

LEGISLATIVE COUNCIL

Tuesday 20 August 1991

The **PRESIDENT (Hon. G.L. Bruce)** took the Chair at 2.15 p.m. and read prayers.

PAPERS TABLED

The following papers were laid on the table:

- By the Attorney-General (Hon. C.J. Sumner)—
 Friendly Societies Act 1919: Mutual Community Friendly Society of S.A.—Amendment to General Laws.
 Justices Act 1921—Rules—Fees.
 Regulations under the following Acts—
 Criminal Law (Sentencing) Act 1988—Forms
 Local and District Criminal Courts Act 1926—Local Court Fees.
 Supreme Court Act 1935—
 Fees.
 Probate Fees.
- By the Minister of Tourism (Hon. Barbara Wiese)—
 Australian Industry and Technology Council—Summary of Proceedings, 1989-90.
 Racing Act 1976—Greyhound Racing Board Rules—Managers, Registration and Stewards.
 Medical Practitioners Act 1983—Regulations—Fees.
- By the Minister for the Arts and Cultural Heritage (Hon. Anne Levy)—
 Road Traffic Act 1961—Regulations—Flashing Lights.
- By the Minister for Local Government Relations (Hon. Anne Levy)—
 Corporation By-laws—Town of Naracoorte—No. 9—Liquor Control.

QUESTIONS

JUSTICE INFORMATION SYSTEM

The Hon. K.T. GRIFFIN: I seek leave to make an explanation before asking the Attorney-General a question about the Justice Information System.

Leave granted.

The Hon. K.T. GRIFFIN: In the budget Estimates Committee last year questions were raised about the operation of the JIS, in particular relating to security of the information stored, the procedures in place to regulate access and the privacy issues being addressed. At that time the Director of the JIS, Mr Taylor, said in relation to security:

We have to have a very high level of security in JIS because of the nature of the information that we carry. We police that security system very strongly.

In relation to privacy he said:

JIS has its own privacy committee, which consists of privacy representatives from each of the agencies. That committee meets on a regular basis to examine each application that is developed to ensure that it conforms to privacy principles. That committee also has very strong links to the State Privacy Committee and we have developed a questionnaire basically for each of the agencies and for each of the applications that we send to both the JIS Privacy Committee and the State Privacy Committee so that those two committees can monitor at all times the privacy considerations within JIS. It is ongoing.

The recently tabled report of the House of Assembly Select Committee on Privacy refers to the number of persons about whom information has been recorded on the JIS. It makes no particular observation about the desirability or lack of desirability of that fact, but Mr Groom (the member for Hartley) has been using the information referred to in that report to gather support for his Privacy Bill. I am sure

that the Attorney-General will recollect that in 1983 a report by Touche Ross Services to the Bannon Government made recommendations that the Government should proceed to formulate legislation relating to the following:

The type of data to be maintained on the offender database, and other databases; the relevance of all data for the purposes defined; the procedures to ensure the accuracy of data maintained in relation to the data subject; the access to data by authorised individuals within the justice agencies; the data subject's right to review data; use of data by non-justice agencies; specialised security in relation to juvenile data; purging policies in relation to historical data; and sanctions and penalties for misuse.

It is on the record that the Government made a decision not to legislate on either security or privacy in relation to the JIS, but concern still remains about the two issues. My questions to the Attorney-General are as follows:

1. Can the Attorney indicate who is on the JIS Privacy Committee and what is its charter?
2. What specific code relating to privacy is applied to the JIS?
3. What sanctions are in place against individuals who may break that privacy code?
4. How can security of the information in the JIS be guaranteed and what are the current guidelines applicable and applied by the JIS?
5. What action is provided for in relation to those who breach the security guidelines of the JIS?

The Hon. C.J. SUMNER: I intended to make a ministerial statement on privacy, security and the JIS tomorrow because of the misconceptions that have surrounded this matter in the past few days. I will address the questions asked by the honourable member in that ministerial statement now that he has raised them. However, although the Government did not legislate, through Cabinet it endorsed certain privacy principles which have been made known to Parliament and with which Government agencies, including the JIS, are expected to comply. The principles with which JIS is expected to comply include the privacy principles laid down by State Cabinet. It is not legislation, but obviously if there is a breach of those principles in the JIS or elsewhere an aggrieved citizen has the right to go to the Ombudsman if they are not satisfied, having taken up any potential breach of those principles with the agency concerned.

The Hon. M.J. Elliott interjecting:

The Hon. C.J. SUMNER: I will get to that. Furthermore, the Government established a privacy committee which can and does hear complaints from members of the public about operations of privacy principles within the public sector, so citizens have those two avenues of action under the administrative guidelines laid down by Cabinet. Whilst there is not legislation, breaches of those principles by officers within the Public Service would not be in accordance with their obligations as public servants, and disciplinary action could be taken under the Government Management and Employment Act. The honourable member also mentioned administrative sanctions under the Government Management and Employment Act. He also stated that the Touche Ross report recommended that individuals have a right to review data. That is central to the privacy principles enunciated by the Government two years ago. Citizens have a right, with certain exceptions as always, to review data held on them by Government. That is established as a privacy principle and was outlined two years ago in the principles agreed to and promulgated by Cabinet.

Provisions dealing with privacy are in place across the whole spectrum of Government activity and are also applicable to the Justice Information System. I have received further information about the privacy and security arrangements within the JIS which are quite strict. I saw a draft statement today and intend to make that statement tomorrow.

row. I will take up the honourable member's questions in so far as they are not already answered in the ministerial statement and provide answers when I obtain them.

ART GALLERY

The Hon. DIANA LAIDLAW: I seek leave to make a brief explanation before asking the Minister for the Arts and Cultural Heritage a question about extensions to the Art Gallery.

Leave granted.

The Hon. DIANA LAIDLAW: At the beginning of Question Time last Thursday (15 August) the President tabled in this Council the report of the Parliamentary Standing Committee on Public Works on the Art Gallery of South Australia, Extensions Stage I. The report notes that the committee unanimously recommended the proposed extensions to the gallery, to cost \$14.973 million on completion in November 1993. The Minister did not acknowledge the report at the time it was tabled or at any time throughout the remaining one hour of Question Time. She had neither the courage nor the courtesy to inform Parliament that Cabinet had earlier decided to defer the starting date for the project by two years, even though she had conveyed this decision one hour earlier to senior people associated with the gallery, and was sitting on a prepared press statement, which she would release to the media at 3.15 p.m. immediately after Question Time finished.

If we were permitted to debate such matters during Question Time, about whether the Minister's assiduous efforts to avoid informing the Parliament about the fate of the gallery extensions amounts to cowardice or contempt for Parliament, we could do so for some time. The Minister's media statement blaming the deferral on the findings of the Public Works Standing Committee is blatantly dishonest. The committee did not recommend that the project be deferred. In fact, as the committee did not even finalise its recommendations until the day before its report was tabled in this place, it is clear that Cabinet did not have access to the committee's findings when Cabinet decided some time earlier to put this important project on hold. I ask the Minister:

1. On what date and for what reasons did Cabinet resolve to defer the starting date for the commencement of work in stage I of the gallery extensions?

2. Why did Cabinet decide that the project be deferred for two years, coincidentally just before the date of the next scheduled State election, and not one year or three years, or even for 10 years, as this Government deferred the commencement date for work on stage III of the Museum?

The Hon. ANNE LEVY: I think the honourable member is showing that she is fairly miffed that she was not the first person to be informed. The Cabinet took the decision, taking into account the tough economic circumstances that exist at the moment.

Members interjecting:

The PRESIDENT: Order! The question has been asked and the Minister is entitled, in answering it, to the same courtesy that was observed while it was asked.

The Hon. ANNE LEVY: Thank you, Mr President. At the earliest possible opportunity, I informed the public of South Australia, including the arts community, of the decision that Cabinet had made. I am sure that the honourable member is disappointed that the Art Gallery extensions are not going ahead immediately. I share her disappointment, and I am sure it is shared by many people in this Chamber and throughout the community. I point out that the Liberal

Party does seem to speak with different tongues on this matter. Sentiments were expressed by the honourable member and sentiments were also expressed by the Leader yesterday in a rather strange media release, which he put out, certainly not to the Parliament, but to the press and to the public of South Australia.

Obviously, other members of the Liberal Party have a very different view regarding extensions to the Art Gallery. I want to quote some statements made by a member of this Parliament, as reported in the *Plains Producer*. The member for Custance, Mr Ivan Venning, stated:

The Liberal Party by no means objects to expenditure on the arts, but I cannot see that money for the arts on this scale is justified in the current economic climate.

Members interjecting:

The PRESIDENT: Order!

The Hon. ANNE LEVY: Furthermore, he stated:

State expenditures of this magnitude must be directed to far more essential services only. Upgrading art galleries can wait for more prosperous times.

That clearly indicates that there is agreement in many quarters that the extensions to the Art Gallery have to be deferred for two years because of tough economic times and that there is support within the Liberal Party for the approach that Cabinet has taken.

Members interjecting:

The PRESIDENT: Order! The Council will come to order.

The Hon. ANNE LEVY: There is obviously support within the Liberal Party for the approach that Cabinet has taken on this matter, and I for one certainly look forward to the extensions when they occur in two years time.

The Hon. DIANA LAIDLAW: Mr President, I wish to ask a supplementary question.

Members interjecting:

The PRESIDENT: Order! I do not know whether the rest of the Council can hear the question, but I cannot.

The Hon. DIANA LAIDLAW: When did Cabinet decide to defer the starting date for commencement on stage I and if, as we suspect, it did so before the Parliamentary Standing Committee on Public Works reported, why did the Minister or Cabinet not inform the committee of that fact?

The Hon. ANNE LEVY: Discussions in Cabinet are not normally revealed, as the honourable member would know very well. I point out to the honourable member that—

The Hon. DIANA LAIDLAW: I just asked for the date; look up your diary.

Members interjecting:

The PRESIDENT: Order!

The Hon. ANNE LEVY: I do not think they want to hear the answer, Mr President.

The PRESIDENT: I think you are quite right. The Hon. Mr Davis.

SMALL BUSINESS

The Hon. L.H. DAVIS: I seek leave to make a brief explanation before asking the Minister of Small Business a question about the Government program for 1991-92.

Leave granted.

The Hon. L.H. DAVIS: There are about 55 000 small businesses in South Australia and they provide for over 55 per cent of private sector employment. These small businesses in fact account for 95 per cent of all firms in South Australia, and in city and country areas provide a vital base for the State's economic well-being and prosperity. Therefore, it was rather startling to discover that in the 4½ page speech by Her Excellency the Governor at the recent opening of this Parliament no reference was made to small

business. This speech traditionally sets down the Government's program for the next 12 months. It not only outlines the Government's legislative program but it also contains comments on various matters of economic importance, such as, for example, the plight of the farming community. Does the Minister realise that small business in South Australia is facing record levels of bankruptcies, bad debts, State taxation and staff retrenchments, and, undoubtedly, the harshest economic climate since the 1930s?

Can the Minister explain why the two words 'small business'—which many people believe is the mainspring for the State's future prosperity—were not mentioned once in the address outlining the Government's program for the next 12 months?

The Hon. BARBARA WIESE: The honourable member usually takes much longer in his explanations to questions, and if he had done so on this occasion I would have had the opportunity to draw to his attention the particular paragraphs in the Governor's speech that relate to business activity in South Australia and to some of the plans that the Government has to assist small business in South Australia. The fact that the words 'small business' may not have been used in the Governor's speech should not in any way be interpreted as meaning that the matter had been deleted from the Governor's speech.

The Hon. L.H. Davis interjecting:

The PRESIDENT: Order!

The Hon. BARBARA WIESE: In fact, there are several references to the Government's intentions in the area of business activity in South Australia. If the honourable member would care to read the speech a little more closely he would find those references. As the honourable member pointed out himself, the fact is that 95 per cent of the businesses in this State fall into the category of 'small business', so almost anything that this Government does in the business sector is in the interests of small business and is directed at small business in South Australia. The honourable member knows that very well. He deals in buzz words; we deal in action.

Members interjecting:

The PRESIDENT: Order! The Council is trespassing on its own Question Time with this unseemly behaviour.

PARLIAMENT HOUSE AMENITIES

The Hon. M.J. ELLIOTT: I seek leave to make a brief explanation before asking you, Mr President, questions in relation to breaches of community standards and expectations.

Leave granted.

The Hon. M.J. ELLIOTT: On a number of occasions things happen in this Parliament which some people might see as being somewhat hypocritical. I give some instances. One example is fairly simple but I think important. On several occasions I have reported to you, Mr President, that quite a few of the toilets in this place have been leaking, and leaking regularly, and losing large quantities of water. That has been reported probably over a 12 month period. On my very conservative estimate we must be losing somewhere around 400 kilolitres plus of water a year. Recently this Parliament amended the Act relating to the way in which water was charged for and tried to encourage people to save water, so some people might suggest that this Parliament is hypocritical in not doing something about a very severe loss of water within its own building.

The second example, about which I regularly receive complaints from people, is that everything that comes out of

Parliament House is on non-recycled paper. Many Government departments now use recycled paper. At least one major manufacturer advertised in the press recently that it was selling recycled paper for the same price as non-recycled paper, and that manufacturer claimed that the recycled paper worked on all machines. Yet, we continue to use the non-recycled product.

Another example that has been raised in this Council on a number of occasions is the lack of fire drills in this place. A recent Government report acknowledged that Parliament House is a real fire trap and stated that significant amounts of money should be spent to upgrade it. I refer also to occupational health and safety. Probably half the employees in this place, as distinct from the members of Parliament, work in conditions that do not comply with the accepted standards in this State. Mr President, I ask whether or not you acknowledge that this Parliament does seem to be hypocritical in the way in which it reacts to a number of these matters, and whether you think something will be done about.

The PRESIDENT: I have taken on board the issues that the honourable member has raised. Of course, the issue of waste water in the toilets has been attended to on numerous occasions. A maintenance man has been up here at least half a dozen times that I know of. Every time I have raised the issue it has been attended to, but the repairs do not last. I think that the long-term solution will have to involve a cost factor in having them replaced. I do not know how many times we must have the toilets repaired. In relation to recycled paper, that can be looked into. I think we have already had a question on that and that it has been answered.

In relation to fire drills, I was here on the last occasion that we had a fire alarm and I was instrumental in the alarm being activated. There was something wrong with the air conditioner. We have fire drill officers appointed and, as I understand it, the procedures were complied with—as far as I was aware, everyone was outside until we were given the all clear to come back into the building.

I am quite happy to have more practical fire drills. However, I believe we have in train a system that is quite adequate. Every member has been supplied with a booklet outlining what happens in a fire situation and they should be conversant with its contents. We are all aware of what the fire signal sounds like. The last fire alarm here, which was a genuine alarm, was complied with virtually 100 per cent as far as I am aware. However, if members feel that the matter should be taken further and if they want practical fire drills conducted regularly, I am happy to raise the matter with the Speaker in the other House and come to some agreement so that that can occur.

PARKING REGULATIONS

The Hon. J.C. IRWIN: I seek leave to make an explanation before asking the Minister for Local Government Relations about parking regulations.

Leave granted.

The Hon. J.C. IRWIN: New parking regulations under the Local Government Act were tabled recently and came into operation on 5 August this year. I am getting advice from a number of sources indicating some alarm at the new regulations—not just the obvious reaction to the hefty increase in payment of parking offences but more to the provisions of the regulations and their timing.

I expect that the Subordinate Legislation Committee has already received, or will receive, numerous submissions on these regulations, including the definitions of road and car-

riageway, and the definition of foot paths, part (b) of which refers to the portion of a road between the edge of the carriageway and the boundary between the road and the adjoining land on the same side of the carriageway as the edge. The mind boggles at how wide will be a footpath adjacent to country roads. I mention the confusion which will arise around the marking of no standing zones. It can be either by sign or by pavement markings.

I give but a few examples that have been brought to my attention. I am aware that Unley council has 31 pages of amendments to its parking arrangements because of the new regulations and those must be in place in time for the Royal Show in a couple of weeks time. There is always a certain amount of confusion regarding parking around the show grounds at show time. Some are tipping it will be even more confusing this year with the rush to comply, let alone the cost and the effort needed to be made by Unley Council.

Under the new regulations, when a new parking control area is declared and the new standard format parking control signs are installed in a particular area (or street), the existing 'old' signs in that area (or street) are to be replaced with the new standard format signs to avoid confusion to road users.

The parking controls that are installed around the Wayville Showgrounds while events are being held at the showgrounds are required to be declared as temporary parking controls under the provisions of section 11 of the new parking regulations and, as such, the new standard format parking control signs are to be used.

The 1991 Royal Adelaide Show commences on 30 August and temporary parking control signs are to be installed around the Wayville Showgrounds area. Therefore, as a mixture of 'old' and 'new' signs is not permitted in a particular area (or street), in accordance with the new regulations, it is necessary to redeclare the existing parking controls and install the new standard format parking control signs.

Is it correct that it has been found necessary to completely replace Part XXIIA of the Local Government Act—the provisions to make regulations for parking and standing of vehicles in public places? If this is so, why were the new parking regulations put into effect on 5 August rather than after Part XXIIA was amended by legislation? Also, has the Minister received any submissions calling on the suspension of the new parking regulations until at least the Royal Show is over for this year?

The Hon. ANNE LEVY: With regard to the last question, there have been suggestions from some councils that the implementation of the new parking regulations should be delayed past 5 August. I do not recall any submission specifically stating that the Royal Show was a reason for this. As I understand it, some councils wanted time to use all their old parking tickets before having to have new tickets printed. However, the decision to proclaim the new parking regulations as from 5 August was taken a long time ago. I am sorry I cannot recall the exact date, but I can certainly check on that.

Councils have had at least three months warning that 5 August was the date on which the new regulations would come into effect. This occurred in consultation with the Local Government Association and after a very lengthy period of consultation with all councils regarding the format of the regulations. These new regulations have been in the pipeline for at least two years, if not longer, and there was considerable consultation before the new regulations were drafted. Indeed, again after they had been drafted, they were circulated to all councils and there was plenty of opportunity

for any council to object or suggest changes. Indeed, suggestions that were received from councils were considered.

However, all councils have known about this matter for a considerable time. I will check the exact date on which they were notified that the new parking regulations would become operative on 5 August. As I said, this was done in consultation with the Local Government Association and by general agreement between the State Government and local government that this was the appropriate time to bring the parking regulations into operation.

In fact, a national conference on parking regulations was held in South Australia last November. It had been hoped that the new parking regulations could be in operation before that conference was held. However, due to the lengthy consultation period and not wishing in any way to inhibit councils in their ability to comment on the regulations, the proclamation did not occur as expected last November. It occurred such that the new regulations come into effect on 5 August. I think that all councils have known for a considerable period that this would happen and should have been able to make the appropriate preparatory plans for this date, according to the particular circumstances of their council area.

The Hon. J.C. IRWIN: As a supplementary question, the Minister did not answer the first part of my question relating to Part XXIIA of the Local Government Act.

The Hon. ANNE LEVY: I am afraid that although I know the Local Government Act pretty well, I am not able to quote Part XXIIA. I very much doubt if many other people could do that, either. If it does refer to parking regulations, there have been suggestions that, despite the care and consultation that has taken place, some part of either the Act or the regulations will need to be amended in the light of experience of the new parking regulations. Detailed proposals have certainly not reached me. However, I can assure the Council that they will be given very speedy consideration when they do reach me. Whether they refer to Part XXIIA I am not able to say, but I am happy to consult on the matter.

GUN LAWS

The Hon. R.J. RITSON: I seek leave to make a brief explanation before asking the Attorney-General, representing the Minister responsible for the police, a question about self-loading centre fire rifles.

Leave granted.

The Hon. R.J. RITSON: The problems of maniacal damage caused occasionally with these weapons by people of obviously disturbed mind has been with us for some time, as has the problem of ownership of these firearms. I have been associated with lobbies concerning this matter since the days of the Tonkin Government. I have been surprised and a little disappointed in the past at the approaches of Government of both political persuasions to this issue, as it has been dealt with in South Australia by defining military style weapons with pistol groups and by preventing the sale or importation of parts or of the weapons themselves, but it leaves all existing weapons in the community and does not define all dangerous weapons.

The firearm used in the most recent tragedy was a high powered .762 mm calibre with a large magazine capacity. It was self loading and rather than a pistol grip it had an ordinary stock. The combination of characteristics of these firearms is the reason for their dangerousness: the high powered, reasonably heavy projectile and the fact that, being self-loading with a high magazine capacity, there is not

much opportunity for a person to be disarmed during the process of reloading. So much more damage can be done. They have very limited, if any, practical use as a hunting firearm. Much finer and more expensive firearms with low magazine capacities are ideal and available for hunting.

I have been all for the eradication, for the most part, of this style of firearm. It was put to me by the Practical Shooters Association, which uses this type of firearm competitively, that in the past the regulations permitted it to keep its firearms but prevented it maintaining them in top competition standard, whilst leaving all other firearms of this class in the community. It wanted a regulation which restricted severely the ownership of those firearms and it would have accepted a restriction as tight or tighter than hand gun restrictions, which are tied to club membership.

Will the Minister consider not only a prospective regulation of these firearms being restricted to club membership or to genuine collectors but also taking out of the community those firearms which cannot be justified in those terms? That will mean, of course, an examination of the register and a retrospective prohibition and, in justice, it should involve a buy-back exercise. If, for example, there were 2 000 such weapons in the community and registered ones were bought back at \$100 each, it would be a \$200 000 exercise, but the community could be substantially cleansed of these firearms if the will was there, leaving them available to *bona fide* collectors or club members, which would not amount to very many people.

The Hon. C.J. SUMNER: Whether or not the will is there depends on Parliament. Gun laws have been dealt with in this Parliament on a number of occasions. It is fair to say that South Australia has amongst the toughest gun laws in the country—certainly tougher than New South Wales or Tasmania where, at various times, political campaigns of some force have been run to counter moves to have tougher gun laws. Indeed, it was one of the major political issues in the election of 1988, which led to the coming of power of the Liberal Government at that time. In South Australia the Opposition has had its say on tighter gun laws and generally has been supportive of the Government's position, although not in all respects.

The Hon. R.J. Ritson: Attrition was indiscriminate.

The Hon. C.J. SUMNER: Whether the will is there depends on Parliament. We have dealt with hand gun control laws and we have some of the toughest laws in Australia. From 1 January next year there will be a requirement for both persons and weapons to be licensed or registered. That is the most recent parliamentary pronouncement on the topic. Whether this additional proposal should be examined I cannot say, but I will refer the question to the Minister and bring back a reply.

The Hon. I. GILFILLAN: I seek leave to make a brief explanation before asking the Attorney-General a question on gun control.

Leave granted.

The Hon. I. GILFILLAN: It is with some pleasure that I recognise that the Hon. Dr Ritson and I are pursuing a very similar cause and purpose, namely, to remove from public risk the use of the SKS semi automatic firearms.

The Hon. R.J. Ritson: Don't try to hop into bed with me.

The Hon. I. GILFILLAN: Recognising that there is some frivolity in the Hon. Dr Ritson's disclaimer, I add that I do not have much enthusiasm to be in bed with him, either. Our common aim is to prevent, as far as possible, a repetition of the Strathfield disaster through the indiscriminate distribution of SKS semi automatic firearms in the community. It is important to recognise that, although the Attor-

ney-General makes much of South Australia having the toughest gun laws, unlike several other States in Australia, it is and will continue to be legal to own and operate firearms of this type in South Australia. Although in his answer to the previous question the Attorney-General indicated that it is up to Parliament to make a decision, the fact is that the Premier and the Minister, Mr Klunder, seem to be at odds over this matter.

In response to this latest shooting tragedy the Premier has indicated that a review of gun laws will take place and at the top of the review list will be the sale of semi-automatic weapons, specifically the SKS Chinese semi-automatic which was used in the Strathfield incident. However, Emergency Services Minister (John Klunder) has stated that the sale of SKS weapons and other similar weapons will not be banned in South Australia, but rather that the Government plans to place tighter registration controls on the weapons. So, there is an apparent difference of opinion within the Government as to what is the appropriate way to deal with these firearms. It is important to recognise that many people who have not joined this campaign to control these weapons are now coming forward. Mr Mal Wade, of Gun Mart, told the *News* yesterday that:

I am all for the control of this type of weapon . . . People who use these are not dedicated sporting shooters. This is a military weapon, that's it.

So, I ask the Attorney-General, with the specific aim of getting current owners of semiautomatic weapons to hand them in or have them made totally inoperable (I agree that they should have adequate compensation, as was suggested in the previous question):

1. Will the Government immediately move to acquire, confiscate or render inoperable all semi automatic weapons of the SKS or similar type in South Australia?

2. If not, how can the Government guarantee that its gun proposals will effectively prevent the risk of a Strathfield massacre happening in Adelaide?

The Hon. C.J. SUMNER: I have answered that question in general terms in answering the question asked by the Hon. Dr Ritson. Again, I will refer the specific question to my colleague in another place and bring back a reply.

STTARS

The Hon. BERNICE PFITZNER: I seek leave to make a brief explanation before asking the Minister of Tourism, representing the Minister of Health, a question on the subject of STTARS.

Leave granted.

The PRESIDENT: I must say that I have difficulty hearing the honourable member. If she could speak up it would be of assistance.

The Hon. BERNICE PFITZNER: STTARS is an acronym for Survivors of Torture and Trauma Assistance and Rehabilitation Service. The Director is the Reverend Martin Chittleborough, who left the secure office of the church and led with dedication his service to people who have been and possibly still are traumatised. Two months ago I attended the inaugural meeting of this service which was well attended and at which the Minister of Health was present. He made the usual speech and made a commitment to match the Federal funding of \$40 000 with a similar amount in kind, that is, the secondment of two persons and an office. The Federal grant of \$40 000 has come through, but the State commitment has not. My questions are: why has the State's commitment of two officers and an office not been fulfilled? How long will it take for the Government to keep its promise to a dedicated group of people and a noble cause?

The Hon. BARBARA WIESE: I will refer the honourable member's questions to my colleague in another place and bring back a reply.

KICKSTART

The Hon. PETER DUNN: I seek leave to make a brief explanation before asking the Minister representing the Minister of Employment and Further Education a question about Kickstart.

Leave granted.

The Hon. PETER DUNN: In each of last week's local newspapers in Whyalla and Port Lincoln, quite a large article appeared about the establishment of this new program called Kickstart.

The State Minister, the Hon. Mike Rann, made a lot of play about it. I have received many questions about what it really means. When reading the articles, it is interesting to note some of the statements, for example, from the *Whyalla News*, as follows:

Whyalla's pilot program will see the future establishment of an employment and training centre here to work with State Government in devising 'innovative local employment and training initiatives'.

Further, the article states:

Employment and Further Education Minister Mike Rann said Kickstart aimed to 'inject new energy and effort . . . in the various regions by harnessing significant local community support and involvement'.

There is quite a lot more about it in the report. More interesting is the Port Lincoln report. Mr Connelly, the DETAFE Director for that area, said:

The department would call on groups within the community, including local employers, trade unions, self-help groups, local government and local TAFE people, to bring themselves together to decide how best to spend the money. He said while it would be difficult to bring such a broad cross-section of the community together in a region that stretches as far as Ceduna and Kimba, it would not be impossible.

He went on to say that:

The local community would be expected to make a contribution to Kickstart and to supplement the level of funding by applying for Commonwealth grants.

The article concluded with Mr Connelly's saying:

I would expect the people of Eyre Peninsula to strong arm their employers to make contributions . . . Contributions could include sponsorship or allowing a staff member to run a training course. I find this a remarkable series of statements, with absolutely no finish to them. My questions are: what are the innovative local employment and training initiatives? Will the money be used for travel or to start new projects? How much local money will be required and how much from Commonwealth grants will be applied? Which employers on Eyre Peninsula would have the cash to be strong armed by residents of that area?

The Hon. ANNE LEVY: I will refer those four questions to my colleague in another place and bring back a reply. I presume that opinions can be given in the reply, as they were given in the question.

The PRESIDENT: It is not the duty of the honourable member asking a question to offer an opinion, but the Council has been very flexible in allowing explanations to questions and in the answers to them. I ask members to observe Standing Orders.

CATHOLIC SCHOOLS FUNDING

The Hon. R.I. LUCAS: I seek leave to make a brief explanation before asking the Minister representing the

Minister of Education a question on the subject of Catholic schools funding.

Leave granted.

The Hon. R.I. LUCAS: I refer to a letter received by my office this week from the South Australian Commission for Catholic Schools regarding funding. The letter claims that, nationally, the Catholic education sector employs more than 48 000 full-time or part-time teaching and other staff. Around 596 000 students are currently being educated in Catholic schools at an annual saving to the public purse of \$1 billion. In South Australia the relative comparisons between teaching staff and students is about 2 500 staff to some 34 000 students.

The Commission for Catholic Schools claims that the operating cost for the average Catholic school is around 80 per cent of that for an average Government-run school. It points out that Catholic education has made massive investments in metropolitan schools and plans expenditure of \$30 million in new schools at Golden Grove, Seaford, Andrews Farm, Gawler, Woodcroft, Munno Para and Aldinga. It says that the Catholic community will be unable to meet this cost with the current low level of capital grants from the Commonwealth. As a consequence of the Catholic involvement in providing schools—and thus easing the demands on Government-run education facilities in the early stages of new suburban development—the commission is seeking a commitment from the State Government to provide interest-free loans to assist the Catholic community in building schools.

My question to the Minister is: does the Minister agree that non-government schools generally provide a vital role in easing the burden upon the Government education budget by making substantial investments in new schools in outlying new suburban developments and, if so, what is the Government's response to providing any assistance for capital expenditure to non-government schools?

The Hon. ANNE LEVY: I will refer that question to my colleague in another place and bring back a reply.

REMM MYER DEVELOPMENT

The Hon. J.F. STEFANI: I seek leave to make a brief explanation before asking the Attorney-General, representing the Treasurer, a question on the Remm Myer development.

Leave granted.

The Hon. J.F. STEFANI: On 1 August 1991, in an article that appeared on the front page of the *Advertiser*, under the heading 'SA Inc. does not exist', the Premier and Treasurer, Mr Bannon, was reported as saying that he had no regrets about his support of and encouragement for the bank's financial involvement in the Remm Myer project. He has been quoted as saying:

I was pleased when they decided the project was commercially justifiable.

When recently appearing before the commission, Mr Kowalick was reported by the *Advertiser* as having been told of dissatisfaction within senior Government ranks.

The Hon. C.J. SUMNER: On a point of order, Mr President, the honourable member seems to be canvassing a matter that is directly before the royal commission that has been established in relation to the State Bank, and he is referring specifically to evidence that has come before that royal commission. I understood that the *sub judice* rule was going to operate in relation to the State Bank Royal Commission. While that does not preclude all discussion on matters relating to the State Bank, obviously matters relating

to its future and the like, if members are going to use the forum of the Parliament to canvass evidence given at the royal commission—as it appears the honourable member is doing—I would suggest that that is in breach of the *sub judice* rule.

The PRESIDENT: I am prepared to uphold the point of order. An agreement has been reached and, because we have a royal commission in South Australia at this moment into the State Bank, any reference to the evidence given there, as the Attorney-General has indicated, could possibly go against the *sub judice* rule. So, I am prepared to uphold the point of order. Can the honourable member rephrase his question so that it does not impinge on the evidence before the royal commission?

The Hon. J.F. STEFANI: I will have to reframe my question and bring it forward on another day.

ART GALLERY

The Hon. DIANA LAIDLAW: I address a question to the Minister for the Arts and Cultural Heritage. As the Minister decided on two occasions earlier in Question Time today not to answer my question about the date on which Cabinet decided to defer the starting time for the commencement of work on stage I of the Art Gallery extensions, I again ask her whether she will seek to inform the Parliament of that important information—not the contents of the Cabinet submission, but the date on which—

The PRESIDENT: Order! The honourable member cannot ask the same question twice.

The Hon. DIANA LAIDLAW: I am asking not for contents of the Cabinet submission but merely for the date on which Cabinet decided to defer—

The PRESIDENT: That sounds very similar to the question asked by—

The Hon. DIANA LAIDLAW: —commencement of this project and why the Minister did not inform the Parliamentary Standing Committee on Public Works of this matter before it reported to Parliament.

The Hon. ANNE LEVY: The first part of the honourable member's question has been asked today. I attempted to give an answer, but obviously members opposite did not wish to hear it. I understand, under Standing Orders, that honourable members cannot have a second bite of the cherry and ask the question again on the same day. With regard to the second part of the question, the Public Works Committee was not informed of a decision regarding the deferral because the decision had not been made. Obviously the PWC cannot be informed—

The PRESIDENT: Order! The time for questions having expired, I call on the business of the day.

ADDRESS IN REPLY

Adjourned debate on motion for adoption.
(Continued from 15 August. Page 217.)

The Hon. BERNICE PFITZNER: I support the motion that the Address in Reply to Her Excellency the Governor's speech be adopted. I congratulate Her Excellency Dame Roma Mitchell on being the first woman Governor of the State. I join with Her Excellency in extending my condolences to the family of Dr Victor George Springett, member of the Legislative Council from 1967 to 1975, to the family

of Mr Geoffrey O'Halloran Giles, member of the Legislative Council from 1959 to 1964 and subsequently a member of the House of Representatives, and to the family of the Hon. Clarence Ross Story, member of the Legislative Council from 1955 to 1975.

I turn now to State matters. We are all acutely aware of the financial losses that are occurring in our Government controlled institutions. I am concerned that the Governor was provided with a speech that touched so little upon the gross mismanagement that is occurring in these institutions. The only reference to the Government's management of the State's economy was:

My Government recognises the vital need to take account of proper concern about overall economic management.

I suggest that recognising the need is not enough. The Government must take steps to rectify mismanagement that has already taken place. Much of the responsibility for South Australia's dire financial plight must undeniably rest with the State Treasurer and Premier, Mr Bannon. Some of the Government's investment and spending failures are: the State Bank, estimated losses in excess of \$1 billion; SGIC, non-performing assets, over \$270 million; and SGIC Private Limited put options, a total of \$1.5 billion. The Government Management Board report states:

The peak potential exposure involved was many times larger than the net worth of SGIC.

This includes the put option that has been proceeded with on 333 Collins Street, Melbourne, \$520 million. Further Government investment and spending failures include: the Scrimber project, almost \$60 million, to be written off by SGIC and SATCO; and WorkCover, unfunded liabilities, \$230 million. Other failures, minor in comparison, are: the New Zealand timber mill loss, \$12 million; Williamstown timber mill loss, \$11.4 million; marine project loss, \$7.6 million; Tandanya Institute loss, \$1 million; SAMCOR loss, \$1.7 million; State Clothing Corporation loss, \$843 000; and State Supply computer purchase error, \$1 million.

In my maiden speech, which I made about 10 months ago, I identified we had a high spending and high taxing Government. Now, not only is it that but it is also a Government that is financially incompetent. It will take this State many years to overcome the current financial plight. It will affect not only this generation's way of life and standard of living but it will also impinge on our next generation and, in particular, it will manifest itself in large numbers of unemployed youth. Indeed, the unemployment rate in South Australia is the highest of all the States and is currently at 10.4 per cent.

Last week I returned from attending the World Chinese Entrepreneurs Convention which was held over a three day period and which was organised by the Singapore Chinese Chamber of Commerce. Eight hundred delegates attended and most delegates were overseas-born Chinese from South-East Asia and the Pacific rim. My purpose in attending the convention was to try to obtain a South Australian/Australian connection with these delegates who were all successful in their own adopted country.

All delegates seemed to be fully conversant with Australia's economic problems, and many volunteered that our wealth of natural resources, which had earned us the title of 'the lucky country', had left us with very little incentive or capacity for hard work. In this context it must be said that our present Federal and State Governments have done nothing to encourage hard work. As Warburton in the journal *Practising Manager* (Vol. 11, No. 1 1990) puts it, we have an 'Australian attitude' that focuses on 'why we cannot do things'. It is a recipe for mediocrity. As he says:

This culture must be success driven . . . We must have enterprises and industries that move from the protected to the com-

petitive, from the local to the global, from conventional to creative and innovative, from conflict-based to cooperation, from value distributing to value adding, from individual to team work, from industry-craft to enterprise.

In the *Business Review Weekly* of April 1991, Professor Chia, head of the Economic Department of the National University of Singapore, stated that:

Singapore and Hong Kong will reach Australian standards of living in approximately six years (1997) and Taiwan and South Korea will pass Australia by the year 2000 or soon after. This assumes that the growth rate of the 1980s will be carried on into the 1990s.

I find this statement disturbing and an indictment of our Government's economic performance. Only 10 to 15 years ago, we were perceived in Singapore and Hong Kong as being economically strong, but we are not now. The average real export growth in East Asia was 11 per cent a year during the 1980s. The world average was half that. In contrast, Australia's average real export rate in the 1980s was 3.5 per cent, and New Zealand's was 2.4 per cent. This year most Asian countries will top 5 per cent despite the world's recession. Australia's share of East Asia's trade is only 2 per cent to 3 per cent of its exports. We must have a strategy that accepts the need for a strong development program in East Asia.

During the convention I asked the panel about Australia's position in East Asian economic grouping—a trading bloc—and my impression was that we were not being included. This is of great concern. It is well recognised that the Association of South-East Asian Nations (ASEAN) has emerged as the most dynamic region in the world. We are geographically placed in the area and must put more effort into forging stronger links with the different member nations.

I turn now to more local topics. As a medical practitioner I often worked in areas that were disadvantaged. What I now consider as disadvantaged are children, the rural area and the environment. Children are our investment for the future. It is imperative that we recognise this and put in place the best for our children's development. In the area of child-care we must look to more innovative ideas as our dollar shrinks in value and as the share of the cake going to child-care decreases.

In these economic times where both parents are often working our children are left to fend for themselves at a very tender age of pre-teens and even during babyhood. I believe that we have to put in the greatest effort during the ages of nought to eight years. Developmental rates are very rapid at that time, and I am of the opinion that deep seated values are implanted indelibly during these years. This belief is supported by Proverbs 22:6, which states:

Train up a child in the way he should go and when he is old he will not depart from it.

The child-care centres that we have in Australia are excellent establishments. They cater not only for the physical well being of the child but also, and probably more importantly, for the cognitive, social and emotional development of the child. Similarly, preschools and kindergartens are important for early childhood development. Some years ago I did a study which showed that there is a difference in development between children who attend kindergartens and those who do not attend kindergartens. Those children who do not attend kindergartens appear to do less well developmentally than those children who do attend. We must try to give, and continue to give, all children the opportunity for preschool experience for a minimum of six months and a maximum of 12 months.

Child abuse is a subject that causes me great concern. In the light of an increase, real or apparent, in child abuse, the Police Department's initiative of a phone-in in the northern Adelaide area must be applauded. Last week a new program

known as Paradox was started. This program encourages children to phone in if they are aware of possible child abuse. As well as identifying child abuse, we must put strategies in place for child protection and prevention. The Department for Family and Community Services is the main service area for child protection. I believe that it is doing a good job in this most difficult area.

However, for the Department for Family and Community Services to be even more efficient and effective I believe that we must look into the present processes and procedures of investigating, monitoring and rehabilitating the people who are involved in these offences, as both the child and the perpetrator need help. Much more work needs to be done if child abuse in all its forms—that is, physical abuse, sexual abuse, emotional abuse and neglect—is to be stamped out. Compared to the animals of the wild, we as a human race, with all our high intellect, have a very poor record and have most to learn.

Immunisation is another topic that is important for children. Immunisation enables children to be protected from infectious diseases that are potentially debilitating. I have some concerns about the existing immunisation programs in South Australia. Recently the South Australian Health Commission looked at measles immunisation, although I believe that the statistics it produced were rubbery. An uptake of 95 per cent was quoted for kindergarten children. However, we know that only 85 per cent to 90 per cent of four-year-olds attend kindergarten, and it is possible that a considerable proportion of the 10 per cent to 15 per cent of children who do not attend kindergarten might not be immunised. I further query the South Australian Health Commission's statement that measles uptake is 95 per cent when I note, from the epidemiology notes of February 1991, that the number of measles cases for 1990 was 42, and the average from 1985 to 1989 was 14.5.

Again, I note that this year a measles outbreak in the Riverland was reported, and the South Australian Health Commission's response was that it was possibly a vaccine failure, while another outbreak in Port Augusta was admitted to be the consequence of poor uptake. To function optimally, the immunisation program in this State should be less fragmented. The service is currently provided by local government, general practitioners and, lately, the Child, Adolescent and Family Health Service (CAFHS).

There is little or no coordination between the three service providers, nor is there a central computer that can give us reliable statistics on immunisation uptake. There is also poor coordination between the academic and service areas of infectious diseases. There ought to be a centre for infectious disease control that takes in the University of Adelaide's Department of Microbiology and Immunology, the Institute of Medical and Veterinary Science Division of Clinical Microbiology, Medical Virology and MedVet Service, and the South Australian Health Commission's Communicable Disease Unit. The aims of such a centre could be to study the pathogenesis of infection, to improve and validate diagnostic methods, to recommend and monitor the implementation of immunisation programs, and to monitor community patterns of infectious diseases. Such a body would be qualified to add constructively to the ongoing AIDS debate. Because the body would be drawn from existing and dedicated professionals, it should not be costly to administer.

Another area of infectious disease about which I am particularly concerned is hepatitis B. There are 300 million cases of hepatitis B in the world, and Australia has 250 000 cases. There are 22 000 new cases a year. The prevalence is 27 per cent in Aborigines, 15 per cent in Asians, 5 per cent

in Mediterraneans and .2 per cent in Australian Caucasians. This disease is 100 times more infectious than AIDS and it is contracted through body fluids in a similar manner to AIDS. Although it is not uniformly fatal as is AIDS, 20 per cent of the people with hepatitis B will die from liver cancer or chronic liver disease.

We can now immunise fully against hepatitis B, but the three doses are relatively expensive. Since the prevalence is high among certain groups we should at least have a program that targets these groups. However, again the programs are sporadic and fragmented. For Aborigines it is reported that the South Australian Health Commission did have a program to immunise all Aborigines in South Australia. However, this program was stopped some two years ago due to lack of further Federal funds. The Asians in our community ought also to be considered, but only a half-hearted program is provided by hospitals, namely, the Queen Elizabeth Hospital and the Lyell McEwin Hospital. Another group with a high prevalence rate is people in prisons. We should have an ongoing program that targets high risk groups, providing not only immunisation services but also education.

I turn now to dogs—not to their immunisation program, but to their propensity to savage people, especially children. In the latest report put out by the Epidemiology Branch of the South Australian Health Commission it is reported that each year in metropolitan Adelaide nearly 500 children are attacked by dogs, resulting in hospital visits. I seek leave to have incorporated in *Hansard* a table of statistics which notes the dog attack rates for children aged from zero to 12 years and the annual hospital cases expected in metropolitan Adelaide.

Leave granted.

Dog Attack Rates for Children Aged 0-12 years and Annual Hospital Cases Expected in Metropolitan Adelaide

Age in Years	Attacks per 1 000 Children per year	Expected Hospital cases per year
0	0.5	7
1	4.0	54
2	5.1	70
3	4.5	60
4	4.4	58
5	3.0	39
6	2.9	37
7	2.1	27
8	2.1	27
9	2.5	33
10	2.5	33
11	1.1	15
12	2.2	32
0-12	2.8	492

The Hon. BERNICE PFITZNER: As can be seen in this table, the highest attack rates involve children in the age group from one to four years. This is an emotive subject as there are many dog lovers. However, much as we love dogs, we must take necessary steps to protect our children. It has been stated that the breeds of dogs most likely to attack are bull terriers, German shepherds, dobermans and rottweilers. However, I do not believe that we ought to target breeds of dogs; rather, we ought to concentrate on better training and control of dogs by their owners. Exceptions should be made for certain dogs that are recognised as being genetically vicious. These dogs should be banned from importation. They are the American pit bull terrier, the Japanese Tosa and the South American fighting dog.

The Dog Control Act 1985 is adequate legislation for dog control. However, the policing of the Act needs to be better implemented. At present the policing is done by councils to varying degrees of efficiency, and unacceptably high dog attack rates continue. Perhaps a central body linked to the

present Dog Advisory Committee, with the role not only of policing but also of education and research ought to be further explored.

We are told that crime rates in South Australia are rising. This relates particularly to juvenile crime, which is said to be out of control. Mr President, I have a table from police statistics showing movement of juvenile crime rates from March 1990 to 1991, and I seek leave to have it inserted in *Hansard*.

Leave granted.

Juvenile Crime Movements comparing the Year Ending March 1990 to March 1991

Classification	A	B	C %
Break-enter dwellings	619	581	-6.14
Break-enter shops	433	600	38.57
Break-enter other	583	590	1.20
Total break-enter	1 635	1 767	8.07
Motor vehicle theft	846	996	17.73
Shop stealing	2 183	3 650	67.20
Other vehicle theft	154	168	9.09
Other theft	1 056	1 070	1.33
Total other theft	4 278	25 921	38.41
Total break, enter, theft	6 513	8 365	28.44
Other property damage	1 263	1 637	29.61
Total property damage	1 320	1 711	29.62
Use of cannabis, oil, resin	731	729	-0.27
Total use and possess drugs	753	754	0.13

Column A=Total for March 1989 to March 1990.

Column B=Total for March 1990 to March 1991.

Column C=Shows the percentage increase (and decrease) of juvenile crime over the twelve month period.

The Hon. BERNICE PFITZNER: Members will note in this table that there is a general trend of increase in juvenile crime, particularly shop stealing, with an increase of 67.2 per cent, and breaking and entering shops, an increase of 38.57 per cent. Members will also note that juveniles are the offenders in nearly half of all crimes. Mr President, I have another table showing juvenile crime as a percentage of total crimes for various offences, and I seek leave to have it inserted in *Hansard*.

Leave granted.

Among all crimes, juveniles accounted for the following:

	Per Cent
Break and enter—dwellings	32.46
Break and enter—shops	52.25
Break and enter—other	59.13
Total break and enter	45.08
Motor vehicle theft	51.68
Shop stealing	47.53
Other vehicle theft	73.61
Total property damage	39.78
Use of Cannabis, oil, resin	78.78
Total use and possession of drugs	70.93

The Hon. BERNICE PFITZNER: It is sobering to note that youths are responsible for nearly 80 per cent of offences involving the use of cannabis, cannabis oil and cannabis resin in South Australia. The response of the general community is that we should get tough, and there are frequent calls by some community leaders advocating more repressive measures.

Interestingly, South Australia had the first children's court in the world—in April 1890, 101 years ago. The system has not changed much since then. We still have an adversarial system in which there is a defence and prosecution arguing the case, without the youth or defendant being able to present his or her own account, and the victim being excluded from active participation. This system is inflexible and inappropriate for juveniles, as it does not meet the rehabilitation needs of the child nor the restitution needs of the victim.

Research has shown that more police, more repression and heavier punishment do not seem to improve the situation. We are now made aware of the encouraging results of the French experience, the Bonnemaison style, in juvenile crime. In 1981, during a long hot summer in Lyon and Marseille, violence erupted with an orgy of attacks on cars. They were set alight and stolen for rodeo races. Leaders of the community mobilised themselves to address the problem. Of particular merit was a report in 1982 by a committee chaired by Mr Bonnemaison, the Deputy Mayor of Epinay-sur-Senine and member of the French Parliament. In essence, the report states that:

In opposing crime we must have prevention, repression and solidarity, and that repression must combine with social preventive measures working together with forces of law and order.

The report identified the problems as those that beset a society in general and life in larger cities in particular. It identifies the problems of poverty, unemployment, poor social life, and of being excluded from the mainstream of society, and this was compounded with drugs, alcoholism and increased temptation offered by the growth of disposable goods.

The Bonnemaison approach is unique in that it recognises the aetiology of juvenile crimes to be multifactorial; it emphasises a philosophy of juvenile crime prevention; and it advocates and encourages a wide range of innovative, exciting and lateral thinking programs. These youth programs of crime prevention must fully integrate with and be part of existing facilities. Here in South Australia the system in the Children's Court is said to be fragmented. There are various agencies in authority, that is, welfare, courts, police and Government. The Senior Judge of the Children's Court, Judge Newman, advocates that a more simple, uniform and consistent system be instituted under one authority. A Bonnemaison style could be used in which a balance is struck between rehabilitation and the punitive approach. Perhaps with the right balance of punishment and rehabilitation we might help the next generation move towards a brighter future.

In closing my remarks on children, a quote from Gibran might stimulate some philosophical thought and even argument. It is as follows:

Your children are not your children.
They are the sons and daughters of Life's longing for itself.
They come through you but not from you,
And though they are with you, yet they belong not to you.
You may give them your love but not your thoughts.
For they have their own thoughts.
You may house their bodies but not their souls.
For their souls dwell in the house of tomorrow, which you cannot visit, not even in your dreams.
You may strive to be like them, but seek not to make them like you.
For life goes not backwards nor tarries with yesterday.
You are the bows from which your children as living arrows are sent forth.

The rural community is suffering. They were the pioneers of this State and this nation. They are described as being asset rich and liquid cash limited. Of necessity they must be savers, self-sufficient and self-reliant—all values that we should be encouraging in the younger generation. Our South Australian farmers are the hardest hit by the present recession. From the Australian Bureau of Statistics the South Australian wheat crop fell over the last year by 49.6 per cent; grapes were down 26.8 per cent; potatoes down 44 per cent; sheep and lamb slaughter down 51.8 per cent; and wool down 24.7 per cent. In all these categories South Australian returns were considerably lower than the national figures.

Australia is not only self-sufficient but also is among the world's most efficient producers of most categories of veg-

etables, cereals, meats, dairy foods and fruit. However, with the United States and France off-loading highly subsidised wheat into Australia's traditional markets, Australia is not able to compete. The representative on the International Policy Council on Agriculture and Trade called for 'a re-think of Government and industry attitudes to export subsidies and industry insurance schemes'. We also must address cost containment and greater efficiencies at home, in particular, by improving our unreliable and expensive transport system, and by solving problems on the wharves and in industrial relations and productivity. We must also become export oriented to develop specific products for specific overseas markets. Governments should be facilitatory in these endeavours and should not be adding weights like payroll tax, high interest rates, WorkCover and no tax benefits. The rural community must export, and Governments ought to provide incentives for them to do so. As mentioned previously, most of the trade growth is happening at our door-step, and we must not let it pass us by. This Government must do more to facilitate the export of Australian agricultural produce, both raw and processed.

Finally, I move on to the environment. We must find ways to promote both economic growth and have a well-managed environment. The term 'ecologically sustainable development' is often used. However, despite the fact that sustainable development has been a theme in many debates, both nationally and internationally, it has been surprisingly difficult to come to a consensus as to its meaning. One rather theoretical definition is:

'Ecologically sustainable development' means using, conserving and enhancing the community's resources so that ecological processes, on which life depends, are maintained, and the total quality of life, now and in the future, can be increased.

However, a more practical definition is given in the Brundtland reports, which define 'sustainability' as:

... development that meets the needs of the present without compromising the ability of future generations to meet their own needs.

This concept does imply that some limits must be imposed on environmental resources. Adelaide is unique amongst all the capital cities of Australia in that it has the city parklands which virtually surround the central business district (CBD) and provides green spaces for people living in the inner suburbs. This vision was put in place by William Light in 1836 for the then village of Adelaide. From 1985 to 1987 there was the concept of for the now larger metropolis of Adelaide—a metropolitan open space system—known as the 'second generation parklands'—to provide green spaces for people living in the outer suburbs, and to provide public recreation in an open 'natural' setting.

This second generation parklands encompasses the area from the north at Gawler River, along the western face of the Mount Lofty Ranges, to the Onkaparinga estuary. Five main areas would be included in this vision of a second generation parklands, first being the escarpment areas. The western slopes of Mount Lofty Ranges and associated elevated areas (for example, O'Halloran Hill) provide a natural backdrop to the Adelaide Plain. This escarpment area maintains the combination of natural and rural character of the Mount Lofty Ranges western slopes. The majority of the escarpment area is currently included in the hills face zone.

In the hills face zone and other parts of the escarpment area are existing reserves, which will provide the necessary natural open settings. Examples are: conservation parks, such as Black Hill, Horsnell Gully, Cleland and Morialta; recreation parks, such as Anstey Hill, Brownhill Creek, Belair, O'Halloran Hill, Onkaparinga Gorge and Sturt Gorge, and reservoirs, such as Little Para.

Watercourse areas are the second element of second generation parklands. There are not many significant watercourses crossing the Adelaide Plain. The conservation of major watercourses in a semi-natural setting will provide visual contrast. They separate adjoining urban areas and can form part of the parklands system. There are 13 watercourses to be considered and they are: Gawler River, Thompson's Creek, South Para River, Little Para River, Dry Creek, Cobbler Creek (east of Salisbury East regional park), Torrens River, Sturt River (east of Main South Road), Field River (west of Happy Valley Reservoir), Christie Creek, Onkaparinga River, Pedler Creek (west of McLaren Vale), and Port Willunga Creek (west of South Road).

The third element is existing reserves. There are many existing reserves that can be incorporated in the parklands. These include reserves attached to watercourse areas, such as Port Gawler Conservation Park, City of Adelaide parklands and Para Wirra Recreation Park; reserves attached to escarpment areas, such as Happy Valley Recreation Reserve, Shepherds Hill Recreation Reserve and Mount Lofty Botanic Gardens; and reserves attached to reservoirs, such as Montacute Conservation Park and Scott Creek Recreation Reserve.

Reservoirs and their catchment present a visual contrast to urban areas and form an important linking element to the parkland concept. Such reservoirs include Little Para, Hope Valley, Happy Valley and Mount Bold.

The fifth element is the coast which is a major recreation area and which also links up other areas of the open parkland space system. Of these five areas, the one fabric that binds this concept of a second generation parkland is the area known as the hills face zone. The hills face zone is the cornerstone of the entire parkland system—the vision for a second generation parklands. However, the vision proposed by the Government five or six years ago seems to have dimmed.

For example, there is confusion in the current '2020 Vision' planning reviews document about which level of government should be responsible for different planning decisions. In one breath the document states, quite logically and sensibly to my mind, that planning decisions in designated areas of State significance should be made by a body immediately responsible to the State Government. Then we learn that the planning review has recommended that the responsibility for an important range of planning decisions in areas of special State significance, such as the Mount Lofty Ranges watershed, the hills face zone, the Murray River flood zone and conservation zones, be transferred from the South Australian Planning Commission to local councils. Fortunately, the majority of members of this Council had the wisdom to disallow the gazetted changes to schedules 5 and 7 of the Planning Act regulations.

There is also confusion in the '2020 Vision' document about the valuable role played in the planning process by the requirement of concurrence, where for certain significant and specified development there is currently a statutory requirement for a local council to agree with a planning decision made by the South Australian Planning Commission, or *vice versa*. Responsible councils and a responsible State planning body will see the merit in preserving this power of veto over sensitive planning issues.

There is one area where there seems to be general agreement amongst all concerned. Developers, conservationists and planners all want a greater degree of certainty about what types of development are allowed and where they are allowed. To avoid confusion and doubt and to save planning costs, developers need to know not only what types of development will be allowed in a given area but also what

types of development will not be permitted. The development control plans must be unambiguous and planning processes need to be readily comprehensible and streamlined.

In conclusion, we Australians must not take this land for granted. Although our neighbours are thriving economically, we still have a plentiful supply of food, thanks to our primary producers; we have mineral wealth; and we have space. Above all, we have freedom of expression and speech. We have great potential, but we do not develop our potential to the fullest. Today, female members of Parliament had lunch with Albertina Sisulu, Deputy President of the African National Congress Women's League. That made me more aware of all our gifts and of all the things we take for granted.

As we have been the lucky country and are becoming arguably the clever country, let us now be the hardworking country. The Government must provide incentives for hard work; there must be reward for hard work. The Government must put in place a system that will help those who can become more sufficient, more self-reliant, and more responsible for their own action. We must be encouraged to strive for excellence in all walks of life and the Government must acknowledge and reward excellence. As J.F. Kennedy, a President of the United States of America, once said, drawing on the inspiration of Kahlil Gibran, 'Ask not what your country can do for you, but ask what you can do for your country.' I support the motion.

The Hon. J.C. IRWIN: I support the motion. I thank Her Excellency the Governor for opening this session of Parliament and I congratulate her on her appointment as the Governor of South Australia. I know she has all the experience and grace to meet the serious and exciting challenges that are ahead of her. She will be greatly helped by the affection and enthusiasm of the people she will meet throughout the length and breadth of the State. Indeed, over this coming week as she tours Eyre Peninsula, she will have a fair measure of that affection and support. I take this opportunity to reaffirm my allegiance to Her Majesty the Queen of Australia. I join Her Excellency in expressing regret at the death of a former member of this Council, the Hon. Ross Story. I had the pleasure of knowing Ross Story over a number of years and have affectionate memories of his dignified contribution to the State and to the Liberal Party. I express my sympathy to his widow, Mrs Sheila Story.

Most economic commentators would agree that, from the breaking of the Australia-wide drought in 1982-83 until 1990, the world had never had such a good and favourable economic climate. It gets under my skin when Federal and State Governments continually hide behind the fact that the world economic climate has declined in past years and say that therefore Australia can do nothing about it but accept that decline and go down with the rest of the world. I put to members that that should not be the case. To put it bluntly, the Federal Government blew it over the major part of the 1980s. Instead of being in a position of great strength at the end of the 1980s, the Australian economy has plunged to the depths of recession, indeed, into depression. The rural commodity prices that I am familiar with—wheat and wool—have never had such high prices as they did in the 1980s. Australia gets such an enormous boost from that economic advantage that it ought to put itself in a position where it can withstand any downturn anywhere else in the world. We do not have to hang on to the European, American or Asian umbilical cord. We can stand on our own two feet, and the sooner we do it the better.

The great redistribution of wealth, which was the experiment of the 1980s, has failed, with the rich getting richer, at least up to 1990, and the poor getting poorer, with no end in sight. The rich who got rich, temporarily I might add, and this included the States of Western Australia, Victoria and South Australia, with their starry-eyed Governments, were woefully inept, and seen to be so, in their economic management. The people of these States are now suffering from their ineptitude. These Governments had all heard about private enterprise; indeed, they had known it since it was once called free enterprise, and that was some time ago. One notes that 'free' has been dropped now. Not much enterprise is free, as there is so much interference from other people, and particularly from Governments, and it cannot be called free any more.

It was free or private enterprise that built this country. These Governments obviously admired that enterprise, for they tried to emulate it. With all their dogma, one wonders why they would even try to go along the path of private enterprise, unless they could see that that enterprise was a good thing. I suggest very much to members that it is a good thing. Private enterprise should be encouraged, and government should get out of the way and let those who know how to do it get on with it. They will do it much better than any Government of any persuasion. Those negligent Governments and fly-by-night entrepreneurs unfortunately have not heard about honesty, integrity and accountability. They have not heard about how to do things properly. They tried to buy that expertise by paying enormous sums of money for people in various professions to come in and give them the right advice. Unfortunately, the people who were brought in to give them that advice were on the wrong playing field and were giving it for the wrong reasons. They were usually giving advice on how to get out of doing various things, in an effort to make ends meet.

Those Governments had not heard about prudent investment guidelines. 'Conservation' was the great buzz word of the 1980s, and it is still very much applicable and it is not without considerable support in the community, but Governments and some private enterprise people did not bother to consider conservation and apply it to the enterprises that they were trying to run—either Government or private. When asked about conservation, farmers will immediately talk about the conservation of fodder, of land and of money. Conservation does not relate only to land, buildings or fodder; it relates also to money and to putting it in a bank or somewhere where it is safe, to be used for a rainy day. I, along with other rural members, such as the Hon. Peter Dunn, are aware that, sadly, the conservation of money in the bank is now not being encouraged by Governments. They tend to say, 'In a bad time, what can we do to help you out?' As another old friend of mine, Bert Kelly would say, the milk cow will let its money down and help some of these people in small business or on farms, and discourage people having to look after themselves by conserving their money so it can be used in better times.

Another factor, of course, is that Governments rip so much money out of the people who are trying to conserve that they have nothing left to put in the bank. Farmers work with markets and they know all about meeting the demands of the markets, both local and international. It is one of the very basic things that they work with. Governments do not understand markets. As an example, I refer to the use of an unlisted property trust, recently frozen, and some assets of SGIC, which have in effect been frozen into the hands of SGIC and not allowed to come onto the market, because it knows it will not get what it paid for them, because of its imprudent buying. Other instrumen-

talities think they can defy the market and that at the end of the freeze period the market will have risen.

However, Mr Acting President, I know that you have had some experience in life, as most of us in here have, and I certainly have, and I have heard all this before. I have even used the same argument myself when doing budgets for my farm. I have thought, 'If I can keep this mob of sheep for another six months it will only cost so much to keep them and I will make double that at the end of six months.' However, I can tell the Council from bitter experience, from what one might call the school of hard knocks, that I have learned otherwise and that at the end of that six months the chances that the mob of sheep would bring in more have usually diminished. Very rarely in my life on the land have I ever made that right decision, to hang off and not take the market price at the time, in the hope that I would get an increased return in six months or a year. It does not work that way and I defy anyone to show me where it does.

I put it to members that the market relates to the present—not tomorrow, yesterday or a month's time. The market is now. The signals it is giving should be heeded. The distortion of markets by Governments and others that are trying to stop runs on assets is a very imperfect way to proceed. There are people out there now who want to purchase assets at the right price, so that they can make those assets work for them and therefore work for the community. But they are denied that because they are frozen out. It is indeed unfortunate that the people in this State and nationally will pay for the folly of politicians and Governments who do not know what they are doing, and in most cases do not know what they are talking about. Let us hope that recent experiences, so painfully felt by Governments and individuals, will not be repeated and that they will be imprinted on people's memories for a long time to come.

The unstable climate that we now have in Australia and in South Australia has a flow-on effect to all facets of life in both the city and country areas. Anyone who has been around knows that. I have not heard the budget speech today, but Mr Kerin will not make the right decisions in the Federal budget, and neither will Premier Bannon in the State budget. The budget decisions will be aimed more at re-election than the health of the community or to things that have to be done right now, as opposed to in two years time, when it is convenient. We have seen so many examples federally of the economy being distorted by the use of various instruments, money instruments and others, so obviously aimed at having the right climate, with unemployment coming down and with interest rates coming down, etc., just prior to an election. The accumulation of that over most of the 1980s has caused the disaster that we now have and again I say that that is mostly self-inflicted, because we did not make the right decisions. We have hidden too much behind the fact that something has happened internationally, that people will not buy our wool or wheat, for example.

I hope that people will never forget the series of decisions made by Governments that have resulted in today's economic climate. It is not good enough for people or for Governments to say, 'Well, ask the Opposition what it would do about it?'. Those saying such a thing must consider who caused the problem in the first place and the fact that any philosophical direction that caused the problem could cause it again. I hope that people are not hoodwinked into believing that that is not the case. Communications that I have received from constituents in the past few weeks and months have really brought home to me that the community is angry, and it is angry enough to start voicing its

annoyance at what is going on. The farmers have been doing it for some time, but now people from towns and cities are increasingly saying that enough is enough.

Not only does my office receive phone calls every day protesting about the things that concern my shadow portfolios but also, before the phone call is finished, they usually manage to vent their abhorrence about other things. From my experience South Australia led or followed the rest of the world in downgrading social values—I am not now talking about money values—in the late 1960s and 1970s. I do not question that change was needed, but I do question the new values and, in many cases, the non-existence of any values at all. The old values were taken away and absolutely nothing was put in their place. It has to be recognised that the social engineering of the 1960s and the 1970s has given the community a quite chilling down side. The community must address the downside problems and find a better balanced atmosphere in which to live their lives and, most importantly, in which to bring up their children. We simply cannot afford, in dollar or human cost terms, to let things slide further into the mire. Psychiatrist Karl Menninger, the United States Secretary of Health and Community Services, saw the problem in stark terms. In his Fathers Day message, in June this year a United States newspaper reports him as follows:

If we don't find a way to prevent the painful abandonment, abuse, and exploitation of children, we will spend the rest of our lives building mental hospitals and prisons.

That is a very powerful observation. I ask whether members think that that is true. It makes a main point for me. Personal safety, law and order is not just a matter of police and prisons. Without in any way diminishing the anti-crime effort in South Australia, I have to say that it does not matter how many police you have, how strict is the courts system or how many prison cells we have, we will not dent the rising crime rate unless the community will accept some social changes and some return to the very important values of what is right and what is wrong. We need to redefine these time-tested values, spell them out and put them through the family and education system as often as we can. We should defend them because the cost of not doing so, as I have pointed out in my contribution to this debate in the past, is too high.

The community must accept these changes or cop the consequences and the associated costs. It is a clear choice. I do not mind going back over the need for change in the 1960s and the 1970s, and the changes that were made. But, I am putting very clearly, and as clearly as I can, that it is now time to look at what has happened since the 1960s and the 1970s and add up the costs in human terms and, if you like, dollar terms. It is time for the community to decide whether it can go on paying those costs or just let things go. In the United States gaols are overflowing as they are here. In the United States 300 to 400 people are on death row, but still the crime rate is rising. When in the United States recently, I had the opportunity to see people on death row and the gas chambers and that was quite chilling.

I acknowledge that the Attorney-General has often pointed to the United States, its crime statistics and the position with its gaols. My reading of the community in South Australia is that it wants strong leadership and the return of discipline to the social fabric of society. We have order on our roads and a very strong discipline to enforce that order. I use this as a very simple example that we can all understand, and I ask, 'Why can't it apply to many other areas of our lives?' Sure, we do not want interference; we want to be able to live a perfectly reasonable life without interference. But, we still have responsibilities. If the community has found that it has to have laws that relate to

driving on the left-hand side of the road, and that it has to have speed signs, red lights, speed cameras and other such things, then it should start demanding the same for social areas. New South Wales is heading in that direction with, I believe, wide community support, including that of the Opposition. It now has truth in sentencing, which Victoria is also embracing.

A prison sentence under this system is a definite sentence, not just some fancy words. As most members would know, law and order has had a number one priority in at least the last two State elections. At the last election I have no doubt that the glossy pamphlet announcing a coalition against crime that was produced by the Government helped win the election, but it has not stopped the escalating crime rate. Some people will say that it is too early to judge that after just over a year, but we are not seeing very many signs that anything has improved since the last election.

In New South Wales a study of prisoners revealed that the typical prisoner is a young male who has no qualifications, is unemployed and functionally illiterate, is under medical treatment and is a drug user. In a Victorian study 86 per cent of prisoners had completed only part of their secondary education. In many cases, it is believed that they may have got only as far as grade seven. A recent federal study of United States students quoted in the *USA Today* and written by Pat Ordovensky in June 1991 stated:

United States students might live on burgers and fries, but many of them don't have the maths skill to add up the bill, a new study released on Thursday shows. The results of a federal study 'portray a nation of students who are not doing well in mathematics', says Richard Boyd, survey chairman. 'This is an alarm bell that should ring all night', said the Education Secretary Lamar Alexander. The survey found:

- Most students can't meet on-the-job demands for problem solving;
- Only 46 per cent of high school seniors can solve problems involving fractions, decimals and percentages, and only 5 per cent are ready for college maths;
- Only 66 per cent of eighth graders and 77 per cent of 12th Graders correctly totalled the cost of soup, burger, fries and cola on a restaurant menu.

Obviously these studies give a broad outline on areas that need to be addressed. We have to move in the following areas, and they are interlinked. I suggest that we have a very similar problem, although I do not have the statistics to support it just yet. I would say that South Australia has very much the same problem, and some of these matters have been underlined by the Hon. Mr Lucas. We have to move in areas that relate to drugs, where over 60 per cent of prisoners are convicted on drug-related charges in South Australia.

Poverty has doubled since 1982. The level of unemployment is unacceptable. At the moment it would not matter what figure you used to give an indication of how many are unemployed, as so many unemployed are hidden under other fancy labels or going through more and more education programs until they must have education coming out of their ears. It is not much fun having lots of education if you cannot do anything with it.

Of special concern is youth unemployment of around 25 per cent, and again that was referred to in the excellent address of Mr Lucas. I refer to family breakdowns. It does not matter who the parents are, whether they are single, married, lesbians or homosexuals: they have a responsibility for children under their care and cannot abandon them. I do not accept that parenting should go to some of those people, but, if society wants that to happen, people living in these circumstances must have the responsibility for their children. What has this much-vaunted education system done for the average and below-average Australian child? Indeed, what has it done to the top end as exemplified by

whiz kids on computers who can press the right button but cannot think? Illiteracy and innumeracy is at 10 per cent in this modern time in Australia, and I put it to the Council that that is appalling.

It should not be accepted by anyone in this Chamber that 10 per cent of the community is illiterate. There are no exact figures on how many prisoners can read and write, but it has been estimated that maybe as many as 20 per cent to 30 per cent are illiterate. Anyone who cannot see that as a problem is very blind. This somewhat simplistic overview gives an idea of where we are all going to have to start in the long haul of reducing crime. In June, I returned from a study trip to Canada and the United States of America. The purpose of that three-week trip was to study policing, crime prevention and correctional services, and in particular the private prison system.

I was fortunate enough while in Detroit to be taken on patrol in a police helicopter. It is a great way to do some sightseeing, but I was brought down to earth very quickly when my companion told me that if he were to let me down in a number of the streets over which we were flying he would guarantee that I would not get out. There are 620 homicides annually in Detroit; that is chilling.

Is that what we have to look forward to in Australia? I hope not. But it will be if we do not start tackling the problem and not let it drift on any further. If the Federal Government is trying to tie Australia—and South Australia—economically to the rest of the world, and hiding behind that, then it cannot have it both ways, because the Attorney-General and I can give figures *ad nauseum* about the increasing crime rate overseas. Because it is much higher than ours we cannot say we will not get there, because we will.

As members already know, Adelaide has already been acknowledged by the Minister to be unsafe, especially at night. We simply cannot hide behind what is happening in the rest of the world. The signs are there and we must do something about it.

I went on patrol with the police in New Orleans. As recommended, I was dressed casually. When I met the police they asked that I pull out my shirt so that I would look as though I had a gun under it, even though I did not. That evening was pretty scary for the few hours that I was with them. Those officers on patrol can, at will, stop people for having the wrong haircut or for looking as though they need to be stopped. They stopped one group of five youths—four black and one white—all under 15; two of them had been on crack and the rest had been either on assault charges or had been involved in some other misdemeanour. As I said, it was very chilling to be in that atmosphere.

There is a curfew in New Orleans for children under 16. It is said that it works and that it has helped enormously. In the hard-core crime areas, while they are on patrol, police stop people for no reason. I do not agree with that, but there is no doubt that it will happen here and will have to happen here if we do not do something about the louts on our streets. In the United States Governments are spending 20 per cent more in the cities on law enforcement than they are on education. 'We are trading textbooks for prisons,' says Jerome Miller, President of the centre that studies sentencing and correctional reform.

Where do we start? There are any number of committees, conferences and meetings happening every day, where people are asking the same questions in Adelaide, and probably around Australia, but the crime rate is still growing. I had a call this week from Camden Park from a woman who had just had her house ransacked. All that was stolen was a gold watch, but every cupboard and every drawer had

been gone through. The woman said that hers was probably the last house in the area to be robbed. All the victims in her area believe that most of the robberies have been done by schoolchildren or juveniles. Most have happened between 11 a.m. and 4 p.m. The thief has always been selective and has taken only things that can be converted to money without any suspicion. Her suggestion was to call on all schools to do a roll call twice a day. If the children are not at school, a telephone call should be made or a letter should go to the parents.

There is every chance that, if the children are not at school, the parents are not aware of that. In Detroit, the police took schoolchildren home or back to the school if they had no written excuse to be away from school and were found on the streets. They do not have that problem any more in Detroit. The answer is not in locking people up and throwing away the key. The biggest part of the answer lies in treating the cause; the smaller part lies in returning to society offenders who will not re-offend. The profile of the typical prisoner, as I have outlined, is only part of the story. This profile does not include the person who was not convicted, not caught or the juvenile. Two weeks ago the Opposition released some figures, through me, showing the dramatic increase in reported crime and, last week, figures showing the increase in juvenile crime. When using the juvenile crime figures, we used the clean-up figures, and it is strange that the relevant figures were not followed by comment from any Government Minister. Are they frightened to tell the people what is happening? Again, it is not good enough—and that is a common phrase of mine—for Ministers to publish in the *Gazette*, as in this instance, figures on crime and then not to make some comment. Because there is no good news there is no excuse for their silence.

The figures released are official figures. They were comprehensive comparisons so that anyone receiving them could check the facts and publish their own assessment. In the press release cover I put in some comments that were fairly obvious to me, but I was very careful to publish the official figures in total, with good areas and some bad areas, so that people could make their own judgment and not say that I was misleading them. The increase is not something that has just happened; it has been happening for some time. The quarterly figures released on 1 August and published in the *Gazette* of offences reported to, or becoming known, to the police show a steady, and in some cases, an alarming increase. I know that there is some confusion about the use of figures, but when I talk about offences reported to, or becoming known to, the police, it is just that. It may well be explained that quite a number of those offences can be easily cleaned up, may not have ever happened, or may have been an illusion, or that someone may have owned up to them.

Nevertheless, they are a guide from quarter to quarter, or year to year, of the trends. The trends are in the area of reporting, not of clean-ups in this case. My observations of rising figures are based on comparisons of the years 1989-90 with 1990-91, ending in March. Again, I am not using the financial year ending in June because we do not have the figures—they are not published. Therefore, I have used what I would call a running year from March 1989-90 to March 1990-91. The total robbery and extortion rate is up 11 per cent; robbery with firearms is up 35 per cent; total theft is up 16 per cent; motor vehicle theft is up 24 per cent; stealing from a person is up 87 per cent; shop stealing is up 31 per cent; sex offences are up 13 per cent; receiving and unlawful possession is up 18 per cent; total property damage is up 20 per cent; and murder is up 58 per cent.

Again, I qualify that without giving the actual figures, as I do not have them here.

Thankfully, this is from a very low base, but it is still up 58 per cent over the past year. It is pleasing to note that motor vehicle traffic offences were in fact down 14 per cent on a 12 month comparison, and I put this down to the breath testing and camera blitzes that have taken place in one form or another over the past 12 months ending in March. A very important point should not be missed here. Where a heavy concentration of prevention has taken place with positive results, it should signal a message to anyone who wants to see it that, first, we cannot afford to let up in that area of concentration. My friend and colleague the Hon. Di Laidlaw would understand that with breathalisher testing one cannot let up; it has reached a very heavy concentration now in South Australia and maybe that is not enough. I put it to the Council that the results are quite favourable. However, if that were reduced to only half the effort, the results would also start to get worse as far as drink driving is concerned. I am trying to make that point very strongly. Once we have the concentration, we cannot afford to let up. I am talking not just about breathalisers, but about any area of crime prevention. We should encourage a concentration in other areas in an effort to achieve the same results.

I must also point out that in looking at the quarterly comparisons, that is, March 1990 to March 1991, there were decreasing areas of crime, including traffic offences. I am very pleased to acknowledge that, but in most cases this trend has not been sustained in the following quarters. Hence the figures that I have just cited, which on a year-to-year basis show an increase in most cases.

So, one cannot be complacent and say that a certain quarter has been good and that the situation will be good from hereon in, because last year's figures have shown that it is not sustained. We had an example in recent weeks of the child abuse task force in the northern suburbs having to be curtailed because the police involved in that exercise were deployed on other tasks. It highlights that the police are continually having to put out fires without the luxury of sustained effort to complete a given task. I heard my colleague the Hon. Dr Pfitzner talking about child abuse. Most of us think about it a lot. If it is successful with police effort in the northern or other suburbs, it seems crazy to start taking people off that task force and putting them on some other job, when they should be completing the one that they have started. Perhaps some have been able to argue that they should stay on the child abuse task force. But, if they have gone to some other area, it makes the point that something is lacking in the resources that we have this movement from one area to another.

We saw the same thing happen with the Hindley Street mobile task force. I understand that Hindley Street is now a safer place to be, but that task force was used on public transport. Not only was it used but also it was announced that it would be used, which was extraordinary. They should have just been used and people not given a chance to make other arrangements. Rising crime levels generate reactions from all levels of society. The community reacts by showing fear for life and property. I guess no-one in this Chamber, even if it were overflowing, could say that some member of their family has not been involved in property damage to their car or had their house broken into. There is fear out there and it is genuine.

A survey in Adelaide in 1985 found that 35 per cent of people felt unsafe when walking the streets at night. Three years later a similar question resulted in 42 per cent of Adelaide's residents saying that they felt unsafe on the

streets at night; that survey was done by Frank Small and Associates in 1988. No doubt a survey, if taken today, would show another huge increase in the number of people in this State who worry constantly about their lives and property. As a result of the increase in crime levels the community makes more effort to protect itself and the winners are the home security industries; and the losers are too many to mention.

Community pressure forces the Government to take stronger measures to curb this increase. More often than not the action from the Government has been reactive rather than going back a few steps and trying to ascertain the reason for the increase and doing something about it. There is plenty of evidence in the community of areas of cause, but too little has been done to do anything about it.

Last week on an ABC radio program, Professor Polk, professor of criminology at the University of Melbourne, said that crime is rising in Australia and will rise for quite some time. Professor Polk said that unemployment of teenagers today is reflected in the increasing crime rate. Many unemployed people today are not unemployed temporarily but will be unemployed for a very long time. They turn to crime because they do not have a home, do not have access to the dole and, with the tightening of regulations of various kinds, they cannot get the homeless allowance and do not have any resources. The long-term problem of the economy will be reflected in the crime rates.

About 25 to 30 per cent of all teenagers today are unemployed and they have no training or skills and are so depressed by the situation that they have no enthusiasm left. From figures published on 1 August in the *Gazette* we see that juveniles were responsible for nearly half of all offences cleared (juveniles being under 18 years of age), and some figures have been referred to by the Hon. Dr Pfitzner. I am referring to offences cleared. I use the word 'cleared' as distinct from offences becoming known and reported to the police. I do so for no other reason than that age groups offending are not published in the official *Gazette* as offences under the offences reported group. They are reported only in age groups in the cleared up figures. I seek leave to insert in *Hansard* a table showing percentage comparisons of juvenile offenders with all other offenders. The table is purely statistical.

Leave granted.

Juvenile Crime Movements Comparing the Year Ending March 1990 to March 1991.

Classification	A	B	C
			%
Break-enter dwellings	619	581	-6.14
Break-enter shops	433	600	38.57
Break-enter other	583	590	1.20
Total break enter	1 635	1 767	8.07
Motor vehicle theft	846	996	17.73
Shop stealing	2 183	3 650	67.20
Other vehicle theft	154	168	9.09
Other theft	1 056	1 070	1.33
Total other theft	4 278	5 921	38.41
Total break, enter, theft	6 513	8 365	28.44
Other property damage	1 263	1 637	29.61
Total property damage	1 320	1 711	29.62
Use of cannabis, oil, resin	731	729	-0.27
Total use and possess drugs	753	754	0.13

Column A = Total for March 1989 to March 1990.

Column B = Total for March 1990 to March 1991.

Column C = Shows the percentage increase (and decrease) of juvenile crime over the 12 month period.

The Hon. J.C. IRWIN: It is clear from this table that juveniles are turning their attention to shop and car stealing

away from breaking and entering. Breaking and entering of dwellings by juveniles went down 6.1 per cent in the 12 months ended June 1991 compared with the year ended June 1990. Again, it is pleasing to see at least one figure going down—in this case by 6.1 per cent—for juveniles. However, there has been an increase in the area of stealing from shops and motor vehicles.

We saw a rapid change in the job structure in Australia. We are losing manufacturing jobs as well as jobs in the skilled and white collar areas. The Labor Party, with its notorious economic policy in hand with the unions must shoulder much of the blame for this. Juveniles are depressed by the economic times in which they live. What future do they have to look forward to under a Labor Government both in South Australia and federally?

The Hon. R.R. Roberts interjecting:

The Hon. J.C. IRWIN: I do not think you can answer that. I am giving you the facts. The most frightening aspect of the crime figures released two weeks ago relate to how many offences are committed by under 18 year olds. Even more terrifying is the number of crimes that are committed by those 14 years of age and under. I am talking about children who should be supervised either at school or at home if they are 12, 13 or 14 years old. They were responsible for 14.28 per cent of all cleared shop stealing crimes for the quarter January to March 1991. They were responsible for 10 per cent of all break and enter crimes, fraud and offences, including theft; 14 year olds and under 14 year olds, using the clear-up figures published in the *Gazette*, on 1 August, were responsible for the following frightening increases for the year ended March 1990 compared with the year ending March 1991.

Other assaults were up by 64 per cent; total assaults rose by 61 per cent; and total robbery was up 38 per cent; break and enter were up 25 per cent; and motor vehicle theft (remembering that 14 year olds are hardly ready to have a licence) increased 40 per cent; with shop stealing up 75 per cent. We are talking not about a few offences but rather about 1 953 offences—more than any other age group combined. The figure for 15, 16 and 17 year olds was 1 812 offences, more than any other juvenile age group. Total break, enter and theft offences increased by 37 per cent. We are referring to young people. They are the worst group of offenders of all juveniles including 15 to 17 year olds. These are alarming figures and cannot be ignored or shrugged off. Something is badly wrong and something strong and positive should be done about it.

Before leaving the statistical area, I must say something about the clear-up rates. They are not available for the 1990-91 year, but I have some available on a March to March basis. Using the example of property offences, for 1989-90, 120 561 property offences were reported to the police. Of those, 18 253 were cleared up, representing a 15.1 per cent clear-up rate. That is not a new figure: it was stated with the budget papers last year. I agree with most commentators who know something about crime or even ordinary citizens like you and me: it is a lamentable record that only 15 per cent of 120 000 offences were cleared up. Every effort must be made to improve this performance. An improvement will be achieved only by a greater concentration of police attending trouble spots immediately, combined with the preventive measures that must be employed.

The clear-up figures are made to look better because accumulated offences becoming known to police prior to 1 July in each year are left totally out of the calculations and when any clear-ups are achieved out of the backlog they are credited to the current year. I hate to think what the accumulated backlog figures of unsolved offences would stand

at now. They would be astronomically high. In the 1989-90 clear-up figures for property offences, there are some pleasing sub-areas of good clear-up rates. Fraud and forgery had a clear up rate of 54 per cent, misappropriation and embezzlement had a clear-up rate of 54 per cent, and shop theft had a pleasing 89 per cent clear-up rate. These preliminary figures I have got on a March to March basis, comparing the latest figures this year against those for last year. Fraud and forgery clear-up rates have gone down marginally to 52.9 per cent, misappropriation and embezzlement have increased to 68.2, which is very pleasing, and shop theft has reached 90.7 per cent clear-up; again, a pleasing figure.

I am told by retailers that shop theft costs South Australia some \$92 million, and I wonder how much is never detected. A way must be found to stop the insidious shoplifter. One hopes the electronic era will produce a wonder bug to detect this practice and wipe it out once and for all. There does not seem to be the will to wipe out shoplifting. With open displays and temptation all around and people walking into shops nowadays, it is little wonder that things disappear off the shelves. The unfortunate part about that is that you and I pay for it, if we are being honest and not trying to get things for nothing.

I expect the high clear-up rates of the offences I have just listed are partly if not greatly due to the paper trail left by the perpetrators, and I am talking there of fraud, misappropriation and embezzlement. I acknowledge the cleverness of the investigators, who are following that paper trail. I guess the hit and run shop thief does not leave a clear trail and is therefore more difficult to catch and prove guilty. Nevertheless, with better prevention, response and detection, the very low clear-up rate should and must be improved.

The abysmal area of clear-up is in property offences. Although there was only a 6.9 per cent clear-up of break and enter offences in 1989-90, the figure to March this year improved slightly to 7.1 per cent. The total theft clear-up is 17.7 per cent and this year, running on March to March figures, it has dropped to 17 per cent. Motor vehicle theft clear-up was 11.4 per cent in 1989-90 and has deteriorated to 10.7 per cent in the year ended March this year. The clear-up percentage of reported crimes has not greatly improved, although there have been some areas of improvement in the past 12 months.

All these areas are highly visible to the average family, especially the elderly. They are the areas of offences where people are very annoyed and many are very frightened. Most people now have been on the receiving end of the ravages of some youths who are not only causing great damage to other people and property but who know full well that they can get away with it. If the Government lowers its effort in any way in this most essential service of Government, it stands to be condemned. The Police Force is not an area which should suffer by this Government's woeful economic record. Many people, including me, will look to the State Budget to see if this Government really does have a commitment to its Police Force. The people demand it. I demand it and it cannot for any reason fail to deliver. Again, it is not good enough for the Minister and others to say they have had such a good run over the past couple of years that now it is their turn for the big downturn. I do not think the people will accept that.

In a recent brochure sent out by the Australian Lions Drug Awareness Foundation they say:

It is now recognised by teachers and parents the crucial role that self-esteem plays in children growing up to reach their full potential leading productive and drug free lives.

How can a child have any self-esteem in today's society, when there is very little future? What we are left with is a society paying the criminal justice system, the insurance

companies and our taxes for police to look after our property and safety rather than looking to the solution and understanding the causes. It just seems to be a pay-out mentality everywhere we go. What we need is a strong Government that will give our children a future, not a government which is hell bent on playing games with other people's hard-earned money.

This then brings me back to the area of responsibility of the parents and maybe the responsibility of schools in knowing where their students are. It is little wonder that a typical prisoner is classified as uneducated if 51 per cent of break and enter, fraud and theft is committed by youths under 18 who are out in the streets flat out thieving and starting out on a life of crime, when they should be in this renowned education system that we are told we have in South Australia. Recent studies are showing that the main reason so many juveniles are encouraged into crime is due to boredom and complete lack of self-esteem and the security within themselves to say no. That must relate to the family and education.

What is required now is a much broader, better informed cooperative public action to achieve effective crime strategies. Such strategies cannot all be left to the criminal justice system alone. There is a role for other experts such as town planners and economists, as well as the need to involve the wider community. We need the silent majority to stand up and demand of politicians that they stop giving unbalanced attention to the minority squeaky wheel. I have a few pointers for the discussions which the community should be having but which so far have yielded no solutions.

Now nearly 52 per cent of women work, leaving homes unattended. I do not blame women for that by any means, but I am simply using that figure. How does society make sure the youth are properly supported and one parent is encouraged to be home after school time? Residential areas are cut off from industrial and commercial areas, leaving masses of unattended houses just waiting to be robbed. The school hours have not adjusted to fit in with the 'two parent' working family. Children are latch door kids with at least two hours without supervision. Parenting of children should be a full time responsibility for parents to share. It is hardly likely that two parents will be able to take on that task all the time. It has been expected in some areas but only of people who had the money to do it.

Unattractive public transport or lack of it means too many people drive to work leaving cars unattended just waiting for the bored juvenile to take it for a spin. In the evenings we drive home and leave completely devoid of people huge industrial and commercial areas also just waiting to be broken into.

Our vast supermarket style shopping centres are just too much of a temptation to some people. In the old days you stood behind the counter and asked for what you wanted, with the eagle eye of the shop assistant watching your every move. It is too simple to just add the massive cost of shoplifting to the cost of items.

Moves in wages allowing younger less experienced people higher wages has meant a swing by employers to hire older more experienced adults. We now have a huge unemployment rate in our younger people, precisely the age group who are most liable to turn to crime out of idleness and boredom. Responsible parents are not helped when subsidies are withdrawn from such things as libraries and swimming pools. The children wander around shopping centres, doing damage instead.

There is much food for thought, I hope, in the figures and comments I have made in this contribution today. I would always be very happy to discuss matters that I raised

with other people who are interested in the whole area of crime, from juveniles to adults. It is my hope that the community will demand that the correct decisions are made in this area of the economy and that the many social problems before us are addressed. I probably have to say quite strongly that I still believe it is up to the community to make the decisions about social values; it cannot sit by being what we sometimes call the silent majority if the silent majority spends its time saying things and not doing anything about them. I guess as politicians we all have our friends and acquaintances who are not too busy to bend our ear about what is wrong with the world but, when it comes to do something about it, they do not want to know about it and will run hard the other way. I do not think they can do that much longer; they must be active in the community. I support the motion.

The Hon. I. GILFILLAN: I indicate my support for the motion. I put on record my respect for and congratulations to Her Excellency the Governor, Dame Roma Mitchell. I believe it is a very fortunate choice and I look forward to her term. It is significant to note that she is the first woman to hold such a position but, relatively, I regard that as of lesser significance than the fact that a person of her capabilities, compassion and intellectual qualities has taken governorship of this State. I congratulate her on that appointment.

I want to canvass a number of issues that I feel warrant examination in some detail. Despite the Government's 'It will be all right on the night' attitude, the painful reality is that much of the Government's long list of so-called achievements mean little to the average person. In the Address in Reply speech that I made last year I raised the issue of the significant financial losses accruing to the State Government through the State Bank's wholly owned subsidiary Beneficial Finance. I was met with protests from the Government benches and was told that this State was being managed in a 'sound financial manner'. That was the interjection that came flying at me from the other side of the Chamber when I dared question this issue last year. I was also told that talk of spiralling losses was nothing but loose talk based 'on rumour and wild speculation'. It was some rumour, some wild speculation. It was spot on.

Since then so much political water has passed under the proverbial bridge and we are now several months into a royal commission investigating the State Bank and its subsidiaries, following the devastating revelation by the Government of losses in excess of \$1 billion. I know that I am being somewhat tedious about this, but I remind the Council that in 1989 I was actually sued for defamation after itemising the areas where the State Bank was over exposed and the losses that it stood to make on those imprudent investments. The bank's reply to that was to gag me. It cost me a lot of money and eventually, somewhat painfully, I signed a letter just to prevent my being bled dry. However much the law might seem to be available to all, the fact is that those with money are the ones who can see the course through. I think it is reasonable to comment that the laws of defamation in this State need revision, in a way that leaves those with a smaller financial capacity in a fairer position. However, the fact is that just prior to the State election I was gagged when I was then identifying the extremely parlous state that the State Bank had got itself into, I believe with the complicity of the Government of the day.

The Hon. Diana Laidlaw: Are you going to seek compensation from them now?

The Hon. I. GILFILLAN: I am civil-minded enough not to want to expose any further financial embarrassment as regards the State Bank, and in consideration of the taxpayers of South Australia I will carry my own loss on that—but this Chamber might hear me mentioning it again from time to time.

It seems that the so-called fantasy has in fact become a reality, much to the chagrin of ordinary taxpayers who are increasingly shouldering the growing burden of this Government's financial ineptitude in managing the affairs of State. It now seems clear that the future survival of this Government hinges to a large degree on the findings of the State Bank Royal Commission and the early indications are that some members on the Government benches may be updating their CVs in preparation for becoming active members of the much vaunted Kickstart scheme, recently unveiled by the Premier, to create new jobs for the unemployed.

This leads me to my next point, namely, the role of Parliament in our society and the need for some very real parliamentary reform. Students are taught that parliamentarians are elected by the people, that Parliaments make laws, monitor expenditure, plan future investment and keep a guiding hand on the work of the Public Service. Parliaments are also assumed to safeguard liberty, to act as watchdogs on justice and civil liberties and guarantee free speech. Increasingly, it appears to me that if any of Australia's Parliaments carry out these functions it is more by accident than by design.

I recently had the pleasure of hosting Australia's first Balance of Power and Independent MPs Seminar here in Adelaide, with 13 MPs attending from four State Parliaments. John Hatton, Clover Moore, Peter McDonald and Richard Jones from New South Wales attended, along with Bob Brown and Lance Armstrong from Tasmania, Dr Ian Alexander and Dr Elizabeth Constable from Western Australia and with Norm Peterson, Martyn Evans and Mike Elliott joining me from South Australia. In addition, we received a number of apologies from other MPs unable to attend because of committee duties or other items on their respective agendas. It was a great success and invigorated me to press ahead with parliamentary reform measures aimed at giving the people a fairer and more accountable system of government and, might I say, Parliament as well.

Indeed, despite our different political backgrounds, the similarities of the problems facing all State Parliaments, Independents and smaller Parties were astounding. I look forward to meeting next year in Hobart, at the invitation of Bob Brown and the Tasmanian Greens, for what I imagine will be an even bigger national seminar.

When either of the old Parties has a majority in both Houses, Executive Government can prevent full debate on private members' Bills or motions by terminating debate on any subject at any time, despite the fact that in essence there has been no real debate. I observe here that that was very graphically put to us by John Hatton from New South Wales. He explained that through the course of several Governments he had virtually been gagged to the point of not being able to make any contribution inside the parliamentary structure.

Under all Governments, debate on legislation is often gagged and large numbers of Bills are shunted through Parliament. In fact, 100 Bills passed through this House in the last session, with a good number of weighty matters being put on the Notice Paper in the last two weeks of sitting when members were already overwhelmed with a backlog of legislation. Restrictive interpretation of Standing Orders, procedures or interference by Executive Govern-

ment can prevent a member of Parliament from taking part in the formulation of a budget of any Government department, or even of the Parliament itself, with the details of Government contracts, procurements and Public Service salary packages often hidden or withheld behind commercial in-confidence clauses, as we have observed just recently with the State Bank and the MFP questioning.

The general public is asked to place a large degree of trust in the Government of the day, and it does so, but in recent years it has received scant confirmation that that trust is deserved. Standing Orders do not provide for debate on the subject of a petition, irrespective of how many signatures it contains, and the same Standing Orders can refuse permission for extensive quoting by MPs from documents or for having documents included in *Hansard*. For the most part, draft legislation is formulated by the Public Service, Cabinet, Caucus, or some special interest group, leaving the Parliament in the role of under-resourced correctors and critics.

Often, inadequate notice is given of legislation, with debate truncated, with detailed information not made available and with not enough time for proper research to be undertaken. The people in the community who are affected are often not consulted and the legislation is not analysed and, by and large, not rationally debated with any significant degree of in-depth knowledge. Increasingly, we are being governed by regulation, following the passing of umbrella legislation giving Executive Government the power to make the regulations, and if those regulations are predetermined outside parliamentary sittings they may only be debated or rescinded if Executive Government does not use its numbers to gag debate on the issue in the Assembly, leaving this Chamber with the awesome task of assessing all regulations.

Parliament can block Supply but there is no structure to involve MPs in monitoring of expenditure except by hit-and-miss methods of raising individual items in Parliament. There are no portfolio committees, for example, to act as watchdogs on departmental expenditure. Without doubt, shadow Ministers (one of whom is with us in the Chamber) and the overwhelming majority of backbench MPs (two of whom are with us in the Chamber) are woefully under-resourced.

Government as a whole may be elected by less than 50 per cent of the people but can command more than 90 per cent of the Public Service resources, leaving the Opposition and crossbenchers starved of necessary information to perform their vital tasks. In reality, the Parliament is often almost powerless against an Executive Government which dominates through both power and resources. Parliament is just not able to be a watchdog on justice and rights.

Although parliamentarians raise issues, the delivery of justice is in the hands of the lawyers and the judiciary who self-regulate and have no mechanism of external accountability. In that case the general public may feel that justice is being denied.

There is no justice ombudsman as is the case in Sweden, nor is there a legal services ombudsman as has been recommended by the Lord Chancellor in Great Britain. The public servant has no legislated right of free speech and whistle-blowers are dealt with ruthlessly even though they may be exposing corruption, wastage, nepotism or gross mismanagement. Even the appointment of parliamentarians is of dubious merit with 90 per cent of MPs throughout Australia not elected directly by the people. Instead, a small and powerful clique sits behind closed doors and engages in a game of preselection which determines who the candidates will be, which electorate they will represent and, to a large extent, what the parliamentarian will say and do.

The odd State out is Tasmania where there are multi-member electorates and a Hare-Clarke system of voting giving Party voters a choice within the Party group at the polls and Independents a better chance of election. Preferential voting, counted proportionally, makes the Tasmanian electoral process arguably the fairest in the world. I emphasise the situation in Tasmania where there is a rotation of names on the ballot paper so as to eliminate the so-called 'donkey vote' and so that Parties cannot preselect a person to remain at the top of any one particular ballot sheet. Thus, it really gives the people the responsibility and the opportunity to specifically vote for and elect a particular person.

I believe that the South Australian parliamentary system needs reform and I look forward with interest to the debate on the Parliamentary Committees Bill which is soon to come before this House, although I believe that many aspects of it may need to be reconsidered. I believe that a number of issues should be considered when examining a parliamentary reform package. After a wait of many years we have freedom of information legislation, although it does not contain many of the provisions I believe would have made it truly effective. For instance, no agency should be exempt under the Act and financial charges should be kept reasonable. The current Act does neither.

In addition, all Government agencies should publish annual reports in a standard form to allow comparisons between departments to be easily made. The Ombudsman and Auditor-General must be able to inspect all documents of Government and publish reports at any stage of an investigation with or without ministerial consent. The Government should recognise the fundamental right of freedom of speech for all public sector employees and legislate to provide full protection for the rights and employment of any public servant who makes information public and/or available to Parliament or members about corruption, incompetence, inefficiency or waste. Such legislation could be based on the United States so-called whistle-blower protection legislation of 1989.

Parliament should have fixed four year terms with a variation of just one week either way of a date set down for the same week of the same month every four years. Incidentally, it is quite likely that New South Wales will adopt this proposal. I remind members that the Democrats were very eager to have this amendment implemented when this State was amending its legislation. Unfortunately, the obsession of the Government of the day having the power to pick the date to suit itself is persuasive for the Labor and Liberal Parties who both see themselves in government and want to maintain that advantage when they are in power.

Drafts of all legislation must be made available for public and community group consideration and comment and if legislation is not proclaimed within 90 days of the third reading it should be debated by the House. Questions in referenda should be clearly stated and relate to a single issue for public decision. These are just some of the forms that serious parliamentary reform could take in the interests of all voting people and in the interests of genuine, open government. I believe that this current regime has a long way to go before it can lay claim to such a mantle.

The release by the State Government of its final MFP feasibility study has met with a good deal of scepticism and caution from the Australian Democrats. I believe that, despite the presentation of 13 volumes of glossy reports, a number of questions still remain unanswered about the project. I was somewhat alarmed by the content of the Financial Advisory Assignment and surprised that many in the media

did not pick up on the impact of that volume, which probably demonstrates how complex and difficult much of this project is to understand. However, the Financial Advisory Assignment, by Melbourne-based Potter Warburg and Associates, did contain a number of warnings to the Bannon Government about the rubbery figures touted with the project by the main consultants, Kinhill-Delfin.

No matter how bright and fanciful many of the ideas for the MFP might be, in the end much of the success of this project will hinge on its financial viability. We certainly do not want to embark on such a large scale, long-term project only to find that several years down the track its viability is jeopardised by another case of Government mismanagement and ongoing debt servicing, which has been the consequence of many of the more spectacular projects in this State including the Grand Prix, with another \$2 million subsidy from the Government this year.

The Hon. Barbara Wiese interjecting:

The Hon. I. GILFILLAN: But, according to Potter Warburg, that is exactly what may happen. I assume that the interjection was that the Grand Prix does benefit the general economy. I would argue that the same amount of investment and energy would benefit the economy of South Australia much more substantially and in a more acceptable way than the Grand Prix. According to parts of the 18 page Potter Warburg report concerning the MFP, there appear to be some inconsistencies in the Kinhill-Delfin report regarding revenue assumptions, inconsistencies which already point to financial projections of millions of dollars.

In dealing with the validity of the conclusions reached by Kinhill-Delfin about the land creation and infrastructure costs for the project, Potter Warburg stated, 'We are therefore unable to make any comment on the soundness of the conclusions which Kinhill-Delfin might have reached,'; that is despite its terms of reference including an assessment of Kinhill-Delfin's conclusions.

I travelled to Melbourne in June and had a meeting with the author of this volume of the report and he clearly indicated that it was difficult to make a clear assessment because Kinhill-Delfin simply did not have or provide enough data. Potter Warburg also found that, despite predictions by the Premier of the revenue return from MFP projects for the State, 'There is a risk that such analysis may invest the results with a perceived accuracy not justified by the quality of the input data . . . where projections of revenues and costs are available for individual projects they are highly speculative.' Potter Warburg also set alarm bells ringing by stating in its report:

We would note at the outset that we consider it would be unwise to draw firm conclusions with regard to project structure and financing from the results of the analysis of these cash flows.

Further, Potter Warburg claimed:

The cash flow estimates are subject to considerable uncertainty . . . because we consider the cash flows projected for the infrastructure component are unrepresentative.

I believe that the sheer scope and size of the project as envisaged by the State Government has too many variables and unknowns for there to be a clear idea on its eventual outcome. In fact, this is borne out by some of the Potter Warburg report which states:

The project has the characteristic of a long draw down period and a relatively short period in which to achieve payment. This characteristic introduces a high degree of risk into the financing as it makes the achievement of repayment highly vulnerable to cost increases or revenue shortfalls . . .

The report talks about the initial stages of the project being financed and supported. That is basically because it is a rather glamorous housing estate that is being promoted in the original stages; it has nothing to do with further devel-

opment down the track, but we do have a track record of having relatively glamorous and successful housing estates at West Lakes and Golden Grove. So, it is no surprise to hear that the report refers to the initial stages being financed and supported. Further, it states:

... there is a need to reduce the riskiness of the cash flows associated with the middle and later stages of the project ...

Given the current economic madness that has befallen this State and the hundreds of millions of dollars in public moneys that have been mishandled by this Government, the MFP and its impact on the future of South Australia demand a full and impartial assessment and warnings and cautions of the kind raised in the Potter Warburg report must be taken heed of. A submission by the South Australian Council of Churches on the MFP, endorsed by the council's general meeting on 13 July this year, stated that the preparatory research on the MFP 'may be too limited and inward looking, the villages too elitist and the MFP community no more than an aggregation of lonely consumers and technological industries, inappropriate for the needs of the 21st century'.

It also said that the cost of the MFP should not be allowed to drain public money from health, education and welfare services and recommended that development not proceed 'without independent impact studies related to economic, social and environmental cost-benefit analyses.' It concluded that 'there are significant dangers' with the MFP proposal. I believe many of the concerns raised by the churches to be valid and the Government would do well to consider these issues before committing any taxpayers' money to such a high risk project.

I will now deal briefly with some other matters. The Government claims in the Governor's speech, that there are encouraging signs in key areas of activity, such as consumer confidence and retail sales. It sounded wonderful on the day. It is simply not the case. No matter how much we would all like to see such signs, under this Government that has not happened and is not happening. Retail sales have barely grown in the past 12 months and in real terms what little growth there has been has been virtually wiped out by inflation. Consumer confidence is at an all time low and a recent business survey by the Business Council of Australia found that more and more companies and small business enterprises are predicting further reductions in employment in coming months. The latest unemployment figures lend support to that, with South Australia holding the dubious honour of one of the highest levels of unemployment in the Commonwealth.

The indications are that this Government has failed in its program of economic management. Despite its love of reports and future stargazing, much of what it predicts for our so-called improved future does not come into effect and I distrust it.

The MFP and its massive amounts of fanciful yet unsubstantiated reports do little to convince me of its merits and the same may be said of much of the 2020 Vision paper, which claims the future of transport of this State, well into the next century, lies in the motor car. It has no vision as to the real demands and needs for the future, it fails to tackle the very real and immediate problems of pollution, greenhouse and ozone depletion, and has completely missed the bus when it comes to energy conservation and alternative energy sources. I introduced a private member's Bill last session aimed at instituting alternative energy research and development, a move that received just a lukewarm response from the Government. However, this same Government has an energy management program set to run for just another three years. Its long-term energy plan is to

build another resource depleting gas-fired power station, and in addition it has to date ignored international offers for joint solar research from Israel that could lead us to a more environmentally efficient and cleaner future. It bases the future energy needs of this State on the continued reliance on rapidly diminishing non-renewable fossil fuels and the Government's utilities are, in many cases, the State's worst polluters.

Mr President, I fear we have very little to look forward to from this Government. It is a Government paralysed by its own ineptitude; a Government currently based on crisis management and damage control; a Government in which policy on the run has become its *modus operandi* and which increasingly looks beyond its own borders for the convenience of scapegoats of someone else's making. Ultimately the ballot box is where it will be judged, but unfortunately for most South Australians the legacy it will leave will be borne by this State for many years.

I will conclude my contribution to this Address in Reply debate by briefly recounting the experiences of my study tour of Vietnam. Although I do not believe for a moment that any one particular activity will dramatically change the fortunes of the State, I was heartened by finding the opportunity for trade and for joint ventures that is available for Australian companies in Vietnam, and the enthusiasm with which that country views Australia. It was quite remarkable to feel the friendship that the Vietnamese feel towards Australians. We have achieved that status, amongst other reasons, by continuing to take Vietnamese students on the Colombo Plan when much of the rest of the world was rejecting them, both as a hangover from the Vietnam war and as a result of Vietnam's involvement in Cambodia. We have had very good performing non-government organisations working in Vietnam. Community Aid Abroad, which is a well-known organisation in South Australia, is one of those groups involved. As well, we have been well represented by ambassadors and diplomatic staff. To a large extent, those Australians who have done business in Vietnam have done so with integrity and consideration of the country in a way that has left a very good impression.

All is not perfect, however, as one would expect, and there have been some blips in developing international trade and business relationships between Australia and Vietnam. Some of it stems purely from the naivety of a nation that for 50 years has virtually been excluded from participating as a world trading nation and for longer than that since it was, in its own right, a trading nation. It also carries a lot of the paraphernalia of a communist dictatorial, authoritarian regime and, although it is quite genuinely espousing a free market as an essential ingredient of the nation, a reasonably long lead time is required for the Government, the bureaucracy, the banking structure, the insurance and general legal framework to be put in place so that a free market can operate widely and effectively. However, that does not mean that there are not good opportunities right now for Australians to become involved, and particularly South Australians.

Before I went I was asked by the Chamber of Commerce and Industry in South Australia to explore the opportunity for a trade mission from this State. I did that with some enthusiasm because I felt that it would be one way in which my trip could have a direct benefit to this State. I brought back a list of approximately 120 projects in which the Vietnamese Government is keen to have Australian partners in joint ventures. Most of the projects involve small to medium size businesses with investment levels between \$2 million and \$3 million at the low end and \$15 million to \$20 million at the upper end. Many of those projects involve

food processing, building of facilities for tourist and office accommodation and some medium technology industries and manufacturing ventures, as well as clothing and garment manufacturing. In all these activities South Australian companies are already quite capable of becoming joint venturers with the Vietnamese operators in Vietnam.

It is important that we view this in a broad perspective. It is obvious to me that we are very quickly being shunned from what were previously our comfortable trading coteries—our trading groups. It has taken the Australian nation a long time to realise that, despite the nice warm benign words, America views us no more favourably in the trading situation than any other country with which it has dealings, and probably, in many cases, less favourably.

This means that we will be pushed, although I hope that we will go willingly into a trade block of South-East Asia, of which Vietnam is a member (not necessarily participating as such but certainly geographically). It is a nation that will become increasingly significant to Australia and it is poised to move forward dramatically. It is not only my observation but a view shared by others with whom I have discussed the matter, that as soon as Vietnam receives infusions of capital and loans from overseas banks that are currently denied it because of the rather blind American embargo (the Americans are still punishing the Vietnamese for having won the Vietnam war), with the accompanying technology and entrepreneurial initiatives, it will boom as a country and will be trading with nations in this area. It is important for us financially that we get in on the ground floor. We have a unique opportunity at this stage because the Americans, Japanese and others locked into that fabric are still at arms length. Although they are sniffing around the edges, they cannot legally trade, lend or develop projects with Vietnam. So, it is of prime importance that Australia move in now and establish the connections and goodwill to hold us in good stead in the years to come.

Secondly, Vietnam is a desperately poor nation in its current state with much human suffering as a direct result of this financial impoverishment. It is inadequate in the health, education, transport and electricity areas. Without painting too doleful a picture, Vietnam is a worthy recipient of humanitarian aid to relieve human suffering that exists in that country currently. We can help to reduce or minimise

that suffering by increasing our trading and joint venture contacts with Vietnam. Apart from the fact that Australians will make money, we will also be exchanging with Vietnam improved technologies in a wide range of areas. It is important that Vietnam come up to speed with simple trades and technologies such as carpentry, electrical fitting, plumbing and general building work, all of which have not been available to it because of its isolation from the outside world.

I am pleased to indicate that the Chamber of Commerce is promoting a trade mission. There will be a meeting on 10 September, which my adviser—a Vietnamese/Australian businessman, Quang Nyugen, who has a business in Adelaide and is a frequent visitor to Vietnam—and I will be addressing and we hope that from that a strong trade mission will be formed to visit Vietnam. I have written to the Premier urging him to send a senior Minister (I suggested the Hon. Lynn Arnold) with the trade mission. It is important that it be specifically a South Australian mission. We were beaten to the jump by a Western Australian trade mission. Members may share my gall upon hearing that the Western Australian trade mission had sold to the Vietnamese the Torrens land title system, with the consultancy to install it, for around \$A10 million. As we evolved the Torrens land title system I felt it a bit rich that Western Australia was selling it to the Vietnamese.

The Hon. T. Crothers: Didn't an Irishman evolve it?

The Hon. I. GILFILLAN: It may have been an Irishman. Interesting connections are involved, but I will not go into it now. I conclude by saying that there are exciting opportunities for South Australia. We are not locked into an inescapable climate of economic doom and gloom, but it does need resolve, new ideas and energy. I hope that will become apparent in the way in which we run this State in the near future. I support the motion.

The Hon. R.R. ROBERTS secured the adjournment of the debate.

ADJOURNMENT

At 5.25 p.m. the Council adjourned until Wednesday 21 August at 2.15 p.m.