HOUSE OF ASSEMBLY

Thursday 20 February 1992

The SPEAKER (Hon. N.T. Peterson) took the Chair at 10.30 a.m. and read prayers.

FISHERIES

Adjourned debate on motions of Mr Meier:

(a) That the Regulations under the Fisheries Act 1982 relating to Abalone Fishery—Scheme of Management made on 27 June and laid on the Table of this House on 8 August 1991, be disallowed.

(b) That the Regulations under the Fisheries Act 1982 relating to Prawn Fishery—Scheme of Management, made on 27 June and laid on the Table of this House on 8 August 1991, be disallowed.

(c) That the Regulations under the Fisheries Act 1982 relating to Rock Lobster Fishery—Scheme of Management, made on 27 June and laid on the Table of this House on 8 August 1991, be disallowed.

(d) That the Regulations under the Fisheries Act 1982 relating to General Fishery—Definitions, Sizes and Licences, made on 27 June and laid on the Table of this House on 8 August 1991, be disallowed.

(e) That the Regulations under the Fisheries Act 1982 relating to Lakes and Coorong Fishery—Scheme of Management, made on 27 June and laid on the Table of this House on 8 August 1991, be disallowed.

(f) That the Regulations under the Fisheries Act 1982 relating to Marine Scalefish Fishery—Scheme of Management, made on 27 June and laid on the Table of this House on 8 August 1991, be disallowed.

(g) That the Regulations under the Fisheries Act 1982 relating to River Fishery—Scheme of Management, made on 27 June and laid on the Table of this House on 8 August 1991, be disallowed.

(h) That the Regulations under the Fisheries Act 1982 relating to Experimental Crab Fishery—Licences, made on 27 June and laid on the Table of this House on 8 August 1991, be disallowed.

(Continued from 19 February. Page 2958.)

Mr McKEE (Gilles): It is considered that all the matters raised by the member for Goyder have been addressed, particularly with the passage of the Fisheries Act Amendment Bill in December 1991. The major area of contention at the time was the proposed amendments to section 37 of the Fisheries Act, dealing with the ability of the Minister and the Director of Fisheries to amend access arrangements under fisheries licences. This was fully debated during the consideration of the Fisheries Act Amendment Bill and was satisfactorily resolved with the incorporation of industry requested amendments. It is believed that this issue is no longer of concern.

However, it may be necessary to address the basic need for fisheries management. This can be summarised as: fish stocks are common property resources owned by the community of South Australia; access to exploit them is provided to commercial and recreational fishers; and the Government of the day has the responsibility for stewardship of these resources on behalf of present and future generations. The principal objectives of this stewardship are: ensuring through proper conservation and management that the living resources of the waters of South Australia are not endangered or over-exploited; and achieving an optimum utilisation and equitable distribution of those resources. This requires the necessary mechanisms (management arrangements) to ensure that exploitation (catch) is kept within biologically acceptable and sustainable levels. It also requires ongoing adjustment to management arrangements due to increases in fishing power by all sectors through avenues such as the introduction of new technology.

The package of amendments approved provides for the current mechanisms for addressing the objectives. The package has resulted from thorough and full consultation with both the recreational and commercial sectors as well as a broader cross-section of the community. The department is unaware of any ongoing concerns from the industry relating to the amendments; in fact, a significant number of the amendments result from industry requests.

Mr BLACKER secured the adjournment of the debate.

CONSUMER PRICE INDEX

Mr HOLLOWAY (Mitchell): I move:

That this House supports the call of the South Australian Council on the Ageing for a review by the Commonwealth Department of Social Security of the basket of goods and services included in the Consumer Price Index as the basis for indexing pensions.

This issue was highlighted in the first half of last year when we had a negative increase in the Consumer Price Index leading, of course, to no indexation rise in pensions. In that half of the year, the negative Consumer Price Index came about as a consequence of a big drop in the CPI as a result of lower housing costs and fuel prices. As I said, as a result of that there was no indexation increase for pensioners in that half of the year.

I want to congratulate the South Australian Council on the Ageing for raising this particular issue and to quote from its newsletter of December 1991, as I think this article sets out well the problems faced by pensioners. The article states:

The problem is, of course, that the CPI is an average figure across the whole population. The CPI is measured by taking a 'basket' of goods and services which research shows to be representative of most people's spending patterns.

In fact SACOTA believes the CPI does not accurately reflect most older people's costs of living, and certainly not pensioners. Most, for example, have much lower housing costs than younger people, but spend a higher percentage of their income on food and household items.

If our belief is correct it means that right now your overall costs are going up faster than the 'average' person's. However it also means that a couple of years ago, when the CPI was escalating, your costs were probably rising more slowly than the 'average'. Then you were doing better than the 'pensioner CPI' (if it had existed), now you are doing worse.

What SACOTA is doing.

The Councils on the Ageing have proposed to the Minister of Social Security an urgent special study on the CPI 'basket' for pensioners. Some theoretical work is being done by the department—we want to match it with some practical information . . .

The purpose of this motion is to congratulate the Council on the Ageing for the steps it is taking to look at the whole basket of goods that makes up the CPI. I would like to give some information as to how the CPI is comprised. An article in a publication of the Australian Bureau of Statistics, which is the body responsible for recording the Consumer Price Index, states:

The CPI measures quarterly changes in the price of a basket of goods and services which accounts for a high proportion of expenditure by the CPI population group (i.e. metropolitan wage and salary earner households).

I point out that, it does not include pensioners. The article continues:

This basket covers a wide range of goods and services, arranged in the following eight groups: food; clothing; housing; household equipment and operation; transportation; tobacco and alcohol; health and personal care; and recreation and education. Pensioners and other social welfare recipients are not included in the CPI population group and the index does not reflect concessional

prices paid by these people, such as subsidised Government dwelling rents, public transport fares and the like.

Another point I would like to make about the measurement of the CPI is that the capital city index measures price movements over time in each city individually: it does not measure differences in retail price levels between cities. We have eight groups of goods and services that make up the CPI. Of course, the problem that pensioners, particularly those who are on the basic pension, face is that they spend most of their income on basic goods, such as food and clothing, whereas many of the other goods that are taken into account in the CPI do not affect pensioners so much.

It is already recognised by the Australian Bureau of Statistics that there is a need for a regular review of the basket of goods that make up the CPI. This is necessary purely for statistical reasons, because we find that over time people's consumption patterns change. Changes also occur in relative prices between goods over time, in taste for goods and in disposable income, and also new products are introduced onto the market. So, the Australian Bureau of Statistics, as a matter of course, regularly reviews the components of the CPI.

What the motion is really getting at is the need to look at this matter specifically from the point of view of pensioners. Because the CPI is now the basis for indexing pensions, it is important that, if pensioners are to keep up their relative standard of living, the index that is used to increase those pensions be based on the goods that the pensioners themselves currently consume. That is what is really needed, and that is why we need some research by the Department of Social Security on this matter. Hopefully, as a result of that, we will would get a much better measure by which to adjust pensions.

We can see the problems that face pensioners at the moment if we look at some of the increases in those eight groups, which I mentioned earlier and which make up the CPI. If we look at the changes over the 1991 calendar year, we see that food, on which pensioners would spend a much higher proportion of their income than other groups in the community, has undergone a 3 per cent increase and clothing a 2 per cent increase. However, the price of housing, which does not affect the vast majority of pensioners, actually fell by 3.9 per cent over the year, and a fall of 1.8 per cent occurred in transportation. On the other hand, household equipment and operations increased by 2.4 per cent, tobacco and alcohol rose by 5.8 per cent, health and personal care (which is an area of particular concern to pensioners) rose by 11.8 per cent and recreation and education costs rose by 1 per cent. The total for all groups was 1.5 per cent. The point is that those groups that particularly affect pensioners rose by more than some of the other groups, which actually experienced a decrease. That highlights the need to develop a measure for indexing pensions which is fairest to pensioners.

It needs to be said that it would not be possible to get a perfect measure of any consumer price system; no system will suit everybody. However, I believe we can get a much better system and certainly one that is much fairer to pensioners. Of course, with the ageing of the population and with a larger number of people being dependent on pensions for their income, this is an important issue. I would like to conclude by again congratulating the Council on the Ageing for the work that it does, on behalf of pensioners in the community. I am sure that all members would recognise that work and also congratulate the council on what it does. In particular, I congratulate the council on bringing this issue to the attention of the public and members of this House. I hope that, as a result of this motion and of the work being done by the South Australian Council on the Ageing, we can help develop a better system for indexing pensions. I hope that, as a result of that, pensioners in this country will be put in a much better position.

Mr QUIRKE (Playford): I should like to make a few brief comments on this motion. It is clear that what is good for the goose is not necessarily good for the gander. By that I mean that, whenever we have an average and an averaging process, that is done across the whole community, across the board, and in many respects does an injustice to a large group of people who have different interests, different perspectives and, in this instance, different consumer spending patterns.

There is no doubt that the CPI, as it is currently measured, is a poor indicator of prices in the supermarket. There is no doubt that the CPI, as measured by the Australian Bureau of Statistics, is a terrible measure for a whole range of other major consumer items. The member for Mitchell referred to sporting and recreational activities, and made a very good point about the cost movements in those areas. He also alluded to the fact that in many instances the pricing structure from one State to the next is barely taken into account at all in CPI movements.

Whilst I think in general in South Australia the CPI and the way that it is measured probably indicates that prices on supermarket shelves in particular are lower than in some of our Eastern State counterparts, the fact of the matter is that mortgage repayments and a whole range of other factors are taken into account in determining the CPI. A couple of years ago mortgages made up a fair component of the CPI, as indeed did the movement in the price of petrol. However, at this stage, with a relatively flat oil market, with interest rates going down to levels that we have not seen for many years and with a whole range of other factors like that, costs at the coalface do not show the sorts of movements that are really taking place out there.

My view is that the CPI is a poor measure in particular for targeting pension rises and aid in general to the aged section of our population. I believe that the Federal Government and the Australian Bureau of Statistics must look at targeting, in particular, the sorts of measures that are so important in determining pension rates in this country. To see, as we did in the media over the past few days, that the next pension rise will be less than $3 is ludicrous and disproportionate in comparison with the obvious costs of living increases which will affect this disadvantaged group in our community. I have no problem in seconding the motion, and I call on the Federal Government to focus more sharply its analysis to help pensioners and to develop a more effective way of dealing with pension movements.

Mr LEWIS secured the adjournment of the debate.

HILLCREST HOSPITAL

Dr ARMITAGE (Adelaide): I move:

That this House, in the absence of specific information concerning the community support services which will be provided following the closure of Hillcrest Hospital, calls on the Government to halt further devolution of Hillcrest Hospital services until the adequate provision in the western surburbs of—

(a) a community psychiatric treatment team;
(b) increased day facilities;
(c) an industrial therapy workshop program;
(d) increased accommodation; and
(e) a drop-in centre

for psychiatric patients in the community.

This motion is based on the fact that Hillcrest Hospital ostensibly will close, the reasons for which I have canvassed

in this place previously. I believe there are a number of reasons, not the least of which is that part of the funds generated from the closure of Hillcrest Hospital will be returned to State Treasury. We all know the state of the finances at the moment. Part also will go to prop up other services within the health portfolio.

The Mental Health Services are under pressure. Given that, there is no clear information as to what will happen to community support for the patients who are at present at Hillcrest Hospital or who use it as the base for their community support. I remind members that the people affected by this motion are often unable to help themselves, and they are above all the types of persons whom we as members of Parliament ought to be helping.

There are many doubts about the plans for the closure of Hillcrest in general, not the least of which is where the beds will go. We have been told many things in the past, one being that 20 of the 60 acute-use beds will go to the Repatriation General Hospital. It was in this House one week ago that the Parliament, on a bipartisan basis, passed a motion indicating that the State Government ought not accept the Repatriation General Hospital as a poisoned chalice within the State health system unless a number of uncertainties were cleared up. There is great uncertainty about what will happen to the Repatriation Hospital, yet that is part of what will be the grand plan for psychiatric services in the future. I will quote from the most recent (1991) annual report of the Flinders Medical Centre. It states:

> The South Australian Health Commission and Department of Veterans' Affairs have continued negotiations on the proposed transfer of the RGH from the Commonwealth to the State of South Australia. A number of important issues remain to be resolved, but it is hoped that the issue of whether or not a transfer will take place can be finalised during the next financial year.

So, there is absolutely no certainty as to what will happen to the Repatriation General Hospital, yet that is a major part of what will happen to Hillcrest, so there is clearly a divergence there.

Let us look at what services ought to be provided to patients from a devolved Hillcrest Hospital. I took advice from a number of people who are the most likely to know in this instance, that is, the psychiatrists who are treating patients with these types of illness, both in private and at Hillcrest Hospital and other public hospitals. I also took advice from the overall professional body, the Royal College of Psychiatrists. The types of things that they suggested to me are needed are those mentioned in the motion—a community psychiatric treatment team, increased day facilities, an industrial therapy workshop program, increased accommodation and a drop-in centre.

The common example that is held up as the most efficient mechanism in the world of community support for psychiatric patients is in Dane County, Madison, Wisconsin, where community supports for psychiatric services have occurred through evolution and not revolution. It is unfortunate that the State Government's financial situation is causing changes to Hillcrest by revolution rather than evolution. It is quite fair to say that Dane County has led the way in the world in the delivery of community-based comprehensive services. Careful thought had been given over a period of time to the needs of the target population and the system of care required to support the group before any major changes occurred.

I would like to quote from a publication entitled *A Systems Approach to Persons with Schizophrenia*. One of the authors of the article is Dr Stein, who talks about a number of problems that have occurred with schizophrenics in the community. The article states:

> . . . we also believe that there are some major problems with how these interventions and programs are organised—they are uncoordinated, they are non-collaborative, and they often compete with one another. Together they comprise a non-system of mental health care. Patients may get lost in this non-system, and no-one feels obligated to look for them . . . We need a system approach in a coordinated fashion to provide continuous and comprehensive care . . . In a system approach, specific treatments, programs, and other services, ranging from housing to financial, are established and integrated to provide comprehensive care to a population of a designated area.

I put it to the House that that is exactly what is needed for psychiatric patients in the community, particularly in the western suburbs, in which you, Mr Speaker, have a major interest. The community psychiatric treatment team, which I believe is the most important of all these measures which the Government should provide prior to any further devolution, should be based on the Madison experience, and that community team provides three levels of support: level 1, total or comprehensive support; level 2, intensive support, but not as intensive as level 1; and level 3, the provision of a single element such as work-related services.

I also believe that an industrial therapy workshop program ought to be provided because, in many instances, these devolved psychiatric patients live in hostels that close at 9 a.m., when they are sent into the streets. They have nothing to do until perhaps 4 p.m or 5 p.m. or whenever the hostel reopens. It is a tragedy for them and an indictment of our society that we do not care enough to have organised programs for them. In my view, that is one of the most essential things we ought to do.

Much of the treatment in Madison is absolutely practical, because, in many instances, these people have severe mental illnesses and are on quite high doses of powerful drugs. They are unable to survive in the community without proper supports. The sorts of supports provided by community psychiatric treatment teams—day facilities, therapy workshops and so on—are the practical things, such as help to patients to maintain their homes. There is no point in our having patients in cluster housing, which I think is regarded as perhaps the ultimate, if they cannot maintain their own homes, if they cannot go to the shops, if they do not know what groceries to buy or, if they are just able to manage grocery shopping but do not know how to prepare meals. That is the sort of support system which ought to be available and details of which we, as the Parliament responsible for these people who cannot be responsible for themselves, ought to have expected the Government to provide prior to any further devolution. There is absolutely no point in allowing people into the community if they cannot run their lives.

In Madison, the *sine qua non* of community psychiatric care, there is a support network program which runs for seven days and four evenings a week and which has a very strong, vocational emphasis. In other words, there is no intent, or reasoning behind the program, of allowing these people to vegetate. There is always the intent of getting these people functioning as properly as they can and, as I said, there is a strong, vocational emphasis, with basic training and social supports. In the area of Dane County, there are two sheltered workshops for these people in which they can occupy their time during the day, again, ostensibly, to give them a purpose in life and perhaps to earn some money from selling the products they produce in the workshops. It gives them some dignity rather than having them lie around in parks with nothing to do.

I believe that an industrial therapy workshop program is one of the most important items we should have been told about. We have been told absolutely nothing. There are many arguments in favour of community care. It is pre-

ferred by consumers, it decreases the likelihood of stigma for mentally-ill patients and, indeed, if there are proper psycho-social rehabilitative programs, there is a much greater likelihood of an improved outcome for the patients.

Surely that is what we as members of Parliament, with the responsibility to the State and indeed to the people who are unable to help themselves, ought to be expecting. It is imperative that further devolution of Hillcrest Hospital is ceased until these adequate support services are provided.

Mr McKEE secured the adjournment of the debate.

HILLS TRANSPORT SERVICES

The Hon. D.C. WOTTON (Heysen): I move:

That this House condemns the Minister of Transport regarding the planned removal of essential STA services in the Adelaide Hills and calls on the Minister, as a matter of urgency, to say what alternative forms of transport will be introduced to ensure that adequate services are provided in the area.

Since I gave notice of this motion, some information has been provided to me which suggests that it is most likely that the STA services that are to be removed from these essential routes will be replaced by the private sector. I have no objection to that happening, and I believe that the majority of people would not disagree with that action. However, considerable concern and frustration exists about what might happen because, at this stage, no definite decisions have been made. A major concern of the people who will be so badly affected by the suggested removal of the STA services is that, if the private sector is brought in, fares will increase substantially.

Last week I asked the Minister of Transport to give an assurance that fares for Hills dwellers would not increase beyond normal STA levels if private operators took over the bus routes affected, namely, routes 820, 828 and 193. The Minister was not able to give any assurance that that was the case. I understand that negotiations are continuing with the private sector. I also make the point that the services, particularly the one to Mount Barker and adjoining areas being carried out by the private sector, are very efficient, and most people who use those services are very pleased with them. However, I would be extremely concerned if STA services were removed and we experienced the significant fare increase as a result.

I have moved this motion because I am particularly concerned for the elderly and students who will not have public transport if the service is removed and a service is not put in its place, whether it be through the private sector or in any other form. I have received considerable representation from people, particularly those who are unable to drive, who use the service and who will be placed in a situation where they will have no transport at all. I do not need to remind the House that transport has been a major issue in the Hills for a very long time. It is not simply a matter of providing transport on the major routes, but the services and routes to which I have just referred are feeder services. Admittedly, route 820 is the major service from Uraidla, Summertown and Greenhill through to Adelaide, but it also serves as a feeder service. If that service is removed, it will make it very difficult, and in many cases impossible, for people to be able to get to Adelaide or into their closer communities. I am also very concerned about the effect that it will have on the schools, specifically the Heathfield High School.

I recently received a letter from the Chairman of Heathfield High School Council which I will read into *Hansard* because I believe it very clearly indicates the concerns of that council for the students who attend that school. The letter states:

At the school council meeting of 13 February 1992 serious concern was expressed at the planned cancellation of STA bus services in this district, and particularly routes 828 and 820 that provide transport for many students to this school. This concern overlays other uncertainties regarding possible changes to services previously provided by the Johnson Bus Service (now to be provided by the Mount Barker Passenger Services) and the strict limitation to eligible students (that is, those living 5 kilometres or more from the school and within the 'catchment' areas of the school) of the Education Department provided services.

As you are aware, Heathfield High School is located several kilometres from the main student 'catchment' areas for the school, particularly Crafers, Stirling, Aldgate and Bridgewater. Other students are further distant, travelling from Piccadilly Valley, Summertown and Uraidla. Public transport is essential for many to access the school.

Bus 828 is the only public transport that passes the school. This service is used for transport before and after school, and also frequently throughout the day by students needing to travel to local centres or to Adelaide for approved reasons, including appointments at doctors or dentists. If the service is removed, there is no alternative transport available and clearly the walking distance into Stirling to the remaining public transport is too great and too time consuming. The location of the school of 875 students at Heathfield must be predicated on the assumed provision of ready access to Stirling.

Loss of the 828 services, both for travel to and from school, and for travel during the day, will have a significant and adverse effect on the school, isolating the school from Stirling and from bus services that may be accessed in Stirling.

The 820 service likewise carries many students from the Uraidla, Summertown and Piccadilly Valley areas to link with the 828 service for access to the school.

Many students will find alternative travel arrangements very difficult, if not impossible. School council is particulary concerned that the nature of roads, and the climate, make cycling to school hazardous and would be most concerned if more students are forced to cycle long distances. Roads are often narrow, winding and steep, and midwinter road conditions with frequent heavy rain, poor light and low temperatures are dangerous.

School council is intending to prepare a detailed assessment on the consequences and impact of loss of these STA bus services. However, the council is confident in their view that the school and students will be significantly disadvantaged if bus transport from such a large part of its 'catchment' area is curtailed.

Council would appreciate any representations that you are able to make on behalf of the school community to maintain adequate public transport access to the school and to alert the 'decision makers' to our view and the needs of our community. In particular, council believes the following issues need to be addressed with some urgency.

(1) Retention of the STA 828 and 820 services or comparable.

(2) Coordination of transport provision in the Hills area to ensure adequate services.

(3) Early public release of comprehensive statement regarding future services to be provided by the Education Department, STA and Mount Barker Services in the reorganised provision of Hills bus services.

(4) A public assurance that the decisions taken will take into account the particular needs of the Hills area and not equate the area with inner metropolitan Adelaide.

(5) A recognition that, whilst other services are less well represented in the area, the diminution of passenger services should not be argued solely on the basis of economy.

I support the concerns expressed in that letter and also the concerns that have been expressed by others who have made strong representations to me. I urge members to support the motion.

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

PUBLIC TRANSPORT CURFEW

Mr MATTHEW (Bright): I move:

That this House calls on the Government to abandon its short sighted decision to cease operating public transport at 10 p.m. on Sunday to Thursday of each week without providing an alterna-

tive means by which South Australians can gain access to affordable transport.

It is fitting that this motion follows another motion on a public transport matter moved so well by my colleague the member for Heysen. It signifies the marked deterioration of STA services. The Minister of Transport has now announced, much to the horror of the South Australian public, that as of 1 August 1992 bus and train services from Sunday to Thursday of each week will cease. Initially, some people thought that meant that they would at least have the opportunity to catch a bus or a train just before 10 p.m., but not so.

What the Minister's announcement did not include was the fact that 10 p.m. is the time at which the last bus must be back at the depot. So, for residents of the outer suburbs of Adelaide, particularly the northern and southern suburbs, it means that many of them must catch their last bus or train prior to 9 p.m. What sort of city anywhere in Australia or in the world would place a curfew of this nature on its public transport system? We have become the laughing stock of Australia: we will become the laughing stock of the world for this outrageously ridiculous situation.

My electorate contains eight railway stations and I probably, therefore, have more concern expressed to me by railway commuters than does any other member of this Parliament. Many of these people see this as being the last straw. First, we had problems with security on trains. People did not feel safe travelling at night or during the day. They did not feel safe leaving their cars in a car park. Only a few minutes ago I was talking to a constituent who had both rear tyres of her vehicle slashed in a railway station car park. That was the start of the problem.

We then saw the proliferation of vandalism that has become such a scourge in our society. Other members of this House and I tried to do something about it by suggesting the 'adopt a railway station' system. I was continually berated by the Minister of Transport in this Parliament for that suggestion but eventually he had to bow to community pressure and that program was introduced—just as he will have to bow to community pressure for this outlandish, outrageous decision he has made.

Following the vandalism problem we had the train strikes, over which the Minister refused to intervene. What is more, he left the State. On that occasion, the Minister went to Tasmania, to the Wrest Point Casino, to participate in an ALP conference. He could have sent a delegate, but it was far easier to turn his back on the problem and go. We then had the train ticket debacle, which is still with us. You cannot buy a ticket on a train. The Minister tells us that you can buy them from post offices, but they are being closed everywhere.

I note, Madam Acting Speaker, that you have quite rightly expressed concern about this outrageous situation. So, even fewer places will be selling train tickets. Next we had the timetable changes. The number of trains and buses has been reduced, but now we have this elimination of transport services more than just after 10 o'clock at night: that is the time at which the last train and bus must be back at their depot. Public anger can best be demonstrated by one of the many letters of complaint received by my office. This letter from a constituent at Seacliff Park reads in part:

> I refer to the recent announcement made by Mr Frank Blevins, Minister of Transport, re axing of train and bus services after 10, Sunday to Thursday. This absolutely disgusts me as being a member of the public relying on public transport to convey me to and from work at [his place of work] . . . also, the article that appeared in the *Advertiser* 1/2/92. My personal situation is this . . . I am currently employed, although working casually . . . I was forced on to the dole queue through no fault of my own; an accident at work caused great stress and trauma for me and, due to not being able to cope with my job, I left and found employment that was more suitable. However, I had been working [there] as well as my full-time job for the past seven years. My job [is night work and] does not allow me to drop everything and dash for a train before 10 p.m. It is not possible to finish work until 10.30 p.m. or 11 p.m. at the latest.

And he will therefore be disadvantaged through this decision. The letter finishes:

> Also, may I say this: I sincerely hope John Bannon and his league of Ministers responsible for putting this State into the mess it is, at the next election get the biggest hiding or thrashing in this State's political history. If you feel inclined perhaps you may wish to read this letter in Parliament personally to Mr Blevins.

Regrettably, the Minister of Transport is not in the Chamber at the moment, but I have no doubt that he will read what I have had to say in *Hansard*, and I hope he takes note of those comments. It is interesting that many of the people who contact me to express their disgust over this action also tell me that they usually vote Labor; they usually vote for the Party that is in Government, but not next time: this is the last straw. Many of them do not have a car, so their means of getting around is being taken away from them. What of the problems that will be caused for people who have been out at night, had a couple of drinks, know they are over the limit and follow the Minister's advice to responsibly catch public transport and not drive? Now he is taking the means away from them. Perhaps the Minister's aim is to gain a few more bickies for the coffers through people being pulled over for being over the limit. I would hope that his methods are not simply that cynical, but one has to question his motive.

It is fair to say that I and other members of this Parliament would argue that there is a need to run a more efficient public transport system. I do not dispute that; I also do not dispute the fact that some services are not patronised as well as they could be, but axing them is not the answer. One has to look at why they are not being patronised. It may be that people are too scared to use them because of lack of security; it may be that people feel they do not have sufficient access to tickets; it may be that the services do not run a connecting service to the appropriate train or bus service. These things need to be investigated, and alternative methods of transport need to be provided if the Government feels that particular services are not economical. The fact is that people do use these services; the numbers are not as low as 400, as the Minister would have had us believe initially, and I was pleased that he admitted the error in his statistics in this Parliament in response to a question I asked only last week. The fact remains that people are not getting the service to which they are entitled, and this Government must back down from this ludicrous proposition and do something.

I am aware that this proposition has been before the Minister for quite some time. Over 12 months ago a proposal was put to the City of Marion and it was treated as confidential within the City of Marion's minutes. The reasons are perhaps understandable. The proposal that the Ministers department put to the City of Marion was that a taxi bus service be operated in my electorate, along the 681 bus route from Hallett Cove and the Hallett Cove Beach railway stations. The proposal was that passengers would catch their taxi from their railway station, show their railway ticket and pay 50c to be dropped off at the door, but that the taxi would not leave the railway station until it was full, in other words, until it had four occupants. Unfortunately, the union did not like it. It started jumping up and down saying, 'Hey, you are taking away our jobs.' It refused to budge and threatened the Minister with a lot of trouble, so he backed off. I was approached by the Taxi Drivers

Association, which asked, 'What is happening? We want to take up this service.'

Marion council wanted to know what was happening, because the Minister had backed off and the council got sick of it. The STA told Marion council that it did not want the council to advertise the service with any association with the STA—it had to be Marion council alone—and the STA would not give the council any guarantee of financial support beyond 12 months. Naturally, the City of Marion said, 'We're not prepared to commit ratepayers' money to that sort of uncertain proposal; we are backing off.'

The council has been left in the lurch. The Minister was left in a situation where he did not have his pilot scheme in Hallett Cove; he did not have his back-up services to replace those that he was going to axe, but he has done that anyway. He has left everyone in the lurch and we are now left with people who are stranded, particularly dwellers in southern suburbs.

I conclude by saying that I was particularly angry to hear the Minister touting his proposal as one that would benefit dwellers of outlying suburbs. I invite the Minister to get out of Whyalla and go to places like Noarlunga Centre, Christies Beach and Hallett Cove and ask residents of those suburbs whether they believe they have been advantaged by his proposal. The Minister will find that he gets a resounding 'No'. I urge the Minister and members—particularly Independent members—to look at this proposal and vote for the motion and signify to the Government that they, too, have had a gutful and that they are not willing to put up with this nonsense. I commend the motion to the House.

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

WOOL SALES CENTRES

Mr BLACKER (Flinders): I move:

That this House views with concern the statements by Mac Drysdale, Chairman of the Australian Wool Corporation, that 'Centralisation of wool sales (is) inevitable' and strongly supports the retention of the Wool Selling Centre in Adelaide.

I thank members for their consideration in allowing me to transpose this motion with one I had listed earlier on the Notice Paper. This issue first came to a head and became a matter of public concern on 19 December last year when the *Stock and Land*, a New South Wales publication, published the article headed 'Wool sales centralisation "inevitable"'. The report went on to quote Mr Mac Drysdale (Chairman, Australian Wool Corporation), claiming that all the sales centres, other than the three top sales centres, would be closed. Needless to say, that created much concern for the South Australian woolgrowing industry, for brokers and employees at the Adelaide Woolstores and for everyone else involved, because the statement made by Mr Drysdale was definitive that the wool sales centre in Adelaide would be one of a number that would be closed.

Some said that the response to this was rather hysterical and that it was not taking the full implication into account. However, that concern was further exacerbated in an article appearing in the February/March edition of *The Farmer*, and headed 'Centralisation of wool sales inevitable—Drysdale'. It quotes Mr Drysdale as saying that all of the smaller selling centres were at risk and would no doubt be closed. In fact, he claimed that that was inevitable. That was further backed up by statements made in other news media, and there has been quite a strong reaction from the wool growing industry as a consequence.

I have had some feedback from my own electorate, where the response in every instance was that the Adelaide wool sales centre must be retained. I then undertook to do some research to find out just where Adelaide fitted in to the whole picture of the wool selling centres and I found that we have been selling in the vicinity of 623 000 bales of wool per season. That was the total for the 1990-91 season. I would like to have inserted in *Hansard* a small statistical table, detailing the number of bales sold in the 1990-91 season and in the first half of 1991-92.

The ACTING SPEAKER (Mrs Hutchison): Is it purely statistical?

Mr BLACKER: I assure you, Madam Acting Speaker, that it is purely statistical.

Leave granted.

Bales of Wool

Selling Centre	1990-91 Season	First Half 1991-92
Sydney	989 269	416 985
Newcastle	324 127	150 236
Goulburn	188 525	56 830
Brisbane	549 018	213 193
Melbourne	728 678	414 049
Geelong	532 858	165 088
Adelaide	623 587	294 134
Fremantle	1 107 884	535 082
Launceston	117.137	42.157
Total	5 491 286	2 392 591

Mr BLACKER: I thank the House for granting leave. It is imperative that we understand that Adelaide is a very significant wool selling centre. Although we are listed as fourth out of 13 in terms of wool sold, on a per bale average basis we are well up among the top wool selling centres. The Sydney wool selling centre sells 989 000 bales, but it has 18 sales, and the Adelaide centre sells 623 000 bales with 13 sales. It means that our average per sale is in the vicinity of 47 900 bales. Let us discount that a few bales, because wool is always carried over from one sale to the next. For the purpose of this assessment, we could say that an average of 45 000 bales would be an appropriate figure.

Having established that figure we then look at the so-called benefits of selling in the Eastern States, where the average is 45 160 bales. In other words, the average of the Sydney and Melbourne selling centres is exactly the same as Adelaide's, but their total sales of wool cover a larger number of sales. As a consequence, I think we are up among the best of them.

Looking at the advantages—or more particularly the disadvantages—of retaining the selling centre, I have sought from the Adelaide Wool Brokers Association some statistical figures on costs, as they would see them, including incidentals involving the roster system, sample bags, secondhand wool packs, freight, catering, and so on. Again, I seek leave of the House to have inserted in *Hansard* a statistical table setting out those individual figures on a per lot and per bale basis.

The ACTING SPEAKER: The honourable member can assure the House that it is purely statistical?

Mr BLACKER: Yes, Madam Acting Speaker.

Leave granted.

Additional Costs. Adelaide Sales—Separation into Melbourne

1. Adelaide Present Roster 13 Sales per season

Receivals—

1989-90	631 403 bales
1990-91	618 596 bales
Base receivals used for calculations	585 000 bales
Average sales volume for 13 sales	45 000 bales per sale
Centres average lot size	10 bales

Average number of lots per sale .. 4 500 lots
Average number of samples packed per sale—for transport ..... 20 samples

		Cost per lot c	Cost per bale c
2. Sample Bags and Seals	$		
Per sale—4 500 bags at $1.30	5 850		
50 per cent split & not re-usable	2 925		
Includes packing and return of re-usable bags. Cost—	2 925	65	6.5
3. Secondhand wool-packs			
Per sale—4 500 samples at 20 samples per bale		15	1.5
225 secondhand wool packs at $3.00 pack	675		
(Not re-usable)			
4. Freight—Transport to Melbourne			
Per sale—225 bales at $12 per bale	2 700	60	6.0
5. Catering—			
Melbourne centre charge 26c per bale			
Adelaide centre cost 17c per bale			
45 000 bales at 9c per bale	4 050	90	9.0
6. Displaying and Selling (including sale room charge and all associated showfloor costs)			
Melbourne			
4 500 lots at $9.00 per catalogue lot* offered	40 500	9.0	90.0
* Note—Any passed in lots attract same charges again when re-offered			
* Passed in twice—New sample required to be sent.			
7. Insurance			
Includes—Intraset:			
— Against work performed—that is, re-gribbing. if samples damaged or security violated.			
— Against legal action—by grower for missing sale, financial deadline, market fluctuations etc.		1.8	18.0
— 4 500 lots at $1.80	8 100		
8. Communication			
Adelaide, Melbourne—Client instructions, reserves etc.		.2	.02
$900 per sale for 4 500 lots		.20	2.00
		13.30	
		+ .80	
Total per lot*		14.10	1.33
* Brokers capital utilisation (premises, fixtures, fittings)			.08
No Contingency built in			1.44 total per bale
Per bale 4 500 at 14.10	63 450		
Times 13 sales	825 000 Total per season additional lot Minimum		

Mr BLACKER: These figures are just part of the story. The figures indicate not only the cost per bale and per lot basis but also a total figure of some 825 000 bales. That is only on the surface. We then need to look at the longer term effect on employment. Immediately, 21 jobs would be lost at the selling centre. More particularly, there are the factors that are not quite so obvious: for example, the amount of wool that would be redirected from the Adelaide centre to the eastern seaboard.

I refer to 100 000 bales from the South-East of South Australia, to the western districts and the Darling River centre. That wool presently goes to Adelaide, but would be redirected to Melbourne; and some 50 000 bales from the western division of New South Wales, that presently comes to Adelaide, would go to Sydney. That is one-quarter of our wool stores. If that occurred, it is estimated that 48 storemen, staff and truck drivers and seven Australian wool testing staff would lose their jobs immediately. So, 55 members of staff would be out of a job immediately together with a further 21 staff in the actual selling arena. On top of that is the cost of accommodation, meals and entertainment in respect of 13 sales per season with an average buyer attendance of 100 persons over three nights for each sale. So, there would be about 3 900 bed night stays and a similar amount of expenditure would be incurred along with about 20 to 25 hire cars per sale over a three day period. So, the accumulated benefits to the State obviously exist to a very large degree.

What I am really saying is that if auctions cease in Adelaide all we will be doing is transferring those jobs, expenses and tourist accommodation to Melbourne or Sydney. So, if you like, again it is a grab from the Eastern seaboard to take away a selling centre that is so vitally important to us. From a grower's point of view, we could add another significant issue. On average, at least 100 growers per day go down to Adelaide to watch their wool being sold. They do so because they want to see how their wool compares with that of other growers. In this way, they are trying to breed sheep and to grow wool for a market. If the growers do not have that ability what will they do? Will they trust a fax machine because a buyer or someone to whom they cannot relate advises that something is right or wrong or whatever?

Another matter for concern is the security of samples. If we send samples to Melbourne or Sydney, what guarantee is there that those samples are secure? Ten years ago, members will recall some industrial trouble—I believe it was an airline strike—and as a result a sale could not be conducted in Adelaide. Samples were sent by rail to Melbourne on that particular occasion. Inadvertently, the railtruck was shunted onto the wrong line. I believe that it was less than a day before the sale was due to start before that rail truck was relocated and the samples found. Although nothing happened on that occasion, there was concern and anxiety about the risk of the loss of those samples. If that occurred, a new lot of samples would have to be obtained with, therefore, a further three month delay with associated costs to the farmers. So, the costs are indeed great.

Another advantage of retaining wool sales in Adelaide is that Adelaide has a reputation for good pastoral type medium to strong wools. So, consistently and repeatedly Adelaide commands slightly higher prices than similar quality wools at other sales. That advantage would be lost. The Adelaide Wool Brokers Association wrote to the Minister (Hon. Lynn Arnold) setting out a number of its concerns, some of which I have already covered but others of which include: the additional cost to Australian wool growers; in excess of 90 per cent of Australia's wool growers support the continuation of auction sales in South Australia; redirection of the

wool and loss of jobs, as I have explained; no saving to the wool industry has been identified thus far; and the sale of about $370 million worth of wool through its Adelaide sales would be lost.

If the Australian Wool Corporation takes away that selling centre, five wool brokers who are working actively in the system at the moment will be affected. The two major wool brokers (Dalgety Bennetts Farmers and Elders) would have some obligation to close their sales here and go to the Eastern States. However, the three smaller brokers who do not have their compatriots in other States would be obliged to conduct their sales in South Australia.

I refer to an article in the *Advertiser* of 16 January that quite clearly demonstrates that those wool sales will take place, and that buyers will attend. I understand that almost all the buyers have sent a petition saying that they would still come to Adelaide. Only two or three have not been game to sign the petition because they have a corporate structure and also have dealings with other wool selling centres. However, I understand that privately they are more than happy with the situation. It needs to be said that the three month trial of selling wool in Melbourne in 1979-80 has become a joke. This is referred to in the same article, as follows:

> If it hadn't finished after three months, the entire buyers corps would have walked out and found jobs somewhere else. It was just not possible to keep up with the sheer volume of wool being offered in Melbourne.

I appreciate that that is probably a logistical problem and that the volume of wool sales can be handled with restructuring of equipment and premises. However, it clearly demonstrates that there is a problem. I hope that I have demonstrated to the House that the concern is very great. I appreciate that time is running out. I am also aware that some of those who have made the statements are having a re-think. I believe that industry is very committed to the line it is taking.

A letter from Mr John Withers, who is from Cooinda Station, via Wentworth in New South Wales, states, in part:

> On several occasions some of my wool has been sold by separation in Melbourne due to industrial trouble or other reasons, and I have not received the same return per kilogram as when sold in Adelaide.
>
> Buyers come to Adelaide to buy a different type of wool grown by the robust South Australian merino and a lot of it from the pastoral areas. I am the fourth generation to sell wool through Elders in Adelaide from the same piece of country, and I hope to continue to do so for a long time.
>
> A petition signed by 51 wool buyers indicate they don't want to lose Adelaide, brokers don't, growers and employees don't and, until the AWC can come up with proof that growers and the industry will benefit, then I oppose it.

I believe that that expresses the sentiments of the vast majority of woolgrowers in this State, and I call on the House to support my motion.

Mr De LAINE (Price): I support the member for Flinders' motion on the recent statements made by Mr Mac Drysdale, Chairman of the Australian Wool Corporation, who suggests that the wool auction centre at Port Adelaide should be closed in favour of Sydney, Melbourne and Fremantle. The member for Flinders has outlined most of the relevant points, but I would like to make a few in addition. Factors to be considered, should the centre be closed are: the effect on South Australian growers' costs and returns (and it is estimated that growers would have to pay an additional cost of $1.41 per bale of wool if it were sold by separation in Melbourne); the effect on marketing efficiencies in the wool industry; the job losses which would occur in the wool, hospitality and transport industries, as well as in small business, particularly in the Port Adelaide area (and that is an area which concerns me greatly) because of the already depressed situation there and the job losses that have already been suffered during this recession; and the effect that the closure would have generally on businesses in Port Adelaide, bearing in mind that there are about 56 empty shops there at the moment, exacerbating the problem even more.

Also the loss of the Adelaide Wool Selling Centre would affect the employment prospects of storemen, broker staff, truck drivers and wool testing staff. In addition, it is possible that some growers in western New South Wales and in the South-East who currently deliver to Adelaide would send their wool direct to Melbourne or Sydney. This would reduce warehouse use and affect transport operators in South Australia, to their detriment once again.

The member for Flinders referred to the fact that 623 587 bales of wool went through Port Adelaide, and this represents 11 per cent of the national wool clip. The effects are substantial, because that 11 per cent represents, for this last financial year, a total of $380 million going through Adelaide, particularly through Port Adelaide. The member for Flinders also referred to losses to the hospitality industry and how this would be significant because of the personnel that come into Port Adelaide when each of these auctions are held. Wool producers have rightly been encouraged to attend wool sales and receive feedback from this experience to enable them to improve the preparation and marketing of their wool. The closing of Adelaide as a centre would deprive South Australian farmers of this valuable opportunity while wool is being sold by sample. They would not be able to justify the expense of travelling to Melbourne.

The Wool Industry Advisory Committee has established a working party group to look again at the costs and benefits of reducing the number of selling centres in Adelaide. This group is comprised of representatives from brokers, buyers, private treaty merchants, the Wool Council and the Australian Wool Corporation. Unfortunately, statements by the Chairman of the Australian Wool Corporation regarding the closing of some centres has pre-empted the findings of the Wool Industry Advisory Committee. The Minister of Agriculture has written to the Federal Minister for Primary Industries and Energy and the Chairman of the Australian Wool Council to ensure that South Australia's interests are taken into account. I strongly support the motion moved by the member for Flinders and ask other members of this House to do the same.

Mr BLACKER (Flinders): I thank the member for Price for his support, and I trust that the House will give the motion its full support.

Motion carried.

LIVE SHEEP EXPORT TRADE

Mr LEWIS (Murray-Mallee): I move:

> That this House supports the live sheep export trade and acknowledges that it is an industry which adds considerable value to the sheep products industry in this State.

Many Australian export commodities earn low unit returns because, by exporting basic commodities with little or no value added component, we fail to get the best advantage for our communities from them. Yet a very large proportion of our export commodities offer an economically viable opportunity for additional processing, called value adding. This stimulates our economy and earns increased export income. The Minister for Primary Industries and Energy, Mr Simon Crean, is a strong advocate of this concept. He has directed that many export commodities be critically assessed to establish whether maximum benefits are being

realised or whether greater benefit can be gained by 'value adding' and then selling the basic product in the different forms in which consumers want it.

Frequently during the past 20 years the live sheep industry has been incorrectly described by a number of interests as being a 'non-value added' trade. They include the AMIEU and its meat processing employers, many of which are State-owned quangos. They say that it should be gradually reduced and that efforts need to be directed towards establishing a higher volume of 'value-added' mutton export trade in its place. This is an illogical and invalid conclusion. Why? Simply because the argument is seriously flawed on at least two counts. The live sheep trade has a significant value added component, and live sheep markets and frozen mutton markets are generally not interchangeable. I quote as my authority for that BAE Occasional Paper 81, 1983, and Saudi Arabian Mutton and Live Sheep Import Statistics 1991 from the Australian Meat and Livestock Corporation.

The continued use of the non-value added argument, in the absence of a careful analysis of the subject, has led the South Australian Livestock Exporters Association, with the assistance of many other people in that industry, to calculate the 'value-added' component of each of the two industries; that is, live sheep exports and the mutton trade. Mr Deputy Speaker, I seek leave to incorporate in *Hansard* a table comparing Australian live sheep and mutton exports as a value-added product. I assure you, Sir, it is purely statistical.

Leave granted.

Comparison of Australian Live Sheep and Mutton Exports as a Value Added Product to Free on Board (F.O.B.) State (As per I.C.C. Incoterms 1990)

	Meat Exports Per Carcase $	Live Sheep Exports Per Head $
Base on farm cost for a 55 kg wether around 4 years of age, suitable for both trades	6.00	6.00
Value Added Component		
1. Live Sheep Shipper Export premium paid (over and above equivalent mutton price) (see Schedule 2A.)	—	3.00
2. Shearing Costs (see Schedule 2B)	—	1.82
3. Transport from farm to regional abattoir (mutton) or export depot at port (live sheep)	1.25	2.28
4. Livestock insurance in transit	0.17	0.17
5. Agents' commission	—	0.45
6. Buying charges	0.30	0.30
7. Meat—slaughter, bagging, packing, cold storage, administration and finance	10.84	—
8. Livestock—export quarantine depoting, fodder, veterinary treatment, mortalities, administration and finance	—	4.39
9. AMLC Levy	0.59	0.43
10. Animal Quarantine Inspection Fee	—	0.12
11. Fodder and veterinary medicines and equipment for voyages (including wharfage and stevedoring for fodder)	—	5.70
12. Livestock transport from export depot to wharf	—	0.78
13. Water—stock water reserves	—	0.09
14. Meat free alongside costs	1.30	—
Meat cold storage and handling	2.80	—
15. Stevedoring and wharfage, carcases and sheep	3.00	0.95
Total Value added component	$20.25	$20.48

Mr LEWIS: The costs included are based on those experienced in South Australia. However, they have relevance to the rest of Australia. The comparisons show that the live export of wethers has a significant value added component. In fact, its gross income is 1.15 per cent more than carcass mutton at the bottom of the market, when prices were at their lowest. It requires an extensive range of goods and services, the combined value of which is more than three times the base on-farm 1991 value, at the bottom of the market, of a wether by the time it is loaded FOB on ships in port.

We need to note that a shipper export buying premium, which at this date is approximately $3, is included. However, this premium in the past has been far higher than that and is expected to increase as live sheep exports increase in volume again during the coming year from their current 10 year low. We need to remember that prices fell at the time of commencement of hostilities in the Gulf to $6 in the yard and $10.50 paid as a price for the shippers sold in June 1990. They resumed at $9 for shippers and $6 for mutton in June 1991. If we go back just a little further, we can see the disparity in the prices which, in June 1989, were $26.80 for shippers and $15.60 for mutton. That is a difference of $11.20.

It is important to recognise that this puts a floor in the market. This will result in increasing the value added component of live sheep exports to a level significantly greater than mutton exports. Historically, this can be shown to be more the case than not. As I have said, prices for the June quarter in 1989 illustrate my point. This clearly indicates that the live sheep export trade is a price leader responsible for the establishment of that floor in the market which is so vital to ensuring that farmers do get a reasonable return as we are price takers, having an excess of production over domestic demand. Therefore, we are price takers on world markets.

It would be unreasonable of me not to acknowledge the contribution to my understanding of this subject made by personnel from Metro Meat, EMS Rural, the Australian Meat and Livestock Corporation, the Australian Bureau of Research Economics, Fares Rural Meat and Livestock Company, and Mr Christopher Hughes, Chairman of the South Australian Livestock Exporters' Association. I am sure all members will be compelled to agree with the proposition.

Mrs HUTCHISON secured the adjournment of the debate.

SOCIAL SERVICE COUNCILS

Mr QUIRKE (Playford): I move:

That this House affirms the legitimacy of the Australian Council of Social Service and the South Australian Council of Social Service in representing welfare oriented groups, recognises the contribution made by ACOSS and SACOSS in policy analysis, policy development and community debate on important social issues, recognises that the provision of community services is a partnership between the government and non-government sectors and recognises that national and state advocacy organisations like ACOSS, SACOSS, the Conservation Foundation and the Consumers Association are an important and legitimate part of the democratic process.

It has taken some time for this motion to be moved, and I make no criticism of that except to point out that the events which gave rise to this motion and the reason I thought the House needed to consider this issue took place in the latter half of last year. At the end of the day, this is probably one of the best cases of shoot the messenger that I have ever seen. In many electorates—I think in most electorates—there are a number of social problems, many of which have to do with poverty, underprivilege and all sorts of things

which, in the overwhelming number of cases, are well and truly beyond the control of our constituents.

Mr Lewis interjecting:

Mr QUIRKE: In many instances in recent times a number of people have been hurt because of, as the member for Murray-Mallee interjected a moment ago, the recession, and I agree with that. However, many people have lived in abject poverty in our community for many years and, unfortunately, no doubt they will continue to do so in the future. It is the role of Government to target assistance to needy groups and to look after the underprivileged, those who cannot look after themselves. It is the role of government to raise within the community programs where the community itself can be of assistance to the underprivileged, the disabled and a whole range of other people who need that sort of assistance. Many programs have been put in place in the past 20 years that have materially helped the lives of many people in our community. Voluntary and Government agencies have put in place many programs as a result of Government and private initiatives—from a whole range of sources.

The motion now before the House relates to the role of various agencies in bringing these issues to the forefront. I have no doubt that many of the messages to Government contain unwelcome news. In many instances, when ACOSS, SACOSS and various other agencies approach State and Federal Government, they bring unwelcome news, but it must be made clear at the outset that what they bring is the news: they do not invent poverty or the recession-generated problems, evidence of which we see in our electorate offices—I certainly see it in my electorate office every day. In many instances ACOSS and SACOSS put before us positive proposals and measures, and they raise items and agendas to correct some of the problems. They are in an important position because, in many respects, they articulate the needs of those who cannot articulate their own cases. Last year we saw the example of these organisations legitimately going about their business. In essence, they were taking a message, not to Government but to the alternative national Government in Canberra. I say 'alternative' because, within the next 12 months, an election will take place, and it may well be that the national Government changes.

I would now like to quote from a front page article in the *Week-end Australian* of 5 and 6 October 1991, entitled, 'Hewson Attacks Welfare Lobby'. The article, by Justine Ferrari and Glenn Milne, makes a number of allegations that I view as being very serious. I have not seen any denial of most of these points, so I can only presume that a good part of the article, if not all of it, is correct. It states:

> The Leader of the Federal Opposition, Dr Hewson, moved yesterday to restore resolve to the Liberal Party in support of his tough economic policies, with an aggressive attack on the welfare lobby for deserting the poor by encouraging a handout mentality . . .
>
> Dr Hewson's comments, aimed at reaffirming his commitment to big cuts to public spending and market economics, were targeted at the Victorian Liberal Leader, Mr Kennett, who has questioned Coalition policy, and New South Wales dissident MP, Dr Terry Metherell, whose defection from the Liberal Party has put the Greiner Government in jeopardy . . .
>
> 'What's happening is that some politicians are going to tell Australians what they think you want to hear, rather than what they know you need to hear,' Dr Hewson told the national congress of the peak welfare group, the Australian Council of Social Service in Sydney . . . Dr Hewson accused sections of the welfare lobby of building bureaucracies instead of helping the poor find jobs and claimed a consumption tax would benefit the underprivileged.

That would, arguably, be one of the best chestnuts in 1991. In other words, the underprivileged do not want money, help, assistance, home and community care, pension increases or anything else: what they need is a tax. Tax will help them! The article continues:

> I put it to you that the Coalition is just as interested in welfare and just as interested in assisting the genuinely needy as the Labor Party. We don't differ about the objectives—just the means.

It is quite clear that a very sharp difference exists between this side and the other side of politics on this question. As I said earlier, there is no doubt, where this issue is concerned, that Dr Hewson was interested in shooting the messenger. He does not like the message and, unfortunately, if the people of Australia elect the Hewson Opposition to government at the next Federal election, national perspectives on poverty of all kinds will be an issue and will have to be addressed. It is my view, where this is concerned, that the Federal Opposition must stop patronising these welfare lobby groups and start taking the message seriously. It must concern itself with issues of poverty in our community.

It is all very well to go around and parade oneself as having all the answers in a 600 page document entitled 'The Fight Back', but at the end of the day a number of issues in that document will materially affect and hurt those people, particularly those that we on this side of the House represent. Where this is concerned not only do we see the instance of an arrogant Federal Opposition that wipes away the messenger but also we see a deeper concern, namely, that it is failing to address these issues. It will fail to address these issues this year, because it knows that the policies it is pursuing will hurt even more this section of our community.

Mr S.G. EVANS secured the adjournment of the debate.

ECONOMY

Mr VENNING (Custance): I move:

> That because of the parlous state of the nation's economy, this House demands that the following urgent measures be implemented by the Federal Government immediately—
>
> *(a)* abolition of payroll tax;
> *(b)* abolition of the 17.5 per cent annual leave loading;
> *(c)* abolition of penalty rates; and
> *(d)* return to a 40 hour, 5 day week.

My speech today follows on from the speeches of yesterday and provides the Federal Government with something positive to get Australia out of its problems. The Liberal Party is often accused of knocking, and this motion is an attempt to place before the Federal Government some matters that it might like to consider. In fact, I think it has to consider them.

This motion asks the House to urge the Federal Government to take the four measures that are outlined. One million Australians are unemployed, and 30 per cent—that is, one in three—young Australians are unemployed. The situation is as bad in the country as it is in the city, but it affects those living in the country much more because of the isolation and the lack of facilities such as are available in the city.

In recent years living standards have been drastically reduced and eroded. Members would know of Australia's massive foreign debt and the balance of trade deficit. The hard work of the primary sector of this country to keep the nation afloat is in vain because of the archaic and restrictive work practices under which it has to operate. I know that members have heard this before, but it is high time we bit the bullet. Members opposite know the problems as well as I do, but because they represent certain sections of the community they feel that they have to go along *ad nauseam* to the end—and I say to the dead end.

The heavy tax burden on individuals and business has to be reduced, as must the heavy wage burden on business. Inefficient national infrastructure and work practices must be looked at and restructured. In September 1991 South Australia had an unemployment rate of 10.8 per cent—higher than the national average of 10.1 per cent—with 77 300 people registered as unemployed, and that figure does not include the hidden unemployed. Antiquated rules stand in the way of people obtaining work. I wonder how long the penalties as outlined in the motion will be in place before we do something about them. These reforms will go some way toward ensuring more cooperative workplaces, more competitive businesses and lower and fairer taxes.

I start with payroll tax. Australian businesses pay $5.8 billion in payroll tax. As most members would be aware, last year South Australian businesses paid $473 million and this year the figure is anticipated to be $511 million. That is a tax on payrolls! What a ridiculous situation. Last August our Treasurer with big fanfare lowered payroll tax by a whole .15 per cent—that is, 15c in every $100—from 6.25 per cent to 6.1 per cent.

It is very welcome, albeit inadequate, relief. Mr Bannon forgot to mention, of course, that payroll tax rose from 5 per cent to 6.25 per cent only 12 months ago, in October 1990. The rate had been 5 per cent since 1974, but the increasing receipts on this form of revenue for the Government have always far outstripped the rate of inflation. In fact, payroll tax would have been lowered a long time ago if it had stayed at the same rate as inflation. It is a blatant tax on jobs, and it applies to the large firms whose wages bill exceeds $432 000. It is a burden on employers and a disincentive to large employers to take on extra staff. No-one can argue against this, but no-one seems to want to make these difficult moves.

Secondly, I want to speak about leave loading. As most members would be aware, it was originally introduced by the Hon. Clyde Cameron when he was Federal Minister during the early 1970s. I spoke personally with the former Minister and he gave me the following valuable statistics. He intended leave loading to be a compensation for shift workers who experienced a significant drop in weekly earnings when on annual leave, and that is fair enough.

Towards the end of the 1960s and early 1970s, the high demand for labour made it essential for workers to work overtime. When annual leave came around, their pay dropped back to the award rate, which was a loss to those people. So, for three to four weeks they found themselves with less money when they needed more, holidays usually being more expensive. The metal trades approached Clyde Cameron to see whether they could get an average of their overtime whilst on holidays.

As we all know, after negotiation, employers and unions settled on a 17.5 per cent leave loading for shift workers and permanent overtime workers—and I emphasise that fact. However, this was granted to public servants, and the rest is history. The Hon. Clyde Cameron said to me:

> I stand condemned. I was silly enough to bring in a blanket clause to cover all, including senior public servants whose salary already had an increment to compensate the senior executive service for taking work home with them. They got the 17.5 per cent loading as well.

The fat cats are getting fatter: the senior executives are already amply compensated for the huge loading. Mr Cameron said:

> No-one was meant to gain from it but no-one was meant to lose. I did a great disservice bringing this in, and I am the first to admit that I made a mistake.

These are admirable words from a man of whom I think much for having the guts to admit that he made a mistake. I should like to think that more people presently in Parliament would recognise that fact and do something about it. It has all got out of hand. The leave loading was conferred on everyone—non-shift workers and shift workers alike. It means a huge impost on the wages bill for both business and Government.

Imagine what the Government alone pays with this 17.5 per cent loading. Not only does it cost business in lost labour when staff are on leave: it also costs them even more as they pay for the privilege of having staff on holiday. Leave loading, which could more appropriately be termed a leave bonus, is a double whammy. In the Public Service, of course, it could cost even more if the higher duty allowance were paid to someone to fill in for the person on leave. It is an unnecessary impost and a bonus for being on holiday. Why should the employer pay that? It should be paid only to shift workers as was originally intended.

I have spoken about this issue to many workers, many of the people on the bottom level of employment, whether they be in caravan parks, on the beach or in other areas, and I have struck very few average working people who do not agree that this should never have been put in place, should be withdrawn and put back where it was originally—for shift workers only.

I do not hear any interjections from the other side. Members opposite would agree, I gather, and I hope that, through the Chair, they will join the push to urge the Federal Government to change, to recognise the folly of its ways and to bring this ridiculous impost back to a commonsense level—and may Clyde Cameron be congratulated for having the intestinal fortitude to get up and admit that he made a mistake.

The third matter is penalty rates, which are a major obstacle to businesses employing more people. Penalty rates are a ridiculous extra tax. Hospitals, emergency services and the Police Force all operate 24 hours a day and are all vital, but they cost so much to Governments and to the community. Particularly important are the retail, tourism and hospitality areas, which are significant in my electorate of Custance, because it is a very strong tourism area and growing every day. Tourism is starting to take off and employers in that industry must employ people seven days a week. A tourism town such as Clare needs incentives for businesses to open on weekends. The coffee shops, the chemists, the photo shop, the takeaway food outlets, petrol stations, the hotel and motel guest services, and so on, should all open seven days a week but they do not, because it is too costly. I hear no interjections; it is just so much commonsense that interjetions are irrelevant. Members opposite agree, but why do we not do something about it?

There are some success stories however, on the positive side. The Daimaru Store is, dare I say it, a Japanese department store in Melbourne which I visited a couple of weeks ago and which negotiated with its employees to have no penalties. People are rostered to work certain weekends and late shopping nights, and in return are paid higher salaries overall. This gives management flexibility and necessary control over its operations and work force. That is how it ought to be done. Boss to worker negotiations in certain areas would give flexibility. We are coming to that, but too slowly.

Australia Post is open again on Saturday mornings—an excellent move. In today's society with so many women working during the week and with different working patterns in general, it is difficult to get to the post office to send parcels and so on, or to the bank. It is about time post offices offered the services that are demanded by clients, instead of the services they want to deliver. Westpac is

another, along with the Metway Bank, a Queensland bank. A 24-hour, seven-day-a-week service is in demand by today's society, and we all know that, but how can people provide that when they are hogtied by this restriction?

It is pretty obvious to most people that, instead of the 38-hour week, we must return to a 40-hour week. In an industry operating under a 38-hour week, out of 262 working days in the year we have 26 days off for rostered leave, which leaves 236 days; 10 public holidays a year, which leaves 226 days; five sick days that can be taken without having to produce a medical certificate, which leaves 221 days. Two hundred and twenty-one days convert to 10 months work. It is quite ridiculous that we can continue in this way when we work a nine-day fortnight. The whole business is out of kilter. I urge this House to support this motion.

The Hon. T.H. HEMMINGS (Napier): I think it would be fair to say that I am extremely saddened by this classic piece of redneckery that one thought was buried many years ago in the struggle between the wealthy and the workers. I am even more saddened that it has come from the lips of the member for Custance who, I always thought, had some degree of compassion in his makeup and some understanding of what it is like to struggle through life, but it seems that that view I had of the member for Custance is way off beam. I would expect it from people such as the member for Murray-Mallee, the Leader of the Opposition and other such rednecks over there, but never from the member for Custance.

Mr LEWIS: On a point of order, Mr Chairman, I take exception to that remark. My neck is nowhere near as red as the member for Napier's.

The SPEAKER: Order! Does the honourable member desire a withdrawal?

Mr LEWIS: Yes, Mr Speaker.

The SPEAKER: The member for Murray-Mallee finds the term offensive and requests a withdrawal.

The Hon. T.H. HEMMINGS: Right, Sir. In all my years in Parliament, I do not think I have ever heard such a speech, which is aimed at protecting and preserving the rights of the wealthy.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order! Is the honourable member going to withdraw?

The Hon. T.H. HEMMINGS: Yes, Sir, sorry; of course I withdraw. As I was saying, it is at the expense of ordinary working class people. It even smacks of the kind of fascism that we heard in the 1930s.

Debate adjourned.

At 12 noon the bells having been rung:

The SPEAKER: Order! Call on Orders of the Day: Other Business.

COUNTRY RAIL PASSENGER NETWORK

Adjourned debate on motion of Mr Venning:

That this House calls on Australian National, in cooperation with the State Transport Authority, to proceed toward the re-establishment of a country rail passenger network with priority being given to services for the Iron Triangle and the South-East.

(Continued from 13 February. Page 2750.)

Mrs HUTCHISON (Stuart): I move:

To delete all words after 'That this House calls on' and insert 'the Federal Government to re-establish the country rail passenger network to Whyalla, Mount Gambier and Broken Hill with priority being given to services to the Iron Triangle and the South-East.'

In support of my amendment, I would like to give background information to the House about what I have been doing, particularly with regard to the restoration of country rail passenger services to the northern part of the State and to Broken Hill and Mount Gambier.

Since March 1991, when it was first brought to my attention that Australian National intended to take away these services, I have been lobbying the Federal Government through the Federal member and also writing direct to the Minister (Bob Brown) to retain country rail services, particularly in the northern part of the State, while at the same time also making representations on behalf of the other services to Mount Gambier and Broken Hill.

Since then I have been actively involved in meetings with the local mayors, including the Mayors of Port Augusta, Port Pirie, Mount Gambier and Broken Hill. Several meetings with those mayors occurred, and as a result I organsied a deputation to the Premier late last year. As part of that deputation the member for Mount Gambier attended with the Mayor of Mount Gambier and myself, as well as the Mayors of Port Augusta and Port Pirie and the Mayor of Broken Hill, Peter Black.

We put to the Premier that the retention of these services was vital for the people in all our areas of the State and asked for his assistance to lobby the Federal Government to have those services restored because, at that stage, they had been taken away. We also lobbied the Minister of Transport for his assistance, which he gave.

As to the consequence of the loss of those services, I speak mainly in respect of my area, which also involves the member for Custance who, I am sure, has been supportive in this matter all along (hence his moving this motion). One of the problems has been the bad state of the rolling stock and the fact that people generally have not wanted to travel on the service because of the poor rolling stock. Having said that, I point out that there was still a good proportion of people from Port Augusta in particular who were travelling on the service.

It was often difficult to get a seat from Port Augusta to Adelaide on that service. For that reason I question the comments of Australian National that the service was not well used. I believe the service from Port Augusta was well used, although I cannot comment so much about the service from Whyalla, which I do not think was so well used.

The other part of my electorate at Port Pirie adjoins the electorate of the member for Custance, and the Port Pirie railway station was transferred to the Coonamia railway siding. That made it more difficult for people from Port Pirie and surrounding areas to catch the train from that siding. It is a badly designed siding and passengers found difficulty in getting on the train, particularly mothers with young children and elderly passengers.

In the main, the people who wanted to use that service were the elderly and parents with young children, which is why the service is so important to people in country areas. For that reason we need to lobby the Federal Government strongly to get it to reinstate that service.

Mr Venning interjecting:

Mrs HUTCHISON: Yes, I accept the comment of the member for Custance: it is extremely important for us to have that service. It is also extremely important that the Federal Government take note of the fact that we need a service which is upgraded and which will be used by people—not a second-rate service, which is not what people in those areas deserve.

Last Christmas I travelled to Western Australia to look at a service to Bunbury—the Australind. Australian National could well take note of that service—it has a refreshment bar, the seating is excellent and it has a very high passenger participation rate. The advertising and promotional material for that service could well be looked at to the benefit of AN, and I strongly urge that it look at that service with a view to installing something along those lines for the country rail passenger services in South Australia. I urge members to support this motion in its amended form, because country people deserve a good country rail passenger service.

Mr S.G. EVANS secured the adjournment of the debate.

TEA TREE GULLY POLICE STATION

Adjourned debate on motion of Mrs Kotz:

That this House condemns the proposed closure of the Tea Tree Gully Police Station between the hours of 11 p.m. and 7 a.m. and calls on the Government to support its own policy of neighourhood and community based policing and reject the proposed closure forthwith.

(Continued from 13 February. Page 2754.)

Mr HOLLOWAY (Mitchell): I move to amend the motion as follows:

Delete all words after 'House' and insert in lieu thereof the following words:

that this House, acknowledging that an adequate police presence is necessary for the well-being and security of the community, expresses full confidence in the expertise of the Police Commissioner to use the record allocation of resources provided to the Police Department to the community's best advantage.

Mr S.J. BAKER: I rise on a point of order, Mr Speaker. That negates—

Members interjecting:

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

Mr S.J. BAKER: The amendment moved by the honourable member negates the original motion; it takes away from the motion's intent, and under our new sessional orders that is illegal.

The SPEAKER: I do not uphold the point of order. The honourable member for Mitchell.

Mr HOLLOWAY: The fundamental point in this whole debate is that it is the Commissioner of Police who has the expertise, the power and the constitutional responsibility to determine the allocation of resources within the Police Department. This Parliament and the Minister responsible to it for emergency services can decide the total allocation to the Police Force, and this House and its members can question the allocation of resources within the police portfolio. At the end of the day, however, it is the Police Commissioner who is responsible for that task. That is a fundamental point that one would have thought the member for Newland would understand. In fact, it is rather amazing that as the shadow spokesperson for this particular area she does not understand that very basic point. I refer her to the situation that occurred in Queensland a few years ago under the National Party Premier of the day, Mr Bjelke-Petersen, and his Police Commissioner, Sir Terence Lewis.

At that time in that State the Government was directing the Police Commissioner on what to do in certain areas. We all know that as a consequence of that cosy arrangement between the Premier of Queensland and the Police Commissioner, corruption was allowed to thrive within the Police Force in that State. Of course, all members would be aware of the findings of the Fitzgerald inquiry.

A fundamental point of the Westminster system is that there should be a separation of powers between the Parliament, the Judiciary and the administrative arm of Government. It is absolutely amazing that the honourable member opposite does not understand that basic point. I certainly do not question the right of the member for Newland to raise the question of better facilities for her electorate: she is entitled to do that and, of course, all members are entitled to make requests for facilities for their particular area. However, I think it would be an absurd situation if this House were to determine the location of each police station in this State or of every other facility that the Government provides. In this case, we have a Police Commissioner to perform that task, and he has the services of some very fine officers at his disposal.

I refer now to the situation at Tea Tree Gully, the subject under question. What is the situation at Tea Tree Gully, especially between 11 p.m. and 7 a.m.? A survey was undertaken of the police workload in that particular area, and I want to enlighten the House on its findings. It was a seven day survey of personal and other telephone calls to the station between the hours of 11.30 p.m. and 7 a.m. In that week, there were 21 telephone calls: 12 were redirected to the Police Communications Centre for attention and nine were of a general nature, including two personal calls. That was the total number of calls between 11.30 p.m. and 7 a.m. over a whole week. Given those results, there is no realistic justification for the retention of the night shift office.

Prior to effecting any closure of the Tea Tree Gully police station, I believe that the Police Commissioner will implement three separate matters: first, the improvement of security measures to protect the unoccupied police buildings; secondly, the installation of an automatic telephone call diverter to transfer incoming calls to the Holden Hill 24-hour police complex for attention; and, thirdly, a telephone connected directly to the Holden Hill police complex will be mounted on the outside of the police station for people attending in person. In other words, if those 21 callers attended the police station between 11.30 p.m. and 7 a.m. during the week they would have access to a 24-hour police station.

It is also important to note that by closing the police station between those hours it will be possible to reallocate the police officer involved to duties within the Tea Tree Gully area. It was quite dishonest of the member for Newland to claim in her speech that the proposed measures include a reduction of police resources in the Tea Tree Gully area. That is not the case.

Mrs KOTZ: I rise on a point of order, Mr Speaker.

The SPEAKER: Order! The honourable member for Mitchell will resume his seat. The honourable member for Newland.

Mrs KOTZ: I believe that the honourable member has reflected upon my character by classing me as dishonest, and I ask him to withdraw that comment.

Mr HOLLOWAY: I withdraw the comment. However, I say that the honourable member's statements in her speech are quite incorrect, particularly the one concerning the reduction of resources in the Tea Tree Gully area. As a result of the proposed closure of the police station, the officer concerned could be redeployed to boost police resources in the area.

It is necessary to point out also that the member for Newland was quite incorrect in the figures that she quoted about police numbers. Under this Government in the past few years there has been a considerable increase in resources and in the number of staff provided to the Police Force. What the member for Newland does not realise from those

statistics is that it takes time to train police officers. This Government has increased its allocation for the training of police officers, and there has been an increase in the number of trainees graduating from Fort Largs over the past few years. Following the graduation ceremonies, the number of operational police officers will increase greatly. That is another point that the member for Newland needs to correct.

The member for Newland also raises in her motion the question of community-based policing. I am well aware that another motion listed on the Notice Paper for later today concerns this topic. I am sure my colleague the member for Playford will discuss that question in more detail. However, community-based policing does not necessarily mean that police officers must be located in a police station when that police station is not particularly well attended. Of course, community-based or problem-oriented policing means a greater involvement of the police in the community and, of course, such measures as Neighbourhood Watch are important ways in which police officers become involved in the community; they become aware of the problems of the community. This is what community-based policing is all about: it does not mean that we should have police in stations that are not being used by members of the public.

I would like to conclude by saying that it is the responsibility of the Commissioner of Police to allocate resources in this State. It is a job that the Commissioner of Police does very well, and I believe we should support the amendment to back the Commissioner in his task. We should certainly reject this nonsense that is suggested by the member for Newland that somehow or other this Parliament should determine the location and the timing of every single police station in this State. It is an absurd notion, and I urge members to carry the amendment.

Mr S.G. EVANS secured the adjournment of the debate.

EDUCATION REVIEW UNIT

Adjourned debate on motion of Mr De Laine:

That this House acknowledges the work of the Education Review Unit since its establishment in 1989, notes that it has conducted reviews of 231 schools, three operational and support units and five program and policy areas and calls on the Minister of Education to ensure that final ERU reports are made available to the Parliamentry Library.

(Continued from 13 February. Page 2755.)

Mr De LAINE (Price): The work done by the Education Review Unit has been recognised internationally for its approach and excellence. As I mentioned last week, one of the objectives of the Education Review Unit is to improve the public awareness of the State school system and its plans, programs and achievements. The importance of the ERU in this process is that the reviews it undertakes are rigorous and, most importantly, the information provided to school communities and the general public is reliable and authoritative. The reports are an important resource for schools and their communities. They provide opportunities for those schools to enhance their educational offering as they prepare our students for the twenty-first century. This is a vitally important area and a major challenge for this and future Governments.

I believe that never before has education been as important as it is now. I also believe that education will continue to escalate in importance in the years to come. This is why the work of the ERU is so valuable and will form a solid base for the future. I commend the motion to members and ask for their support.

Mr LEWIS secured the adjournment of the debate.

COMMUNITY POLICE STATIONS

Adjourned debate on motion of Mr Matthew:

That this House calls on the Government to investigate as a matter of priority the establishment of police stations at Hallett Cove and Brighton as part of the commencement of a move back to community police stations.

(Continued from 28 November. Page 2492.)

Mr QUIRKE (Playford): I move:

Delete all words after 'House' and insert in lieu thereof the following words:

supports the Police Commissioner's right and duty to allocate available police resources, including the location of police stations, in the best interests of the people of South Australia.

In essence, the problem comes down to this: there is an evolutionary process—

The SPEAKER: Order! The honourable member will resume his seat.

Mr S.J. BAKER: I rise on a point of order, Mr Speaker. Normally, if an honourable member is to move an amendment in this House, we at least know what it is.

The SPEAKER: Order! The Deputy Leader is correct: it is the practice of this House to circulate amendments.

Mr QUIRKE: Thank you, Mr Speaker. I gave the amendment to the Clerk some time ago and asked that that distribution take place. I apologise to members that that has not happened.

Mr S.J. BAKER: On a point of order, Mr Speaker, similar to my previous questioning as to whether this amendment can proceed, I point out to the House that in the most recent changes to the Sessional Orders we moved that, if a motion is substantially changed and does not reflect the original motion, it should not be allowed to proceed. For the very same reason, we have here a specific reference to—

The SPEAKER: Order! The honourable member is turning it into a debate. Before I disallow the point of order, let me explain why, because we had some dispute over the last disallowance. The motion in itself is very specific about the establishment of a station at a particular site. To negate that, the Chair believes that you must say either it cannot or will not be done there. The amendment does not do that. It refers to the right to allocate police resources, including the location, which may include that site, in the best interests of the people of South Australia. Therefore, I do not uphold the point of order.

Mr S.J. BAKER: On a further point of order, Mr Speaker, going from the specific to the general, the case no longer exists for the original motion. The reason for a motion specifying a particular area is that it—

The SPEAKER: Order! I understand the honourable member's point of order. I do not uphold it. If there is any ongoing dispute, I think we should clarify the Standing Order in order to be more specific as to what will or will not be accepted by the House.

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

That the Speaker's ruling be disagreed to.

The SPEAKER: It must be in writing. Please bring up your reasons in writing.

The Hon. T.H. Hemmings: It is the first time in 15 years that I have seen this.

An honourable member interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order! The House should recognise that this is a very significant action that is being undertaken, and it should be treated with due respect. I have received the following motion from the Deputy Leader:

I move disagreement with the Speaker's ruling in that the amendment allowed by the Speaker is inconsistent with Sessional Orders which do not allow a negating of the original motion.

Does the honourable member wish to speak? The procedure is that the mover has 10 minutes and a speaker against has 10 minutes.

Mr S.J. BAKER: I shall be very brief. It may well mean that we must address the question of Sessional Orders again and get them right. Originally, when we moved to stop the stupidity that has occurred in this House over many years, the reason was to allow members to move motions which were applicable to their areas of concern without having them changed by the Government and negated.

To change a motion from the specific area of interest of a member of this Parliament quite clearly negates the original motion. If one looks at the two motions debated today, and their associated amendments, it is clear that, whilst a member of this Parliament has specific cares and concerns about his or her particular area, those same cares and concerns may not pertain to the whole of South Australia. Therefore, to change the motion from the specific electorate to the broad community—and this is what we are testing today—does negate the meaning of the original motion, and this House agreed that we should not negate members' motions. For those reasons, I disagree with your ruling, Mr Speaker.

The Hon. M.D. RANN (Minister of Employment and Further Education): It is a matter of concern, despite the somewhat spurious nature of the attack by the Deputy Leader of the Opposition, not only on the Speaker of the Parliament or his ruling but also on the Sessional Orders of the Parliament. I refer to the Sessional Orders adopted on Thursday 17 October 1991 in relation to private members' business. Paragraph *(e)* on page 2 provides:

An amendment which is, in the Speaker's opinion, a direct negative of the question may not be proposed.

Under the Sessional Orders, the Speaker has given his opinion that the amendment is not in the negative. Therefore, the Speaker's ruling is entirely consistent with Standing Orders and with the Sessional Orders agreed by all Parties of this Parliament. This is purely an ill-based, shabby attempt to undermine the Speaker's position and authority in this Chamber. In terms of the substance of the debate, it is quite clear. The adjourned debate on the motion of Mr Matthew states:

That this House calls on the Government to investigate as a matter of priority the establishment of police stations at Hallett Cove and Brighton as part of the commencement of a move back to community police stations.

The amendment supports the Police Commissioner's right and duty—and this involves an attack on the Police Commissioner as well as on the Speaker—to allocate available police resources, including the location of police stations, so that is covered by Hallett Cove. This is quite clearly a misjudged, ill-timed attempt by the Deputy Leader of the Opposition to undermine the Speaker of this House. It is entirely inconsistent with the Sessional Orders with which he agreed.

The SPEAKER: Order! The Sessional Orders make very clear that it is in the Speaker's judgment, as has been stated in debate. A combined committee agreed to the Standing Orders. If the House disagrees with those orders, or has some dissention with them, that committee is the place for this matter to be dealt with. I have perused the motion and the amendment very clearly, and I do not agree with the motion of the Deputy Leader.

Motion negatived.

Mr QUIRKE (Playford): I move:

Delete all words after 'House' and insert in lieu thereof the following words:

supports the Police Commissioner's right and duty to allocate available police resources, including the location of police stations, in the best interests of the people of South Australia.

In moving this amendment, I do not wish to reflect on the events that have just taken place but, in essence, the issue is not one of pedantic words but one of the separation of powers. Quite clearly, if this House and, indeed, the Government were able to direct resources of the police, courts, and other arms and instrumentalities of the State so precisely on such a small scale as this, the Government and this Parliament would be open to a charge of corruption. It would be open to charges of pork-barrelling and, above all else, of being basically unfair. Indeed, at each particular election, no doubt there would be a rush of police station closures in areas where the Opposition had stations which were close to the border or even situated in Queensland, where they went for all sorts of other reasons. Depending on who won, immediately after the election there would be a rush on the real estate property market as to where the new police stations would go.

At the end of the day the Police Commissioner is charged by the people of South Australia with the duty and responsibility to deploy the resources of the police in the most effective and efficient manner. At the end of the day the Police Commissioner does not take his marching orders from any of the 47 members in this House, and that situation has developed and evolved over the past 150 years. I would have thought that that was supported by every member in this place.

Mr Lewis interjecting:

Mr QUIRKE: It may well be the case that that is nonsense, as the member for Murray-Mallee interjects. I am sorry to hear that, because I now have faith in only 46 members of this House having some commonsense on this issue.

The Hon. T.H. Hemmings: You're being generous!

Mr QUIRKE: The member for Napier says that I am generous. He may well be correct on that particular point but—

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

Mr QUIRKE: I think it is absolutely imperative that decisions as to the deployment of resources be handled, first, by those who are competent to do so. As far as that is concerned, I make no reflection on members, but they are not in the firing line as far as the deployment of police resources is concerned. Further, it seems to me that, were it at the whim of politicians, we may not necessarily see the best deployment of resources across the whole of South Australia. This amendment seeks to reinforce the time-honoured position in all Western democracies where the police and those responsible for the deployment of their resources do so without the political interference of the Government or Parliament of the day.

I had hoped that, in the time allocated for this debate—which has been somewhat shortened by pedantic interchange—I could speak about community policing. Obviously the Police Force of South Australia has embarked on what I think is a necessary measure in the latter part of the 20th century. At the same time we must understand that, historically, the days of having police stations at the end of every

block in South Australia are long gone. Even with the resources now available to police in South Australia because of the numbers, it is essential that we understand that, with the spread of the metropolitan area being now almost 80 kilometres from north to south, with suburbs developing in the south and the far north-west and north-east of the metropolitan area, it is neither possible nor desirable to have the one or two-manned police stations which were a feature of the 1930s, the 1940s and well into the 1950s.

The motor car and the spread of the metropolitan area have made it essential that police resources do not lose touch with the community. That is why in 1986 this Government moved down the road of establishing community policing projects. I believe that it has done a very good job, particularly in my electorate, where we see Neighbourhood Watch schemes, the sorts of schemes about which members opposite get up and say they were responsible for. Members on this side were responsible for those schemes. The member for Albert Park in particular was a great advocate of the Neighbourhood Watch scheme—a strong community policing initiative.

I conclude by saying that at the same time the police need centres for specialist expertise. Because of the motor car and all the problems associated with it, because of modern transportation and the spread of the metropolitan area, it is essential that certain police resources be concentrated in specific areas on a 24-hour basis. We cannot neglect that in a rush straight back to the early 19th century with two police on the beat in every street. There may be 3 700 police officers in this State, but there are a lot more streets than that.

Mr S.G. EVANS secured the adjournment of the debate.

THIRD ARTERIAL ROAD

Adjourned debate on motion of Mr Matthew:

That this House calls on the Government as a matter of priority to commence construction of phase 2 of the third arterial road in order to alleviate traffic problems on Brighton and South Roads and condemns the Government for attempting to spread the road building project over an unacceptable length of time.

(Continued from 13 February. Page 2759.)

Mr HOLLOWAY (Mitchell): I oppose the motion and I believe that all sensible members of this House would do likewise. The member for Bright has asked us to support the construction of phase 2 of a project as a priority before phase 1 has begun, in fact, even before planning for that phase has been completed. If ever there was a case of putting the cart before the horse, this motion is it. No engineering basis whatsoever exists for the second phase to be constructed before the first phase, and I suggest that the motives of the member for Bright in moving this motion are more to do with scoring political points than with making a contribution to the solution of traffic problems in the southern suburbs of Adelaide.

I will outline the background of this project and explain what phases 1 and 2 of the project comprise. Phase 1 of the third arterial road project involves the widening of Main South Road and its intersection with Ayliffes Road, in my electorate, and Seacombe and Marion Roads, as well as the intersection of Sturt and Main South Roads. The estimated cost of phase 1 is $18 million in 1991 prices, and construction of phase 1 is scheduled to commence in late 1993, being completed by 1996.

Indeed, late last year the plans for phase 1 were displayed in the Science Park building in my district, and many residents from my electorate and adjoining electorates who were interested in the project came to view the plans. Phase 1 of the project aims to overcome existing problems in the Darlington area which will result because several intersections within the region operate close to capacity. One needs to point out that the problems are concentrated around Darlington because of the geography of that area. Where the Sturt Creek meets South Road there is a steep gorge, and all traffic routes from the growing southern suburbs converge around the Darlington area. This is where the main problems, in terms of access from the southern suburbs, occur.

Phase 1 is also aimed at providing significant extra intersection and mid-block capacity around Darlington to allow for future growth. It also aims to provide for efficient spreading of the traffic loads from the southern areas across Marion, South, Ayliffes and Goodwood Roads. It further aims to put in place improvements related to the later provision of phase 2, such as the widening of Marion Road and service roads on sections of Marion and Main South Roads adjacent to the points at which phase 2 would connect to these roads. In some areas, services will be relocated during phase 1 works to suit the later construction of phase 2—the phase that the member for Bright believes we should bring on now.

Phase 2 of the project involves the provision of an entirely new 8.5 kilometre long arterial road from Darlington to Reynella at an estimated cost of $82 million in 1991 prices. This phase of the project would need to be completed by the time traffic flows were nearing the mid-block capacity of the arterials in the southern corridor, such as Main South Road, Flagstaff Road and Ocean Boulevard, and this is still some years away.

The concept plans for phase 2 of the third arterial road have been prepared and a corridor of land has been identified. Indeed, around 90 per cent of the land required is in Government hands, and acquisition of the affected properties is continuing on an owner approach basis. I point out that a number of matters that could alter the timing of the provision of phase 2 of this project are being considered during the planning review process, and these include employment levels in the southern areas, the provision of public transport and its level of use, the effectiveness of urban consolidation policies and the population distribution impact of the MFP. They are some of the factors that will impinge on the ultimate requirement for phase 2 of the arterial.

What needs to be understood by the House is that the main problems that face people living in the southern suburbs in getting to the city occur around Darlington: that is where the bottlenecks begin and the hold-ups are. Certainly, in a few years, with growth in the southern suburbs, there will be problems south of the Darlington area, and that is where the second phase of this project will be required. However, at present all the problems exist around the Darlington area because of the inadequate intersections through there.

The other point that needs to be appreciated is that at present there are six lanes of traffic on Main South Road through the Darlington area past Flinders University. When Main South Road reaches the intersection of Goodwood Road, there are eight lanes available for traffic, four along South Road and four along Goodwood Road. So, the real problem is restricted movement near the Mitsubishi factory at Bedford Park.

The first phase of the third arterial project involves the widening of that road to eight lanes, so that the eight lanes that arise from the convergence of South Road and Good-

wood Road will continue on into eight lanes right through the Darlington area. This will alleviate the immediate problems through that district. I am sure that anyone who is aware of the problems and hold-ups in the area, particularly around Flinders University and the Flagstaff Hill interestion, also would be aware that there is a need to solve those problems.

As I said earlier, a display of the first phase of the project was held in the Science Park late last year, and a number of pamphlets were available to members of the public who were looking at this project. It was entirely appropriate, with a major project like this which has great benefits for and which will have a great impact on the area, that the people of the area should have a chance to look at the plans and comment on them. I think that what the member for Bright is saying in this motion, in trying to bring forward the second phase before planning is even finished, is an insult to those people who live in my electorate and who have the right to put their views to the Highways Department engineers who are planning this project.

Are not those people entitled to have their say about a road project that will have a great impact on their lives? Of course they are, yet, what the member for Bright is really saying is that we should bring on the second phase now to suit the people living in his electorate before the views of other people are taken into account in relation to the planning of the first phase.

In the short time that is still available to me I will point out some of the important issues that need to be considered for the local people, the people who live along South Road at Bedford Park. They have a great deal of difficulty in gaining access to that road. I am pleased to say that, as part of this first phase of the third arterial project, provision will be made for service roads along one section of Main South Road to enable people who live in the area to back out of their driveways safely. It is not easy for the people who live along this busy stretch of road to back out of their driveways in the morning with peak-hour traffic going past their homes, and the provision of a service road will be of great benefit to them.

Other matters concern access for pedestrians. I see, as part of the first phase of the third arterial project, that a path under the Main South Road bridge at the Sturt River is proposed to enable access to the linear park, which this Government is developing in that area. I must say that that will be of great benefit to the residents. Another matter that needs to be looked at is parking in the area, and again that is being taken into account as part of the planning for the first phase of the southern arterial project.

I think it really is rather absurd for the honourable member to suggest that, before all this planning is completed and before all these problems are considered by the engineers of the Department of Road Transport, we should go ahead into a later phase of the project. I believe that in years to come the second phase of the project will have its day, and I think it is at that time that we should be looking at it proceeding.

Debate adjourned.

[*Sitting suspended from 1 to 2 p.m.*]

PETITION: HILLCREST HOSPITAL

A petition signed by 15 residents of South Australia requesting that the House urge the Government not to close Hillcrest Hospital was presented by Dr Armitage.

Petition received.

MINISTERIAL STATEMENT: DEPARTMENT FOR FAMILY AND COMMUNITY SERVICES

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 the House yesterday, the member for Morphett in a question to me accused an officer of the Department for Family and Community Services of a 'gross abuse of power' in the use of emergency powers under section 19 (3) of the Children's Protection and Young Offenders Act. In my reply, I gave the House some facts about this matter, but, in what I am sure was intended to be a helpful interjection, the member for Alexandra questioned whether my answer applied to the question being asked.

I have checked with the member for Morphett and he confirms that we were talking about the same case, and he intended to refer to a 2½-month-old child, not the 2½-year-old indicated in his question. I support my department in the action taken in this matter. The facts are as follows: at 5 a.m. on 28 January the father turned up at the Lyell McEwin Hospital with his 10-week-old child and drew to the attention of the medical officers what he called a 'floppy leg'. It was obvious the leg was broken. The mother had woken up that morning and found that the father had changed the diaper, and it was at this point that the peculiarities in the leg were noticed. The child was transferred to the Children's Hospital where the leg was X-rayed and shown to be broken. The hospital staff requested a full skeletal survey and, although this was initially resisted by the parents, eventually it was undertaken and showed a broken rib.

The professional opinion of the staff at the Children's Hospital was, and is, that considerable force would have had to be applied for these breakages to occur. They were very fearful of the child's future if he were to be returned to the care of either parent. The child continues to be literally up to its armpits in plaster. The staff of the Children's Hospital alerted the Department for Family and Community Services, which made immediate contact with the mother. The police were informed, and the father has been charged with assault occasioning actual grievous bodily harm.

He was not remanded in custody, but a condition of his bail was that he have supervised access only with the child. This has been varied in the Children's Court by Judge Newman, who denied any access at all. The man is living with relatives pending trial. The energies of the officers of my department were then turned to providing adequate and proper support for the mother. This was not easy because she was so shocked by the turn of events that at times she withdrew from contact with other people. Staff of the department were endeavouring to arrange support services, which would involve, for example, professional contact, including CAFHS, with mother and child on a daily basis. This, however, proved impossible when a lawyer, Mr Lindsay, indicated to officers that there would be no further contact unless he was present.

The department's desire to work with the mother was frustrated by the unrealistic behaviour of her lawyer who, in any attempt to help the mother, created a wedge between his client and the department. The department was unable to monitor the baby, and the Children's Hospital remained gravely concerned for the baby's safety while one fracture remained unexplained.

Mr Speaker, in contrast to what I said yesterday, I now have to reveal that advice from the Children's Hospital was

that the medical officers were not convinced that there would not be further damage to the child if he were placed in the mother's care, notwithstanding the constraints on the father. Acting on the advice of the Children's Hospital, the department had no option but to remove the baby temporarily until the position was re-established where the mother would cooperate.

Members would appreciate that the support which my officers felt the mother required was almost impossible to deliver where appointments had to be made through a solicitor, and in circumstances where solicitors are not always the easiest people to contact. Attempts to contact the mother's lawyer on Friday 14 February were unsuccessful and he did not return telephone calls. While the department continues to express some concern for the ongoing safety of the child, at least the judgment of 17 February requires that continuing assessments be done on the mother and the child. This was proving impossible in the atmosphere of the previous week.

There had been some concern about the involvement of the lawyer, whose attitude made it impossible for FACS to work with the mother. FACS always encourages clients to seek legal advice at an early stage when appropriate (as it was in this case). However, lawyers should not use their position to shut the door on cooperation between clients and FACS. The social work interview can be terminated by the social work client at any time. It is not like a police interview where there is power of coercion and where it is appropriate for a legal representative to be present. There are occasions when the department does not object to having lawyers present in the interviews but, as a general rule, this is not necessary, as a social interview in cases such as this one is to work out what steps to take to keep a child safe. This usually involves determining the type of support a family needs to reduce its stress and perhaps to increase parenting skills.

It has been suggested to me that, instead of invoking section 19 (3) of the Act, the officers could have arranged a section 12 with the judge over the phone. This, in fact, is not possible. I invite members to read section 12 for themselves. It is clear that what is envisaged here is a judicial procedure which requires the leading of evidence and which is simply not appropriate to a quick phone call. Section 19 is in the Act to accommodate urgent situations which, as this case demonstrates, will always be followed by judicial review. The honourable member should not read into the judge's decision any suggestion that the officers abused their powers or, indeed, that what they did was inappropriate. In particular, the honourable member's statement, 'The court is also of the belief that it was extremely unethical of FACS to take the child simply because a lawyer wished to be present during interrogation of the mother,' is putting words into the judge's mouth that were never uttered in the court. I leave to Judge Newman to determine whether he wants to be represented or misrepresented in this way. In point of fact, the judge awarded guardianship to me under circumstances already outlined earlier in this statement.

In summary, then, on the one hand, we have a situation where medical officers were extremely concerned about any attempt to return the child to either parent. On the other hand, a lawyer was frustrating attempts of senior and experienced officers in my department to work constructively and cooperatively with the mother in an endeavour to help her to care for the child in a way which kept the child safe. My officers were in effect the 'meat in the sandwich', they had to make a judgment in the interests of the child. They did so knowing full well that their actions would be subject to judicial review. Section 19 is very rarely used and is seen quite properly as an action of last resort. One would hope that the conditions laid down by Judge Newman will be sufficient for my officers and other service agencies to work constructively with the mother and child. One would also hope that the unfortunate circumstances in which all of this was made public will not unduly hamper that effort.

QUESTION TIME

NORTHERN SUBURBS SCHOOLS

Mr D.S. BAKER (Leader of the Opposition): Will the Minister of Education concede that Education Department support for northern suburbs schools is extremely limited, leading to long waiting lists of children with problems needing specialist help; and that this, together with other parental concerns about the quality of public education, is responsible for 4 000 children from the Elizabeth/Munno Para area being on the waiting list for Trinity College, where tuition fees are up to $1 475 a year and, if he does concede the problems, what does he intend to do about them?

In a newspaper article today, the Education Department's Acting Director of Personnel, Ms Marilyn Sleath, said:

> Departmental support . . . was available outside the school to help students with behavioural problems.

However, the Opposition has been told by senior departmental sources today that the current waiting list for problem students to receive attention at the Northern Learning Centre is still about the same as last August—around 200—and that schools are experiencing at least a three-week wait from the time they seek help to the time they receive an initial visit from officers even to discuss these behavioural problems.

The Hon. G.J. CRAFTER: I thank the honourable Leader for his question, for his rather belated interest in education and, indeed, in those in our community who are most in need of assistance: assistance that can be provided only by the State. First, I will correct the information with respect to support for students in need in the school to which the honourable Leader referred. Information provided to me today indicates that, in addition to the normal staffing that that and every other school is given by formula, that school has an additional quota of staff at a cost of $135 500 to target students in need in that school community. In addition, the school receives additional support of some $39 000, primarily in flexible cash grants also to assist those students in need. Therefore, a total of some $174 000 in special assistance is given to that school directly. Externally available to that school, and to other schools, is a variety of programs. I will list some of the programs available, particularly in the northern Adelaide area. If the Leader is sincerely interested in this issue, he will be interested to know the Education Department's response to students in that area.

The Teacher and Students Support Centre provides a project team of six full-time officers who assist students in need in that district; there are 10 guidance officers in that area; there are seven officers attached to the Northern Learning Centre; and there is an inter-agency referral manager. That referral process is unique in Australia and involves specialist health and FACS officers coordinating with Education Department staff to provide support services that are required for those students with severe behavioural disorders.

Then from Statewide teaching and staffing resources we have the provisions of our adolescent day centre, and those staff are associated and working closely with FACS for

students who are involved in the juvenile justice process. We have additional support services for teaching staff in those difficult situations from our teacher and support centre staffing resources, personnel counsellors and social workers. We have systems wide student behaviour support, an area where an enormous amount of work has been done in recent years and also substantial resources, which have been outlined in this place on previous occasions, particularly in relation to the social justice budget.

We have provided an additional nine teachers who are operating withdrawal programs for students who are taken from their schools for periods of time. We have appointed 70 primary school counsellors at a cost of $2.8 million. This is the only State in Australia which has primary school counsellors. We have a network of those, and one is attached to the school to which the honourable member referred. There are inter-agency referral managers and school discipline policy development programs for teachers and school communities.

It is not as if there is no provision of additional resources. Should there be more? Yes, always. I think that an argument can be made for more and more resources, whether in education, health, public housing and so on. I can assure members that the education budget is given a very fair hearing each year in the budget process. The South Australian education system is the best resourced education system in this country. I find it interesting that there is a campaign abroad, sponsored by elements of the teachers union in this State, supported strongly by the press and now by the Opposition, to focus on particular elements of education.

Mr Ingerson interjecting:

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

The Hon. G.J. CRAFTER: If the Opposition wants to participate in some of these targeted campaigns, in this instance in the electorate of Napier, it ought to listen and assess all the facts about the situation before forming the judgments that it does. I might say that the performance of Conservative Governments, if the hope of the Leader's question is that all this will change if there is a change of Government, is a forlorn hope. We have seen the priority that has been given to education in New South Wales by the Greiner Government, for instance, and the philosophies espoused by the Opposition here which come directly from the British Conservative Government's philosophies. The Labour Party in Britain, I notice, has just announced its policy. Honourable members will be interested to know about class sizes after 12 years of Conservative Government in England.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order! The Minister is now starting to debate the matter. I ask him to draw his response to a close.

The Hon. G.J. CRAFTER: Obviously the Opposition does not want to hear about that matter.

The SPEAKER: Order! I ask the Minister to draw his response to a close.

The Hon. G.J. CRAFTER: I will supply that information on another occasion. I conclude by saying that these are the facts. I can assure honourable members that officers in the Education Department are doing all they can, often in very difficult and trying circumstances, to meet the needs of the students in their care. More and more responsibility is being given to teachers in our schools, and more of the troubles of the community are being vested in our schools. We are doing our best to respond to them.

ORGAN DONORS

Mr HAMILTON (Albert Park): Will the Minister of Transport advise the House of the number of organ donors who are recorded on the licence database at the Motor Registration Division? Recent articles in the press have expressed the concern of the Australian Kidney Foundation that as many as 3 000 Australians are on the waiting list for organ transplants. Driver's licence renewals contain an organ donor card, which invites the holder of a licence to become a donor. Unfortunately, I understand that only small numbers of drivers are availing themselves of this invitation.

The Hon. FRANK BLEVINS: I thank the member for Albert Park for his question and congratulate him, I know on behalf of all members of this Parliament, for his fund raising efforts for the Queen Elizabeth Hospital, which has one of the best renal and transplant units in this State.

The SPEAKER: Order! I ask the Minister to return to his response to the question.

The Hon. FRANK BLEVINS: My interest in this area—and it goes back a long time—was prompted again by an article in the *Weekend Australian* late last year entitled 'Wanted: more organ donors.' The Australian Kidney Foundation made comments in that article expressing a view and outlining results of a survey. In part, the article states:

> Australia has one of the lowest rates of organ donation among developed countries—averaging 12.6 donors per million people.
>
> Yet while more people are talking about organ donation with friends and relatives, only 30 per cent of the population are registered donors.

I did wonder what the percentage would be in South Australia if the motor registration database were used. I was quite surprised and disappointed to find that a recent review of 588 licence transactions processed at 20 photopoints during the period from 25 November to 6 December last year indicated that only some 16.2 per cent of drivers had affixed the organ donor acknowledgment to their driver's licence. I believe the system is not very effective, given that surveys show that about 60 per cent of the population have stated that they would be happy for their organs to be used if required after their death, particularly when about 3 000 people are waiting for organs and that, on some figures, one in seven of those people will die before an organ is made available. That situation is untenable.

There is the question of Australian uniformity in people indicating that they are in favour of their organs being donated after their death. I will pursue that to see whether we can achieve some Australia-wide uniformity and a better system because, as I have said, it seems to be an absolutely untenable position. I make the plea—and I know I can speak on behalf of all members of Parliament—that people consider carefully, when they are issued with a driver's licence or when they are applying for renewal of a driver's licence, placing the dot on the licence, because that will help someone if, unfortunately, they die through a road accident or whatever. At some stage, members of the community should have a look at what is done in some European communities were there is an opt-out provision rather than an opt-in provision and, provided all safeguards were there, on a personal of basis, it is something I would support. Obviously, there would have to be a great deal of community support.

SOUTH AUSTRALIAN GOVERNMENT FINANCING AUTHORITY

Mr S.J. BAKER (Deputy Leader of the Opposition): Why did the Treasurer tell the House on Tuesday that in all

SAFA's structured financial deals 'there is nothing secret or covert' and 'they are all fully reported on' when the existence of financing deals, such as the one involving Tricontinental Corporation, Babcock and Brown and the Noarlunga Hospital, became known to the public only when revealed by the Liberal Party? The Treasurer still has not honoured his promise of last November to provide a list of all such tax deals.

The Hon. J.C. BANNON: I stand by the statement I made: they are reported in the SAFA annual reports and, on the list I will be providing very shortly, I will actually have a reference for each of those transactions on the date on which they were reported.

Members interjecting:

The Hon. J.C. BANNON: I will give you the page, too.

The SPEAKER: Order! The member for Peake.

RECYCLED MOTOR VEHICLE TYRES

Mr HERON (Peake): Will the Minister for Environment and Planning provide the House with information on strategies being adopted to deal with the problem of disposal of used motor vehicle tyres?

The Hon. S.M. LENEHAN: I am delighted to inform the honourable member and other members of the Parliament that at the recent ANZEC meeting in Canberra all Ministers agreed to and approved a strategy to deal with the problem of disposing of about 10 million used tyres generated in Australia each year. ANZEC agreed that, where practicable, disposal of whole tyres to land fill would cease by the middle of 1993 and that, in the meantime, charges for the land fill disposal of shredded tyres would be increased in some areas to encourage recycling. In this context it is interesting to note that Pacific Dunlop recently established a tyre recycling facility in Victoria which will absorb a considerable proportion of the used tyres generated by South Australians and indeed by the eastern States. The Pacific Dunlop facility will produce a number of products, including rubber matting and rubber chips, which will substitute—

The Hon. D.C. WOTTON: On a point of order, Mr Speaker, I draw your attention to Question on Notice No. 397, which I believe addresses the same matter as that being referred to by the Minister.

Mr S.J. Baker: And has not been answered yet.

The SPEAKER: Order! My attention was distracted when the question was being put to the House. The only way for the Chair to judge is to have the question asked again so that I can look at it against Question No. 397 on the Notice Paper. I ask the honourable member to repeat the question. The member for Peake.

Mr HERON: Will the Minister provide the House with information on strategies being adopted to deal with the problem of disposal of used motor vehicle tyres?

The SPEAKER: I uphold the point of order: Question on Notice No. 397 is specifically on the use of used tyres. The question is out of order.

MARCEL SPIERO

Mrs KOTZ (Newland): My question is directed to the Minister of Correctional Services. What explanation has been given so far by the prison officers involved for the departure of the prison van carrying Marcel Spiero 40 minutes ahead of schedule and without the assigned Dog Squad escort, and for the variation in the route taken by the van to court? In the circumstances, is the possibility of inside collusion in the escape of this dangerous criminal still being investigated? In the Minister's statement yesterday, he disclosed that the prison van driver varied the designated route to the court by turning right into Regency Road, where the highjack took place, on part of the route not previously designated.

The Hon. FRANK BLEVINS: The incident is still under investigation by the police, the Major Crime Squad and the Department of Correctional Services. I am not sure what information the police have, nor is there any way I can find out (nor would I want to find out) until they furnish the department with a report, if indeed they do. With regard to the information available in the Department of Correctional Services, the member for Newland or any other member of Parliament—and I have made this offer on numerous occasions over the past eight years—is welcome to see that information. I trust all members of Parliament to use the information sensibly so that people's security—whether it be prison officers, prisoners, or members of the public—is not jeopardised. I assure the member for Newland and other members that there is no information available to me that they cannot have.

TORRENS ISLAND ANIMAL QUARANTINE STATION

Mr ATKINSON (Spence): Will the Minister of Agriculture say whether he believes that animal husbandry in South Australia is under threat from Commonwealth recommendations to close the Torrens Island animal quarantine station? Does the Minister accept the suggestion that the administration and staff of the station should be transferred to the State Department of Agriculture?

The Hon. LYNN ARNOLD: I appreciate the honourable member raising this important matter and appreciate his concern for the well-being of the animal husbandry industry not only in South Australia but across the nation. I note that some comments were raised last night in the Supply debate, although it concerned me that the member who chose that forum to raise the matter had not also, to my knowledge—and I may be incorrect—chosen to write to me about it to ask whether we were taking up the matters raised in the report referred to.

Certainly, I am not to know whether or not he is expressing a concern about this issue and whether I should tell him what is going on. He is not one of the raft of shadow Ministers of Agriculture or would-be shadow Ministers, so it is not in my interests to tell him what I am doing on every single issue, but he chose the occasion last night to criticise me for being apparently, allegedly, silent on this issue.

The SPEAKER: Order! The Minister is now debating his response.

The Hon. LYNN ARNOLD: I take your point, Sir, and will now get to the substance of the issue. What I have done will certainly prove that, although I may have been silent with the member for Murray-Mallee, I have not been silent in the quarters that count, where the decision will be made on whether or not the recommendations of that report will be acted on. Last Friday, at a meeting of the Agricultural Council of Australia and New Zealand, I raised the points of view that South Australia has about this report on the review of the Australian animal quarantine stations, and indicated to Simon Crean, the Federal Minister for Primary Industries and Energy, that I wanted him to share those concerns with his colleague, the Hon. Alan Griffiths, who is particularly responsible for this issue and, at the same

time. I was also enlisting the support of my agriculture ministerial colleagues from other parts of Australia. That approach, which was listed on the agenda of the council last Friday, was backed up by a letter from me to the Hon. Alan Griffiths, and also by a detailed letter from the Director-General of Agriculture to Dr Gardiner Murray, the Executive Director of AQUIS in Canberra, plus a briefing to be followed up on South Australia's views on the report.

The report contains many useful recommendations, and we are prepared to constructively consider those. In the response submission that we have sent back we indicated our views on that. We agree that there is merit in supporting the transfer of the Torrens Island Animal Quarantine Station to the State. We think that things will be achieved from that to the benefit of animal husbandry in this State. However, we want to recommend that that should be contingent on the retention of that quarantine station as the major livestock quarantine station on mainland Australia. We have some great criticisms about some of the assessments that have been done about the so-called viability of that quarantine station. We also express our concerns about the proposed loss of the veterinary officer position on Torrens Island.

Coming to the 'viability' of Torrens Island, one of the issues that I raised last week with my ministerial colleagues is that a rent assessment on the site has been taken into account in the figure which is totally unrealistic. For example, we understand that in calculating the financial viability of the location a best use rental figure of $355 000 is being attributed. That figure seems to make Federal officers believe that Torrens Island is not an economic proposition, yet that very figure has no legitimate basis; there is no alternative use for that site that would generate $355 000 in rental.

Mr Lewis: Tell Crean!

The Hon. LYNN ARNOLD: That is precisely what I have been doing. I am taking this opportunity to advise the honourable member of the action that has been taken in advance of his own expressed concerns on this matter. If he kindly listens, I will go through the sorts of points of view that we have been making known to the Federal Minister.

Secondly, we believe that the highest market value of $1.8 million appears to be based on a land value assessment of the area that, again, is unrealistic in terms of alternative use propositions that could be made for that area, in the context of where the area is located and the uses to which surrounding properties are put. These are the kinds of indication over which we have expressed concern. We note that the best use rental attributed to Torrens Island is higher than that for Eastern Creek and Spotswood, even though the highest market values of Eastern Creek and Spotswood quarantine sites are themselves much higher than that of Torrens Island.

Coming to the issue of animal husbandry benefits, or disbenefits that will occur if Torrens Island closes, it is quite clear that the Torrens Island Quarantine Station does have all the necessary facilities to allow for the conduct of such practices as embryo implantation of bovine, ovine and caprine embryos into Australian surrogates under secure conditions that minimise the risk of disease establishment and dissemination, and that there are no other premises—Government or private—on the Australian mainland that can meet these criteria. The removal of that will be a substantial disbenefit to the animal husbandry industry in this country.

The closure of Torrens Island would result in the loss of those facilities and could result in less scrupulous entrepreneurs taking the law into their own hands, with the potential for bypassing quarantine altogether. In this event, not only do we have the disbenefit, the cost to the nation of not having proper services available to the industry, but the cost to the nation would far exceed the best use rental that Treasury has imposed. I ask the member for Murray-Mallee, therefore, constructively to support what we are doing in this area, and appreciate the concern expressed by the member for Spence.

PRISONER ESCORT PROCEDURE

Mr SUCH (Fisher): My question is directed to the Minister of Correctional Services. Have investigations into the escape of Marcel Spiero scrutinised whether departmental management always applied rigorously the procedures for the escort of high risk category prisoners, outlined to the House by the Minister yesterday? I raise this question in view of information put to the Opposition from within the correctional system since the Minister's statement yesterday that the procedures he outlined to the House for the escort of high risk category prisoners are not applied as rigorously as he has suggested. I have been told that Spiero has been escorted from the gaol on some seven previous occasions, including as recently as 21 January this year when he appeared in the District Criminal Court.

He was not always escorted by the Dog Squad which, as the Minister said yesterday, was a requirement for all high risk prisoners. I have also been told that the investigation of this matter should include the written instruction given to the escorting officers of Spiero on 11 February and whether or not the requirement to take the Dog Squad was written into those instructions after the escape to cover up the failure of security procedures in this case.

The Hon. FRANK BLEVINS: The ministerial statement I made yesterday was the latest information given to me. I will place before the Department of Correctional Services the information the member for Fisher has put before this House today, and obtain a response as soon as possible.

POORAKA PRIMARY SCHOOL

Mr QUIRKE (Playford): My question is directed to the Minister of Education. What negotiations have taken place between his department and the Pooraka Primary School community about rebuilding and refurbishment following the fire? Will the Minister assure the school community that its members will be consulted about all options and that progress on this rebuilding and refurbishment will commence soon? Members will no doubt be aware of this and other school fires in recent times. In my electorate three schools have been seriously damaged at great expense to the department, to teachers, students and taxpayers alike. The Pooraka Primary School fire involved the destruction of facilities, many of which were specially put there as a result of parental assistance.

The Hon. G.J. CRAFTER: I thank the honourable member for his question and for his interest in that particular school, which has suffered greatly as a result of the fire to which he referred. Continuing consultations will be held with that school about the work that needs to be undertaken to restore it following the fire. Negotiations and discussions of a preliminary nature took place with the school in November last year. As a result of that, a brief was prepared and is currently with SACON for the full development of the project, and further consultation with the school is expected in the near future.

A site meeting was held at the school on 18 February at which the principal of the school, SACON and officers of the Education Department discussed the brief and investigated the proposals currently before the school community. Further negotiations with the school will need to occur once a report has been received from SACON. As I said, we anticipate receiving that in the near future. In addition, the school has also had difficulties with a leak in its swimming pool. Some $8 000 was expended about 18 months ago, but that did not resolve the difficulties with its viability, and that problem is also receiving attention.

MOUNT LOFTY RANGES MANAGEMENT PLAN

Mr INGERSON (Bragg): I direct my question to the Minister for Environment and Planning. Why was there no consultation with members of the State-wide Planning Review Steering Committee, the Mount Lofty Ranges Steering Committee and several relevant heads of Government departments before the Minister changed the agreed consultation strategy for land management in the Adelaide Hills, does the Minister intend making changes to the Mount Lofty Ranges Management Plan and, if so, what are they?

I have been told that the Chairman of the Planning Review, Mr Brian Hayes, acting on behalf of the committee, the Chairman of the Planning Commission, Mr Ray Bunker, acting on behalf of the commission, and the joint Chairman of the Mount Lofty Ranges Steering Committee, Mr Pat Secker, also acting on behalf of that committee, have all written to or contacted the Minister and the Premier to complain about the lack of consultation over the radical plan for the transferral of titles in the Hills. In fact, I am told that the key recommendations of the Mount Lofty Range Steering Committee on titles were ignored by the Minister.

The Hon. S.M. LENEHAN: I thank the honourable member for his question. I find it rather amazing that the honourable member, who is Opposition spokesperson for planning, and his colleague who is Opposition spokesperson for the environment and water have never previously made a public statement on behalf of the Opposition in relation to this matter. The honourable member well knows much of the background to this information and I am very pleased to provide it. In fact, there has been quite a deal of consultation on this whole matter. The honourable member also knows that we are talking about a consultative process that has been taking place for more than four and a half years, with considerable public money having been spent.

Opposition members have continuously criticised me and this Government because we have not rushed out in that period and made definitive decisions about how we could preserve the Mount Lofty Ranges in respect of protection of the water supply and, indeed, the protection of agricultural land—not to mention the environmental amenity of the whole ranges. Not withstanding that considerable criticism and, I must say, members having been quoted in local papers as calling for a management plan to be released and for the Government to make its decision, I took the management plan that was approved and supported by the steering committee and the advisory committee to Cabinet, where it was approved. That plan was approved in total, with one exception; that is, in relation to the transferable title rights proposal. Let me remind members—

Members interjecting:

The Hon. S.M. LENEHAN: Well, I did not interrupt you when you were asking the question, and I am very pleased to give the full answer.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order! The Minister will direct her remarks through the Chair.

The Hon. S.M. LENEHAN: For those members who do not know, there was a proposal that was based on the concept of a transferable title rights scheme, by which those landowners in the water supply protection zone could have some degree of financial benefit from maintaining their land and not have the ability to subdivide it or to sell it off under individual titles. When I and, indeed, the Cabinet looked at that scheme, we discovered that what was being proposed in our view, and I believe in the view of every rational intelligent human being, could not operate; it was inoperable. The transferable title rights that would have been created would have been worthless. They would not have been worth the value of the paper on which they were written. I was not prepared—neither was Cabinet—to be part of a hoax on these people in the Mount Lofty Ranges. Indeed, history will judge us as being absolutely correct.

It will be very interesting to see where the Opposition lines up in terms of the recommendations of the management plan and the mechanisms by which we can implement this scheme which has been worked on by the local community and the wider South Australian community for in excess of four years. I do not apologise for that length of time, because there has been extensive consultation. This is probably one of the most visionary and historic moves that any Government can take. We make no apology for that, because we have taken the recommendations of the steering committee, and I believe that we will make those recommendations work.

When I released the draft management plan, I made it very clear to the community that I was prepared to listen to people and to consult anyone who wished to speak to me about some of the fine tuning to make the plan work, and work effectively. To that extent I have met everybody who has sought a meeting with me. I have started my meetings at 8 o'clock in the morning. I have met individuals, these new representative groups and other groups which are legitimately there and have been there for a long time. I have spoken to everybody who has had anything to say publicly on this issue.

Indeed, we will be looking at some fine tuning of the transferable title rights scheme, which was exactly what I said when I released the management plan. I hope that the Opposition spokesperson for the environment will support that approach. If we are serious about community consultation—and one is prepared to give many hours to meeting and listening to what people have to say—and if consultation is to be genuine, we are going to take on board suggestions and look at fine tuning. Again, I make absolutely no apology for that approach, because that, in my view, is what good government is about.

With regard to the point in respect of consultation, there was consultation, and I have made it very clear to the member's colleague that there were sound reasons why there was not extensive consultation on the extension of the transferable title rights scheme. We knew from the discussions that we had with local government in September 1990, when we talked about some kind of a freeze on the subdivision of rural land in the Mount Lofty Ranges, that there had been a rush into the local councils for applications for subdivisions. We had already had that experience. We also had the experience of the draft management plan having been leaked. It was widely discussed throughout the community, and the Opposition spokesperson for planning had copies of it and was making statements in the media, the local paper and elsewhere. When we were going to take the

whole substance of the management plan and extend one aspect of it, that aspect had the potential for causing one of the biggest land scandals that we would have seen in this State in terms of speculative applications for subdivisions within townships.

Mr S.J. BAKER: On a point of order, Mr Speaker, the Minister is becoming repetitious. She mentioned this at the beginning of her contribution and she is now mentioning it again.

The SPEAKER: Order! Opposition members place the Chair in a strange position. They ask a question seeking information and then, when they get full and free information, they say it goes too long. I would say, however, that the Minister has had a long time in responding to this question and I would ask her to draw her answer to a close.

The Hon. S.M. LENEHAN: There were a number of points to the question and, in response to the point of order, I am not repeating what I have said: I am answering the first part of the question last. I was explaining to the Parliament why there was not extensive consultation with the groups mentioned. Indeed, there was consultation with some of the representatives of those groups, but there was not extensive consultation, the reason being that I believed it important not to precipitate what I thought would have been an enormous speculative scandal in land in the Mount Lofty Ranges. The evidence was there to support the decision that Cabinet and I took. I believe that the plan is workable, and I hope that the Opposition will support a Bill when I bring the amendments to the Real Property Act before this House.

SOUTH AUSTRALIAN CITRUS INDUSTRY

Mrs HUTCHISON (Stuart): Will the Minister of Agriculture indicate what the future holds for the citrus industry, which is a key regional industry? There is considerable concern, given the depressed prices for citrus products in recent years and also the recent destructive hailstorm in the Riverland.

The Hon. LYNN ARNOLD: I thank the honourable member for her question. It is important, because some 70 per cent of Australia's citrus production does come from South Australia, and we did have not only the effects of the hailstorm last year but also major price fluctuations, which have been devastating for the industry. Indeed, the Premier and I were well aware of that when we went to the Riverland to meet with growers and discuss the problems that they were facing last year. At the time, some of the prices were falling below $80 per tonne for whole fruit for juice.

Something of a turnaround has occurred in this situation, given the substantially lower production estimates from Florida, and that has seen the futures price for frozen concentrated orange juice jump from around $US1 160 to $US1 700 per tonne. That has meant that the price, which was hovering around $A80 per tonne for whole fruit in Australia, now looks like topping $A200 for premium fruit in this coming season. Indeed, I understand that in some transactions up to $A250 per tonne may have been paid for juice fruit. The average is expected to be $180 per tonne. That is a significant turnaround, and I am pleased to see that.

There is also believed to be the prospect of an increase in production of some 4 per cent, but this will still be below the record 1989-90 crop. Members will recall that the situation we faced in 1989-90 was compounded by both excess world production and a major increase in production in Australia, particularly in South Australia, and that that really had a major effect on the prices. So, the prospects are looking better than they did last year. I will have to bring back for the honourable member some statistics on what applications we received from the Riverland with respect to rural assistance by those who were hailstone affected.

I come back to a point I have made to the industry itself, that is, that it needs to continue, all the time, to examine what the future market opportunities are. I was concerned to note that the officers who prepared the data for the National Agricultural and Resources Outlook Conference, held in February this year, predict that there will not be a major increase in citrus exports between now and 1996. They are predicting that that will increase only from 52 000 kilotonnes in 1990 to 66 000 kilotonnes by 1996. That is a major disappointment, because I would have believed the potential was much better; for example, the fact that we have only 1 to 2 per cent of the Hong Kong citrus market should be of major concern. That market remains an untapped opportunity.

PORT THEVENARD GYPSUM CHARGES

Mr GUNN (Eyre): How does the Minister of Marine justify the large increase in port charges at Thevenard to the company Gypsum Resources Australia which is harming gypsum and salt exports from this State? The Government's port pricing consultation paper, release last November, includes a foreword by Mr Hedley Bachmann, the Chief Executive Officer of the Department of Marine and Harbors, who claims to 'recognise the need for micro-economic waterfront reforms to gain a sustainable competitive advantage for South Australian ports and their users'. But the consultation paper itself does not propose reduced costs: instead it says it 'retains approximately the present levels of total charges to the customer groups' while proposing five new charges. Gypsum Resources Australia has now informed me that even this statement is incorrect, because it will be $323 000 worse off as a result of higher port charges at Thevenard, and this increase has made the company uncompetitive in terms of salt exports to Japan and is threatening gypsum exports to New Zealand.

The Hon. R.J. GREGORY: I thank the member for Eyre for his question. The port pricing paper distributed by the department is a response to waterfront industry reform. As members opposite would recall, there have been constant complaints from the rural sector about the cost and the operation of our port authorities in Australia. One of the ways of ensuring that port authorities are operating effectively and charging properly, and that their costs are transparent, is to have a proper pricing policy.

To do this, there needs to be consultation with the consumers or customers of the department as is precisely what has happened with that document. It was prepared after considerable discussion with the users of the ports in South Australia. It was distributed to those users and other people for consideration and consultation and, eventually, the comments will be taken into consideration when the port pricing policies are finally determined. One would realise that it is our intention to ensure that, when we do charge, we charge the true cost. One only has to look at the past record of the department to realise that costs have not increased in line with CPI increases; in fact, over the past four years there has been a real decrease in costs of not over 19 per cent. The actions undertaken by the department over the past two years have further driven down our costs. The Liberal

Party ought to be applauding what we are doing rather than criticising it.

PROBATIONARY LICENCES

The Hon. J.P. TRAINER (Walsh): Does the Minister of Transport consider that the penalties prescribed for contravening probationary licence conditions are appropriate in comparison with penalties prescribed for what appear to be far more serious offences and, if not, will he advise the House of the underlying rationale for these penalties? A member of the public drew my attention recently to the fact that she had lost her P plate licence for a minor offence, a loss of licence which would mean loss of her employment as she started work at 7 a.m. in an area where only her car could get her to her job. Subsequently, her licence was reinstated pending a court appeal. A similar case was recently related in a letter to the Editor in the *Advertiser* of 10 February regarding an 18-year old who had his licence suspended for not having his licence document with him in the car when stopped by the police for a defective brake light. Does the Minister agree with the sentiments expressed in that letter?

The Hon. FRANK BLEVINS: I thank the member for Walsh for his question and will make some comment on the purpose of the provisions.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order!

The Hon. FRANK BLEVINS: Am I missing something here? The prime objective of a probationary licence is to instil in new drivers a respect for their licence and I encourage good driving habits from the beginning of their driving life. A contravention of any of the conditions attached to a probationary licence will result in its cancellation. The licence is cancelled if the holder fails to display P plates, fails to carry the licence, accumulates four or more demerit points, drives at more than 100 km/h on the open road, exceeds any speed limit by 10 km/h or more, or drives with any concentration of alcohol in the blood. The driver casualty rate of young drivers is more than three times that of drivers over 21 years of age. Most of the accidents are either speed or alcohol related. The conditions that require carriage of a probationary licence and the display of P plates are designed to assist the police in enforcement. The legislation recognises that the holder of a probationary licence may suffer hardship through cancellation of the licence. Consequently, a right of appeal to a court against the cancellation is available and may be available to the constituent of the member for Walsh.

I assume that the court appeal is available. This gives drivers a second chance to prove they are worthy of holding a licence. Otherwise, they learn the hard way by being stood down from driving for six months. Unfortunately, the threat of loss of licence for breach of conditions is the most effective method of encouraging young drivers to observe the road laws and behave in a responsible manner. I accept—and I know that the member for Walsh would have to agree—that it is absolutely vital in the interests of these young drivers and other people on the road that the most stringent conditions apply at this stage, when they are starting to drive. If by strong measures and strict enforcement we can prevail on those people to develop good habits we can expect those habits to carry on for the rest of their driving life. Whilst it may appear tough, it is tough, but it is also fair and necessary.

RIVER RED GUMS

The Hon. P.B. ARNOLD (Chaffey): Will the Minister for Environment and Planning assure the House that all possible legal action will be taken against those responsible for vandalising 200-year-old river red gums near Chowilla on the River Murray? The Government has received representations from a number of people about this problem but it is best summarised in a letter to the Minister dated 17 December last year from Mr Max Schmidt, President of Region 5 of the Murray Valley League. I quote in part from his letter as follows:

> I discovered a group of large majestic river red gums, four in all, that have been severely mutilated by at least two persons. One tree has been completely ring-barked and is now starting to die.

This matter has been referred to the Woods and Forests Department, the National Parks and Wildlife Service, Lands Department and the Department for Environment and Planning. In turn, each department seems to believe that it is the responsibility of the other departments. Those responsible for this vandalism of the river's heritage have carved their names on some of these trees. While they are from Geelong in Victoria, local residents are looking for assurances that they will be pursued to the maximum extent the law allows to discourage such behaviour in the future.

The Hon. S.M. LENEHAN: I share the honourable member's obvious abhorrence for this kind of behaviour. Anyone who wilfully destroys a tree or any other form of native plant or animal deserves the full fury of this community. Anyone who destroys without any purpose river red gums, which have taken in some cases hundreds of years to grow and develop and which provide shelter for birds and animals, as well as shelter and pleasure for human beings, apart from ensuring the prevention of soil erosion, has a lot to answer for in the community. I will take up this matter personally and we will pursue the culprits to the full extent of the law and look at having them properly punished.

NATIONAL PARKS

Mr HAMILTON (Albert Park): Will the Minister for Environment and Planning advise the House whether the Government has been able to maintain and, as appropriate, extend the system of national parks in South Australia so that all eco-systems are representative and preserved?

The Hon. S.M. LENEHAN: All members will agree that it is vitally important to preserve the ecosystems in a number of areas, not just in one area, and to look at the best representation right across the diversity of South Australia. It is important that we recognise that 20.35 million hectares of South Australia, which is something like 21 per cent of the State, is now protected under the national parks and wildlife system.

This compares to the 4.3 million hectares under protection in 1982 when the Bannon Government came to power. One must acknowledge that that is an enormous advance, from 4.3 to 20.35. It is correct to say that the system is both extensive and diverse. As at December 1991 there were something like 248 national parks and reserves, comprising 16 national parks, nine game reserves, 13 recreation parks, six regional reserves and 204 conservation parks. As part of the system, the State Government is creating what is possibly one of the most extensive desert park systems in the world with the inclusion of the vast salt lakes and tracts of sandhills under the protection of the National Parks and Wildlife Act.

The most significant area in this whole arid land parks system is Lake Gairdner, a vast lake set in the ancient Gawler Ranges. This national park covers some 550 000 hectares and has spectacular seasonal variations that ensure its role as one of the premier landscape visitor attractions in South Australia. It is important to pay tribute to the staff and management of the national parks and wildlife section of my department, who work tirelessly not only to bring extra areas within the parks system but to give above and beyond what would be considered the normal course of their duties to ensure the protection of these very important areas in South Australia.

NATIONAL PARKS OFFICERS

The Hon. H. ALLISON (Mount Gambier): My question is directed to the Minister for Environment and Planning. Is it the usual practice of National Parks and Wildlife officers to break into homes in the course of investigations? Last Sunday, Craig and Jill Barrett of Swallow Drive, Mount Gambier, went out for the day. They returned home at 7.30 that evening to be advised by neighbours that up to six National Parks and Wildlife officers, accompanied by up to four police officers, some of them heavily armed, had spent a considerable time during the day visiting and revisiting the front of their home, which is adjacent to a busy shopping centre. Mr Barrett was told by neighbours that at 5.30 p.m. the national parks officers began to break into the house by forcing a wire screen from a window. At this moment, a neighbour who had been observing intervened.

Apparently the National Parks and Wildlife officers were investigating allegations that on the previous day a local shooter had exceeded the bag limit of ducks on the opening day of the duck shooting season. When the investigators showed him a copy of the shooting permit of their suspect, they were advised that the suspect had moved from the house some time before. I spoke with Mr Barrett earlier today. He is most embarrassed. He is a perfectly respectable, law-abiding man; his wife is a perfectly respectable woman—

The SPEAKER: Order! The honourable member will refrain from making comments.

The Hon. H. ALLISON: These are Mr Barrett's comments: this is what he told me.

Members interjecting:

The Hon. H. ALLISON: Fair is fair, Mr Speaker!

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order!

The Hon. H. ALLISON: Here is Mr Barrett defending himself to me on the telephone. I simply say that to members and hope that their laughter is misplaced. Mr Barrett has been renting the house for only the past few months. He is building a new home nearby, and says that he has never shot a duck in his life. He wonders what damage his house would have sustained had the neighbour not intervened. He told me that he is resentful that his house and contents could have been subject to an intensive search by armed Government officers when he and his wife are perfectly innocent of any offence, when the house itself is not connected with the suspected offence, as is required—

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order! The member for Mount Gambier will resume his seat. There is a point of order.

The Hon. J.P. TRAINER: Although the honourable member is entitled to explain his case, he is not entitled to comment on it.

The SPEAKER: The Chair did make that point. The honourable member said that he was quoting his constituent. However, I think the honourable member very clearly explained it.

Mr S.G. EVANS: I rise on a point of order, Mr Speaker. The honourable member was just going to refer to a particular part of the Act—

The SPEAKER: Order! I do not know how the Whip would know that.

Mr S.G. EVANS: He started to say that; that is how I know.

The SPEAKER: One of the major disputes in Question Time is the amount of time Ministers take to respond. However, questions are now getting as long as the answers. I will certainly allow the honourable member to ask his question—he was on his feet when Question Time finished. All members should remember that Question Time is taken up with both questions and answers.

The Hon. H. ALLISON: To conclude, I think members will realise that Mr Barrett has been very reasonable in only being embarrassed; he has not attacked anyone. He has simply said that he is embarrassed about the situation. Will the Minister say whether it is the usual practice of members to do this sort of thing under the Act?

The Hon. S.M. LENEHAN: We have a system whereby people are innocent until they are proven guilty. I want to make two points.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order!

The Hon. S.M. LENEHAN: The answer is 'No, this is not the usual practice.' I will be very pleased to obtain a report for the honourable member as soon as is physically possible.

GRIEVANCE DEBATE

The SPEAKER: I put the question that the House note grievances.

Mr HAMILTON (Albert Park): Members will recall that last year there was some disquiet within my electorate in relation to the proposed closure of the Seaton North Primary School. Members will also recall that a group of parents—quite democratically—decided that they would campaign against the closure of that school. I harbour no ill feelings towards those people, who thought they would like to demonstrate outside my office to illustrate—

Members interjecting:

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

Mr HAMILTON: —how they felt about the proposed closure. I instructed my staff that they should provide the demonstrators with every opportunity should they want to make a cup of tea or to use the toilet facilities of my electorate office. Indeed, they did make use of them. However, since that time the Government has made it clear that that primary school will close at the end of 1992. Having that information, I have had discussions with a number of people from two of the schools that will be affected by these closures. I have written to the Minister of Education pointing out the need for the upgrading of facilities at the Hendon Primary School and the Seaton High School as a consequence of the closure of the West Lakes High School and the Seaton North Primary School.

I am pleased by the response from the Minister's office; it has been prompt. The correspondence from the Minister dated 6 January 1991 states:

However, I assure you that in 1992 additional support will be provided for the students, parents and staff to ensure that the closure of the school and transfer of students to neighbouring schools occurs with minimal interruption to the school community. Further, the proposed upgrading of both the Hendon Primary School and Seaton High School will be the subject of joint discussions between the respective school councils and the Education Department early in 1992.

After I received that information I again wrote to the Minister seeking more information about the progress of the sale of West Lakes High School. I wanted to know what benefits would accrue, as a consequence of the sale of that school, to other schools within the electorate of Albert Park.

The Minister has provided me with some information in relation to those matters. It is very important, and I want to place it on the record of this Parliament as I have told the principals and, indeed, the parents of children at the two schools that I have mentioned—Seaton High School and Hendon Primary School—that I would use every tool available to me to ensure that the promises made to upgrade those schools would be honoured. I believe that the Minister and, indeed, the other Ministers to whom I have spoken, clearly understand my intention to pursue the upgrading of both those schools. I do not put that on the record lightly. I put it there with a clear indication, as my colleagues know, that it is my intention to ensure that students in the western suburbs of Adelaide, and in particular in Albert Park, have the best facilities available to them as a consequence of the closures of the high school and of the Seaton North Primary School at the end of this year.

Mr OSWALD (Morphett): Yesterday I raised the issue of the Department for Family and Community Services using its emergency powers to take a two-and-a-half-month old child from its mother. This issue is not about the guilt or innocence of the parties involved; it is about civil liberties and the right of the mother to legal representation and the need to uphold that right. It is also about FACS procedures remaining within its Act. First, I do not deny FACS its right and obligation to carry out a detailed investigation if it has a reasonable suspicion of child abuse—in fact, I welcome it. The questions which have to be answered in this case are: first, if FACS were worried about the child between 4 February, when the *de facto* husband was arrested, and 14 February, when FACS forcibly took the child with the aid of the police, why did it not go to the court and obtain an order to place the child in safe care under section 12?

Secondly, what were the new extenuating circumstances which existed that allowed FACS to invoke its emergency powers under section 19 (3) to break and enter and which did not exist on the morning of 14 February when the mother's solicitor wrote to the regional director at Salisbury? I should like to incorporate in *Hansard* part of a copy of the letter from the mother's solicitor, from which I will quote as follows:

I was engaged by Miss X on Friday 7 February 1992. On Monday 10 February 1992 I arranged for her to attend at the Adelaide Magistrates Court (the father of her child was due to appear) and ensure that the police inserted a condition in his bail that he not approach the child until his proceedings had been completed. She did so and that condition was imposed. The father has not attended on her since his arrest on 4 February 1992. This was confirmed by the Crown who appeared on behalf of FACS in the Children's Court last Monday 17 February 1992, when the court ordered that the child be returned to his mother.

Miss X provided me details of the department's continual attendance at her home and continual telephone calls made to her. She described how one officer in particular continually held out the threat of the child being taken from her if she did not comply with the department's requests, which appeared to include the necessity of her making some admissions as to culpability in respect of the injuries the child sustained.

I wrote to the department on 11 February 1992 and a copy of my letter is enclosed herewith.

That is available for members if they wish to see it. The letter continues:

The department alleges they received that . . . on 13 February 1992. The letter indicates Miss X's is continuing cooperation but notes that in the circumstances which had arisen it was appropriate that I be present if she were to be interviewed further by the department. On 13 February 1992 I received a telephone call from the head of the Salisbury branch of the department. She insisted that I alter my advice to my client and warned of 'other action' if I did not. I said that it was unlikely my client would change her instructions to me but I would speak to her.

I faxed the department a letter on the following day, 14 February, and again a copy is enclosed. Please note Miss X's instructions about attendances at the Adelaide Children's Hospital. I should point out that my client was, in any event, voluntarily attending the hospital at that stage.

The head of the Salisbury branch of the department telephoned my office upon receipt of this letter. I was in court in the afternoon and was not able to return her call until approximately 4.45 p.m. By that time the department had already seized the child.

During that telephone call I asked her what new events had occurred such as to justify the use of the department's emergency powers. She said that no new events had occurred and that the department's action related solely to my failure to advise the department that my client had changed her instructions.

In other words, the mother was to instruct the solicitor that he was not to attend.

This issue is not about the guilt or innocence of the parties involved: far be it from me or anyone to attempt to resolve that question outside the court. It is about the right of the mother to legal representation, and it is about the powers of the department and the powers it operates under, that is, the Children's Protection and Young Offenders Act and its own Community Welfare Act. I hope that the Minister will examine the contents of this letter and look at the issue in the light of the rights of the mother to have legal representation and the actions of the officers at Salisbury in denying her those rights by invoking the emergency sections.

Mr FERGUSON (Henley Beach): I wish to refer to an issue that I believe should be tackled in a better way than it is being tackled at present, that is, truancy. I believe that truancy is the cause of many a petty crime, and the proof of what I am saying relates to the way truancy is being tackled in Western Australia, where truancy patrols have been instituted and where the incidence of petty crime has been reduced dramatically.

Mr Brindal: Refer it to the select committee; this is very sensible.

Mr FERGUSON: I will accept the interjection, because the honourable member has made an important point.

The DEPUTY SPEAKER: Order! The honourable member will address his remarks through the Chair.

Mr FERGUSON: The honourable member—inadvertently perhaps—has made an important point. Indeed, I am a member of that select committee, as indeed you are, Mr Deputy Speaker, and I have no intention of revealing the business of that select committee, but I have been very disappointed by the fact that very few references about truancy have been made to the select committee from members of the Liberal Party and from the school system itself. I hope that as this select committee unwinds, we will hear some detailed propositions on truancy, because the committee does need assistance and guidance as to what recommendation it ought to bring down on this matter.

During the parliamentary recess I took the opportunity to visit the shire of Gosnells in Western Australia. I believe that what the city of Gosnells has done in respect of truancy is something that we should perhaps follow, that is, the authorities, have been very keen to support the introduction

of truancy patrols. Incidentally, local government in Western Australia seems to be more involved in crime prevention than local government in South Australia. However, in Gosnells there has been a drop of about 85 per cent in the incidence of petty crime (and that involves mainly house breaking and shop lifting) since the introduction of truancy patrols in that area.

In my own electorate I have had complaints about schoolchildren playing truant and being a general nuisance both to the public and to the local shopkeepers. I hasten to add that the incidents have involved students who do not live in my electorate and who have taken the opportunity to abscond from school to see what nuisance they can create in my district. I do not say that students in my area are blameless, because I have no doubt that some students travel from my area to other members' areas with the same purpose in mind. There does not seem to be a systematic attack upon the problem. I believe it is time that we and the community took on board this problem with a view to seriously looking at it and trying to find answers.

I thoroughly approve of the introduction of truancy patrols to gather in those students who should be at school. However, truancy patrols in themselves are not the answer to the problem. At a recent crime prevention meeting in my area, mention was made of students who are regularly absent from a nearby high school. The committee was not able immediately to suggest an answer to the problem. It was informed that the students concerned were disruptive and were not popular with their own contemporaries. They were not welcome at the school. It was a relief to both students and teachers that they did not attend that school. In a situation like this, it is very difficult for the matter to be policed, but it is certain that it is of no use to the community to have young people stay away from school and have the opportunity to create havoc in the area, as is happening. I am aware of the recent efforts of the Education Department to tackle this problem. I understand that a new roll is being devised.

The DEPUTY SPEAKER: Order! The honourable member for Coles.

The Hon. JENNIFER CASHMORE (Coles): I refer to the deprivation of funds by the Department for Family and Community Services for the SHAUN (self-help for the adult unemployed Norwood) centre at Nelson Street, Stepney. The SHAUN centre is well known to anyone who represents an electorate east, probably south and immediately north of Adelaide. It has been operating for 15 years, is a highly respected organisation that operates in the inner suburbs and has, over its 15 years of operation, earned not only the respect but also the gratitude of large numbers of people in the inner city areas. The Department of Family and Community Services has made a decision which, if the Minister allows it to stand, will result in the closure of the SHAUN centre. In short, SHAUN is to be deprived of $20 000, which means that it would have to close the centre in April. Thus large numbers of people presently supported by an experienced group that has proved its worth will have that support denied to them.

The $20 000, according to the Department for Family and Community Services, will be transferred to the northern suburbs. I am not saying that the northern suburbs is not an area of acute need—(some of the questions asked in the House today have demonstrated that)—but I am saying that wherever one lives the tragedy of unemployment is just as acute and the needs of unemployed are just as acute. So, why on earth would a department take funds from a centre that is working and meeting desperate need and transfer them to another centre? It is not a case of more people being helped: it is a case of different people being helped. More money will undoubtedly be required to deliver the same services, starting from scratch, than is presently being used at the SHAUN centre.

The coordinator of the centre, Paul Ash, whose position was cut back by half last year, has made the point that there is a strong emotional attachment to this centre over its 15 year history: a lot of people know it. Therefore, it does not have to start from scratch and invest time, effort and money into becoming known. It is already established; it is a place which offers not only opportunity for self-help but also the security which comes from an established network. It would be a very short-sighted move to close down SHAUN and to simply transfer funds that have been used in a highly cost-effective fashion from the eastern suburbs to the northern suburbs.

As far as I am aware, there has been no criticism whatsoever of the way in which SHAUN is administered or has used its funds. It has been a cost-effective operation and has established a range of services, including transport services for the unemployed and needy, as well as accommodation services. Local councils, local members of Parliament and local communities support SHAUN.

Will the Minister agree to review his department's decision and recognise that unemployment strikes with as much philosophy in the eastern suburbs as it does in the northern suburbs? I would not describe Stepney as exactly a blue-ribbon area that is heavily supported by infrastructure for those who are socially deprived. It would be wrong to put an end to a centre that has proved its worth, is still meeting a need and will continue to meet a need. I urge the Minister to reconsider the department's decision.

Mr QUIRKE (Playford): I rise to comment on some problems in my electorate, in particular, transport of the elderly. In the middle of my electorate, and very near my current electorate office in Ingle Farm, the Salisbury Community Health Centre has had for a number of years a program of providing transport: a bus picks up the various patients around the area and transports them to the health centre free of charge.

Until something like a week ago it did so every day of the week. Many people in my electorate relied on that form of transport, not necessarily simply for the provision of medical services but for many other important aspects of their daily lives. Whilst my electorate is serviced better than many others are in terms of public transport, a number of aged residents in my electorate are not near bus stops. Many of the bus stops in my electorate have buses that go straight to the city or to other points. As a consequence, the service provided by the Salisbury Community Health Service has been widely used by many elderly patients in my area as a means of community transport, of communication and getting together and to get to some of the senior citizens' activities, to go shopping and, above all else, to seek important medical care.

Unfortunately, in the area in which I live the council has not to this stage provided community bussing as has happened in many other council districts in South Australia. It is with great regret that the Salisbury Community Health Service has largely transferred many of its functions to the other end of Salisbury. It is with further regret that the transport system, on which many elderly patients in my area rely, has also gone over there with them.

A vacuum appears to have been created that will be exceedingly hard to fill. Local government members make the point that they provide a level of community service in

a whole range of other areas. I would be the first to agree that in my area many community services are provided by local government, and would be the first to admit that I hope that the Department of Family and Community Services or the Department of Health (or the combination of both) will be able to see something done about the provision of this bus service in the Ingle Farm-Para Hills region.

Fewer issues in my electorate have elicited so much response. If I were handing out brickbats on this, I would say that there should have been a much greater period of consultation before the guillotine fell. We were made aware of these changes in December. They were not popular with those who had to implement them. I understand that the bus itself was driven by two volunteer drivers, both of whom refused to move over to the new area with the bus.

I have sought the intervention of the Minister in this respect so that we can return the service, at least in the interim, and can discuss a range of alternatives at both the local and State level. I have asked the Minister whether I can bring in a delegation of people affected by this, and I hope that that will be achieved over the next two weeks.

Mr MEIER (Goyder): Last evening during the Supply debate I was highlighting the problems a constituent, Mr Dean Smith of Two Wells, had experienced over some years with the supply of water to his property but, unfortunately, time did not allow me to conclude my remarks, which I now wish to do. I stated to the House that Mr Smith runs a very large cattle lot in the area of Two Wells. In an area of some 500 acres, he has 700 head of cattle plus some sheep.

What I did not say was that he estimates that his cattle would drink between 10 and 15 gallons of water per head per day when the weather is very hot, but he has found that at times during the past few years the amount of water that comes from midnight on is such that only 500 gallons is able to flow into his storage tanks overnight. One does not need to be a mathematical wizard to appreciate that if you have 700 cattle which drink between 10 and 15 gallons each, that is some 7 000 to 10 500 gallons per day, yet through the E&WS Department mains he is getting some 500 gallons. This is a recipe for potential disaster.

The Hon. T.H. Hemmings interjecting:

Mr MEIER: Yes, something that your Government has been in charge of for some 10 years.

The DEPUTY SPEAKER: Order! The honourable member will direct his remarks through the Chair.

Mr MEIER: I am sorry, Mr Deputy Speaker: members opposite make these remarks, but I just remind them that their Government has been in power during the past 10 years and has done little or nothing about this and many other water problems throughout the State. The biggest disappointment to me was to receive the latest correspondence from the Minister of Water Resources which is dated 31 January, and I quoted parts of this last night in relation to the fact that the existing water mains were originally designed for rural broad acre farming use and not intended for intensive farming use. The Minister also stated:

> Preliminary results from pressure recorders indicate that the system recovers well during the night, and reasonable supplies should be available.

It is not happening, and that is for sure. The Minister goes on to say:

> I understand Mr Smith has some on-site storage but it is situated a considerable distance from his meter. He may lose the advantage of the system's nightly recovery through the friction in his own private piping. Mr Smith may therefore wish to consider installing on-site storage close to his water meter and then pumping from this storage to his feedlot, as this should help to improve the quantity of supply.

I stated last night and reiterate that Mr Smith replaced his pipes approximately three or four years ago at the considerable expense of some $2 000, but it did nothing for his water supply. For the Minister to restate that some years down the track shows the height of ignorance. I wish that this Government would start to recognise the importance of so many of these rural industries to the economy of South Australia.

This Minister is quite prepared to see a several hundred head cattle feedlot disappear from the inner area. I would say that Mr Smith is at a stage where he does not see much point in continuing if the Government does not help in this matter of the water. It is a traumatic experience for the cattle, the sheep and, certainly, for Mr Smith. I urge the Minister to reconsider her answer to me and not simply to indicate that to improve the water pressure would involve the expenditure of a large amount of limited capital funds but, rather, to step forward and say, 'We have to look to South Australia first. We have to promote South Australia. We are going to spend funds to make sure that, in the primary sector, the rural sector, at least, we can lead the way.'

SUPPLY BILL (No. 1)

Adjourned debate on the question:

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

(Continued from 19 February. Page 2972.)

Mr GUNN (Eyre): First, I want to draw attention to the urgent need to increase the funds available to parents who qualify for the State Government's isolated parents allowance to assist them in educating their children. This allowance was initiated by the Tonkin Government in the early 1980s following representations that the member for Mount Gambier and I made to the then Opposition. When the scheme was implemented the allowance was $500 per pupil. However, since that time, the allowance has increased only marginally and, at this time of severe economic downturn in the community, when there is a need for these people to be able to access the huge educational facilities available in metropolitan and other regional areas, the State Government has a responsibility to assist those parents.

Last year the total amount paid to isolated parents by the State Government was $284 000, and that was paid to a relatively small number of people. In fact, I understand that it involved 412 students. I believe that the current allowance should be doubled so that parents receive some $1 400 per annum. This year parents will receive $708 per student. That was increased from $691 in 1991. Of course, these people also qualify for Commonwealth assistance.

If the increased figure that I suggest were introduced, it would help those people who are battling to educate their children. It is no good the Government's spending millions of dollars on education but denying access to it by people living in the outlying areas of the State. The cost of educating one's family when one lives in an isolated area is, in many cases, beyond the resources of parents. Those students should not be denied the opportunity to qualify for tertiary institutions. It is a matter of great concern to those people involved and to members on this side of the House. We initiated the scheme, and I call on the Minister of Education and the State Government to do something about increasing the funding as a matter of priority. Most of the people involved live in the electorate of Eyre, for which I have responsibility. After the next election, those people will still

be there, and I call upon the Government to do something positive about the situation.

The second issue I wish to draw to the attention of the House is the Government's attitude and policy in relation to pastoral rents. There has been ongoing controversy since the passage of amendments to the pastoral Act in South Australia, because the Government unfortunately did not understand the industry. It accepted advice from certain individuals and groups which were not really keen on the pastoral industry and which had no understanding or regard for the value that the industry has to the community, the number of people employed by it or the need to encourage those people to manage their property effectively so that they continue to make a very large contribution to the economy of this State.

Until October 1990 the total pastoral rents received in South Australia amounted to $404 000. Between November 1990 and 31 October 1991 it was some $770 000—nearly double. That in itself is unacceptable in times of downturn. I believe that the figure should be reduced to $404 000 per annum in total and that there should be a ceiling of no more than 45 cents per head of sheep, or the equivalent for cattle.

The other very important issue is that there ought to be an improvement in the tenure system; people should have better security for their lease. The nonsense that went on at the time of the debate on the pastoral legislation was not based on commonsense or what was best for the industry; it was an attempt to appease radical minorities in the community who had no understanding of or desire to see the pastoral industry continue to develop and improve. It was an attempt to appease people, and that is why we ended up with an unsatisfactory piece of legislation. The Liberal Party believes that these people should have secure tenure and we will fix that problem when we gain Government. We gave undertakings at the time of the debate and I repeat them today.

Further, we believe that public servants should not chair boards such as the Pastoral Board. The chairman should be independent and should have outside experience so that he or she can take a balanced view and not be subject to the will of Government so that he or she can make objective and sensible decisions. The pastoral industry has operated in this State for a long time and we should encourage those people involved in it to improve their property. There are two ways of doing that: by reducing the tax burden on those involved and by giving them decent security on their lease, and by having a board in which they can have confidence. Those things are essential if we are to assist the industry in continuing to play an important part in our economy.

The third point I wish to raise briefly this afternoon relates to the current arrangements for the electoral redistributions, the manner in which they proceed and the long-term effects that they will have on the community. I believe that the last redistribution highlighted how inaccurate and how out of date is the current Constitution Act. It also highlighted the lack of regard for the views and opinions of the community. I believe the commissioners took little or no regard of the evidence put to them by rural communities. I also believe that the Parliament failed to understand the significance of the amendments that it passed prior to the redistribution.

What people have to understand clearly is that, if the community is to have any confidence in the parliamentary system, it has to be in a position not only to feel that it can participate in the selection of candidates but it must also be a fact. The present arrangement is such that, with the single member electoral system, small communities will be denied the opportunity of participating effectively in the parliamentary system. Parliament did not have the courage to take the appropriate decisions. I am still of the view that the only fair, reasonable and democratic electoral system is a system of multi-member districts.

I do not believe that it is the right of Parliament to prevent large minorities from having representation in this place. That is not what the Parliament was brought together for. Of course, it suits the purpose of the present incumbents in the system, particularly the masters who sit behind the parliamentary representatives, because it is easier to control the Party machines with single member constituencies. Multi-member electorates not only give communities the right to select which Parties they want to represent them but they offer a choice of candidates from the Parties that they select. We know that, in Tasmania and elsewhere in the world where this system has been put into effect, people often have different views from the political masters who pre-select candidates. Therefore, the electorate has two choices: it can select which individual it wants to represent it and from which political Party. That is in the interests of all citizens.

I believe that there should be a system in this State of having four House of Assembly members for each Federal district. That would solve many problems, involving the ridiculous problem of the boundaries which have been drawn and which are completely out of kilter with reality and commonsense because they are not based upon the desires and will of the electorate.

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

Mr BLACKER (Flinders): Last evening I was expressing my concern about the rundown of the capital assets of farmers, about their machinery having become old and needing to be replaced, and, because farmers do not have the ability to replace it, their facing a desperate problem. That problem extends to machinery manufacture, the servicing of equipment, service industries and other matters. However, I think it is also fair that I should raise my concern about the way in which Government assets have similarly been run down.

Schools are being run down as regards capital and maintenance. As such, the time will soon come when massive amounts of money will be required to upgrade and replace our school assets. We can say the same about our hospital structure, and more particularly our water works system. That is the issue that probably worries me most at this time. I do not believe that the E&WS has set aside any money for capital reconstruction.

Mr Ferguson interjecting:

Mr BLACKER: I am pleased that the member for Henley Beach interjects to say that it has. I thank him for that information, because until recently no significant funds at all had been set aside for capital reconstruction. All members will know that some of our assets are more than 80 years old. If it were necessary to replace just a small percentage of our infrastructure, it would be humanly impossible for the department to do it. I am concerned about that problem, because this idea of running down our resources and assets applies not only in the private sector—that has been brought about because of drought, low commodity prices and other issues—but in the public sector as well. The interjection by the member for Henley Beach has assisted me somewhat. I just hope that the degree is sufficient that future generations will not be saddled with something that they cannot cope with.

Another issue that I wish to raise relates to the Patients Accommodation Travel Scheme. My views were expressed at the time when the scheme was changed from the Isolated Patients Travel and Accommodation Scheme which at that time was federally funded. It was then hand-balled back to the State for its administration, allegedly with sufficient funds to carry it on in the same way as it was then operating. Now we find that the benefits that were meant to be derived by people living outside a 200-kilometre radius from the major medical centres are not available. It is becoming increasingly difficult for country patients to gain access to the medical services that were available under the original IPTAS. They should be able to have access to those services.

I have received letters not only from individual patients, but from doctors and specialists who deem it necessary that their patients should seek specialist medical treatment at another centre, yet, because of finances, those patients are unable to do so. This Government and any future Government must tackle this issue. We in this House, some with tongue in cheek, say that all people are equal, but if we are to demonstrate that all people are equal we must ensure that there is an opportunity for all persons throughout the State who need medical services to have a reasonable chance of gaining access to them. We have heard about hospital waiting lists and issues like that. Whilst I appreciate that is of concern—and it is of very great concern to me—we must provide the mechanism to enable those who require such treatment to gain access to it.

I have received a note from Mr Rufus McLeay, a consultant physician in Port Lincoln, who says:

> You may or may not be aware that patients travelling to Adelaide are denied an allowance for the first night's accommodation and are denied an allowance for the use of taxis.

I find this particular issue quite extraordinary because patients are entitled to claim an allowance for a taxi from Port Lincoln out to Port Lincoln airport, but when they get to Adelaide, after having paid the first $30, which is part of it, they are not allowed a taxi from Adelaide Airport to the hospital or appropriate specialist to whom they have been referred. If they have to stay overnight, they have to pay for that accommodation themselves, through no fault of their own. More often than not, having got to Adelaide in order to see a specialist, the specialist may be busy and will suggest that the patient comes back the next day, in three days or in a week. Of course, that adds enormously to the cost and that patient's ability to gain access to the specialist treatment that is required. Mr McLeay goes on to say:

> I think this is prejudicial treatment for country patients. I would be pleased if you would give the matter some consideration and perhaps raise it in Parliament as an example of discrimination against country patients who require further investigation or treatment in the city.

Country members of Parliament know full well what I mean by all of this, because they would have similar examples brought to their attention. It is not appropriate that I should nominate individual examples, but the basic principle of allowing persons to obtain medical treatment is necessary.

I put this question on the basis that we are seeing a downgrading or redirection of some of our medical facilities and services in country hospitals. Whilst I can understand that some restructuring might be necessary in some circumstances, the major goal for all areas of the State should be reasonable access to acute care facilities and hospitalisation in those areas, particularly isolated areas. I could quote, for example, the Elliston District Hospital. Although there are relatively low numbers in the immediate community, there is still a desperate need for the hospital facilities and associated health care facilities which have been adequately and appropriately run at the Elliston hospital.

Because somewhere along the line someone can dial up a computer and say that the numbers are not warranted, the Government is looking at the removal of the acute care facilities at Elliston. If one looks at the map, one will see how many hundred kilometres it is to the nearest hospital facility, and also that more often than not a person would not be able to make it to an alternative health centre because of the sheer distance and the time involved. I am sure that you, Madam Acting Speaker, would be able to relate clearly to that scenario.

I wish briefly to raise one other issue which I think this Government and the wider community should look at: in New South Wales the Coonamble wool producers, with the help of the State Minister of Local Government and Cooperatives and the Coonamble Shire Council, are working towards a joint venture partnership with China for the marketing of wool for Europe. I believe this idea has considerable merit, because more often than not some of the potential buyers of our raw product want to trade on a Government-to-Government basis. By using the format of a cooperative, with State Government backing—hopefully with Federal Government backing—those people are showing entrepreneurial flair. I believe that we could provide an avenue through which some of our valuable, worthy product, which is world-renowned, could be accessed into some of those potential world markets which have not been accessed.

I note that the Coonamble international cooperative or alliance, or whatever it might like to call itself (for the purposes of this debate, it does not matter what its name is), is following an important principle; it is organising a group within the community which, with the support of the State Government and the local council, is able, with a format and some cooperative backing, to access those markets.

The ACTING SPEAKER (Mrs Hutchison): Order! The honourable member's time has expired.

Mr OSWALD (Morphett): I would like to raise two matters this afternoon: first the types of videos that are being shown to young offenders at SAYTC; and, secondly, the Glenelg development and water pollution in the Patawalonga and the Sturt Creek. It has been brought to my attention that M-rated movies are being shown at SAYTC. One movie—and I will name it later—according to many people who have seen it and have spoken to me, has a certain amount of merit, and the movie to which I refer is *Silence of the Lambs*. I also understand that it contains some very graphic, violent scenes.

Other movies in the M classification also contain some graphic, violent scenes. I really think we must question the types of movies that are being shown in that institution, when we know that many of those children are susceptible to influence. We are exposing them to violence which is just not in the real world and which is quite out of character. I acknowledge that it depends on the mental capacity of viewers to cope, but I question whether that is appropriate viewing at SAYTC.

I take this opportunity to bring this matter to the attention of the Government. Maybe the Minister is completely unaware of the type of movies being shown to these children. I do not think any reasonable person would consider my request to be out of place. Movies and videos—what we see on the screen—quite dramatically affects the behavioural patterns of children and the way they think. If we are to expose children to violence which, in my opinion,

borders on being 'sick', there will be ongoing influence on their mind. If those running the institutions allow such movies to be shown, where corrective diversion programs are supposed to be in place to educate children on what we would like them to think the real world is about, we really must question the qualifications of those who are running the institutions. I hope that we will see a change of policy in the department so that, if the staff at SAYTC are to run movies—and I know that the M rating relates to children 15 years of age and above—the heirarchy at least has the commonsense to watch the films beforehand and, if they contain sick violence, to decide not to show them to those children.

In relation to the Patawalonga redevelopment, I would like members of this House to start taking an active interest in what is happening at Glenelg. The developers, who have the nod from the Government, were given six months to fine tune their proposals, sit down with government and work out a proposal which can be taken to the people for comment. Over the past two or three months I have deliberately refrained from becoming involved publicly in the issue. The Mayor of Glenelg has had a bit to say on it—but then again he is entitled to, because he is the Mayor and the Chairman of the Government working party.

Many details of that proposal have not been made known. Two basic projects are going on; the first being the development itself, which is centred around the estuary and which involves a marina and residential housing. Secondly, another committee is involved in trying to come to grips with water pollution, both visual problems and what is carried in the water. It is trying to work out what to do in the long run in relation to the discharge of stormwater. This afternoon, I will not talk about the development itself, other than to say that, if the Government does not move very quickly, I will have a lot to say publicly about its performance and its management capabilities, but I will have a bit to say about water pollution.

Over the past six months, several proposals have been put to us. First, there was a scheme to cut the Patawalonga out through the West Beach sandhills into the sea. That was added to, and there was to be ponding of the Patawalonga and the Keswick Creek in the West Beach Trust area, so that the water would come down and lie in reed beds. It was all worked out: reed beds would be planted through the West Beach Trust area. The surplus water, which drains from almost a third of the metropolitan area of Adelaide, would be ponded and, eventually, no water would go out to sea except during a flash flood. An elaborate scheme was proposed whereby water from a flash flood would go out to sea. We now find that that the Airports Corporation and the West Beach Trust have hit it on the head, so that scheme is now off.

The Patawalonga is a ponding basin on its own, but it is so silted up now that it does not act as a ponding basin; there is so much silt under the water that nothing soaks away and it all goes out to sea. Anyone who watched the television the other night would have seen the Patawalonga being drained and millions of litres of black sludge going out into the seagrass.

What we are not getting from this Government and this planning committee, which has been working for some time, is a solution to stop the water from coming down from the nine council areas that drain into the Patawalonga and into the Sturt and Keswick Creeks. Until we can come to grips with the water that is coming down, we will not be able to achieve much. On the development side, the bodies involved have said that they will need $5 million to clean up the water, put in a gross pollutant trap and take out the silt and the floating solids. But that will not take out the dissolved impurities in the water; they will still go through the lock and out into the seagrass.

At the end of the day we will have to come up with a proposal to stop the stormwater from entering the lake. It is no good talking about an electric pump pumping fresh water into the top end of the Patawalonga and shandying existing water. It all goes out to sea, and all the dissolved pollutants end up in the seagrass. We are expecting a proposal to prevent the water from coming into the Patawalonga in the first place. The Sturt Creek is concrete lined and has a concrete base. We might ask what on earth we can do to make the water pond as it comes down the Sturt Creek, and therein lies the purpose of this committee, which has discussed the issue over four or five years, to my knowledge, in looking at different proposals.

The Government will have to bite the bullet. Whether it will levy every council upstream .5 per cent on their rates to help pay the costs is up to the Government to decide. Local governments have no problem with this scheme. As far as I can gather, there is general agreement across the board at local government level that a scheme such as this is not inappropriate. The Government should start to think about a scheme whereby all councils become involved. All that we heard at the Old Gum Tree ceremony was a statement by the Deputy Premier that other councils should be talking to each other in an attempt to do something about it.

It is up to the Government to coordinate the planning: it is not for the councils individually to do it. This Government or the next one will have to do something to stop water flowing into the Patawalonga. It is polluted water and it ends up in the sea. I put to the House that the Government must look closely at the development at Glenelg. It is an enormous development with enormous ramifications. If the Government does not start making decisions soon (and it has only another two or three months before the six months is up) there will be public furore, as its management ability on these two major projects down there is being sorely tested.

Mr S.G. EVANS (Davenport): This grievance debate provides an opportunity for members to raise matters of concern to constituents, and the first issue I raise is an important one. A young high school student caught a bus at Blackwood to go to Urrbrae High School, travelling along Unley Road to Cross Road where he changed buses to go to Urrbrae. He put his multi-trip ticket into the machine and it was chewed up. So, he took it to the driver who took his name, did the proper things and told him that he would get a refund. He bought another ticket from the driver and travelled by bus to Urrbrae. Coming home that night, he got onto the bus and the machine again chewed up his multi-ticket—the second one that he had bought. He got down to Cross Road and explained to the driver, as by that time he had no money. He got down Cross Road and tried to get the bus on Unley Road to go home to Blackwood, but the driver would not accept the argument, so he was left there.

His father is separated from his mother and has been left with four children. The father was working, there was nobody else at home, so in the end he thought of friends living in the Mitcham area and he got them to drive him home. How bad are these machines? This is the fourth time that that has happened to this young lad. How often has it happened to others? There must be a lot of similar incidents, and it is not acceptable. The driver may tell people to write in and say that they have lost their ticket, and eventually they get back their money. It is a lot of humbug and messing

around. Either the tickets or the machines are faulty. When that lad got his second ticket, initially it would not go into the machine, as it was slightly wider, so the driver helped him with that problem. The Minister should be conscious of the problem, because the family is upset and angry: it has happened to them often. It makes it difficult for young people if they are left waiting for some form of transport or waiting for others to take them home. In this day and age there are many dangers.

I was sent a letter on another matter from a person in Belair. The letter states:

Dear Stan,

I am writing to you to seek help in a matter of which is of great importance to myself and to many fellow prospective university students. In 1989 I applied for enrolment in the Graduate Diploma in Property at the University of South Australia commencing in 1990. My application was rejected and so I applied again in 1990. On the second occasion my application was accepted. Rather than commence the course in 1991 I deferred the course for one year as I was going overseas.

I resigned from my job and spent most of 1991 overseas with the full intention of returning to Australia to study in 1992. I returned in November 1991 and accepted my deferred offer and looked forward to recommencing study.

In all my preparations for commencing study I made one fatal mistake—I missed the enrolment day. Both my sister and mother are studying at the University of South Australia and they had told me that enrolment would not be until early February. Who would think that enrolment day would be before they had even sent out the second and third rounds of SATAC place offers? When I doublechecked the enrolment date I realised I had just missed the actual date (21 January). I called the university and was told that my non-attendance on the particular enrolment day indicated that I didn't want the place and thus I no longer have a place in the course. They placed my name in a 'lapse book' and said they would contact me if a position came up. I called the students union and was advised that there was very little or no prospect of being reoffered a place as a result of my having my name in the lapse book. They also mentioned that they had argued against the current process but to no avail.

So, after so long of looking forward to studying in 1992 I have discovered that because of one small mistake I shan't be studying and with the current economic climate do not have great prospects for finding employment. Further, because I accepted the offer of a place it is not possible to be considered for another course by SATAC. My only option is to apply again for the 1993 intake. I have included a photocopy of the 1992 Orientation and Enrolment Guide for the University of South Australia—Magill, Salisbury and Underdale campuses—where they only charge students $20 for late enrolments. I had the unfortunate luck of my course being at the Adelaide campus and so instead of merely having to pay a $20 fine I lose my place completely. It is a surprisingly inconsistent policy and the penalties enormously different for the same university.

I have written to you because, in my opinion, the policy of the University of South Australia is extremely harsh and unnecessary and should be changed. With so many students enrolling I am sure I am not the only person who has been given a rude shock and had their future plans destroyed by a small error and an uncompromising university policy. People are human and will make mistakes and some allowance for this should be made. A late enrolment fee is a much more sensible and humane approach to late enrollers. I hope you can be of assistance in this matter if not for me then at least for those students that follow me in future years.

That is a legitimate argument. His future is probably destroyed. He missed the date after taking advice about the enrolment date from family members who were also at the university.

I refer now to broken shop windows. I heard of a case last night and it was raised today by the member for Fisher. Last night premises at Blackwood had all plate glass windows broken, at huge cost. Another business had windows broken five times in a two-week period, about a fortnight ago, and repairs cost $850 a time. The insurance company has said that it will no longer insure those windows as it is happening too often. The proprietors tried sleeping on the premises on Thursday, Friday, Saturday and Sunday nights, but nothing occurred. As soon as they stopped sleeping there, it happened again.

With the amount of glass windows being broken, one starts to wonder whether it is vandals or whether this new phenomenon is a case of people in the glass business organising someone to break it. That seems illogical if it is one organisation trying to do it, because it is not likely to get any significant part of the business. It would be a gamble as to which glass supplier got the business. I do not know whether other members around Adelaide have experienced this: it was not prominent 12 months ago. It was an odd breaking of windows or breaking and entering into premises, whereas this instance is just a case of smashing the windows and getting out of the way. The member for Fisher referred to $13 000 for one business, which will not be insured in the future. It will put these businesses into insolvency—there is no doubt about that—unless the problem is tackled.

We have great trouble getting enough police to respond in the Blackwood area. In connection with last night's incident, the police indicated to the owner, 'It is no good turning up; we can't do anything. We will catch up with you some time when we are floating around the area.' That is not much satisfaction to people who have paid their rates and taxes, as well as all their business costs and expect better protection and response when something goes wrong. There needs to be better recognition of the concerns of people. If we need to employ more police, so be it. I hope that it is not a case of someone in the glass supply business organising this. It appears to be a new phenomenon, involving plate glass.

Bill read a second time and taken through its remaining stages.

ROAD TRAFFIC (PRESCRIBED VEHICLES) AMENDMENT BILL

Adjourned debate on second reading.

(Continued from 20 November. Page 2132.)

Mr OSWALD (Morphett): The Opposition will not delay the House for too long with this Bill, although we have a couple of questions to be clarified in Committee. I was interested to read in the report that a recent South Australian study of the cases of fatal articulated vehicle road crashes indicates that excessive drinking by truck drivers has contributed to crashes in which 15 people have died in 10 years. The fact that that sort of information exists means that we should support this type of legislation. I agree with the zero blood alcohol limit and, because of the technology, with its being at the .02 level. We all know the reasons for that, which can be brought up in regard to people taking medicine, cough syrup and the like. We are also aware that this fits in with the 10-point black spot road safety recommendations that are coming through from the Commonwealth. As we have stated in previous debates, we support all those proposals except for some minor modifications. I have some questions as regards the Hire Car Association which, so that I am not repetitive, I will raise when we come to the appropriate clause in the Bill. The Opposition basically supports the legislation and will assist with its passage.

Mr HAMILTON (Albert Park): I add my support to the Bill. We have received favourable comments, from people not only in my electorate but outside it, particularly Football Park patrons who are delighted with the money spent on

the intersection in question. Hence, I give my support, and not only because of this black spot program.

The Hon. FRANK BLEVINS (Minister of Transport): I thank the member for Morphett for his support of this Bill on behalf of the Opposition and also the member for Albert Park for his support. It is a very important measure. As I said in my second reading speech, people who are paying passengers and are riding in a vehicle have the right to expect that the driver of that vehicle has not been consuming alcohol, and the same principle applies to the other measures in the Bill. I commend the Bill to the House.

Bill read a second time.

In Committee.

Clauses 1 to 3 passed.

Clause 4—'Interpretation.'

Mr OSWALD: The Hire Car Association is very keen to have 'a vehicle that is being used for the purpose of carrying passengers for hire' carefully clarified. Does 'that is being used' mean at the time it is being used for carrying passengers for hire, so that, when it is not being used for carrying passengers for hire and the driver is travelling around using it privately, that driver would not be covered by this legislation but only when he is carrying passengers for hire?

The Hon. FRANK BLEVINS: Yes, my advisers give me an absolute guarantee that the hire car industry will not be affected other than when they have a passenger in the vehicle and it is being hired by a passenger. If it is being used privately, the general legislation applies to those drivers in the industry who are allowed to drive, and the .05 limit applies to the driver of the hire car.

Mr OSWALD: Can the Minister give an example of the type of vehicle which new paragraph *(ca)* is picking up?

The Hon. FRANK BLEVINS: To respond to the member for Morphett, I move:

Page 2—

Line 17—Insert after 'bus':

designed to carry more than 12 persons (including the driver).

After line 17—Insert new paragraph as follows:

(ca) a motor vehicle that is—

(i) designed for the principal purpose of carrying passengers;

(ii) designed to carry more than eight persons, but less than 12 persons (including the driver); and

(iii) used regularly for the purpose of carrying passengers for hire or for a business or community purpose;.

The reason for that relates precisely to the question that the member for Morphett asked. On perusing the Bill it was discovered that the ordinary vehicle that is driven by the family person who prefers this kind of van, which has a significant number of seats in it, could be caught. That was not in mind in the definition of 'bus'. This amendment ensures that we are talking about only those vehicles that are being used regularly for the purpose of carrying passengers for hire or for business or community purposes. For example, my next door neighbour has a van and would be very irate if he had a beer on the way home from work and were caught, and I would not blame him. My advice is that this amendment covers the point completely.

Amendments carried; clause as amended passed.

Clause 5 passed.

Bill read a third time and passed.

REAL PROPERTY (SURVEY ACT) AMENDMENT BILL

Adjourned debate on second reading.

(Continued from 14 November. Page 1955.)

The Hon. D.C. WOTTON (Heysen): This is only a very small Bill and is consequential on the Survey Bill that passed through this House last week. I am a little surprised that this Bill is being dealt with at this time, but the Minister might be able to explain. I should have thought it appropriate for the Survey Bill to have passed all stages in the other place before we commenced dealing with this matter. I am not sure of all the practicalities, and would be interested in determining that.

The survey legislation incorporated procedures to introduce the coordinated cadastre, and it is necessary to amend the Real Property Act to provide legal status for coordinates determined from the survey of measurements. The Bill provides that status. In addition, it allows the court the authority to rebut coordinates and make provision for the correction of errors in the coordinated cadastre.

The Bill also requires the Registrar-General to alter the certificate of title of land in confused boundary areas to reflect the new boundary details as surveyed. The Minister will be delighted to know that I do not have a heap of amendments in relation to this legislation, but I do have a couple of questions to which I hope she will be able to refer when she responds to my very brief second reading contribution.

I am seeking clarification to determine, first, whether there is any provision for some form of compensation where, as a result of the greater sophistication in surveying these days (and particularly as a result of the legislation), a person's title is to be varied. Secondly, is there a need for some sort of notice to be provided to make other people aware of any particular changes to the boundary? As I understand the current situation in relation to changes in boundaries, obviously the property owners involved, as well as people who have an interest in that piece of land and its title, would be notified. Thirdly, as I understand it a fund is available for such compensation to be paid, and I would be interested to know what sort of finances are tied up in that fund. The Opposition supports the legislation and, if the Minister will provide the answers to those questions, the Bill will proceed through this House.

The Hon. S.M. LENEHAN (Minister of Lands): The reason why we are dealing with this legislation now is that both these Bills were seen as a package of measures, and one needed to be dealt with in concert with the other. I should like to explain the situation in relation to the honourable member's second question, as to whether there will be provision for compensation for an error in the coordinates. The coordinates are calculated from the measurements shown on survey plans certified as correct by licensed surveyors. These plans are then checked by the Registrar-General to ensure compliance with statutory and other legal requirements. If a surveyor has wrong information on a survey, which leads to incorrect coordinates being calculated, clearly the surveyor is liable for any damage caused.

This is absolutely no different from the current situation relating to titles. The Survey Bill, which passed this House last week, requires that surveyors must be covered by professional indemnity insurance to ensure that their clients are covered should a mistake be made. If a mistake is made by one of the Surveyor-General's staff in processing the information to calculate the coordinates, the Government will make good the error. The question of compensation then would be a matter for the civil courts to decide.

With respect to the third question, the fund was established for a different purpose, not for the purpose of this particular measure. In fact, it was established for errors in the title register which is under the control of the Registrar-

General. I am not aware how much money is in the fund, but that money would not be used for errors in the coordinated cadastre system. I will find out the amount of money that is in the fund for the honourable member.

The Hon. D.C. Wotton: And what it is used for.

The Hon. S.M. LENEHAN: The fund is administered by the Registrar-General and is used for compensating errors in the title register. I will inform the honourable member how much money is in the fund when the information is to hand.

Bill read a second time.

In Committee.

Clauses 1 and 2 passed.

Clause 3—'Insertion of Part V Division IIA.'

The Hon. D.C. WOTTON: On several occasions I have been asked to determine the requirements regarding notification as it relates to confused boundaries. Can the Minister provide that information? Also, I would appreciate it if the Minister could make the fund information available at a later stage.

The Hon. S.M. LENEHAN: I will provide that information as soon as it is to hand. With respect to informing people about changes in boundaries, I refer the honourable member to clause 51 of the Survey Bill which concerns surveys within confused boundary areas. That clause sets out the requirements for notification, and then subclause (4) provides:

> As soon as practicable after a plan of the boundaries of land within a confused boundary area is forwarded to the Surveyor-General under this section, the Surveyor-General must give notice in accordance with this section—
>
> *(a)* to all persons with a registered interest in the land;
>
> *(b)* to all persons with a registered interest in land adjoining the land;
>
> and
>
> *(c)* to all other persons who have a registered interest in land that is likely, in the opinion of the Surveyor-General, to be directly or indirectly affected.

While this Bill amends the Real Property Act, the answer to the honourable member's question lies within clause 51 of the Survey Bill, and that information in fact is required by law to be provided to those who are directly or indirectly affected.

Clause passed.

Title passed.

Bill read a third time and passed.

ADJOURNMENT

At 4.44 p.m. the House adjourned until Wednesday 26 February at 2 p.m.