

The SPEAKER: The honourable member will resume his seat. I refer the member to Standing Order 144 which states:

The Speaker is responsible for the orderly conduct of proceedings of the House and for maintaining its decorum and dignity.

I suggest that that rule embraces anything the honourable member may wish to cover, so I suggest he be very careful.

The Hon. T.H. HEMMINGS: I will, Sir; I am bound by your ruling.

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

Mr OSWALD (Morphett): I have received a letter from Mr Doug Rowe, who was a Liberal Party candidate in the last election. He has raised a matter and I do not think it would hurt if it were ventilated in this House. It is a very important subject dealing with the way in which all is fair in elections but, when sitting members seek to use parliamentary privilege to attack candidates who cannot respond, that establishes a very dangerous precedent which should be deplored by all members in this place. As a future practice, it should be stopped. During the last election campaign, the member for Walsh used the privileges of this House and on 21 February 1990, recorded in *Hansard* at page 323, he stated:

For some reason or another the Liberal Party picked a used car dealer whose licence had been taken away, and it is not very

often that the Department of Consumer Affairs goes to that length.

Mr Rowe has written to me, and I have accepted his request to read part of his letter to the House. It states:

He [Mr Trainer] stated my licence was taken away. This statement is incorrect.

In actual fact, when I read the evidence, it is incorrect. There was some discussion between Mr Rowe and the registration board about the renewal. He failed to renew his licence because he had some difficulty with the terms of the Act under which he had to operate, but the fact of the matter is that the department never took his licence away from him.

I refer also to the proceedings of the board and quote from part of the document as follows:

The board does not at this stage question Mr Rowe's character or repute.

I will not say any more other than to go back to my opening remarks and repeat that it is a practice that should stop. If members use parliamentary privilege to attack candidates in the field when those political candidates cannot reply, I think it is dangerous. I know that the subject of parliamentary privilege is under question at the moment, and this is another example of how someone in the field has no opportunity of reply. In this case it was the Liberal candidate for Walsh. I hope that the practice will cease.

As a member of Parliament, I deplore the use of parliamentary privilege to attack political candidates. The place to attack in the rough and tumble of the election campaign is out in the electorate, by whatever means are at one's disposal in the electorate. Members should not come in here and use the privilege of this House to attack so that people cannot come back with some sort of legal writ.

Enough of that subject: I should like to raise another important subject. I received a letter from a Tim Looker of Glenelg, who wrote to me on 19 August at my electorate office as follows:

Dear Sir,

I am writing to seek your help with a matter that has caused concern and cost to my family. In May of this year my wife was awarded, in the family court, an amount of \$35 per week as maintenance for her son, my stepson. The court order was effective from 7 May and payments were to be made through the Child Support Agency.

When by the middle of July we had still not received proper payment, we raised the question with the Child Support Agency. Their reply amazed us. It seems that the boy's father had constructed a clever ploy, using a 'trust' account, and had provided the Child Support Agency with 'documentary proof' that he made the payments. Of course we had not received the money and our only course of action was to contact the police and commission a solicitor to sort it out.

It was plain a fraud had been committed and that the law was being flouted. We had assumed that a court ruling was sound and that police action would follow any attempt to get around the law. This has proved not to be so. On contacting the police they showed little interest in following up the matter. It was left to us and our hired solicitor to make sure that the ruling of the court was met.

It has cost us \$1 000 in legal fees to fix this matter. We are very upset that we have had to pay this money when we are struggling financially. The father of the boy has in effect defied a court ruling and gets off scot-free while the police, who should enforce the law, show no interest. We would be pleased if you could raise this matter with the police and secure for us some action. We can provide them with more details . . .

The letter concludes 'Yours faithfully, T.D. Looker.' There are several issues involved. I know that the Federal Government is involved in this, as it is a Federal department, but I believe that we all have some responsibility, whether at Federal or at State level, to try to solve this problem. There is no doubt that the system is being abused and there is no doubt that many non-custodial parents are ignoring their responsibilities. It is true that there is a lack of will

on the part of the Child Support Agency in collecting payment.

Perhaps at State level there needs to be some cooperation with the police and with other authorities to enforce the law, because there is absolutely no point in our having a law if it is not to be enforced—and we all know that the law exists. I ask the State Government to converse with its Federal counterpart and see whether we can tidy up this whole problem of the Child Support Agency and the fact that orders are made but not enforced. I do not think that any member of this House could say that they have not had at least one or two such cases come across their desk this year. This is a very common problem, as far as I am concerned.

The third letter I received relates to a subject I have been asked to ventilate in the House. It is from a very elderly lady in the Glenelg area who wrote to me on the 20th of this month, as follows:

It is of great concern that I, a member of the Christian community . . . have learnt of the practices of devil worship, etc., teenagers being influenced by a 'message' on videos, etc., sometimes leading to suicides. Although not married myself I have a niece and nephew with their families and know of many others.

There may be many bookshops selling books on the occult. I noticed a pile of books by the same author on this subject just outside the shop near the SGIC sign in King William Street. Can the Government not ban these books and so prevent their distribution and sale together with those on pornography?

That books about the occult and pornography are freely available is a matter of concern to many residents of Glenelg, and I share their concern, as do many other members of the House. I request the Attorney-General to address this matter with some urgency.

Recently there was comment in the media about a matter I raised, that is, X-rated words on t-shirts. One day I was walking along King William Street and saw a fellow wearing a t-shirt with 'get f....d', 'f... off' and other such things. I made a comment to the media about this, it was picked up and, with some relish, this story ran for most of the day and night because, I think, it really did offend the sense of decency of ordinary people in the community. I thought it was about time that someone in public life said, 'Enough is enough. If people are to wear X-rated t-shirts they should be confined to wearing them in their own home.' I do not care whether people wear X-rated t-shirts to bed, around the home or whatever, but I think we have to draw the line about their being paraded up and down King William Street in front of women and children, and indeed in front of many men who would find them offensive when in mixed company.

The Attorney-General shrugged off this matter and said, 'The police have more to do with their time.' I submit that the police have a responsibility to take the offender aside and warn him and, if he persists, charge him. The wearing of such t-shirts in public is illegal and carries a heavy fine. I am concerned about the principle of the matter and it is about time we became a lot firmer. If these laws exist we should enforce them.

Mr QUIRKE (Playford): It would be very hard to outdo the contribution of the member for Napier when he talked about the Scarlet Pimpernel. The easiest thing to do would be to name a member of the Opposition as the pimpernel; you, Mr Speaker, might sit me down and we could all go home. I understand what the member for Morphett said about the widespread use of parliamentary privilege in this place with respect to private citizens. If people stand for election for a political Party, whether the Liberal Party, the Labor party, the flat earth society or whatever, I suppose that they hold themselves up for public office and, in many

respects, do not quite deserve the same sort of parliamentary ethics that are largely necessary when one is dealing with ordinary members of the public.

I remind Opposition members of what they did to a man by the name of Terry Cameron last year—and they may well have forgotten about it now—the cheap shots that were taken against him and the members of his family for a number of months, and the terrible anguish that that caused to this man, his wife, children, relatives and friends. In large part I agree with what the member for Morphett says about the use of parliamentary privilege, and about the fact that it is something which, if we are not careful, will fall into disrepute. However, the episode last year which concerned Terry Cameron did not do this Chamber or quite a number of its members opposite any great service.

The Hon. J.P. Trainer interjecting:

Mr QUIRKE: In fact, the member for Walsh raises the question of John Dunnery and other members who have been singled out and abused in this place; that is the only way to describe it. However, I must say, on a different note, I was somewhat bemused by the contributions of members on the question of a select committee to consider the protection of citizens in our community. As I said in my speech earlier, I thought there was a full moon; that was the only way I could explain some of the carryings on. I then realised that this is a very momentous day. In fact, this is the day that could have been; unfortunately, it was not. What could have happened today is that the budget brought down in Canberra could have been brought down by the first Liberal Government in many years. It was not, and there are a number of reasons for that, which largely are beyond the scope of my contribution tonight. However, I commiserate with the many members opposite who were watching the budget presentation and I could see the forlorn look on their faces, showing that they would like to be tasting something outside the political wilderness, something they have not been able to taste for many years. I think that in many respects it is probably for the betterment of the community that they cannot enjoy that taste when they come up with ideas such as a consumption tax.

In my time in this place, since the election last year, I have been steadily assessing the role that the Opposition has played in South Australia and I must say that my estimation of not only the ability of members opposite but also their contribution has gone down by the month. In the first part of the year I thought that, in many respects, the Opposition was going through a period of some turmoil and that it would get itself organised and that eventually we would have an effective Opposition. Question Time seemed to work quite effectively and a number of public issues were raised on both sides of the House and I thought it worked quite well. In fact, the description given to me by some of my colleagues of how this House used to function over many years, where after only two or three questions there was uproar, bedlam and all sorts of other debates, has not happened. I am very pleased that in the first part of this year we did a lot of productive work.

However, I, like many other members, read in the newspapers that things would be different when we returned for the budget session. I looked forward to the first great censure debate here. I must say that I have never witnessed anything as appalling as that debate. I wonder whether the Scarlet Pimpernel, whoever that person is, scripted the performance that unfolded. That is the only way one could describe the spectacle witnessed in this place. Of course, we had the

Leader of the Opposition, who had a prepared brief, becoming somewhat concerned when the role of the Governor was raised. That matter was clarified by you, Mr Speaker, in relation to reflections on the Governor, and that seemed to take the sting out of the Leader's speech. However, when the member making the next contribution could not remember where the by-election was held, that really was the top hat for the whole show.

I apologise to the member for Custance on behalf of many other members because I remembered where the by-election had been held. As I have said previously to the member for Custance, he is following in the great footsteps, and I am not talking about his father or Senator John Olsen; I am talking about a more ancient person who had the same name as I have—a distant relative. I just hope that for the next three years or so of this Government we will see the Opposition playing a useful and functional role.

The member for Murray-Mallee has attracted my attention; he approaches carrying his desk drawer. There are several things that I do not wish to see and amongst them are the drawers of the member for Murray-Mallee. I will not elaborate on what I saw in the drawers of the member for Murray-Mallee but, if anyone wants to see me afterwards, I will write it on a piece of paper and put it in an envelope.

Quite seriously, the approach by the Federal Liberal Party to the whole question of a consumption tax worries me a great deal. I believe that we should look very seriously at the impact of this tax. In fact, it is amazing that the Federal Liberal Party, and, it appears, its State colleagues here, would dally with this proposition. I would have thought that the object of Opposition members in the next three years was to get a few more pensioners, battlers and some other citizens, who perhaps are not quite as wealthy as those members, to vote for them. They will not be doing that with a consumption tax, which, particularly on the State level, is a regressive tax that hits everybody the same, regardless of their means to pay. On the Federal level, it is possible to introduce compensation measures, but it is impossible to compensate in one way or another a range of low income earners.

My father, a migrant in Australia, was just an ordinary tradesman. The last thing he would have wanted was any handout from the Government. He was a worker whose attitude was very simple: he wanted to provide for his own family; he wanted a job; and he wanted to work as hard as he could in the new land to provide a home, an income and education for his children. He did all those things, and he did them proudly. At the end of the day I do not suppose that he really had much money left. In fact, when he died, he left very little, but the reality was that he felt he had had a successful life.

I believe that the consumption tax proposal, which is being dallied with by members opposite, should be looked at by the entire community and placed under a microscope. I suspect that there will be many more budgets which will depress members opposite not because of the measures contained in them but, rather, because members opposite will not introduce those budgets.

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

Motion carried.

At 10.28 p.m. the House adjourned until Wednesday 22 August at 2 p.m.

HOUSE OF ASSEMBLY

Tuesday 21 August 1990

QUESTIONS ON NOTICE

ISLAND SEAWAY

11. Dr ARMITAGE (Adelaide), on notice, asked the Minister of Transport: Why was the *Island Seaway* not in operation over the Easter period this year?

The Hon. FRANK BLEVINS: The *Island Seaway*, except for Easter Monday, has never operated over the Easter weekend.

WATER AND SEWERAGE RATES

70. Mr BECKER (Hanson), on notice, asked the Minister of Water Resources:

1. How much was Hon. Hugh Hudson paid for his 'pricing review' of water and sewerage rates, what is the breakdown of the cost and what were the terms and conditions of the contract or arrangement with him?

2. Were tenders called for the 'pricing review' and, if not, why not?

3. Was this review suggested by Hon. Hugh Hudson and, if so, when, to whom and why?

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

1. The Engineering and Water Supply Department paid Mr Hugh Hudson the following amounts relating to his consultancy work:

	\$
24.5 days work @ \$550 per day	13 475.00
Research assistant 1 day @ \$200 per day	200.00
Eight return flights to Canberra @ \$550	4 352.00
Accommodation and meals	1 670.05
Taxi fares	133.15
Total	<u>\$19 830.20</u>

The standard Government contract for consultants was used.

2. No tenders were called. Mr Hudson was invited to submit an offer to carry out the review because having regard to his experience in carrying out similar major reviews interstate, his knowledge of Government and his formal economic qualifications he was considered eminently qualified to carry out the task.

3. This review was not suggested by Mr Hudson, it was a Government initiative.

SELF-EMPLOYMENT VENTURE SCHEME

72. Mr D.S. BAKER (Leader of the Opposition), on notice, asked the Minister of Employment and Further Education: How much was provided in grants in 1989-90 to the self-employment venture scheme to provide working capital to unemployed individuals and groups and for each grant, who was the recipient, what was the amount and what was the specific purpose?

The Hon. M.D. RANN: The total funding for each self-employment venture scheme participant in 1989-90 is listed below and includes details on repayable loan and grant amounts.

SEVS STATISTICS 1989-90

DKT No.	Name	Total	Grant	Loan	Venture
7088/88	T. Doyle	4 880.94	1 666.66	3 214.28	First Adelaide Co-operative
	R. Johnson	3 214.28	—	3 214.28	
	R. Matters	2 440.47	833.33	1 607.14	
	E. Mathews	4 880.94	1 666.66	3 214.28	
	J. Mathews	4 880.94	1 666.66	3 214.28	
	J. Nolan	4 880.94	1 666.66	3 214.28	
	A. Pittrakkis	1 607.14	—	1 607.14	
7635/88	J. Scott	3 214.28	—	3 214.28	Garment manufacturer
	J. Poritz	3 000.00	1 000.00	2 000.00	
7709/89	D. Slavin-Molloy	3 700.00	1 300.00	2 400.00	Signwriter
7713/89	R. Ford	5 000.00	2 400.00	2 600.00	Horse shoeing
	L. Ford				
7716/89	D. O'Donnell	2 000.00	—	2 000.00	Tenants consultant
7719/89	H. Zimmerman	11 900.00	3 410.00	8 490.00	Crafted tiles
	U. Zimmerman				
7722/89	B. Osborne	6 000.00	2 000.00	4 000.00	Motor cycles wrecking
7723/89	S. Dixon				and spare parts Furniture manufacture
	K. Bednarczuk	6 800.00	2 870.00	3 930.00	
7725/89	M. Bednarczuk				General carpentry
	T. O'Day	5 870.00	1 495.00	4 375.00	
7726/89	J. O'Day				Art gallery
	B. Maat	6 000.00	—	6 000.00	
7727/89	K. Olson				General building
	J. Steadman	6 077.00	2 138.00	3 939.00	
7729/89	L. Steadman				Tapestry charts Reptile enclosure
	J. Oxton	3 000.00	—	3 000.00	
7730/89	R. Burrell	7 000.00	2 000.00	5 000.00	Computer software
	P. Burrell				
7734/89	R. Kennedy	6 000.00	1 700.00	4 300.00	Industrial ceramics
	M. Kennedy				
7735/89	P. Gabb	3 600.00	1 600.00	2 000.00	
7741/89	J. Morton	4925.00	1 225.00	3 700.00	Auto instrument repair
	M. Morton				
7744/89	R. Bartley	3 975.00	1 975.00	2 000.00	Almond paste manufacture
7748/89	A. Liashenko	5 954.00	1 184.00	4 770.00	Custom built furniture
	R. Liashenko				
7752/89	M. Bach	3 000.00	1 000.00	2 000.00	Photography
7754/89	S. Bryce	3 000.00	—	3 000.00	Second hand clothing

DKT No.	Name	Total	Grant	Loan	Venture
<i>Totals brought forward</i>					
7755/89	D. Ward	6 000.00	2 400.00	3 600.00	Antique second hand goods
	C. McErvale				
7757/89	J. Sleeman	5 667.00	1 795.00	3 872.00	Herbal clinic
7760/89	M. Grela	4 000.00	2 000.00	2 000.00	Car maintenance
7768/89	J. Bryant	7 000.00	2 700.00	4 300.00	Motor vehicle repair
	S. Bryant				
7773/89	J. Northover	4 500.00	2 044.00	2 456.00	Pine outdoor furniture
7776/89	S. Jones	6 000.00	1 700.00	4 300.00	Futon manufacture
	G. Jones				
7779/89	T. Huynh	7 200.00	3 000.00	4 200.00	Asian fashion
	H. Huynh				
7780/89	B. Beaumont	3 000.00	1 100.00	1 900.00	Signmaker
7787/89	G. Piercy	3 600.00	2 040.00	1 560.00	Alexander technique
7788/89	S. Cavanagh	2 700.00	1 300.00	1 400.00	Desktop publishing
	- Lang				
7790/89	C. Browning	3 900.00	1 800.00	2 100.00	Leadlighting
7796/89	I. Walsh	15 000.00	5 000.00	10 000.00	Rabbit shooting
	R. Walsh				
7799/89	E. Lynch	3 906.00	951.00	2 955.00	Stone mason
7756/89	P. Tara	5 000.00	2 500.00	2 500.00	House painting
7812/89	M. Sykes	3 000.00	600.00	2 400.00	Fitness consultant
7814/89	M. Clode	1 300.00	450.00	850.00	Plastic welding
7816/89	S. and K. Mundy	6 500.00	2 150.00	4 350.00	Handmade footwear
7819/90	P. Wormald	6 000.00	2 000.00	4 000.00	Food and craft shop
7821/90	T. and J. Cross	1 200.00	250.00	950.00	Listening devices for the deaf
7829/90	R. and D. Wrightson	3 200.00	1 065.00	2 135.00	Signwriter
7832/90	P. Cooper	6 240.00	2 226.00	4 014.00	Upholsterers
7834/90	L. and S. Williams	3 100.00	1 100.00	2 000.00	Alexander technique
7841/90	A. Donaldson	6 100.00	2 200.00	3 900.00	Used photocopier sales and service
7842/90	T. Austin				
	D. Monaghan	7 775.00	2 425.00	5 350.00	Technical paint service
7843/90	Fullagar	10 000.00	3 000.00	7 000.00	Recycled denim
	Letham				
7813/90	H.J. Levi	3 000.00	1 000.00	2 000.00	Electrician
	M.C. Levi				
7826/90	J. Ejenberg	6 770.00	2 000.00	4 770.00	Car maintenance and repair
	B. Ejenberg				
7846/90	G.K. McKinnon	10 000.00	3 500.00	6 500.00	Market garden
	C.L. McKinnon				
7847/90	G. Brown	2 000.00	—	2 000.00	Electrocraft
7854/90	W.R. Johnson	10 000.00	3 300.00	6 700.00	Gnome farm
	M. Johnson				
7857/90	R.E. Haines	4 700.00	2 000.00	2 700.00	General home and maintenance business
	G.J. Haines				
7858/90	D. Sanderson	8 150.00	2 700.00	5 450.00	Promotion of Australian religious books/publications
	K.D. Sanderson				
7866/90	J. Lyons-Reid	10 730.00	3 015.00	7 715.00	Asian catering
	M. Mansor				
7869/90	W.J. Turner	10 000.00	3 300.00	6 700.00	Floor covering service
	T.L. Wallace				
7875/90	J. Makk	5 000.00	1 700.00	3 300.00	Signwriting
7876/90	E.D. Gwynne	10 000.00	3 333.00	6 667.00	Nut and fruit tree nursery
	S.J. Gwynne				
7877/90	G. Elliott	11 882.00	4 882.00	7 000.00	Mechanical workshop
	K. Elliott				
7892/90	C. Temesi	10 000.00	3 500.00	6 500.00	Fitness centre
	C. Temesi				
7893/90	H.M. Costello	10 645.00	3 445.00	7 200.00	Commercial artist
	C.L. Costello				
7894/90	K.M. Costello	5 000.00	1 000.00	4 000.00	Compositor
7905/90	B.J. Fredberg	10 000.00	3 300.00	6 700.00	Australia timber handicraft
	M.J. Fredberg				
7682/89	M. Williams	1 860.00	620.00	1 240.00	Fruit and vegetable delivery
	S. Tonkin				
7816/89	S. and K. Mundy	767.00	—	767.00	Leather footwear
7821/90	T. and J. Cross	500.00	—	500.00	Food and craft shop
Grand totals		389 692.93	125 187.97	264 504.96	

OVERHEADS REVIEW

74. Mr D.S. BAKER (Leader of the Opposition), on notice, asked the Minister of Marine: What was the cost of the overheads review undertaken for the Department of Marine and Harbors by Pak Poy and Kneebone in conjunction with K.H. Consulting?

The Hon. R.J. GREGORY: The cost of the consultants, Pak Poy and Kneebone Pty Ltd and K.H. Consulting Group

was \$107 164.61. The executive summary of the consultant's report described the main outcomes of the consultancy as:

validation of the proposed new organisation strategy for the department;

identification of potential productivity improvements and savings in the GME Act employment area of \$1.5 million per annum;

an accurate and detailed data base relating to overhead costs; and
 a mechanism to ensure continuous change.
 In terms of the identified savings in the GME Act employment area of \$1.5 million per annum the study was clearly beneficial.

MANAGEMENT INFORMATION SYSTEM

83. **Mr D.S. BAKER (Leader of the Opposition)**, on notice, asked the Minister of Housing and Construction: Was Sacon's integrated Management Information System fully operational before 30 June 1990 to meet the assurance given to the Auditor-General (1989 Report p. xix) and, if so, when and, if not, why not, and when will it become fully operational?

The Hon. M.K. MAYES: Sacon's integrated Management Information System is now operating in accordance with the undertaking given to the Auditor-General. Since it is a new system it is currently in a settling-in period, which is common practice, and further refinements will be progressively added to the system as required.

DEPARTMENT OF PERSONNEL AND INDUSTRIAL RELATIONS

84. **Mr D.S. BAKER (Leader of the Opposition)**, on notice, asked the Minister of Labour: At 30 June 1990 how many persons were on the unattached list administered by the Department of Personnel and Industrial Relations and how many were on the list of redeployed persons?

The Hon. R.J. GREGORY: At 30 June 1990, 29 people were on the unattached list and, of these, 15 were on leave without pay. There were 137 people listed as redeployees. These redeployees were all gainfully employed. The redeployees on active duty were working in funded vacancies, except for 14 people who were participating in individual retraining or experience placements to enhance their long-term relocation.

ADELAIDE FESTIVAL CENTRE

91. **Mr D.S. BAKER (Leader of the Opposition)**, on notice, asked the Minister of Housing and Construction:

1. Does Sacon now regard all work on the Adelaide Festival Centre Plaza Redevelopment as having been completed and, if not, when will the project be completed?

2. What was the total cost of the project to 30 June 1990 and what is the estimated final cost?

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

1. All contracts have reached practical completion and are subject to the correction of defects prior to granting final completion certificates.

Many of the contractor's defects have been corrected; however, the correction of some defects have been delayed by the recent appointment of a provisional liquidator to the largest on-site contractor (Kirkwood Pty Ltd) and Sacon is currently arranging for another organisation to complete rectification of defects applicable to this contract.

Final rectification of defects is anticipated by October 1990.

Some smaller items of work, such as the painting of the southern plaza sculptures, etc., have been contracted to the Adelaide Festival Centre, to be carried out in conjunction

with its routine maintenance, and it intends to carry this out within the next two months.

2. The total cost at June 1990 was \$10 503 652. The estimated final cost is \$10 980 000, dependent on the satisfactory resolution of some contractual claims.

CORPORATE AFFAIRS COMPUTER

95. **Mr D.S. BAKER (Leader of the Opposition)**, on notice, asked the Minister of Education, representing the Minister of Corporate Affairs: Was the project to computerise corporate affairs information relating to companies, business names and other organisations completed as scheduled by June 1990 and, if so, what was the total cost and, if not, when is it due to be completed and what is the estimated total cost?

The Hon. G.J. CRAFTER: Cabinet approved the implementation of the Corporate Affairs computer system in December 1988. The project schedule, prepared in February 1989, provided for the computer system to commence live operation by the end of June 1989. The system for live processing of companies commenced on 26 June 1989. The balance of the system for processing business names and other organisations commenced live operation in September 1989 as scheduled.

The project budget for the year ended 30 June 1989 was \$1 600 000. Actual expenditure in the same period was \$1 449 023. For the 1989-90 year the project budget allocation was \$1 834 864 and actual expenditure totalled \$1 673 698.

By June 1990 the corporate affairs system had largely achieved a settled operational mode, with further development being concentrated mainly on information reports for use by the business community. By the end of July 1990 some 50 private sector organisations had taken up subscriptions to on-line inquiry services offered by the Corporate Affairs Commission.

GERARD YABBIE FARM

100. **Mr D.S. BAKER (Leader of the Opposition)**, on notice, asked the Minister of Employment and Further Education:

1. Has a pilot version of the yabbie farm project at the Gerard Aboriginal Reserve been completed and, if so, when and at what cost?

2. When will the project be further evaluated to determine whether it should proceed on a permanent basis?

The Hon. M.D. RANN: A pilot version of the yabbie farm at Gerard has been completed. \$109 333 previously advanced under CEP was to be used for the project of which \$64 598 was State funds. It was completed in late 1989. At completion, some \$10 849 of the total funds had not been expended but still remain with the Gerard community. The Gerard community and the Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander Commission (the successor to the Aboriginal Development Commission) have also contributed substantial, but unknown, funds.

An evaluation of the project was commissioned by the Gerard community and ATSIC. The community, with the help of ATSIC, is currently reviewing the options recommended for any further development of the pilot project.

YOUTH EMPLOYMENT PROGRAM

101. **Mr D.S. BAKER (Leader of the Opposition)**, on notice, asked the Minister of Employment and Further Edu-

cation: How much was provided in grants in 1989-90 to the youth employment program providing employment and training opportunities for the unemployed through local government authorities and community organisations, what was the amount and specific purpose of each grant and who was the recipient?

The Hon. M.D. RANN: The attached chart provides the details requested by the Leader of the Opposition. The total sum of these grants is \$1 183 830. The amount appropriated in the budget was \$1.35 million. The difference between these two amounts is that which is set aside as the first one-third advance to the following calendar year's funded projects (as has occurred in previous years).

Sponsor's Name	Project Title	Description	No. of Participants	Grant \$
Davenport Community Council Inc.	'Ukari Development Stage 2'	Landscaping around Supermarket and Bungala area; tree planting around the community; nursery redevelopment with traditional and European plants; upgrading of existing playground area around Supermarket. This project is of specific benefit to the Aboriginal community as a whole as well as increasing the level of participants' employability.	13	106 190
Corporation of the City of Noarlunga	'Happy Valley Trails'	Establish site office for tools and first aid etc.; construct 3 trails; establish nursery; tree planting; irrigation; establish lookouts and minor picnic areas; create seating/shelters at rest areas. The participants will gain positive work habits and skills. The community will gain an upgraded reserve with more available facilities. An important factor is the conservation and protection of native plants and tree species.	18	139 890
Kaurna Plains Early Childhood Centre	'Kaurna Outdoor Indoor Improvements'	Developing Aboriginal early Childhood Centre as follows: Outdoor—expand and develop areas (landscaping, fence replacing, playground equipment, etc.). Indoor—develop to optimise space and usefulness (shelving, pin-up boards, display areas, partitions, general upgrading of facilities, etc.). Childcare work, pre-school aide, carpentry, sewing, the arts, cooking, etc. The project will help to Aboriginalise the Centre as well as provide role models for the children. The Aboriginal community will benefit in many ways as well as increasing the employment prospects of the participants.	18	141 300
Kura Yerlo Council Inc.	'Kura Yerlo Garden'	The project involved: Establishing a vegetable garden; creating community awareness to availability of fresh vegetables and aid towards a balanced diet; development of office management for sale of produce to the community; establishing voluntary groups and stronger networks. The participants will gain child care experience coupled with office skills which will give them a competitive edge in the labour market.	13	106 600
Umbrella Youth Housing Association Inc.	'Mudbrick Kit Home'	The work included: Construction of a display mudbrick home; development of detailed assembly instructions on video cassette; development of printed plans, sketches, specifications and written instructions. Enables semi-skilled people access to low cost quality housing in kit form. The participants will receive a wide range of skills and exposure to further skills which will give them a choice for future development.	10	168 400

Sponsor's Name	Project Title	Description	No. of Participants	Grant \$
Umoona Community Council Inc.	'Umoona Beautification'	Install irrigation system/horticultural techniques to a level to establish and maintain a home vegetable garden; writing reports and business English; basic budgeting; time planning. Project aims to develop the skills of the participants to a level that is more suitable for positions that are sometimes available from nearby stations, as well as to encourage further study.	13	105 700
Vietnamese Community S.A./ Woodville Council	'Young Vietnamese in Action'	Involved work at the Vietnamese Community Centre, upgrading and expanding their existing facilities as well as some landscaping work with/ for Woodville Council. Includes: Development of reading room (installing shelving, painting, etc.); landscaping; erecting kit form playground equipment; paving driveway; developing workshop area in shed (i.e. painting, welding, etc.). Will cover issues relevant to the work and social problems faced by these people.	13	112 200
Whyalla City Council/Buildaskill Inc.	'Skateboard Park'	A strongly supported project by the local community, establishing an important employment history for the individual participants in an extremely depressed labour market area. Involved: Construction of a subground bowl design skateboard rink with a perimeter fence and turnstile; installation of a drip system, irrigation and landscaping of enclosed area; removal of dangerous equipment from Council playgrounds: repair of other playground equipment and areas including impact resistant material.	18	154 550
Southpower Inc.	'Sizzling A-Maze-Ment'	First stage of a recreation park on Heritage Industries land; which will enhance the tourism potential of the South Eastern Region. Project participants include a number of disabled. The group carried out the following: Erection of a maze using local timber materials; development of the park in general; development of several BBQ areas. When completed, the community to benefit through access to these facilities.	18	149 000

HIGHWAYS ACT REPORT

112. Mr D.S. BAKER (Leader of the Opposition), on notice, asked the Minister of Transport: Will the Minister make available to the Opposition a copy of the Highways Act Revision Committee Report presented to him in January 1989 and, if not, why not?

The Hon. FRANK BLEVINS: The Committee report mentioned by the Leader was a step towards preparation of a Bill for an Act to replace the Highways Act. A draft Bill for a new Principal Roads Act and a related discussion paper will soon be released for comment by interested bodies and the public. Copies of these documents and the report sought by the Leader will be provided to him at that time.

VOLUNTARY EARLY RETIREMENT

115. Mr D.S. BAKER (Leader of the Opposition), on notice, asked the Minister of Labour:

1. How many employees were invited to participate in the Voluntary Early Retirement by Invitation scheme in 1989-90 and how many accepted?

2. What was the amount of benefits paid under the scheme in 1989-90?

3. What has been the outcome of a review of the effectiveness of the scheme commenced in May 1989?

4. Has the Government implemented the recommendation of the Auditor-General in his 1989 report to develop an arrangement for voluntary retirement for persons under 55 years of age and, if not, why not, and, if so, how many persons under 55 years of age have participated in the scheme so far?

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

1. & 2.

	Offers	Acceptances	Payments
Administrative Units			\$
GM&E Act	14	12	446 594
Weekly Paid	32	17	314 064
Sub-Total	46	29	760 658
Statutory Authorities	39	36	1 132 894
Total	85	65	\$1 893 552

3. In May 1989, a committee chaired by the Deputy Commissioner for Public Employment reviewed the effectiveness of the scheme. It was concluded that there was a strong case for continuation of the scheme, but that some minor modifications were desirable. The scheme was extended to 30 June 1990 with the following modifications:

- The early retirement incentive payment was increased for employees at lower salary levels (that is, below \$25 000 per annum) to increase its effectiveness for this group of employees.
 - Participants were required to sign an undertaking not to seek re-employment within the public sector for three years.
 - A minor modification was made to the computer derived formulae to calculate early retirement incentives to make it easier to use.
4. The need for a scheme for excess employees aged less than 55 is currently under consideration.

COLLEGE ARMS TRAINING COMPANY

117. **Mr D.S. BAKER (Leader of the Opposition),** on notice, asked the Minister of Employment and Further Education: What was the operating result of the College Arms Training Company Pty Ltd for each of the years 1988-89 and 1989-90?

The Hon. M.D. RANN: The operating result of the College Arms Training Company Pty Ltd was for—

1988-89	\$135 837 loss
1989-90	\$77 289 loss (subject to final audit)

The 1989-90 result was particularly pleasing because the company made an operating profit before deducting \$87 000 for depreciation. In addition, because of its special role, the hotel carries a training overhead of about \$88 000 over and above the usual training requirements in such establishments.

WEST TERRACE CEMETERY

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

1. How much damage was done to graves, headstones, etc. at the West Terrace Cemetery during a recent spate of vandalism?

2. Is such damage covered by insurance and, if not, who will meet the cost of repairs?

3. What security is now being maintained at the cemetery and what is the estimated yearly cost of security?

4. Why was no action taken to increase security following the press release by the member for Hanson of 2 June 1989?

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

1. The total estimated cost for repairs to the damage caused at West Terrace Cemetery is \$139 000. About 40 per cent of the damage has been repaired and the remaining work has been scheduled to be completed by Christmas.

2. The Government covers its own insurance on Government assets and repairs will be funded by the Government.

3. Sacon security officers are patrolling the cemetery after work hours on week days and on a 24 hour basis on weekends and public holidays. Fixed alarms are currently being installed into the workshop and remote detectors will be placed around the cemetery. These will be monitored at all times. Estimated yearly cost of security is about \$18 000 and the once-off cost of the alarms is about \$11 000.

4. Following the incident in June 1989, the Police Department was contacted and was asked for increased patrols to the cemetery. These were further supplemented by random patrols by the West Terrace Cemetery staff, particularly during non-working hours.

ID CARDS FOR JUSTICES OF THE PEACE

125. **Mr BRINDAL (Hayward),** on notice, asked the Minister of Education, representing the Attorney-General: Will the Minister consider the introduction of identification cards for all Justices of the Peace and, if not, why not?

The Hon. G.J. CRAFTER: To date there has not been any demonstrated need for identification cards for Justices of the Peace which would justify the costs involved in producing them. However, the Attorney-General's Office will consider the suggestion.

TELEPHONE SERVICES FOR JURORS

126. **Mr BRINDAL (Hayward),** on notice, asked the Minister of Education, representing the Attorney-General: Will the Minister consider the provision of one or more of the following services in place of the old-style red telephones:

- (a) free phone services for local calls only for all citizens involved in jury service; and
- (b) blue phones or similar for the use of jurors who may have to call interstate during the course of their service; or
- (c) 'phonecard' phones and provision to jurors of 'phonecards' to an appropriate value?

The Hon. G.J. CRAFTER: Telephone facilities are currently made available to persons performing jury service upon request of the juror. This includes local and STD calls, provided the jury has not retired to consider its verdict. I believe this question on notice may have arisen from a juror who attempted to use a red phone to make an interstate call. The red phones in question are located within the public areas of the Sir Samuel Way Building as a service available to the public and witnesses attending the courts. Once the request was made to court staff, by way of complaint, facilities were readily made available as a matter of course. It is unfortunate that the juror concerned did not inquire of court staff prior to using the red phone facility. By way of future clarification, the use of telephone facilities will be included in the general address to jurors in the induction process.

GRAFFITI

127. **Mr BRINDAL (Hayward),** on notice, asked the Minister of Transport:

1. Will the Minister consider the provision of financial assistance to residents in the vicinity of railway stations on

the Noarlunga line who are suffering increasing incidents of graffiti being applied to their property?

2. Will the Minister consider the use of STA employees to rectify such damage?

3. Will the Minister consider instructing STA employees and transit police to include properties immediately adjacent to railway stations in their surveillance patterns?

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

1. Graffiti/vandalism is a community problem. The STA is endeavouring to combat the problem on its properties, but cannot provide financial assistance to residents of neighbouring properties.

2. STA employees can only rectify damage on its properties. Adjacent residents are responsible for their own properties.

3. Transit Squad officers, in the course of their duties, monitor behaviour on STA property and in the vicinity of transport operations. These officers are required to take the appropriate action on detection of an offence. Other employees are encouraged to report any suspicious behaviour that comes to their attention.

STA CONCESSION FARES

128. **Mr BRINDAL (Hayward)**, on notice, asked the Minister of Transport: Is there currently any provision within the STA concession fares scheme for aged and other persons to cover the situation where a person is waiting to catch a designated bus or train at a scheduled time and that bus or train is delayed such that it arrives after the expiry of the time allowable for concessional travel so that the concessional fare is still applicable and, if not, will the Minister look at a mechanism whereby it can be and, if not, why not?

The Hon. FRANK BLEVINS: The two hour validity of tickets is designed to allow adequate time to make a journey from one end of the metropolitan area to the other. It is not designed to allow return travel, although in some instances this may be achieved. The validator is the arbiter when any doubt exists about ticket expiry times. Passengers should allow sufficient time to counter any delay in the running times of vehicles, generally due to circumstances beyond the control of the STA, for example, roadworks, traffic congestion, weather, accidents, etc.

STATE TRANSPORT AUTHORITY

135. **Mr MATTHEW (Bright)**, on notice, asked the Minister of Transport:

1. Why has STA refused additional bus services to Penfield for DSTO staff when buses have to pass Penfield while travelling between the Elizabeth Depot and the Salisbury Interchange?

2. In view of the Government's public commitment to supporting major defence projects and technology development, will the Minister take action to ensure STA provides train and/or bus transport for people who work at DSTO, Salisbury?

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

1. In recent years, the demand for STA buses and trains travelling to and from the Penfield area has progressively

reduced. A significant reduction in the workforce at DSTO and more flexible working hours have contributed to this decline. Those on flexible working hours often prefer the greater mobility offered by private transport over the fixed timetables provided by public transport. Bus and train services to and from Penfield have consequently been reduced over the years as demand for these services has declined.

Buses normally travel between the Elizabeth Depot and Salisbury Interchange via Philip Highway, although some do travel via West Avenue, Penfield. The times these buses travel between the depot and Salisbury (first pick up at Salisbury Interchange) are arranged to meet the transport needs of the public at large, particularly school and college students. The times that the buses using West Avenue pass through the defence establishment would not ideally match the travel needs of staff at DSTO so the demand for services at these times would be very low.

2. The Penfield line beyond Hilra is maintained at the cost of the Federal Government through Australian Construction Services, which advised that funds for the refurbishment of the railway line was not available last financial year and expect a similar situation to prevail this year. Replacement of the train services between Salisbury and Penfield with bus services would involve the STA in significant extra costs as an additional bus and driver would be necessary. The train is used by large numbers of passengers between Adelaide and Salisbury and would still be required. While the STA is prepared to provide the existing service, it does not have the significant additional resources necessary to either assist in maintaining the track or to replace the train between Salisbury and Penfield with a bus.

Recent passenger counts indicated that patronage on the Penfield line is progressively decreasing, despite the recent distribution of a handbill promoting services. Currently, about 50 to 60 passengers travel to and from Penfield each day. In these times of financial restraint, and particularly as the condition of the railway line will progressively deteriorate to an unsafe condition for trains, the STA has proposed to DSTO that:

- the STA continue to provide train services between Adelaide and Salisbury;
- the Department of Defence provide an 'internal' passenger transport service linking Salisbury and Penfield; or
- the STA provide a bus service at DSTO cost, estimated to be \$120 000 annually.

Discussions with DSTO regarding future transport options in the area have commenced.

139. **Mr D.S. BAKER (Leader of the Opposition)**, on notice, asked the Minister of Transport: How many fare paying passengers did STA services carry in each of the years 1987-88 to 1989-90?

The Hon. FRANK BLEVINS: The number of fare paying passengers on STA services 1987-88 to 1989-90 was as follows:

Year	No. of Fare Paying Passengers ('000)
1987-88	57 345
1988-89	53 120
1989-90	46 968

The drop in the number of fare-paying passengers from 1988-89 to 1989-90 was primarily due to the introduction of free travel for children and high school students commencing on 30 January 1990.