

## HOUSE OF ASSEMBLY

Wednesday 13 October 1993

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

### CFS/SES

A petition signed by 317 residents of South Australia requesting that the House urge the Government not to amalgamate the Country Fire Service and State Emergency Service was presented by Mr Blacker.

Petition received.

### SPEECH PATHOLOGISTS

A petition signed by 83 residents of South Australia requesting that the House urge the Government to appoint an additional speech pathologist to serve the Eyre Peninsula was presented by Mr Blacker.

Petition received.

### STATE BANK

A petition signed by 330 residents of South Australia requesting that the House urge the Government not to sell the State Bank of South Australia was presented by Mr Blacker.

Petition received.

### FOCUS 2000

A petition signed by 130 residents of South Australia requesting that the House urge the Government to retain the current ownership and funding of the *Focus 2000* newspaper for South Australian Housing Trust tenants was presented by Mr Meier.

Petition received.

### MULTIFUNCTION POLIS

**The Hon. LYNN ARNOLD (Premier):** I seek leave to make a ministerial statement.

Leave granted.

**The Hon. LYNN ARNOLD:** Mr Speaker, there have been press reports in the *Sydney Morning Herald* and the *Adelaide Advertiser* today concerning an apparent decision by 40 Japanese companies to 'quit the MFP'. I would like to advise the House of a communique I have just received from Mr Yahiro, the Senior Adviser, Mitsui and Co., who also happens to be the Chair of the MFP Cooperation Association of Japan, and Mr Ross Kennan, CEO of the MFP Development Corporation. Mr Kennan is currently in Tokyo with the Federal Minister responsible for the MFP, Senator Chris Schacht, to hold a series of high level meetings with the potential Japanese investors in the project. He has met with Mr Yahiro this morning to prepare this communique. The following is the text of that communique:

Mr Yahiro and Mr Kennan regretted the inaccurate and misleading articles appearing in today's *Sydney Morning Herald* and *Age* newspapers on the MFP project. Mr Yahiro said there was no truth to the allegations that Japanese companies had decided to quit the MFP against investing in the project, or to postpone investment decisions for 10 or 20 years. Japanese companies would look at investment opportunities on their merits and make their own decisions. The purpose of Mr Kennan's visit was to outline to

Japanese companies the projects currently being developed in the area of environment, education and information.

There will be a seminar attended by 45 members of the MFP Australia Cooperation Association of Japan (MACAJ) for this purpose on 14 October. Mr Yahiro said that there had been no decision by Japanese companies against investing in the MFP. He recalled indeed that he had been encouraged by the positive economic stimulation measures recently introduced in Australia. The decision to cut company tax and exemption of State tax for 10 years in the MFP development areas will make the investment environment of the MFP more attractive. The press articles in question were therefore both inaccurate and regrettable. No spokesman for Mr Yahiro made the alleged statements.

It is true that MACAJ members see the MFP as a project that will continue to develop into the twenty-first century, but this in no way rules out early Japanese involvement in it. In the environment area there is already Japanese involvement in the MFP services company and a joint research project between Australia and Japan.

That ends the text of the joint statement.

### PAPER TABLED

The following paper was laid on the table:

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

South Australian Commissioner of Police—Report, 1992-93.

## QUESTION TIME

### MULTIFUNCTION POLIS

**The Hon. DEAN BROWN (Leader of the Opposition):** My question is directed to the Premier. What is the amount of investment, other than for feasibility studies, so far committed by Japanese companies to the MFP?

**The Hon. LYNN ARNOLD:** I do not know where the Leader was or whether he had his ears plugged while I was making this statement. When I visited Japan in May and spoke to a seminar of the MFP Australia Cooperation Association of Japan, which was well attended by senior Japanese companies, they expressed very great pleasure at the moves made by my Government in introducing taxation incentives and other support for the MFP. They then said that they were awaiting information on investment proposals.

I came back to this country from Japan and said precisely that and I have said that in this Parliament as well, and the Leader has heard that. They said that they wanted investment proposals and that the MFP Australia Cooperation Association would then send people to Japan and they would talk about investment proposals with the members of the MFP Corporation Association of Japan. That is precisely why Ross Kennan is there now and that is why there will be a seminar tomorrow on this matter with these leading companies.

It is quite clear that the Opposition has one thing in mind: to scuttle this project. There is no doubt that the Opposition wants to do everything possible to scuttle this project. Opposition members were delighted when they got a copy of the *Sydney Morning Herald* and saw the article there; they were delighted when they saw it in the *Age* as well; and, sad to say, yet again saw that kind of coverage in the *Advertiser*. They were absolutely delighted. What they could not bargain on was the fact that that article would be found out; that the inaccuracy of that article would be proven; and that the very people in Japan who are looking at the MFP with great interest would say, 'The article is not true. We are considering investment in the MFP. We are wanting to hear from the

MFP about investment propositions and that is why we want Mr Kennan in Japan now. We want to talk to him and hear what the proposals are.'

*Members interjecting:*

**The SPEAKER:** Order! The Leader is out of order. The Premier.

**The Hon. Dean Brown:** Just answer the question.

**The SPEAKER:** The Leader is out of order once again. The Premier.

**The Hon. LYNN ARNOLD:** Let us come to an MFP equivalent that exists off Kobe City in Japan. I have cited this example before, as the Leader would well know. That project was first mooted in the 1960s, was developed as a concept in the 1970s and formally reached the establishment of a corporation in 1980 or thereabouts, and the first investment in that project took place in 1990—ten years after the formal establishment of the project and about 20 years after the concept had first been mooted. They did not think that was exceptionally long for a project which they clearly labelled as a project for a generation.

Given the fact that the MFP Corporation was established by this Parliament only last year, the board appointed only this year and the CEO appointed only this year, I think that the few months that we have seen in between compares very favourably with the 10 to 20 years time frame that their own MFP equivalent took.

*Mr S.J. Baker interjecting:*

**The SPEAKER:** Order! The Deputy Leader is out of order.

**The Hon. LYNN ARNOLD:** Likewise, for those who have taken the trouble to do their homework on the French MFP equivalent, they will find that the same lead times take place in terms of investment getting off the ground. Opposition members have this naivety that apparently major investments can be clicked on from the establishment of such a proposal and they would be there. That is a naive concept on the part of members opposite.

*Mr S.J. Baker interjecting:*

**The SPEAKER:** Order! The Deputy Leader is out of order.

**The Hon. LYNN ARNOLD:** South Australians should be warned about anyone who would want to be in government who has that kind of thinking: that they can work on those sorts of premises and see investment happening. It simply will not happen that way. We would end up raising expectations by that kind of thinking and they would then be most cruelly dashed.

Opposition members have only one agenda with respect to the MFP. It does not yet get itself called a policy but the agenda is that they want it to fail. They want it to fail and they will attack it by any means whatsoever and try to ensure that it fails. They do not have the support of the Japanese in that. They thought they had it this morning when they read the papers, but they have not.

#### PUBLIC HOLIDAYS

**The Hon. J.P. TRAINER (Walsh):** I address my question to the Premier. Does the Premier intend to reduce the number of public holidays in South Australia? Overnight reports say that free public holidays are to be cut by the Kennett Liberal Government in Victoria, and constituents have already contacted several members of Parliament on this side, wanting to know what the Government's position is on the matter.

**The Hon. LYNN ARNOLD:** I do not intend reducing the number of public holidays, and I assure not only members but also the public that when I am re-elected as Premier I will not reduce public holidays in South Australia. My position is very clear, but what is the genesis of the question that the member for Walsh asks? Why would he ask that question now? The reason is that Jeff Kennett in Victoria has decided that he will do something about this matter. One has to say that one takes with grain of salt what one reads in the *Advertiser*, but my guess is that it is probably reasonably correct on this occasion, when it reports:

The Victorian Government has cancelled three public holidays in a move it claims will help rid the country of its reputation as the 'land of the long weekend'.

It is quite clear when actual calendar comparisons are done between Australia and many other countries overseas that such an appellation is not fair to Australia. Such a decision to say that we have far too many holidays in this country does not stand up when considered in the light of other countries in the world and how many public holidays they have. That is what Jeff Kennett wants to do. I think it would be important for the Leader in this place, who would want to be Premier of this State, to say what he would do in Government, to say what his policy would be with respect to public holidays. Yet again, quite clearly I put on the public record what my Government's policy is. I would like to hear what the Leader's policy is on this matter. Yet again we know that we always have to take with a grain of salt what the Leader says, but at least it would be nice to hear him outline a policy for a change, bereft of ideas as it may be and full of the capacity to distort as it doubtless will be. Nevertheless, a clear statement is called for.

#### MULTIFUNCTION POLIS

**Mr S.J. BAKER (Deputy Leader of the Opposition):** Now to matters more important. My question is directed to the Premier.

*Members interjecting:*

**The SPEAKER:** Order! The Deputy Leader will resume his seat.

*The Hon. J.P. Trainer interjecting:*

**The SPEAKER:** Order! The member for Walsh is out of order. The Deputy Leader.

**Mr S.J. BAKER:** My question is to the Premier. Why has the Liberal Party not been provided with a copy of the agreement between the Federal and South Australian Governments on funding of the MFP? Will he confirm that promised Federal funding of \$40 million is not a firm commitment? The Liberal Party sought a copy of this agreement during the Estimates Committee hearings. In response, the Premier said that the agreement was signed before the last Federal election, and he saw no reason why the Liberal Party should not have a copy. In fact, the agreement was not signed until as recently as 9 August this year, five months after the Premier suggested, and the Opposition has not been provided with a copy as yet.

The Prime Minister's One Nation statement in 1992 promised \$40 million for the MFP, including \$12.5 million in last year's budget. However, this money has not been spent and I have been advised that the agreement with the Federal Government gives no guarantee that money not spent in one year can be carried forward into the next. Accordingly, because of delays in the project, South Australia may not receive all the \$40 million promised by the Commonwealth.

It is a possibility enhanced by what I have been told is the Keating Government's serious concern about South Australia's handling of the project.

**The Hon. LYNN ARNOLD:** To take up that last comment, I can assure the House that if the Federal Government had any concerns about this matter it would not be giving it the support that it is, for example, by Senator Chris Schacht being in Japan at the moment actively promoting the concept. The Estimates Committee process is one whereby—

*Members interjecting:*

**The SPEAKER:** Order! The Deputy Leader is out of order.

**The Hon. LYNN ARNOLD:**—some questions are taken on notice, and promises are made to get replies back as soon as possible. I have done that with a large number of questions that I was asked. As has happened over the years, some answers take a bit longer than time allotted. I do not keep a personal inventory—

*Members interjecting:*

**The SPEAKER:** Order!

**The Hon. LYNN ARNOLD:** If we are to talk about the way in which certain Ministers perform in terms of answering questions on the Estimates Committees, the member for Mount Gambier could well do to look down in his papers, because when he was Education Minister, a year later I received answers from him to Estimates Committee questions.

**The SPEAKER:** Order! The Premier will resume his seat. The Deputy Leader has a point of order.

**Mr S.J. BAKER:** Sir, not only is he debating the question but he is going back about 12 years.

**The Hon. LYNN ARNOLD:** The Leader would do very well to watch the kind of accusations he makes in that regard. My record in making sure that answers come from Estimates Committees to this Chamber is very good indeed. I do not keep a personal inventory of all of the questions outstanding; this has been brought to my attention and I will ensure that it is attended to quickly. If we can get the matter attended to tomorrow I will be happy for that to happen. If there is any other reason that is delaying the response I will certainly tell the Deputy Leader why that is the case.

### LABOUR COSTS

**Mr FERGUSON (Henley Beach):** Can the Minister of Labour Relations and Occupational Health and Safety tell the House how Australia's and South Australia's labour costs compare with those of the major world economic powers? In an *Advertiser* article today it was reported that Australia is one of the cheapest places in the world to hire labour.

*Members interjecting:*

**The SPEAKER:** Order! The member for Murray-Mallee is out of order. The Minister will resume his seat until the House calms down. Members are only interfering with their own Question Time. I suggest that everyone take note that we did not get too many questions yesterday and the way we are going we will not get too many today.

**The Hon. R.J. GREGORY:** I thank the member for Henley Beach for his question. I saw the *Advertiser* article this morning concerning an inquiry conducted by academics from New South Wales and Queensland. The study showed that Australia has very low labour costs. I was not surprised to read that because, under a Labor Government, much work has been done to redress this matter; yet we have received

nothing but complaints and criticism from members opposite for all our work that has meant that our industrial costs, taking into account wages, insurance, levies, pensions, benefits and taxes are less than they are in many other countries.

*Members interjecting:*

**The SPEAKER:** Order!

*Mr D.S. Baker interjecting:*

**The SPEAKER:** Order!

**The Hon. R.J. GREGORY:** The member for Bragg says 'Come on, come on!': it means that the member for Bragg either cannot understand or refuses to accept that information which has been provided by people who are looked upon as independent observers in this matter.

*Members interjecting:*

**The SPEAKER:** Order!

**The Hon. R.J. GREGORY:** The part of the article that really intrigued me was the following quote:

'Many groups in the community complain about their lot but the data shows that wage costs are lower in Australia than other countries,' Professor Bamber said. He said a serious problem for Australia was that low wage costs resulted in lower productivity, as employers had no incentive to increase efficiency.

Earlier, there were interjections from the member for Victoria and, before I had a chance to respond to the question, from the member for Murray-Mallee: both of those members indicate that they do not understand what is bedeviling Australian industry. It is not workers or wage costs but the inability of manufacturers and their managers to cope with new technology, to introduce it, so that we can sell our products overseas and compete. We only have to consider the industries where managers have done that, where they have been able to train their workers and where their workers cooperate. They can compete on the world market and do it extremely well. The thinking of the members for Bragg, Victoria and Murray-Mallee is such that they want to go back to the Dark Ages, because they think that the cost of wages is all that matters. They need to understand that wage costs are not a factor any more. In the food industry it is not wage costs that will prevent us from selling overseas: it relates to the quality of product and our ability to sell it. It is all right for the member for Victoria to interject, 'Oh, come on!', but the reality is that it is the cost and the quality of the product, and that means—

*Members interjecting:*

**The SPEAKER:** Order!

**The Hon. R.J. GREGORY:** that proper training of people—

**The SPEAKER:** Order! There is a point of order. The Minister will resume his seat.

**Mr S.G. EVANS:** On a point of order, Mr Speaker, the Minister is debating his response.

**The SPEAKER:** The Minister is certainly commencing to debate the issue and I ask him to finish his response to the question as quickly as possible.

**The Hon. R.J. GREGORY:** I conclude by saying that the people who conducted the survey recognised correctly where the problem lies. The problem is a lack of innovation by management in introducing new technology so that we can compete on the international market.

### MULTIFUNCTION POLIS

**Mr OLSEN (Kavel):** During his talks in Japan in May this year with companies being targeted to invest in the MFP,

was the Premier warned that the lack of progress on the project, coupled with a downturn in the Japanese economy, may force Japanese companies to review their investment plans? In February this year several Japanese representatives expressed serious concerns about delays in the MFP project to the Leader of the Opposition. The Chairman of the Japanese MFP Committee, at a function in Tokyo on 11 May this year, attended by the Premier, questioned progress on the project saying, in the understatement of the year:

It cannot be said to be progressing at the pace for which one might hope.

Contact with Tokyo today confirms that at the time of the Premier's visit officials of companies considering investment in the project had serious concerns about delays being caused in Australia. They warned that, because the project had not progressed to the stage where they could identify specific investment opportunities, the state of the Japanese economy was likely to force their companies to postpone any investment decisions for some time.

**The Hon. LYNN ARNOLD:** I draw attention to the ministerial statement that I made earlier today. I also have some information that has just come to me: apparently an allegation was made that the comments in the *Sydney Morning Herald* might have been made by Mr Hoshi, who is a spokesperson for Mr Yahiro. I have just received advice that he is fully aware of the joint statement made by Mr Yahiro and Mr Kennan and has stated publicly to the press in Japan that he agrees entirely with the statement issued by Yahiro and Kennan. That highlights yet again that the article in the *Sydney Morning Herald* is misleading.

It is interesting that the member for Kavel has chosen to quote Mr Yahiro direct. It is true that, when he came to this country 18 months to two years ago, he made some comments that were reported, and the reporting of those comments was interpreted as being negative about the prospects of the MFP. There is no doubt that the reporting indicated that he did not seem too optimistic about the investment prospects of the MFP. That is why it was important to hear what he had to say when I was there in May and what he had to say today. I will quote what Mr Yahiro said when I was there in May. I have said it before, but obviously the member for Kavel has not been paying rapt attention and I invite him to do so now. Amongst other things, Mr Yahiro made the following statements (and I am prepared to read his entire speech into *Hansard* if members wish, but it would be pertinent to read a number of paragraphs to save the time of the House—I am very anxious about that):

With these preparations in place, the announcement of such an enthusiastic new economic policy by Premier Arnold, and the inclusion as an integral part of the policy of positive stimulus measures for MFP are clear indications of the 'inseparability' of South Australia's economic revitalisation and MFP, and it seems that 'a soul has truly been breathed into' MFP.

In particular, the designation of the MFP as an 'enterprise zone' involves the provision of various taxation incentives, and to those of us who have repeatedly stressed the need for such public incentives, it is highly gratifying to see our wishes granted.

That is the opinion on the MFP of the person whom the member for Kavel is quoting. It is also true that he made reference to the fact that Japan is in a state of recession. He was not the only one to say that. Mr Saito, who is on the international advisory board, also made comments about Japan being in a recession and that acting as a dampener on Japanese investment. There is no doubt about that and it

relates to not only anywhere in Australia but also anywhere else in the world. There will be a dampening down on foreign investment figures from Japan in this calendar year, and Australia will feel the impact of that as will other parts of the world. It will not be a total stopping of it or a total choking off, but certainly they will not be as large a set of figures for foreign investment as they were the year before. When the recession is over—and that will not be 10 to 20 years as stated in the article in the *Sydney Morning Herald* but rather a few quarters at the most—then foreign investment figures will bounce back again and Australia will have its share of that foreign investment. And South Australia, with things like the MFP, will receive its rightful share of investment also.

## DEFENCE INDUSTRIES

**The Hon. T.H. HEMMINGS (Napier):** Will the Minister of Business and Regional Development advise whether any new developments have occurred in South Australia's push to secure defence industries in South Australia?

**The Hon. M.D. RANN:** I am sure that the *Advertiser* will be rapt in this very positive news for South Australia, as will members opposite. Today South Australia and the Salisbury region in particular consolidated its place as the high tech defence industry capital of Australia. I have today just returned from a ceremony to mark the start of work on the \$1 billion Jindalee operational radar network (JORN) nerve centre at the RAAF base at Edinburgh. Just a few moments ago, in fact almost simultaneously as we are meeting here today, the Federal Minister for Defence, Robert Ray, is announcing that AWA Defence Industries (AWADI), based in the northern metropolitan area, has been selected as the preferred tenderer for the \$100 million Project Parakeet for the Australian Defence Forces. I understand that AWADI was selected as the best tenderer as it was more advanced technologically, the intellectual property rights arrangements were suitable and it was the best on price. I understand that the contract will be signed before the end of this year and the system will be introduced in 1995 with the project completed by 1997.

Project Parakeet involves a mobile and secure tactical communications system for the Australian Army and for sections of the Royal Australian Air Force. It will provide voice, telegraph, data and facsimile services. The \$1 billion JORN project will provide a vital service by helping to protect our vast northern coastline and provide early warning of penetration by intruders. JORN is one of the world's most advanced over the horizon radar systems and is vital, not only for defence purposes but also for search and rescue operations and for collecting data for the Bureau of Meteorology.

As well, I am sure that all members will be interested to know that discussions are continuing with regard to South Australia's bid to win a major part of the \$750 million Orion P-3C upgrade. We have established a task force to capture this project for our State, building on the strengths that we have reached with the submarine project and with the smart end of the frigate project. Certainly, we are leaving no stone unturned, both in the quality of our incentive packages being offered to the preferred tenderers based on the advantages of our enterprise zones and in our extensive lobbying of Canberra politicians and bureaucrats and the prime tenderers.

Members will be interested to know that yesterday I had meetings with Lockheed, one of the tenderers, which in its press announcement—I did not see it reported—said that, if it won the project cited, the MFP site at Technology Park was

the place where the high tech electronics work would occur, as have a number of other tenderers. Certainly our aim, which I am very confident we can achieve, is to maximise the wealth and job creation potential for the people of South Australia by ensuring that South Australia is the defence capital of this nation and that Salisbury is the electronics capital of the country. I expect to be able to advise the Parliament soon of another major announcement in the high tech industry sector which will bring hundreds more jobs to this State, but please do not look so depressed. He who speaks with forked tongue over there, who will do his best—the cardboard cut-out—

*Members interjecting:*

**The SPEAKER:** Order!

**The Hon. M.D. RANN:**—but whose mates still keep shafting behind his back hopes that the *Advertiser* will prop him up. Well, we will see.

### POLICE STRENGTH

**Mr MATTHEW (Bright):** In view of a decrease of 49 operational police in the budgeted strength of the South Australian Police Force in 1993, does the Minister of Emergency Services concede that more police are needed to combat what amounts to serious increases in most areas of crime in this State, and will he agree that some statistics are understated in that a survey from the Office of Crime Statistics last March, issued by the Attorney-General, showed that 18.5 per cent of break and enter victims and 58.7 per cent of attempted break and enter victims did not report the crime to police?

**The Hon. M.K. MAYES:** I thank the honourable member for Bright for his question. I anticipated that something of this sort might be raised, and I am pleased he has given me the opportunity to respond, not only to that question but also, of course, to the way in which it has been presented to the community by the *Advertiser*. One has to really question the motives of the *Advertiser* in—

**The SPEAKER:** The Minister will resume his seat. The member for Murray-Mallee.

**Mr LEWIS:** Do I take it that the Minister—

**The SPEAKER:** Order! You do not have to take anything. If you have a point of order, make the point of order. If not, resume your seat.

**Mr LEWIS:** The point of order is that the Minister has indicated to the House that he intends to debate another matter apart from the question itself by directly stating—

**The SPEAKER:** Order! The Chair has not heard enough of the answer yet to uphold or deny the point of order. The Minister will resume his answer and as always keep in mind the need for relevance.

**The Hon. M.K. MAYES:** I certainly will, Mr Speaker. The member for Bright, of course, referred to the statistics and to the soaring crime rate, which was probably a direct quote from the *Advertiser*. Talk about selective reporting and picking out figures to suit your case! I think the member for Bright can be well accused of that this afternoon in this place, because quite clearly—

*An honourable member interjecting:*

**The Hon. M.K. MAYES:** Well, you would not know about door knocking.

**The SPEAKER:** Order!

**The Hon. M.K. MAYES:** The electorate would not know you.

**The SPEAKER:** Order! The Minister will direct his remarks to the Chair.

**The Hon. M.K. MAYES:** Indeed, I will. I apologise. The figures presented—and the member for Bright has drawn on these figures no doubt to frame his question to me—are quite misleading. One of the things most members of Parliament would hear from their constituents on an ongoing basis is concern about car theft and break and enter, both into their homes and into shops. They are the issues raised by the electorate with members, as I am sure my colleagues would agree.

Referring to the statistics tabled today as part of the police report, one can see quite clearly that that figure has not been picked up. I refer members to the report and to offences against property as reported in table 312, under the heading 'Break and enter—dwellings': the number reported for 1991-92 is 21 177; and for 1992-93, 21 673. That indicates a reduction of 2.3 per cent in those reported offences. I think that is a credit to the Police Force of South Australia, demonstrating a significant break-through and a change in the trend. If one looks at the trend line, which is provided in the graph, one will see that we have turned the trend around; we have stopped it. I want to congratulate the Police Force, unlike the member for Bright, who is obviously trying to undermine not only people's confidence in the police but also the work that those officers are doing in the community.

Under the next heading, 'Break and enter—shops', the figure for 1991-92 is 5 799; and for 1992-93, 5 713, indicating a drop of .5 per cent in reported crimes in this category. In connection with the illegal use of motor vehicles, the figure was 12 875 in 1991-92, and 11 299 in 1992-93, indicating a drop of 12.2 per cent, and so it goes on. In respect of larceny from shops there has been a drop of 22 per cent. One of the issues referred to in the *Advertiser* article was an increase in the cause of death. We have seen that increase occur, and that is why this Government is constantly looking at increasing police surveillance on the roads in every way. **The Hon. Frank Blevins:** It opposed speed cameras.

**The SPEAKER:** Order!

**The Hon. M.K. MAYES:** Indeed, it criticised the Government for bringing in speed cameras. I want to make one final comment in response to the question. The *Advertiser* referred to break-in rates, mainly for homes and shops, which have increased by 12.6 per cent. I ask members to reflect on those figures I have presented. Those statistics, reported in the Commissioner's report to this Parliament, show that in fact the number of dwelling break-ins decreased by 2.3 per cent and shop break-ins decreased by .5 per cent. I would like to know to which report the *Advertiser* was referring, because quite obviously it was not referring to the report which I have seen and which has been tabled in this House.

### SEATON HIGH SCHOOL

**Mr HAMILTON (Albert Park):** My question is directed to the Minister of Education, Employment and Training. Can the Minister provide information on proposals to redevelop the Seaton High School? As all members of the House would be aware I have been involved in this matter for some years, and—

*Members interjecting:*

**The SPEAKER:** Order!

*Members interjecting:*

**The SPEAKER:** Order! The member will be aware that comment is out of order in questions.

**Mr HAMILTON:** The Seaton High School Council might be interested in the Minister's response on this issue, unlike the Liberal candidate who wants to make political comment at those school council meetings.

**The SPEAKER:** Order!

**The Hon. S.M. LENEHAN:** I thank the honourable member for his question. He is certainly one of the most ferocious pursuers of issues within his own area of any member in this Parliament. I certainly hope that his electorate recognises that when the time comes, as I am sure it will. This is yet another issue which the member for Albert Park has raised and indeed has raised very constructively and positively on behalf of his electorate and particularly on behalf of the Seaton High School Council. I am delighted to inform the honourable member that plans for the redevelopment and consolidation of Seaton High School are currently being developed in consultation with the school and with the school community.

Stage 1 of the redevelopment will be funded by the sale of property which is surplus to the school's requirement and work is expected to commence before the end of this financial year. This project is an example of how cooperation and consultation on the use of resources can return funds for the redevelopment of our schools. I would like to refute the headlines in Monday's *Advertiser* that the Government is selling schools to reduce its debt. In fact this is patently—

*The Hon. D.C. Wotton interjecting:*

**The SPEAKER:** The member for Heysen is out of order.

**The Hon. S.M. LENEHAN:** This is patently and absolutely incorrect and I would like to quickly and clearly put on the public record that funds from the sale of surplus Education Department properties have been, under my predecessor and now under myself, and will continue to be channelled back into the development and redevelopment of other schools. In other words, what this Government has done consistently is channel the funds directly back into education in South Australia in a most appropriate way of maximising the use of resources. It is the Opposition that wants to sell off schools to retire debt and, indeed, members opposite have said that they will be selling off schools and other properties to be able to retire \$1 billion worth of debt.

*Members interjecting:*

**The SPEAKER:** Order!

*Mr S.J. Baker interjecting:*

**The SPEAKER:** The Deputy Leader is out of order.

**The Hon. S.M. LENEHAN:** I challenge the Opposition—

**The SPEAKER:** The Minister will resume her seat. The member for Bragg has been constantly interjecting and the Deputy Leader has been cautioned several times this afternoon. I draw the attention of the members concerned to their conduct.

**Mr S.J. BAKER:** I rise on a point of order. The Minister is debating the question.

**The SPEAKER:** If the Deputy Leader had taken that point of order it would have been well within the Standing Orders. Interjections are out of order. I draw the Minister's attention to the Standing Order on debating questions and ask her to bring her answer to a close.

**The Hon. S.M. LENEHAN:** In conclusion, I challenge the Opposition to tell this community where they are going to close the schools.

*Members interjecting:*

**The SPEAKER:** Order!

*Members interjecting:*

**The SPEAKER:** Order!

*Dr Armitage interjecting:*

**The SPEAKER:** I warn the member for Adelaide.

*Mr Hamilton interjecting:*

**The SPEAKER:** I warn the member for Albert Park.

**Mr HAMILTON:** I rise on a point of order.

**The SPEAKER:** There is no point of order. The member for Albert Park has been warned. The member for Newland.

*Members interjecting:*

**The SPEAKER:** The member for Newland.

## CRIME RATE

**Mrs KOTZ (Newland):** Thank you, Mr Speaker; thank you all. My question is directed to the Minister of Emergency Services. In the light of the latest crime statistics from the South Australian Police Department showing an increase of 9 per cent in crimes involving assault and violence, does the Minister concede that even these figures may be disguised by numerous victims not being prepared to formally report assault cases? Further, is he aware of a number of such cases occurring in the Rundle Mall precincts in the past few months where parents and schools have complained of students being assaulted and robbed?

The Liberal Party has been told of three such incidents in recent months, but in each case the parents chose not to pursue the matter to the extent of making a formal report. In one case, on 3 June, a young boy was punched in the jaw after being harassed for money outside the Myer-Remm centre. In another incident, a 15-year-old boy had to rescue his 13-year-old brother from a gang of youths in the Mall who were violently harassing him. In another, two boys were confronted by a gang who demanded their basketball boots and caps and violently jostled them.

The Executive Officer of the Independent Schools Parents Council of South Australia, Mr Bob Nelson, has written to the Leader about Concordia College students who have been physically attacked and verbally abused in the Mall. His letter concludes that complaints by parents and Concordia 'have received little or no response' and that 'no-one seems to want to accept any responsibility for initiating meaningful action'.

**The Hon. M.K. MAYES:** I find that rather extraordinary. I do not know whether the Chairman of the Independent Schools has written to me, but I cannot recall a letter coming across my desk. It sounds as though he has written to the Leader of the Opposition and I guess it should come across—

*Members interjecting:*

**The SPEAKER:** Order!

**The Hon. M.K. MAYES:** I have noticed that you have written to me asking me to intervene in the justices—

**The SPEAKER:** Order! The Minister will make his remarks through the Chair.

**The Hon. M.K. MAYES:** Yes, Mr Speaker. The final comments by the member for Newland have me somewhat perplexed, because there has been an ongoing discussion between the Commissioner and the Lord Mayor in regard to addressing those issues in the area. We have upgraded the Hindley Street Police Station. It is unfortunate that the honourable member has not had a discussion with the inspector in charge of Hindley Street to find out what is happening there, because the area is under very close scrutiny: I can assure the honourable member of that. I shall be happy to provide the officers to brief her on what is happening in Hindley Street and Rundle Mall.

Let me make a comment here. The honourable member has raised an issue in relation to reporting offences. The statistics accompanying the figures detailed in the report involving attempted rape, for example, highlighted that there had been an 11 per cent increase. We, as a Government, with the Police Department have been running two major community programs designed to encourage people to come forward concerning such assaults, particularly against children. Operation Paradox, one of those projects, aims to encourage children to break through the taboo we have had in this community as regards the reporting of that sort of offence.

We all know that the police have provided the hot line numbers and we have had a 24-hour telephone service manned to encourage members of the community to come forward and report these matters. We have seen an enormous increase in that response, which I am sure reflects the ongoing program that we have had.

I should like to refer to the comments made by Dr Moody this morning on the radio. Leigh McClusky asked Dr Moody, who is involved in examining the area of sexual assault at the Queen Elizabeth Hospital, about the figures that were presented in the police report. Dr Moody said, 'But in fact in our unit the numbers of people who are coming and saying that they have been raped recently have been steady and certainly have not increased over the last three or four years.' Leigh McClusky asked, 'Would you say, Dr Moody, that for every woman who comes in and actually reports a crime of physical violence there might be three others out there who are not coming in?' The answer was, 'I think we should say that the figures that are published in this morning's paper are much more likely to be related to the increased detection of childhood sexual abuse.'

That is part of what this Government has done; that is part of the practice we have been following. We have been working with all the agencies, both private and public, to encourage people to come forward so that we can finally get a handle on the size of this problem. I find it extraordinary that the honourable member should come in here and criticise the work that has been done by our agencies and by the police, who find it enormously frustrating when they cannot answer back. I will answer back for them. I am sick of hearing this sort of criticism of our Police Force, particularly from that member and from the Leader. I believe it is time that they supported the police.

*Members interjecting:*

**The SPEAKER:** Order! I warn the Leader and I warn the Minister. Interjections are out of order. We have wasted enough time in Question Time. We will now get on with questions and answers.

### SENIORS WEEK

**The Hon. D.J. HOPGOOD (Baudin):** My question is directed to the Premier.

*Members interjecting:*

**The SPEAKER:** Order! I have spoken to the Leader. The Leader of the Opposition has been spoken to several times and he has been warned. As long as he clearly understands that, we will get on with the business of the House. The member for Baudin.

**The Hon. D.J. HOPGOOD:** Sir, I will try again. My question is directed to the Premier. Will the Premier outline to the House the details of the package of measures which he

launched this morning at the beginning of Seniors Week for services for older South Australians?

**The Hon. LYNN ARNOLD:** I am certainly very pleased to do that. The member for Baudin was present at the launch of Seniors Week this morning. In fact, he was present beforehand playing with the Jazz Disciples on the tram to Glenelg that the STA put on for the occasion, and it was a very successful occasion.

Coincident with the launch of Seniors Week, I was very pleased to launch a booklet, *An Age of Opportunity*, which sets out the latest programs that the Government is targeting for older people in our community not only in this financial year but beyond. The figures are very impressive. Almost \$7 million will be spent on new and extended services directed at more than 250 000 South Australians who are over the age of 60. The package brings together 28 programs covering housing, health care, community services, safety and security, transport concessions, help for older people from non-English speaking backgrounds, and recreational and volunteer opportunities for older people.

I will not go through those 28 programs again, because that would consume too much time, but the booklet is available for those who would like it. I should, however, like to draw attention to some of the highlights.

*Members interjecting:*

**The Hon. LYNN ARNOLD:** If you had listened a moment ago, I told you.

**The SPEAKER:** Order! The Premier will resume his seat. I am not psychic but in my opinion there is obviously some collusion between the Deputy Leader and the member for Bragg because the same question has been asked. I warn the member for Bragg, who has been interjecting all afternoon as well, and I call on the Premier to complete the answer.

**The Hon. LYNN ARNOLD:** The member for Bragg does not benefit too much from collusion with the member for Mitcham. He falls down the bench a bit when that happens.

**The SPEAKER:** Order! The Premier will answer the question.

**The Hon. LYNN ARNOLD:** Some of the highlights in the package include a specialised loan package by HomeStart Finance Limited to help older people buy retirement housing or modify or renovate their existing home; an expansion across the State of services under the HomeAssist scheme covering home security assessments and social support, backed by a \$500 000 increase in funding; a health promotion and fitness program geared to the particular needs of older people; an extra \$315 000 for home security services and programs designed to boost older people's confidence in dealing with the fear of crime; an elder protection program, which is an Australian first, to improve help for the 3 to 5 per cent of people who will experience some form of physical or emotional abuse during old age; and a \$215 000 extension under the transport subsidy scheme to country areas and increasing the number of access cabs.

It is a very exciting program. As I said, I released that coincident with the launch of Seniors Week. I must say that I have to feel sorry for the Leader sometimes because he has not released any policies. He has tried to resist doing that. On this occasion, at this very pleasant launch of Seniors Week and the activities that are about to take place, he miscued. He came close to a quasi-policy launch and started to go into what a Liberal Government would do. But it was inappropriate for the occasion, as people in the audience said. He was very quickly told by somebody at the back to stop the politics. You have to feel sorry for him because he does not come out

with policies at all, and then, when he comes close to one and starts to let out some policy leaks, he is told to stop. I really do have some sympathy for him.

**Mr S.G. EVANS:** I rise on a point of order, Mr Speaker. The Premier is debating the question.

**The SPEAKER:** Order! Yes, I uphold the point of order. Has the Premier finished or is he very close to finishing?

**The Hon. LYNN ARNOLD:** The *Age of Opportunity* booklet is available for all members if they would like to have copies.

#### DRUG AND ALCOHOL SERVICES COUNCIL

**Mr OSWALD (Morphett):** Will the Minister of Health, Family and Community Services explain to the House why the Drug and Alcohol Services Council will not accept an appeal for help from a drug addict and will not make an appointment before January 1994? I have been contacted by a constituent of Glenelg, a self-proclaimed drug addict, who has been desperately seeking help but who has been told that he cannot be seen until January next year because of budgetary constraints which have limited the resources available. I am also advised that when a drug addict seeks help it is the crucial time for treatment to be initiated and that to force them to wait three months could have very dangerous results.

**The Hon. M.J. EVANS:** If the honourable member was genuinely concerned about that individual's health he would have taken steps immediately it came to his attention to speak to me about it and we could have discussed that matter immediately with the relevant professional advisers and ensured that the individual's needs were taken care of. However, if the honourable member wishes to give me the name of the individual concerned, I would be happy to have that investigated immediately. I would also extend a general invitation to him to inspect, as I have done, the facilities of the Drug and Alcohol Services Council at all points through the metropolitan area. He will see the very high standard of service that is offered there; he will see the many clients who come in, for example, on the methadone program and who are given immediate attention in that regard. They are able to make use of some very progressive and effective therapies for what is a very difficult program for the individual. Rather than using that as a political point, we might look to the health care of that individual and I will be happy to see to that immediately he gives me the name.

#### WORK FOR AUSTRALIA CAMPAIGN

**Mr De LAINE (Price):** Can the Minister of Education, Employment and Training provide information on the response by employers of South Australia to Government employment programs and on the visit to Adelaide on Monday of this week by transport magnate Lindsay Fox and ACTU Secretary Bill Kelty to promote the Work for Australia campaign?

**The Hon. S.M. LENEHAN:** Yes, I would be delighted to provide the honourable member with information about this visit by Bill Kelty and Lindsay Fox to promote the Work for Australia campaign. I was disappointed that there was very little in the media about this. I guess that is because it was in a form of good news; it was about a bipartisan approach to getting Australia, and in this case South Australia, back to work. One would have thought something might have been put out in the printed media about the programs and the very generous employment schemes which

the Federal Government has in place and which are now being promoted around the country by Bill Kelty and Lindsay Fox.

Notwithstanding the pretty consistent lack of publicity about these programs over the past 12 months, I am pleased to say that the private sector employers are starting to use the apprentice and trainee wage subsidy schemes that are available through the Federal and State Governments. During last year there were about 40 000 commencements under the various schemes. However, the point was made by Lindsay Fox and Bill Kelty that the need in terms of promoting these programs was made in respect of the fact that if every employer in South Australia was to take on one new trainee or apprentice we would have no unemployment in this State. That these two people, from opposite sides of politics, are working together and giving of their own time and resources—they are not paid to do this—highlights the fact that the responsibility is on everyone. It is not just on a few individuals or on the Government or on a bipartisan Government and Opposition approach; it is back to every employer in this State.

I think it is important that I highlight just a couple of these very generous schemes. One of them includes a subsidy of up to \$230 a week under the JobStart program; up to \$3 000 a year for an apprentice with a further \$2 000 if an employer takes on an extra first year apprentice. It is very easy for employers to get this information; they merely have to contact the Federal Department of Employment, Education and Training, any CES office or my own department and we will provide them with this information. The programs are generous. They offer the opportunity for South Australia to accept the Kelty-Fox bipartisan approach to expand our employment and training opportunities.

#### SCHOOL CLASS SIZES

**Mr SUCH (Fisher):** Is the Minister of Education, Employment and Training aware of an ALP campaign leaflet presently in circulation which is entitled 'Look what is happening in South Australia' and which contains the inaccurate claim: 'We have not increased class sizes in schools'? If so, will she seek to have the leaflet amended to remove this inaccuracy and, if not, why not? The Labor Government's curriculum guarantee released in August 1989 stated on page 4 that the then current maximum class sizes of 25 students in junior primary, 27 students in primary school, 27 students in secondary years 8 to 10 and 25 students in secondary years 11 to 12 would be maintained. In November 1990, however, State Cabinet broke that promise and decided to cut 795 teaching positions in Government schools. As a consequence, class sizes rose by up to two students in most State schools.

**The Hon. S.M. LENEHAN:** There is an old saying about people in glass houses, and I really think the honourable member wants to recall that saying, because it is very interesting that what happened in this State under a Liberal Government was to have—

*Members interjecting:*

**The Hon. S.M. LENEHAN:** We will have a bit of history; if you want history, then you will get history—with the permission of the Speaker.

*Mr Meier interjecting:*

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



**Mr S.J. BAKER:** On a point of order, Mr Speaker: again I indicate that the Minister is debating the issue, and she said 'If you want history, then you will get history.' That is a complete flouting of Standing Orders.

*Members interjecting:*

**The SPEAKER:** Order! Obviously Question Time is of no significance to either side of the House.

*The Hon. H. Allison interjecting:*

**The SPEAKER:** Order! The member for Mount Gambier is out of order. Until the Minister puts her answer forward, the Chair cannot make a decision on the point of order raised, and I think that perhaps it might be pre-emptive. I will listen very closely and if there is any debate or untoward comment I will certainly bring the Minister's attention to it.

**The Hon. S.M. LENEHAN:** Thank you, Mr Speaker, I have no doubt you will. In terms of the question that was asked about class sizes and various commitments to class sizes, it is worth putting the matter in context. My colleague reminds me that when he began teaching under a Liberal Government in this State he had 52 children in a class. The education record of Labor Governments in this State is second to none in this country, and that is what is getting under the skin of the Opposition. We do not even have to go back in history, we can just go back to the time of members in this House. When the member for Mount Gambier was the Minister he slashed school assistance by 4 per cent, and we saw for the first time in the history of this State teachers taking to the streets to protest.

*Members interjecting:*

**The SPEAKER:** Order!

**Mr S.G. EVANS:** Mr Speaker, the Minister is debating the answer.

**The SPEAKER:** The Minister has certainly commenced to debate the answer.

**The Hon. S.M. LENEHAN:** Mr Speaker, I have made my point and that is fine. With respect to the question, let us be very clear that what the pamphlet is saying is that in this budget we have not increased class sizes, and indeed we have not done so. We have maintained class sizes; in fact, we have put extra resources into our education budget in this year and we have just gone through an Estimates process whereby the honourable member had every opportunity to pursue the matter. If there was anywhere where we had cut education resources the whole might of the Opposition had every opportunity to raise that. There was not a whimper, not a word, and it makes me think that the honourable member feels that this pamphlet is just a little too successful in pointing out the truth. The truth of the matter is that we still have what is comparable to the best class sizes in this country. We also have among the best professional teachers, they are paid equivalent to or higher than any other teachers in this country, and we provide a range of other services such as services for children with special needs.

We certainly provide much greater resources than are provided in New South Wales or Victoria. If members opposite do not believe me, they can go to Victoria and now to Western Australia and talk not just to teachers but to the communities and listen to what those communities are saying about the closing of schools and removing resources, including \$145 million out of the budget this year in Victoria. We have increased our education budget and I wonder whether the honourable member will tell the community that we have increased our budget for education. He will not, because he does not like the truth.

*Members interjecting:*

**The SPEAKER:** Order!

## LOTTERIES

**Mr HAMILTON (Albert Park):** Can the Treasurer—  
*The Hon. T.H. Hemmings interjecting:*

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

**Mr HAMILTON:** Can the Treasurer report on progress with respect to the review of regulations governing the conduct of small lotteries? When is it expected that new regulations arising from the review will come into operation? I have been approached by a businessman who alleges there are many rorts in this field. He further alleges that he has been to two members of the Opposition without success, and hence he came to me. I have taken up the matter and have advised the Minister that I intended to ask this question in the House.

**The Hon. FRANK BLEVINS:** I do have information for the member for Albert Park who, I know, has a deep interest in this matter. It is a matter that we ought not treat too flippantly, because it touches on most members of this House who are involved at one time or another as purchasers of raffle tickets or with the other numerous activities that people undertake to raise funds, or as others do on our behalf. New regulations will be going before Cabinet soon: I think either next Monday or the Monday after. Obviously, there will be a four month waiting period that applies to the implementation of subordinate legislation, so the new regulations ought to be in force, provided the House agrees, sometime in February 1994.

The review has been a lengthy process. I did not realise there were so many experts in the area. I must admit it was not an area that interested me a great deal, but I find that some of the finest minds in this Parliament have spent hours researching the problem and they have then proceeded to impart all that wisdom to me, for hours and hours. It has involved some very notable people but, nevertheless, all their endeavours are now coming to a climax and I hope that in about a fortnight to be able to announce some quite monumental decisions in this area.

I expect them to include a significant reduction in the number of licences for which the current regulations provide, and that is in line with our policy on deregulation; the abolition of four licence categories will probably occur, where prize values are below a specific amount—generally \$500—where the level of activity under the licence is minimal and where all proceeds are returned to participants. All of us who have participated at one time or another in organising some of these small lotteries will be pleased to see that those areas will be deregulated and become essentially buyer beware.

The sale of instant tickets is an area that is also going to be given a great deal of attention. An estimated 400 million instant tickets are produced in South Australia each year; it is an extensive industry indeed. Unfortunately, it is the area of activity that provides the greatest scope for malpractice involving amongst other things—we have all heard these stories—the pre-identification or removal of major prize winning tickets from a series of tickets placed on sale to the public. I am sure the House will be pleased to see that area tidied up.

There will be some deregulation of provisions in respect of eyes-down bingo or housie and the development of a less restrictive provision in some areas of this activity, and I shall

be pleased to enlarge on that to the honourable member directly rather than going through it extensively in the House. I know that it is an area that concerns a great number of our constituents. These are the things that they take very seriously and they consider them to be very important. One area that will get particularly strong attention is industry standards with respect to production of instant lottery tickets. In that area I believe that a ticket manufacturing supplier's licences is required. That is one area of regulation that we have to have. We cannot allow that area to be completely deregulated. The House will see a number of other matters in regulations over the next couple of weeks and I know that the successor to the Subordinate Legislation Committee will have a great number of meetings on these issues. Members here, including the Deputy Leader, who is one—

**The SPEAKER:** I think the Minister can draw his response to a close.

**The Hon. FRANK BLEVINS:** Yes, Sir, I am. The Deputy Leader is one, the member for Davenport is another and, in particular, the Minister of Health, Family and Community Services will pore over these regulations at great length to make sure they are in order.

**The SPEAKER:** Order! The Minister has completed his response fully and freely and it is now extending far beyond a reasonable time.

---

#### GRIEVANCE DEBATE

**The SPEAKER:** The proposal before the Chair is that the House note grievances.

**The Hon. T.H. HEMMINGS (Napier):** It is rather opportune that I make this grievance on image making, because I understand that the whole of the Liberal Party opposite and the ABC are due to make a film of what is happening on the other side. There are 23 members opposite, two are women, so that leaves 21 remaining. One member is in the National Party, and that leaves 20.

**The SPEAKER:** Order! There is a point of order. Members will come to order.

**The Hon. JENNIFER CASHMORE:** Mr Speaker, I rise on a point of order. If I heard the member for Napier correctly, he implied that neither the member for Newland nor I are members of this House. He counted the members of the House and said there are 23 members opposite, two of them are women and that that left 21 members. If that was the member for Napier's imputation, I take exception to it and ask him to withdraw it.

**The SPEAKER:** Order! The member for Napier has no power to remove any member at all from the House. If his mathematics are in error, it is his problem and not the problem of the House or the Chair.

**The Hon. T.H. HEMMINGS:** For the benefit of the member for Coles I was just engaging in some arithmetic. If I remove from the count the two members opposite whose sex is female, that leaves 21; one is in the National Party, so that leaves 20; three members are retiring, and that leaves 17. Of that 17, two have upset everyone of their colleagues and that leaves 15. The remaining 15 members are all wearing striped or polka dot ties. From a good friend in the Liberal Party in another place (one cannot blame anyone here) I understand

that all members opposite have been going to image making sessions at \$350 a head and they have been told at these image making sessions that the way to look good in the eyes of the public is to wear a striped or polka dot tie. I have been looking at members opposite and have concluded that I have never seen a more ghastly set of striped or polka dot ties. I do not include you, Sir, because I admire everything you do. Take for example the Deputy Leader: even if one makes allowances for the soup stains on his tie, it is still ghastly.

**Mr S.J. BAKER:** On a point of order, Mr Speaker.

**The SPEAKER:** Order! The member for Napier has already acknowledged that he was not reflecting on the Chair. He has made that clear.

**Mr S.J. BAKER:** I was wondering, Sir. You too have a striped tie.

**The SPEAKER:** The member for Napier has clearly exempted the Chair.

**The Hon. T.H. HEMMINGS:** Thank you, Sir. They always have a go at me, don't they. I understand that at those image making sessions Liberal Party members were told to evaluate where they had gone wrong in the past. Members opposite may be wearing the ties, but one lesson they have not learnt is to cure their habit of knocking everything. We are now seeing the knocking of the MFP. We had the Tombstone Kid in 1985 and in 1989, who single-handedly lost the election for the Liberal Party. Now we have Dino the Dinosaur. Dino is extinct even before he dies: before he dies he is ensuring that the Liberal Party will fluff its chances of being elected at the next State election, because what we are hearing, especially in relation to the MFP, is knock, knock, knock. Members opposite do not have one good word to say about the MFP and not one positive word for anything in this State. If they have that attitude, they deserve to lose and, even with the best will in the world, with the ABC cameras on the member for Hayward making a speech, they will not be able to claw back the ill will they are spreading in the South Australian community.

I understand that people are angry about the way they perceive the Government has treated them, but continually I hear, 'What about that Dean Brown? All he can do is knock and carp and whinge?'

**Mr LEWIS:** On a point of order, Mr Speaker—

**The SPEAKER:** I assume the point of order is that members must be referred to by their office in this place. The honourable member's time has expired.

**Mrs KOTZ (Newland):** I wish to address an issue of particular importance to the people of my area, especially given the rather contemptuous manner in which the Minister of Emergency Services answered my question today on law and order, showing his complete lack of concern for individuals in our community and his lack of control in that portfolio area. In the Tea Tree Gully area we have a serious problem in relation to car theft. Cars are continually stolen from a particular area. A report in the Messenger Press almost a month ago made note of the fact that the police are still concerned about the number of cars being stolen from Tea Tree Plaza and Modbury interchange car parks. This was six months after the launch of a crackdown undertaken by the police on organised stolen car rackets. From then, the stolen car racket unfortunately has not diminished.

To give the House an indication of what we are talking about, I refer to the fact that, when that report of one month ago appeared in the press, it was also reported at that time that between 10 and 15 September eight cars were stolen over

that six day period. On 10 September three cars were stolen, one on 13 September, two on 14 September and two on 15 September—eight cars over six days. The cost of the cars stolen totalled \$51 500. Between 17 and 23 September, a seven day period immediately following, 16 cars were stolen. Predominantly they are being stolen from the Tea Tree Plaza shopping centre car park, the Modbury Hospital car park and the immediate vicinity of the Modbury district. Over that seven day period, seven cars were stolen from the Tea Tree Plaza car park, three from Modbury Hospital car park and six from the immediate vicinity. The total value of those 16 cars was \$159 700.

In the following week, seven cars were stolen from the Tea Tree Plaza car park. For the following eight days after that, another eight cars were stolen with four again being stolen from the Tea Tree Plaza car park and the Modbury Hospital car park. The value of the cars stolen over that eight-day period was \$92 740. In just under a month (approximately 20 days), 30 cars were stolen from 10 September to 1 October in the areas that I have designated. If we add up the approximate values of those stolen cars in each of the given areas, we get a total of \$303 940. Is \$300 000 the average monthly value of cars stolen from one area in this State and are we talking about more than \$3.5 million worth of motor cars being stolen from one area in a year? If we multiply that by the number of cars stolen throughout the State, what sum are we talking about?

I call upon the Minister of Emergency Services to implement a specific task force specifically to address the massive crime problem in the Tea Tree Gully and Modbury areas—what appears to be a smorgasbord of opportunity for car thieves to the detriment of the people in our community, who are faced with further financial burdens whether or not they are insured. Over a two-year period from 1 July 1993—

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

**Mr HAMILTON (Albert Park):** I welcome the opportunity to follow the honourable member who has just spoken, because one statement made by her related to the lack of concern by the Minister. That is arrant nonsense and well she knows it. I challenge any member—

*Mr Venning interjecting:*

**Mr HAMILTON:** Get back into your burrow. I challenge anyone to go through *Hansard* and note how many times I have raised law and order issues in this Parliament. I believe that I would be amongst those who have raised this topic often during the period that I have been in this place. I lay claim to the fact that I asked the State Government on 17 November 1983 to introduce the Neighbourhood Watch program into this State. Little recognition does the State Government get from members opposite—in fact, none. As to the expansion of those programs, every member of this House would benefit from Neighbourhood Watch, Hospital Watch, Rural Watch, River Watch, Taxi Watch and so on.

The honourable member opposite wants to make some political gain. No-one in this Parliament would condone the theft of motor vehicles. A member of my family only last year had his car stolen, never to be seen again. Like every member who has had a car stolen or who has had a member of their family thus affected, I was furious about it. I berated the Minister and asked what the hell was going on. The Minister advised me of programs that have been put in place.

Members opposite think that we can have a police officer on every corner in this State and that that will reduce the incidence of crime. They should talk to the police officers

themselves, or even the Police Commissioner. They say we have to get smarter. That is no reflection on the police at all. The facts of the matter are that criminals are getting smarter. The Coalition against Crime, set up by this Government to address these problems, is relevant and pertinent. What we have is people like the honourable member opposite who thinks she can make some political gain at this point in time but, if they ever get into government, they will certainly incur the wrath of the member for Albert Park, or hopefully the member for Lee at the time, because I will remind them as I have done in the past and as I have done to my colleagues of the need to address the problems of law and order and what is taking place out in the community.

I do not believe that any thinking member of this House would condone those activities. I believe that every member, on each side of the House, would be looking at strategies and ways in which to reduce the incidence of break and enter and stealing offences. My colleague reminds me that, in the Caucus of the Party, I led the charge for setting up the juvenile justice select committee. No recognition for that has been given by members opposite. Well may the honourable member opposite have a stupid look on her face. The reality is that I have had a very strong commitment to this issue ever since I came into this Parliament. I have argued that vandals ought to clean up their own mess. Let members go back and refer to the front page of the *News* of 17 October 1987 and to the glowing editorial about the issues that must be addressed to attack vandalism graffiti. Again the Minister responsible for the passage of the Bill commended me in this House for my initiative in this area. Let no member opposite carry on stupidly on the eve of a State election and think that, because they will get some cheap political headline in the *Messenger* press, that will be the answer. The answer is more complex and diverse than the honourable member opposite is trying to pretend—that it is the fault of this Government, not of themselves.

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

**Mrs KOTZ:** On a point of order, Mr Speaker, I believe that the honourable member is reflecting on my duties in representing my constituents. I ask him to withdraw what is an offensive imputation.

**The SPEAKER:** The Chair can only ask the honourable member to withdraw.

**Mr HAMILTON:** No, Sir, I will not. The member opposite is a dill when she raises this sort of nonsense.

**The SPEAKER:** Order!

**Mr GUNN:** On a point of order—

**The SPEAKER:** Order! The honourable member is out of order—very much so. He was asked to withdraw. The only thing the honourable member is allowed to do is to withdraw or refuse to withdraw. The honourable member for Eyre.

**Mr GUNN (Eyre):** Yesterday in the grievance debate, the Minister of Environment and Natural Resources took it upon himself to cast aspersions in relation to the conduct of the Combined Shooters and Firearms Council of this State, in particular Mr Fleetwood. The Minister yesterday made a number of grossly inaccurate comments. Today we had a Punch and Judy show from the Minister, who was waving his hands around and jumping up and down. Obviously he is having a bad week. Yesterday the Minister said, 'I am not sure whether he is authorised to do that.' Well, let me tell the Minister that he is authorised to do it. He went on to say, 'I have never come across Mr Fleetwood before—certainly

breaches the Electoral Act.' Well, the Minister is wrong again. It does not breach the Electoral Act. I refer to paragraph 7.2 of the Electoral Handbook:

Specific provision relating to electoral advertising during an election period: the period commencing on the issue of the writ and expiring at 6 p.m. on polling day.

The writs have not been issued, so the Minister is again wrong. He then went on to say, 'I think he has done his cause a disservice.' Further on, he referred to 'the loony fringe group'. Let me outline Mr Fleetwood's background in this industry. He joined the South Australian Police Force in 1978. Within 10 years he had risen to the rank of sergeant in the Star Force in the special weapons section. He is a qualified gunsmith, having also been involved in his family business for 40 years. He was the national pistol champion in 1981, the national rifle champion three times, and was appointed to the Firearms Steering Committee within the South Australian Police Department. He implemented firearms training and safety courses in the South Australian Police Force. He was appointed by the Commonwealth Government as an adviser to ADAB in the Papua New Guinea constabulary. He was a project trainer for the mobile squads for their role on Bougainville and mainland New Guinea. He is director of the Sportsgoods gun shop. He has recently been invited to apply for a senior position within the New Guinea constabulary to implement a firearms training program and armoury maintenance schedule, and is currently awaiting confirmation of that appointment. If that is not a record within the industry, I do not know what is.

The Minister, unfortunately, took it upon himself to cast aspersions and make inaccurate and grave allegations in relation to Mr Fleetwood which he could not justify, which were not true and which were unwise.

**Mr Ferguson:** You are being unkind to the Minister.

**Mr GUNN:** I am being very charitable. As for the whole fiasco of the regulations, the Minister has no-one else but himself to blame. He cannot say that there has not been confusion, concern and a complete stuff-up of the arrangement. I have here a South Australian firearms licence which does not have even the codes on it. The person has been given the licence, but it shows no codes of the firearms he is authorised to use. I take it from this that he is allowed to use every one. That is this brilliant computer that we were told would solve everything. We have another one here—an application for permit to purchase a firearm. It identifies target shooting. That does not come within the criteria. You cannot use a 22 Ruger self-loading rifle for target shooting. So, this is wrong. They are two examples. I give another one. A person was charged \$13 for a permit to purchase ammunition—there should be no charge for that.

There is confusion. If the Minister had taken notice of the industry, of the responsible firearms people, of the evidence and of the move that I made in the Legislative Review Committee, we would not have all this antagonism in the community. He has brought it upon himself. He is now casting around making wild accusations against people who are responsible and who have a fine track record of service in this State and of representing Australia, and it ill behoves him to make inaccurate, untrue and malicious statements. As a Minister of the Crown, he ought to withdraw and apologise. He is doing his cause no good. He is reflecting upon people who do not deserve it. In a democracy, people are allowed to circulate documents if they want to or to participate in public debate.

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

**Mrs HUTCHISON (Stuart):** In this brief time I will refer to an article in the *London Daily Telegraph* of Wednesday 16 June 1993. As far as I am concerned, it is obscene, a disgrace to journalism and an absolute disgrace in terms of human rights. Written by Auberon Waugh, it is headed 'Way of the World: Australian Claims' and states:

The Australian Foreign Minister, nowadays called Mr Gareth Evans, is asking us to give him £50 million to 'clean up' the Maralinga desert and compensate displaced Aborigines following our nuclear tests down there in the fifties and sixties.

In fact we 'cleaned up' Maralinga to the satisfaction of the Australian Government when we stopped testing there in 1968. I don't think it has a legal leg to stand on. Everything depends on compensation for the 120-strong Tjarutja tribe, which claims to have been displaced. The idea that this tribe deserves extravagant compensation for events of 30 or 40 years ago is, frankly, mad. There was no system of land ownership, and no agriculture to establish territorial claims, although much is made of the Aborigines' local preferences for meditation or dreaming. The desert is probably cleaner for their absence.

I should have thought that a bit of extra radiation might have improved the dreaming potential, but whether I am right or wrong, it is obvious that the Australians should pay for their own neurotic feelings of guilt. There is no reason why we should pay for them. The Foreign Office argues that we should give Mr Gareth Evans his £50 million in order to ensure good trading relations with our Commonwealth partner. This, again, is nonsense.

I am often amazed that a country which produces such brilliant wine and seems to be full of such sensible, straightforward people can let itself be so badly led. No doubt it is the effect of the sun's rays through a depleted ozone layer in the southern hemisphere, but their uncouth Prime Minister is hell bent on leading them away from the Crown into humiliation and ruin in Asia.

Far from giving them huge sums of money for their Aborigines, I think it is time we protected ourselves. Murdoch, having besieged the monarchy, destroyed Geoffrey Howe, Nigel Lawson and Norman Lamont, now seeks to use the extraordinary monopoly position created for him by Mrs Thatcher to destroy the Prime Minister. Is anyone safe?

All that is needed to see him off is simply a Bill of Attainder, requiring the sale of all his assets in this country. With what is left over after he has satisfied his creditors, we might present the Tjarutja tribe of Maralinga with a few cases of Australian tawny—made from the shiraz grape, but by no means to be despised on that account.

That is an indictment on that particular journalist. In terms of human rights it is absolutely disgraceful and I would hate to think that any journalist in Australia would write such rubbish in any of our papers. I must say that I am not at all impressed with the quality of the journalism in this State but I venture to say that I doubt that we would see journalism of that calibre here. For a country which has prided itself on being part of a large Commonwealth of Nations, to allow this type of journalism to be printed for all and sundry to read is really an indictment on their system. I suggest that it is time journalists in the United Kingdom got their act together and did something about this type of thing. If there is a code of ethics at all in England with regard to their journalists, I hope it will be upgraded, because if this sort of thing gets passed the code of ethics does not do anything at all for that country.

In the few moments remaining to me I would like to take issue with the Federal Government about one of the requirements of the signing of the Medicare agreement and that is the occupied public bed days versus private bed days. I am strenuously urging the Minister to put strong arguments forward on behalf of South Australia to have that decision completely changed, because it should never have been allowed to get through. It was made for the benefit of the more populous States of Victoria and New South Wales. One

of the real problems is that South Australia and particularly the local issues involving country hospitals were not considered when this issue was discussed at the Federal level.

I do not agree with that decision reached at the Federal level. It is one which has jeopardised the position of all country hospitals in this State, and I will be continuing to lobby the Minister on it.

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

**Mr MATTHEW (Bright):** Yesterday, for the first time regrettably, I missed a day of representing my constituents in Parliament due to an affliction; I had a gastric virus and for most of yesterday morning I spent looking down the bottom of the toilet bowl. That aside, having faced that ordeal—

*The Hon. J.H.C. Klunder interjecting:*

**Mr MATTHEW:** No, the Minister can rest assured that he was not the reason I had my head pointing down the toilet bowl. Having been through that ordeal and having come back to the House today I was angered, needless to say, to hear of a cowardly attack launched on me by the Minister of Labour Relations during my absence. The Minister did not have the guts to make the statements he made in this House yesterday in my presence because had he done so he knows I would have been in a position to immediately jump to my feet and refute his outrageous allegations.

In this House yesterday, during a ministerial statement preceding Question Time, the *Hansard* record shows that the Minister proceeded to launch an attack on me regarding a personal explanation I made in defence of a previous outrageous statement he made about me last week. In his statement the Minister said, in part, referring to an *Advertiser* report that attributed comments to me, that I had received strong evidence to support claims I made during the Estimates Committee about a State Bank supply contract awarded to State Supply. I refuted the *Advertiser's* comment in this Parliament. The Minister claims that one of his staff contacted the journalist concerned, who backed up his original reporting. I know what I said to the journalist, and I still contend that the *Advertiser* report was inaccurate.

Secondly, the Minister refutes my claim that I did not call on the Anti-Corruption Branch to investigate the claims I made in the Estimates Committee, and he also selectively quotes from *Hansard*. I feel it is important to complete the *Hansard* explanation that was given by the Minister so that the missing pieces are put into place. During the Estimates Committee I asked the Minister, and I quote:

I understand that the tender awarded to State Supply for the stationery supplied to the State Bank bore a strong similarity to a bid lodged at an earlier time by a major Adelaide based wholesaler. How did that strong similarity occur, in view of the fact that the Adelaide based wholesaler lodged his bid before the bid of State Supply?

The Minister then responded:

I ask Mr Bridge to respond to that question.

The Minister's staff member, Mr Bridge, then said:

In relation to an earlier part of the question, the contract value was somewhere between an estimated \$3 million and \$4 million. I cannot confirm that the bid by the other supplier was put in before or after State Supply's bid. The process was managed by the State Bank and I understand that it was a rigorous process which was done quite properly. Certainly, we did not have any other knowledge of any other bids, so I guess the question should be put to the State Bank.

I then asked the question:

I realise the Minister has come into the portfolio after this decision was made but will he undertake to investigate my claim and

compare the tender lodged by State Supply with other tenders? Will he approach the State Bank to determine whether there is a strong similarity and why, because, as the Minister will appreciate, the allegation is of a most serious nature if the information I have been given is correct? It has been alleged to me that somehow State Supply actually obtained a copy of a tender lodged by a competitor.

Mr Speaker, instead of going to the Treasurer, as he could have done, and asking for State Supply to be contacted, the Minister has called in the Anti-Corruption Branch. He then came back into this House and claimed I had wasted taxpayers' money. I stand by my claim that if taxpayers' money has been wasted it has been wasted by the Minister, and the Minister alone, for he had the option of approaching the Treasurer and having that information sought by other channels. I stand by my concerns over this tender. The Minister has since replied saying that it is \$2.4 million per annum, but information provided to me at this time suggests State Bank's annual supply usage in the previous financial year was \$1.9 million; a \$0.5 million extra impost seems a little strange indeed, and further areas of investigation are required.

The Minister also referred to allegations concerning drugs in prison. He claims that I have never provided information to the police of any substance or accuracy. I refute that statement. It is completely untrue. For the Minister to make any statement of that sort, using the word 'never', he would have to check every statement I had ever made to the police as either a member of Parliament or a private citizen.

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

---

#### ROAD TRAFFIC (DRINK DRIVING PENALTIES) AMENDMENT BILL

**Mr GUNN (Eyre)** obtained leave and introduced a Bill for an Act to amend the Road Traffic Act 1961. Read a first time.

**Mr GUNN:** I move:

*That this Bill be now read a second time.*

The purpose of this Bill is to give the magistrates a limited discretion when dealing with cases of people convicted of driving under the influence. The reason for this measure is that there have been a number of very difficult cases in rural areas of South Australia where the loss of a driver's licence has resulted in grave difficulties and has greatly affected not so much the person concerned but that person's family. In a decent democracy it has always been my view that it is unwise in the extreme to remove all rights of discretion from magistrates or to remove rights for people to be able to appeal.

In my experience, on every occasion on which such proposals have been made, they have caused undue hardship, which was not envisaged at the time, particularly to people who have no means of rectifying the difficulties inflicted upon them. For example, children who require medical attention may reside a considerable distance away from the doctor, and I refer particularly to asthmatics and others. Other children may need to catch school buses if they have to travel long distances in isolated communities. Those are two examples where the amendments that I am proposing will give the court discretion. It will not be automatic. The person's legal representative will have to argue at the time of

sentencing that a total driving prohibition will create undue hardship to other members of the family or for other reasons. Therefore, I believe it is essential that this provision be enacted.

This matter was first drawn to my attention by representatives of the Northern Lawyers Association at Jamestown and by other lawyers. The Law Society brought it to my attention some months ago when appearing before the Legislative Review Committee discussing another matter. Representatives argued to me most strongly in private that these provisions should be enacted. I am at a loss to understand why the Government has not proceeded with this measure. It will in no way countenance people who drive while they are affected by alcohol and it is not intended to lighten the sentences which will apply. However, it would provide a protection where the suspending of a driving licence will not only inconvenience but greatly penalise members of the family who have no alternative means of transport; they do not have taxis or subsidised public transport.

**Mr Venning:** Or trains.

**Mr GUNN:** There are not many trains left in South Australia. In my experience in this House, whenever we have passed legislation which takes away a discretion or right of appeal there have been problems. I will give another example. In that dreadful Native Vegetation Act there is no right of appeal, and disgraceful decisions have been made by that undemocratic and illiterate body. In relation to this provision in the Road Traffic Act, a number of examples have been brought to the attention of all members where it has been difficult for the court to impose a sentence in cases where it wanted to take into account the rights of people other than the accused. I believe this measure will overcome those difficulties.

Clause 1 is the short title. Clause 2 amends section 47—driving under the influence. Clause 3 amends section 47(b); clause 4 amends 47(e); and clause 5 amends section 47(i) which relates to compulsory blood tests.

These clauses amend the principal Act to empower a court that convicts a driver of a first offence against section 47(1), 47b(1), 47e(3) or 47i(14) to make the driver's licence conditional instead of imposing the otherwise mandatory disqualification. I point out that this provision applies only to people who are convicted of a first offence, not a second or subsequent offence. There is a clear difference.

The amendments allow the court to impose conditions limiting the hours during which, or the locality within which, a vehicle may be driven pursuant to the licence or to impose any other restriction that the court considers appropriate in the circumstances of the case. Such conditions are to operate for such period as the court thinks fit, not being less than the prescribed minimum disqualification period.

The amendments limit the exercise of these powers to cases where the court is satisfied that imposition of the prescribed disqualification would result in undue hardship to the convicted driver or a dependant of the driver.

The amendments make it an offence for a person to contravene or fail to comply with a condition of a driver's licence imposed by a court under the new provisions. As no penalty is specifically provided, the maximum penalty is \$1 000, that being the general maximum penalty for offences against the Act, and that refers to section 164a.

The powers conferred on courts by these amendments apply in relation to the following drink driving offences.

Section 47(1): Driving a vehicle or attempting to put a vehicle in motion while the person is so much under the influence of intoxicating liquor or a drug as to be incapable of exercising effective control of the vehicle.

Section 47b(1): Driving a motor vehicle or attempting to put a motor vehicle into motion while there is present in the person's blood the prescribed concentration of alcohol.

Section 47e(3): Refusing or failing to comply with all reasonable directions of a member of the Police Force in relation to a requirement to submit to an alcotest or breath analysis and, in particular, refusing or failing to exhale into an apparatus by which the alcotest or breath analysis is conducted in accordance with the directions of a member of the Police Force.

Section 47i(14): Failing or refusing to submit, on request, to the taking of a blood sample and failing to assign any reason based on genuine medical grounds for the failure or refusal or making any other false or misleading statement in response to the request.

I commend the Bill to the House. I believe it will overcome a number of difficulties and hardships which have been inflicted on people who should not have to suffer those difficulties.

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

#### **STAMP DUTIES (REFINANCING OF LOANS) AMENDMENT BILL**

Adjourned debate on second reading.  
(Continued from 6 October. Page 735.)

**Mr VENNING (Custance):** I shall speak briefly in support of the Bill. I very strongly support the sentiments of the Bill as I hope the Government will. It contains a common-sense, straightforward and fair-minded sentiment, and I congratulate the member for Murray-Mallee on taking the initiative.

One of the biggest problems in rural areas and industries is the matter that has arisen involving the average age of farmers, which is about 58 or 59 years. The reason for this has been the prohibitive cost of transferring land and the cost of transferring debt in the banks, particularly at this time when farm debt is huge. We also know that interest rates are varying and generally falling. Most members will appreciate the advantage of being able to transfer debt and mortgages from one financial institution to another, whether it be from banks, credit unions or whatever. To see it tied up because of the huge amount of stamp duty that has to be paid is iniquitous and ridiculous. I hope that all members opposite would agree that this situation is unfair and is causing unnatural things to happen. We must free up this situation.

I commend the member for Murray-Mallee for the way he has framed his Bill and also for the fact that he has included a \$10 fee to pay the costs incurred by an institution in making transfers. Apart from that, it would free up the loans that farmers and industries in rural areas have from one institution or another. I would have faith in the House seeing that this Bill is fair and not politically loaded, and the industrial sector in the community certainly would look upon us all favourably if we gave this Bill passage through this House. I commend the member for Murray-Mallee for this Bill and support it 100 per cent.

**The Hon. T.H. HEMMINGS (Napier):** Mr Speaker, I am pleased to be able to make some contribution to this motion, although it seems to me it is a bit of *deja vu*. We have been there already, and I think the examples that the member for Murray-Mallee has given us have been adequately debunked by members on this side of the House. I am not saying that I do not have sympathy for those people who are currently in that fixed position, who do not know where to turn and who are seeking some form of assistance through cheaper interest rates—

*Mr Venning interjecting:*

**The Hon. T.H. HEMMINGS:** I do not need the member for Custance to advise me, because I had the pleasure and the honour of serving on the Rural Finance Select Committee, along with the members for Eyre, Stuart and Mitchell, and it was chaired very ably by the member for Henley Beach. We know all the problems of the rural sector, and the high interest rates. We know the problems experienced out there in the rural sector and we know who are the villains; the villains are the banks. I think it has been quoted chapter and verse in this House who are the real villains and where we should be sheeting home the blame. But what the member for Murray-Mallee does not seem to realise is that it is not only those in the rural sector who are suffering. It is also the small business area, and that is the point that was made on the Government side when we discussed the matter previously, and that is, what is good for the goose is good for the gander.

I have yet to hear reference to this from those members who represent the rural rump, those good old-fashioned rednecks we see sitting opposite. I would like to see the day they speak up for the small businessman in the city. The member for Murray-Mallee keeps on mouthing across to me about reading the Bill. It has been suggested that perhaps he has not taken his medication, but I will not respond to that. Let us see what the member for Murray-Mallee said in his second reading speech. He mentions that finance lending business is leaving South Australia to the States where stamp duty rates are lower. Where are those El Dorados where the stamp duty rates are lower? The main rate in New South Wales (a big State), Victoria (another big State), Queensland (a very big State) and Western Australia (a fantastically big State) is .4 per cent, compared to .35 per cent in this State. In this State we are lower, so can we then believe the member for Murray-Mallee? I suggest that we cannot believe the member for Murray-Mallee and then, by following on the logic of what the member for Custance said, who praised what the member for Murray-Mallee said, we cannot believe him either.

**The Hon. J.H.C. Klunder:** It's a bad association.

**The Hon. T.H. HEMMINGS:** It is a bad association, Minister. I would have more sympathy if I heard a bit more support for those in the metropolitan area who are running small business or even just ordinary folk who are struggling with high interest rates in the metropolitan area, be they just under a normal mortgage. Let us take the other aspect of it, which the Liberal Party is always very keen to champion, and that is the spirit of free enterprise. Already within the private sector, financial institutions are actively encouraging people to change over to refinance loans held with other financial institutions. That is their right, I have no objection to their doing that, so why then is the member for Murray-Mallee not standing up and making a plea for my colleague the member for Henley Beach's constituents who are going down that path of refinancing? Does the member for Murray-Mallee not consider those constituents, or does he consider only the

farmer? I acknowledge that in the rural sector there are problems. There are problems not only of adverse weather conditions but of pricing and of failing to get markets.

*Mr Gunn interjecting:*

**The Hon. T.H. HEMMINGS:** I do; I am one of them, but at least I have the courage to stand up and demand fair play for everyone, not for those farmers, those constituents, whom I represent in the rural part of the electorate of Napier.

*Members interjecting:*

**The SPEAKER:** Order!

**The Hon. T.H. HEMMINGS:** There is one thing you can always be sure of about the Liberal Party: they can always be very selective of where they direct their criticism. As far as the members opposite who represent the rural communities are concerned, those of us who live in the cities do not exist. The record of evidence taken by the Rural Finance Select Committee shows that, in regard to the real villains and sheeting home the blame on the banks, time and time again farmers were encouraged to take on bigger and bigger loans, to expand into bigger and bigger units, when their own commonsense and the advice from the rural counsellors were telling them not to get involved in that kind of situation. The member for Eyre, who is one of the most truthful members whom I have met from the other side of politics, would have to agree with the view that I have just expressed. In many cases out there in the rural community, the farmer was his own worst enemy. He was encouraged by those bankers to expand—

**Mr Ferguson:** Rapaciously.

**The Hon. T.H. HEMMINGS:** 'Rapacious' is a very good word for some of those bankers. The member for Eyre knows that I am quite correct in that area. I feel that, whilst there is every degree of sympathy for the cause that the member for Murray-Mallee is espousing in this House, the view of the more sensible members in this House remains the same. He has tried it once and did not get away with it; he has tried it again and I am sure that, true to form, the House will reject this piece of ill-timed legislation.

**Mr LEWIS (Murray-Mallee):** I have been treated to some drivel in the past in this Chamber, but never to quite as much as that contribution. The member for Napier should read the Bill. Of course, he is in conflict in his argument with the arguments made by the member for Mitchell on the matter. The member for Mitchell said I had widened the ambit of the proposition before the House during the last session. This now includes all small business as well as home owners. The member for Napier accused me of not caring about small business and home owners who have been subject to the same harassment as farmers from finance houses and banks holding their interest rates up. The member for Napier said that, yet the Bill covers exactly those provisions. It includes small business and home owners whose loans are not more than \$200 000. It does not say anything about farmers, so the member for Napier is at odds with the member for Mitchell on that point.

**Mr Venning:** He's been away.

**Mr LEWIS:** He has been away too long; he has lost track, or something.

**Mr Venning:** He's got water on the brain.

**Mr LEWIS:** Yes, or something on the brain, if he had a brain to have it on. The other unfortunate point made by the member for Napier in the course of his contribution was that in 1985, 1986 and 1987 banks were urging farmers and other business people to get bigger or get out, to buy more and to

go further into debt. He claimed that rural counsellors were telling farmers not to do that. The regrettable aspect of the member for Napier's flawed argument for him is that there were no rural counsellors employed at that time. The first rural counsellor had not even been named or appointed. Rural counsellors came into existence as a consequence of the financial difficulties into which members of the primary producing industry in the rural areas in particular—not so much the miners—had been plunged by that binge of lending before interest rates escalated.

The member for Napier is wide of the mark in the information he puts before the House in support of his case in opposing the proposition. Having said no more than that and having got it all wrong, the member for Napier needs no further explanation from me to enable him to come to a conclusion which is opposite to his present attitude to the Bill. Tragically for him, his arguments mean that he should support it. The member for Mitchell made a contribution on 6 October, and I will take his points from the top. He stated:

The exemption needed to be considered carefully so that no loopholes were created.

There are no loopholes. The provision simply restricts the availability to those borrowers who are natural persons and who have loans up to \$200 000. There are no loopholes. It does not matter whether they are home owners, small business people or people located anywhere: if they can get a better interest rate than the rate the institution from which they borrowed is charging them, they will be able to change. They would not do that in a capricious fashion because, quite simply, the amount of money they would save by constantly swapping horses, at it were, would not warrant the other costs they would incur—stamp duty aside—in doing so. Transfer costs in the redrawing of the documents would be necessary. This provision simply enables every little person—anyone like you and I, Sir—to get the best rate there is in the market without having to suffer this stamp duty misery tax.

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

Bill read a second time.

In Committee.

Clause 1—'Short title.'

**Mr HOLLOWAY:** I wish to take this opportunity to answer some of the points raised by the member for Murray-Mallee, or perhaps I can do so later when we are dealing with a more appropriate clause.

**The CHAIRMAN:** Yes. I am sure that with a bit more experience you will be able to weave that in in a different way.

Clause passed.

Clause 2—'Refinancing of certain loans.'

**The Hon. T.H. HEMMINGS:** As to the total cost to the State, can the member for Murray-Mallee say how many members of the community could take advantage of the proposal?

**Mr LEWIS:** It will cost the State nothing, because those people who cannot get out of their current mortgage—not having the cash to do so—simply stay there and no transfer is made. They do not have the means by which it is possible for them to make the transition or the shift from one finance house to the other. It would cost them more than they could afford. It is not legitimate, sensible or reasonable to say that the National Bank would necessarily refinance it and add it to the principal as part of the capital upon which the new interest rate was struck. That is usury, in my judgment,

anyway, and the member for Napier would understand that point.

This is simply the easiest and most efficient way, without incurring a host of public servants' costs in the process of doing it. It is the simplest way of addressing the problem. I know that the member for Mitchell on several occasions during the course of his remarks on the Bill commented that the Government was looking at the problem and would find other ways of addressing it. The Government has been looking at the ruddy problem for six years and has done nothing about it. Clearly, there is not a simple or more efficient way of dealing with it.

After all, it was created by factors outside the control of the people who are now trapped. They are now so poverty stricken that they cannot afford to meet the fees up front. Therefore, they simply stay in the existing mortgage that they have and they are unable to transfer. The bank is simply adding on the interest to the principal and compounding it on a quarterly, half yearly or annual basis, according to the term of repayment specified in the mortgage, and eventually their equity is entirely eroded and they have nothing left. Then they lose the lot and they have to throw themselves on the mercy of the State. They need Department of Family and Community Services social worker support to help readjust to the enormous distress they are now suffering and they need the Commonwealth Department for Social Security welfare payments to support them for the rest of their lives because they have been destroyed.

It would be far more efficient if they were able to make the transfer, get the cheaper interest rate and solve the problem that way, rather than being destroyed and, through that destruction, distraught by the circumstances in which they find themselves, being unable to adjust for some considerable period and perhaps even needing not just simple social work counselling but medical counselling to recover their equanimity and sanity. All in all, we do ourselves, as members of Parliament, and the Government a favour by passing this measure. It reduces the cost in other ways, in particular the welfare cost to the public purse.

**The Hon. T.H. HEMMINGS:** I thank the member for Murray-Mallee for that rather clear and concise explanation in response to my question. It obviously came from the bottom of his heart. I place on record my sincere thanks for that. Another area in which I am sure the member for Murray-Mallee will be able to satisfy not only me but hopefully the other members of the Committee relates to clause 2, which inserts new section 81d. The new section provides:

Notwithstanding any other provision of this Act, where on an application made after the commencement of this section in a manner and form determined by the Commissioner and supported by such evidence as the Commissioner may require the Commissioner is satisfied. . .

It goes on to paragraphs (a), (b), (c) and (d) of that new section which I will not cite. Will the member for Murray-Mallee inform the Committee what he sees as the 'manner and form determined by the Commissioner and supported by such evidence as the Commissioner may require'? The reason I ask the question is that I have always been of the belief that all legislation should be spelt out so that even the most (and I will not use the word 'ignorant') simple of us in the community who would want to take advantage of this measure would be able to understand exactly what is required of them.



I refer back to the rural finance select committee, which is relevant because it was information seeking: time and again the committee heard evidence that some of the forms that farmers were required to fill in (and, let us face it, we are here to assist our country folk) were too hard to fill in. When we were on Kangaroo Island you, Mr Speaker, would recall the classic case of the farmer who said that he did not understand the form and he was up all night filling it in; when he was finally able to fill it in to the best of his ability and sent it across to the mainland, it was rejected by some terse clerk in the Department of Social Security. He had to wait for a couple of months before trying again. The new section refers to the manner and form and such evidence. I know what Treasury officials can be like in terms of the preparation of the written form. It can varied and garbled or worded in such a way that one could easily believe that it was intended to confuse rather than to assist. I would appreciate any advice from the member for Murray-Mallee.

**Mr LEWIS:** The form of words here is that commonly used by people in drafting legislation of this kind and the form referred to in new section 81d would be a form that standardised the information to be provided. The standard information would state the name of the natural person or persons, state the real property to which the mortgage applied and swear an oath to the effect that the amount involved was less than \$200 000. The four provisions would require that a copy of the mortgage document be provided as evidence to the Commissioner to satisfy him that no shonky business was going on, that it checked out on the form and that both the mortgage and the previous mortgage discharged, as provided for in this new section, would cover substantially the same property, notwithstanding, as I said in the second reading debate, that variations to buildings can be made over time.

One could build a pergola, which means it is not the same property but is substantially the same as that is attached to the house. If one is operating out of a small factory or a small business premises, one may add another facility on the edifice, but it is substantially the same property and is on the same title. If there is a variation on the title, it may be a consequence of the Government compulsorily acquiring a small piece of land on a corner for reasons of traffic control and so on over the period that the mortgage was in force. The property is substantially the same. This is the legal terminology used to cover all such circumstances. Paragraph (c) of new section 81d provides that evidence will show that the amount is no more than \$200 000. The final paragraph provides that the mortgage is held by a natural person, that is, that no death certificate exists so the property is not from a deceased estate. This new section ensures that there are no loopholes and that provisions are available to people, whether farmers, small business people or home owners, to enable them to get the best interest rate in the market.

**Mr HOLLOWAY:** The remarks made by the member for Murray-Mallee go to the heart of the problems of the legislation. Interstate experience with schemes that provide a stamp duty concession, particularly for rural producers, on the refinancing of a loan has shown that it is difficult to tell—

*Mr Venning interjecting:*

**Mr HOLLOWAY:** I am talking about interstate schemes that operate primarily for rural producers, but it does not matter whether a rural producer or anyone else is involved: the point is that it is difficult to measure whether a genuine refinancing has taken place. We are talking about stamp duty, one of the principal forms of revenue for a State Government. Few forms of income are available to a State Government and

stamp duty is one of the most important of those. If we are to take away from that, we have to be careful that a need exists for a genuine concession. The point I made in the second reading debate was that the Government was looking at an administrative scheme specifically for rural producers who are in difficulty; in other words, the Government was looking to provide stamp duty relief but quarantined to those who genuinely need it.

The Government did not want to create a revenue hole by providing a general exemption that could conceivably open up a means for a far wider group of people to avoid paying stamp duty. I also made the point in the second reading debate that presently a number of banks already provide for the removal of stamp duty. The banks actually absorb stamp duty into their costs of refinancing. I quoted into *Hansard* part of a letter from the National Australia Bank that set out for consumers the means to refinance with the National Bank, stating that stamp duty costs would be absorbed. In general, interest savings from refinancing far outweigh the costs of stamp duty.

If there is a problem with refinancing, it is acute particularly for certain rural producers, because they do not have the means of swapping so easily. The problem is most acute for those rural producers who are in the most trouble, because they are the ones that other banks are not interested in in terms of refinancing anyway. There are some real difficulties in that sector, thus the Government believes we should look at that sector as a special case to ascertain whether an administrative scheme could bring some relief to those people. It is far more important to look at a scheme that can address those really in need rather than to open up a general concession that conceivably could cost the Government considerable revenue without actually assisting those who are genuinely in need.

For that reason, the Government will oppose the Bill at the third reading, even though we do have sympathy particularly for rural producers who are finding it difficult to refinance. I reiterate that the Government is looking at a scheme that will address those specific and restricted problems.

**Mr VENNING:** I am totally amazed at the attitude of the Government, particularly the member for Mitchell. He said more than once that this Bill was for rural producers. Quite clearly, it is not. The member for Murray-Mallee stated, and the Bill quite clearly provides, that it relates to sums of less than \$200 000. It is not only for rural producers. The member for Mitchell also said that the Government will have to forgo the collection of stamp duty. As has been said previously, the Government picks up very little stamp duty on these transfers, because there are no transfers.

Who is actually winning out of this? As the member for Napier said earlier (and I did actually listen), the banks are ripping us off; they are giving poor advice. It is the banks that are winning in the present situation, and nobody else. It locks up the situation so they can hold onto these loans. If we were able to free up the system by enabling people to move between financial organisations, the banks would be under greater pressure to be more competitive and to look after their clients. The whole argument from the Government side is contradictory. I am amazed that the Government has not thought this through, particularly at the present time, given the way things are.

The member for Stuart, whose electorate is rural, in the last few days that she is a member of Parliament, would not want to go out and sell the Government's line to her constituents. When people know that interest rates have come down

to a reasonably low level, they also know that they could renegotiate their loans on interest rates 2 to 3 per cent less than the present rate. Even 1 per cent of an average farm debt of \$250 000 is a lot of money. I ask members to calculate it. Just 1 per cent of an average first home loan, which I am told is \$75 000, is a lot of money. Nobody would disagree with that.

Who is winning? It is not the Government *vis-a-vis* lost stamp duty but the banks, because the borrowers cannot afford to renegotiate as they have to pay stamp duty. The whole thing would be freed up. There would be much more competition between money lenders. Inevitably, interest rates would come down because competition would be more fierce. I hope that the House will pass the third reading of this Bill. I commend the member for Murray-Mallee for this measure.

**Mr HOLLOWAY:** I just want to make one point in answer to the member for Custance. He talked about a rural loan of \$250 000. The whole point is that that situation would not be covered under the Bill, and that underlines the very point I was making: there are specific problems in the rural sector, because some of the loans are bigger than \$200 000. That is why one needs to look at that specific category to deal with that problem.

The member for Custance is correct: this Bill does cover more than rural loans. But why do we need to look at some of those other areas? If there are hardships, if people want to buy houses, those issues can be addressed in other ways. If there is hardship in terms of refinancing loans, that hardship occurs in a specific part of the rural sector, because banks are not competitive in many rural areas: that is where the matter needs to be addressed. That is the core of the point I was making.

**Mr VENNING:** I accept the honourable member's interpretation of what I said. I cited the average debt of \$250 000 as an example, and I said that \$200 000 is the ceiling. But that has nothing to do with the argument. The Government is not dinkum; it says all these platitudes and agrees, but then it welches. I am just disgusted.

**The Hon. T.H. HEMMINGS:** Before asking the member for Murray-Mallee for a further explanation, I want to make a comment to the member for Custance. I get rather peeved and fed up with members opposite who represent rural communities complaining about the plight of farmers when the farmers organisation has amassed \$15 million plus for a political fighting fund, and now I understand that the national farmers union—

**Mr VENNING:** On a point of order, Mr Chairman, I ask you to rule on relevance. This has nothing to do with the subject of the debate.

**The CHAIRMAN:** I do not accept that point of order. It is relevant. The connection is tenuous, but it is relevant. The member for Napier.

**The Hon. T.H. HEMMINGS:** Thank you for your protection, Mr Chairman. I always knew that you had a soft spot for me. Not only is there a \$15 million plus political fighting fund, which is out there supporting the political agenda of the conservative Parties of this country and I can tell members which side the banks are on in this country; they are on the side of the member for Custance's own political Party—but also \$155 million was paid by the national farmers union for Elders after John Elliott stuffed it—a member of the Liberal Party, by the way, who is now screaming like a stuck pig about conspiracy.

*Mr Becker interjecting:*

**The CHAIRMAN:** Order! The member for Hanson will come to order.

**Mr S.G. EVANS:** On a point of order, Mr Chairman, I believe that in the Committee stage members should seek information, sticking strictly to the clauses and not debating what happens with Mr Elliott—

**The CHAIRMAN:** My problem as Chair of this debate is that the member for Custance introduced some highly controversial matters, accusing members of the Government of taking certain attitudes. He must have known when he instigated that sort of debate that it would draw rebuttal. The member for Napier is rebutting the proposition that was put by the member for Custance. I cannot be unfair and allow only one side of the question. The honourable member for Napier.

**The Hon. T.H. HEMMINGS:** Thank you, Sir. I just wanted that placed on the record. I am not saying that the national farmers union was wrong in paying \$155 million to buy back Elders after John Elliott, a prominent member of the Liberal Party, had stuffed up that organisation. I am not saying it was wrong to do that, but what I was going to say was that it would have been a lot better if the national farmers union had spent some of that \$155 million helping out its constituent members. That is the point I was going to make.

Again, it reinforces the remarks I have made in this House previously, that as soon as the United Farmers and Graziers became a part of the broader monolithic National Farmers' Union which dictates policy in Canberra, they lost their own identity. The member for Eyre nods his head. I am sorry, he is shaking his head; he is not agreeing with me. I will do some information seeking. With all due apology to the member for Murray-Mallee I had to digress into that area. Clause 2 inserts new section 81d, paragraph (b) of which provides:

that both the mortgage and the previous mortgage apply to the same, or substantially the same, real property;

I understand that the member for Murray-Mallee—I cannot hear myself speak, because of this cross-flow of—

**The CHAIRMAN:** Unfortunately the member for Napier is getting too much help from his own side. I would ask members to be quiet and let him continue.

**The Hon. T.H. HEMMINGS:** I understand that in the second reading speech of the member for Murray-Mallee he addressed the use of the words 'substantially the same' and gave the House some rather simple examples of constructing a pergola, bricking in a barbecue, or laying a concrete floor in the garage. I understand what the member for Murray-Mallee is alluding to. What happens if there has been substantial changes to the property?

*Mr Lewis interjecting:*

**The Hon. T.H. HEMMINGS:** The member for Murray-Mallee made a little quip about the word 'substantial'. I am talking about dramatic architectural changes to the property. That has not been addressed. It is all very well for the honourable member, who is flushed with success, having got this Bill through the second reading stage. We are now in the clauses, I am on my feet for the last time under the Standing Orders and shortly we will be going to a vote. The member for Mitchell has said that the Government will be opposing this piece of legislation but, let me remind members, I am a free agent.

I am not due to stand for election again. I have a lot of time for the problems being experienced by small farmers. I also have sympathy for the small business person who seems

to be receiving scant sympathy from members opposite. So, I would suggest that the member for Murray-Mallee may have won me over; that I will go against my Party Whip and possibly vote for this measure. I suggest that the member for Murray-Mallee not treat this question lightly but give it the serious consideration it deserves, because the honourable member, by having the term 'substantially the same', merely includes the old barbie, the pergola and the concrete floor in the shed. I would like to know what separates 'substantially the same' and 'substantial improvements' because there is a distinct difference. My vote hinges on that reply.

**Mr LEWIS:** I did explain, not only in the second reading but about 10 minutes ago, to the member for Napier that, when things are substantially the same, they are substantially the same; case law has demonstrated that this is the appropriate form of words. The people who draft the legislation have done this for me at my request in the fashion which they know to be appropriate. Quite simply, if it is not substantially the same it is different and if it does not therefore relate to the same title it is different. Changes occur only where compulsory acquisition of a slice of land has occurred to widen a carriageway, or something of that order, but the sum involved must be under \$200 000. The member for Napier, were he to seriously consider that, would have understood that there is no loophole. Case law has already been taken on the meaning of the term and it is well documented.

Clause passed.

Title passed.

**Mr LEWIS (Murray-Mallee):** I move:

*That this Bill be now read a third time.*

The House divided on the third reading:

AYES (21)

Allison, H.	Armitage, M. H.
Arnold, P. B.	Baker, S. J.
Becker, H.	Blacker, P. D.
Brindal, M. K.	Brown, D. C.
Cashmore, J. L.	Eastick, B. C.
Evans, S. G.	Gunn, G. M.
Ingerson, G. A.	Kotz, D. C.
Lewis, I. P. (teller)	Meier, E. J.
Olsen, J. W.	Oswald, J. K. G.
Such, R. B.	Venning, I. H.
Wotton, D. C.	

NOES (21)

Arnold, L. M. F.	Atkinson, M. J.
Bannon, J. C.	Blevins, F. T.
De Laine, M. R.	Evans, M. J.
Ferguson, D. M.	Gregory, R. J.
Groom, T. R.	Hamilton, K. C.
Hemmings, T. H.	Heron, V. S.
Holloway, P. (teller)	Hopgood, D. J.
Hutchison, C. F.	Klunder, J. H. C.
Lenahan, S. M.	McKee, C. D. T.
Quirke, J. A.	Rann, M. D.
Trainer, J. P.	

PAIRS

Baker, D. S.	Crafter, G. J.
Matthew, W. A.	Mayes, M. K.

**The SPEAKER:** There being 21 votes for the Ayes and 21 votes for the Noes, I cast my vote for the Noes.

Third reading thus negatived.

#### LEGISLATIVE REVIEW COMMITTEE

**Mr McKEE (Gilles):** I bring up the final report of the committee on an inquiry into matters pertinent to South Australians being able to obtain adequate, appropriate and affordable justice in and through the courts system, and move:

That the report be received.

Motion carried.

#### SOCIAL DEVELOPMENT COMMITTEE

**Mr HERON (Peake):** I bring up the third report of the committee on the risk of HIV transmissions in health care and other settings and the rights of infected and non-infected persons, and move:

That the report be received.

Motion carried.

#### COURT AND TRANSCRIPT FEES

**Mr GUNN (Eyre):** I move:

That the regulations under the District Court Act 1991 relating to court and transcript fees made on 1 July 1993 and laid on the table of this House on 3 August 1993 be disallowed.

One of the hallmarks of a democracy is that people have equal access to the law. When people of limited financial means are taken to the courts they should not be placed at a disadvantage. The member for Gilles has just tabled an extensive report which clearly indicates that transcript fees have now reached the stage of being quite ridiculous at between \$450 and \$700 per day. The only person whom we have so far come across in our deliberations who was not concerned about it was the Attorney-General, but the committee has recommended that there be no further increases.

This matter has now reached the stage where the Government can no longer idly sit by hoping that this matter will go away or that the Government will be tossed out of office and this will not be its problem. Every day it is getting more difficult for people to avail themselves of the opportunity to read what is said about them in the court so that they can rebut it if necessary. The recommendations in the committee report just tabled by the member for Gilles is 'that the Government accepts—

**Mr McKEE:** On a point of order, Mr Speaker, are we debating the report now? What is the issue that we are debating now?

**The SPEAKER:** There is no point of order. However, to clarify the position, we are debating item 2 on page 3 of the Notice Paper, which is the motion by the member for Eyre:

That the regulations under the District Court Act 1991 relating to court and transcript fees made on 1 July 1993 and laid on the Table of this House on 3 August 1993 be disallowed.

**Mr McKEE:** Further to that point of order, Mr Speaker, why are we referring to a report which has just been tabled and is due to be debated in a week's time?

**The SPEAKER:** No member may refer directly to the content of the report, but may refer to the report. A member may not debate the content of the report, because, as the member for Gilles has pointed out, it is a matter for the future, but a member may refer to issues to support the argument rather than the actual content of the report. The

report has been tabled and will be debated. The member cannot debate the content of the report, but he can refer to it.

**Mr GUNN:** I do not have to read chapter and verse. I know what is in the report, even if the member for Gilles does not. The injustice that this Government and the Labor Party are continuing to inflict on the people of this State is unacceptable. If you can stop me from referring to it chapter and verse, you cannot stop me from debating the principles of the issue. You have all got to wear it, because when we have the opportunity—

**The Hon. J.P. TRAINER:** On a point of order, Mr Speaker, the honourable member should refer to members opposite and not use the second person plural.

**The SPEAKER:** The honourable member is well aware of that. I am sure it must have been an oversight.

**Mr GUNN:** Mr Speaker, if that is the only criticism they can direct at me, I am very happy. If the honourable member wants to interrupt what I want to say and take up the time of the House, I point out that there is a very simple principle involved, namely, that the cost of justice is out of control.

*An honourable member interjecting:*

**Mr GUNN:** The honourable member who is interjecting does not appear to be concerned about that. This motion would disallow the latest increase in transcript fees which will impose another serious cost on people who are brought before the courts, whether they are guilty or not. The report to which I referred recommends that people who are taken before the court for indictable offences should not have to pay transcript fees. Therefore, I recommend the motion to disallow the regulations.

One of the greatest things we can have in this world is common sense, and not much has come from this Government so far today. Therefore, this motion gives the Government the opportunity—

*An honourable member interjecting:*

**Mr GUNN:** The honourable member says that I am a terrible man.

**Mr Hamilton:** You are a terrible man to say things like that.

**Mr GUNN:** I thought I was praising them. I am just a quiet, simple country lad who is trying to save them from their own folly, but they do not want to be helped. Therefore, I commend the motion to the House and challenge members opposite to bring it to a vote forthwith.

**Mr McKEE** secured the adjournment of the debate.

## FIREARMS

**Mr GUNN (Eyre):** I move:

That the regulations under the Firearms Act 1977 relating to fees, made on 29 April and laid on the table of the House on 4 May 1993, be disallowed.

This is the second impost that this Government has placed upon legitimate, law-abiding firearms owners in this State, and I move this motion to indicate clearly that the current arrangements concerning firearms in this State and the fee structure involved in it are completely out of control. This requires a complete review and rewriting of the regulations and it needs to be done by people who have a bit of common-sense and judgment and who understand the practical realities of the real world, not living in academia or involved in activities which bear no relationship to commonsense. I therefore formally move this motion as it will give me a second opportunity to deal with the firearms mess that this

Government has created. It has failed to accept the warnings, the counselling and the responsible and legitimate representations made to it, and I therefore give the Government another opportunity to come to its senses. I commend the motion to the House.

**Mr QUIRKE** secured the adjournment of the debate.

## EXPIATION FEES

Adjourned debate on motion of Mr Gunn:

That the regulations under the Summary Offences Act 1953 relating to Traffic Expiation Fees, made on 1 July 1993 and laid on the table of this House on 3 August 1993, be disallowed.

(Continued from 6 October. Page 736.)

**Mr FERGUSON (Henley Beach):** I feel sure, Sir, that the member—

*An honourable member interjecting:*

**Mr FERGUSON:** My Argo shares are going exceptionally well at the moment—

*The Hon. J.P. Trainer interjecting:*

**Mr FERGUSON:** I did purchase those shares out of my own efforts; I had no money left to me by my parents, not like other people. And I do apologise to the member for Bragg, because for years and years I have been suggesting that it was his father who left him the money and it was not, it was his mother who left him the money and he explained that to the House this morning. We can hardly take this proposition that is in front of us with any seriousness. If the member for Eyre and any other member of the Opposition were serious about this proposition that we have in front of us, they would make sure that it was Liberal Party policy and that we would have on the front page of the *Advertiser* tomorrow a policy from the Liberal Party that would suggest that they would abandon all expiation fees.

However, we have in front of us a proposition from a backbencher of the Liberal Party who is coming up to an election and who wants to use the pages of *Hansard* to distribute to his country members so that he can stand up and say, 'Look what I have done as far as you are concerned,' but knowing full well that he does not have the support of his Party, and if by some strange stroke of fate his Party was elected to become the Government following the coming elections, nothing would happen, because his Party does not have a policy decision as far as this matter is concerned.

So, what we have in front of us is a fraud. Even if the member for Eyre was successful in convincing the Parliament that he was right and that we should oppose this proposition as far as expiation fees are concerned, what would happen? All that would happen is that expiation fees would remain the same and that the 1.9 per cent CPI average would not be added to the infringement notices. So, what we are talking about is a piece of window-dressing. All it would mean is that the annual CPI increase that is added to the expiation fees—a miserable 1.9 per cent—would not be added. But the member for Eyre would go back and tell his constituents that he had defeated the expiation proposition in this House.

There has been a considerable decline in the number of road accidents since the introduction of expiation notices in this State. We have to admit that it was the Tonkin Government that first introduced expiation notices, and some members on this side of the House were not convinced that that was the way to go, but in the fullness of time over the 12 to 15 years that the expiation notices have been in operation

we have come to the conclusion that they are a weapon that has been used in the reduction of road accidents in South Australia. If we look at the years 1986-87, we see that the number of fatal accidents in that period was 246 and if we look at the current year, the 1992-93 year, for which the figures are available, we see that the number of fatal accidents was 157 and the number of deaths, 178. There has been a continuous downward trend as far as road accidents is concerned since the introduction of the expiation fees, and that is all we are worried about on this side of the House—saving lives.

Some aspersions have been made by the member for Eyre that this is a revenue raising measure. I can assure the member for Eyre that we are not the slightest bit interested in the revenue issue; all we are interested in is saving lives. That is the only thing we are worried about. I do get flummoxed when I hear the Liberal Party campaign on law and order. The member for Newland had another go in Question Time today about law and order, and a member in another place, the Hon. Trevor Griffin, bobs up every 5 minutes—indeed, I thought he was on television yesterday—talking about law and order.

What the Liberal Party means by law and order is law and order for those people who are in the metropolitan area, but they do not want law and order for those people in the country area. This is exactly what the principle would be if this proposition was accepted, because the real reason for the introduction of this proposition is that the country members are on the receiving end of complaints because their constituents are receiving expiation notices for the excessive amount of speed that is being used by country motorists. They cannot have it both ways. Either it is law and order or it is not. Either one believes in the rule of law or one does not. And the rule of law, as far as road accidents is concerned, is something that has been passed by both houses of Parliament and should be accepted in principle by all members of Parliament. It is not good to become hot and strong on these issues of expiation fees simply because it is affecting your mates. If it affects your mates you stand up in the House and scream, yet on the other hand there are certain members in this Chamber who want to hang people on every street corner as far as any offences are concerned.

I cannot see any consistency in their arguments. It is a bit like the old electoral system that we had under Sir Thomas Playford. It was all right for country people to have a vote weighted three or four times in their favour every time they voted and for the people in the metropolitan area to be forced to suffer it. Exactly the same principle applies in regard to expiation fees. What members opposite are really saying is that, because their country constituents are being caught and are on the receiving end of expiation fees, they will oppose the proposition but, as far as the metropolitan area is concerned, they could not care less. The inconsistencies of the arguments of the member for Eyre in this motion are hard to swallow. He said that he had approached one or two police officers who were not happy handing out fines with expiation notices. I checked at the Henley Beach Police Station where not one person was prepared to stand up and say that they were unhappy about handing out expiation notices. From time to time I wonder where these stories come from. The impression given by the member for Eyre in his motion was that he was opposed totally to the expiation fees, yet we know that the total of his opposition would be merely to knock off a small increase that will apply to expiation fees this year.

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

**Mr BECKER** secured the adjournment of the debate.

### COURT AND TRANSCRIPT FEES

Adjourned debate on motion of Mr Gunn:

That the regulations under the Supreme Court Act 1935 relating to court and transcript fees, made on 1 July 1993 and laid on the table of this House on 3 August 1993, be disallowed.

(Continued from 6 October. Page 736.)

**Mr McKEE (Gilles):** The Government opposes this motion. I want to deal with a number of the points made by the member for Eyre in his dissertation. The member for Eyre continually and repeatedly suggested that the price of transcript was between \$5 and \$6 a page. That is simply not correct. The recent increase of 50¢ brought the price for 1993-94 to \$4.50 a page. Transcript fees in South Australia are amongst the lowest in Australia. The fee of \$4.50 a page for transcript in South Australia is reasonable when compared with other jurisdictions. In the Commonwealth jurisdiction, for example the Family Court, the Federal Court and the Administration Appeals Tribunal, litigants have to pay a basic charge of \$6.50 a page plus a loading of \$2 a page for same day transcription. They have to pay \$8.50 a page for the same level of service that is provided in 90-95 per cent of the cases heard in the higher courts in this State.

The rate in New South Wales is \$6.50 a page where the matter transcribed is less than three months old and \$7.50 a page where the matter is more than three months old. The rate in Victoria is \$6.50 a page. Those three different areas in different States are all more expensive than the transcript fees charged in South Australia. South Australian transcript charges have been maintained at what I consider to be reasonable levels because the Court Services Department and the Courts Administration Authority have continually made productive improvements through the implementation of new technology and improved work practices.

The member for Eyre also suggested that the cost of transcript charges in South Australia would represent a barrier to citizens seeking justice. The vast majority of cases are heard in the Magistrates Court and in a large proportion of those cases evidence is recorded in one form or another but is transcribed only in the event of one of the parties lodging an appeal. Exceptions to this are lengthy or complex matters, partly heard matters and committal proceedings. The package of legislation that was proclaimed on 6 July last year will lead to many cases that would previously have been heard in the District Court now being heard in the Magistrates Court, thereby reducing court costs for many of the litigants.

The member for Eyre suggested that the provision of tape recordings would enable litigants to review proceedings at the end of each day. That might be true, but the usefulness of such recordings would be limited. The current trend is for transcribed evidence also to be captured electronically and fed into a computer so that it provides search and retrieval facilities. Such facilities reduce the amount of time spent by counsel reviewing evidence and ultimately reduces costs to the litigants.

The other area of concern was that transcript fees were simply a means of cost recovery. The facts are that in the 1991-92 financial year, the South Australian Courts Services Department recouped over \$12 million through court fees and

charges, but this amounted to only about 24 per cent of the total budget in that financial year. Even though transcript fees are what we consider to be a reasonable level, it is not simply a cost recovery mechanism.

The cornerstone of a democracy is the right to justice and the access of all citizens to that right to justice. If it was an ideal democracy, everything associated with the courts ought to be free, including lawyers' fees. If we are to question the cost of law and the access of citizens to law, that is one area that ought to be examined closely. In a less than ideal world but under a good democratic system, a responsible Government should make sure that people have access to the law at the most reasonable, fair, cheap and accessible cost, and this Government has done that by maintaining and stating that the transcript fee should be set at \$4.50 a page. I have raised all the points that the member for Eyre has referred to. I believe I have refuted them. The Government refutes them and opposes the motion.

**Mr BECKER** secured the adjournment of the debate.

### FIREARMS

Adjourned debate on motion of Mr Gunn:

That the general regulations under the Firearms Act 1977, made on the 29 April and laid on the table of this House on 4 May 1993, be disallowed.

(Continued from 6 October. Page 737.)

**Mr QUIRKE (Playford):** I have addressed the House a number of times on this issue, particularly when the Firearms Act came through and when other debates on this topic have arisen. I have made representations to the Minister on this matter and on this motion to totally disallow the regulations. The Government is not willing to accept those representations for a number of reasons. The main reason is that it would leave totally empty the regulations on this matter. The old regulations expired on 1 September and the new regulations—no matter how deficient they are, and I will come to that in a moment—came into force on 1 September this year as a result of the old regulations expiring.

I have made representations to the Minister for a number of reasons. First, it is pretty obvious to all members who have had concerned legitimate firearm owners seeking assistance through their offices that there is much complexity involved in the new renewal forms. The renewal forms in many respects are not only deficient but are enormously complex, convoluted and lead to much confusion in an area, which surprises me because these regulations result not so much from the 1992 Firearms Act but stem from the 1988 Firearms Act and the select committee.

There has been five years to get the forms right and, where that is concerned, the matter has been referred by the Minister to the Commissioner of Police for him to do something about it. The other issue that I raised with the Minister (and the Minister in turn has raised with the Commissioner) is basically this: when legitimate firearms owners, those who have a licence pertinent to the old regulations that expired on 1 September, renew their licence, information is required, and I understand that those people will have a fairly smooth transition into the new Act in that the previous categories of firearms ownership will translate into the new Act. It has been suggested that, at the end of the day when the complexity and confusion is removed from the renewals process, that will be the case. However, a number of problems need to be

addressed. I have drawn them to the attention of the Minister and he has given a commitment that they will be sorted out.

One issue arose when a constituent contacted me last week. That constituent is a firearms collector and has a range of firearms in various categories, although I do not know how many. Unfortunately, he does not have firearms in some of the newer categories under this legislation and the regulations. He was assured, as was his representative earlier, that he would be able to continue his hobby without too many problems, provided he met the security arrangements and all other provisions of the Act. It so happens now that, if he does not own a firearm in a certain category, he cannot obtain a licence for that category without going through some sort of TAFE course and incurring the cost of having that over-stamped on his licence as it is now. That was not the intention of the regulations or the principal Act: the matter needs to be sorted out because, if it is not, many of these people who previously had licences for collection purposes will have an enormous problem when they come to pursue their hobby.

Indeed, I would hope that the review of the bureaucracy will spotlight a couple of questions. The approval to purchase system operates now with long arms as well as with short arms (indeed, with short arms it has been there since the 1977 Act, which was regulated in 1980). It would be appropriate for the police to examine the system and perhaps reduce the resources needed for this area. Ownership of a licence approved for a specific category should be the first and probably the only barrier to ownership in that category. Certainly with category C weapons—pistols—there is no legitimate reason why a person should chase around clubs or go to the police to get approval when they could simply go to the police to get approval to purchase, provided that person was a current licence holder.

The issues raised with the Minister stem from the teething problems of the new regulations introduced on 1 September. The Minister has assured me that at some stage he will bring into the House a report from the Commissioner on how these regulations can be implemented smoothly and how the confusion and complexity can be overcome so that people will be able to renew or seek approval to purchase firearms of various kinds through a process that is more simple than is the case today. The issue here is not so much to sort out the complexities of the whole process but rather whether we will have a regime of regulations in place. This Bill would knock out all regulations, and the Government cannot accept that position. I make a commitment on behalf of the Minister that the Government is interested in sorting out many of the problems that currently exist. They will be sorted out and I understand that a memo has been sent to the Police Commissioner to report as soon as possible on the matter.

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

### COURT AND TRANSCRIPT FEES

Adjourned debate on motion of Mr Gunn:

That the regulations under the Magistrates Court Act 1991 relating to court and transcript fees made on 1 July 1993 and laid on the table of this House on 3 August 1993, be disallowed.

(Continued from 8 September. Page 622.)

**Mr McKEE (Gilles):** The Government opposes this motion. Many of the arguments that I will put forward in this debate I have used in a previous debate on another motion relating to transcript fees. It is important to point out that the

charge of \$4.50 per page is most reasonable and one of the cheapest of any in Australia. In the 1993-94 financial year, the cost per page for a CAT reporter is \$9.18 per page; audio transcription costs \$10.23 per page; and for a Pitman writer the cost is \$12.60 per page. That is the cost to the Government or the taxpayer to provide such a service, yet litigants are charged only \$4.50, less than half the cost to the Government.

I congratulate the Court Services Department in South Australia for being able to operate a tight ship. It does that by keeping up with the latest moves in technology and applying them when necessary throughout the department. The cost for a private contractor for a running transcript is \$7.35 per page or part thereof and for a delayed transcript \$6.80 per page or part thereof. It has been suggested that, if recording and transcription was put under a private contractor, the cost would be about \$10 per page. It would not be any cheaper for litigants if the Government took that road, even though it does use private contractors from time to time. The Government opposes the proposition because it believes that it is supplying court transcripts at the best possible price.

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

#### ECONOMIC AND FINANCE COMMITTEE

Adjourned debate on motion of Mr Becker:

That the seventh report of the Economic and Finance Committee on an inquiry into the use of external consultants by Government departments and statutory authorities be noted.

(Continued from 6 October. Page 738.)

**Mr QUIRKE (Playford):** I will not take up too much time of the House on this issue. I should really apologise to the House because this motion appears in this form. The report of the Economic and Finance Committee came in in the new way during the winter recess of the Parliament and so we did not formally move the noting of the report as we have done in all other instances. The member for Hanson moved that this inquiry be noted. That is normally the job of the Chair of the committee, and I apologise for that omission. I think the debate will take only a few moments.

The report was the result of a considerable amount of work of the committee. I think it would be fair to say that it was the second longest review during the time that I have been the Chair of the Economic and Finance Committee. There were a number of key findings in the report concerning the use of consultants. It is interesting to note that in our research we found that \$146 million had been spent from 1987 to 1992 on external consultants as such across the Government sector. It is also interesting to note that that figure is quite small in comparison with the use of external consultants in other States. In Queensland, \$300 million was spent on the use of external consultants in two years. Given that Queensland has roughly double the population of South Australia, it is using resources at a rate twice that which applied here in South Australia in the years 1987 through to 1992.

There were a number of findings in the report. We found that many of the decisions made by external consultants simply rubber stamped decisions that had already been made, and made by people who were paid sufficiently to make those decisions and who should have stood by those decisions instead of trying to bring in an outside party to clothe those

decisions somewhat better than would normally have been the case.

The other issue to which I draw attention and on which the committee spent a great deal of time concerns the engagement of consultants through the process of tendering. The committee found a number of areas where recommendations were made as to how more fairly to distribute the work of consultants in South Australia. Recommendations were made about threshold amounts which basically come down to \$10 000 and, as I remember rightly, \$50 000. In many instances the committee was concerned that a tendering process could cost more than a consultancy itself, and I believe that a number of our recommendations overcome that problem.

One of those recommendations was that a register of consultants be established and that a fair shake of the smaller consultancies be spread amongst those people on the register. In terms of the larger consultancies, the committee made a number of recommendations about the use of competitive and compulsory tendering. I do not want to take up any more time now. The report came down some considerable time ago. It has, I believe, been well received and in many areas sets the pattern for the engagement of outside consultants across the public sector in South Australia.

**Mr BECKER (Hanson):** I thank the members who spoke in this debate. All has been said. It was an outstanding report. The controversy of employing former public servants is continuing. I note that Jan McMahon of the Public Service Association has had quite a bit to say recently on this subject, because of the report and because of the outstanding way in which the issue was investigated and the report presented to Parliament following my giving notice of a motion in this House in about October or November 1992, when I suggested that executive salaries be pegged at \$150 000. That was amended by the member for Playford, and we were looking at packages from \$100 000 onwards.

Because of that work, I believe that some sanity will return to executive salaries, not only in the public sector but I hope in the private sector, because that is where it all started. It started with these smart alec entrepreneurs who took control of some of the best companies developed in this country at the expense of the workers. It was not the workers who benefited: the executives benefited by paying themselves huge salaries and bonuses. I hope we never have the return of that day in this country. I commend the motion to the House.

Motion carried.

#### GOVERNMENT MANAGEMENT AND EMPLOYMENT ACT REGULATIONS

Adjourned debate on motion of Mr Ingerson:

That the various regulations under the Government Management and Employment Act 1985 made on 24 June and laid on the table of this House on 3 August 1993 be disallowed.

(Continued from 18 August. Page 335.)

**Mr S.G. EVANS (Davenport):** At the request of the member for Bragg, I move:

That this Order of the Day be discharged.

Order of the Day discharged.

## ENVIRONMENT, RESOURCES AND DEVELOPMENT COMMITTEE

Consideration of the report of the committee on the Hindmarsh Island Bridge project.

**The Hon. T.H. HEMMINGS (Napier):** In asking the Parliament to note the report on the Hindmarsh Island bridge project, I point out that there was considerable media reaction as to the recommendations of the committee. I will address some aspects of the report and I understand that my colleague the member for Price and possibly members opposite will contribute also. This report and the time restraints placed on the committee once again highlight the concern of our committee in relation to not only inadequate resources but the way that either this House or the other place puts enormous restraints on the committee system.

I am not one to keep on harping to you, Sir, as one of the Presiding Officers of the Parliament, about the lack of resources, but when our request for extra research assistance was made to you, you and your colleague in the other place referred it to the Minister. We did that in the terms of the legislation that we work under, and we were refused. At the same time, because the project had been considered by Cabinet and it was well on track, almost to the stage where tenders were being allocated before it reached us, again there was enormous pressure on the committee to deliver a report. In relation to all of those problems the committee did a very fine job. Again, looking at the terms of reference given to us by the other place, it was nothing other than a mischievous motion designed to embarrass the Government.

**Mr Ferguson:** Political muckraking.

**The Hon. T.H. HEMMINGS:** My colleague the member for Henley Beach once again comes to my rescue with the ideal description of what was going on in the other place when he says 'political muckraking'. That is all it was and I congratulate the member for Henley Beach for that timely interjection. It was all about questioning the Minister as to why certain things had happened when the Minister had already responded in that other place during their own quaint time which they call 'Question Time'. What should have been considered were the environmental questions and they were not considered by the other place at all; we included that term of reference in our agenda.

Throughout the report those concerns have been brought up time and time again. Let me give some examples of environmental issues that have not been satisfactorily resolved, even now, and I very much doubt that they will be resolved by the time the bridge is completed: water quality (not even considered); effluent disposal; access roads; toilet facilities; and tourist amenities. There are significant wetlands on this island which are subject to Federal and international agreement, yet they do not appear to have been the subject of any form of consultation between Government agencies and those people involved.

There is a treaty signed by the Australian Federal Government and the Japanese Government involving the protection of bird life which inhabits the wetlands of Hindmarsh Island and which regularly migrate to Japan. Yet, that has not even been considered in any form of discussion between the Government, local council or the Department of Environment and Natural Resources. There has been talk about a comprehensive management plan for the whole of the Murray mouth. There has been plenty of talk about it but no action.

If I may transgress slightly, the supplementary development plan for Hindmarsh Island has currently been lodged with the Environment, Resources and Development Committee. There has been no indication in that supplementary development plan as to the comprehensive management plan that is so necessary for Hindmarsh Island, whether a bridge be built or not. That is the whole point of our recommendation. So much has been overlooked and judgment has been clouded by the question of whether or not a bridge is built or whether we use ferries. The committee says there are wider issues to be considered.

In relation to the supplementary development plan the committee will make sure that the relevant agencies appear before the committee to tell us exactly what has happened to the comprehensive management plan that we asked for. We were told that it was in the process of coming together, yet it seems that once the decision was made about the bridge it has not seen the light of day. It has not been one of the better reports that we have put out but that is not due to the committee's inadequacies. The fact is that the other place used the legislation in a mischievous way to try to embarrass the Government. The media saw it as such and reported it as such. If one reads the report one will find that its contents are more relevant to the people of Hindmarsh Island than to whether or not we build a bridge.

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

## RURAL COUNSELLORS

**Mr MEIER (Goyder):** I move:

That this House congratulates the rural counsellors of South Australia on the excellent assistance they are providing to the farming and rural communities during this rural crisis and urges both State and Federal Governments to provide every assistance necessary to ensure the counsellors can continue their work and, where necessary, for the Government to provide them with additional support services.

Members would be aware that the rural counselling scheme was first announced by the Federal Minister for Primary Industries and Energy, the Hon. John Kerin, in 1986. At that stage some \$900 000 was provided for a three year program. Now, a total of \$4.1 million is available Australia-wide to assist in the employment of approximately 73 counsellors. In South Australia the first meeting of rural community group representatives, bankers, Government and service organisations was held in July 1986, and a decision was made to support the development of local action groups in areas of the State deemed to be in difficulty.

We saw those areas continue in numbers until today we have 11 such areas in South Australia with, as a result of last night's meeting at Jamestown, some 16 rural counsellors. There is no doubt that the job of a rural counsellor is far from easy. I became involved with the rural counsellors when I served as shadow Minister of Agriculture for some two years. I give credit and express my admiration to those rural counsellors, who work tirelessly, whether it be on the West Coast, in the Riverland or in the Barossa—and those were the three key areas operating some four years ago. Some of the people involved are still the same people. Since that time many new rural counselling services have been established.

I was prompted to move this motion at the annual general meeting of the Yorke Peninsula Rural Counselling Service held on 2 September last. Having listened to the Chairman's report, the rural counsellors' report and the comments from the many people who attended that meeting, I felt it was very



clear that these services were not only needed but needed to be developed. There are two rural counsellors serving the electorate of Goyder: Mr Allan McMahon, operating from Kadina, and Mrs Kathy Ottens who operates the Mid Upper North Rural Counselling Service from Lochiel. The hours that these people work is something that has to be seen to be appreciated, particularly for the salary they are paid. At this

stage, Mr Speaker, I seek leave to insert in *Hansard* two statistical tables relating to rural counselling in South Australia.

**The SPEAKER:** Are the tables purely statistical?

**Mr MEIER:** Yes, Mr Speaker.

Leave granted.

RURAL COUNSELLING IN SOUTH AUSTRALIA(Figures compiled for the period January to June 1993)						
Rural Counselling Service	Total Clients since service started	Total clients in last six months	New Clients	Reopened client files	Hours worked per week	Kilometres travelled in 6 months
Barossa & Light	496	131	68 static	33	65	17 000
Broken Hill	125	80	26 static	2	48	35 000
Eastern Eyre· Errol Schuster	385	206	60 increase	30	64	30 160
· Monica Dodd	260	209	59 increase	6	56.5	17 999
Far West	189	85	35	50	47	16 500
Kangaroo Island	193	69	27 static	13	53	22 010
Le Hunte	326	87	36 increase	5	45	38 893
Mid/Upper North	219	137	76	61	58.5	26 291
Murraylands	499	99	76 static	23	50	25 510
Riverland· Sara Duvnjak	439	99	34 static	19	45	26 000
· Frank Kaesler	298	210	157 increase	53	59	24 430
South East· Garry Possingham	251	159	63	10	46	28 196
· Valerie Monaghan	110	66	27	1	43	16 374
Yorke Peninsula	229	172	128	44	49	25 505
Total	4 019	1 809	872	350		
Average per Rural Counsellor	287	129	62	25	52	24 990

RURAL COUNSELLING IN SOUTH AUSTRALIA(Figures compiled for the period January to June 1993)					
Rural Counselling Service	Total Debt \$	Current Clients			Clients adjusted out
		Average debt per client \$	Average property size (hectares)	Average equity %	
Barossa & Light	18 666 000	153 000	1 304	64	5
Broken Hill	29 637 202	370 465	40 468	64	2
Eastern Eyre· Errol Schuster	36 391 040	176 656	1 715	48	19
· Monica Dodd	27 578 656	246 238	1 000	52	2
Far West	15 340 715	180 479	2 566	17	19
Kangaroo Island	23 140 824	335 374	688	36	4
Le Hunte	19 837 000	283 000	2 256	63.5	12
Mid/Upper North	47 247 152	218 736	4 342	64	
Murraylands	16 071 000	232 913	1 274	39	26
Riverland· Sara Duvnjak	9 520 000	(horticulture)111 515	(horticulture)17	(horticulture)44	13
· Frank Kaesler	16 037 590	151 837(horticulture 79 808)	4 747(horticulture 20)	65(horticulture 56)	14
South East· Garry Possingham	27 299 000	262 000	894	63	3
· Valerie Monaghan	22 759 000	379 000	506	63	6
Yorke Peninsula	40 230 000(18 months)	268 000(18 months)			6
Total	309 524 620				131
Average per Rural Counsellor	23 809 586	238 555	1 936	52	10

**Mr MEIER:** Members will be interested to see the hours that are worked. For example, the Barossa and Light rural counsellor worked 65 hours per week and the Eastern Eyre rural counsellor, Errol Schuster, worked 64 hours. Then it

comes down to the Yorke Peninsula rural counsellor, who worked 49 hours, and the Mid/Upper North rural counsellor, who worked 58.5 hours per week on average. If these people had to work according to union rules, they would be on 38.5

hours per week in many cases. If they were working according to Public Service hours, it would be a similar period. These people need to be applauded. They are doing an outstanding job. They are probably the life blood of the rural sector in many areas around this State.

There are many things in these statistical tables in which members will be interested. Time does not permit me to go into all the details, but the increase in the numbers of clients over the past six months is rather frightening. The annual reports of the various rural counsellors say much the same thing: there has been a massive increase in their workload and in the numbers of people seeking assistance. The reasons are varied, and I will go into them when I have considered further details in their reports.

The objects of rural counsellors are varied. They include assisting primary producers in the management and reorganisation of their farm finance through budget advice; debt reconstruction and the introduction of different farming practices; the provision of information and advice to primary producers and their families in assessing their viability; and consideration of longer-term options. The objects also include help to meet the social and emotional needs of primary producers and their families, and so it goes on, even to the extent of informing the community in the various areas of the problems that are occurring, and outlining some of the solutions to these problems and the activities that are being conducted to alleviate them. The rural counsellors have wide objectives. Therefore, it is not surprising that their workloads are such that they are working many hours per week at a relatively low rate of pay.

I should like to look at some of the things that are highlighted by the rural counsellors. The demand for their services has continued to be heavy and, in fact, has continued to increase, particularly in the past six months because of the unseasonal heavy rain experienced in the summer which led to downgrading of grain and lower crop returns. A large proportion of farming properties experienced some financial loss. Likewise, continued low wool prices have had greatly reduced farm cash flows. Most rural counsellors indicate that it is impossible for them to visit all the people who contact them and would like them to come out to their properties. The telephone is invaluable to them.

The major reasons for the financial difficulties include climatic variations, low commodity prices, high interest rates, poor financial management skills, inability to reduce farm costs, declining land values and small farm size. Looking at the example from the Mid/Upper North Rural Counselling Service, I believe it is interesting that, in respect of 444 persons seen, the largest factor was low commodity prices and the smallest factor was poor financial management skills. In fact, only nine of the 444 were identified as having poor financial management skills. That is a credit to the farming sector. It shows that in many cases they are good financial managers and that factors out of their control have caused these negative effects on the rural sector.

It is a great shame that in normal times, with the unseasonal weather that downgraded and ruined many crops, farmers could have looked to sheep and wool production to counter their income loss, but that was not the case last year. Enterprises whose only income was derived from wool continue to face great financial hardship. Likewise, it was disappointing for those who rely so much on pig production to see the importation of Canadian pigmeat for a sustained four-month period, which had a serious impact on their cash flows.

What sort of assistance do the rural counsellors give? Earlier I mentioned the objects, but identified are assistance such as debt repayment plans, assets and liabilities statements, whole farm viability statements, cash flow budgets, gross margins analyses, rural assistance service applications, counselling for adjustment out of farming, negotiations with creditors, helping with loan applications, personal and family counselling, insolvency advice and referral to other welfare organisations. A very varied type of assistance is provided.

Part of my motion refers to the fact that additional finance is needed and that the Government must ensure that continued finance is provided. The Chairman of the Yorke Peninsula Rural Counselling and Information Service, Mr Ian Carmichael, in his annual report, says:

Financial support for the counselling service is a major concern; Government funding, both State and Federal, is only on a yearly basis. With local contributions becoming a greater burden on cash starved country communities, a review of financing is urgently required in order to meet the demands for our rural counselling service.

That is another matter I wish to bring to the attention of the House. It is very difficult to work on a year to year basis and not know where all the money is coming from. Likewise, local communities are providing an increasing amount of money. In the annual reports we note that many community organisations are involved in money raising: service clubs, agricultural bureaux, church groups, women's organisations, and the like. The most fitting statement came from Mr Allan McMahon's conclusion to his report:

The counsellor has often tried to establish what it is about farmers that makes them completely different from any other group of people. Why is it so important to be careful when severing the links between a farmer and his/her farm? After dealing with over 300 farming families one thing emerges as being the important facet. Farmers have an incredibly strong bond with their work [more so] than any other employee or business person. It is a personal bond. There seems to be more emotion and spirit invested in their work than any other profession. It is more than capital, more than machinery. There is a different attitude in rural areas when owning a farm or land. Many who have not owned land will not understand this bond at all. This is why many bureaucrats push the idea of farming as a business. There is more to it than this. Much more.

The line bureaucrats and financial institutions push is that farming is strictly business. Many farmers will agree in principle with this notion, but there is more to understanding the farmer. Their attitude is all well and good but it achieves little on where the farmer 'is coming from'.

One banker who completely missed the whole concept of what farming was about talked about an adjustment out of farming as being viewed as either failure or non-success. He did not understand that to a farmer both of these concepts are the same. To a farmer, to lose their farm is to have failed. It means to have failed their family, community and, most importantly, themselves.

The value of the rural counsellors cannot be overemphasised. We would hope that we will be without rural counsellors in five or 10 years time but if we look at what the rural counsellors are doing, see the problems occurring and the lack of action by Government and other institutions in trying to overcome them, unfortunately, I believe that rural counselling may have to increase rather than decrease over the coming years. There is no doubt that the farming sector needs that assistance, advice and help, and I compliment the rural counsellors of this State and thank them for the work they are doing and trust the Government will continue to provide real and additional support.

Motion carried.

## 2000 OLYMPIC GAMES

**Mr BECKER (Hanson):** I move:

That this House congratulates the Sydney 2000 Olympic Games Bid Committee upon its successful campaign.

At about 4 a.m. on Friday 24 September Juan Antonio Samaranch moved to the podium in Monte Carlo to address the assembled International Olympic Committee delegates and accredited committee and staffers from the various bidding cities to announce the successful city to host the Olympic Games for the year 2000. Those words still ring in my ears as I proudly sat up listened to Mr Samaranch announce that the winning city was Sydney. I was proud and delighted that Sydney had been successful, following the tremendous amount of work that has been undertaken by the Sydney Olympic Games Bid Committee led by John Coates, who was President of the Australian International Olympic Council, by John Fahey, the Premier of New South Wales, by Bruce Baird, who was the Minister in charge of the bid, and by Rod McGeoch, who was the Chief Executive Officer of the bid committee.

It was a wonderful combination of a lot of hard work and dedication, but we must not forget the previous bids established by Brisbane, which sought the games for 1992 and by Melbourne, which sought the games for 1996. It is estimated that in the vicinity of \$100 million has been spent by these three cities, the State Governments and also the Federal Government in assisting those bids: \$100 million, not to forget the amount of money that has also been spent by certain Australian cities seeking the Commonwealth Games.

It is significant that a letter appeared in the *Advertiser* of 12 October, stating the following:

Foundations for Sydney Games laid in Adelaide.

Sydney has been awarded the millennium Olympic Games, an honour that I am sure it deserves. I have no doubt, whatsoever, that it will host a wonderful games.

It is most important that the Sydney bid committee, the people of Sydney, the people of Australia and the people of Adelaide recognise that much of the credit for the successful bid must be directed to the Adelaide 1998 Commonwealth Games bid team.

The Adelaide team, led by Steve and Angela Condous, produced an exceptional bid for the 1998 Commonwealth Games, made an excellent impression on delegates in Barcelona and convinced us all that the nation of Australia would be a suburb location for a major games.

The foundations of the Sydney bid were undoubtedly laid for it by the team from Adelaide. The team and the people of Adelaide should take pride in the undoubted contribution they made toward winning the Olympic Games for Australia.

It is signed by Steve Cooil, Isle of Man Commonwealth Games General Team Manager, Castletown, Isle of Man. Steve is a person who became a great friend of most of the delegates for the Adelaide 1998 Commonwealth Games. The Minister at the table, the former Minister of Recreation and Sport, the Hon. Kym Mayes, and I were part of that bid team and we met and made some wonderful friendships amongst the delegates within the Commonwealth Games movement. I would like to take this opportunity to refer to some statistical information, which is taken from the book *The Lords of the Rings*, written by Simson and Jennings, and which unfortunately may be too detailed to have inserted in *Hansard*, dealing with the members of the International Olympic Committee who voted on the bids. There are some 93 delegates, many of whom were also delegates for the 1998 Commonwealth Games bid won by Kuala Lumpur. That information shows those who have voted and who have had the opportunity to vote, and it gives an idea of the delegates who are Olympic delegates as well as Commonwealth Games delegates.

It goes without saying that everybody in Australia is very proud of the success of this bid. We wish the New South

Wales Government, the City of Sydney and the Federal Government a successful games and in particular in funding and financing those games. I have already written to the Premier of New South Wales suggesting that if they seek total accountability they should incorporate in the legislation similar clauses to those that we have for the multifunction polis, so that it is referred either to the Public Accounts Committee or a similar committee so there will never be any argument as far as the costs are concerned. What Sydney has to watch, and the technical details have been provided, is that some of these world organisations will insist on changing the technical requirements, and they do that many times in the years leading up to the games, so if Sydney stands firm and says, 'This is what we offered you, this is what we will provide,' I believe the budget requirements can be met.

As far as South Australia is concerned, I know the Government and the Opposition—everybody in South Australia—will offer every assistance and cooperation to ensure that the games do Australia proud and that the Olympic ideal is upheld, as well as provide the opportunity to salute the twenty-first century and ensure that the youth of the world will be able to live in peace, harmony and enjoy the opportunities to meet and to enhance world relations. For that reason we commend Sydney for its hard work and all those involved in the bid and we hope that the dawning of the year 2000 will provide wonderful opportunities for sporting persons as well as all other people who have the opportunity to participate in any way with these games. It is a pity for us, the City of Adelaide, that we missed out on the 1998 Commonwealth Games. I hope our opportunity will come very shortly. In 1976 there were the Montreal Olympic Games and in 1978 Edmonton hosted the Commonwealth Games, so who knows, 2002 might be our year.

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

**Mr De LAINE (Price):** I support the motion moved by the member for Hansen and congratulate the bid committee on its efforts and professional presentation in winning the games for Sydney, Australia. I am glad the committee did not suffer the same political manipulation that the last Olympic bid encountered which was won by Atlanta. Again, last year we saw the technically excellent bid put in by Adelaide for the 1988 Commonwealth Games defeated in a similar political situation.

The successful bid will be a great fillip for Sydney and Australia and considerable tourism spinoffs should eventuate from the games and flow to South Australia. As a person who has been involved in top level sport over a number of years I am pleased that for the second time Australia will be hosting the world's greatest sporting extravaganza. For only the second time in history the Olympic Games will be held in the southern hemisphere. Many people do not realise that since 1896, when the modern games were reconstituted, all but one of the games—Melbourne 1956—have been held in the northern hemisphere.

Games in the northern hemisphere present a great disadvantage for most of Australia's athletes, who in most events have to compete out of season. It is a tremendous disadvantage for athletes to have to prepare in the middle of winter and then travel to the other hemisphere to compete in a different season. In recent years this has been redressed to some extent through the substantial funding that both State and Federal Governments have given to sport and for setting

up the institutes in Canberra and the Institute of Sport in this State.

The 1956 Olympic Games in Melbourne were the most successful ever for Australia in terms of the performance of athletes and the number of medals won and there are two reasons for that. First, as the games were held in Australia, the cost of not sending athletes overseas meant that for the first time Australia was able to field a full team in all sports. The most important reason why we did so well was, as I just mentioned, that athletes were competing in season, and we can expect to see that happen again in Sydney in the year 2000.

The Melbourne games were well run and provided first class facilities for sports and all the other associated events that went with the games. I attended those games and was most impressed with the professionalism shown. Australians do things well, because we have had to survive in an isolated geographic situation and, in order to attract major events to Australia, we have had to be professional and provide adequate facilities. I am sure that Sydney will continue the tradition of doing things well and I am confident that the 2000 Sydney Olympics will be well run, be well resourced and be successful. I am pleased to join with the member for Hansen in congratulating the Sydney 2000 bid team for its outstanding effort and I am pleased to support the motion.

**The Hon. M.K. MAYES (Minister of Environment and Natural Resources):** I join with my colleague the member for Price in supporting the comments of the member for Hanson and I endorse all of what he said. I do not want to be seen to be too close in our views, as we have been accused, but the experience that we had together in our Commonwealth Government bid, which was the best bid ever presented to any Commonwealth Government General Assembly by any bid city, was an eye-opener to both of us and I certainly endorse the honourable member's comments about the management of the budget that is required.

As to the Sydney organisers, a great deal of jockeying for positions is underway now and those who have the executive responsibility to run the games' preparation must be sure to take account of what the member for Hanson has said: they must not bow to the pressure from international organisations. We were told repeatedly that they seek to add further bids to their original commitment, and that increases the budget commitment and expense and can put in jeopardy the original proposed budget.

In the time allotted I want to congratulate John Coates. Much can be said about other people, but John Coates has been the architect of this victory and when you have been through the bid process as we have been you realise how difficult it is to collect those votes. The narrowest of margins was involved. Had there been a split vote, the IOC President, Mr Juan Samaranch, would have voted for Beijing. I have no doubt about that and, therefore, it is a significant success for Sydney and for the architect behind the bid. Although I met John Coates more recently, I go back 11 years before that because he has been the driving force, the engineer, the designer and the one who has delivered to Sydney and Australia.

It is not just for Sydney. I already have the impression that Sydneysiders believe the games are just for Sydney—but they are for Australia. The games will provide an amazing boost for our young sports people and our community. In a sense Brisbane, Melbourne and Adelaide had to be sacrificed for Sydney to achieve and I have no qualms about that. I am

delighted that Australia has won the games for the year 2000. It is significant that the opening of the next century will provide an opportunity to present to our youth all of that which will come with the games in Sydney, but it is important to recognise that what was built on for Sydney's bid was the work by Brisbane, particularly the work of Melbourne and also to some extent the work of Adelaide.

I have no doubt that the Commonwealth votes that came across to us in the last round from Manchester, with Manchester's clear indication of support, partly had to do with the fact that Adelaide put up such an outstanding bid for the Commonwealth Games of 1988 and they felt a clear obligation. It was also a mixture of looking at the northern hemisphere and seeing who might get the games in 2004. It is important that we recognise the work done by people who went before and provided support. John Coates was again involved in that. I join with my colleagues in this matter; I am delighted and I congratulate Sydney on its success. I look forward to seeing the best games ever, as I am sure they will be. Australians can do it. We underestimate our capacity. We have seen what happened at Barcelona and I am sure we can equal and improve on Barcelona. I have great pleasure in supporting the member for Hanson's motion.

**Mr BECKER (Hanson):** I thank members for their support. It is pleasing that copies of this motion and debate will be sent to John Coates, President, Australia's International Olympic Committee, thus demonstrating the bipartisan support and pride that we have in our country, and particularly the management that John Coates has given the International Olympic Committee in Australia. I commend the motion to the House.

Motion carried.

## ANZACS

**Mr QUIRKE (Playford):** I move:

That this House applauds the surviving Anzacs, some of whom are now returning to the scene of the final battles of the Great War in which they fought; notes that these and other events of this year denote the seventy-fifth anniversary of the ending of hostilities on 11 November and, further, this House calls upon the Government, all Government departments, schools and the general community to reinstate the two minutes of silence on 11 November in recognition of service and sacrifice.

It gives me great pleasure to move this motion, even though 11 November is still some weeks away. In 1918, the nineteenth century came to an end: the technical date for the start of the twentieth century was 1 January 1901, but indeed the historical date was some years after that. The titanic struggle from 1914 to 1918 saw most of the old regime in Europe swept away. Indeed, Europe and Europe's position in the world was changed forever.

Australia also saw fundamental changes which swept away a youthful colonial idealism and a naivety that would never be repeated. Indeed, the population for the whole of Australasia was less than 5 million people. In terms of the manpower that Australasia, New Zealand and Australia, put into the First World War, the figures are quite staggering. Indeed, some 60 000 men were killed in that war and, of about 320 000 men sent to that war on all fronts, two-thirds were either killed or wounded. The burden on that generation was never really overcome. Many of the men who went to fight in the war found, when they returned home, that there was full employment but not for very long. Employment petered out in April 1920 and it is not commonly known that

for that generation the unemployment rate was over 12 per cent in April 1920 and did not come down below that figure until well into the Second World War.

In many respects, it was a generation that suffered an enormous amount and, indeed, if we go into some of the country towns that dot the Adelaide Hills or to Burra, we see small statues with names which are hard to pronounce and dates chipped on them. Those dates denote battles fought in the 1914-18 war and in many instances in those towns we see a list of the names of the fallen. The interesting thing is that a significant proportion of the population in those towns perished in that conflict. On a trip to Burra I saw the war memorial and from memory 171 names were engraved on it of a population at that time of 2 500. My guess is that the number of eligible males who could have gone to that war would have been less than 500; probably about 250 went and a significant number of those would never return.

In the 1914-18 war we in Australia were shaken out of a sense of naivety that had permeated Australia right through the colonial years. The role of Great Britain as a protector for Australia was seriously brought into question in the 1914-18 war, particularly in 1918 when Britain came so close to defeat. We have seen marvellous television footage of the Australians who are going back there now, 75 years after the conflict—to Villers-Bretonneux and so on. They returned to the battlefields of 1916 to 1918 and it was marvellous to behold.

A recent television series on the American Civil War, arguably one of the best programs put to air in recent years, showed the 1938 celebration, 75 years after the battle of Gettysburg, when the rebels and union soldiers came together and at that time were in their 90s. Interestingly, the film footage from 1938 resembled much of what we have seen recently on the French battlefields and much of what we will see as we get closer to 11 November. The interesting thing about the Civil War veterans is that the last known veteran died in 1959, 98 years after the struggle started. Indeed, I would hazard a guess that the figure I gave the House last year of 600 veterans from the First World War being still alive in our midst would now be very much lower than that. Within 10 years, very few if any of those veterans will be alive.

Of course, not too many women can return to the field of conflict. A number of VADs went over there and most of them, at least until 1917, had to be 30 years of age or older. So any of those women who are alive today would be at an advanced age indeed. I understand that the last of the VADs died recently, before the celebrations of the end of the 1918 war.

Some images of that war need to be dispelled. First, we listen to many of the veterans who were quite young when they went to fight in the 1914-18 war. The average of the fallen was 27 to 28 years, not 14 to 15 years as we are fed on television. In the First World War, the average age of the fallen was 28 years and the average age of the fallen in the Second World War was 26 years: in Vietnam amongst the American forces it was 19 years. The situation in which the Australian Army found itself in France in 1918 resulted in enormous and heroic struggle. The Australian Army went to the Dardanelles in 1915 and, after the failure of that campaign, it went into two of the theatres of operation. The Light Horse went into the Palestine campaign, about which not a great deal has been written. It was a nasty campaign in which many men died, but nowhere near the number who died in France.

The Australian Army went onto the Western Front in July 1916. It arrived too late for the beginning of the Somme offensive, but it was there for the night attack on 14 and 15 July. From then on it was in constant combat until 9 November 1918. Indeed, at that time the men had fought over the same ground many times. Some 59 000 Australians were killed on that front at that time. In 1916 alone, between 15 July and the end of August, 27 000 men fell fighting for a town called Poizier which in the end had been taken and retaken five times and was simply rubble.

In those conflicts many of the names of those towns became household words here in Australia. Many of the German towns in South Australia in particular were named after them. Some of the generals of the First World War gave their names to suburbs, one being in the electorate of the member for Spence: Allenby Gardens. If we go through the Netherby area, we find the names of all the famous generals of the First World War, very few of whom were all that competent but we see the names of one after another as we drive through that area. I refer to such names as French, Haig and the name of the Australian General—one of the few creative minds of that conflict—Sir John Monash.

In 1918 the war ebbed backwards and forwards, and many of the veterans who have gone back there will have mixed memories of the events. Indeed, it was not until August 1918 that the German Army was finally put to flight and driven from the field of battle. It was eventually driven 200 miles, and by 9 November the Australian forces, used as shock troops for the main British forces, reached the town of Mons, which was the scene of the first conflict with the British Army in August 1914. When the Armistice was agreed to on the night of 9 November 1918, it was decided that some 36 hours later, at 11 a.m. on 11 November, fighting would stop across all fronts. Germany had agreed to the Armistice, which was severe, and historians have come to write about the severity of the Treaty of Versailles. The reality is that the Treaty of Versailles was only a recognition of the terms of the Armistice agreed to on 9 November.

One of the last men to die in combat was an American. As far as is known, he was killed two hours and 50 minutes after the cease-fire was supposed to have taken effect. His name was Corporal Phillip Adams, and the conflict in the Ardennes stopped some short time thereafter. Of course, Adams might have been the last man killed in battle in 1918 but he was not the last man to die as a result of the First World War. Many of the veterans would come home carrying terrible wounds and all sorts of other scars of the conflict, both physical and mental, for many years. There is no doubt that many of the veterans who returned are still carrying some of those scars today. It is worth noting what these men did in this conflict through this motion in this place on the coming 75th anniversary of this conflict.

**Mr S.G. EVANS (Davenport):** Mr Speaker, I draw your attention to the state of the House.

*A quorum having been formed:*

**Mr S.G. EVANS:** The Opposition supports the motion. I commend the honourable member on the research he has done, but the most important aspect of his motion is where he calls upon all of us in Government, Government departments and schools to observe two minutes silence on 11 November in recognition of the great contribution made by those who returned and the sacrifice made by those who did not return. My father was one who came back, and he found a Scottish lady to bring back with him. She is still with us

today and in good heart. Had he been alive, he would have been 101 today.

Some 300 or 400 old timers are still with us today. There were many bad aspects of the war. About 50 per cent of the young men in some of the villages in the country never came back, and some young women also made the supreme sacrifice. Many of my generation know about it, but many of today's children are more likely to be taught about the Chinese opium war than about the sacrifice that was made by Australians in that terrible war and in subsequent wars.

There has been some mention of England's contribution or how she could have protected us in that first war. She took a pounding, and she took a pounding in the Second World War. I know from letters that went from my home to my relatives in Scotland that they were fortunate they were not pounded as much as were people in England. Those who criticise that little country need to be sure in their own mind just what the dangers were. If England had fallen in either of those wars, we might not have the freedom that we have today.

I congratulate the member for Playford for moving the motion. I trust that others will pick up the sentiments he expresses—that on 11 November, we observe two minutes silence in respect for those who made the supreme sacrifice and to show gratitude to those who came back after fighting for peace and freedom not just in this country but right throughout the world.

**Mr LEWIS (Murray-Mallee):** I do not have a great deal more to contribute to this debate other than to draw attention to a further gap in the way in which we could urge our fellow citizens to acknowledge the sacrifice and recognise the benefit that we have. If the House passes this motion, I believe that we should all, especially you, Sir, communicate to radio and television stations our feelings on the matter and our desire to have this silence observed, so that they in turn at 11 a.m., when the news service would ordinarily come on, would simply say, 'After two minutes silence, the news will be read,' and leave the airwaves silent for two minutes. By that means, the message would spread even further.

In my judgment, it would do nobody anywhere any harm to recognise what was done to ensure that we could live as free people and, in the process, exchange ideas with each other and be free to move to do that in ways which other societies are not. By that means, also, we might come to appreciate the greater benefits we have in consequence of the efforts and sacrifice which they made.

Motion carried.

### SPEED CAMERAS

Adjourned debate on motion of Mr Gunn:

That in the opinion of this House the South Australian Police should adopt a similar code of practice for the operation and use of speed cameras as those which apply in New South Wales.

(Continued from 25 August. Page 487.)

**Mr McKEE (Gilles):** The Government opposes this motion, which has been before the House on many previous occasions and which obviously is intended purely as some sort of political advancement for the member for Eyre, whose arguments we have rejected before. Having spoken on this matter previously, I believe it has been generally accepted that such steps taken by the Government in relation to this matter represent a direct attempt to reduce the road toll. If people are speeding on the roads and are detected by a

camera they are simply breaking the law. It is a matter of using modern police technology in the form of speed cameras to catch people who are simply law breakers, and if they are caught by this method expiation notices are given in accordance with the Act.

I want to quote some figures in connection with the acceptance of speed cameras by the people of South Australia. It is interesting to see these figures because between February 1991 and August 1993 a survey was conducted which showed that in February 1991 some 64.3 per cent of South Australians supported the operation and use of speed cameras. In August 1991 the figure was 71.6 per cent; in August 1993, 69 per cent. Those figures have remained high and demonstrate an acceptance by the great majority of people in South Australia and a desire to see a reduction of the carnage on the roads. If modern technological methods such as speed cameras will achieve this, then so be it, because what we are doing is preserving life.

It is also interesting to note the figures in that survey relating to the acceptance of speed cameras. In the 18 to 30-year-old age group, 32 per cent of people supported speed cameras; and in the 65-plus age group, 53 per cent. It is interesting that more females than males in our society support speed cameras. However, those figures remain consistently high. The use of speed cameras in this State is accepted, as this study has proven in terms of helping to control the speed at which vehicles are driven on our roads. Whatever steps the Government takes to prevent carnage on the roads, prevent people from speeding, and prevent people from breaking the law should be accepted by this Parliament, and we oppose the motion.

**Mr BECKER (Hanson):** I support the motion. The member for Eyre, like many of our rural colleagues, is genuinely concerned at the enforcement of the speed limit throughout South Australia and particularly on rural roads. The member for Gilles, who has just resumed his seat, has read out the statistics provided in *Hansard* at page 539 by the Minister of Emergency Services, the Hon. Kym Mayes, in answer to a question asked by the member for Price on 26 August 1993. Those statistics are real information sought by the people and they prove the effectiveness of the introduction of speed cameras and the impact that they have on the road toll.

What everybody is objecting to is the way in which speed cameras are located and the way that the system is being enforced. This, unfortunately, on some occasions reflects on the really good work done by a very loyal, very valuable and very competent Police Force. Some two or three years ago I had the opportunity to visit one of the sections of the Police Force operating in the City of London to ascertain the effectiveness of speed cameras and whether we in Australia had adopted the correct system. It is difficult to know whether or not we are doing the right thing and being fair in detecting speeding motorists.

After spending all morning at this particular police station with the officers who were involved in speed detection it was clear that the most effective way of detecting a speeding motor vehicle is to place a sensitive strip across the road. The strip is buried just under the road and as each vehicle passes over that given point to another given point (you need two markers) you can accurately judge the speed of that particular motor vehicle, which is then photographed. The system we use here involves photographing a motor vehicle going over a given point. I am quite sure that the member for Murray-

Mallee could give us a more technical description of what occurs with the type of equipment we are using.

One really does not know exactly how accurate the speed cameras are. There is no doubt that the vast majority of motorists who are detected by the speed camera realise that they are guilty. There is no excuse for speeding in the metropolitan area; there is no excuse for exceeding the speed limit to any large degree on our rural roads, yet, unfortunately, a large number of motorists do so. A momentary lapse of concentration can lead to the road accidents we see occurring in the metropolitan area. Somehow we have to stop the ridiculous carnage on our roads.

I do not care what anybody says: the current road toll is still far too high and exceeds the number of young people who lost their lives in the Vietnam War on any one given day; it is far in excess of what might be expected in terms of the number of people who could be sacrificed in the interests of defending a particular democracy. There is no excuse for speeding and no excuse for a person not concentrating when driving a motor vehicle. There is an excuse for coming up with a system that is foolproof and a system that is accurate. I understand at present that expiation notices for about a third of the motorists who could be detected for speeding are not proceeded with because there could be other vehicles in the vicinity of that motor vehicle at the time. That proves the point that we do not have the ultimate, perfect system.

Recently I asked the Minister of Emergency Services a question about speeding motorists on Tapleys Hill Road, West Beach. Seven have been detected in the past 12 months. That is an 80 km/h speed zone and the highest speed detected was 99 km/h. One can drive along Tapleys Hill Road, West Beach, to Glenelg North doing 80 km/h and cars overtake at such a speed that they rock the car. Something has to be done. However, because of the close proximity of Adelaide Airport and all the sophisticated radar and electrical equipment at that site, it is not easy to come up with an accurate speed detection unit. What annoyed me and the workers who were laying a footpath, kerbing and bitumen along the road was that, although they had signs up asking motorists to slow down to 25 km/h, they were not observing that request.

Many years ago, when I was shadow Minister of Transport, I asked the then Minister, the Hon. Geoff Virgo, whether we could do anything to protect workers on roads in both the metropolitan and country areas, and we came up with a system of reducing speed limits to 25 km/h. However, when cars are whizzing past at 80 or 90 km/h, that is scandalous and unforgivable. I do not think that any worker should have to tolerate such conditions. At the same time, I believe that we have to be sensible in using and enforcing our speed detection laws.

I believe that what New South Wales is doing—putting up a sign warning people of a radar trap or speed detection unit ahead—is a good idea. In the past we had plenty of patrol cars and motor cycles on the road, and the site of a police unit made everybody slow down. I would dearly love to see in operation some system of signs and warnings to motorists of speed detection areas. I believe that would achieve something without giving people the opportunity to accuse the police of being nothing but revenue raisers. I commend the motion moved by the member for Eyre. I think that he is on the right track.

**Mr FERGUSON (Henley Beach):** The member for Hanson has put forward what I think is a good case for opposition to this motion. I can agree with everything that he

said, because I frequently travel from Henley Beach to Glenelg. We often go there for shopping and leisure activities. The number of motor cars that exceed the speed limit along the Tapleys Hill Road section by the airport is quite disgraceful. It seems that when the road is wet they speed up even more. Therefore, I would support the introduction of speed detection units.

If the Parliament were to instruct the police—this would be the result if the motion were carried—to put up signs where they have located speed detection devices, there is no doubt that the traffic would slow down in those areas. One has only to look at what happens at intersections where a warning is given that a camera is present. It certainly has the effect of stopping motorists running on the red lights.

There is no doubt that the signs would be effective, but the argument falls down—

*An honourable member interjecting:*

**Mr FERGUSON:** Try to keep to five minutes?

*Members interjecting:*

**Mr FERGUSON:** The argument falls down when we consider the attitude taken by the member for Hanson—and I think he has taken a correct attitude—in his condemnation of speeding motorists. We want to engender in the minds of the motoring public that they should not speed at any time. If a camera is positioned so that motorists do not know where and when their vehicle is likely to be photographed, surely they will have second or third thoughts about speeding at all.

I am not sure whether speed detection devices should be staffed by policemen. The State spends a lot of time and money training the police in crime detection. Whether those people who are servicing these devices should be policemen is an argument for another day, and the Parliament should debate that particular issue.

I think that the way in which the devices are being handled at present is correct. Surveys are taken of the danger spots or hot spots where accidents occur, and I understand that is where the cameras are set up and where motorists are caught by them. I believe that the police are doing a great job. They have reduced the road toll considerably, as I said in an earlier debate this afternoon. In 10 years the road toll has been reduced spectacularly. I will observe the courtesies by keeping to the time that has been allotted to me. I oppose the motion.

**Mr LEWIS (Murray-Mallee):** I support the motion for the reasons given not only by the member for Eyre but by the member for Hanson. The member for Henley Beach is out of touch with the facts not only as to the effectiveness with which these cameras operate but, more particularly, the locations in which they are used. We have to tell the police to salvage their units and remove the radar transceiver from them: they are not accurate and cannot be relied upon.

The member for Hanson drew attention to the fact that these devices cannot be used in the vicinity of the airport. That is an acknowledgment of the interference with the signal from these devices by the harmonics of the radar used at Adelaide Airport. The only technology which can effectively, accurately and consistently measure the Doppler effect to determine speed, then calculated by a computer, is laser technology. That part of the spectrum of the EMR is superior and ready for application within a matter of weeks. We must use it because we are requiring citizens to cough up money for alleged offences detected by devices using technology which is flawed. I do not intend to go into a long dissertation

about the wavelengths involved and how they are otherwise influenced by externalities from these machines.

For the benefit of the member for Henley Beach, I ask: how is it that not one death has occurred between Callington and Murray Bridge on the South-Eastern Freeway across the Monarto Plain? One of the favourite spots for the highway patrol to erect speed cameras is in the vegetation thickets on the median strip where they cannot be seen by approaching motorists.

Not one death has occurred there, and it would not matter a jig if the motorists travelled along that section of road far more rapidly than the permitted limit of 110, frankly. It would not affect the safety with which they could traverse that section. Other sections on the South-East freeway are equally free, that is, absolutely free of road death, and they too have been used as the locations for such cameras to collect revenue, not to get rid of bad driver behaviour on black spots. I have no difficulty with their use and operation, as long as it is with efficient and accurate technology in an honest and fair manner so that justice is done and not only done but thought by the public at large to have been done.

With those few remarks I would add only that the member for Henley Beach says that these devices have reduced the road toll. Whilst the perception was there that you would get caught, it did. I can tell you, Mr Speaker, that I have never been photographed by a speed camera in a vehicle when I have been driving—never at all. I have been detected speeding and have taken it the same way as any other citizen would, but not caught by a speed camera. Last year the road toll was fairly low and I would have to tell you, Mr Speaker, if you did not know, and other members likewise, each month this year there has been a steady increase in the number of deaths on the roads over and above the longer term trend. So the effectiveness of the perception is no more. We must get a more accurate and effective device. I know motorists who have driven past a speed camera at speeds which they knew were higher than 110, and no photograph was ever sent to them. So the technology is flawed. I know of other motorists who have driven past and been photographed and sworn that they were not travelling in excess of the limit. I would believe them, because I know the technology is flawed.

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

#### THEBARTON WOMEN'S SERVICE ASSOCIATION

Adjourned debate on the motion of Mr Becker:

That this House congratulates the Thebarton Women's Service Association on 82 years of outstanding community service.

(Continued from 25 August. Page 493.)

**Mr HERON (Peake):** I rise tonight to support the motion from the member for Hanson in supporting the Thebarton Women's Service Association on their 72 years of outstanding community service. I understand that this association is the oldest charity organisation in the town of Thebarton which was established in approximately 1921. From the Thebarton Women's Service Association, some 13 other branches were formed around Adelaide in various other suburbs, but, unfortunately, of the associations like that, only seven are now operating, those being Kensington and Norwood, Port Adelaide, Brighton, Woodville, Burnside and Campbelltown. For organisations like this, supporting the needy families in the community, we cannot take our hats off high enough to those sort of people who do that work.

The history of the Thebarton Women's Service Association, as outlined by the member for Hanson, as he said in this House on 25 August, says it all. Over those 72 years, some 1 400 women have been members of that association. They not only help people in Thebarton but they have supported over 140 other charity organisations throughout Adelaide. On many occasions over the past few years I have attended functions where the Thebarton Women's Service Association has given its support, and it was only recently that they assisted me in a function I held in Thebarton so the people of Thebarton could meet the Premier. On that occasion they did a magnificent job.

Also, there is talk around the suburb of Thebarton that an historical society is about to be formed and if that is the case I will be putting forward to that society that it look very closely at the history of this women's association, especially as was outlined by the mover of the motion, the member for Hanson. I congratulate the past and present members of the Thebarton Women's Service Association for a job very well done, and I ask all members to support the motion.

**Mr BECKER (Hanson):** I thank the member for Peake for his concern, sincerity and support for the motion. This is a wonderful organisation that has served the people so well over 72 years, and I commend the motion to the House.

Motion carried.

#### MITCHAM HILLS

Adjourned debate on motion of Mr S.G. Evans:

That in the opinion of this House there is an urgent need for more police resources to be made available for proper policing to be achieved in the Mitcham Hills.

(Continued from 11 August. Page 201.)

**Mr De LAINE (Price):** I oppose the motion moved by the member for Davenport. An increased police presence in the Blackwood Mitcham Hills area has been a matter constantly pursued by the member for Davenport. The honourable member has agitated for the provision of a 24 hour police service in Blackwood for a considerable length of time. A 24 hour residential service in this area is impracticable and unwarranted and I will explain the reasons why. Blackwood initially operated as a country station, and a sergeant and five members provided an office and limited response functions for 16 hours a day. The area was then aligned with Stirling and the Adelaide Hills. This service was reduced to a nine to five office function only in the late 1970s. The area was then aligned with the Darlington division, after the metropolitan reorganisation of 1986. This decision reflected the demography of the area and the most efficient police services delivery projections.

Blackwood has never operated as a 24 hour station, but about 30 years ago had a resident sergeant in attendance. The Blackwood area is serviced by patrols from the Darlington patrol base on a 24 hour basis and an office service at the Blackwood station is provided by a member from Darlington between 10.20 a.m. and 4 p.m. on Monday, Wednesday, Thursday and Friday. The Blackwood police office is non-operational and takes in accident reports, firearms registrations and general police inquiry. An officer receiving a request for police assistance radios or telephones the Police Communications Centre for assistance in that regard.

The member for Davenport implied that crime and anti-social behaviour in the Mitcham Hills areas is worse than in other suburbs. The fact is that crime statistics for 1992-93 show that offences against property compared with the South



Australian victimisation averages per rate of population, and victimisation rates for offences against the person and public order offences are less than the South Australian average. The crime rate in the Blackwood area is no higher than any other comparable area and is lower than many. There is no demonstrated need for increased policing in the area, but the demands represent the unrealistic wish of some local residents for a village atmosphere isolated from mainstream suburbia.

The honourable member also asserts that the reopening of Blackwood police station as a 24 hour station, having a member permanently stationed there or having a patrol base, would reduce crime, anti-social behaviour and reduced police response time. The cost would be considerable: at least 10 people would be required to man a two person patrol providing 24 hour coverage and extra vehicles and furniture and equipment would be needed. The Blackwood police station would need many thousands of dollars spent on it to bring it up to occupational health and safety standards. The small office at the moment is satisfactory for the limited function it performs.

The majority of the Blackwood police station consists of an unoccupied residence. All requests for police assistance are channelled via police communications and it is doubtful if response times would be improved. The honourable member also implied that Darlington police patrols cannot handle the problems. Many people have been arrested, reported and cautioned for a variety of offences, including breakings, arson, property damage and behaviour offences. In March 1993 a female was arrested for arson at Blackwood High School, the ANZ Bank and the senior citizens' club.

The strategy used is to rely on public cooperation and community based programs supported by reactive police patrol attention. Both are producing results comparable with other districts. Suggestions have been made by residents for the installation of mobile telephones in patrol vehicles to enable police to contact parents. Darlington police have been instructed to advise parents of youths coming under notice. In an effort to combat youth crime in the Blackwood/Mitcham Hills area many policing strategies have been adopted over the past few months. These include special plain clothes patrols, increased uniform patrols, utilising the Regional Response Group, Star Division, transit police and mounted police targeting trouble spots. Many offenders have been cautioned, arrested or reported for a variety of minor or serious offences.

In addition, Neighbourhood Watch groups have been actively engaged and encouraged to support their local police and they work together in an effort to maintain harmonious relationships in the Blackwood community and environs. The Blackwood Youth Project and the Mitcham Anti-Vandalism Committee have police involvement, including the Darlington Divisional Commander, and they have made a major contribution in assisting 'at risk' children. A blue light funded camp was conducted at the Echunga police reserve in April 1993 for anti-social youths. Those who participated interacted with local police, transit police and other community groups.

Recently, meetings were held at Mitcham council with senior police personnel to address the Blackwood situation. The Mitcham council, transit police, Regional Response Group, social workers, church workers and the Youth Support Group discussed the Mitcham Hills program and possible outcomes. The diversionary programs, which were so successful in Hindley Street, Modbury and Salisbury, are now being implemented at Blackwood. Further meetings are

planned by the groups mentioned. An encouraging outcome is the establishment of a committee under the direction of a social worker comprised of the 'at risk' children to discuss strategies in an effort to solve the real problem of anti-social youths. During the past financial year Darlington patrols attended 21 245 incidents and the average response time was 12 minutes. This compares with the metropolitan average response time of 11 minutes.

The member for Davenport is correct in asserting that people in past times could leave doors unlocked and did not need high fences or dogs, and I agree entirely with him, because it is the same everywhere. That was the situation in the Port Adelaide district but, unfortunately, things have changed everywhere and not just in the Mitcham Hills area—they have changed all over the world in that regard. The honourable member is also correct in saying that community attitudes have changed. Unfortunately, they have changed for the worst. This is a challenge to Governments to find ways of changing these attitudes.

The findings of the Select Committee on Juvenile Justice and the subsequent legislation that followed will go a long way towards addressing many of the problems caused in our community by young offenders. It is unrealistic to say that crime and vandalism can be stopped by providing more resources. They can assist in the apprehension of wrongdoers, but they will not prevent crime occurring in the first place. Given the constant requests by members of the Mitcham Hills community for increased police resources, the situation is monitored carefully and continuously by the police. A new operation codenamed 'Clean Up' covering the Mitcham Hills and other problem areas within the Darlington Division will commence on 11 November this year and continue until 30 March 1994.

**Mr S.G. EVANS (Davenport):** I am disappointed with that part of the honourable member's response saying that he does not believe there is a need for greater services in the Mitcham Hills area and that, therefore, he opposes the motion. I am disappointed about that. I know many people will be disappointed. Because of the shortage of time, I cannot say more, but I ask members to think about this, because it is a serious problem—over \$2 million in fires and one person could be responsible for much of that. I ask members to support the motion.

The House divided on the motion:

AYES (22)

Allison, H.	Armitage, M. H.
Arnold, P. B.	Baker, D. S.
Baker, S. J.	Becker, H.
Blacker, P. D.	Brindal, M. K.
Brown, D. C.	Eastick, B. C.
Evans, S. G. (teller)	Gunn, G. M.
Ingerson, G. A.	Kotz, D. C.
Lewis, I. P.	Matthew, W. A.
Meier, E. J.	Olsen, J. W.
Oswald, J. K. G.	Such, R. B.
Venning, I. H.	Wotton, D. C.

NOES (22)

Arnold, L. M. F.	Atkinson, M. J.
Bannon, J. C.	Blevins, F. T.
De Laine, M. R. (teller)	Evans, M. J.
Ferguson, D. M.	Gregory, R. J.
Groom, T. R.	Hamilton, K. C.
Hemmings, T. H.	Heron, V. S.
Holloway, P.	Hopgood, D. J.

## NOES (cont.)

Hutchison, C. F.	Klunder, J. H. C.
Lenehan, S. M.	Mayes, M. K.
McKee, C. D. T.	Quirke, J. A.
Rann, M. D.	Trainer, J. P.

## PAIRS

Cashmore, J. L.	Crafter, G. J.
-----------------	----------------

**The SPEAKER:** There being 22 Ayes and 22 Noes, the casting vote is for the Chair. I fully sympathise with the motion moved by the member for Davenport; I am sure every member here would desire more police resources in every district in the State. Every electoral area would like more police resources. I do sympathise, but I cannot stand out for one more than the other. If the motion had referred to all areas, the vote might have been different. However, before casting my vote, I also draw members' attention to Standing Order 67 relating to their entering and leaving the Chamber. I cast my vote for the Noes. The motion thus passes in the negative.

**Mr ATKINSON:** On a point of order, Mr Speaker.

**The SPEAKER:** Order! Before the honourable member can take a point of order, he shall be in his proper place. I point out that the honourable member is not in his proper place. When he resumes his proper place, the Chair will contemplate a point of order.

**Mr ATKINSON:** On a point of order, Mr Speaker, it seems to me that a proposition either passes or fails.

**The SPEAKER:** Order! Before the honourable member continues, I point out that a point of order is not a matter of 'seems': either there is a point of order or there is not. If the honourable member has a point of order, I ask him to put it; if not, a debate will not be entered into.

**Mr ATKINSON:** The point is that passing in the negative is a contradiction.

**The SPEAKER:** Order! The honourable member will resume his seat. He has raised this point previously. It has been explained. However, if he wishes a blackboard and a sand tray to be used, I will do it. I will explain to him through Erskine May and all the other primers and bibles we use in this place why it is so. However, it has been explained very clearly to the honourable member before. If he wishes it to be explained again and if he wishes to approach the Chair when the Chair is not in the Chair, it can be explained again slowly and clearly so that he understands it.

**Mr ATKINSON:** I would appreciate it being explained to the whole House.

**The SPEAKER:** Whether the honourable member wishes it to be explained to the whole House is not relevant at all.

### STATUTES AMENDMENT (SUPERANNUATION) BILL

**The Hon. FRANK BLEVINS (Treasurer)** obtained leave and introduced a Bill for an Act to amend the Superannuation Act 1988 and the Police Superannuation Act 1990. Read a first time.

**The Hon. FRANK BLEVINS:** I move:

*That this Bill be now read a second time.*

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

Leave granted.

This Bill seeks to make amendments to both the *Superannuation Act* and the *Police Superannuation Act*.

The amendments are all of a technical nature.

The amendments, if approved by the Parliament, will provide clarification to certain provisions, and improve the operation of the scheme, particularly in the area of investment activities and through the adoption of simpler early retirement formulas for certain groups of contributors. The amendments will also remove some minor inconsistencies and overcome some technical deficiencies.

Overall the proposed amendments will improve the operations of both the main State contributory scheme and the Police Superannuation Scheme.

I now wish to refer to some of the more specific changes proposed in the Bill.

An amendment is proposed to the provisions in the *Superannuation Act* that provide clarification in those circumstances where it is unclear whether in fact a contributor has resigned or not. An additional provision is to be inserted that will also provide clarification in the situation where a contributor has his or her employment terminated on the ground of incompetence. In such circumstances, the proposed new clause will specify that such a person will be deemed to have resigned. In conjunction with the amendment proposed in clause 4 of the Bill, other minor amendments are included in the Bill to make it clear that where a person leaves the scheme for any reason (other than invalidity, retrenchment or death) and the member is over the age of 55 years, the normal early retirement benefits are payable. The person under the age of 55 years who has his or her services terminated because of incompetence will be able to preserve his or her accrued benefits.

The Bill also contains proposed amendments to the provisions of the *Superannuation Act* and the *Police Superannuation Act* that deal with the investment of the fund by the South Australian Superannuation Fund Trust. The existing wording of section 19 of the *Superannuation Act* and Section 11 of the *Police Superannuation Act* is to be amended. In respect of investment in property outside Australia and in real property outside the State, it is proposed that the Minister be able to approve of a class of investment in addition to specific investments. This amendment will enable much quicker and more efficient investment switching to occur within approved parameters.

The Bill also includes a proposed general provision that will limit the level of pensions payable under the state scheme at seventy five per cent of final salary. This limit was referred to when introducing the *Superannuation (Scheme Revision) Amendment Act 1992*, late last year. However, as some existing formulas in the Act will in future years and in certain circumstances enable a benefit to exceed this level, it is proposed to include a general limiting clause in the scheme's provisions. The Commonwealth's superannuation standards also set a maximum limit of seventy five per cent of salary for pensions.

Clause 8 of the Bill introduces a revised formula for calculating the benefits payable to state scheme contributors who resigned before 1 July 1992, elected to preserve their accrued benefit and are under the age of 60 years when the benefit is claimed. In order to calculate benefits for this group of contributors, reference is now required to be made to the early retirement formula that existed before the Act was amended late last year under the *Superannuation (Scheme Revision) Amendment Act*. The administration of the scheme will accordingly be enhanced by incorporating back into the provisions of the existing Act, a simplified formula that is based on the benefit structure that applied before the restructuring occurred. The benefit structure is based on a maximum pension of 45.5% of final salary being payable at age 55 years.

An amendment is also proposed to be made to subsection 9 of section 39 of the *Superannuation Act*, which currently excludes employees of Australian National Railways Commission from the option to preserve their accrued pension on resignation. The modification proposed will enable an employee of Australian National who resigns to take up employment with the new National Rail Corporation, to elect to preserve their accrued benefit. This will overcome potential difficulties created where, in particular, freight locomotive driver operations are effectively being moved from Australian National to the National Rail Corporation. In most cases the locomotive drivers are only resigning to apply for what is seen as their own job but with a new employer.

Clause 10 of the Bill deals with a technical deficiency in the existing formula under Clause 6 of Schedule 1 of the *Superannuation Act*. The amendment seeks to incorporate the productivity benefit enhancement into the existing formula as occurred with other formulas under the Amendment Act late last year. This same clause of the Bill also brings back into the provisions of the Act, the early retirement formula which is to apply to the small group of contribu-

tors who are still active members of the scheme but are not entitled to receive the benefits under the enhanced early retirement formula introduced under the *Superannuation (Scheme Revision) Amendment Act 1992*. The group referred to are the employees of the Australian National Railways Commission who are still contributing to the state scheme. The formula being inserted into the Act is a simplified version of the old early retirement benefit formula. The level of benefits payable under the existing formula that applies to this group of employees, is maintained under the new simplified formula being proposed.

#### Explanation of Clauses

##### *Clause 1: Short title, Clause 2: Commencement*

Clauses 1 and 2 are formal.

##### *Clause 3: Interpretation*

Clause 3 explains references to "the principal Act" in the Bill.

##### *Clause 4: Amendment of s. 4—Interpretation*

Clause 4 makes it clear that a contributor to the State Scheme whose employment terminates because of his or her incompetence is entitled to the benefits applicable on resignation.

##### *Clause 5: Amendment of s. 19—Investment of the Fund*

Clause 5 replaces section 19(3) of the *Superannuation Act 1988* with two new subsections. These subsections will enable the Minister to authorise a class of investments by the South Australian Superannuation Fund Investment Trust and to vary or revoke such an authorisation.

##### *Clause 6: Amendment of s. 34—Retirement*

Clause 6 amends section 34 of the principal Act. Paragraph (a) amends the definition of "B" in subsection (2) to make it clear that "B" does not include a period when the contributor was not an active contributor. New subsection (5) added by paragraph (b) limits the amount of retirement pensions to 75 per cent of final salary. Subsection (6) sets out the circumstances in which an old scheme contributor will be taken to have retired.

*Clause 7: Amendment of s. 38—Death of contributor* Clause 7 amends section 38 of the principal Act. At the moment benefits for the spouse and children of a contributor whose employment is terminated by death and who has not reached the age of retirement are based on full contribution points credited to the contributor up to the age of retirement. This is not appropriate if the contributor has been employed part time during part or all of his or her period of employment. The new provision inserted by this clause reduces the number of contribution points to be credited in respect of future years of service where the contributor had been employed on a part time basis in a way that mirrors the basis on which contribution points are extrapolated under section 24(4).

*Clause 8: Amendment of s. 39—Resignation and preservation of benefits*

Clause 8 amends section 39 of the principal Act. Paragraph (a) makes it clear that the voluntary termination of employment by a contributor before 55 is to be regarded as resignation. This ties in with earlier amendments that provide that voluntary termination of employment after 55 is to be regarded as retirement. Paragraph (b) changes the reference in subsection (5) from 60 years to 65 years for consistency with other provisions of the Act (see section 28(2)). Paragraph (c) inserts new subsections in section 39. New subsections (9) and (11) are inserted in substitution for subsections (8c) and (9) respectively. Subsection (10) provides a new formula for early retirement of contributors who resigned from employment before 1 July 1992. Subsection (12) provides a definition of "resignation".

*Clause 9: Amendment of s. 39a—Resignation or retirement pursuant to a voluntary separation package*

Clause 9 amends section 39a of the principal Act. This section was drawn on the basis that a contributor was able to resign from employment up to the age of retirement. Earlier amendments made by the Bill make it clear that voluntary termination of employment by a contributor after 55 is to be regarded as retirement. The amendments to section 39a are consequential on this change.

##### *Clause 10: Amendment of schedule 1—Transitional provisions*

Clause 10 amends schedule 1 of the principal Act. Paragraphs (a), (b) and (c) insert a new formula and definitions in clause 6 of the schedule. Paragraph (e) inserts a simplified early retirement formula into clause 15 of the schedule.

##### *Clause 11: Amendment of s. 11—Investment of the Fund*

Clause 11 makes an amendment to the *Police Superannuation Act 1990* that corresponds to the amendment made by clause 5 to the *Superannuation Act 1988*.

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

## STATUTES REPEAL (OBSOLETE AGRICULTURAL ACTS) BILL

**The Hon. T.R. GROOM (Minister of Primary Industries)** obtained leave and introduced a Bill for an Act to repeal the Canned Fruits Marketing Act 1980, the Farmers Assistance Act 1933, the Primary Producers Assistance Act 1943 and the Primary Producers Debts Act 1935. Read a first time.

**The Hon. T.R. GROOM:** I move:

*That this Bill be now read a second time.*

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

Leave granted.

This short Bill repeals four measures that have become moribund. The *Canned Fruits Marketing Act 1980* ratified the Commonwealth/States scheme for the marketing and equalisation of certain Australian canned fruits. That scheme was dismantled in 1988/89 with the repeal of the Commonwealth Act and subsequent winding up of the Australian Canned Fruits Corporation.

The *Primary Producers' Debts Act 1935* was superseded by the *Primary Producers Assistance Act 1943*. The latter in turn has been rendered superfluous by more recent legislation. There are no accounts under either Act.

In the course of inquiries into this situation, the existence of the *Farmers Assistance Act 1933* was discovered. This measure has clearly been inoperative for decades.

The provisions of the Bill are as follows:

*Clause 1* is formal.

*Clause 2* provides for commencement on a day to be fixed by proclamation.

*Clause 3* repeals the *Canned Fruits Marketing Act 1980*.

*Clause 4* repeals the *Farmers Assistance Act 1933*.

*Clause 5* repeals the *Primary Producers Assistance Act 1943*.

*Clause 6* repeals the *Primary Producers' Debts Act 1935*.

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

## CHILDREN'S PROTECTION BILL

In Committee.

(Continued from 12 October. Page 867.)

Title.

**The CHAIRMAN:** The Minister was about to answer a question from the member for Newland.

**The Hon. M.J. EVANS:** The title of the Bill is significant and we debated it previously in relation to the young offenders legislation. In this case, the Bill covers predominantly children from nought to 12 years, in the majority, with the number of older young people being more limited. However, I can certainly understand the honourable member's interest in having the title amended to include the word 'younger person'; it might read 'Children and Younger Persons Protection Act'. That is not at all unreasonable, as it follows the New Zealand model.

However, it is not a simple matter to do that as extensive changes would be required to the wording of the Bill and at this point in the proceedings it would be better to adopt the measure as it is, all members giving consideration over the next few days to the most appropriate title with the final decision being taken in another place at a later time.

**The Hon. D.C. WOTTON:** The member for Newland is not in the Chamber at present, but I have discussed the matter with her. I know she feels very strongly about it. I appreciate the assurance that the Minister has given that the matter will be considered further in another place. It is appropriate that we reconsider the title of the Bill because, while the Bill will deal mainly with younger children, it recognises young

people of an older age. It is appropriate that the title reflect the fact that we are dealing with children and younger persons also. I support what the member for Newland had to say in this place previously. I am pleased to learn that the Minister is prepared to consider the matter further and to have it considered in another place.

Title passed.

**The Hon. M.J. EVANS (Minister of Health, Family and Community Services):** I move:

*That this Bill be now read a third time.*

**The Hon. D.C. WOTTON (Heysen):** I will be brief in the third reading stage but I do want to make some comment. This has been a very difficult and complex debate. It reflects the legislation: it is complex legislation, as was said during the second reading stage by a number of members on both sides of the House. It is recognised as being a very sensitive issue in dealing with the care and protection of children. As I have said previously, I believe that families do have a responsibility in providing care for their children, and the majority of people feel that way and acknowledge that that is the case. They acknowledge also that they are responsible for decision making to a large extent.

The Bill, as it comes out of Committee, does contain a number of progressive measures and certainly is a significant improvement on the original draft that was circulated. I reiterate what I have said previously: this legislation must be child centred but family focused. The Opposition has attempted, during the debate, to put more balance into the legislation but has failed to do so in this House, and I must say that, regrettably, I believe that the Minister has been rather stubborn in his attitude towards some of the changes that the Opposition wished to make.

A number of the issues that were raised by way of amendment in this place will be further addressed in another place. There were a number of particular areas where we felt that there was a need for change. We believe that the care and protection coordinator should be independent of the Department for Family and Community Services. We believe it is essential that every child has the right to have an independent advocate. We expressed concern about and a need to reconsider the definition of 'abuse', 'neglect' and 'at risk'. Most importantly, we feel it necessary to ensure in the legislation that the child's best interests are paramount. I realise that the Minister, in the amendment that he brought before this House, has improved the Bill slightly, but the Opposition feels that the amendment that was put forward from this side of the House is preferable to that which was introduced by the Minister and supported in this House because the Government has the numbers in this place.

I want to acknowledge again the considerable amount of representation that has been received regarding this legislation. That representation has been varied, and even as late as today I have received further representation from interested bodies that are concerned about some parts of the legislation and have sought to have amendments introduced. I recognise, in saying that representation has been varied, that it has ranged from very strong support for the Bill generally in its present form, from organisations such as SACOSS, to proposals for a large number of changes that were seen to be necessary and were promoted by the child protection coalition. Again I refer to the large number of organisations that now make up that child protection coalition.

This Bill is much improved on what we had originally. It can still be improved: it should be improved. We will attempt in another place to improve it to ensure that the legislation is

child centred but family focused. I would only hope that, in another place, the Government will support the amendments or that other members in another place will support some of the amendments that will be brought before that Chamber.

**Mrs HUTCHISON (Stuart):** I will be brief in my remarks, but I would like to make a few comments at the third reading stage. This Bill emanated from the substantial work that was done by the Select Committee on Juvenile Justice, and the Minister at the bench, the member for Henley Beach and also the member for Light were members of that committee. There was an enormous amount of evidence taken and an enormous amount of work done. As a result of that, four Bills were proposed, one of which we are now debating. This Bill has the potential to make an enormous difference to the way in which young people are looked after in this State. The previous system, whilst it had applied for some time and was working well in some areas, needed to be looked at. That is exactly what was done by the Juvenile Justice Select Committee and in the preparation of these Bills.

I know that the Minister himself has put a lot of work into this, because it has been a particular interest area of his, and the member for Heysen has also had a particular interest in this area, as have all of us who have been involved in it. I am very pleased to have been able to support this Bill in its passage through this House, and I look forward to its promulgation, together with the other measures in the package, as soon as possible.

**The Hon. M.J. EVANS (Minister of Health, Family and Community Services):** I would like to thank members for the constructive way in which they have approached this whole debate and for their comments on the third reading. I regret that I cannot agree entirely with the member for Heysen when he refers to further pursuing some of the matters that he raised in this House, because I do not think they would assist the way in which the Bill is structured at all and would be quite counterproductive to the views which all members have expressed in relation to these measures. However, I appreciate there are some in the community who share his opinion on that, and I believe it to be a positive and genuine one, even though I personally do not accept the basis upon which he puts it forward. However, I am sure that that debate will continue on another day. At this stage, I have much pleasure in commending the third reading to the House.

Bill read a third time and passed.

#### COMMUNITY WELFARE (CHILDREN) AMENDMENT BILL

Adjourned debate on second reading.

(Continued from 9 September. Page 689.)

**The Hon. D.C. WOTTON (Heysen):** This is a Bill that can be seen to be part of the much larger package. I said in the debate on the Bill that has just been passed that there was some uncertainty in the community about how this Bill fitted in with other Bills in that package. There has been long debate on the Children's Protection Bill and the young offenders legislation, both of which have an impact on the legislation that we are now debating. I have been rather intrigued with the lack of input in regard to this legislation in comparison with the Bill that has just been passed, as I indicated previously.

That Bill involved a considerable amount of representation by a large number of organisations and individuals, whereas I have received very little representation on this Bill. I am not sure whether that means that there has not been a lot of consultation. I hope that is not the case. I hope that the same organisations that made representation regarding the Children's Protection Bill would also be aware of the matters being addressed in this legislation. I should also say that, as I have mentioned in the other Bills that have been debated as part of this package, it would be the intention—if there is a change of Government in the near future—of a Liberal Government to reconsider these Bills which make up the package and in particular the Community Welfare Act which, again, is a complex piece of legislation. It is a measure that needs to be addressed and considered carefully.

The Bill before the House amends the Community Welfare Act of 1972. There are a number of issues I wish to refer to in Committee. As I said earlier the Bill that we are now addressing comes as a result of the passing of the Young Offenders Act, the Youth Court Act and the Children's Protection Bill, which was debated in this place extensively last evening and again this evening. The Bill deletes the administrative provisions in the Community Welfare Act for children to be placed under the guardianship of the Minister; the provisions which set out the Minister's responsibility in regard to the interstate transfer of children under guardianship; and the powers of the Director-General for the care and protection of children under the guardianship of the Minister.

It also relates to the provisions for the establishment of regional and local child protection panels, which are repealed under this Bill. Notification of suspected child abuse offences against children, medical examination and treatment of children, and the temporary care of children in hospital are also provisions that are repealed under this legislation because, of course, they are dealt with under the Children's Protection Bill. The community welfare forums that have been known in this State for some time are also abolished under this legislation and a section is inserted to ensure that the Minister and the department consult with relevant organisations in providing services to the community.

At the appropriate time I wish to ask questions of the Minister about this particular clause. Principles for dealing with children to ensure that all action is taken in the best interests of the child are provided in the Children's Protection Bill. I do not want to go into a number of the areas that were referred to in connection with that legislation but that is a controversial part of the Bill. The principles for dealing with children under the Community Welfare Act are no longer required and are repealed as a result of this legislation. The provision relating to the establishment of facilities for children and for foster care have been recast to bring them into line, according to the Minister's second reading, with current language programs, procedures and practice.

The matter involving the responsibilities of foster parents is a very complex one and it is a matter that I intend to raise during the second reading. The opportunity has been taken to delete, insert and amend clauses in the Community Welfare Act of 1972 to bring it into line with the objects, definitions, provisions and terminology of the Children's Protection Bill which we passed only a few moments ago. Reference to the Department for Community Welfare has been replaced with one to the Department for Family and Community Services. The Director-General is replaced with the Chief Executive Officer. 'Shall', a word which I am informed is not used in modern drafting, has been replaced by 'must', 'will' or

'should'. I guess we could spend some time debating whether that is an actual improvement but to some extent we have to depend on advice given to the Parliament in those matters.

The language has also been amended in the Act to make it non-gender specific. Then, of course, a number of transitional provisions are dealt with under schedule 1. Guardianship orders made under the Community Welfare Act will run their term but there is provision in this Bill to cancel an area or appeal against a refusal to cancel. The same powers and duties apply to the Minister and Chief Executive Officer in respect of children subject to guardianship orders as apply under the Children's Protection Bill.

If I have any concern about this Bill it is the enormous amount of power given to the Chief Executive Officer of the department. I can assure the Minister that it is not the intention of the Opposition to attempt to change that situation in this debate this evening, but I am sure that all members would agree from reading the legislation that the power given to the Chief Executive Officer is certainly extensive. It is one that I personally would intend watching very carefully. It is not my intention to delay the House any longer in regard to this legislation, although there are a number of matters to which I wish to refer in Committee. The Opposition supports the legislation.

**The Hon. M.J. EVANS (Minister of Health, Family and Community Services):** I appreciate the support of the Opposition, as expressed by the member for Heysen, for this legislation. This Bill along with the companion measure, which the House will be invited to debate shortly, are both relatively technical Bills which incorporate a number of changes to the basic legislation to bring it up to date and to incorporate necessary amendments which flow from the juvenile justice and children's protection legislation which the House has already considered.

The member for Heysen indicated that he had not received as many representations on this Bill as on others. It would have to be said that these Bills contain very little new policy: they are basically about ensuring that the legislation is consistent and not about reforming the Community Welfare Act. I agree with him that the Act would well bear a thorough review designed to update the policy aspects of legislation as well. However, I believed that it was most appropriate that in fact that should await another day and that to incorporate policy changes in this area as well as the major changes we have made with respect to the young offenders and children's protection provisions would not be an appropriate response at this time. It is much better to ensure that we have those provisions tidied up and properly organised in all the relevant Acts, and then at another time the House could tackle the substantive reform of the Community Welfare Act itself.

On that basis we have generally limited ourselves in the Community Welfare Act amendments to those which are necessary to bring the Act up to date and to incorporate the many redefinitions that are necessary following the Children's Protection and Young Offenders' legislation. I appreciate the support of the Opposition and commend the measure to the House.

Bill read a second time.

In Committee.

Clauses 1 to 6 passed.

Clause 7—'Objectives of the Minister and the department.'

**The Hon. D.C. WOTTON:** This clause, which amends section 10, is an important part of the Bill, because nowadays

other ethnic and cultural values must be considered. Does the Minister have any particular avenue by which he intends to ensure that this is the case? During the Estimates Committees I asked the Minister how many people working in the department, for example, were of different ethnic groups within the community, and the Minister provided some information on that matter. However, is there any particular avenue by which he proposes to ensure that the clause is adhered to?

**The Hon. M.J. EVANS:** It is essential that this kind of clause should be in this sort of legislation. The principal purpose is to alert the Minister and the members of the department, when they deal with policy matters and individuals within the community, to be aware of the cultural sensitivities and differences between various groups within our society. People having been put on notice about that requirement, the most appropriate mechanism is often to consult the various representative groups. For example, within the Aboriginal community there are a number of groups which represent the cultural values and traditions of Aboriginal people.

That is also true of a number of other ethnic groups within our society. Usually, the policies are discussed with those representative organisations, and the procedures and case handbooks which are prepared by the department reflect the need to take that into account. In particular cases, where individuals and sensitive cultural values are involved, departmental officers can seek advice on those matters. Principally it is to ensure that they are on notice about the importance of this matter. It is not a legal prescription in the sense of having a criminal penalty attached to it; rather, it is Parliament saying to the department, 'We wish you to be aware and to take notice of these matters.' It is then a matter for the professionalism of the officers concerned to take that into account in their daily work.

Clause passed.

Clause 8—'Consultation.'

**The Hon. D.C. WOTTON:** Again, this is an important part of the Bill. Clause 21(1) provides:

The Minister and the Department should, in providing services to the community, where appropriate—

- (a) consult with any Government department, agency or instrumentality and any non-government organisation that provides similar services to the community. . .

Again, I wonder whether the Minister has any particular mechanism to take into account the views of non-government organisations. I know that the Minister consults non-government agencies, as I have in recent times. There is a large number of non-government agencies: some very large, others quite small. It is probably more difficult in Opposition than in Government to keep in touch with all those non-government agencies. As there is a certain amount of duplication in the activities of those agencies and of some Government departments, it is essential that there be appropriate consultation between the Government and the non-government organisations. Can the Minister provide any information to the Committee which would suggest the type of mechanisms that would be used to ensure that is the case? Going further into that clause, we find:

The Minister and the Department should, in providing services to the community, where appropriate—

- (b) encourage members of the public and organisations to make known to the department—

and it goes on to spell out any comments, any areas of unmet needs, any recommendations and any other matters relevant

to the provision of services by the department. Subclause (2) provides:

The Minister must ensure that appropriate procedures are available to allow the complaints of clients of the department to be considered and, if appropriate, acted upon by the department.

Can the Minister indicate what procedures are available to enable that to happen?

**The Hon. M.J. EVANS:** Consultation speaks for itself. To some extent this clause sets out the requirements of the department to consult, and the officers are working on a daily basis with those from the non-government sector. Indeed, consultation on the development of programs occurs with the executive officers and staff of non-government agencies on an almost routine and daily basis, and I have encouraged the department to develop programs in cooperation and consultation with those non-government organisations. I believe that is an important part of the way in which the department is moving in the 1990s. That occurs on a regular basis. Departmental officers do not need a plan to do that as long as they understand the requirement that it must occur. The people involved are well known to them, and many other peak organisations like SACOSS and such are available for extensive consultation on a regular basis. Consultation in that context has almost become a way of life these days.

It is also important that the complaints are considered. The department has a senior officer at Director level who is available to consult with any client who is dissatisfied. That officer acts as an ombudsman at the point of first contact with the department and is able to work directly with the Director-General of Family and Community Services at operational level and, if necessary, ensure that the appropriate action is taken by officers within the department. That is the mechanism.

If clients are still dissatisfied, they can approach the Minister, the Ombudsman or a member of Parliament. There are external mechanisms for accountability which are well known. Within the department itself—and I have often seen this mechanism used—when a complaint is received it will be referred to this senior officer so that it can be seen that the proper steps have been taken to ensure that the client's requirements are addressed by a senior officer within the department. That does not always mean that there is agreement on the outcome of these matters, but at least the client is satisfied that a senior officer has examined and fully investigated the allegation or complaint.

**Mr MEIER:** Mr Chairman, this is a very important Bill and I therefore draw your attention to the state of the Committee.

*A quorum having been formed:*

Clause passed.

Clause 9—'Special Welfare Funds.'

**The Hon. D.C. WOTTON:** Clause 9 deals with the funds that are to be maintained by the Minister, in the first instance a fund for the Family and Community Development program and, secondly, a fund for the Early Intervention and Substitute Care program. This clause provides that an application for the allocation of money under this section must be made to the Minister in a manner and form approved by the Minister. The Minister may allocate money under this section on such conditions as the Minister thinks fit. Can the Minister indicate whether there is a criterion that he works by in determining which money should be allocated or the conditions under which the Minister should suggest that funding is worthy of being provided?

**The Hon. M.J. EVANS:** In the circumstances it will be better if I obtain a detailed response for the honourable member and write to him with that detail.

Clause passed.

Clause 10—'Amendment of heading.'

**The Hon. D.C. WOTTON:** Clause 10 refers to the Children's Interests Bureau. I did not have the opportunity in the debate last evening because of the lack of time to refer to this matter in detail. I indicated to the House that I was aware that there was a draft Bill circulating in regard to the Children's Interests Bureau and the future of that organisation. Is the Minister prepared to provide more information to the Committee regarding the future of the Children's Interests Bureau and when does he anticipate that the legislation that has been circulated will be introduced into this House?

**The Hon. M.J. EVANS:** There is no doubt about the future of the Children's Interests Bureau, at least in my mind and that of the Government. There is certainly every intention that the bureau should be continued. There is indeed, as the honourable member has said, a draft Bill. He indicated some lack of satisfaction with the terms of that Bill, but did not actually indicate why he was not satisfied with it.

**The Hon. D.C. Wotton:** I can do so.

**The Hon. M.J. EVANS:** Not this evening perhaps, but at some more auspicious moment I would be quite happy to receive his comments on that. Certainly if it is at all possible I would like to have that Bill on the table of the House in the next few weeks, so I will be considering that with my colleagues and determining whether we can bring that in in the near future. Notwithstanding the opportunities for enhancing the role of the bureau through new legislation, the reality is that it exists now and as far as the Government is concerned it will continue to exist.

**The Hon. D.C. WOTTON:** I do not want to get into a lot of debate on this subject at this stage, but I want to express my concern about the comments that I am receiving from the organisations and individuals within the community who feel that they will not be provided with the opportunity to have appropriate consultation in that legislation, and I would suggest to the Committee that there is some concern in the community in that the Children's Interests Bureau as it exists at the present has been rather sat on by the Minister and has not been given the opportunity to make appropriate comment about its own future. I believe that is unfortunate, because as I said last evening I have considerable respect for those who have served in that bureau over a period of time and I have considerable respect for the aims and objectives that bureau has had. I would hope that the Children's Interests Bureau continues to be a real force, a watchdog in regard to children's welfare in the future, and I believe that it is important that there be the opportunity for wide consultation in the community and in particular that the opportunity be provided for the bureau itself to be heard in the community in regard to the future responsibilities that that bureau might have.

**The Hon. M.J. EVANS:** I have not detected any lack of ability or enthusiasm on the part of the Children's Interests Bureau to comment on matters, including that of its own future. Indeed, I have discussed on several occasions the terms of the draft Bill with members of the Children's Interests Bureau and quite extensive discussions have been held in that regard. We are not debating that Bill now, but I do understand that the draft Bill has been circulated and comments are being received. I can certainly indicate to the

honourable member that this matter will not be rushed through this place, and ample opportunity will be given for consultation on that Bill with any interested member of the public at all.

Clause passed.

Clauses 11 to 13 passed.

Clause 14—'The purpose of foster care.'

**The Hon. D.C. WOTTON:** This clause and a number of clauses remaining in the Bill deal with the matter of foster care. I ask the Minister whether in his opinion there has been appropriate consultation with those involved in foster care. The Minister mentioned earlier that there is not a lot of new policy in this Bill. I understand that certainly there are a lot of changes in regard to the responsibilities that foster parents have in this Bill, and I want to be quite sure that there has been appropriate consultation. While the Minister is seeking advice on that—and I also raised this matter during the Estimates I would raise again the concern that has been brought to my attention by some foster parents in regard to the overall program under which they work.

I was not satisfied with the response that the Minister gave during the Estimates Committees about the number of people who are available to act as foster parents. I think all members would recognise the important role that these people have. I would support that role very strongly and I am wondering whether the Minister can provide any information regarding the availability of people to carry out this work or say whether there is any concern about the lack of numbers that are available to do that. If there is a concern about that, what action is being taken?

**The Hon. M.J. EVANS:** During Foster Care Week recently I indicated in a public statement that we would like to receive offers of foster parents in the area of children with disability and in the older adolescent group. Those are two areas and, whilst there is certainly not any crisis situation, it would be helpful if the number of those available parents were to be at a higher level. In other areas we have adequate numbers. It is a bit like the blood donor situation: you cannot really have too many. If we have a number of parents on the books, it simply increases the flexibility and freedom of choice to match the cultural, religious and ethnic values with the foster parents and geographic locations and so on. It would assist the work of the department if the number of parents was higher. The number of available parents is within appropriate parameters so, while we are always looking for more and while we would certainly like to have more in the area of adolescent children with disability, I am satisfied that the situation is well under control at the moment.

If the honourable member was not satisfied by the response in the Estimates Committee or by the further information which I would have thought would have been provided to him after that, if the question was not able to be fully addressed on the day, I would be happy at any time to provide the honourable member with more detailed information about aspects of the system. Perhaps he would like to place a question on notice or write to me or indicate specifically what information he requires, as we would be more than happy to provide it or, on one of the regular briefings with the department, the honourable member could put that matter to the department directly, because it is information that I am happy for him to have. I understand that most of the provisions relating to foster care are similar to what is now in the Act. They have simply been slightly updated in language and presentation. There are some slight amendments, including the appropriate fit and proper test for

a foster parent, but I do not think it can be said that there are any significant changes in policy matters.

Clause passed.

Clauses 15 to 36 passed.

Schedules 1 and 2 passed.

Schedule 3.

**The Hon. D.C. WOTTON:** I refer to section 22(2) which is amended by the schedule. It provides:

A family and community services centre established by the Minister may be used, with the Minister's approval, by any other department, person or agency for the furtherance of the welfare of the local community.

I do not want to spend time on this provision other than to support the facilities being used by other agencies and the local community when it relates to community service activities. To what extent are the facilities used now and to what extent is the community made aware that it can use these facilities? In many cases, particularly in country areas, not many people or community organisations know that they can use such facilities.

*Mrs Hutchison interjecting:*

**The Hon. D.C. WOTTON:** I am pleased about that. Perhaps other members should make sure that their constituencies and their communities know that these facilities are available. It is a good idea. Has the Minister any idea how people in the community might be made aware that the facilities are available?

**The Hon. M.J. EVANS:** I must admit that nothing immediately comes to mind, but I am certainly prepared to take that on notice. The member for Stuart has indicated one mechanism, that is, that local members indicate that to interested groups. When local community organisations are looking for accommodation or facilities they are usually active in pursuing the options available in their local town or city. It is not usually a problem to have to encourage them to do that. If any member has an indication that a local group would like to be assisted in this way, they can encourage them to take up the matter up with the management of the facility.

Schedule passed.

Title passed.

Bill read a third time and passed.

#### **STATUTES REPEAL AND AMENDMENT (CHILDREN'S PROTECTION AND YOUNG OFFENDERS) BILL**

Adjourned debate on second reading.

(Continued from 9 September. Page 690.)

**The Hon. D.C. WOTTON (Heysen):** The Opposition supports the legislation, as I said earlier this evening. Copies of the Bill were circulated but I have not received any representations, so I can only presume that, because the Bill is to a large extent consequential, there is not concern about it in the community. The Bill amends various Acts affected by the enactment of the Young Offenders Act, the Youth Court Act and the passage of the Children's Protection Bill. It contains provisions to ensure that matters will not be disrupted by the repeal of the Children's Protection and Young Offenders Act and the enactment of the new legislation. The new Young Offenders Act does not, as was the case with the Children's Protection and Young Offenders Act, spell out the rights of young offenders to bail, nor are the Youth Court's sentencing powers fully spelt out.

The provisions of the Bail Act 1985 and the Criminal Law (Sentencing) Act 1988 now apply to young offenders. In the case of the Bail Act a minor amendment is needed to ensure that the new Youth Court is a bail authority. The Bill also contains the transitional provisions necessitated by the repeal of the Children's Protection and Young Offenders Act and the creation of the new Youth Court and a totally new regime, of course, is dealt with in regard to young offenders and children in need of protection. The regime adopted in the transitional provisions is to allow all proceedings for offences to be started or continued under the new regime, even though the alleged offence was committed before the new legislation came into operation. It may be, for example, that a young offender has an appearance before an aid panel outstanding at the time the new legislation comes into operation and this will need to be dealt with. A number of provisions in the Bill are non-contentious and, because there has not been any representation received by the Opposition to suggest there is opposition to the Bill, the Opposition is pleased to support the legislation.

**The Hon. M.J. EVANS (Minister of Health, Family and Community Services):** It is a pleasure to thank the member for Heysen for his general support of the legislation. The Bill relates simply to the transitional measures necessary to ensure that the children's protection and young offenders legislation, which this House has already adopted, can sensibly come into place and is mainly brought about by the fact that the legislation was formerly in one measure but is now to be divided. That has created some legislative problems in itself, as has the necessity for extended transitional provisions. In that sense most of the measures are quite technical but, if there are questions, they can be addressed in Committee.

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

#### **ADJOURNMENT DEBATE**

**The Hon. M.J. EVANS (Elizabeth):** I move:

That the House do now adjourn.

**Mr McKEE (Gilles):** In this short time this evening I will refer to the wine industry. I am on the public record and on the record of this House as putting forward a proposition to advance the export sales of South Australian wine product. In terms of promoting an international wine expo in Adelaide along the lines of the European wine expo such as Vin Expo in France, Vin Italy (obviously in Italy), I have had a number of discussions with members of the tourism department. Those discussions have taken place in a formal sense through meetings with officers of the tourism department, members of the wine industry in South Australia, wine producers, wine makers, wine promoters and the world renowned South Australian Restaurateurs Association. In particular, members of that association have formed a committee to examine the proposal, and already there is some suggestion about putting on something associated with next year's Festival of Arts.

Also, we in South Australia should keep in mind the advances being made by the Victorian Government in promoting its wine districts. I have seen a number of its publications. It has copied much of what South Australia is doing in promoting its wine regions, but the Government and the tourism department must be mindful of the extra money



being put into the promotion of the different wine areas of Victoria.

To pursue the idea of the wine expo, I thought it appropriate during the break to visit a wine expo. The world's largest is called the Vin Expo held in Bordeaux in France. The important aspect is that the Vin Expo is not held in Paris: some proponents of the Vin Expo in Australia suggest it should be held in Sydney, particularly in Darling Harbor. The French, who have centuries of experience in making and promoting wine, decided that the Vin Expo should be held in Bordeaux, which is the supreme wine growing region of France.

So towards the end of June I visited the Vin Expo in Bordeaux to find that it is one of the most successful expos of any kind that I have seen. I can give the House some idea of the size of the expo at Bordeaux: the hall in which the exhibitions are placed is as wide and as long as the straight at Victoria Park racecourse. The building is well over one kilometre long and holds thousands of exhibitions from all across the world, including Australia. Australia was well represented there and in fact the heads of Penfolds Wine Group of South Australia were there. Mr David Combe, who represents Penfolds in Europe and London, was also there, as were representatives of South Australian, Western Australian, Victorian and New South Wales wineries. The industry in Australia must learn from these exhibitions, in particular from some of the other countries in the southern hemisphere that were exhibiting, for example, Argentina, Uruguay and Chile from South America. They put on special and innovative displays to announce to the world that they are in the market of exporting and selling their wine product. Australia must be mindful of that.

I walked around the city of Bordeaux and visited nine hotels to ask for a room, only to be told, 'No, Monsieur, we have no more rooms for you but we will ring and get you a room.' I asked, 'Where will that be?'. They said that the closest accommodation during an expo was 120 kilometres away. That again indicates the success of a venture such as a wine expo. It would not only enhance the export of our wine product but also bring people associated with the wine industry to Adelaide. It would have a spin-off in the hotel accommodation and restaurant areas, and I suggest that over time it could rival the Grand Prix in terms of the number of people who come to Adelaide. I have been firmly convinced of that position, having been to Bordeaux and having seen the famous Vin Expo.

I took with me some wool samples, being mindful of the huge wool stockpile that Australia has, in some ways supported by the taxpayers. When in Poland, through connections I had arranged there, we visited the city of Lodz, a drive of about an hour and a half from Warsaw. I went there initially to look at the wool stock exchange. The city of Lodz was the centre of a major textile industry in Poland. It is a city of about one million people but, since the collapse of Communism in the eastern bloc countries, it is struggling to reform the economy to a more free market based economy and a lot of industries have suffered. Consequently, there have not been a lot of orders for wool from Australia. After discussions with the wool stock exchange in Lodz, I came back with an order from the Polish stock exchange for wool from Australia. It is only a small order, starting with 50 tonnes per month for a couple of months, but doubling by Christmas, and it will be reviewed in the New Year, perhaps going to about 200 tonnes per month. It is not a large order but it is a firm order and is there month after month. It is

backed by the three major banks in Poland to ensure that payment is received.

The Wool Corporation is mindful of the fact that some countries order wool, have it delivered and send it to the factories but, when the time comes to pay for it, there can be a problem. Those are some of the questions that I asked these people about the method of payment and they assured me that their business is supported by the three major banks in Poland, which are underwritten by the major United States banks to assist Poland in its change to a free market economy. I was happy to do my little bit in relation to the wool stockpile with which Australia suddenly finds itself. Also while in Poland I made arrangements to visit the Ministry of Privatisation. This is obviously a new ministry, set up under the auspices of the new Government to assist industry with its transformation from a communist economy to a free market based economy.

I was informed at those discussions that the job of the Ministry of Privatisation is to privatise about 6 000 businesses in Poland, all of which were once State-owned operations and many of which have fallen on hard times. In fact, many of the businesses and factories in the industrial cities of Poland are in very bad shape technologically. Half of them are closed down and, consequently, the work force is predominantly unemployed. But Polish people are very determined. They have a long history of survival. This, they believe, is just another hurdle for them to overcome. I believe that they are setting about it in the correct fashion. The two areas that I visited whilst I was overseas were associated with particular South Australian concerns: first, the wine industry and, secondly, the sale of South Australian wool samples. In both cases, I thought I was quite successful.

**Mr S.G. EVANS (Davenport):** I do not know when the State election will be, but I take this opportunity to say thanks to some people, regardless of when it may be because, when it is announced, I may not be in the House or in a position to say a few words. Before I was elected, I had been inside this building only once—to meet with the then Leader of the Opposition for a brief discussion. It was thought that I might not win because I had defeated a sitting member for preselection. From there, one had to learn the lessons of orientation with the Clerk at that time, and that continues today for new members. That was interesting.

It was frightening for a person who had no background in public speaking and no ambition to be a politician, until a politician told a lie about his family. When that occurred, I decided that I had an interest, and then a gentleman came to me and asked whether I would stand or go to a local branch. I said 'No.' He said, 'We want you to be President.' I said that I had never been a president of anything like a Liberal Party branch, especially in a place like Stirling. I was in a village outside that area. He came when I was working on the saw benches and asked me at about 7.30 at night to get dressed and go, and I did go and became the President on that night.

Not long after, somebody asked the local member whether he was going to continue. He was 75, and he said, 'Yes, the Party needs the experience.' I thought, 'How does any other young buck get that experience?', so when an article came out in the press attacking me and my family, I decided that I would visit the gentleman with a list of six names—one lady, five men—to get him to step aside so I could contest preselection. He did not accept that. He said that, if I thought I could beat him, I should stand against him. Mine was not

one of the names. I said, 'No man or woman says that to me. You have a contestant.' That was the beginning of my career to come to this place.

I know that in doing that I did not help my family or others in the business; perhaps they were dependent upon me to some degree, as were the employees. So from a business of some 60 odd, it went back to two or three, because others did not want the worries that went with employing people. So, I have an apology to make to those who are of my family, not immediate in the case of wife, sons or daughters but those a bit further away, such as sisters and their families, because that was the type of business it had to be. I know that people in the community will not accept that, because if you are reasonably successful, you will be rubbished. There will be those who pick faults, and there will be those who know at times that you will have to have a clash with somebody to win a point or you will be crushed yourself, whether it be an employee or a customer who is trying to crush you.

I am grateful that I came to this place. I am disappointed in the way the place has been changed. I do not believe that members of Parliament can represent their electorate in here as I could when I came in here. I believe that the place has been what I call 'bastardised', and I say that because, when I came here, there was no list of speakers or list of questions. You stood and the Speaker decided whose turn it was as is the case in most Parliaments now. Once we went to the list system, people relied upon the Whip or somebody else chasing them to get them in here to speak at that time. When you did not have the list system, if they did not stop in here, they did not get an opportunity to speak or to ask a question. So what we have done, also through amplification to members' rooms, is to give members the opportunity not to be in the Chamber. I do not know whether that is good or bad.

When I first came here, we had one secretary to four members, and people such as Allan Rodda answered virtually all his correspondence in long hand. Some of us would not like that today. I am not saying that that was a good thing. That is the difference between the operations of then and today. Some of the staff slept here; the catering staff slept here, as did some of the members. That was when the change was taking place. The staff were here to make their beds and clean up their rooms, and accommodation and meals were provided—breakfast, dinner and so on. For country members, that was critical.

But another thing happened in that area. While members were staying here and hotels shut at 6 o'clock (and I am not saying that people drank heavily), members from all walks of politics could go to the billiard room, have a game of snooker or billiards and talk about the issues of the day. Quite often compromises were reached because people bumped into one another all the time. I was the one who moved to have electorate offices. David Brookman said at the time that, if we did that, we would become the highest paid social welfare workers in the State. He was not quite right. We are not the highest paid social welfare workers, but we have become social welfare workers. Those electorate offices changed the whole concept of Parliament. Until that time, you had to come in here to get your work done. You met your colleagues and opponents and had a chance to discuss issues. It does not happen now. So the character of the place changed as far as negotiations were concerned.

Television is another issue. What happened when we introduced television here is that the front bench on both sides

decided, 'This is the scene; we have to get our face on it', and backbenchers became cocky's chaff—that is all. Because there would be long questions and long answers, the opportunity to raise an issue about your own electorate was gone. You would write to Ministers to get a response, and sometimes it would take weeks or months, or the Minister would release the reply through one of their own before they passed it onto the member. In other words, there was abuse of the system in my view and respect for the individual representative. Television is part of that problem, because the Minister of the day thinks he or she should give the answer today to impress the cameras. Anybody with any nous knows roughly what the questions will be on the day. In that, Ministers make more errors, because they are trying to respond immediately. I remember some Ministers in the past, whether it be Hudson or Brookman, would say, 'That is a very important question. I will get a considered reply for the member and bring it down tomorrow.' If you did that in today's scene, the television people would say it is unfair for them.

*The Hon. S.M. Lenehan interjecting:*

**Mr S.G. EVANS:** Both sides of politics. So, they sit up there expecting it to happen. When I first came here, there were people from the *Chronicle*, the *News*, the *Sunday Mail*, the *Advertiser* and the ABC. Sometimes these days you are lucky to see one of them in the gallery, because it is only the fed out stuff that counts. You have to prepare it. They do not stop, listen and take it. Quite often, young people come here and do not understand the Standing Orders or what should happen. I have said enough about that.

I want to thank you, Sir, and those who went before you as Speaker, the members appointed as Chairman of Committees, the range of clerks right down to those who arrange our pay, the catering staff, those in the library, and the police officers who help us. We used to have a police officer out the front of the building who helped us take our cars off the rank. He was always there to make sure there was no accident; that parking situation and the officer have gone, but I thank all concerned for their cooperation.

I thank *Hansard*, in particular. The *Hansard* staff make a bad speech sound reasonable where I am concerned but others speak much better. *Hansard* is one of the important links in this place and I respect the efforts that its staff put in. I thank not only members of *Hansard* whom we see taking the notes but also those involved in transcribing outside the Chamber.

Les Martin was the only caretaker when I came here. He worked 24 hours a day, seven days a week and he was a great guy. As I have only 10 minutes to speak in this debate I am sorry if I have missed any of the staff. I want to say to everybody who has cooperated with me: thank you for the good times. There have been some rough patches, and with some of those it has been my own fault. I have a great family. I have great kids. One of my children, who sat at a polling booth for 12 hours when he was eight years old, is hoping soon to come into this place. I thank them for the support they have given me; we stood close as family. I also thank those people out in the electorate who supported me at all times.

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

Motion carried.

At 10 p.m. the House adjourned until Thursday 14 October at 10.30 a.m.

