HOUSE OF ASSEMBLY

Thursday 17 October 1991

The SPEAKER (Hon. N.T. Peterson) took the Chair at 11 a.m. and read prayers.

AUSTRALIAN TAXATION OFFICE

Mr MATTHEW (Bright): As other events have preceded the motion standing in my name, I seek leave to amend it as follows:

Leave out the word 'recommends' and insert 'conveys its disappointment'; leave out the words 'that the' and insert 'over the failure of that Government to locate at least one of the'; leave out the words 'be located'; and add an 's' to the word 'building'.

Leave granted; proposed motion amended.

Mr MATTHEW: I move:

That this House conveys its disappointment to the Commonwealth Government over the failure of that Government to locate at least one of the proposed new Australian Taxation Office buildings in the vicinity of Noarlunga Centre or Westfield Marion Shopping Centre in preference to central Adelaide.

Approximately 1 500 Australian Taxation Office staff are spread across five city buildings. The Taxation Office decided to concentrate those workers into more suitable accommodation. Since the Australian Taxation Office decided to make this move, on 30 August 1991 it signed a contract to have a building constructed on the corner of Flinders and Pulteney Streets in the city and on 14 September 1991 it signed a contract to have a building constructed on the corner of Waymouth and Young Streets. Those two buildings will cater for the anticipated needs of the Taxation Office well into the next century.

At the time of placing my original motion on the Notice Paper, I hoped to precede at least the signing of the latter contract but, regrettably, that has not occurred. Whilst it will not be possible at this late stage to have a taxation office constructed south of the city rather than in central Adelaide, I think the House is at least in a position to convey its disappointment to the Federal Government and to prevent such short-sighted decisions from happening again. An interesting and relevant article on the front page of yesterday's *Advertiser* entitled 'Our car-mad city among worst in the world' states, in part:

Adelaide is among the world's most car-dependent cities and our streets will soon be choked if we don't change our ways, according to Australia's peak consumer organisation.

It warned 10-minute delays at traffic lights will become commonplace and pressure for more efficient public transport will increase as road systems collapse under the strain.

The article conveys the content of the writings of the Australian Consumers' Association, which has also pointed out that, on a *per capita* basis, Adelaide rates just outside the top 10 cities in the world for car use, behind giants such as New York, Los Angeles and Washington. South Australian motorists, in fact, out-drive Sydney and Melbourne motorists in terms of car travel. Three-quarters of our workers use cars to get to work, and it is interesting to note that the latest figures compiled back in 1986 by the Road Transport Department show that, of the estimated seven million trips made around Adelaide every day, five million are done by car.

It is also interesting to note that the average speed along South Road, which many would recognise as one of the State's busiest roads, during peak times is only 26 to 30 km/h, with one-third of the travel time spent stationary. Much of this sort of travel behaviour could be altered quite significantly if Governments took a regional rather than a centralised approach to their development. That could have occurred with the Commonwealth Government's paving the way through a sensible location of the Australian Taxation Office. In fairness, the Australian Taxation Office conducted a survey of its staff quite recently by asking them the postcode area in which they resided and whether or not they would be prepared to work in a location other than central Adelaide.

The results of that survey were quite interesting. The Australian Taxation Office found that 22 per cent of its employees lived south of Anzac Highway and that the majority of employees surveyed were quite prepared to work in a location other than central Adelaide, including an outer metropolitan location. As a result of that, a number of groups started lobbying quite strongly for a more realistic location of the tax office. Notable amongst those groups was the City of Noarlunga, which made a statement to the media on 11 September 1991 through Mayor Ray Gilbert, who said in part:

. . . the tax office's decision to build a new office on the corner of Flinders and Pulteney Streets in the city was shortsighted and absurd . . . Mayor Gilbert today accused the Federal Government of ignoring regional economic development in South Australia.

That was the view of local government, but the move to have Government offices located in the regions has received support from both sides of politics. I was particularly pleased to note that the Federal Labor member for Kingston (Mr Gordon Bilney), who is also a Minister in the Hawke Federal Government, also believed that the Australian Taxation Office should be located at Noarlunga and, indeed, he put out his own media statement to that effect.

There is no doubt that regional economic development of the sort that would occur through the location of a large Government office in the southern suburbs, or in any outer suburb of Adelaide, for that matter, would create jobs in outer suburban areas and, obviously, reduce the strain presently being experienced by our city transport systems. The decision to build the new taxation offices in the city is completely contrary to the philosophy of the Federal Government's Better Cities Program.

In fact, the tax office has built regional centres in other States but, for some reason known only to the Australian Taxation Office, has decided to build its two offices in the city centre. If the Australian Taxation Office had said that there is much vacant space in the city and it would make sense to utilise that space, perhaps I would have a little less reason to criticise. However, it has not done that. It has ignored the fact that there is empty office space in the city: it has decided to build two new offices—once again in the city. It makes good sense to choose to build those offices outside rather than in the city centre.

The dispersal of its employees in outer suburban areas would mean that those employees could travel against the traffic flow into the city. They could travel to an outer area, many living in that area and many being able to avail themselves of the opportunity to use our train system, which runs very close to the Noarlunga Centre.

I recognise in closing that it is too late to reverse the decision as the contracts have been signed; nevertheless, it is important that this Parliament conveys a message to Canberra to let the Commonwealth Government know that we expect consistency in decision making, encouragement of regional economic development and job creation opportunities in outer suburban areas. This could have been achieved by locating at least one office south of Adelaide, and it can be achieved by such a location of offices for any other large departments of the Federal Government outside the city centre. I urge members to support this motion as it is worthy of bipartisan support.

The Hon. T.H. HEMMINGS secured the adjournment of the debate.

ACCESS CABS PROGRAM

The Hon. T.H. HEMMINGS (Napier): I move:

That this House recognises the role that the Access Cabs program has played in allowing the physically disabled to be less housebound and to be more involved in the day-to-day activities of the community.

When I was doing my research on this motion dealing with the transport subsidy scheme, it became patently obvious to me that this was yet another Labor Government initiative that the Liberal Party had criticised from the outset. You might ask, 'What's new?', and I would basically share that view that you would express to me, Sir.

The SPEAKER: I would ask the honourable member not to put words into the mouth of the Chair. The member for Napier.

The Hon. T.H. HEMMINGS: That would be the last thing that I would wish to do, Sir. You are a very independent person. One has only to go back through the *Hansards* of 1987 to come to the same conclusion as I did. If one reads the *Hansards*, time and again, when the then Minister, Gavin Keneally, was introducing this program and explaining it to the community, the Liberal Party, under John Olsen, was criticising it. As far as Liberal members were concerned, there was no reason why physically handicapped people should have the same access as you and I and others in this House share. In effect, the criticism is not based on present members opposite, but the line in 1987 was to criticise anything that the Government did. That was the usual carping, knocking tirade from the other side. One wonders how long it will be before the penny drops and members opposite realise that the vast majority of the initiatives put out by this Government for ordinary people are for the good of the people. The quicker the Liberal Party comes to that conclusion, the better.

The Access Cabs program has been an outstanding success. Since it began, over 900 000 trips have been undertaken. Those 900 000 trips have enabled people to cease being housebound. Handicapped people can now enjoy being in the mainstream of life doing things that all too often most of us take for granted. For example, they can do their own shopping, select what they want without having to rely on others to do it for them, visit their own health centres, visit their own chiropodist or podiatrist and so on. To be able to visit and not be visited: that simple sentence sums up the Access Cabs program.

Those of us who know a physically handicapped person who does not have access to a program such as that of Access Cabs realise that they can never visit us: we always have to visit them. Most of us in this place are busy, so we can visit someone only on a strict timetable. However, with the Access Cabs program, those handicapped people can use the vouchers and visit us. Often the most important thing they want to be is self-reliant. Again, being self-reliant is something we all too often take for granted.

Another aspect of the Access Cabs program might be hard to understand by those of us who are used to the normal 'cabbie', because not only does the Access Cabs program provide a kind and careful service to the people using it but also, from what I hear from those who use the service, there is plenty of tender loving care. It will be hard for those of us who are used to the normal cab driver to conjure up such a situation. However, there are those drivers who, because of the voucher system, tend to pick up the same passengers so that it develops from being not only a cab driver/client service but also a social relationship. It is worthwhile placing on the record that this service does exist, and those of us in the community should recognise it. As I said, some of those friendships have developed into a secure social relationship, which augurs well for those using the service.

It might be a good idea to remind the House of the people assisted by the Access Cabs program. The transport subsidy scheme provides subsidised travel for people confined to wheelchairs, people who cannot climb three stairs of 350 millimetres in height, people who cannot walk 100 metres without rest and people who cannot sit unrestrained on public transport. What did those four categories of people do before the Access Cabs program came into being?

Mr Hamilton: They were stuck in their home.

The Hon. T.H. HEMMINGS: As the member for Albert Park says, they were stuck in their home. Alternatively, they had to go through that awful trauma of adapting to a family saloon car, which created real problems not only for them but also for people who transported them from point A to point B. Many people in the community fall within those four categories. Since 1987 the scheme has grown significantly. It is interesting to note that, as at 30 June 1991—which are the latest figures available—the Access Cabs program had 14 200 members, which is an increase of about 4 000 (or 40 per cent) over the previous year.

As each successive year comes in, more people use the program. The number of trips undertaken by those voucher holders increased by 30 per cent in 1990-91, and the total number of trips for that year was 324 000 altogether. Again, that is a significant increase. The Government still ensures that, no matter how many people get on the program, they can be catered for. The fleet size has increased to 26 vehicles, which is a considerable amount. Only the other week, when I was leaving Parliament House at the ungodly hour of 11.30 or 12 o'clock, I took a trip in an Access Cab because it happened to be on the line.

I thought that for comfort we could not beat it. If there is one coming through at any time I advise all members to take advantage of it. The Board of Specialised Transport Systems is responsible for that area and is currently preparing a request to the Minister of Transport for five additional vehicles because of the increased number of people making themselves available for that service. It does not end there. The Government will not sit and rest on its laurels. It has a successful service and it will be expanding. The Transport Subsidy Scheme Advisory Committee has presented preferred expansion options for the scheme. The options put forward are an increase in the fare maximum from $30 to $40, unlimited vouchers for wheelchair members and an extension of the scheme to the next tier of larger towns, such as on the south coast, in the Barossa Valley and at Naracoorte and Kadina.

So again, by example, the Government is not simply making the system available in the metropolitan area but also recognising that a need exists in the larger country towns and adapting to that. It will broaden the entry criteria to include the intellectually disabled. This Government deserves real credit in this area in that it has picked up the problems of intellectually disabled as well as physically disabled people. It also recommends reciprocity between the States. It is important that, if a disabled person travels from here to Victoria, the Access Cab program currently operating in Victoria can be used by people from this State and *vice versa*.

A joint transport policy and planning and council working party has been established in the Barossa Valley to examine

the possibility of a transport brokerage system in the area. If members are unsure of what that means, I point out that the concept of a transport broker is similar to that of a sharebroker. The transport broker would be a facilitator between buyers and sellers of transport services, between users and providers. The broker would try to match transport demands with the supply of transport and suggest ways by which transport resources could be more effectively used. The brokerage service could be provided free or a fee could be charged to either the user or the provider. If the councils in the Barossa are prepared to provide accommodation and all support services for a broker, it could well be appropriate for the Government to fund that broker's salary for a maximum of two years, in which time the effectiveness of the project could be evaluated. If successful, the Barossa experience could provide a guide for other areas, both rural and urban.

Since 1987, the Government has put into place a necessary and viable service for handicapped people. The service goes about its business quietly and efficiently and has provided hope and dignity for thousands of South Australians. Therefore, a motion such as this demands the full support of this House. However, with the Opposition's past record of criticism, I doubt that that will be the case. I am sure that when I sit down and the motion is adjourned and debated on at a later time, a member opposite will make it his or her business to criticise this service and to say that it is either a waste of money or is being mismanaged. I expect that, but I am forever hopeful: I always give everyone the benefit of the doubt. Let us hope that for the first time in my time in this House I will be proved wrong and the Liberal Party will support this motion.

Mr BLACKER secured the adjournment of the debate.

ENVIRONMENT POLICIES

The Hon. T.H. HEMMINGS (Napier): I move:

That this House expresses its sympathy to the Minister for Environment and Planning on seeing the Liberal Party continually filching her environment policies.

Members interjecting:

The Hon. T.H. HEMMINGS: If ever money were to be paid for productivity, I would be a millionaire. Over the years we have all become pretty used to the Liberal Opposition hijacking Labor Party policy and recycling that policy as its very own. One can always hazard a guess as to why the Liberal Party does that and, from being a Liberal Party watcher over many years—I consider myself an expert on the things it does and, perhaps, more pertinently, the things it does not do—I see it as a common trait and tend to put it down to certain things. It may be because the members of the Liberal Party are too lazy, and that is a view shared by my colleague, the member for Henley Beach; it could be because they are completely bereft of any original ideas at all, and that is the view of my colleague the member for Walsh; or, perhaps (and this is the view that is expressed by my colleague the Minister on the front bench) the Liberal Party, despite what it says publicly, has come to recognise that what the Labor Party has to offer is original, suited to our times and, perhaps more importantly, in tune with what the community wants at any given time.

Members interjecting:

The Hon. T.H. HEMMINGS: My colleague the Minister of Employment and Further Education says it is a reactive Party, and it is fairly obvious that members opposite are reacting now in the way they normally do. Over the years I suppose we have all come to the conclusion that it is a combination of all three, or more, factors—whichever suit them at that particular time. However, knowing that and time and time again seeing our policies stolen, hijacked, recycled and used, what has prompted me to stand up and move this motion?

Recently, a deputation of pretty irate conservationists came to see me in my office. Those people had received through the mail the Liberal Party's document headed 'Managing the State: a key issues statement on the environment', which contained a postscript from the current Leader, the member for Victoria, and the issues statements that had been put out by the member for Heysen. It was done on recycled paper and for that I congratulate them. One of those people in the deputation, who assured me that she was a former Liberal voter, put to me in quite strong terms that, if someone steals from her home, they face prosecution and a gaol term.

She said that, from the way that she understood it, if someone steals industrial secrets, the same thing happens to them. Her question was that a political Party could just willy-nilly pick up an environmental policy, change the name at the bottom—which would have been that of the Hon. Susan Lenehan—scrub off the top part that says 'Labor Party environment policy' and replace it with 'Liberal Party', and get away with it. I tried to calm her down and give the reasons for the highjacking that I have just outlined to the House, but she was not satisfied with that. I reassured her that the Minister was quite unfazed about all this. As you well know, the Minister was quite pleased in a way, because if the Liberal Party is saying that what Labor put forward to the people is correct, she is doing a good job on behalf of this Government and the people of this State. However, as I say, she was not satisfied; she wanted me to bring this matter to the attention of the House and, hence, the motion that is before us.

I am sure that you, Sir, and members opposite have already seen this Liberal statement and obviously picked up the similarities between the current Government policy and what the Liberal Party will put forward at the next election. But for the benefit of those in this House who have not read the document, it behoves me to highlight those similarities for all to see. I shall go through the document point by point, which may take me a long time, to outline to the House the glaring differences in the document. The section on waste management appears to have been written following discussions with someone in the Waste Management Commission in which the strategy of the commission was explained in some detail.

Now, I know that the member for Heysen had a briefing from the Waste Management Commission quite recently. It may well be that that is the connection. The policy even mentions that 'a great deal of work has already been done in identifying options for the collection, recycling and marketing of waste.' We all know that: we read the report of the Waste Management Commission but, obviously, members opposite do not. The document also endorses the value added market driven approach which the Recycling Advisory Committee report recommends. Under the heading 'Recycling', what appears in the document appears to be a direct lift from the policy and practice of the Waste Management Commission. The three options which have been spelled out were the same three options examined by the commission and the favourite option is that option favoured by the commission.

So the Liberal Party is saying that it will adopt what is current Waste Management Commission policy. I do not argue with that, but why does the Liberal Party not say, 'We are adopting the Government's and Waste Management

Commission's policy in the area of recycling.'? Even the choice of the two regional depots which the Liberal Party puts in (and, by the way, it is now called 'material recycling facilities'—for the member for Heysen can use that in his updated version) is straight from the recommendations of the Waste Management Commission, as is the conclusion that the depot should be run by private industry or local government, and that local government should bear the responsibility and costs of collection.

An honourable member interjecting:

The Hon. T.H. HEMMINGS: Well, it may well be that the member for Heysen did not even write the policy. The Liberal Policy also endorses the Government's container deposit legislation, and states that the success of the returnable bottle system in South Australia in reducing litter makes it inappropriate to be abandoned. The policy also picks up the issue of 'Government stimulation', which the Government has already addressed through its State Supply policy of paying a 5 per cent premium on goods manufactured from recycled materials for a period of six months from the date of initial purchase by an agency. Again, that is old hat; it has already been put in place by the Government. Yet, the Liberal Party tries to tell us that it is a new idea.

The Liberal Party policy also supports a national recycling scheme, which the Minister has already proposed through ANZEC, and a system of levies is to be imposed at a national level for those manufacturers not complying with the national scheme—an assumption implicit in the Minister's ANZEC strategy. However, the Liberal Party's document is a bit off the pace in as much as it will no longer be necessary to ship used newsprint overseas after the ANM Newsprint Recycling Plant has been established at Albury. I sincerely hope that the Liberal Party has not forgotten that great initiative that was announced recently by the Minister. In this respect ANM has guaranteed to take at least 15 000 tonnes, and possibly as much as 20 000 tonnes, of used newsprint per year from South Australia on quite favourable terms. This should ensure that the expensive option of shredding and baling for export overseas is no longer necessary.

I now turn to waste minimisation and disposal. Here, Sir, members of the Liberal Party have either been on magic mushrooms or gone completely barmy. The Liberal Party policy says that country towns should generate electricity from rubbish dumps and that, to put it quite kindly, is naive gobbledegook. ETSA was not even prepared to take on the Falzon proposal at Wingfield which offered the largest quantity of available bio-gas in the State. Fortunately, SAGASCO was prepared to take the gas and shandy it with natural gas for distribution throughout the network.

It is significant to inform the House that even Wingfield provides only enough natural gas for about 10 000 homes. So, it would be absolutely impractical to suggest that small country towns could provide meaningful quantities of electricity on a cost-effective basis from local rubbish dumps. The numbers just do not stack up. It would be like filling the boot of your car with chickens and generating methane to run the car from the resulting chicken manure. It is just so stupid that it does not even bear thinking of.

In the area of national parks it seems that the Liberal Party, and in particular the member for Heysen, do not know what is going on. In its policy the Liberals claim that national parks are not fit places for endangered species to inhabit. That is patently absurd, since national parks were set up for that very purpose. The reality is that most extinctions in South Australia occurred before the turn of century, and those that have occurred since have resulted from changes to the fire regime in the Pitjantjatjara lands in the north-west.

A number of species have been brought back from the brink of total or local extinction by breeding programs conducted at Monarto and the successful reintroduction of threatened species on to offshore islands and into privately run sanctuaries such as Warrawong and Yookamurra. Species involved include the greater stick nest rat, the western brush bettong and the mallee fowl. Until predators such as foxes and cats can be removed or severely reduced in the wild, there is little point in reintroducing threatened species to their former ranges. They will be safe only in offshore islands where predators have been eliminated, or on managed onshore islands such as Warrawong.

The suggestion in the Liberal Party's policy that private national parks should be created under the oversight of the Minister is patently absurd since very few parks make any money, and since the vast majority of parks have been declared for the preservation of species and are, by their very nature, well away from population centres. To suggest that we should not have national parks where they could not turn a dollar would be biological lunacy.

I turn now to the part that really worries me. Unbeknown to the Liberal Party, the rest of South Australia has been paying entry fees to a number of parks since 1986, so the considerable public discussion that the Liberal Party requests in its policy paper seems to have already finished. In the past financial year, entry fees raised $2.4 million, which enabled the National Parks and Wildlife Service to employ a considerable number of people in country towns on a seasonal basis to assist with the running of their local parks.

To suggest that an additional five or six people should coordinate and support volunteers in order to replace the paid staff of the parks would not find favour with the trade union movement, and nor should it. Given that 63 groups of the Friends of the Parks organisation have been established since 1986, there seems to be little point in changing what is obviously a successful scheme. The Liberal Party's environmental protection policy states:

> Technical officers and environmentalists already employed by the Government have the necessary expertise and could be transferred from the various departments to the authority.

That is the basis on which the Environmental Protection Authority will be established. Once again, the Liberal Party appears to have been briefed on the Government's plans prior to writing its own policy document. It differs not at all from the planned Environmental Protection Authority which will be established early next year by consolidating functions from various agencies into one agency within the Department of Environment and Planning.

I have given the House sufficient evidence that the Liberal Party's policy has been lifted directly from current Government policy. It has been dressed up on recycled paper with the idea of fooling the community. I have sufficient faith in the community to know that they will not be fooled. They are quite happy with what the Government has done with respect to waste management, recycling and environmental policy. What I suggest to members of the Liberal Party is that they accept that we have taken the lead, that we do it better than they do. All we need is a little postscript on the back of their policy that says it is a direct lift-out from the Labor Party's policy, and that they urge people to support the Government. I look forward to the Liberal Party's response to this motion; I suggest that there will be very little comment from Opposition members. They have been caught with their pants down. An honest

admission that what they have done is a direct steal would satisfy me.

Mr S.J. BAKER secured the adjournment of the debate.

TAXES AND CHARGES

Mr S.J. BAKER (Deputy Leader of the Opposition): I move:

That this House calls on the Government to ensure that:

(a) all proclamations involving increases in taxes, charges or penalties be published, in addition to the *Government Gazette*, in the public notices of at least one daily newspaper within 24 hours of proclamation;

(b) all such proclamations show the amount of the tax, charge or penalty which prevailed prior to the proclamation; and

(c) each responsible Minister issues a public statement, whenever the rate of increase of a tax, charge or penalty exceeds inflation, explaining that increase.

This is a very important motion. It is all about responsibility and accountability. There have been numerous examples of where the Government has broken the rules. The Premier gave an undertaking to this House that whenever taxes and charges increase at a rate greater than inflation the responsible Minister would notify the public of such changes. That has not occurred. The Premier has broken his word and he has again brought Parliament and his Government into disrepute.

I put forward a similar motion last session in an attempt to achieve an element of honesty such that, if the Government had decided to make a change which would cost people more money, it should have the guts to admit what it was doing and not hide behind statements in the *Government Gazette* which is read by few. It should not allow that charge to be brought in through the back door without debate: it should have the guts and the gumption to say, 'This is a charge, tax or penalty that we intend to impose; and it will be imposed for these very reasons . . .' However, that has not happened.

I cannot go back much further than the 1960s, but the system we have today has been in vogue for at least the past 20 to 30 years and obviously before that time, but that does not mean to say that it is right. I believe it is now time for all Governments to front up to their responsibilities, and this motion provides exactly for that. It was prompted again by the spectacle of a Government grasping for money three days before the end of the financial year. On 27 June we saw this amazing spectacle of a *Government Gazette* not being able to be printed on time because of the large number of changes in taxes, charges and penalties that had to be gazetted prior to the end of the financial year. There were over 800 increases in all, and I do not know that anyone in this House could remember a worse example of a grab by Government for more revenue from the long-suffering public. They cover the whole spectrum of legislation and regulations, and their extent in terms of their impact had to be seen to be believed.

We saw many of those areas detailed in the *Gazette*, but I will not go through them because members can read the *Gazette* of 27 June. Many of those increases went far beyond the rate of inflation. Fishing licence fees is one increase that comes readily to mind. The Government did not issue a statement to say that fees for fishing licences were to be increased: it did not have the honesty or fortitude to come forward and put this information before the people of South Australia. It used this bulging *Gazette*, which could not be produced until 24 hours after the time it was due because of its sheer volume, to sneak through large numbers of changes. Government members would say that the public would get angry for a day but then the matter would be forgotten. That is not good enough.

I am suggesting that there should be a number of elements of accountability in the process, so that not only should the *Gazette* be used to notify changes but those changes should be notified in the appropriate column in one of the dailies. There should be a press release by a Minister if any tax, charge or penalty increase is greater than the rate of inflation. The public would then know about such increases, not only from reading their newspapers but also from the Minister's actually coming forward and announcing what is happening in this regard.

It means that Ministers will have to think about the process before they actually undertake it rather than relying on the backdoor method of the *Gazette*. It also means that bureaucrats will have to justify increases to the Minister because they know they will be in the spotlight as soon as those increases are implemented. It means that everyone will have to rethink the process of increasing taxes, charges and penalties, because the whole system will be far more accountable, as it should be. We can never condone the sort of thing we saw on 27 June with these enormous licence fee and tax increases across the board. It was like a huge vacuum sucking up every area in which a tax or charge had not been increased in recent times. All these amounts were raised to boost the coffers of the Treasury.

Whilst we realise that the Treasury is in a parlous state, the Government's actions in this regard defy description. A number of ancillary matters are associated with this motion, as members will appreciate: pressure would be placed on the cost recovery process, and there would have to be justification for those increases. Repeatedly we have heard Ministers say, 'Look, that charge is only for the cost of providing the service.' I would dispute that in many cases. Often the cost of the service is far too high and, by the process of greater accountability, a number of these areas would be revealed and a better service being delivered at a cheaper cost to the public.

We should then be able to ask whether a useful service is being provided and its cost would be under examination. Whether it is a useful service or whether it just occupies the time of bureaucrats and does not add to the collective wealth or protection of the community would be questioned. This would also raise the question of whether an activity could be undertaken in a better or different way. We could check whether we need to regulate in such a manner, whether we need to implement a fee and whether we need operate in the way we have always operated.

We could focus on whether we might operate in a better manner, or ask why the Government should perform that function. Examining the 800 penalties, taxes and charges increased in the *Gazette* of 27 June, we can find many areas about which we can question the Government's involvement. We can ask why there is a charge and, if there is to be a charge, we can ask why we do not contract the activity out and why it is not a direct service by someone contracted by the Government to provide that service. For all those reasons we can have a complete change in the mentality of those in Government, through the processes I have outlined to the House.

The Government has also been associated with a number of misdeeds and the events of 27 June reflect poorly on the management capabilities of this Government as well as reflecting its desire for increased revenue. We need to have a more accountable Government in these times when people's real incomes are decreasing rather than increasing. We should scrutinise seriously every increase introduced by the

Government. This process will achieve that, and I commend it to the House.

Mr M.J. EVANS secured the adjournment of the debate.

FLINDERS MEDICAL CENTRE EMERGENCY SERVICES

Mr BRINDAL (Hayward): I move:

That this House calls on the Minister of Health to immediately instruct the South Australian Health Commission to provide the money needed for upgrading emergency services at the Flinders Medical Centre.

I move this motion with more than a little sense of outrage, not only on my own behalf but on behalf of my colleagues the members for Fisher, Bright, Morphett and certainly my colleague the shadow Minister, the member for Adelaide. I hope that I also move it on behalf of those many Labor members whose electorates are serviced by Flinders Medical Centre.

I do not like picking up my local Messenger newspaper and seeing that a service that already is overstretched and under-resourced is going to be further pinged by a Government that is so strapped for money that it is prepared to put the health of the people who live in the southern areas at risk in the name of economy and economics. If that is the way this Government works, the sooner it is gone from here the better.

In 1983—in fact, since the beginning of Flinders Medical Centre—it was acknowledged, I believe, that there was a problem with the accident and emergency services and that those services would be upgraded in phase 4 of the building. Members opposite will know, as members on this side know, that stage 4 has never been instituted. However, if we look at a number of inquiries that have been held—and we go back to 1983-84—we can see that the Sax inquiry made the following recommendation:

> . . . that Flinders Medical Centre continues to develop as the second major acute hospital serving the southern area for district services . . . Flinders Medical Centre should be developed as the major trauma centre for the southern sector.

Also, in 1985, Susan Cooper, Ryder Hunt and Partners wrote the following:

> . . . the Sax inquiry, the accident and emergency department is to continue to develop as the major trauma centre for the south of the city. Needs which have been mentioned at this stage are an additional treatment area and an area for the treatment of children.

In 1990 a project team was established to define the department's requirements and that process identified the following deficiencies within the existing accident and emergency facilities:

> . . . insufficient treatment cubicles to enable efficient patient throughput resulting in lengthy waiting times, and patients being treated in public areas without privacy.

It might be all right for Government members, most of whom live in the northern suburbs, to think that the treatment of people in hospital corridors—a public area—is acceptable for those who live in the south, while they have cosy majorities in northern suburbs and while the biggest hospitals are all either at the northern end of the city or in the northern sectors of the city. That might be fine, but I, for one, and I believe every colleague of mine in this House, no matter what their political Party, should violently object to people receiving treatment in hospital corridors, because this Government cannot find the funds to upgrade emergency facilities in what is the major hospital in the south of the city.

It is the major hospital in that area but it is falling to bits. Why? Not because it does not have good and dedicated staff—it has, it has excellent staff. People who are treated there never complain about the staff, but the hospital has less than adequate facilities. If the Government is proud of that, when it goes to the people the people might deliver a very different judgment on this Government. If members opposite do not have the gumption to support me in this motion, they will stand condemned. The member for Mitchell, whose electorate just about touches Flinders Medical Centre, and the member for Walsh, who is not here, should be as vitally concerned as I am, as should be the Minister for Environment and Planning, the Deputy Premier and Minister of Health, whose electors are also served by that facility.

So, we have patients being treated in corridors and we are told by this Government that that is all right. I do not think it is. The current design of the accident and emergency department has made it necessary to create two distinct treatment areas to maximise the number of treatment cubicles. This leads to inefficient utilisation of the existing medical and nursing resources. I am quite sure that the person in charge of that facility or the Administrator of Flinders Medical Centre would be more than prepared to give any member of the Government benches and any Minister of the Crown a complete briefing at any time about the problems that exist at the centre.

There are no designated and appropriately equipped areas for paediatric patients, gynaecological patients or psychiatric patients. My colleague was subjected to a thorough briefing and heard that this creates a real problem. People who are there because they are traumatised and have injured children say they are often forced to mix with people who have psychiatric problems. This causes great distress and trauma for children, parents and mature adults who, while suffering their own trauma, are forced to put up with the trauma of others, again through no fault of the hospitals but through great fault and to the great discredit of this Government.

OPERATION KEEPER

Adjourned debate on motion of Hon. T.H. Hemmings:

That this House notes the fine work carried out by the South Australian Police Force through Operation Keeper.

(Continued from 12 September. Page 810.)

The Hon. B.C. EASTICK (Light): I have pleasure in supporting the thrust of the motion, although I have an amendment to which I will refer later. The member for Napier indicated that this sort of activity was taking place in his electorate, and I, like you, Mr Deputy Speaker, share the same area. Regrettably, some of the people to whom the officers involved in Operation Keeper have had cause to speak reside in our electorates as well as other electorates in the northern area.

It is a great misfortune that what has resulted from Operation Keeper is only the tip of a very large iceberg. The people directly associated with Operation Keeper have indicated that what they thought was a difficult but somewhat minor problem has turned out to be one of large proportions. They have also indicated that they have come to grips with a number of other issues which are currently causing problems in the community but which need further operations to gain total control of them.

One of the problems that we have is that Operation Keeper originally was to run for two months. That period has been extended, a fact which I applaud. This difficulty

needs to be addressed right across the whole community. While resources are being used for Operation Keeper to good effect, regrettably the same activity was not able to proceed in other areas. I also make the point that, whilst officers were deployed on Operation Keeper, their services were denied in other areas of investigation that are essential in our society at present. Whilst taking away nothing from Operation Keeper, we have to recognise that it has been at the expense of a number of investigations throughout the area, and I will touch on one or two of those in a minute. In presenting this motion to the House, the member for Napier said:

> Sadly, too often in the past society has had no desire to talk about abuse in all its forms, whether it be child or wife, sexual or physical; we left it well alone as if it did not happen to us and as though it was not our business.

Sadly, that is a truism: it is a fact of life that, in the main, the community has not wanted to know what was happening next door, across the road or elsewhere for fear it might become involved. We are fully appreciative of the fact that some societies that have come to join the Australian community brought with them an air of silence in matters of crime, but we always believed that that did not apply in South Australia—regrettably, it does.

In a number of instances associated with facts that I will reveal in a minute, activities are taking place with the full knowledge of members of the family or relatives, and no positive action is being taken by the people who should be giving care to the young folk involved. We have adopted a live and let live approach. The honourable member drew attention to the fact that, in respect of child abuse and other abuse cases, there are sometimes delays of up to six to eight months before the reports are considered by officers of the Police Force. That is most unfortunate, because in that intervening period of time more damage is being done not only to the child or children involved but not infrequently to others. Because the perpetrator was not revealed, apprehended or helped—something that is available to some offenders who commit these hideous crimes—they went on doing it or experimenting.

It is a tragedy that, in this day and age, when we truly believe in the family unit as the basis of society, resources are not available to help come to grips with this. But let us be realistic about it: at times the family itself does nothing to assist in overcoming the difficulties that occur under its nose, in some cases pushing them aside and under the carpet, not wanting to know about them and, worse still—and this really gets to me, as I believe it would to every member of this House—in some circumstances actually condoning what takes place and getting some vile, uncouth pleasure out of watching it.

It is important to note that Operation Keeper has an end point: not an end point in so far as the number of exposures it can reveal but an end point in so far as the time for which those resources can be made available. I hope that the expertise that has been developed through Operation Keeper will go on to other areas. Undoubtedly, that is the aim of the police, but it is impossible to say whether it will have the same profile and whether when it starts in other areas it finds that what was thought to be a less affected area is, regrettably, equally affected: in other words, that the tip of the iceberg south, east, west or whatever the case may be, is much more extensive than was anticipated. Resources must be made available urgently to clean up this and a number of other crimes in the community.

Detective Chief Inspector Presgrave, Sergeant John Bean and the other officers involved in this area are to be congratulated on the result—and given an element of public sympathy for having to be pitchforked into such a seamy, unnecessarily stressful set of circumstances. They have been able to rise above the difficulties that some other officers are unable to accept. They must be moved out, and their inability to be utilised is an unfortunate fact of life. It also applies to those who are unfortunate enough to be detailed to the Accident Investigation Unit of the Police Force. Some last but a very short time and must be taken out of the unit because they cannot live with the circumstances unveiled to them. This has been the case with a number of officers in the past, not only in Operation Keeper but elsewhere, when they have come face to face with the reality of some of these issues.

The amendment I propose to the member for Napier, who moved this motion, is one that I believe the whole House will be able to accept. Accordingly, I move:

> After the words 'Police Force' insert 'and, in particular,'.

I believe that members of the House have great respect for the Police Force. The member for Napier touched on the fact that, unfortunately, we read about one or two officers who have gone off the track, but in South Australia we are fortunate that the vast majority of police officers are out there doing the job under difficult circumstances.

I believe that the member for Napier will accept that we are praising the Police Force and, in particular, will accept the amendment. In relation to what I said about the tip of the iceberg, I will not repeat the statistics that the member for Napier included in his address. They are horrifying, but even they are probably not a true reflection of the totality of the problem. They are in the order of debate for anyone to pick up.

I want to pick up one or two comments from an address by the Lord Mayor of Adelaide, Steve Condous, to the Lone Pine Agricultural Bureau of South Australia social in the Barossa Valley only three weeks ago. It is reported in the Angaston *Leader* of 2 October 1991. Whilst it does not directly fit on to Operation Keeper, the consequences of our not taking heed of Operation Keeper lead to these other circumstances. The Lord Mayor was talking about the problem of street kids—street kids not overseas, not in somebody else's backyard, but in our own city area. I want to relate two of the circumstances that he revealed on that night.

The Lord Mayor pointed out that, with police and social workers, he had frequently gone on to the streets of Adelaide to see what could be done to overcome some of the difficulties of street kids. He said that, if the street kids are not picked up and counselled and given attention within four days, they are lost forever. They are his words, not mine, but ones which I have heard reflected by the police on other occasions. In particular, he talks about a 14-year-old girl in these words:

> She was slim, blonde and very good looking and had been on the streets for quite some time. Lord Mayor Condous said, 'At 1 a.m. it is not really right for a young girl like you to be alone.' The young girl soon explained how her father left the family. The family then couldn't meet its financial responsibilities so her mother took in a boarder and a *de facto* relationship started with the mother.
>
> It wasn't long before the mother was working night shift and the man decided to sleep with the young girl while the mother was out. The girl complained to her mother who said, 'Let it just go on for 12 months and then we will have enough money and we can kick him out.' The girl didn't want to wait that long and so she moved out.

That is one of the consequences which flow from a number of these difficulties. Again, the report states:

> Lord Mayor Condous told of another street kid he met, a 15-year-old girl. The girl said she had a very violent father. To keep peace in the home the girl let her father have sex with her from the age of 11 to 15. This continued until one day when the girl's

father brought some of his mates along to join in and the girl decided to open the window and leave.

That is one of the unfortunate facts of what is happening in our community. Mr Condous also spoke of a mother who sat on the sofa watching the father having sexual intercourse with his own daughter. Those are some of the things which Operation Keeper has picked up. There are real problems out there. I welcome the fact that the Police Force has been able to make Operation Keeper an effective attack upon some of the problems. I hope that we will support the Police Force in Operation Keeper and the other operations which are necessary to improve our society.

The Hon. T.H. HEMMINGS (Napier): I am quite happy to accept the member for Light's minor amendment. The basic thrust of what he was telling the House was in no way different from the content of my remarks a few weeks ago. On that occasion I made the point that through Operation Paradox, Operation Keeper will continue, but on a State-wide basis, so some of the areas to which the member for Light has referred, other than the Elizabeth-Munno Para area, will be picked up by the Police Force. As I recall, when the announcement was made, additional officers were being earmarked to deal with abuse offences. I have no problem with the member for Light's plea that, if there is a need to increase numbers to cater for this particular crime, they should be earmarked within the police budget.

The success of Operation Keeper really stemmed from one man. He had the idea that one should not have to wait six to eight months after a crime was reported through either the Department for Family and Community Services or the Education Department and so on before the matter came to court. There is another scenario. I am not trying to belittle the crime of child abuse, but in many cases if the crime could be dealt with in its early stages, the perpetrator could be guided towards living a decent lifestyle. That might not be important in the heat of the moment after the crime has been committed but, given the costs to society of those kinds of people ending up in gaol for six or seven years, one wonders what benefits that would have for society in the long run. The House would be aware that the cost of maintaining our prison system is becoming a vast drain on the State's resources. I thank the member for Light for his support. I have no problem accepting the honourable member's amendment. I would like to think that we could dispense with this matter with all urgency and get on with other business.

Amendment carried; motion as amended carried.

MEMBER FOR FISHER

Adjourned debate on motion of Hon. T.H. Hemmings:

That this House, having always paid due deference to the monarchy and to vice-regal representatives, as evidenced in Standing Order 121, and to our oath of office, dissociates itself from the disrespectful and irresponsible attitude of the member for Fisher to our royal family.

(Continued from 12 September. Page 813.)

Mr SUCH (Fisher): I do not wish to take up much of the time of the House because I believe this is a frivolous motion. The allegations have been refuted, and I regret the amount of time that has been taken up thus far in dealing with an issue such as this when there are serious matters with which to deal, including that of high unemployment. I trust that in the future the member for Napier will seek to address some of the issues confronting the community, including the high and totally unacceptable rate of unemployment, which affects both adult and junior members of the community.

Mr FERGUSON (Henley Beach): I feel compelled to enter this debate because I was offended by the attitude of the member for Fisher to our Australian Queen. To illustrate the point, I well remember the time when the Japanese were bombing Darwin and I, as an Adelaide schoolboy at the Magill Primary School, had to go through the exercise of bombing drill.

A request was made to our mothers to produce a bombing kit. In that kit precautionary material was held in case of a bombing attack; there was a cork, which we were told we were to put between our teeth in the event that percussion from the bombs caused problems. I had no idea what would happen if we bit the cork in half and swallowed it. Also included in that kit was a set of safety pins and a bandage, among other first aid equipment. In those days bandaids were not known; they had not been invented, and sticking plaster was used. A reel of sticking plaster was included in our kit. Sewn onto the outside of the kit and given to us by the school was a little Union Jack. That Union Jack made me feel absolutely safe, because I had the power of the British Empire and the monarchy protecting me and, had there been a bombing raid on Adelaide, I knew I had nothing to fear.

I absolutely cringed when I read the press releases put out by the member for Fisher. I felt that they were disrespectful to our monarchy. I was among those people who lined the streets of Adelaide in 1963 when we saw the second visit from the royal family to our shores, and I joined with the hundreds of thousands of people in the streets of Adelaide to welcome our Queen. I view it as an absolute affront to this House that the member for Fisher should so discredit the royal name and the Crown by suggesting that the monarchy should be introduced into Australia and the way in which it should be introduced.

I well remember during my school years knowing more about Clive of India and the relief of Ma Feking than the exploits of Captain Sturt and Mawson of the Antarctic. I remember the newsreels of those days when East London was bombed. Some of my relatives live in East London and I remember a newsreel in which the King visited a bombed out section of East London and a very grateful commoner rushed up to the King and said, 'Thank God. Your Majesty is safe.' I resent the suggestions that have been made by the member for Kavel, who has indicated that members on this side of the House have a disrespect for Her Royal Majesty, and I think it is impertinent of the honourable member to suggest that the Australian public does not have the ability to decide whether or not we should continue to recognise royalty.

I believe that every Australian has the maturity to know whether we should retain the Queen or change to a republic. It is impertinent for the member for Kavel to suggest that Australians ought not have the opportunity to make that decision. We could not forget our former Prime Minister Sir Robert Menzies, during the royal visit of 1963, saying:

It is a proud thought for us to have you here and to remind ourselves that, in this great structure of government which has evolved and of which our Parliament is a part, you are the living and lovely centre of our enduring allegiance. Ma'am, you today begin your journey around Australia. It is a journey you have made before. You will be seen in the next few weeks by hundreds of thousands—I hope by millions—of your Australian subjects. Mothers will hold their children up to have a look at you as you go by, and they themselves and their husbands will have a look at you. This must be something which to you is almost a task. All I ask of you in this country is to remember that every man, or woman or child who even sees a passing glimpse of you go by will remember it—will remember it with joy—will remember in

the words of the poet who said—'I did but see her passing by, and yet I love her till I die.'

The loyalty of the Australian public to the Queen resulted in our Prime Minister being made Lord Warden of the Cinque Ports. I am sure that every Australian is proud of the fact that such a decoration was imposed on our Prime Minister. One of the duties of the Prime Minister in those days, as part of his duties as Lord Warden of the Cinque Ports (and I quote from *Menzies. Last of the Queen's Men* by Kevin Perkins and published by Rigby Limited at page 226), shows what the loyalty of the Australian public resulted in as far as our Prime Minister was concerned. It states:

Menzies was delighted, as part of the colourful ceremony of honouring the new Lord Warden, to be enrolled as a member of the Hastings Winkle Club, although most Australians regarded it somewhat whimsically. Installed as a Freeman of Hastings as the town celebrated the 900th anniversary of the Battle of Hastings, Sir Robert was presented with the Winkle Club's badge, a solid gold winkle shell.

He must produce his winkle whenever challenged by another member, or pay a sixpenny fine to charity. After becoming a member Sir Robert had to winkle up by holding his gold winkle shell aloft and shouting, 'Winkles up.'

I am sure that the loyalty the Australian public has shown to her royal majesty was rewarded by our Lord Warden of the Cinque Ports.

Mr BRINDAL: On a point of order, Mr Deputy Speaker, twice in the course of this debate the member for Henley Beach has referred to the Queen as her royal majesty; I think the correct title should be either her majesty or her royal highness.

The DEPUTY SPEAKER: There is no point of order. The reference was quite respectful.

Mr FERGUSON: Thank you, Sir, but on this occasion I am very pleased to be corrected by the member for Hayward. I am sure that the member for Hayward is prepared to state his loyalty to the Crown in the same way as members on this side of the House have been prepared to state our loyalty to the Crown. In so doing, I would think he would support the motion moved by the member for Napier, because I feel sure he would not have been prepared to allow one of the members on his side to be so disrespectful to the Queen as to put out the press release which the honourable member did and which we all find so revolting on this side of the House.

I wish to conclude my remarks and once more express to you, Sir, and to the House our deep respect for her majesty. I hope this motion is supported.

Mr MEIER secured the adjournment of the debate.

MEMBER FOR HEYSEN

Adjourned debate on motion of Hon. T.H. Hemmings:

That this House condemns the member for Heysen in the strongest terms for inciting the people of South Australia to act outside the law and calls on the Leader of the Opposition to sack him immediately from his position as Liberal Party spokesperson for water resources.

(Continued from 12 September. Page 819.)

Mr INGERSON (Bragg): I rise to comment on the statements made by the member for Napier, the Hon. Terry Hemmings.

The Hon. T.H. HEMMINGS: On a point of order, Sir, and I bear in mind your statements that we should not be frivolous—

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

The Hon. T.H. HEMMINGS: The member for Bragg referred to me by name.

The SPEAKER: If the honourable member referred to the member for Napier other than by his electorate or the position he holds in Parliament, he is out of order.

Mr INGERSON: I withdraw, Mr Speaker. One of the tragedies in this debate is the fact that the Premier has sent along an old man to argue this case. It is a pity that he had to send along a has-been member of this Parliament. He has been a mayor and a backbencher in this place, and it was pointed out the other night that he is a has-been Minister as far as the Government is concerned. One of the interesting things is that it will not be very long before they say that he has been in this Parliament, and that is probably one of the privileges that we will have.

It is often said that we send the oldest people along, because they are wisest but I think that, unfortunately in this case, we again have a major problem when looking at the contribution made, because many references have been made in the contribution to my colleague the member for Heysen as inciting people to break or to go outside the law. I remember a Premier of this State, a colleague of the member for Napier, saying very strongly to the people of South Australia that, if you did not support a particular law, you ought to argue it in the public arena, demonstrate against it and, if possible, have the particular law changed through the ordinary legal processes.

The member for Heysen has done just that: he has put before this House a Bill, which will be discussed at a later time, in an attempt to proceed following the normal legal processes. He has also argued the point publicly at a meeting. I might correct the member for Napier here: that meeting was not organised by the member for Heysen; it was organised by the Burnside council. Again, that is one of the facts that the old so-called wise member for Napier has put forward in his argument, and that ought to be corrected very quickly.

However, the member for Heysen clearly suggested to that meeting that one of the processes that could be taken up by some 600 members of the community—principally residents of the eastern suburbs—if they wished, was to take this particular backward law to the courts and have it tested. I would have thought that it was fair and reasonable for the member for Heysen and, for that matter, any member of this Parliament to suggest to the community at large that this particular Bill, or any Bill that they thought was flawed, be taken through the courts or the legal system.

Mr Brindal: What is fair and reasonable?

Mr INGERSON: As the member for Hayward asks, what is fair and reasonable when it comes to this Government? Well, we have seen many issues that are badly treated by this Government and, in particular, by the old man, the member for Napier, who described himself as such in his presentation on this matter.

One of the principal reasons why the member for Heysen questioned this water rates legislation at a public meeting was one of natural justice. If we have a situation such as was put forward strongly and supported, I note, by the member for Napier that this water rates Bill had a beginning on 1 July and an operation date of 30 June of the following year, the community should, in its own mind, expect that the billing system would apply from 1 July and go through to 30 June. When a Government, through one of its departments, implements a charging system that goes back at least six months prior to that date, the community has a fair and reasonable natural justice argument to put to politicians.

The member for Heysen made very clear that natural justice and fairness should be recognised in this Bill. When I read the contribution of the member for Napier I realised that it was a deliberate stunt by the Government to cover

up for the inadequacy of one of its Ministers, in particular the Minister of Water Resources. There is no doubt that the documentation put out by the department on the Minister's behalf was a deliberate attempt to misrepresent the position and a deliberate cover-up by the Government for what I think was inadequate legislation. Unfortunately, the member for Napier, the old man of the other side of the House—

The Hon. M.D. RANN: On a point of order, Mr Speaker, I think that these gratuitous references to the age and qualities of the member for Napier are unparliamentary and reflect on him in a grotesque way. We all saw the problems the Prime Minister got into when he referred to someone as a silly old bugger.

The SPEAKER: Order! The Minister leapt to his feet and beat the member for Napier, who I assume was going to take the same point of order. I suggest to the Minister that the member for Napier is well able to take the point of order if he has taken offence. If the member for Napier were to take a point of order, I would ask the member for Bragg not to use that term. I think that the member for Bragg has used it for effect but that its ongoing use does nothing for the standard of debate in this Parliament, and I would ask him not to use the term in future.

Mr INGERSON: Mr Speaker, in observing your ruling I point out that I was only quoting from the member for Napier's own speech. He, in fact, stated that himself. The member for Napier said that the member for Heysen had incited 'the little old ladies from Burnside', but, not being present at the meeting, he would have a lot of difficulty in making his case stand up. I would have thought that it would be fair and reasonable for the member for Napier to make the effort to come along and see why people in the eastern suburbs are revolting against what is a very backward piece of legislation. I noticed that no Government members, even though they were encouraged and invited to come along, saw fit to do so. The Minister of Water Resources, the Minister of Education (representing Norwood) and the Minister of Recreation and Sport (representing Unley)—

The Hon. D.C. Wotton interjecting:

Mr INGERSON: —did not send any departmental officer, as the member for Heysen commented. Nobody from the Government came along to that meeting, and I think that that is a tragedy. The member for Napier has deliberately put this motion before the House in a very devious and frivolous way. I do not think that the House should recognise it as anything more than a frivolous attempt by the member opposite to embarrass my good friend, the member for Heysen, who was out there deliberately arguing on behalf of the community their rights in relation to this water rates issue.

Mr FERGUSON (Henley Beach): I do not believe that this is a frivolous motion at all. It is a very serious motion, because we have found that the member for Heysen has been conducting a campaign of confusion and misinformation against the introduction of the new water rating system. The campaign has included press statements and suggestions that people might riot in the streets. We have just heard a defence in relation to what the member for Heysen said about encouraging people to riot in the streets. I have sat in this Parliament for nine years and listened day after day, hour after hour, to speaker after speaker from the other side of the House talking about law and order, yet now the member for Bragg is prepared to suggest that everything the Liberal Party has said about law and order should be thrown out the door, and that it will introduce a new policy that endorses what the member for Heysen said encouraging people to riot in the streets.

It is very hard to find Liberal Party policies and I am extremely pleased that at least the member for Bragg is suggesting that people ought to break the law as far as this measure is concerned. The member for Bragg did not actually say—

Mr INGERSON: On a point of order, Mr Speaker, I did not make the comment that people ought to break the law. The honourable member rightly knows that I said that the course suggested by the Hon. Mr Dunstan should be adopted, and that is not a policy of deliberately breaking the law.

The SPEAKER: Order! I do not believe that there is a point of order against Standing Orders. The honourable member has made an explanation of the terms that he used, but there is no point of order.

Mr FERGUSON: Thank you, Sir, for that ruling. As I understand it, the member for Bragg, in defence of the member for Heysen, supported his remark that 'people might riot in the streets'. The member for Bragg made encouraging remarks about it. No matter whether he referred to what a former Premier of this State said, he was encouraging the suggestion. Over the years, we have heard a lot of righteous indignation from members opposite about law and order and about what that former Premier said. I have not had time to go back through *Hansard*, but what the Premier said in those days received considerable criticism from members opposite. However, the honourable member is now condoning that sort of action.

The member for Bragg referred to a public meeting at which people were encouraged to mount a legal challenge against the new system. Only time will tell whether the member for Heysen has been encouraging people to spend their money while he has not been prepared to spend any of his. The member for Heysen has every opportunity to challenge the system if he so desires, but he has not taken that opportunity. Instead, he has urged other people to do it. Not only that—

The Hon. B.C. Eastick: What are you going to do when his representations are successful?

Mr FERGUSON: That matter is *sub judice*. It is not for me to comment. Given the opportunity, I would do so, but I am not prepared to break the traditions of this House while the matter is *sub judice*. What else has the member for Heysen advised the general public to do? I refer to the *Sunday Mail* of 22 September 1991 and the headline 'Liberals in call for rates reform'. Here we have the member for Heysen, on his white charger, with his white hair and his lance at the ready, going to challenge the system. What do we find? The article states:

> Mr Wotton said that the Opposition supported a total user pays system for domestic properties with rebates for the disadvantaged.

I thought, 'You beauty! He has solved the problem. At last we are going to get a user pays system.' I know that he must have been genuine, because he announced it in the *Sunday Mail* on 22 September 1991. Then I thought to myself: a total user pays system. I looked forward to this with great interest because I was waiting for the member for Heysen to come into this Parliament and give us the formula that would produce a total rates system that would be cheaper—and that is the inference to be drawn from this newspaper article, involving the sort of proposition he put to that public meeting.

What sort of formula will the member for Heysen use to produce a user pays system? As a member of the Government, I was very much relieved, because the shadow Minister has discovered the magic formula that we have been looking for in this State for more than 150 years, namely,

a user pays system. I waited with bated breath for details of the proposition—a user pays system where the average man and woman, the average householder in the seat of Hayward, would be able to pay lower water rates than under the system introduced by the Minister.

The member for Bragg referred to the Bill introduced by the member for Heysen. It is not my intention to breach Standing Orders to discuss what is in that Bill. I would not do that. All I will say is that the member for Heysen is suggesting a return to the old system. Where is the formula that he was espousing at a public meeting filled with conservative people from Burnside and surrounding areas?

The Hon. T.H. Hemmings: Those little old ladies!

Mr FERGUSON: So, for those little old ladies with their blue rinse hair, the member for Heysen, on his white charger, was going to provide an answer to the water rates system—a user pays system. I will just repeat the newspaper article:

Mr Wotton said the Opposition supported a total user pays system for domestic properties with rebates for the disadvantaged.

He has not yet even been able to tell this House what the rebate system is likely to be. Everything has been announced in the press, but we have not yet seen a formula for the user pays system he is proposing. I know why the member for Heysen cannot produce that formula: it is not possible to do so. If he produces a user pays system, the good citizens of Adelaide and the Adelaide Hills (the area he represents) will be paying so much money that they will think the system introduced by the Minister of Water Resources was a total gift.

Why cannot the Opposition be fair dinkum? If it is going to produce a user pays system, let it do so. Every member in this House knows that a user pays system would be so expensive and so politically unpopular that the Liberal Party would be in Opposition for another 20 years in this State if it introduced such a proposition. But what does the member for Heysen do? He digs away; he tries to get people to riot in the streets; he goes to meetings and gives information which is completely untrue. On the one hand, he says he will introduce a user pays system but, on the other, when he gets the opportunity to produce something in this House it is a fizzer—an absolute fizzer! He would be lost without his letters and press cuttings in delivering his words of wisdom to us.

The member for Heysen is a master at creating confusion. This publicity has stated that he favours a user pays system yet he has introduced a Bill providing for the system to revert to property-based values. He says that a Liberal Government would ensure that the E&WS worked 'from a base with a differential between residential and commercial properties'. The member for Hayward was definitely right when he suggested that members opposite had the right to have a bob each way. That is a good way to behave when one is in Opposition, but when one has the responsibility of government one has to deliver the goods.

We heard the member for Bragg suggesting that Government members were invited to a meeting. I certainly was not invited to that meeting and I do not know any member on this side who was invited. However, when Government members have to face meetings, they have to put the position exactly as it is. They cannot stand before an audience and waiver and wobble all over the place as to what the propositions might be. If the Opposition claims that it will introduce a user pays system, then when it comes into this House and this Parliament, which really means fronting up to the people of South Australia, it should be fair dinkum and produce a user pays system. The member for Heysen has not been able to produce a formula that would be equitable for the people of Adelaide and encompass a user pays system.

Mr Lewis: What about the electricity?

Mr FERGUSON: What about electricity? What has that to do with the proposition before us? Apparently the member for Murray-Mallee is suggesting that the same method of calculating electricity charges should be used in respect of water charges?

Mr Lewis: Do you think that electricity charges are fair?

The SPEAKER: Order! Interjections are out of order.

Mr FERGUSON: I realise that I should not respond to interjections, Sir, but I was tempted.

The SPEAKER: Don't be tempted.

Mr FERGUSON: I will not be tempted anymore, Sir. We have before us—

The Hon. D.C. Wotton interjecting:

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

Mr FERGUSON: We now have before us a proposition, which I am sure the member for Heysen supports, that our water rates should be charged on the same basis as electricity charges, even though it would mean a doubling or trebling of present E&WS charges. If that is what Liberal Party members believe, why do they not stand on the front steps and tell everyone? They can get out of this little environment here and get back to the *Sunday Mail* and put out a press release explaining the proposition that the member for Murray-Mallee has suggested. I would be delighted, because I would win Henley Beach by 20 per cent. If that proposition were to go into the *Sunday Mail* and the policy was announced to the general public, I would have no problem in winning Henley Beach by 20 per cent. We know that the member for Heysen is not willing to do that. He said he would introduce a user pays system, but then he introduced a proposal that would return us to the old system. It is worse than having a multiple number of chemist shops.

Mr INGERSON: On a point of order, Mr Speaker, I object to the inference that having a multiple number of chemists shops is anything other than a good thing in this community. I ask the honourable member to withdraw his reflection.

Mr FERGUSON: I have no trouble at all withdrawing if it offends the member for Bragg, and I believe that the member for Bragg ought to be congratulated on the way in which he has pulled himself up by the bootstraps to become one of the most successful men in the city of Adelaide. However, if the words I used offended him, I completely and absolutely withdraw. I think that I have covered this subject pretty well. I will get the opportunity to speak again when we debate the member for Heysen's Bill, and I look forward to it. I look forward to exposing him, as far as the general population is concerned, on the way in which he has misled the public, because he has not been able to come up with a formula better than that put up by the Minister of Water Resources. I look forward to that debate. I support the member for Napier's motion.

Mr BRINDAL secured the adjournment of the debate.

COMMEMORATIVE MEDAL

Adjourned debate on motion of Mr Brindal:

That this House petitions Her Excellency the Governor to strike in the name of the people of South Australia a commemorative medal to acknowledge the valuable role played by the Royal Australian Navy and support groups of other service wings in the Vietnam conflict.

(Continued from 12 September. Page 819.)

Mr HOLLOWAY (Mitchell): I move:

Leave out the words 'petitions Her Excellency the Governor to strike in the name of the people of South Australia' and insert in lieu thereof 'calls upon the Federal Government to strike'.

There is not a great deal of time for me to say much about the amendment this morning. However, briefly, I support many of the sentiments of the member for Hayward in relation to the debt of gratitude that is owed to those who served in the Vietnam War in whatever capacity—whether as front-line troops or in supporting the war effort at that time. I am sure that all members of this House would agree that this country is obligated to those who served in that conflict. Regardless of the disputation that existed in the community at the time and regardless of the circumstances of that conflict, I am sure that we would all recognise that those who served their country in that conflict deserve to be treated properly by their Government.

Two questions arise from the motion moved by the member for Hayward. The first is: what is the appropriate form of recognition for those who served in Vietnam, particularly those referred to in this motion—those who were supporting the war effort? The second question is: who should make the award? The answer is that, obviously, it has to be the Federal Government.

Those who served in the Vietnam conflict, of course, did so in the name of their country; they did not do it in the name of South Australia; they fought for Australia. It is appropriate that it should be the Commonwealth Government which recognises the services of those who performed military duties for their country. Regardless of whether or not this State is technically able to strike a medal, it is the Commonwealth Government that should make this decision. There is a great deal of complexity in relation to this issue, which I would like to go into at a later stage. However, at this stage it is enough to say that the Federal Government is the appropriate body to address this matter. I seek leave to continue my remarks later.

Leave granted; debate adjourned.

Mr BRINDAL: On a point of order, Mr Speaker, if the House accepts the amendment today and subsequently today we change the Standing Orders, will it then be in order to ask on a point of order whether the amendment negates the motion, because I believe that under Standing Orders it will not be possible to have that sort of amendment?

The SPEAKER: The House has accepted the amendment. It certainly has not voted on it but it has seconded the motion for the amendment.

Mr BRINDAL: If the Standing Orders change, will it then be possible to question whether the House can still accept the amendment, or does the amendment then stand because it has been accepted today?

The SPEAKER: That is a hypothetical question and I do not think that the Chair is in a position to answer it, because there is no indication of exactly how the Standing Orders will be changed.

Mr BRINDAL: Thank you, Sir, I will raise it with you later.

[*Sitting suspended from 1.1 to 2 p.m.*]

PETITIONS: PROSTITUTION

Petitions signed by 346 residents of South Australia requesting that the House urge the Government not to decriminalise prostitution were presented by Messrs Goldsworthy and Hopgood.

Petitions received.

PETITION: FREE STUDENT TRAVEL

A petition signed by 99 residents of South Australia requesting that the House urge the Government to restore concessional fares on public transport for all full-time students was presented by the Hon. Frank Blevins.

Petition received.

PETITION: HEATING APPLIANCES

A petition signed by 20 residents of South Australia requesting that the House urge the Government to review the policy on the provision of heating appliances in Housing Trust dwellings was presented by the Hon. H. Allison.

Petition received.

PETITIONS: GAMING MACHINES

Petitions signed by 89 residents of South Australia requesting that the House urge the Government to provide for the administration of coin operated gaming machines in licensed clubs and hotels by the Liquor Licensing Commission and the Independent Gaming Corporation were presented by Messrs Chapman and Such.

Petitions received.

PAPER TABLED

The following paper was laid on the table:

By the Minister for Family and Community Services (Hon. D.J. Hopgood)—

Department for Family and Community Services—Report, 1990-91.

MINISTERIAL STATEMENT: DEPARTMENT FOR FAMILY AND COMMUNITY SERVICES ANNUAL REPORT

The Hon. D.J. HOPGOOD (Minister of Family and Community Services): I seek leave to make a statement.

Leave granted.

The Hon. D.J. HOPGOOD: In presenting to the House the 1990-91 annual report of the Department for Family and Community Services, I would like to take this opportunity to make a statement in relation to the report and that of the Police Commissioner, which will be tabled shortly by my colleague, the Minister of Emergency Services. There has been a great deal of debate recently about the levels of juvenile offending and the increases in the number of juveniles committing offences. I draw members' attention to the fact that, when comparing figures for juvenile crime presented in the two annual reports, it is important to remember that the police and the Department for Family and Community Services each employs a different basis for counting the contact juveniles have with the justice system.

The police data relate to apprehension statistics, whereas the Department for Family and Community Services data refer to appearances before the Children's Court and Children's Aid Panels. As a consequence, an individual apprehended by the police for several offences may be counted

several times in the apprehension figures, yet only once in the court or aid panel figures. Also, a juvenile may be apprehended and thus included in police figures but not referred to a Children's Court or aid panel and, therefore, will not appear in Department for Family and Community Services statistics. Differences also exist with respect to the offence descriptions used. This results because Department for Family and Community Services data relate to charges laid at the court or panel hearing, whereas police data are based on charges preferred at the time of apprehension. It is thus not possible to make a direct comparison between the reports.

Such discrepancies in counting procedures are no different from those which exist in other States, and in many respects are much better. It is significant that the Police Department and the Office of Crime Statistics in the Attorney-General's Department have strongly supported the establishment of a National Crime Statistics Unit, which is based in the Melbourne office of the Australian Bureau of Statistics. That unit is charged with the development of a set of national crime statistics using uniform counting standards which, for the first time, will enable true comparisons to be made between States.

While the adoption of uniform national counting rules will allow accurate comparisons between interstate police statistics, differences will remain in the counting rules between police and the Department for Family and Community Services because they are counting different aspects of the same situation. It will therefore still be necessary to distinguish carefully between different contacts juveniles have with the justice system.

As time goes by, the justice information system will give us the ability to look at the picture in a more comprehensive way and track both offences and offenders. Officers of my department as well as the police and officers of the Crime Statistics Unit of the Attorney-General's Department are working towards the development of a facility which will provide members and the community with a more integrated and comprehensive analysis of crime and justice figures so that it will be possible to make meaningful comparisons between offences and offenders and the way that both are dealt with by the justice system.

The tabling of these two reports is part of a developing strategy to provide a more comprehensive and integrated picture of crime and justice issues. In the course of the next few months the Office of Crime Statistics will work with officers of my department and the police in coordinating an integrated analysis of crime trends in South Australia. However, a preliminary examination of the Department for Family and Community Services' statistics have been prepared by my department and is tabled with the annual report. It is a commonly expressed, but incorrect, view that juvenile crime is at record levels and climbing at unprecedented rates. The figures do not substantiate this.

While the number of offences and the number of offenders in all age categories have increased over the past decade in South Australia, and elsewhere in Australia, juveniles have represented a declining proportion of offenders apprehended since the early 1980s. For example, juveniles accounted for 69 per cent of police break and enter apprehensions in 1981-82, but the figure was 49 per cent in 1990-91. Similarly, the juvenile proportion of serious assault apprehensions has dropped from 23 per cent in 1981-82 to 15 per cent in 1990-91. In fact, the proportion of juveniles among police apprehensions declined in eight of the nine 'Selected Offence' categories used in Police Department reports between 1981-82 and 1990-91.

There have been increases in the past two years in the number of appearances before Children's Court and Children's Aid Panels, but these have still not reached the levels that they were in the early 1980s. Moreover, they have mostly involved extra Children's Aid Panel appearances which deal predominantly with offences of a less serious nature. This is not a matter for complacency; however, I mention it simply to try to gain some sort of perspective on the size of the problem.

It is regrettable that there have been some quite uninformed and alarmist conclusions drawn about recent crime trends which are sometimes the result of operational factors rather than real changes in levels of crime. In fact, it must be stressed that official crime statistics are influenced not only by the real levels of offending behaviour in the community but also by the way in which the justice system responds to crime.

A prime example of how operational changes can give the impression of a sudden upsurge of a particular type of crime is a recent claim that incest offences were getting out of control whereas the increase was in fact due to the success of Operation Keeper. Similarly, police action by the tactical response group in Hindley Street some 18 months or so ago in association with a range of preventative measures initially saw a rise in offences, but ultimately led to a very changed and safer situation in that locality. It is important therefore to gain a clearer understanding of the factors responsible for changing levels of reported crime in order to come to grips with the problems that need to be tackled. The interdepartmental coordination I referred to earlier will continue to improve our understanding of crime statistics and the changing patterns of crime in this State.

Over the next few months as the Report on Crime Trends becomes available I hope that we will see a more informed and less sensational debate about crime which addresses real issues. I acknowledge that crime is a problem, but in order for us to focus our efforts on addressing it we need to deal with the real issues rather than the sensational ones. I thank my ministerial colleagues for making available the time of their officers in this worthwhile enterprise and I commend to honourable members the annual report, which I now table.

MINISTERIAL STATEMENT: IPL (NEW ZEALAND) MILL

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

Leave granted.

The Hon. J.H.C. KLUNDER: Mr Speaker, the member for Mount Gambier asked me a question yesterday concerning the losses incurred as a result of the sale of the IPL (NZ) Mill at Greymouth. Mr Speaker, I answered that my recollection of the variance related to a timing difference in relation to the bringing to book of an amount of $2 million—my recollection was correct. However, Mr Speaker, I did undertake to obtain a report for the honourable member regarding this matter.

The capital loss brought to account in 1990-91 was $11.968 million. However, since the balance date of 30 June 1991, SATCO has received a further $199 000 in recoveries which will be brought to account this financial year. The reported capital loss will thus be reduced to $11.76 million, very close to the SATCO Chairman's advice, as outlined in my ministerial statement of 12 February 1991 that he expected a capital loss of $11.5 million. Mr Speaker, in addition to this amount, the corporation brought to account as at 30

June 1991 a further $2 million, being the asset deficiency of the New Zealand subsidiary at the inception of the IPL (Holdings) Group in 1985. This information is provided in the Auditor-General's Report for 1990-91 on pages 419 and 422.

QUESTION TIME

WORKCOVER

Mr D.S. BAKER (Leader of the Opposition): On how many and on what occasions during the past year has the Premier discussed the WorkCover scheme with AWU South Australian Branch Secretary Mr John Dunnery?

The Hon. J.C. BANNON: I would have discussed it with Mr Dunnery in conjunction with the United Trades and Labor Council perhaps on one or two occasions over the past 12 months. Just as members of the Opposition have discussions with employer bodies and with the United Trades and Labor Council on issues of interest, so I as Premier from time to time in relation to important matters of public interest also have such discussions. I think that it is quite appropriate that I should do so. I meet on a six-weekly basis with employer organisations and they put views to me as well.

I know that one could expect this question was going to be asked by the Leader of the Opposition who, of course, operates in a total vacuum as far as consultation with interest groups or others in the community is concerned. He gets up in this place, as do all his colleagues, and says, 'I have been informed that' or 'The Opposition has been advised that', etc., but apparently that is quite different from the Government's legitimately consulting with or hearing the representations of other bodies. Of course, we expect this question because of the publicity about the tapes of the discussions Mr Dunnery had—

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order!

The Hon. J.C. BANNON: —with somebody else. I do not know what the validity of the tape is or how accurate the conversation is. Certainly the language used is quite colourful. It is somewhat more colourful than any language that was put to me in a deputation, I might say, and probably more colourful than even some of the Leader's colleagues use about him. It would be interesting to get the odd tape recording on that.

Members interjecting:

The Hon. J.C. BANNON: Well, Mr Speaker, there are different levels of eloquence. For instance, Mr Dunnery's rather lurid language reported in this tape is obviously at one end of the scale. At the other end you would put the response of the Deputy Leader on radio the other day. He was asked in an interview the following question:

> If we go back to the book that is about to come out by Ms Cashmore, the book that she will be publishing, do you think there would be a collection of Dale Baker's speeches the Party would want to publish?

The Deputy Leader's reply was extremely eloquent: it is recorded as, '(laugh)'. Eloquent commentary indeed! I suggest that is somewhat less colourful language than Mr Dunnery is alleged to have used.

To get back to the point of the Leader's question, I point out that at all times my door is open to representations by people, on behalf of their organisations, with an active interest in issues of the day. WorkCover is such a one and I have received representations about it, and the matter was debated at the ALP convention in August. My position on those matters is made quite clear in my public statements and the course that we are pursuing is one that is done in the appropriate way as far as the interests of the State are concerned.

Mr Dunnery might have his interests and he might like to tell his members or whoever he is talking to how well and effectively he is representing them. Good luck to him and good luck to anyone else who does the same thing. I have my own interests: the interests of the State of South Australia. In conjunction with my Minister, those are the interests that are being pursued.

SECURITY INDUSTRY

Mr QUIRKE (Playford): I direct my question to the Minister representing the Minister of Consumer Affairs. What measures currently exist to regulate the security industry in South Australia and what can be done when the management of a firm engages in very questionable practices? The House will remember that I raised the question of Intrepid Security in this place six months ago because of repeated instances of wages cheques failing to meet payment on presentation, underpayment and threats to me and my secretary. Since that time, more employees and former employees of Intrepid have sought my assistance. Industry representatives have done the same.

On 27 September Kenneth Darren Price signed a statutory declaration in my presence in which he alleged a number of very concerning aspects of Intrepid's conduct. Mr Price had been dismissed by a Richard Flanagan on 24 September and put on seven days notice. According to the declaration, Mr Price asked Flanagan on 27 September why he had been dismissed and was abused and assaulted. Flanagan repeatedly punched Mr Price around the head, and used steel capped boots to kick Mr Price's German Shepherd in the head and to kick the side of Mr Price's car, which sustained damage. Mr Price is still owed money and has advised me that he will soon need to sell his car to pay bills incurred as a result of his employment with Intrepid. Naturally after this incident, he decided not to raise other questions with Intrepid's management.

The Hon. D.J. HOPGOOD: I will refer that matter to the appropriate Minister. However, I would assume that the matter has been drawn to the attention of the South Australian Police Force, because there certainly seems to have been every reason for that to have been done.

AUSTRALIAN WORKERS UNION

Mr S.J. BAKER (Deputy Leader of the Opposition): Can the Premier advise the House what benefit there is for business and the community of South Australia in his advising Australian Workers Union members at Port Pirie smelters to support the election of John Dunnery as AWU Branch Secretary, which he did earlier this year?

The Hon. J.C. BANNON: This question is really as pathetic as the one the Leader of the Opposition has just asked, but it is even more irrelevant than the one the Leader asked. I could give him the benefit of the doubt that perhaps there was some faint issue of public interest in questioning in this House the issue of WorkCover and union attitudes to it. Fair enough, although we know that was not the game he was playing. But the Deputy Leader gets up with this ridiculous question which is not a follow up and is not related: it is one that I do not think is worth dealing with in this place.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order!

BETTING

Mr HAMILTON (Albert Park): My question is directed to the Minister of Recreation—

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order! The Chair cannot hear the question. The member for Albert Park.

Mr HAMILTON: Thank you for your protection, Sir. My question is directed to the Minister of Recreation and Sport. Following the reply by the Minister of Recreation and Sport in this House on 29 August 1991, can the Minister report on the progress for implementation of place only and multiple betting by bookmakers?

The Hon. M.K. MAYES: This is a good question and is one that has caused much concern within the bookmaking community. I know the honourable member has had discussions with the league and, like me, is concerned about the situation. It is fair to say that the Chairman of the league is also concerned. The BLB Chairman has also expressed concern that the matter proceed quickly.

I can inform the House and the honourable member that the issue will be discussed as part of the board's deliberations on the rules at its next meeting on 22 October, and I understand, from communications with my officers and the Chairman, it is likely that the rules will be resolved at the following meeting. I hope that within the next month we can see the introduction of these rules in accordance with the feelings and views of the House and of the community as a whole. I am looking forward with some degree of excitement to the fact that the rules will be adopted so that bookmakers can offer a multiple betting facility to the community.

WORKCOVER

Mr SUCH (Fisher): My question is directed to the Premier. Has Mr Dunnery ever made any form of suggestion to the Premier or his staff that Government changes to the WorkCover scheme be delayed until after his re-election as AWU Branch Secretary?

The Hon. J.C. BANNON: Not that I am aware of. Quite rightly, Mr Dunnery—

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order!

The Hon. J.C. BANNON: —has quite properly been a member of delegations from the United Trades and Labor Council. As it is a large constituent body of that organisation, it would be strange if he was not urging in fact not changes to workers compensation but no changes to workers compensation. That is on the record and has been made clear. He has every right to do that, and I do not think any member of this Chamber should suggest that he does not have that right.

I understand that the United Trades and Labor Council makes representations to members of the Opposition as well. I know equally that members of employer organisations make public statements and, in fact, representations to both Government and Opposition. That is appropriate. To try to then turn that into some sort of sinister arrangement is absolute nonsense.

RAILWAY CROSSINGS

Mr HOLLOWAY (Mitchell): Will the Minister of Transport inform the House when boom gates will be installed at level crossings on the Tonsley rail line? There are three level crossings on the Tonsley spur line—at Daws Road, Celtic Avenue and Alawoona Avenue, all within my electorate. None of these level crossings is protected by boom gates. The Tonsley rail line runs in a north-south direction and the warning lights at these crossings are difficult to see at certain times, particularly when vehicles are driven into the setting sun. My constituents wish to know when the dangers at these crossings will be reduced.

The Hon. FRANK BLEVINS: I thank the honourable member for his question, which seeks information about the honourable member's electorate, unlike the nonsense we have heard in questions today from the Opposition. This is what Question Time is about; it is not about that kind of nonsensical rubbish.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order! I ask the Minister to come back to the question.

The Hon. FRANK BLEVINS: I am pleased to be able to tell the member for Mitchell that the boom gates will be installed very soon. As all members would know, the Government made a decision to install boom gates on all crossings. In 1990, unfortunately, there were a couple of very bad accidents, fatal accidents. While one could always argue about the cost of road safety measures, there is no doubt that the community demanded, and the Government quite properly installed these devices. It was announced that the cost would be $1.5 million and that is a cost that the STA ought to bear, as I believe the benefit outweighs the cost.

The work was programmed to finish at the end of the year. It will not quite do that. The two-year program is very close to target, but it will be January or February next year before it is all finished. With reference to the Tonsley line, the crossing at Alawoona Avenue is expected to be completed in January, as is the Celtic Avenue crossing at Mitchell Park. The Daws Road crossing at Ascot Park will take a little longer, but should be finished in February. When they are all completed by February or thereabouts, the 15 level crossings that did not have boom gates will have them and will be upgraded and we know that over a period of time that will save some lives.

WORKCOVER

Mr BRINDAL (Hayward): If the Premier maintains that he has not bowed to pressure from his old union leadership, how does he explain his Government's failure to comprehensively amend the WorkCover scheme in the seven months since he made his promise to achieve nationally competitive WorkCover levies?

The Hon. J.C. BANNON: 'Nationally competitive WorkCover levies within the next two years' I said. Secondly, a select committee of Parliament is currently operating—I would have thought that the honourable member would know that—and it is considering these matters. Thirdly, the matter was under consideration at the recent annual convention of the ALP and certain motions were passed there which resulted in ongoing negotiations. Fourthly, a major actuarial assessment is being undertaken of the WorkCover funding at this moment. Until those results are available, we are not in a position to know accurately the size or dimension of the problem we are dealing with.

In addition, a Bill has already been introduced by the member for Bragg and has been referred to the committee.

Finally, my colleague the Minister of Labour is consulting with both employer and employee organisations. All of those reasons are why we are not presenting legislation at this time.

FAST TRACK INTERMODAL SERVICE

Mr M.J. EVANS (Elizabeth): Is the Minister of Transport aware of a proposal by Charlick Trading Pty Ltd, with Australian National as a subcontractor, to develop and establish a new rail head on land at Gillman to be known as the Fast Track Intermodal Service, and that substantial work has commenced on this site and is scheduled to become effective on 1 November 1991? Further, will the Minister comment on whether he has given any consent, under clause 9 of the schedule to the Railways (Transfer Agreement) Act 1975, to this enterprise? It is my understanding that this proposal will have the effect of increasing freight costs while reducing services to importers and exporters in this State and that at this point insufficient consultation on the proposal has taken place with interested parties.

The Hon. FRANK BLEVINS: Mr Speaker, I would welcome your total protection while I am giving this answer.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order!

The Hon. FRANK BLEVINS: Don't tempt the Speaker on this one. I am aware that Charlick Trading Pty Ltd and Australian National are establishing a new rail head at Gillman to be known as the Fast Track Intermodal Service. The aim is to improve the speed, efficiency and effectiveness of intermodal container transport and delivery within the Adelaide area. My consent is not required under clause 9 of the schedule of the railway agreement. Clause 9 refers to reductions in services or line closures of non-metropolitan railways. I have not been informed by the Commonwealth Minister for Land Transport that line closures are contemplated. It is intended that the general level of service provided will be improved. There may be some increase in freight costs of some importers and exporters in this State. However, the aim is to reduce the overall costs of intermodal container movement. In aggregate, the benefits are expected to outweigh any disbenefits.

As I said, my consent has not been sought; it was not required by the parties. If there are still some queries, whether they be from freight forwarders or from any other interested parties, including members of Parliament, etc., I recommend that they contact Australian National for further details. I am sure that Australian National will be able to give them the detail they require and to put their minds at rest. If that is not the case, the Commonwealth Minister for Land Transport is also available for representations, whether by industry, individuals or anyone else.

REMM-MYER PROJECT

The Hon. JENNIFER CASHMORE (Coles): Is the Premier aware that in 1988 union officials, including Mark Gnatenko of the CMEU, Brian Hennig from the Carpenters and Joiners Union, Larrie Hughes of the BLF and Tony Bush of the Plumbers and Gasfitters Union, were flown to Brisbane where they were wined and dined by Remm officials on the Brisbane River in a bid to secure Remm's position as the developer of the Myer project; and what talks did the union officials subsequently have with the Premier to guarantee Remm's involvement in the Myer project?

The Hon. J.C. BANNON: Unions had no talks with me to guarantee Remm's involvement in the Myer project. In fact, if the honourable member had followed the course of that project she would know that industrial relations were in fact difficult throughout most of the course of it. In fact, on some occasions, in the interests of that project, both I and the Minister of Labour used what good offices we had to try to ensure that work was kept going speedily. Whether or not a company wanted to discuss its work practices or construction methods with union officials and by so doing let them examine them, I do not know. However, I understand that that is quite a common practice in industry. I believe that Remm, in this instance, was using quite different construction methods for a multistorey building and, presumably, wished the unions to understand exactly what was involved. I think that is quite appropriate.

SAND REPLENISHMENT PROGRAM

Mr FERGUSON (Henley Beach): Will the Minister for Environment and Planning indicate the extent of the sand replenishment program carried out by the Coast Protection Board and say whether there are indications that the program has been successful in providing improved beach conditions and protection of sand dunes in the metropolitan area?

The Hon. S.M. LENEHAN: I thank the honourable member for his ongoing interest and concern with respect to the work that has been undertaken to ensure that the beach environment in the Henley and Grange area, in particular, is protected and, indeed, enhanced. I am delighted to assure the honourable member—

Mr Lewis interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order! The member for Murray-Mallee is out of order.

The Hon. S.M. LENEHAN: I am delighted to assure the honourable member that the sand replenishment program that has extended over three years and cost $6 million has been successful. Replenishment work has been carried out at North Glenelg, Somerton, Brighton, Seacliff and West Beach. The effectiveness of this program is being evaluated by a coastal survey program and, so far, the survey has shown that sand is building up in the West Beach Trust area, which will improve the protection of those very important and sensitive sand dunes.

In addition, sand has remained on the foreshore from North Glenelg to West Beach to provide an improved beach area. Additional replenishment may still be necessary but, as the deficit is reduced, the rate of loss should decrease. The 1984 protection strategy will be updated this year as a result of this coastal survey.

MULTIFUNCTION POLIS

Mr INGERSON (Bragg): Does the Premier agree with Japanese businessmen quoted in the *Advertiser* of Tuesday and today as saying that the Federal Government needs to do more by way of incentives and public relations to attract overseas companies to invest in the MFP? If not, how does he envisage inducing sufficient private investment to be made to justify the enormous Government expenditure that will be required to make the MFP a reality?

The Hon. J.C. BANNON: First, enormous Government expenditure is not required. I refer the honourable member to the costings contained in the report, and would ask him then to look at that against the time scale and against the

amount we have already spent on infrastructure, and to understand that this is part of urban consolidation and that it saves us money in terms of increasing the outer spread of the metropolitan area, which is becoming more and more costly and repressive as far as public sector services are concerned. In fact, if one analyses the cost of this project, it is remarkably cheap.

Secondly, in relation to what the gentlemen are reported as saying, it stands to reason. We are on the threshold of marketing this project. From 31 July, with the commitment of the Federal Government, we are in that phase of consolidation of marketing and of investment, and a number of things need to be done as a consequence of that. The fact is that the chief executive of the MFP is in Japan at this very moment. At the Australian Japan Business Cooperation Council meeting in Nagoya and a number of centres he will be discussing the project.

Equally, the Commonwealth Government is involved in such marketing procedures. On the question of incentives, I have already explained to the House that a number of things could be done in conjunction with projects generally at State and Federal level which, packaged together, provide very good incentives to Australian or international investors. They are part of what we normally do.

As far as a major infrastructure project such as the MFP is concerned, for some considerable time already I have been urging the Federal Government to look at the tax treatment, in particular, of such projects, to see whether some of them can go ahead. I should have thought that that was a very urgent requirement. In consequence of my representations, the Commonwealth has established—

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order!

The Hon. J.C. BANNON: —a working party, which will present a paper at the forthcoming Premiers Conference. I hope that members opposite show some support for that because it can attract more private sector investment to projects of the nature of the MFP.

WATER STORAGE

Mr De LAINE (Price): Will the Minister of Water Resources advise whether recent rainfall in the catchment areas has resulted in good inflow to the metropolitan reservoirs? How much water is now held in storage?

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order!

Mr De LAINE: How does this compare with last year?

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order! The Chair cannot hear the question. Members may not want to hear it, but the Chair does. The Minister is about to respond and the Chair wishes to hear that response.

The Hon. S.M. LENEHAN: I suppose it could be said that this question is in memory of previous Ministers of Water Resources whom I am sure, if they were in the House, would be delighted with the answer I am about to give. In fact, one former Minister who is in the House is delighted, and I am pleased about that. I know that everyone is vitally interested in the question of water quality and quantity with respect to Adelaide. This year, the late rains have been very successful, and our reservoirs now hold 177 000 megalitres of water, compared with a total capacity of some 202 000 megalitres. For the mathematicians amongst us, that means that we now hold 88 per cent of our storage capacity, which is a 10 per cent improvement on last year. I am delighted to be given credit for the late rains, the water storage and the fact that we are 10 per cent up on last year.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order! The Minister will resume her seat. Again, the Chair is having great difficulty in hearing the response.

The Hon. S.M. LENEHAN: For those members who are showing such vital interest in this question, I inform them that the Kangaroo Creek and Hope Valley reservoirs are both full and that the Mount Bold, Happy Valley and Millbrook storages are above 98 per cent capacity. I would not want the Opposition to think that I am only about good news, because there is a note of caution in my answer. Notwithstanding the vitally important levels within our storage system, we will still need to pump water from the Murray River this year. That highlights the vital importance of water conservation for the city of Adelaide and, indeed, the need for us to be ever vigilant about the quantity and the quality of South Australian water.

STATE GOVERNMENT INSURANCE COMMISSION

The Hon. B.C. EASTICK (Light): My question is directed to the Treasurer. When will SGIC publish its full annual report for last financial year? Why did it publish a document dated 16 August 1991 under the title 'SGIC Annual Report for the Financial Year 1990-91' if it is not its annual report? In a letter dated 10 October 1991 the Premier wrote to me admitting that SGIC had wrongly claimed to list all 'members and officers who are members of the governing body of a body corporate as at the date of this report' when a large number of such directorships were excluded. He also admitted that SGIC had failed to list all the directorships required to be listed by its Act. This failure occurred despite the incomplete reporting of directorships having been raised in the House last year.

The Premier's excuse for these latest breaches was that the document I quoted from was not SGIC's full annual report which he said would be published later this year. The report published on 16 August and referred to in my question was tabled in this House on 29 August 1991 in typewritten form and without a hard cover. Both the hard cover and typewritten documents commence with this statement:

> The commissioners present their report together with the accounts of the State Government Insurance Commission (SGIC) and its consolidated accounts for the group for the year ended 30 June 1991.

The Hon. J.C. BANNON: I have already explained to the House that the reason that was done is that I issued an instruction that all our financial institutions should table their accounts, should have their accounts ready for presentation to Parliament, by the time I presented the budget, so on the same day we could have a total picture of the State's finances. That caused considerable difficulty in terms of timing for those organisations but I am delighted to say that they were able to meet it.

In the case of the State Bank, it was able to produce its report but, as I said at the time, it needed a little longer in order to comply with the new accounting standard, which others are not complying with until later this year, and that a set of accounts in the form of that accounting standard would be issued. In the case of SGIC, it was not able to produce, nor in the time available did I think it was reasonable to expect it to produce, its full, properly printed report representing the official annual report of the SGIC, but it was able to produce its annual accounts and the text of the body of the report.

I was not making any excuse in my letter to the honourable member and I thank him for raising the matter. I appreciate that he did. I was simply pointing out that the official annual report of SGIC, the printed, bound version that is distributed and represents the official record, is still under preparation and that further material will be involved in it. The report that I presented on 16 August was the report of SGIC, but not the official, printed one and the official accounts. I explained why it was done in that form and if the honourable member's view is that I should not have presented it, I am afraid that I disagree with him. I think it was very important on that date that we showed the markets, and in doing that we were justified because the markets reaffirmed our ratings, and that we showed the public, and again we were justified because we were better able to present the overall financial and debt picture of the State than if we had not done so.

STATE EXPORT PERFORMANCE

The Hon. T.H. HEMMINGS (Napier): As this is International Business Week, will the Minister of Industry, Trade and Technology advise the House of the State's export performance over the past four years?

The Hon. LYNN ARNOLD: I thank the honourable member for his question but I have to say that I am not in a position to give him the figures for the last financial year because they have not been processed. However, I can provide figures for the previous 10 years, and I will seek leave to insert a statistical table.

At the start of the decade when the Tonkin Government was in power, South Australia was a net importer of traded goods and services. In other words, it ran at a trading deficit because we sold less overseas than we bought in this State. The figure was quite a significant variation. Throughout the 1980s, the position turned around so that by the middle to late 1980s we saw a significant surplus of South Australian goods sold overseas compared with those goods that were imported into this State.

Even if we take account of the goods that are landed in other States for transshipping into South Australia, we still have a surplus on traded goods and services. In fact, the figure for 1989-90, the last year for which financial figures are available, in unadjusted terms is $626 million credit and, if it is adjusted for goods coming from other States (but originally from overseas), the figure is estimated to be in excess of $300 million. The reality is that South Australia has had a creditable performance since the election of this Government—

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order!

The Hon. LYNN ARNOLD: —in terms of the export of goods and services. If the rest of the country was able to generate the surplus in traded goods and services consistently that we have had in South Australia since 1983-84, we would not find the balance of payments problems that are facing this country at large. That is to the credit of South Australian business, producers and miners, and it is firmly to the credit of this Government for working with business, miners and producers in creating the type of environment needed. Even in these tough times we find that South Australia is out there winning sales overseas, and I commend business for doing that, because that will be the substance of our survival as we successfully develop export markets.

STATE BANK

Mr MATTHEW (Bright): My question is directed to the Treasurer. As the State Bank of South Australia had an exposure of more than $20 million to the National Safety Council and has lost most if not all of this money, will the Treasurer seek a response from the Federal Government to assertions by the former head of the council's Victorian division, the late John Friedrich, in his just published autobiography, that the Federal Government had encouraged banks to lend to the NSC 'as a method of payment for certain services' the Federal Government itself did not want to be seen to be directly paying for?

The Hon. J.C. BANNON: I thank the honourable member for drawing that quote to my attention. I was not aware of it. I will look at it and see whether it is worth pursuing.

PORT AUGUSTA HOUSING

Mrs HUTCHISON (Stuart): Is the Minister of Correctional Services aware of potential housing problems facing the Department of Correctional Services when middle and upper level staff are recruited from outside the area for the redeveloped Port Augusta prison? What steps have been taken to address this problem? Currently there is a shortage of housing in the Port Augusta area and some concern has been expressed about housing arrangements for prison staff recruited from outside the Port Augusta area.

The Hon. FRANK BLEVINS: I thank the member for Stuart for her question and for her interest and assistance in dealing with what is a real problem, that is, a significant influx of people into a provincial city that already has a housing problem. In its planning for the Port Augusta prison redevelopment, the Department of Correctional Services is aware of the potential housing problem in that city. Research undertaken by the department indicates that the availability of rental housing is restricted and limited suitable housing appears to be on the market for sale. The department has consulted with local real estate agents, Port Augusta council, the South Australian Housing Trust and the Office of Government Employee Housing on this matter with a view to assisting departmental staff moving to Port Augusta to find suitable housing. Discussions with local contractors have not been fruitful because the extent of the risk is unknown and, quite rightly, the department is unable to give purchase guarantees.

An honourable member interjecting:

The Hon. FRANK BLEVINS: I am not sure. However, in an effort to limit the problem and stimulate the local housing market, and with the Government's full support, the department has decided to purchase land at Port Augusta and transport eight houses from ETSA at Leigh Creek. The plan is to pay full commercial costs and debt servicing, house purchase and relocation, landscaping and associated costs. Working with local real estate agents the department will offer the houses for sale at realistic market prices to existing staff taking up transfers or promotional positions in Port Augusta. In the unlikely event that the houses are not sold in this way they will be offered on the open market.

The department recognises that this action will only partly relieve the potential housing problem for its staff in Port Augusta. However, the department is confident that, once the potential growth of purchasing on the rental market is fully recognised, local contractors and entrepreneurs will extend the initiative taken by the department to the benefit of the local community.

In closing, I want to assure the member for Stuart and the community of Port Augusta that the local waiting list

for Housing Trust accommodation will in no way be affected by any special measures taken to assist correctional staff with their housing problems. We are not claiming any preferential treatment on the South Australian Housing Trust list to the detriment of any of the residents at Port Augusta who have certainly been on the list longer than any of the new employees who go to Port Augusta to work in the expanded prison. It is a creative way of dealing with the problem.

I know that the member for Stuart has been at the forefront in discussions with the Department of Correctional Services and other interested parties in Port Augusta in attempting to find homes for this quite significant influx of new people to the city. I believe that those people will benefit the city enormously in many ways, not least of all in a commercial sense, and any assistance we can give them on a purely commercial basis to satisfy their housing needs will be to the benefit of Port Augusta. Again, I thank the member for Stuart for her question and for her assistance.

ELECTRICITY CHARGES

Mr LEWIS (Murray-Mallee): Does the Minister of Mines and Energy recognise and understand that, by the Government's taking the extra $45 million from ETSA this year on top of its 5 per cent levy on gross electricity sales, and the almost 14 per cent charged on its capital, electricity prices in South Australia are increasing faster than those in any other State? On page 22 of ETSA's 1990-91 annual report tabled yesterday, it is indicated that, despite increased ETSA efficiency, the Government increased electricity prices by 5.7 per cent from 1 July, almost triple the rise made in July 1990. The 5.7 per cent increase was higher than in any other State, even though ETSA's electricity price was already the second-highest in the Commonwealth.

The Hon. J.H.C. KLUNDER: I should point out that, at the time when we were increasing electricity prices by an average of only 2 per cent (and I refer to the previous year), we were actually taking more money out of ETSA than we took this year. I should also point out to the honourable member that the amount of money we are actually taking out of ETSA is nowhere near the amount we would have been taking out of ETSA if we had followed the Liberal Party's prescription, either on the honourable member's own requirement of there being a 4 per cent real rate of return, or the Deputy Leader's position of taking a 7 per cent real rate of return.

HOUSING TRUST RENTALS

Mr HAMILTON (Albert Park): Will the Minister of Housing and Construction inform the House whether the South Australian Housing Trust raised its general rent in 1984 specifically to recover costs incurred through the payment of excess water charges which the trust undertook on behalf of tenants in that year? There have been claims in the media and particularly on the ABC yesterday morning, including claims by some South Australian Housing Trust tenants, that the trust raised its rental charges in 1984 specifically to meet costs incurred through excess water charges. The allegation is that the trust is now double-dipping by once again charging tenants for excess water usage.

The Hon. M.K. MAYES: The answer is 'No'. The decision was taken in 1984 to pay for excess water through the trust's normal revenue. There was no increase in rents in 1985—none at all. I will give the House the background to reinforce the statement that there was no claim against tenants as a consequence of rent increases because of excess water. I will briefly run through the rent changes that occurred.

In October 1983, a 10 per cent increase in rents followed a 12.5 per cent increase in the consumer price index. In February 1984, a further 4 per cent increase was applied to rents for single unit accommodation. This was an adjustment to the differential between single unit and double unit housing. In October 1984, there was a general rent increase of 7 per cent following a CPI increase of 6.2 per cent, and in 1985 there was no rent increase at all. In effect, it is quite clear that no excess water charges were included in any rent increases that were made following the decision of 1984 to remove from trust tenants the requirement to pay for excess water. The estimated cost to the trust for those people with individual meters—who can, in fact, have their water usage monitored—is around $7 million in any year. Of course, that is a cost that removes the opportunity for the trust to use those funds for housing—to offer South Australians who are waiting for housing that same opportunity.

It is very clear that the trust had to make a decision with regard to excess water. It is equitable and it fits with what individual tenants in private accommodation face, and, of course, the situation that private owners face. So, there is an equity base right across the community. We think that is a justified situation. There is a good deal of speculation about what flowed from the decision in 1984 and, quite clearly from the figures, this was not passed on in the way of rent increases to trust tenants.

FOREST VALUATIONS

The Hon. H. ALLISON (Mount Gambier): Will the Minister of Forests explain the $180 million discrepancy between the valuation of forests by the Woods and Forests Department and the South Australian Government Financing Authority? On page 228 of the Auditor-General's Report (No. 16) it is clearly shown that the Woods and Forests Department revalued its forests upwards from $458 million to $524 million and, from memory, there was a $40 million abnormal adjustment. That was over the past 12 months, but the South Australian Government Financing Authority's Annual Report (page 41) indicates that over the same period the South Australian Government Financing Authority, which holds a 100 per cent equity in the forests, has revalued its holding downwards from $347 million to $343.4 million, based, as the authority claims, on a valuation by independent experts conducted in July 1991. Therefore, that leaves a discrepancy between the two departmental valuations of almost $180 million.

The Hon. J.H.C. KLUNDER: I am not in a position to comment on SAFA's revaluation or evaluation of the forests. The evaluation that the department did involves several factors and I will get the honourable member a written statement so that the information is accurate.

STOLEN CARS

Mr HAMILTON (Albert Park): Will the Minister of Transport report to the House—

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order!

Mr HAMILTON: Aren't you interested in stolen cars and crime?

The SPEAKER: Order! The member for Albert Park will address his question through the Chair.

Mr HAMILTON: Will the Minister report to the House the progress in relation to vehicle identification numbers? Given the expressed concern of members of the Opposition and, indeed, members of the Government in relation to crime in this State, I understand that in certain parts of the world a large number of car parts are stamped with an identification number to assist police if a car is stolen, stripped or otherwise disposed of. This is very important and relevant to all those people in the community who are concerned about the large number of stolen cars.

The Hon. FRANK BLEVINS: This is a very important question and a very important issue. When we talk about crime statistics, it is very difficult to get those statistics down in other than a very long, slow, grinding way, with one exception. The exception is car theft. In Australia, for some reason, it is an epidemic. It is a much greater problem here than it is in the United States, for example. We all think of the United States as being some kind of country full of crime—

An honourable member interjecting:

The Hon. FRANK BLEVINS: We do not with England. We see England in a very different light. We see America as the crime country of the world. In this case, it is lagging behind Australia, because I understand that Australia has a higher rate of car theft than almost anywhere else in the world. There are various reasons for that, of course. Straight-out joy-riding is extraordinarily difficult to deal with. I believe that the manufacturers can do something, and I am pleased about, and want to congratulate General Motors on, the new security system it has installed in certain of its new vehicles.

That is a great step forward, because General Motors' vehicles are among the most popular to be stolen. However, whether the new security system will in any way deter the professional car thief as opposed to the joy-rider is another question again, because the professional car thief wants these cars to resell them, to strip them, to sell the parts individually or to rebuild cars that have been written off. Anyone who saw *The Investigators* on the ABC on Tuesday would have had a very good idea of the problem. For a long time, I have been advocating vehicle identification numbers being stamped on all the significant parts of the vehicle, which will make it very much harder for the criminal element in our community to strip the cars, to take them apart and to sell the individual parts, because those parts will be identified.

It will be a uniform number throughout the vehicle. The police are very strongly in favour of this, as are most of my ministerial colleagues throughout Australia. ATAC, the ministerial council comprising all Ministers, has asked for an investigation of this proposal, and that investigation is taking place. I was bitterly disappointed to hear at the last ATAC meeting from the vehicle manufacturers that they were opposed to this method of assisting in securing vehicles. Their claim was that it would be too costly; that it would cost the industry X million dollars every year.

What they did was take a $15 cost, multiply it by the number of vehicles and then say, 'There is the millions of dollars cost to the community.' It is an absolutely nonsensical argument, as far as I am concerned. Some of the vehicle manufacturers in Australia are already doing for the export market what they will not do for Australian motorists. That is absolutely unconscionable. I can assure the member for Albert Park and the House that this Government will continue to press for a design rule to be brought in by the Australian Government that insists that all significant car parts are stamped with an identification number, which is one way in which we can prevent crime, one way in which we can bring the statistics down and, more importantly to the individual motorist I suppose, one way in which we can ensure to some extent that we can all have our vehicles until we want to dispose of them, rather than until someone wants to take them away from us.

It will have the other benefit of bringing down comprehensive car insurance premiums, because a very large part of the premium we all pay when we insure our cars results from the very high rate of vehicle theft. So, for the sake of $15 at the point of manufacture, this benefit can be available to Australian motorists. I know that some members of the Opposition would join me in calling on the Australian Government to ensure as soon as possible that vehicle manufacturers institute this program on the assembly line.

MULTIFUNCTION POLIS

Mr VENNING (Custance): My question is directed to the Premier. What procedures will be adopted to attract applications from overseas and interstate for the vital job of chief executive of the MFP, and what remuneration package will go with the position?

The Hon. J.C. BANNON: The MFP corporation is intended to be established by Act of Parliament. Once that legislation has passed through this House, a corporation will be appointed, and it will be its job to appoint a chief executive.

OVERSEAS MARKETING

The Hon. T.H. HEMMINGS (Napier): What overseas marketing does the Minister of Industry, Trade and Technology believe South Australian business should be targeting in terms of export growth?

The Hon. LYNN ARNOLD: I thank the honourable member for his question. Obviously, International Business Week has incited his considerable interest. There are some markets overseas that South Australian firms have pioneered, and they have achieved a greater degree of penetration than have other States. I have often quoted the figure for the Middle East countries, where 21 per cent of our exports go, whereas for the nation the figure is 5 per cent. A third of the country's exports to Iran come from South Australia.

Other markets where we have greater than our share include New Zealand, the Soviet Union (in better times, of course), formerly West Germany (now Germany), China and, to a lesser extent, the United Kingdom. However, there are some markets where South Australian firms have not achieved the degree of penetration that has been achieved by firms in other States of Australia. In other words, our share of the exports to those countries is below what our overall export share of the country's trade would suggest. They vary at the margin from countries such as Singapore, Taiwan and the United States, where we are very close to our share, to other countries where we are significantly below it. We are significantly below our share in those countries referred to as the 'Asian dragons', and that is a matter of some concern. The Republic of Korea pulls that figure down quite badly. It is a market in which we are under-represented in terms of exports.

Japan is also a matter for concern. Exports to Japan are some 2.9 per cent below—and I mean that in whole terms—

our share. That means that we do not get the sales that we should be getting if we were as successful as firms in other States in relation to that market. In terms of targeting overseas markets, it is important that we maintain the healthy mix that we see in our basket of exports from this State. Those exports comprise 55 per cent manufactured goods: 40 per cent (or thereabouts) agricultural, unprocessed commodities; and some 3 or 4 per cent mineral products, with the balance being services that are exported. That is a healthy mix of exports. An over-reliance on any one particular sector could heighten the vulnerability of our regional economy in the years to come. Therefore, it is important that we try to maintain that, and I regard that as an important target that we should be considering. I seek leave to have two statistical tables inserted in *Hansard* without my reading them.

Leave granted.

SOUTH AUSTRALIA'S OVERSEAS IMPORTS AND EXPORTS
Unadjusted for imported goods bound for South Australia landing interstate and the reverse for export from South Australia

	South Australia	
	$ m	% change on year
1981-82	1 337	—
1982-83	1 244	−7.0
1983-84	1 319	+6.0
1984-85	1 603	+21.5
1985-86	1 737	+8.4
1986-87	1 502	−13.5
1987-88	1 805	+20.2
1988-89	1 862	+3.2
1989-90	2 050	+10.1
1981-82	1 276	—
1982-83	1 227	−3.8
1983-84	1 636	+33.3
1984-85	1 921	+17.4
1985-86	1 988	+3.5
1986-87	2 044	+2.8
1987-88	2 263	+10.6
1988-89	2 464	+8.9
1989-90	2 676	+8.6

BALANCE OF TRADED GOODS AND SERVICES

	$ m
1981-82	Dr 61
1982-83	Dr 17
1983-84	Cr 317
1984-85	Cr 318
1985-86	Cr 251
1986-87	Cr 542
1987-88	Cr 458
1988-89	Cr 602
1989-90	Cr 626

RELATIVE PENETRATION OF OVERSEAS MARKETS
1989-90 (Source: South Australian Treasury)

Country	Variance (% points above/ below SA's share of exports to selected markets)
Iran	29.8
New Zealand	5.6
USSR	4.8
West Germany	2.3
China	1.5
UK	1.1
EC	0.1
Singapore	−0.9
Taiwan	−1.0
USA	−1.0

RELATIVE PENETRATION OF OVERSEAS MARKETS
1989-90 (Source: South Australian Treasury)

Country	Variance (% points above/ below SA's share of exports to selected markets)
France	−1.1
Hong Kong	−1.5
Italy	−1.5
Asian dragons	−1.9
Japan	−2.9
South Korea	−3.5

SOUTH AUSTRALIA INC.

Mrs KOTZ (Newland): Does the Premier stand by his statement to the House on 8 August that South Australia Inc. does not exist?

The Hon. J.C. BANNON: Yes, I do.

The SPEAKER: Order! Call on the business of the day.

PAPER TABLED

The following paper was laid on the table:

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

Commissioner of Police Report 1990-91.

STATE EMERGENCY SERVICE (IMMUNITY FOR MEMBERS) AMENDMENT BILL

The Hon. J.H.C. KLUNDER (Minister of Emergency Services) obtained leave and introduced a Bill for an Act to amend the State Emergency Service Act 1987. Read a first time.

The Hon. J.H.C. KLUNDER: I move:

That this Bill be now read a second time.

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

Leave granted.

Explanation of Bill

This Bill has been introduced to amend the State Emergency Service Act 1987 to provide the State Emergency Service with sufficient authority when dealing with emergency situations and to provide accompanying immunity from civil and criminal liability in the exercise of duties associated with such situations. The purpose of the amendment is to bring the call-out system operated by the Service for many years within the framework of the Act.

The Bill also provides for the repeal of section 18 of the State Emergency Service Act. Section 18 is now obsolete, in view of the replacement provisions relating to volunteer workers, under the Workers Compensation and Rehabilitation Act 1986.

The State Emergency Service Act 1987 and Regulations came into operation on 1 January 1988. The Act provides for the exercise of powers by emergency officers, pursuant to section 12 of the Act, when an emergency order is in

force pursuant to section 11 of the Act. Under section 15 of the Act, an emergency officer may, on the request of an authority specified thereunder, assist in dealing with an emergency. Section 12 (2) *(i)* permits the emergency officer to direct any person to assist in the exercise of powers under that section.

The Act therefore currently provides for the exercise of powers by emergency officers and contemplates that such powers will be exercised with the assistance of other volunteers. The emergency officer is empowered to act only when an emergency order is in force, or when assisting certain authorities in dealing with an emergency.

Section 17 of the Act provides immunity from liability in the exercise or discharge of these powers and duties and transfers any liability incurred, to the Crown. Whilst volunteer members and volunteers assisting the State Emergency Service, are therefore protected from liability in the exercise of powers pursuant to the Act, such immunity does not extend to members and volunteers, in circumstances occurring outside the bounds of sections 12 and 15 of the Act.

It has been normal practice for many years that a State Emergency Service Unit responds to an emergency call for assistance direct from a member of the public. It may be the case that a home may be threatened or damaged by storm or flood activity. In this instance neither an emergency order is in force nor have the Police, Fire Service or any authority described under section 15 specifically requested such assistance. It is not intended that this method of response be discontinued.

Accordingly, emergency officers and volunteers may be performing a function which is outside the Act only because of a different method of activation. Upon proclamation of the Act, all Unit Controllers and Deputy Unit Controllers were appointed emergency officers under section 10 of the Act. No other volunteer members of the Service have been appointed emergency officers nor is it envisaged that such appointments will be made in the future. The Service comprises some 2 700 volunteer members, operating out of some 66 registered State Emergency Service units, spread across both metropolitan and country areas. In all, approximately 130 of the membership of 2 700 are emergency officers.

It has become apparent since the inception of the State Emergency Service Act, that the Service requires greater authority and accompanying immunity from liability in respect of its call-out procedure. Prior to the proclamation of the Act, a public liability insurance policy was in place to cover volunteer members of the Service. The Government now self-insures and it is questionable that complete indemnity can be provided, given that the Act does not provide complete authority and immunity, in respect of all activities undertaken by the State Emergency Service.

Clause 4 of the Bill amends section 8 of the Act, by providing that it is a function of the Service to respond to emergency calls and where appropriate, provide assistance in any situation of need whether or not the situation constitutes an emergency.

Clause 5 amends section 15 to permit members of the Service who are not emergency officers to assist as 'assistant emergency officers', when requested to do so, pursuant to section 15.

These amendments extend the scope of the Act, insofar as members of the service can now respond to calls for assistance received directly from the public in the absence of an emergency order and/or assist when requested to do so, in the absence of an emergency officer.

Whilst the amendments increase the scope of authority capable of being exercised under the Act, it must be pointed out that there is no intention to move control away from emergency officers in respect of call-out activation.

It is envisaged, that when a call for assistance is received directly from the public or another agency, the emergency officer will be able to respond to that call and deal with the emergency, even though there is no emergency order in force. It will be the emergency officer who will decide whether to respond, assess the nature of the response and give the direction for volunteers to attend and perform such duties as are consistent with those contained in section 12 of the Act.

It is not intended that volunteers will automatically assume the powers exercisable by emergency officers. Volunteers will still be acting at the direction of an emergency officer. Emergency officers, however, will not be bound by an emergency order. Volunteers will therefore be able to continue their involvement in the routine tasks they already perform on call out.

Scope exists for performing certain duties as prescribed by section 12, in the absence of an emergency order. Those activities which might be engaged in by volunteers at the initial direction, but in the absence of an emergency officer, include search or cliff rescue and vehicle accident rescue and assistance, normally in the event of storm, flood or building damage. These are associated with those powers exercisable under section 12 (2) *(c)*, *(e)*, *(f)*, *(g)* and *(i)*. Those powers exercisable pursuant to section 12 *(a)*, *(b)*, *(d)* and *(h)*, that is, assuming control of real and personal property, directing evacuation, controlling buildings, structures and vehicles and removal of obstructing personnel, would generally only be used in extraordinary circumstances such as disaster or major emergency and would require an emergency order, if other emergency organisations were not able to deal with the emergency. It is necessary for such control to be maintained given that liability will attach to the Crown.

In regard to the question of liability, clause 6 of the Bill, amends section 17 of the Act, by substituting a new subsection (1) which now includes reference to 'an assistant emergency officer' and also now refers to the exercise, performance or discharge of a 'function' under the Act. Immunity is therefore provided for members now falling into the category of 'assistant emergency officers' and for all those who are exercising the call-out function, contemplated by the amendment to section 8.

Finally, clause 7 repeals section 18 of the Act, which was suspended when the Act was proclaimed. With the proclamation of the Workers Compensation and Rehabilitation Act, section 18 became redundant. Section 18 applies the now repealed Workers Compensation Act 1971 to volunteer emergency officers. State Emergency Service volunteers, presently receive full WorkCover benefits by arrangement with the Government. Consideration is being given to formalising this arrangement by making a regulation under section 103a of the Workers Compensation and Rehabilitation Act, declaring State Emergency Service volunteers to be a prescribed class of volunteers performing work of a prescribed class that is of benefit to the State and therefore whose presumptive employee is the Crown. This has occurred in relation to Country Fire Services volunteers.

Clause 1 is formal.

Clause 2 provides for the measure to be brought into operation by proclamation.

Clause 3 amends section 3 of the principal Act, the interpretation section, by adding a definition of 'assistant emergency officer'. This term is defined as a member of an SES

unit who has not been appointed under the Act as an emergency officer.

Clause 4 amends section 8 of the principal Act which sets out the function of the State Emergency Service. The clause adds a new function designed to make it clear that SES units may respond to emergency calls and, where appropriate, render assistance in any situation of need whether or not the situation constitutes an emergency as such.

Clause 5 amends section 15 of the principal Act. This section presently provides that an emergency officer may, on request by an appropriate officer of the other authority concerned, provide assistance to deal with an emergency that is being dealt with by the police or under the State Disaster Act 1980, the South Australian Metropolitan Fire Service Act 1936 or the Country Fires Act 1989, or an emergency that has occurred outside the State. The clause amends this section so that the power to provide such assistance also extends to assistant emergency officers, that is, those members of SES units not appointed to be emergency officers.

Clause 6 amends section 17 of the principal Act which presently provides an immunity from personal liability for emergency officers and persons assisting at the direction of emergency officers in respect of acts or omissions in good faith in the exercise or discharge, or purported exercise or discharge, of powers or duties under the Act. This immunity is extended to assistant emergency officers under the clause and made to relate expressly to the performance of functions under the Act. The effect of this is to make it clear that all members of SES units are protected when rendering assistance whether or not an emergency exists (see the amendment proposed by clause 4 to section 8 of the Act) and that assistant emergency officers are protected whether or not it is clear that they are acting at the direction of an emergency officer at the particular time that a question of civil or criminal liability arises.

Clause 7 provides for the repeal of section 18 of the principal Act relating to workers compensation for volunteer members of SES units. This matter is now provided for by provisions of the Workers Compensation and Rehabilitation Act 1986.

Mr LEWIS secured the adjournment of the debate.

EVIDENCE AMENDMENT BILL

Second reading.

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

Provisions similar to the provisions of this Bill are presently to be found in sections 152, 153 and 154 of the Justices Act 1921. They are more appropriately placed in the Evidence Act than in the Justices Act (or Summary Procedure Act as it is to be called in the future).

The provisions deal with, first, taking statements from persons who are dangerously ill. The statements may be admitted in evidence at a preliminary hearing or trial if the person making the statement is dead or unable to give evidence at the preliminary hearing or trial. The provisions secondly deal with the situation where a statement from a witness has been filed at a preliminary hearing, or the witness has given oral evidence, and has subsequently died or becomes so ill as to be unable to give evidence at the trial. Provision is made for the record of the witness's evidence at the preliminary hearing to be read as evidence at the trial. The court has a discretion to admit the evidence and will not allow the prosecutor to present the evidence if, in the circumstances of the case, it would be unfair to the defendant.

Clauses 1 and 2 are formal.

Clause 3 inserts evidentiary provisions in relation to evidence from witnesses who are seriously ill or who die.

New section 34j establishes a special procedure for obtaining a statement of a witness who is seriously ill and admitting the statement in evidence in a prosecution for an indictable offence. The statement can be taken on the part of the prosecution or the defence. It can only be given by a person who is dangerously ill and, in the opinion of a medical practitioner, unlikely to recover from the illness. The statement is to be taken by a magistrate or justice and must usually be taken under oath. The opposing party must have had reasonable notice of the proposal to obtain the statement and a reasonable opportunity to attend and cross-examine the witness. The statement is admissible in evidence at the preliminary examination or trial of the charge if the person from whom the statement was taken is dead or unable to give evidence.

New section 34k provides that where a witness at a preliminary examination of a charge of an indictable offence subsequently dies or becomes seriously ill, the court of trial may give leave to admit the record of evidence given at the preliminary examination. A limitation is imposed on the granting of such leave where the evidence is for the prosecution. If the court considers that admission of the evidence without the opportunity of cross-examination would, in the circumstances of the case, be unfair to the defendant it must not grant leave.

Mr INGERSON secured the adjournment of the debate.

GEOGRAPHICAL NAMES BILL

Consideration in Committee of the Legislative Council's amendments:

No. 1. Page 2, line 1 (clause 4)—Strike out 'or'.

No. 2. Page 2 (clause 4)—After line 12, insert the following:

'or *(d)* a place prescribed by regulation.'.

No. 3. Page 2, lines 13 to 16 (clause 4)—Leave out these lines.

No. 4. Page 4, line 4 (clause 8)—After 'Surveyor-General' insert 'and the committee'.

The Hon. S.M. LENEHAN: I move:

That the Legislative Council's amendments be agreed to.

In accepting these amendments, I point out that the second amendment inserts a new paragraph *(d)*. The third amendment ensures that a place to be exempt from the Act is exempted by regulation rather than by proclamation. The last amendment, relating to the committee and the Surveyor-General, ensures that the Minister must take into account the advice that is provided by the Surveyor-General. Adding those words is just a bit of tidying up, and I am happy to accept the amendments.

Mr LEWIS: The Opposition is happy to concur with the Government's wish and accepts the amendments.

Motion carried.

STANDING ORDERS COMMITTEE REPORT

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

That the report be noted.

I move this motion instead of the more usual motion for the adoption of the report because a number of changes to the committee's proposal have been suggested to me. Later, with the leave of the House, I intend to move the sessional orders in an amended form to incorporate those suggestions. I will canvass the proposed changes now. The effect of the proposed changes is that the two hours per week for private member's business would be extended to 3½ hours, from 7.30 p.m. to 8.30 p.m. on Wednesdays and 10.30 a.m. to 1 p.m. on Thursdays. Private member's Bills will be dealt with on Wednesday evenings, disallowance motions and committee matters from 10.30 a.m. to 11.30 a.m. on Thursdays and other motions from 11.30 a.m. to 1 p.m. on the same day. Notices of motion have priority within their respective categories and can be postponed from week to week.

Time limits have been reduced to 15 minutes for the mover, 15 minutes for a member if opposing the proposition, 10 minutes for all other members and five minutes for a reply. Leave to continue remarks may not be sought, although it will be automatic if the time allotted for the category expires. All adjourned business on the Notice Paper will be separated into the three categories, with Bills being set down for Wednesdays and motions for Thursdays. An amendment which is a direct negative of the question may not be proposed. Questions on Notice must be handed in by the adjournment of the House on Wednesday for inclusion in the Notice Paper for the following Tuesday.

It is proposed that there be two grievance debates: the first immediately after Question Time each day, which would consist of six members for five minutes each; and the second as we have now, that is, if the House adjourns by 10 p.m. on Tuesday or Wednesday, but for 20 minutes only. The 5 p.m. provision on Thursday will no longer apply, and nor will there be a grievance at the Thursday adjournment. I should explain that this is an interim report, and I understand that the committee is considering a number of changes to Standing Orders. The two proposals that we are putting forward were considered to be of sufficient importance to be dealt with more urgently.

There is one other matter that I would raise in commending the motion to the House. If the motion passes in its present form, we will have the unintended consequence of doing away with the adjournment debate this afternoon, should the opportunity arise. As that is an unintended consequence, there are two ways that we can get around it. One would be to amend the motion so that the sessional orders apply from Tuesday of next week. The second would be to simply suspend so much of the sessional orders this afternoon to allow the adjournment debate to occur. I favour the latter procedure, and I give notice that I will seek the concurrence of members at the appropriate time should the opportunity for an adjournment debate arise. I commend the motion to the House.

Mr GUNN (Eyre): I am pleased to participate in this debate, because I was given the task by my parliamentary colleagues in the Liberal Party, as a member of the Standing Orders Committee, to initiate a number of the suggestions I put to you, Mr Speaker, as Chairman of the committee. I asked the committee to consider a range of amendments to Standing Orders to allow for the greater participation of members. The Opposition strongly believes that Parliament is a forum not just for the Government. Parliament is elected to consider all points of view, and all members should be able to participate fully.

I was interested to note recently the considerable lather the press in New South Wales worked itself into when for the first time the New South Wales Leader of the Opposition was given the opportunity to introduce a Bill and have it read for the second time. I find such a state of affairs amazing and quite undemocratic. Really, it is an affront to democracy that the New South Wales Parliament does not permit private members to introduce legislation. Fortunately, we are much more progressive in South Australia.

The Hon. Jennifer Cashmore: Or less regressive.

Mr GUNN: At least we are progressive in allowing members to bring matters to the attention of Parliament. Unfortunately, the practice has developed that few matters are brought to a successful conclusion because the Government of the day and others have been able to block the Notice Paper, to talk things out and generally frustrate the will of members who want to bring matters forward for debate and have them discussed properly and brought to a conclusion.

The proposed changes to the sessional orders will, I hope in some way, redress that. As the Minister has rightly pointed out, these are not the recommendations of the Standing Orders Committee. The committee made a number of suggestions that obviously the Government did not accept, and I understand that there has been some discussion about what has been accepted and what has not been accepted. Members who have been around here for a long time know that, if they get half of what they ask for, they are doing well because Governments are hesitant to give Oppositions any benefits or assistance that may make life difficult for the Government. If I were a cynic, I might suggest that the Government has agreed to these amendments because it realises that it is in a transition period, that it is about to move to the Opposition benches. That would be my view if I was a cynic.

The Hon. B.C. Eastick: That would be out of character!

Mr GUNN: Yes, quite out of character. I have always been a most charitable person in this place. However, the capacity on a daily basis for at least six members to raise matters of public importance is in my view essential for the running of the Parliament and for the welfare of the people of this State as a whole. At least once a fortnight most back bench members will have the opportunity to raise a matter of importance, and I sincerely hope that, when the time is allocated for the six five-minute grievance debates, each member will be given an opportunity. I hope that we will not see one or two members attempting to hog the Notice Paper and take precedence over other members. If that situation arises, the Standing Orders Committee will have to have another look at the system.

Further, I do not know why it is necessary for Ministers to be given the opportunity to participate in that debate, because they always have the ability to make a ministerial statement, either before Question Time or at any other time during the day, with the concurrence of the House. In my experience, that opportunity is always granted, so I believe the participation of Ministers is unnecessary. I understand that that was part of the agreement, although the committee never envisaged that Ministers would participate in the debate.

I believe that we must look, on a long-term basis, at the situation whereby members put motions on the Notice Paper and leave them there and never bring them on for debate. The effect of that is often to prevent other members from bringing matters forward. It is a bit like putting a Question on Notice to stop members asking questions without notice on the same subject. This matter needs careful analysis.

The Standing Orders Committee gave all these matters a great deal of time and consideration, as you are aware, Mr Speaker. I am pleased to say that the committee did seek to come to an agreement on all these matters. It will be

necessary for the Standing Orders Committee to meet on a more regular basis than it has done in the past, because there are a number of other important matters that this Parliament should address.

One is that Parliament should have its own independent funding. It should not be necessary for it to go cap in hand to the Government. The facilities here are inadequate, but I recognise that it is not politically or electorally popular for Governments to spend money on this building, even though it is obviously an asset to the State. It has much significance. However, Governments have not been keen in the past to do so.

If Parliament had an adequate independent budget, some of the urgent improvements required to this building to help with the efficient running of Parliament and to assist in our dealings with the public could be attended to. Particularly in times of economic stress, I recognise that Governments will not spend money on the Parliament if they think they can spend it elsewhere to curry favour. That is a matter that I hope the next Standing Orders Committee report to the Parliament will address.

Other matters are contained in this report that ought to be carefully analysed. I agree that we should not go back to the bad old days with Parliament sitting throughout the night, except in rare circumstances. The amendments will obviously go some way to alleviating that situation. The other matter which I believe has not really been addressed is the urgent need for the Standing Orders Committee to examine closely the setting up of more parliamentary select committees so that members are more involved in the legislative process and have access to more information from Government departments. These amendments will certainly go a long way to improving the standard of the debate in Parliament, but they do not address the steps that are necessary in the public interest.

From my experience in this place—and the Standing Orders have been modified and improved in my 20 years here—there is a need to involve more members of Parliament in the decision-making. The role of Parliament is not for the convenience of Government. Unfortunately, Ministers tend to think that the Parliament is assembled for the convenience and benefit of Government. It was never intended to be so. Parliament is supposed to be a representative body to allow all shades of opinion to be expressed in the Parliament. I am delighted that at least 1½ hours more time will be devoted to private member's business each week. I am delighted that there will be the opportunity for regulations to be properly debated because, with Governments relying more and more on regulations to carry out decisions or to put into effect policies or to raise revenue, it is essential that regulations are properly considered by the Parliament, and that members are not forced into the charade of putting a notice of motion to hold a regulation, whilst never having the opportunity to adequately debate it.

There is an urgent need to amend the Standing Orders in respect of regulations. Unfortunately, Parliament can only agree to them or defeat them. Parliament should have the opportunity to be able to amend regulations. I believe that the Subordinate Legislation Committee should be in a position to amend regulations because, in many cases, in my experience only one or two clauses of a regulation are offensive to the majority of members. At the moment the only course open to the committee is to vote against or accept the whole of the regulations. That is a matter that the Standing Orders Committee of this Parliament should address as a matter of urgency.

I believe it is quite appropriate to restrict members' debating time to put a stop to nonsense such as we have had to put up with recently whereby the member for Napier is attempting to dominate the Notice Paper with what can only be described as drivel. It has been an affront to commonsense for the Parliament to have to listen to some of the nonsense that has flowed from the honourable member in recent weeks. At least in the future we will only have to put up with him for 15 minutes on each occasion.

I am pleased to support the proposed amendments to the sessional orders. I believe they are long overdue. I am very pleased to have been part of the Standing Orders Committee and to have taken part in these deliberations. I am somewhat concerned that the decisions of the Standing Orders Committee have been overridden, but I realise that political reality dictates that committees can recommend what they like but Governments will accept what they believe is fair and reasonable. Governments will never totally accept everything that is recommended, and that is their right. These amendments are probably the most liberal that have been instituted anywhere in Australia.

The Hon. B.C. Eastick: And achievable.

Mr GUNN: And they are achievable. One must be a political realist when dealing with these matters and put forward what is achievable, not perhaps what is desirable. In my view, Parliaments around Australia could take a lead from the Standing Orders which we are about to put into effect in this Parliament because I believe they will certainly be approved. Having sat in the galleries of Parliaments around the world, I must say that the lack of rights of Opposition Parties elsewhere is quite deplorable.

I sincerely hope that some changes will be made in relation to the asking and answering of questions in the future. I really believe that the system of asking questions, with members getting up and asking prepared questions and, in many cases, not understanding what they are asking does not do a great deal for the role of Parliament. Even worse, when Ministers stand up in the Parliament and read long prepared answers—and on some occasions the answer bears little or no relevance to the question asked—really turns the whole system of asking questions in the Parliament into a farce. It becomes a game between two sets of advisers—one on the Government benches and one on the Opposition benches.

I believe that the purpose of asking questions is to obtain information from the Government. Therefore, I look forward to seeing the Standing Orders amended to make some improvements so that we can get closer to the United Kingdom system where, in a very short time, members ask a number of questions and receive brisk and precise answers. The British system is more relevant to an effective parliamentary system. Under that system the public recognises that members are genuinely attempting to obtain information and are not engaged in unnecessary point-scoring.

It has been an interesting exercise to participate in this process, which took some months. I appreciate the role that you played, Mr Speaker, and your Deputy, the member for Elizabeth. Without the involvement of each of you, it is unlikely that we would have got as far down the track as we have. I look forward to the Standing Orders Committee reconvening in the near future to continue to refine the Standing Orders, making them more relevant for the 1990s, so the community can have confidence that the members they send to this place are not gagged but have the ability to raise matters of importance, are able to comment on legislation, and that the Government of the day is forced to account in the Parliament for its actions.

I have pleasure in supporting the report. I recognise that the member for Elizabeth is unhappy about one or two matters, and I am inclined to agree with his point of view. However, a number of my colleagues are concerned that we may be unduly gagging debate in certain areas, and at this stage I am prepared to accept their judgment, even though I have some hesitation about so doing. I am pleased as a matter of principle to support the proposals put forward, even though they are not strictly in accordance with what the Standing Orders Committee recommended.

The Hon. M.J. EVANS (Elizabeth): I share the sentiments expressed by the member for Eyre in his concluding comments. While I am very pleased to see these changes come before the House in a form in which the vast majority of them will presumably be acceptable to the House, it is disappointing to note in the proposal that in many ways they will be varied from what the Standing Orders Committee reached by way of consensus agreement after many months of discussion and consultation. However, that is a matter of detail, which I am sure we will be addressing in the next debate in this sequence. Therefore, I will confine my remarks to the more general matters of noting the report of the Standing Orders Committee.

As an independent member of this House, while being aligned to one of the major political Parties but not part of that political Party, it has always been my view that one of the more important contributions that such a member of Parliament can make is indeed to promote the institution of Parliament itself and to lend whatever support is possible as an individual member to that institution and to try to protect it from some of the problems that beset a Parliament in the modern context. Of course, one of those problems is the dominance of the institution by the Executive Government and, indeed, the dominance of the place by political Parties as a whole.

So, it was with some pleasure that I was able to secure my appointment to the Standing Orders Committee some months ago and to begin the process—and I emphasise the word 'begin' because, of course, this is an interim report of the Standing Orders Committee and I assume and hope that the process will continue beyond today—of the reform of Standing Orders in a meaningful and significant way. The House, of course, formally adopted revised Standing Orders in the last Parliament and they were a useful means of expressing some of the archaic language in more modern terms and in other more acceptable ways. But they did not in fact set about reforming in any meaningful way the actual procedures or processes of this place. They certainly did not grant, as these proposals grant, any significant benefit to private members to allow them to redress part of the balance that has shifted so dramatically in favour of the Executive Government in the past few decades. These Standing Order proposals, as I am sure the report of the Standing Orders Committee so properly expresses, do contribute significantly in that way. I believe that is the most important feature of this interim report.

As an independent member of this House I believe that I have been able to play a useful and important role in contributing to this debate even being brought about, because I doubt that, without the finely balanced way in which this House now finds itself placed numerically, neither the Government nor the Opposition would have treated this opportunity as seriously as they have done and, consequently, ordinary members of this House, representing individuals in the community rather than major political Parties and the vested interest groups that they so often and so ably represent in this place, would not have been able to make the contribution that I believe they will be able to make in the future. I certainly congratulate those who have been involved with me on the committee, including you, Mr Speaker, being able to reach the degree of amicable agreement that we have reached about the vast majority of the provisions that are before the House this afternoon.

The committee met on a number of occasions and went to some trouble to produce a consensus document. That has not followed through to the last minute, but before this time I believe that an acceptable degree of consensus had been achieved, and that is always a very desirable thing. Even without that, the vast majority of the recommendations that the committee made have been adopted, and I believe that they will make a very important contribution to the debate in this place. They will allow private members the opportunity of so-called prime time airing in this place and, given the modern demands of the media and the public, I think that is a very important innovation, I hope that private members will take it seriously and will take advantage of the opportunity that that allows them to address their constituents and the public, as well as through the medium of this House. I commend the report to the House. While we are required at this stage only to note it, I believe that its recommendations are worth while and I have much pleasure in supporting the noting of the report and subsequently, I hope, the adoption of it.

Mr FERGUSON (Henley Beach): Naturally, I support the proposition that is before the House, because I was part and parcel of the committee that produced the report. I will be supporting the amendments that are to be moved subsequently although I know that you, Mr Speaker, will not allow me to talk about those amendments.

The SPEAKER: That is correct.

Mr FERGUSON: Mr Speaker, you probably know that I feel that at times in this House private members do not have the sort of attention they deserve. So, I am extremely pleased—and I believe that you are probably too modest to say—that you have had a lot to do with the propositions now before us. It was at your suggestion that many of these propositions were actually taken up and I believe that, when they are subsequently adopted, the suggestions you put forward will be of benefit to the vast majority of members in this place.

I also pay tribute to the member for Elizabeth for his contribution to this report, especially in terms of allowing private members to have prime time for debate. I endorse his remarks in that regard, and I do not intend to embellish them. The only thing about which I have some trepidation is the way the Whips will treat this proposition. I have no fear that it will not be treated intelligently, but there will be a problem: the Whips will treat this proposition properly although, because prime time will be involved, they will be under great pressure to provide their best speakers at that time.

The Hon. D.J. Hopgood: That means you will be on every day.

Mr FERGUSON: I thank the Deputy Premier for his confidence in me. However, I hope that this proposition is treated in the spirit in which it is put to the House, so that backbenchers—and I mean all backbenchers on both sides—get an appropriate go in terms of contributing to debates. I hope that the Opposition does not take the opportunity to attack the Government on a vital issue every day, day after day, through the same speakers, and I hope that the Government has the courage to ensure that it gives all backbenchers an opportunity to debate rather than just those

who are best able to rebut an attack that might come from the Opposition.

All the other propositions are certainly revolutionary. When they are carried, we will have the most adventurous set of Standing Orders of any Parliament in Australia. I hope that the Standing Orders have been so put together that they will give every member of the House the opportunity that they deserve to have their voice heard in this Parliament. I support the proposition, and I will be supporting the amendments when they are moved.

The Hon. JENNIFER CASHMORE (Coles): I support the proposition that the Standing Orders Committee report be noted. Like members who have spoken previously, I welcome the optimum opportunities it gives for private members to exercise their representative and legislative roles in this Parliament. I am not sure whether I heard the member for Henley Beach correctly—I hope I did not—but I believe I heard him say that the he hopes the Opposition does not take the opportunity to attack the Government day after day on contentious issues as a result of the amendments to Standing Orders. As I understand the role of the Opposition, and as it has developed over the years, that is precisely one of its roles and one that I can assure the member for Henley Beach and all members of the Government the Opposition will pursue as vigorously and diligently as it possibly can. To hope that we will not do so is, in fact, to hope that the interests of the people of South Australia will not be represented as vigorously as they should be represented.

I agree with the member for Elizabeth—although I am not sure whether he actually expressed this opinion in so many words—that we would be unlikely to have arrived at this point had we not had a hung Parliament and the influence of independent members in, shall we use the word, 'encouraging' the Government to see things through the eyes of private members rather than from the perspective of the Executive. I hope that future Parliaments will be able to give thanks to this Parliament for establishing a set of Standing Orders that enlarges the opportunities of private members to represent their constituents and the interests of the State.

The fact that grievances can be heard more frequently and over a longer period is an enlargement of the right of representation of all South Australians. It should be welcomed not only by members of Parliament but by the public and, certainly, by the media, which report the proceedings of Parliament. The streamlining of private members' business through the imposition of time limits on members is something that, in many senses, I regret, although I can see the benefits that are likely to flow. The principal benefit is that fillibustering will be, in effect, outlawed. I note that the member for Napier is looking particularly interested in this comment. It is certainly relevant to him. Fillibustering, in effect, will be difficult if not impossible, and that should be to the advantage of all members who hope to see either their motions or their legislation brought to the point of a vote.

In short, the propositions that we are noting have a good deal of merit. Unlike other members who have spoken, I am not in a position to compare them, in terms of their generosity, with the Standing Orders of other State Parliaments, the Parliaments of the Provinces of Canada or, indeed, the Mother of Parliaments. I simply say that I, like other members (particularly the member for Eyre), should like to see our Standing Orders go considerably further in limiting the time permitted for Ministers to answer questions and in proscribing the manner in which members can ask questions; that is to say, I would endorse the free asking of questions without a written script.

I also believe that the position of the Speaker should be secured in the same way as it is secured in the House of Commons, that is, that the Speaker should be free from challenge at election. It is pleasing to see you with a smile on your face, Mr Speaker. I am not being fanciful: I am being quite sincere when I say that the Speaker should be protected from challenge at election, at least for a limited number of terms, that is, for more than one term. I am not sure whether it should be two or three terms but, given the nature of the superannuation provisions of this Parliament, I should have thought that protection from challenge for two terms would ensure the independence of the Speaker.

To me, that is one of the most important elements in a well-run Parliament in which the rights of all members are respected, irrespective of their Party, their position in Government or in Opposition. The steps we are considering today are very valuable but are not nearly as far as we could go if we really wanted to enlarge the powers of the people to decentralise the present vice-like grip that the Executive has on Parliament and, therefore, on democracy in this State. I can say only that I hope that the following steps, including the couple that I have suggested, are taken seriously by the House and adopted before the term of this Parliament expires.

The Hon. J.P. TRAINER (Walsh): I want to support the proposition and to respond to a couple of the remarks that have already been made. I hope that the member for Coles will accept that what the member for Henley Beach was trying to say was that, if members of the Opposition are given extra opportunities, they should use them to be constructive and not destructive; that, in participating, they should make constructive suggestions rather than just taking part in mud-slinging. I should like first to say a few words about the nonsense the honourable member introduced regarding the role of the Speaker in our Parliament—not that the proposition the member for Coles put forward that the Speaker should be protected for two consecutive terms would not be of personal benefit to me, particularly if it were retrospective!

However, apart from that bit of levity, I should have to say that her proposition as a whole is absolute nonsense. The practices of the House of Commons with respect to the role of the Speaker relate very much to the fact that that is a very large body with about 650 members, as distinct from our very small Parliament of 47 members. The practices and procedures that we have adopted here have evolved to meet the practical requirements of a much smaller Parliament.

The Hon. Jennifer Cashmore interjecting:

The Hon. J.P. TRAINER: I did not interject on the member for Coles, and I should appreciate her exercising the same courtesy towards me. One can exercise a certain luxury with respect to the total independence of the Speaker in a very large body such as the British House of Commons with 640 members that is not available in a House with only 47 members and where the Party structures that we have in Australia are so different from those in the United Kingdom. But if the member for Coles feels rather badly about the fact that we have not followed the British tradition of the Speaker's having the position more or less for life, I suggest that she have a look at what her own Party did here in 1912 when we shifted away from the British tradition to that which is followed now.

The first Labor Government in the world that was not part of a coalition was elected here in South Australia in

1910 and faced this issue. Sir Jenkin Coles had already been Speaker for 20 years (from 1890 through to 1910); he was left in the Chair, and one of their own, Harry Jackson, was appointed as the Deputy Speaker, only replacing Sir Jenkin Coles on his death. They stuck to the tradition. However, when that Labor Government lost to the Liberal Party in 1912, it found that its Harry Jackson was knocked off by the Opposition and replaced with Larry O'Loughlin. From that day forward in South Australia we have followed for this issue a completely different set of procedures and practices from those of the British House of Commons.

The Hon. T.H. Hemmings interjecting:

The Hon. J.P. TRAINER: Yes, they were the ones who ripped up the rule book, as the member for Napier said, and replaced it with a new one. I should now like to advert to some of the remarks of the member for Eyre. I think that he was being excessively cynical about the degree of consultation that took place in the evolution of the propositions that are before us at the moment. The report of the Standing Orders Committee was, in effect, the first of several drafts. Wisdom is not something that just comes upon us like being hit with a bolt of lightning on the road to Damascus: it is something that we gradually put together with a degree of consultation with all the members who are represented here.

Gradually, that first draft, for lack of a better phrase, has been hammered into better shape as a result of further consultation. Some members opposite have commented on how these changes will benefit the Opposition. Indeed, the way in which the Opposition will be affected was stressed very much by the member for Coles. I am more concerned about the backbencher, regardless of his or her Party, than about the Opposition *per se*, but I will turn to that subject in a moment.

I am pleased that we have followed the practice that has been adopted with other recent changes, that new Standing Orders are at first introduced as sessional orders only so that they are, in effect, given a trial run for a period of a parliamentary session. I am pleased with some of the propositions contained here. Like the member for Henley Beach and others, I am particularly gratified by the proposal that we have a half hour put aside after Question Time each day for matters of public importance, with up to six members being entitled to speak for up to five minutes each. I put forward that proposition with some vigour in 1984-85, unfortunately with not very much success at that time. I am glad that eventually that proposition has again seen the light of day and that probably in this case it will be adopted.

I mentioned that I was very concerned about backbenchers in our political institutions having an effective role. At the moment, I do not think we have. The media have a lot to answer for the fact that our role is not as effective as it ought to be, and I will return to that matter later. I do agree with some of the members who have spoken earlier that Parliament is very much just an extra arm of the Executive. That might sound a very strange comment to make coming from the Government Whip, who in some respects is himself an arm of the Government with respect to the backbench. However, it is a two-way process.

I have been a backbench member of this Parliament for 12 years. I and the member for Albert Park share the honour on this side of the House of being the two longest serving backbenchers here. Some members on the other side of the House, of course, have had an even longer time on the backbench, and some of them would have a little difficulty in approaching the Parliament with a totally constructive frame of mind because they have been almost in semi-permanent Opposition.

The role of the two Whips is to be the meat in the sandwich between the leadership and the backbench on each side of the House, to convey to the backbench the requirements of the leadership and, at the same time, to convey back to the leadership the views and aspirations of the backbench. The member for Davenport (the Opposition Whip) and I, to a very large extent, along with you, Mr Speaker, have particular roles as champions of the backbenchers. We have a difficulty here in South Australia that goes back for 130 years of our constitutional history, of the Parliament being very much subservient to the Executive, and that is partly because of the power of the purse. Right from the early time of our first Parliaments in the 1850s, we tended to drift very quickly away from the basic thrust, under the Westminster system, whereby Parliament votes money to the Executive, rather than the other way around. Yet, the Parliament, as has been pointed out by others, is instead very much captive to the power of the purse that the Executive is able to exercise through the Party system.

The system in South Australia has evolved much more strongly in that latter direction than has been the case in some other States. I think it was the member for Eyre who commented earlier on the significance of perhaps introducing single line budgeting for the Legislature. That would partly address the problem but, of course, that is not the end of the matter. For institutional reasons not connected with funding, the Parliament tends to be very much dominated in its debates by the Cabinet Ministers and by the Leaders of the Opposition in both Houses. Each backbencher still can exercise in his or her own electorate just as effective a role as was possible 10 or 20 years ago, perhaps as a result of the fact that electorates are serviced with much more energy and resourcefulness than was previously the case. Members are even more effective at a local level than was the case with some of our predecessors in this Chamber—and that is not a reflection on them; I am merely indicating what I see as being a change in the times. By servicing the electorates more effectively, we create our own demand to further service the electorate even more effectively.

However, as far as the community at large is concerned, I believe that the status of members of Parliament has been very much diminished in the public eye during those 12 years over which I have had firsthand experience. The community sees very little of the Parliament through the media outside of the comments, remarks and activities of the Government Executive and the leadership of the Opposition. Indeed, most members of the public, unless they are aware of their own local member of Parliament, are relatively unaware that backbenchers even exist. I have seen this phenomenon worsen since 1979, because very few contributions by backbenchers receive any sort of media coverage unless there is something into which the media can get their teeth in the way of trivia, something bizarre, some sort of a scandal, a member's being evicted or something that does not really bring the Parliament into good standing.

It is very difficult for someone who is a backbencher to add anything to the community's political agenda: that the political agenda is set basically by the leadership of the Government and the Opposition on both sides and by their non-elected minders. Let us face it, when we make our speeches in here, unless the media actually report on the Parliament, most of what we say might as well not have been said. A half a dozen or a dozen people may be listening in the gallery, but otherwise the effect of most of our words, unless they have some sort of impact in one way or another in the media, is pretty minimal. We merely utter words which then appear in *Hansard* to be buried away, gathering

dust on shelves for eons to come. Even the pearls of wisdom of the member for Napier in many cases will only just gather dust, because we get so little media coverage compared to what was the case not so long ago, particularly through the morning newspaper which likes to look upon itself as the newspaper of record.

A member can put a lot of effort into serious and intense research on a particular subject but, if it is not taken up in some way by the media, who are the medium or intermediary between us and the community so far as our political utterances in here are concerned, it is quite futile. For example, consider what happens with questions during Question Time. I ask members to cast their minds back to the way questions used to be reported in the media 10 or 15 years ago. It would be reported that a certain member had asked about a particular issue, and a description was given of the Minister's reply. Now, all that appears is, 'The Minister said yesterday that . . .' and the Minister's statement is reported.

In many cases, there is not even any hint that it was actually in response to a question. The fact that a particular member was the person responsible for attempting to bring that issue to the attention of the community—whether it be Government or Opposition—gets no mention whatsoever. I have tried to draw that matter to the attention of the Editor of the *Advertiser* and I think they believe that I am a damn pest or that I am doing it for the sake of my own ego. However, I assure members that I take this matter seriously, and I have been doing so for a long time. I know they think I am a darn nuisance, but I will continue to do so because I think it is a very important matter. What is the point of members' researching questions on behalf of their constituents and asking them in here, if they then just go nowhere?

Mr Hamilton: But journalists are never frightened to ring you up for a comment.

The Hon. J.P. TRAINER: If they think they can get some controversy out of you, as the member for Albert Park says, they might. A retired Federal member might be good value to give them a headline.

Mr Ferguson: From the western suburbs.

The Hon. J.P. TRAINER: From the western suburbs; I will not mention any names. Other than that, they do not want to know you. As a result of this, very much of the hard work backbenchers put in can be an exercise in futility. For a long time we have also been faced with the problem about the way in which time is allocated for particular purposes. One of the first absurdities that struck me when I came in here in 1979 was the institution known as the Address in Reply. I think that the pomp and pageantry and the symbolism associated with the Address in Reply are magnificent. To be able to go into the other place as part of the honoured tradition and listen to Her Excellency's speech is a wonderful occasion. We may get very blasé about it, but those of us who have the opportunity to bring in guests observe that they find it absolutely fascinating because they are not as blasé about it as we are.

However, on returning to our Chamber, what then used to occupy the next couple of weeks? It was the entitlement of each member of this House to speak for one hour each in reply to the Address of Her Excellency the Governor. Of course, the Speaker and the 10 Ministers on the front bench did not participate in that debate, but that still left 36 members all entitled to one hour each over the ensuing couple of weeks.

Mr Hamilton: That's the price you pay for democracy.

The Hon. J.P. TRAINER: The member for Albert Park calls it the price you pay for democracy. For three-quarters of the time, it was often the price you paid for drivel. Beyond half a dozen members, the quality tended to taper off because after the first 10 or 20 minutes of a member's contribution the overwhelming majority remaining of the 60 minutes was padded out by what were, in effect, three or four grievance debates linked together. That was the feast of verbiage. What happened over the subsequent weeks was a famine of opportunity.

During the Address in Reply debate, the Whips ran around saying, 'Come on, you have got to stretch it out for an hour. There is something wrong with your manhood'—or personhood—'if you cannot manage to speak to it for an hour. Find something to talk about for an hour.' So members would pad out the Address in Reply speech so that debate would go for 36 hours. A week or so later, a constituent might come to a member and say, for example, 'Mr Hamilton, would you please raise such and such a subject for me in Parliament this week or next week, as soon as possible?' The only opportunity that existed, however, was the 10 minute grievance debate at night. Most of the time those opportunities vanished because the House would extend beyond 10 p.m. and the adjournment debate would disappear.

This excellent proposal for six five-minute speeches after Question Time was originally suggested by the Joint Committee on the Law, Practice and Procedures of the Parliament in 1984-85. As I mentioned, it was not adopted at that time although the reduction to the Address in Reply debate was. This is the other side of the coin. If the member for Albert Park listened carefully, he would realise that this was supposed to be the benefit to make up for the loss of that Address in Reply time. It was proposed to exchange that block quantity, which was not used effectively, for a more effective range of individual opportunities for backbenchers spread throughout the course of the year.

I am pleased that this proposal has been revived and this opportunity will be provided for members in prime time, when they will have a guaranteed opportunity to canvass matters while they are still topical. One side benefit might well be that the amount of debate and comment that members try to intrude into their questions in Question Time will be reduced. Question Time might revert to questions seeking information rather than providing information, as in recent years there has been a tendency for Question Time to be used more and more for miniature speeches on topics of the day. If this proposal is adopted, members will have proper, formal opportunities to make speeches on burning issues of the day rather than try to infiltrate them into their explanations of questions. Although I could add many more remarks, I simply indicate my support for the motion.

Mr BLACKER (Flinders): I support the motion before the House particularly as it relates to the provision of greater private members' time. However, I express a little concern because, as a member of the Standing Orders Committee, I am aware that what the House is debating is not exactly the same as the report of that committee. The committee made its recommendation unanimously and although I am fully aware that negotiations go on around the corridors of this place, I would have thought it appropriate that members of the committee who made a unanimous decision would be consulted on any amendments.

Mr Becker: Were you consulted?

Mr BLACKER: I was definitely not consulted on this amendment. I am a little concerned about that and I place on record that I consider appointment to a committee to be an honour and a privilege, that membership carries the

responsibility for any decision that is made by the committee and that one should be consulted on such issues.

This motion gives greater flexibility and more time for private members and will enable backbenchers, be they Government or Opposition members, to bring forward issues of concern to the State and to their electorate in a way that will carry a lot more weight and mean a lot more to members and their constituency. I note that the time for starting on Thursday has been amended from 9.30 a.m. to 10.30 a.m., compensated by an hour on Wednesday evening, to accommodate Executive Council meetings. I have no difficulty with that and all members would recognise that is an appropriate move to ensure that Executive Council meetings are not affected by the sittings of the House.

An issue that is not in the report before the House concerns the guillotine or 4 week rule, which provides that should a motion be brought before the House a vote has to be taken on it in four sitting weeks. In reality, that is five weeks because there is always at least one week off. That is generally the amount of time that it takes for a piece of legislation to pass through this House. Of course, on many occasions legislation passes more quickly as has been mentioned. I supported that suggestion, although I raised some concerns about motions for disallowance of regulations and other issues. Every other member supported that matter as well.

I am still in two minds about this issue. I would like to see an improvement in the turnover in private members' time and a bringing to fruition of the motions before the House rather than their sitting on the Notice Paper as political tools, a practice used by members of both sides on many occasions. Notice Papers of Parliaments gone by show us that some motions are moved on the opening day and have gone right through a session without a vote being taken. It is only in recent years that a vote has become an automatic process at the end of a session, provided there has been more than one speaker to a motion. That practice is an abuse of the privilege of private members' time and it needs to be stopped.

My concern is that there are genuine times when motions for disallowance need to be extended, when we know that Government departments are reviewing a situation and when we need to be able to bide our time in order that those changes can be implemented, at the same time keeping the motion alive. Once a motion has been carried it is very difficult to get it amended because the whole process has to start again. That is my only reservation with the guillotine because in every other respect there is value in making sure that Opposition members, Government members and Ministers are obligated to treat issues with some sincerity and make sure that they are debated appropriately.

There is no need for me to refer to any other issue, except to say that I commend this effort to increase the availability of private members' time to all members of the House. It is quite radical inasmuch as in the 18 years that I have been a member of Parliament I have not known Standing Orders to allow such a large amount of time—with the exception of the early to mid 1970s when Question Time went for two hours, giving greater access to all members of Parliament. It was most uncommon for me not to get at least one question. Most days I asked two questions and occasionally I asked three questions.

That was in a two-hour period and I was only one of 47 members. That demonstrated to me a real commitment by Ministers and all members of the House to see that Question Time was used in the appropriate way to ensure that the information being sought was provided. The other issue that seems to have gone by the wayside is the use of Questions on Notice. It was always the practice then that, provided a question was put on the Notice Paper before 3 p.m. on Wednesday, members were guaranteed a reply on the following Tuesday when Parliament sat. That system was abused when members put dozens of questions on notice and it became an impractical proposition.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order!

Mr BLACKER: Perhaps the solution is to provide that no member can have more than a given number of questions at any time on the Notice Paper.

Mr Becker: No way.

Mr BLACKER: While I understand the interjection of the member for Hanson, I believe in the right of all members to raise issues of importance. However, there is still an obligation on all members to do a little vetting of their questions to ensure that they raise questions of importance and roll them over. If members were able to put five Questions on Notice and roll them over once a week, they could get through an equal number of questions than they do under the present system. I support the proposals with the reservations indicated, but I express regret that there was not wider consultation on the issue. I recognise that the proposed move is a step in the right direction and I hope that the House, Parliament and South Australia will benefit by it.

The Hon. T.H. HEMMINGS (Napier): I wish to speak briefly—

Mr S.J. Baker interjecting:

The Hon. T.H. HEMMINGS: I do not need the Deputy Leader to instruct me on what to do. The noting of this report and the two subsequent decisions that we are to make as a result of it are extremely important to all of us. That leads me to my contribution, that is, to remind the member for Eyre exactly what private members' time is all about. The member for Eyre commented about my hogging all of private members' time. True, at the moment I have on the Notice Paper 14 private members' motions that are either being debated in this House or due to be debated. That is my right as a member of this Parliament and, if members opposite, particularly the member for Eyre, do not like it, they should make sure that those points of view (which you, Mr Speaker, referred to in your report and which members said that they did not have enough time to debate) are covered in motions that they can put on the Notice Paper, so that we can have a chance to listen to their point of view.

It is also true that my colleague the member for Henley Beach argued strongly about this matter about four weeks ago, when the Leader of the House, sitting on the bench today, and the two Whips decided that, because certain events had occurred in the Soviet Union, the Parliament would be deprived of some private members' time so that that matter could be debated. That decision was made by three members of this Parliament and the member for Henley Beach argued against it, and good luck to him, because he believes in what private members' time is all about, as indeed do I. The member for Coles seems to believe that, because I have 14 motions on the Notice Paper, the new Standing Orders will limit my contributions.

If members review the record, they will find that most of my speeches fall well within the allowed 15 minutes, and some are even shorter. If the new Standing Orders are perceived by those members opposite as a means of gagging me, it just will not work. My intellect (and I say this in all humility) is such that I need to be able to express myself in this Parliament and, if that does not meet with the

approval of members opposite, I apologise. Their only consolation is that at the end of this Parliament—some time towards the end of 1993 or possibly early in 1994—they can rest assured that I will pack my *Hansards* and be gone. When I leave, my loss will be felt by you, Mr Speaker, I know.

As to some of the points made by the member for Coles about how much further we should go down the track in changing Standing Orders, much has been said about Ministers giving lengthy replies. I well remember the member for Alexandra as a Minister on this side of the House. His replies used to go for 15, 20 or 25 minutes—

The Hon. D.J. Hopgood: The chook on the roost.

The Hon. T.H. HEMMINGS: Yes, the chook on the roost. No members opposite had any problem with that when they were sitting over here. In fact, they used to cheer on the member for Alexandra, who has tempered and mellowed a bit now. It is obvious that if the Opposition ever gets back here the member for Alexandra will not have a position, and perhaps that may not be a bad thing.

I would also like to pick up some of the comments made by the member for Flinders. I agree with most of his comments and he touched on a sore point. As to Questions on Notice, if ever a system has been abused in this Parliament, it is that of Questions on Notice. Without singling out any member, I indicate that the member for Hanson interjected on the member for Flinders saying that they were all important questions.

If one is a student of the Notice Paper, one finds that the member for Hanson asks between 400 and 500 Questions on Notice a year about the so-called illegal use of Government motor vehicles. I advised the House many years ago that the average cost, regardless, of following through a Question on Notice is about $200. The member for Hanson will be remembered for two things. He will have cost the Government of the day a fortune. He has on the Notice Paper a motion about Camden Park Primary School, but we could have built four primary schools for the member for Hanson if he had used Questions on Notice wisely.

The member for Hanson is the only person I know who spends every Saturday afternoon and Sunday on the Anzac Highway median strip noting all Government vehicles that go up and down the highway. If ever there was a candidate for getting a chest infection, it would be the member for Hanson. Let us be honest about what Questions on Notice are all about.

I support fully most of the thrust of the report and the amendments to be debated after we note the report. I bring to the attention of the House the matter of the increase in private members' time, for the disallowance of regulations, and so on. I will give the House a warning because, with the way in which members are operating, we will find that a mechanism will be used because, when we run out of disallowance motions, we can move onto Bills.

We are very likely to get a situation where we will run out of private members' time. In a fit of pique, I may take to heart what the members for Eyre and Coles said, pack up my *Hansards* and sit in my office and sulk during private members' time. I may not want to proceed with the notices of motion that I have already placed on the Notice Paper. I have a further six to go before Caucus on Tuesday. I may decide to tear them up and not proceed with them. If that happens, Sir, you may well find yourself in the embarrassing situation of having to send us off to lunch at 12 o'clock instead of 1 o'clock.

The SPEAKER: That is in the hands of the Parliament.

The Hon. T.H. HEMMINGS: As you intimate, Sir, that is in the hands of the Parliament. You have always said that. You are a servant of the Parliament, and a damn good servant! I give this warning to members Opposite: if they want to make these new Standing Orders work, they have to lift their game. I have tried to lead by example and show them how to use private members' time effectively. As I say, I am satisfying not only my own intellect but the many readers of *Hansard* who follow my career with great interest. I suspect that members opposite will not be able to lift their game, and that will be a tragedy for the parliamentary system that we know and cherish.

Mr S.J. BAKER (Deputy Leader of the Opposition): If we ever needed an example of why we need gross reform of our Standing and Sessional Orders, that was it.

Mr Becker: Capital punishment!

Mr S.J. BAKER: 'Capital punishment' says the member for Hanson. Perhaps that in itself would be an answer. To get the debate back onto an even keel, I will speak very briefly on the subject. I congratulate all members who participated in the committee for the wisdom they provided in the major thrust of the recommendations. The recommendations have been modified to accommodate a practical working, both here and in the running of Government. Those things always occur, but the points have been noted. What we have is a very superior package to the one that was in place before we started the exercise.

I remind members that we are in a very fortunate situation as far as the Parliament is concerned. We do have a very evenly balanced Parliament, and that is the time when change can be achieved. I pay homage to you, Sir, as Speaker of this House, because it is quite apparent that we do get good Parliament when we have people dedicated to seeing the due processes of Parliament carried through to their utmost, and we see that with you. We saw that with Bruce Eastick from 1979 to 1982, and maybe one or two other Speakers of this Parliament who have presided with great skill and integrity. However, that has not been the rule: it has been the exception. I know that we as a Parliament can never make things 'people-proof' or 'politics proof', but we have to design a set or rules that will serve the best interests of the people out there, the people who elect us and pay the bills.

Members of the committee should be commended, because they have given greater power and strength to not only the backbenchers but all of us, should we choose to use the time available, whether it be private members' time if one is not a Minister or the grievance debate for all members. Great strides have been made in respect of the recommendations put forward. Except for Queensland and, to a certain extent, New South Wales, we had probably the most deficient rules of all Parliaments in Australia. We were backward and running behind, not providing enough time for members to have freer expression of private members' business within the Parliament.

The recommendations contain a number of very strong pluses. The changes will make members more accountable because one hour will be set aside for private members' Bills. That means that, if a good idea needs some legislative backing, members will have to go through the process and apply themselves in doing the research and debating the legislative changes that will bring about the desired amendment to current practice. That is a very healthy process and something that members do not do enough. So, one hour is set aside for that process.

Reference has already been made to regulations. They bedevil us. I spoke about regulations earlier in relation to the number of regulations that we have and the number to which increased costs were applied about 27 June 1991. We

will have a greater opportunity to scrutinise regulations and look at recommendations of the Subordinate Legislation Committee. Also, we will have more time to debate motions, although, if there are 14 motions on the Notice Paper by the member for Napier, I suggest there are 14 good reasons why a further motion should be moved to restrict the member for Napier from ever speaking to this Parliament again, because he has spoken far too long and far too often about things that do not matter.

There are some pluses but, as I have said, we can never make rules people-proof, and it will require a great deal of goodwill to ensure that the new times and better arrangements work to the benefit of the Parliament. Given the likelihood that there will be some time between now and the next election, if these rules do not work and the Standing Orders Committee is still in session, there will be further reforms to the process, and further reforms may well be necessary. I commend to the House the efforts of those people involved in the changes that we have before us today.

Mr HAMILTON (Albert Park): It was not my intention to enter into this debate but, after the churlish contribution of the Deputy Leader of the Opposition, I feel prompted to stand up and defend the right of every member of this Parliament, including those members of Her Majesty's loyal Opposition, to stand in this place without fear or favour and protect his or her back. That is what we are elected to do in this Parliament. No-one in this Parliament would deny the member for Albert Park, apart from you, Sir, the right to stand up and express himself in terms of looking after the interests of those people who I believe on a number of occasions have been intelligent enough to re-elect me to this Parliament. I thank them from the bottom of my heart for the opportunity to serve in this wonderful place, where we are not dictated to, where we are not told what to do, and where we can express ourselves in the forums of our Party and in this place.

It is not often that I take my Whip to task, but it is a healthy sign of democracy when one disagrees with one's Whip. It is a healthy sign that sometimes there is dissent in the Government. I do not always agree with my Whip, and this is another such occasion. When I first came into this place, I was allowed 60 minutes for my Address in Reply. I believe that I filled those 60 minutes with sufficient interest that, after the first three years, I was re-elected by an increased majority—from 4 per cent to 15.2 per cent. I attribute part of that increased majority to the number of *Hansards* that I circulated amongst my electorate, particularly those people who had an influence in my electorate. They gathered up enough votes to increase my majority by about 300 per cent. The member for Walsh should reconsider his statements today.

The Hon. J.P. Trainer interjecting:

Mr HAMILTON: I am glad; I am prompted by that. If there is one thing I have to say about the present Whip, he, like yourself, Sir, was a very good Speaker. Every member who takes on that position—

The Hon. T.H. Hemmings: An onerous job!

Mr HAMILTON: I agree—has to put up with us devils on either side, and that is not an easy task. We all have different views and sometimes we fall out of bed and crack our toe, or something like that, or we have a night out on the town, and that is sometimes reflected here in the Parliament.

Mr Becker interjecting:

Mr HAMILTON: Like the member for Hanson, who interjects constantly, but who has not spoken in this debate as yet—

The Hon. T.H. Hemmings: He is too frightened to.

Mr HAMILTON: That is right. One thing that I have learnt from the member for Hanson is that one must ask questions. Before I came to this place I used to read about the member for Hanson in *Hansard* and the questions that he asked. I thought, 'Well, there is a man I should follow'. One can always learn from the Opposition. I thought that this was a good opportunity. So, when I came to this place I followed that lead. I asked a couple of questions, and I put others on the Notice Paper. Unfortunately, I was taken to task by the then Premier—a great friend of the member for Hanson. He took me to task, rather unkindly I thought, attacking me strongly in the media. However, I was not to be denied and the *Advertiser*—whilst I have some criticism of it now, in those days it reported very accurately—said that the role of Her Majesty's Opposition is to probe, criticise and put up alternatives.

I am not here to deny any member of the Opposition his or her right. However, to pick up the member for Mitcham's comment about research, successive Governments have not provided appropriate facilities. I have raised this issue time and time again. All members of Parliament need adequate research facilities. Perhaps the contributions of the member for Mitcham would improve quite dramatically if decent research facilities were available to him. Be that as it may, I do not wish to be uncharitable about his contribution.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order!

Mr HAMILTON: I am cognisant of the time, Sir, and I do not want to waste the time of the Parliament—it is so very precious. Backbenchers should have the right to stand up here without fear or favour to look after their patch; they must do that. Like many others, I distribute my speeches around the electorate; I take them to senior citizen clubs, football clubs and hotels and I talk to people, as you are well aware, Sir, and I occasionally get a run in the local rag. It was interesting one day when I was talking to a person in a Government department and I apologised for being so aggressive in relation to a particular issue. He said, 'Mr Hamilton, there is no need to, my mother lives in your area and we are well aware of what you do in your electorate.' So, it pays to advertise and to put your point of view across.

I thank the member for Mitcham for goading me to stand up tonight. I must say that the member for Walsh has been an excellent contributor to this Parliament. He is one of the class of 1979 and, although I think he has made a wonderful contribution to this Parliament, I disagree with him on some matters. I thank you, Sir, for the opportunity to speak in this debate.

The Hon. J.P. Trainer interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order!

Mr BRINDAL (Hayward): I also commend the Standing Orders Committee for the work that it has done. Like many of my colleagues, I see it not as an end in itself but, hopefully, as a beginning. I agree with many of the remarks made and disagree with a few. The member for Walsh—a previous Speaker—said that it was silly to model a Parliament of 47 members on a Parliament of 650 members. I put it to this House, and particularly through you, Sir, to the member for Walsh, that in any Parliament, even a Parliament of 10, the independence of the Speaker is of paramount importance, whether that Parliament has 10, 47 or 650 members. That was the point made by the member for Coles. I think it is a valid point and one that I know you, Sir, always keep uppermost in your mind, whether or not the member for Walsh is inclined to forget. The member for Walsh also said that the media was to be taken to task;

it is all the media's fault that this place falls into some sort of disrepute among the members of the public.

The Hon. J.P. Trainer interjecting:

Mr BRINDAL: I remind the member for Walsh that, as he said to the member for Coles, I did not interject on him and I would thank him for the courtesy not to interject on me. The media, as the member for Walsh said, is entirely responsible for the diminished image of this Parliament. But I put it to you, Sir, that the image of this Parliament has been diminished largely as a result of what I see—and I know members opposite see this also, because they have commented on it—as the lamentable decline as a result of the movement of power from this place increasingly towards the bureaucracy. I put it to the House that, if the Government is to become the running dog of the bureaucracy, and if this place is to become the running dog of the Executive, the public and the media can hardly be blamed for increasingly seeing this place as irrelevant and not worth the time or public money that is expended by the State on its maintenance. For that reason I support the change in the Standing Orders as they come before the House.

The winds of change must blow through this place. It has to be updated; it has to be made more relevant. As one member opposite said, all members of Parliament have to be given the right to a proper voice in the proceedings of this Parliament and in the machinery of Government. Any move—and I believe these are moves that will increase the right of all members to participate in this place—which diminishes, as one member called it, the 'vice-like hold' of the Executive over this place has to be applauded.

The member for Eyre expressed some reservations and, while I, with the honourable member, will vote with my colleagues on this matter, I express some reservations about the lack of a guillotine. Increasingly I have sat here on Thursday mornings and wondered whether I was at the Heckle and Jeckle cartoon show, or whether I was in fact participating in private members' time. Therefore, I think a move to curb the worst excesses of some members opposite is, again, to be applauded. Members opposite certainly prove the following old Shakespearean adage:

> Self love, my liege, is not so vile a sin as self neglectance.

Members opposite very much live and act in this place according to that adage. I will not detain the House further with this. I think many points have been made and enough has been said.

However, I respectfully draw your attention, Sir, to some remarks made by the member for Flinders in saying that, as a member of the Standing Orders Committee, he believes that the report, as it comes to the Parliament, is not the report as passed by the committee. I think that is a serious allegation. The way I read the Standing Orders, the Standing Orders Committee is a sessional committee of this Parliament. Accordingly, this Parliament should have the right to debate its reports in total as they come before the House.

I know that on occasion it is necessary for the two major groupings within the Parliament to make—and I will not call them 'deals'; I am off the word 'deals'—accommodations. But I believe those accommodations should properly be made either before a committee makes its report or in dealing with the report as it comes before the House. I think that the member for Flinders was quite clear in what he said and I ask you to look at this matter as I think it is very serious. However, I commend the Standing Orders Committee and will support the motion.

Mr BECKER (Hanson): I support the adoption of the report from the Standing Orders Committee and, whilst I can see merit in several of the issues raised, I am a little disappointed that they did not go further. I often think that we have been subjected to change in this House over the past few years simply for the sake of change. I often wonder what is wrong with the system that we have if it is used properly.

When I first came here we had a two-hour Question Time, which was an advantage to all members, who were given the opportunity to probe the Government of the day, to seek information and, at the same time, to raise issues not only of policy but of matters related to an honourable member's electorate. We cannot do that any more. When Question Time was reduced to one hour, we warned the then Government that we wanted the right to follow up questions if an issue was raised on that day, if it was relevant to an honourable member's electorate or if it was a matter of policy. We said that there should be an opportunity to follow up questions to have clarified points that may be concerning the community.

The Government was warned that, if it were unable to extend Question Time for an hour, there would need to be other ways of obtaining that information. The two successful ways were questions on notice and/or private members' motions. The proposal of the Standing Orders Committee is that private members' Bills be dealt with on Wednesday evenings from 7.30 to 8.30—do not ask me why—and that notices of motion be handled on Thursday mornings. I wonder why there is that distinction. If we are to allocate 3½ hours to private members' business instead of two hours, it should not matter what issues are dealt with. Either we give members the opportunity to raise various issues or we do not.

It seems to me that the proposals that have been put forward are discriminatory. That is why I could not understand why the Standing Orders Committee has not put a time limit on the new recommendations. Why not say that we will try the new Standing Orders for the rest of this session (until about Easter next year) and, if they are successful, extend them from there. If they are not, we can make certain changes. It would benefit backbench members if there were no differential in terms of what issue could be raised when. Either we give members the time to raise issues or we do not; it is as simple as that. To insist that Bills be debated on Wednesday evenings is a little harsh.

As I said earlier, my disappointment relates to Question Time—the time for verbal questions and the opportunity to raise follow-up questions. When I first came here, an honourable member was given the call for a question as he or she was seen by the Speaker, rather than by the list system. The list system is discriminatory against any honourable member who wants to raise an issue. I can understand its merit from the point of view of a political Party: it may have a plan of attack and may want to use a particular method of examining a Minister, and nothing would be worse than to have that disrupted by someone asking what is happening to the school crossing on Tapleys Hill Road, for example, in the middle of an important political issue relating to the Woods and Forests Department, the State Bank, Remm or anything else. I can see some merit in the plan of attack, but there must be some flexibility. The way in which the Standing Orders have come down does not give us that flexibility.

Much has been said about the use of questions on notice, and I hope that the Standing Orders Committee will remember in future that, in accepting its report today, we still expect it to look further into the issue of questions on notice. I know that these recommendations contain a requirement that questions on notice, which were normally handed in by 9 a.m. on Thursdays, must be handed in prior to the

adjournment on the preceding Wednesday. That does not make much difference at all: it is neither here nor there.

The most important issue is obtaining answers to the questions on notice. I am disappointed that the Standing Orders Committee has not brought down a recommendation insisting that answers be provided to questions on notice, because some of those questions have been listed for over two years—nearly three years, in some instances. If we are going to practise a democracy, the Ministry or the Government of the day should be held accountable and should have the decency to answer questions on notice.

The member for Napier tried to take the mickey out of me and suggested that I ask 400 or 500 questions each session in relation to the use of Government motor vehicles. What he and members of the Government—and, tragically, a very small minority of the Public Service—fail to understand is that people are given a Government motor vehicle as part of their employment package or as their right of employment: no one will dispute that. In many cases, the car is essential to the job. However, there has been far too much abuse of Government motor vehicles by a minority, and that is reflecting on the vast majority: 1 or 2 per cent are upsetting the apple cart for the other 98 per cent who do the right thing.

I should have thought that by about 12 months ago this 1 or 2 per cent with the idiot mentality would have woken up to themselves and realised that, if they keep doing what they are doing, all public servants will end up losing the use of Government motor vehicles. I should have thought that it would be plain to any administrator that there are some who are still constantly flouting and abusing the instructions set out by the Government Management Board on the allocation and use of Government motor vehicles.

That is why I am asking those questions. It does not cost $200 to answer some of those questions. If it does, there is something terribly incompetent in our Public Service system. It probably costs $5 or $10 at most. However, I know what they are like. There are a few within the bureaucracy who like to intimidate. They do not want to be held accountable so they come up with all sorts of inflated figures to show that it is too expensive to answer questions. Don Dunstan was a great one at that. If you asked a curly question or one close to the bone, he would say, 'It's too expensive to provide the honourable member with the answer to the question', particularly in relation to the research that was necessary.

Every budget contains an allocation to provide staffing for the provision of information to Parliament. There is that allocation for every Government Minister. We are employing public servants to answer questions and to provide the Minister with information for Parliament. Every Minister comes in with his or her docket bag, with dockets and with a file of questions that he or she may be asked. There are people sitting in the Minister's department working out questions that the Minister may be asked verbally in the House, so that the answers are prepared.

During the early days of the royal commission into the State Bank, we heard the admission that answers to questions that I had asked in this House were incorrect; they were fudged. They deliberately falsified the information. It will be a long time before we get the results of that hearing and a long time before we have the opportunity to come back, but the royal commission has already confirmed what I have suspected for many years: it has been a cat and mouse game, and it is a tragedy that we are paying public servants good salaries and providing good working conditions. We need to do that, to keep them in the service, and, if they are going to act in a dishonest manner in not providing answers to questions in Parliament, we will have to think of ways of dealing with those people. We cannot employ people if they are going to be so dishonest.

I believe that, when the two-hour Question Time was taken away, the change was too sharp and sudden. It took away the right to probe but provided the opportunity for members to put questions on notice. That has probably created a considerable amount of work. It creates a lot of work for members too but, at the same time, it can be a very handy vehicle for the Government of the day to provide the correct information that is sought, and to provide that information in precis form for the benefit of all to read. It is on the record.

I should have thought that the Government would welcome the opportunity to have questions on notice rather than a barrage of verbal questions. I should have thought that the Standing Orders Committee would accept that and put a time limit on the provision of answers to questions on notice. Four weeks or six weeks is ample time for information to be provided. From my inside information from some Government departments and authorities, I know that the answers are provided to the Ministers within a very short space of time and could sometimes be given to Parliament on the following Tuesday.

Of course, the Minister does not take the answer to Cabinet or Cabinet may resolve that it will not answer that question immediately. I understand the frustration from that point of view. I am also fearful that a series of motions that are quite frivolous will be put on the Notice Paper. We have already had two examples of that, one of which was on today's Notice Paper from the member for Napier, which states:

That this House expresses its sympathy to the Minister for Environment and Planning on seeing the Liberal Party continually filching her environment policies.

What is the great moment in relation to Government business, and what would it cost the taxpayers to have that type of information discussed and debated in the House? I do not mind notices of motion coming from any member—and they can put on as many as they like—but to waste the time of the House and to stack up the Notice Paper with notices of motion that are totally irrelevant and petty is insulting, and it abuses the system.

Standing Orders should also have instructed and directed the Government that, if motions are to be moved or private members' Bills introduced, the response should be made by the Minister. That is the reason why the Minister always responded years ago. In the past few years, the ministry has become lazy, it is tired, and it has passed on to the backbenchers—the junior members of the House—the opportunity to respond to private members' legislation and/or motions. That is an insult; that is not the way to conduct a democracy. The Standing Orders should have given clear instructions. Ministers are well paid and, if they are not capable of earning their salary, we will have to pass a motion to reduce their salaries.

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

That the time for moving the adjournment of the House be extended beyond 5 p.m.

Motion carried.

Mr S.G. EVANS (Davenport): I realise it is late, but this subject, as members would know, has concerned me ever since people started to attempt to restrict the opportunities for individual members in the early 1970s. At that time we were promised that the situation would be better for private members and individuals, but that was not the case. We were promised that, if we went to a one hour Question

Time in lieu of a two hour Question Time, the questions would be brief and the answers also would be brief. That has not been the case. My colleague the member for Alexandra was referred to as being one, when the Opposition was in government, who gave long answers. On most occasions where I could, as Whip, I gave the honourable member the opportunity to ask his question last because, if he went past 3.15, we did not lose any of the hour. If members look back, they will find that that was the case on quite a few occasions.

I support the noting of the report, but I want to express one or two concerns. First, Parliament should never think that every member can be brief, explicit and have a command of the language such that they can use a lot of adjectives, in other words, be a scholar of the English language as a member of Parliament. That is not a requirement of a member when coming into Parliament. In fact, if it were, in many cases many ordinary people would not be represented. It is not the nature of some people to have that ability. Even if some people set out to attempt to learn that, it would not fit their character. We should not try to regiment every person into that sort of operation, as much as I know it might be difficult for *Hansard* at times and as much as I know it might be difficult for others who listen to wait patiently when they have that capacity; they might think in terms of their not being able to put up with fools. But it is important that we try to preserve as many rights as possible. We must acknowledge that.

I can recall a Labor member, Cyril Hutchens, making a point very strongly along those lines, and I agreed with him. Others may not. There was talk of our adopting the guillotine. I wonder why we have got to this stage. When I came here, there was unlimited time for speeches. One member spoke on scientology for three hours and 20 minutes one night. Everyone attacked and condemned him for that. Indeed, I think before my time another member spoke for about four hours. However, it was not frequent.

The Hon. D.J. Hopgood: The record's six, I believe.

Mr S.G. EVANS: Yes, I think the Minister might be right. They were exceptions. When a time limit is imposed, everyone tries to reach that limit. We did not achieve better debate from that action. We are now restricting members significantly, and I accept that. However, it is not possible for some members to say what they want to say on some subjects in five minutes, and it never will be possible. There was also concern that Ministers could use some of the six five-minute time allocations. I do not object to that: every member should have a similar right. I know that Ministers get some rights in other fields in relation to giving personal explanations at any time during the day: I believe they have the right to explain themselves to the House at any time. I do not object to Ministers having the opportunity to use the five minute allocations.

However, I am concerned that the Parliament is in an ideal situation now, but it will not always be that way. The numbers are such now that we can achieve change that considers the individual and provides that opportunity. Mr Speaker, you are part of that scene, because you and your colleague and the member for Flinders are not part of the major two Parties. The numbers are such that you, Mr Speaker, can bring some pressure to bear—and others may say commonsense—to make sure there is some justice in any change such as this. But it is temporary: it is not likely to happen in the next Parliament. I know that you, Mr Speaker, would like it to happen, but that is not likely. If we were all genuine about the changes we want to make, before this Parliament finished we would ensure that changes could be made in the future without a two-thirds majority. That would stop any political Party in government—whether it be Liberal or Labor—changing the scene to suit itself, as happened in the early 1970s. It would stop that 'bastardry', because that is really what happened. It was a way of attacking the system to put it in the hands of the Government of the day and, by that means, the Executive. I hope that members take note of that.

The member for Walsh, the Government Whip, referred to the media, the operations of the Parliament and the reporting of the Parliament. I do not blame the media for the opinion that the public may have of parliamentarians or of the Parliament. I could make a speech along those lines and not disagree too much with the member for Walsh, but there is no doubt in my mind that the print media make fewer reporters available to the Parliament than was the case. That means a bigger load is placed on those reporters, and the only way in which they can operate is to try to take the easy way out as often as possible. That means that a system has developed where, instead of a member of Parliament making a speech and the media taking note of that, members have to prepare their speeches and questions and hand the speech or question to the media. That resulted in Governments supplying the Ministers of the Crown with battalions of minders to prepare everything and pass it through the system so that members could ask questions, Ministers could make long replies and it would get through to the media.

Likewise the Opposition moved in a similar direction, although the funds and resources are more limited. That was the result and it adversely affected the operations of Parliament. It is not necessarily a trait of all MPs. Resources for the Opposition are limited to the Leader of the Opposition and those immediately close to him such as members of shadow Cabinet and they cannot employ other people to do it. However, a Government backbencher can say to a Minister, 'Look, I want to follow through a particular issue. Can you get some of your departmental officers to get some notes on it?' Alternatively, the Minister might get an officer to get the notes together from the department and hand them to a member and say, 'Ask me a question on this or make a speech on it.' That is exploiting the resources for the benefit of the Government of the day.

Once the practice is in operation, it continues. It does not matter which side is in power, and I hope that it is something that members are concerned about. There has been brief comment about long answers and long questions. I am one who believes that a question should be limited to about a minute and the answer to a maximum of two minutes. I believe in time limits because when we had a two hour Question Time, Ministers did not have minders preparing a booklet of answers to questions that might come up, so they had to say if they did not have the detail in front of them that they would get a detailed report for the honourable member who asked the question and make it available the next day; and it would be made available the next day. The member would ask the Minister whether he had a reply because the Minister would have already told the member, even if he was an Opposition member, that he had a reply to the question.

That practice has also been destroyed, with adverse effect. I hope time limits are placed on questions and answers. I also hope that you, Mr Speaker, and those who follow you are given more power to be able to be stricter on the relevance of answers to questions and that we try to abide by your directions. The member for Elizabeth made the point that the representation of individuals is paramount. I agree that that is one of the things we have to attempt to do and, although the member for Elizabeth might not go

this far, the principle is that, although it is irrelevant to a lot of members when I raise a point about the Coromandel Valley Road or about someone having problems with a Government agency, because I asked a question in the House, my constituent knows about it and feels that he can rely upon Parliament, that Parliament is doing what people expect it to do. However, if the system becomes so clogged up that I cannot do that, people will have less faith in Parliament.

I support the motion to note the report, but I point out that it does not mean a change to Standing Orders, as some members have said. The report recommends some sessional orders and it will be on trial only this year, so the member for Hanson should be assured of that. We might need to bring in a guillotine, but I hope that we do not. Members realise that we are better off without it. If they behave themselves, we will not need it.

Motion carried.

The Hon. D.J. HOPGOOD (Deputy Premier): I seek leave to amend the motion proposed by the Standing Orders Committee to the one I have circulated, but with the following additional amendment:

Clause 1c (ii)—strike out 'of preaudience' and insert 'to be heard first'.

Leave granted; proposed motion amended.

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

That for the remainder of the Session—

I—Standing Orders be so far suspended in relation to private members business as to provide that—

a. unless otherwise ordered, the House meets on each Thursday at 10.30 a.m.;

b. on Wednesdays and Thursdays, private members business takes precedence in the following manner:

(i) 7.30 p.m.-8.30 p.m., Wednesdays—Bills;

(ii) 10.30 a.m.-11.30 a.m., Thursdays—Motions for disallowance of regulations and motions with respect to committees;

(iii) 11.30 a.m.-1 p.m., Thursdays—Other motions, provided that—

(A) notices of motion will take priority over orders of the day in (i) and (ii) and for the first 45 minutes in (iii);

(B) if all business in (i) or (ii) is completed before the allotted time the House proceeds to (ii) or (iii), respectively, notwithstanding that the business is set down for the following day;

(C) if all business in (iii) is completed before 1 p.m. on Thursdays the sitting of the House is suspended until 2 p.m.;

c. the following time limits will apply:

Mover, 15 minutes;

One member opposing the question, as deputed by the Speaker, 15 minutes;

Other members, 10 minutes;

Mover in reply, 5 minutes;

provided that—

(i) an extension of 15 minutes may be granted, by leave, to a member moving the second reading of a Bill;

(ii) leave to continue remarks may not be sought by any member, but a member speaking when the allotted time for that category of business is completed has the right to be heard first when the debate is next called on;

d. all adjourned business presently on the Notice Paper shall be set down for a Wednesday (in the case of Bills) and a Thursday (in the case of motions) in the order they now appear on the Notice Paper provided that motions in paragraphs b (ii) and b (iii) shall be separated.

I commend the motion to the House.

Mr M.J. EVANS (Elizabeth): I move:

After subparagraph (I) b (iii) (A)—insert—(AA) adjourned business will be automatically set down for the next sitting week in the order of introduction to the House:.

After subparagraph I c—insert—

d. If any motion in paragraphs b (ii) or b (iii) has not been voted on by the Thursday of the third sitting week after introduction, the Speaker will at a time determined by him or her during that sitting put the question on that motion notwithstanding that no other member has spoken to the motion or that any other member indicates he or she wishes to speak to it.

da. all adjourned business presently on the Notice Paper shall be set down for next Wednesday (in the case of Bills) and next Thursday (in the case of motions) in the order they now appear on the Notice Paper; provided that—

(i) motions in paragraphs b (ii) and b (iii) shall be separated; and

(ii) motions shall be voted on in the manner set out in paragraph d by the end of the sitting on the third Thursday after the commencement of this sessional order.

Subparagraph II a.—after 'Members' insert '(but not including Minister)'.

I support the motion before the House to provide for the remainder of the session that Standing Orders be so far suspended to provide for a number of important changes, which have been canvassed in some detail already. However, I believe that the proposals are deficient in that they do not include several important aspects that were recommended by the Standing Orders Committee. The two aspects that I have singled out for attention and amendment are those that relate to the proposal for a four-week rolling guillotine of private members' business in relation to motions, committee reports and the disallowance of regulations and, further, the question of whether or not Ministers should be permitted to speak in the grievance debate after Question Time. The amendments that I have moved are consistent with the recommendations of the Standing Orders Committee.

If private members' time is to be given the seriousness which I believe it deserves, I also believe that one vital aspect of that is that matters are not deferred and adjourned from week to week until the end of the session and at that point questions are put, one after another, and votes are taken sequentially in one bizarre half hour period when no-one is absolutely certain what has been carried or lost, when absolutely no impact on the public, the Government or the Public Service is available and when the whole process ceases to have much meaning at all. In order to ensure that private members' time has relevance to the community, to Government departments and to industry and commerce it is an essential feature of that process that a vote is taken at a regular interval so that the decisions of the House can be known to the public. Otherwise the whole process degenerates in the way that we have seen in the past.

This report provides substantial additional opportunities for private members. What is required is not just time but relevance and significance and the only way to achieve that is to ensure that a vote is taken. Given the reduction in time available for individuals to speak on these matters, there will be an effect of moving this through somewhat more quickly than we have seen in the past. I believe that the extension in time each week and the limitation on the speaking time during debates will ensure that everyone who wishes to make a contribution to a proposal can do that and that a four-week rolling guillotine, which in effect provides a five-week debating period, is more than enough to ensure that matters can be decided upon.

After all, look at the matters we put through this House each week in the course of three or four sitting days on a Government-sponsored and Opposition-supported guillotine. Every week in this House matters of great importance

and public moment are subject to a guillotine moved by the Government and adopted and supported enthusiastically by the Opposition to ensure that debate will be strictly limited in this place. The effect of that is acknowledged throughout the building. Almost everyone in this Chamber supports it, with the possible exception of me. The reality is that members opposite and members of the Government find themselves unable to provide that same service for private members to ensure that their business can also be dealt with in this expeditious and effective way.

While members are able to support the most massive intrusion on public rights and privileges through this House in legislation on a guillotine, they find some reluctance to ensure the same degree of relevance for private members' motions. I have to say that when Governments and Oppositions conspire together on the matter of Standing Orders, I have some concern for democracy in this place because there can be no doubt that, if Oppositions and Governments agree, someone must be suffering in the process. That is the concern I have in this context and it is a concern that I will carry with me.

I believe that the amendments that I have moved to ensure that our private members' time is not only full and effective but is able to be given the dignity and certainty of a vote being taken on it are an essential part of the reforms in the package before us. That is why the committee adopted them and that is why I am suggesting them by way of amendment today.

The remaining amendment is not a particularly significant or important one, but it is one that the Standing Orders Committee recommended and it is one that I believe is worth putting before the House by way of amendment, that is, to exclude Ministers from the five minute grievance debate after Question Time. Ministers are given enormous power in this place over and above those powers available to private members. They have access to their Cabinet colleagues at any time, and especially at Cabinet meetings. They are able to exercise influence and influence public debate in a wide ranging way and certainly in ways that are not available to private members. While I am sure the Ministers would seek to limit themselves only to acting in their capacity as individual representatives and members, I believe that, when one accepts these offices, one trades a certain amount of one's other privileges in exchange for it and I believe that the ministry on the whole came out of the process very much on the favourable side of the ledger.

In my own capacity in this place as Chairman of Committees and Deputy Speaker I have to accept certain limitations on what I am able to do and you, Mr Speaker, also accept certain limitations but in exchange for that we have powers and privileges in this place that extend beyond those of an ordinary member. They give us access to the Government and to departments in a way that others may not have, and the traditional trade-offs in that process, which have evolved over many years and decades—if not generations—safeguard the positions of those who hold those offices. I commend the amendments to the House and, although I move them as one, it may be desirable to put them separately.

Mr S.J. BAKER (Deputy Leader of the Opposition): I will be brief because time is running away. I commend the argument put by the member for Elizabeth who has shown great diligence and consistency. The principal matter that I will address is the preservation of the right of a private member to allow for his or her own disposition of a motion before the House. It is that member's motion and it should remain the property of that person and the House and it should not be cut off by any artificial means. There is that big difference between that and Government business.

So far as I am aware, and I have looked at a number of Parliaments, no guillotine is provided in respect of private members' time in any British Commonwealth jurisdiction (there may be, but I have not found one). We are taking a quantum leap forward. I do not necessarily discard the arguments put forward by the member for Elizabeth, but there are concerns on our side. As to the conspiracy theory placed before the House, it was unworthy of the member for Elizabeth to advance that view.

Obviously, we have concerns, and the member for Flinders expressed the same concern as a number of others have expressed to me about regulations. We are very much over regulated. So many laws are passed through the backdoor method—through the regulatory process—that the only chance we have of changing or altering them or of making people change their mind about them is to hold them up in Parliament. The one device available is the process of disallowance and that important mechanism is available to members of the Opposition and even Government members. They can hold a motion in abeyance to ensure that it is scrutinised properly, and I would not like to see that process lost.

In a number of other areas private members believe it is absolutely vital to hold a motion before the House for the full length and breadth of the session. We have had a number of examples of that and the member for Davenport can quote the example of gambling machines in the Casino. We will uphold some traditions. This is a marginal matter. Indeed, if members cannot apply themselves diligently to the process, we will have to look at such measures as guillotines. Since a significant number of months is left before the term of this Government finishes, there can be a further process of change. At this time it is not appropriate to support the amendments of the member for Elizabeth.

Mr FERGUSON (Henley Beach): I cannot support the member for Elizabeth's amendments but I am attracted to the proposition that we should have a four week rolling guillotine. I will be watching what happens from here on to see whether we should bring in such a guillotine. I am not so concerned about a member who wishes to have a motion on the Notice Paper and who maintains that motion until it falls off the Notice Paper. My concern is about a member who moves and speaks to a motion and then seeks leave to continue his or her remarks later. As it gets toward the end of the session, members on this side, or even on the other side, do not have the time to rebut the arguments put to the Parliament. Members often circularise the remarks made in this place in their electorate and the general public then do not have the advantage of seeing both sides of the argument.

I hesitate to suggest that there are contrived situations where a motion is moved and a member of the same persuasion as the mover moves an amendment and the matter is adjourned so that no-one has a chance to reply to the motion. That means that a proposition can be voted on and opinion is expressed by this Parliament, often without the opportunity of giving an opposing point of view.

As we get further into the session, this is more and more likely to occur, so I see much merit in the member for Elizabeth's proposition for a four week rolling guillotine. The changes in front of us may overcome the problem in the present system and we should give them a try but, if they do not overcome the problem, I will argue strongly both in here and in other meetings that a four week rolling

guillotine should be introduced. I commend the member for Elizabeth for his amendments.

Mr BLACKER (Flinders): I seconded the motion because I believed the matter needs to be debated. I am a realist and I know what will happen should a division be called, but it needs to go on the record that the amendments moved were recommended by the committee. The member for Henley Beach has outlined good reasons why the committee arrived at its decision and, to that end, we all need to look carefully at what has been said.

As has been recognised—and I made mention of it during the previous debate—there is concern about disallowance motions, and therefore we need to streamline the mechanism in respect of disallowance motions so that the matters can be addressed in a better way than at present. I support the amendments in the knowledge that it will be on the record and, if things do not work out as other members hope they will, at some future date the matter can be raised again and further debated.

The Hon. J.P. TRAINER (Walsh): Certainly, at this time I cannot support the amendments of the member for Elizabeth. I would add that I take umbrage, like the Deputy Leader opposite, at the implication that some sort of Party collusion or inappropriate cooperation between the two major Parties is likely to lead to the majority of this House not concurring with the views of the member for Elizabeth. I believe the reason the House is not likely to support these amendments has nothing to do with any agreement between the Parties but simply because 43, 44 or 45 other members do not share his views or have differing views to his as to what are appropriate uses of the forums of the House.

No one member in here is the fount of all wisdom. We must not assume when we put together propositions—whether they are mine or those of the member for Elizabeth, for instance—that those who disagree with us are either fools or knaves. Over a period of time I believe this House exercises wisdom in the way it attempts to conduct its affairs, and I have a great belief in the collective wisdom of the House as to what are appropriate uses of the forums of the House. If his amendment is rejected, I ask the member for Elizabeth not to descend to any vale of despondency, because we are talking only of sessional orders. In actual practice, it may well be that the propositions before the House, without his amendments, will not work out quite the way the majority of the House anticipates they will. If that proves to be the case, that does not preclude the House at some later date from adopting some of the propositions that have come from the member for Elizabeth or other members.

I will now address in more detail the aspect of his proposals which relates to the five-minute grievances at the conclusion of Question Time. I believe most strongly that Ministers should be entitled to participate in that debate, in the same way they are entitled (although they rarely exercise that entitlement) to participate in the 10 minute adjournment grievances later in the evenings or, in some cases, at about 5 p.m. on a Thursday. Ministers have slightly different rights and duties from the rest of us. They are unable to ask questions in Question Time as they are the ones supposed to be responding to questions. Out of Cabinet solidarity, they do not normally make speeches outside their portfolio areas, or those portfolio areas that they may represent on behalf of a Minister in another place; the exception to that being during conscience votes on particular controversial issues during private members' time, when they may participate in those debates. Apart from that, they get little opportunity to speak outside their portfolio area.

They do have the same entitlement as any other member to take points of order and to make personal explanations, but only about personal reflections or personal misrepresentations. They have the right to ministerial statements, but they are statements related only to their ministerial responsibility. And they would not have the opportunity to make statements in these new grievance debates about matters that concerned their electorates if the amendment of the member for Elizabeth was agreed to. Ministers currently have the right to participate in the adjournment debate, but it is a very rare occasion when that is exercised.

From my point of view as Whip and a backbench member, and from the point of view of most other backbench members, for a Minister to participate capriciously and inappropriately in these six proposed five-minute grievances would be seen as an abuse of the House, one that would be greatly resented not only by the Opposition but by all backbench members, including those on the Government side of the House. They would bitterly resent someone who had the privileges of a Minister abusing their access to these particular grievance debates. That access would be exercised only on exceptional occasions, such as matters relating to their electorate, but certainly not in relation to anything ministerial that should be covered by a ministerial statement, or personal reflections upon themselves which would be covered by a personal explanation. For example, it could be used for some particular local issue which does not trespass on another Minister's portfolio or relate to their own portfolio; perhaps it would apply with respect to the impact of some Federal matter on their electorate. It might be used to express good wishes to some local identity on their retirement, or to express congratulations or condolences, but there would not be many of those occasions.

A Minister should be entitled to that privilege, the same as a Minister is entitled to enter into the 10-minute grievance debates. However, it would be very rare for it to occur. Ministers should not be disadvantaged by not having access to these debates, and their electorates should not be disadvantaged by Ministers not having access to this forum of the House. I am sure that it would not be abused. On that basis, I oppose the amendment on this matter moved by the member for Elizabeth.

The Hon. D.J. HOPGOOD (Deputy Premier): I thank members for their participation in this part of the consideration of these sessional orders. I will confine myself purely to remarks about two matters which are the subject of amendments placed before us by the member for Elizabeth, and I will deal with the second one first. I underline everything my colleague the member for Walsh has just said. On behalf of the Ministry, I put on record that the Ministry will not abuse this privilege; nor is it likely that it will use the privilege. Indeed, if there is even the slightest suggestion of abuse, not only will I vote for whatever is necessary in the next session to remove the opportunity, I will second the motion. Enough said about that.

I turn now to the matter of the so-called rolling guillotine. First, let me say that I felt, and still feel, that part of my responsibility to this Chamber, as the Leader of the House and, incidentally, a person who took no part in the deliberations of the report (not being a member of the committee), I had to try to find consensus in this matter. When it was conveyed to me that the Opposition would not support at this stage in this session an automatic rolling guillotine, it seemed to me I would be placing myself and the Government in a position of denying to some members what they saw as a right if in fact I recommended that this Chamber voted in such a way as to do away with the right,

quixotic though it may sometimes seem to be, of a member to leave his or her motion on the Notice Paper for an indefinite length of time. I fully support the principle of what the member for Elizabeth is trying to do: to get away from this business of everything being adjourned to the end of the session and there being very little incentive for getting on with the job.

The very clarity of what the member for Elizabeth has said has also clarified my thoughts on this, and I now better understand from the last 10 minutes or so why certain members are a little hesitant about embracing this at this stage. The member for Elizabeth contrasted what I am now asking the House to do with what I ask the House to do at about 3.15 p.m. every Tuesday. I will make a couple of points there. First, if we were to accept this amendment, we would not be giving the House the option from time to time of guillotining a particular private member's motion. We have that now: we do not use it, but we could. We would be writing into the sessional orders that that must happen unless the House, by specific resolution, set aside that provision. To that extent, the illustration is not really apposite.

Secondly, we would be taking away from members that which we do not remove from the Government. If Government business is guillotined, it is because the Government wants it guillotined. It decides from week to week what it wants guillotined. I remind members that, in the last session, I introduced amendments to the Community Welfare Act and the Children's Protection and Young Offenders Act. From all the might and power of my position as Deputy Premier, I was not able to get that debated in the session or, rather, I chose to give other things preference in the overall interests of Government business. Incidentally, I still have not reintroduced those Bills.

I can remember the time when, in Opposition, I used to taunt the member for Heysen, as Minister for Environment and Planning, when he would regularly bring into the House a Bill to amend the Aboriginal Heritage Act, and it would sit and sit on the Notice Paper. At the end of the session, it would be one of the slaughtered innocents, as we say, and it would be introduced in the next session and sit and sit on the Notice Paper again.

One wonders why the thing was introduced. However, it was the right of the Government of the day and of the honourable member, as Minister, not to have his motion debated for whatever reason. We have Bills on the Notice Paper—Government business—that may still be on the Notice Paper on 17 November or, even, 30 November. That will largely be because the Government decides either that other matters have priority or, indeed, that it is not appropriate at that stage to proceed with certain legislation.

Sometimes Bills are introduced and allowed to remain on the Notice Paper merely as a way of informing the public of what the Government has in mind—as a sort of semi-statutory green paper, as it were. Again, that is sometimes what honourable members have in mind. That is the argument on the other side of the fence. I am not sure whether it is altogether a compelling argument. If private members' time continues to be the shambles that the member for Elizabeth feels it is at this point, I have no doubt that the House, in its wisdom, will return to the matter in the new session. In any event, given that these are sessional orders, clearly something will be done in the next session in relation to all of these matters. I commend my original motion to the House.

The Committee divided on the amendments after subparagraph b (iii) (A) and after subparagraph I c:

Ayes (2)—Messrs Blacker and M.J. Evans (teller).

Noes (39)—Messrs Allison, Armitage, L.M.F. Arnold, P.B. Arnold, Atkinson, S.J. Baker, Bannon, Becker and Brindal, Ms Cashmore, Messrs Chapman, De Laine, Eastick, S.G. Evans, Ferguson, Goldsworthy, Gregory, Groom, Gunn, Hamilton, Hemmings, Heron, Holloway and Hopgood (teller), Mrs Hutchison, Messrs Ingerson and Klunder, Mrs Kotz, Ms Lenehan, Messrs Lewis, McKee, Matthew, Mayes, Meier, Quirke, Such, Trainer, Venning and Wotton.

Majority of 37 for the Noes.

Amendments thus negatived.

Amendment to subparagraph IIa negatived; motion carried.

ADJOURNMENT

At 5.43 p.m. the House adjourned until Tuesday 22 October at 2 p.m.