

## LEGISLATIVE COUNCIL

Thursday 3 November 1994

The **PRESIDENT (Hon. Peter Dunn)** took the Chair at 2.15 p.m. and read prayers.

### PAPERS TABLED

The following papers were laid on the table:

By the Minister for Education and Children's Services (Hon. R. I. Lucas)—

Tertiary Education Act 1986—Report on Operations. Reports, 1993-94—

Engineering and Water Supply Department. Group Asset Management.

South Australian Asset Management Corporation.

By the Minister for Transport (Hon. Diana Laidlaw)—

Department of Environment and Natural Resources—Report, 1993-94.

### QUESTION TIME

#### TEACHERS' SEPARATION PACKAGES

**The Hon. CAROLYN PICKLES:** I seek leave to make a brief explanation before asking the Minister for Education and Children's Services a question about teacher separations. Leave granted.

**The Hon. CAROLYN PICKLES:** The Minister told the Estimates Committee that targeted separation decisions would be undertaken in concert with placement processes for 1995 in an attempt to balance teacher reductions, the return of country teachers to the city and teachers going on and returning from leave.

Members will recall that a combination of budget cuts and decreasing enrolments will mean 547 fewer teachers next year. It has been reported that 1 300 applications have been received for packages. My questions to the Minister are:

1. Who is deciding which teachers will be offered separation packages?
2. What criteria are being used to decide which applications for separation packages are rejected?
3. When will teachers be advised that they are to be separated?

**The Hon. R.I. LUCAS:** As with all targeted separation packages, the Department of Education and Children's Services is required to abide by the guidelines that the Commissioner for Public Employment lays down in relation to which employees are entitled to a package. Whilst there is a number of details, the essential requirement is that the position must be surplus. Therefore, the Commissioner will not agree to a package being offered to someone if the department—or in this case a school or an agency—has to back fill or to replace that particular person in the continuation of that job or function. For example, we could not offer a package to a maths teacher if it meant that we would then be short of maths teachers and would have to employ someone to replace that person.

However, for example, if we have too many arts teachers for the positions available, we can offer a package to an art teacher because, when that person takes a package, we do not then have to employ another art teacher somewhere else in the system. That is the essential and overriding requirement,

which is no different for us than it is for all other Government departments and agencies.

As to who makes the decisions, essentially the overall requirements are laid down by the Commissioner for Public Employment, but the senior officers of the personnel division of the Department for Education and Children's Services, together and in consultation with principals of schools, manage the process. The needs of the schools and what subjects they might offer the following year will affect the number of maths, tech. studies or art teachers that the system will need, depending on the curriculum choices that schools make in relation to face-to-face teaching as opposed to subjects being offered through the Open Access College, as has often occurred over the past 10 years or so, particularly with country schools.

**The Hon. CAROLYN PICKLES:** When will they be advised?

**The Hon. R.I. LUCAS:** The first round of people would already have been advised. It is a gradual process. As there is agreement with the Commissioner for Public Employment and the department is convinced that it has surpluses in an area, they will advise them. My understanding is that some have already been advised, and that will continue as a gradual process up to and including around the second week of November—I would need to check that—when by and large most packages should have been offered. There may well be some flow-on of a smaller number of them, but the large bulk of them would have been done by around that period.

#### FLOODING

**The Hon. R.R. ROBERTS:** I seek leave to make a brief explanation before asking the Minister representing the Minister for the Environment and Natural Resources a question about flooding in country areas.

Leave granted.

**The Hon. R.R. ROBERTS:** I have been approached by a constituent from the Mid North town of Booborowie. My constituent owns a property next door to the Collinsville Stud, which was to go into liquidation and be sold but which is currently being managed by a group under the auspices of the State Bank. My constituent has had a problem which goes back until 1962—

*Members interjecting:*

**The PRESIDENT:** Order!

**The Hon. R.R. ROBERTS:** At that time, people on the Collinsville property undertook to do some work on their property and change the creek line, which used to run south-west from the property of a Mr Broad. The problem that occurred is that, when they filled the old creek and tried to redirect the main stream of water into the original creek, taking its natural course the water flowed into Mr Broad's property, causing some damage. Problems have also been experienced with flooding in the town of Booborowie, and work was undertaken by the local council to redirect the water flows north of Booborowie, and I understand that a drain was cut to connect the original watercourse with a creek some distance away. The result has been that the flows in that area have drastically increased, and last year my constituents experienced extreme flooding at their property. Their home has been built on the banks of this creek since 1847, and they never experienced any flooding problems until this work took place.

As a consequence of complaints by my constituent, I understand that the people from the Collinsville stud dug a three metre drain to drain away the water which took the place of a creek that I understand was some 30 to 40 metres wide. Obviously, there was no water course for the water to be taken away. My constituent has taken up the matter with his local council and his neighbours, the Collinsville Stud, and to date has not had any relief. I understand that he contacted the Minister for the Environment and Natural Resources, and his office last year referred him back to the local council. My constituent is completely frustrated in his efforts to resolve these matters, which are of great importance to him and his family, and he took up the matter with two local members in his area. One local member told my constituent that the matter was too hard. The other local member has not been able to do anything about it. In his frustration he came to me to see whether some relief could be received.

Because of the frustration of his not being able to get the relief through the department in the past and/or the district council of Burra, my questions to the Minister for the Environment and Natural Resources are whether he will have his officers visit Mr Broad at his property at Booborowie and inspect and assess the nature and extent of the flood problems caused by the human intervention in the water systems at Booborowie? Will he further consult with the Burra council to develop appropriate systems to alleviate the problems caused to my constituent and his property and determine who is responsible for any reparative work that may be required?

**The Hon. DIANA LAIDLAW:** I am familiar with the area of land in question and will be happy to refer the question to the Minister, but I suspect that it will essentially be determined that it is a local government matter. I will do so anyway.

#### POLICE FORCE

**The Hon. T.G. ROBERTS:** I seek leave to make a brief explanation before asking the absent Attorney-General, through the Leader of the House, a question about police officer training.

Leave granted.

**The Hon. T.G. ROBERTS:** In interstate dealings with people associated with sieges and confrontationist situations, the Victoria Police Force has been shown to have handled the situation badly, particularly when dealing with people at high risk. A number of confrontations resulted in police officers shooting a number of people—I think four in total—who were seen, on reflection, not to be presenting a threat so much to the public as to themselves. The position in South Australia is far better. The record of the South Australian police in siege situations has shown to be better, but the circumstances in which the police officers in Victoria found themselves when confronted with people under psychiatric or medical care have not been a noted feature in this State.

I ask the Attorney-General and also the Minister of Health whether a training program is in place for police officers in South Australia that seeks to bring about negotiated settlements rather than violent confrontations for those in the community at high risk.

**The Hon. R.I. LUCAS:** I will be happy to refer the question to the Attorney-General and perhaps the Minister for Health and bring back a reply. When one looks at the relative situation in South Australia in relation to police handling similar situations, we have indeed been fortunate that the

approach in South Australia over the years has been much different from that used in some other States of Australia. Whether that is due to special training or some other factor, I am not sure. I will be happy to refer the honourable member's question to the Attorney-General and bring back a reply.

#### POULTRY MEAT

**The Hon. M.J. ELLIOTT:** I seek leave to make a brief explanation before asking the Leader of the House, representing the Minister for Primary Industries, a question about the deregulation of the poultry meat industry.

Leave granted.

**The Hon. M.J. ELLIOTT:** I have received correspondence from concerned poultry meat growers who fear that the State Government intends to deregulate the industry. Their concerns stem from a review of the industry which states that the Government believes that the industry is well organised, efficient and mature and that there is no longer any need for specific legislation. However, some contract growers for one of the two major processors in South Australia, Australian Poultry Ltd, have revealed to me several areas where they say contracts have been breached. These include processor obligations regarding the supply of chickens, expansion and a failure to issue weighbridge tickets, among other issues.

Contract growers say that alleged contract breaches have not been challenged in the courts for fear of not being offered contract renewals. Growers fear that deregulation would definitely increase the vulnerability of growers to the superior bargaining power of the processors. The demise of South Australia's egg industry should give fair warning of the danger of losing what is currently a viable industry. Growers believe that rather than deregulating the industry the Government should be improving the legislation to ensure the continuation of a viable industry and to provide reasonable security for contract growers. My questions are:

1. Does the Minister support the deregulation of the poultry meat industry?
2. Is the Minister aware of allegations about current breaches to the Poultry Meat Industry Act?
3. Will the Minister investigate alleged breaches of that Act?

**The Hon. R.I. LUCAS:** I will refer the questions to the Minister and bring back a reply.

#### HOSPITAL STANDARDS

**The Hon. BERNICE PFITZNER:** I seek leave to make a brief explanation before asking the Minister for Transport, representing the Minister for Health, a question about standards in public hospitals.

Leave granted.

**The Hon. BERNICE PFITZNER:** I refer to an article in the *Sunday Mail* of 30 October which contains an allegation by the Secretary of the South Australian Branch of the Australian Nursing Federation. She alleges:

Patients have reported being discharged after day surgery while still under the effects of anaesthetic. . . Other patients have been discharged following major surgery still in pain but without pain relief, without discharge letters, without adequate support in the home and told to seek any further assistance from their GP. . . We have reports that patients are being left for extended periods on trolleys in corridors of accident and emergency departments while waiting to be admitted to hospital.

Although the article does state that these allegations could be anecdotal evidence, they still seek to undermine and blame the casemix policy which encourages hospitals to run an efficient and effective health service. If these serious allegations have no foundation, the Secretary of the South Australian Branch of the ANF is irresponsible and is undermining the confidence of the community in public health. We know that this Secretary is a Labor candidate for the Federal seat of Adelaide. If the allegations have substance, which is doubtful, will the Minister investigate these issues in order to determine where the error lies—in hospital administration or with the discharging doctors? If there is a difficulty, will the Minister look into putting some guideline in place where the discharge of patients for different conditions cannot take place before a certain number of days or some similar strategy?

**The Hon. DIANA LAIDLAW:** I share the honourable member's concern about the allegations raised in that article. I will refer the honourable member's questions to the Minister and seek a reply.

### COMMUNITY HEALTH CENTRES

**The Hon. M.S. FELEPPA:** I seek leave to make a brief explanation before asking the Minister representing the Minister for Health a question about amalgamation of community health centres.

Leave granted.

**The Hon. M.S. FELEPPA:** It is proposed to amalgamate the inner southern, Port Adelaide, Parks and Eastern Community Health Services. The argument in favour of the amalgamation is that staff to client ratios show that too many staff are being employed for the service given and that the staff can be reduced to produce a cost saving for the Government while maintaining services to the community. The general staff to client ratio recorded in *Hansard* during the Estimates Committee of 15 September is 1:20, and on this staff cuts are founded. In the same part of the Estimates Committee report there is also mention of staff to client ratios of 1:101, 1:47, 1:67 and 1:127. The ratio of 1:20 seems to refer to one health unit, possibly in the Elizabeth area. It is not clear which unit is the one, but 1:20 is certainly not the norm or median staff to client ratio. In a reply during the Estimates Committee hearing, Dr Armitage (the Minister for Health) stated:

... that a staff to client ratio of 1:150. . . is unsustainable when we know that efficiencies can be made from amalgamating services.

If he had said that a staff to client ratio of 1:20 is unsustainable it would have sounded reasonable, but 1:150 is at a limit and to raise the ratio would threaten the quality of services. My questions to the Minister are:

1. What is the limit of staff to client ratios beyond which the Minister considers services would deteriorate?

2. Will the Minister provide the Parliament with the staff to client ratios for each of the Community Health Service units proposed to be amalgamated in the central area east and west of Adelaide?

3. Do these ratios support the intention to achieve cost savings while maintaining services?

**The Hon. DIANA LAIDLAW:** I will refer those questions to my colleague in another place and bring back a reply.

### HOSPITAL FUNDING

**The Hon. T. CROTHERS:** I seek leave to make a brief explanation before asking the Minister representing the Minister for Health a question about hospital funding in South Australia.

Leave granted.

**The Hon. T. CROTHERS:** In a report in the *Sunday Mail* dated 30 October 1994 and headed 'Blitz on health system', the branch Secretary of the South Australian branch of the Australian Nursing Federation (Ms Gail Gago) attested that reports continue to come to her concerning patients being denied treatment or of dressings not being changed on time or, indeed, of patients—

**The Hon. Diana Laidlaw:** I have a sense of *deja vu*.

**The Hon. T. CROTHERS:**—you can ask your brother-in-law directly—indeed, of patients being discharged while still under the effects of anaesthetic, in what is now being described as a cash strapped hospital system in South Australia. The shortfalls of the system I have herein described are, according to Ms Gago, but a few of the many that come to her attention.

*The Hon. R.I. Lucas interjecting:*

**The Hon. T. CROTHERS:** This lack of cash injection into the South Australian health system may well, as Ms Gago asserts, be partly attributable to some of the economic rationalists in our community—

*The Hon. R.I. Lucas interjecting:*

**The Hon. T. CROTHERS:**—such as the Hon. Mr Lucas, who is currently interjecting. I hope he listens, as he may well learn a bit. Who knows: he has been slow of learning in the last 10 months. But, for the thinking person, that is not the sole reason why hospitals are cash strapped. Members who were present in this Chamber last week when I directed some questions to the Minister for Health on the Federal Baume report may have been more than slightly shocked at the huge size of incomes paid to some of our medical health specialists. In fact, some members indicated to me afterwards that they viewed them as verging on the obscene. I believe that that was a fair comment in respect of the question that I asked.

It is clear to anyone who thinks that the specialists must be taking an awful lot of funding out of the health system by way of their, by any standards, very large incomes. Indeed, for the record, there are some 4 100 specialist surgeons throughout Australia, and a quick calculation, that is, 4 100 by their average annual income of \$400 000, will allow honourable members to effect the necessary calculations to estimate how much they take a year out of the health system. For the record, I have done that calculation. The sum of money means that 4 100 specialist surgeons will earn \$1.64 billion each year. I might add, I have based those earnings on conservatively based individual annual earnings of \$400 000 per year of each of the 4 100 specialists throughout Australia. Indeed, elements of the Baume report indicate that the incomes could be very much higher. On top of this, I noticed an article in a recent edition of the *Advertiser* stating that the Australian Taxation Office had named some medical specialists as paying no tax at all and some of those incomes that no tax at all was paid on were in excess of \$600 000.

*The Hon. J.F. Stefani interjecting:*

**The Hon. T. CROTHERS:** It does not matter, Mr Stefani, who is allowed what. The question for you to answer is: is it morally right or morally wrong? Perhaps in the

light of your interjection, your tax should be checked by the Taxation Office.

*Members interjecting:*

**The PRESIDENT:** Order!

**The Hon. T. CROTHERS:** As I have said, some of these high income earning specialists are paying no tax at all on annual incomes worth hundreds of thousands of dollars. Honourable members interject with levity, but what I say to them is that, as a consequence of that, the cross of the average South Australian taxpayer is becoming increasingly heavier to bear with the weight of the propagation of these types of activities.

**The Hon. L.H. Davis:** You can carry mine.

**The Hon. T. CROTHERS:** Yours would be very small, I would think. There would probably be very few nails in you. They would not be able to catch you—like the tax. My questions to the Minister are:

1. Can he inform me how many medical specialists operate in South Australia?

2. In what medical and surgical disciplines do they practise?

3. How many millions of dollars have they been paid by the South Australian health system in the last full year?

4. What was the collective total of their incomes from all sources here in South Australia?

5. If the State Minister for Health cannot access the figures, will he endeavour to secure them from his Federal counterpart?

6. What is the shortfall of medical specialists here in this State? Will the Minister table the answers to these questions and, if not, why not?

7. If there is a shortfall of specialists, why and for what reason does the Minister for Health consider that such a shortfall exists?

I conclude by saying that members of Parliament in this State have recently taken awful stick in the press, and the *Advertiser* in particular, in respect of their earnings. A quick calculation will show that the income earned by the 69 members of this Parliament is less than \$10 million per year, yet here we have 4 100 specialists earning between them on a conservative estimate \$1.64 billion per year. If that does not bear looking into, I'll go home. I ask one final question: does the Minister for Health find that specialist incomes are obscene under the standards that prevail in respect of incomes earned in general terms in Australia?

**The Hon. DIANA LAIDLAW:** I will refer the honourable member's questions to the Minister for Health and bring back a reply. In the meantime, at least in respect of the earlier part of the honourable member's explanation, I share his concern about the havoc that the Federal Government is wreaking on our health system and the ramifications that are being experienced in this State. Specialists' incomes—

*An honourable member interjecting:*

**The Hon. DIANA LAIDLAW:** Yes. So I will refer those questions to the Minister and seek a reply.

#### AUSTRALIAN AWARDS

**The Hon. ANNE LEVY:** I seek leave to make a brief explanation before asking the Minister for the Status of Women a question about Australian awards.

Leave granted.

**The Hon. ANNE LEVY:** The Australian system of awards is, according to a media report, to be reviewed by a group chaired by Ms Clare Petre of the New South Wales

Community Services Commission and the Administrative Review Tribunal. It will review, I suppose, the types, numbers, categories and criteria for the awards which currently are issued twice a year: once on Australia Day and once on the Queen's birthday weekend. It is no secret that one of the reasons for the establishment of the review is the concern that women migrants and the less affluent are not being properly recognised in these awards.

For a number of years I have established figures for each lot of awards both for South Australia and for the country as a whole, and there does not seem to be much change occurring with regard to the proportion and type of awards which are awarded to women. I think that, currently, women receive about 23 per cent to 25 per cent of the awards that are granted. It is sometimes said that there are not as many nominations of women, and it may well be that there is a 3:1 ratio of nominations, although I doubt whether the ratio would be that extreme.

However, when women are given awards they are much more likely to be given lower level awards, and over a period of time my figures show that in the higher awards the proportion of women may be as low as 8 per cent or perhaps in some years as high as 15 per cent, whereas in the lowest awards the proportion of women can be 33 per cent to 35 per cent. So, a supposed lack of female nominees can certainly not explain this disparity.

It is clear that the guidelines as to what is judged to be the appropriate level of award that currently exists discriminate against women so that women are much more likely to receive a lower level award than a higher level award. Their contributions are not being regarded as important as those of men. I ask the Minister whether she will make an official Government submission to this inquiry which has been set up by the Federal Government, pointing out the discrimination that is occurring against women in these awards—and if she does not have the figures I am very happy to supply them to her—and putting forward solutions as to changes in criteria that should occur so that women are more properly recognised for their contribution to Australian society in the Australian honours system.

**The Hon. DIANA LAIDLAW:** I was proposing to prepare a submission in my own name. I will consider one under the authority of the Government. I appreciate the honourable member's offer of research that she has done in relation to this matter. I think that the research done by my office is recent in comparison to the work done by the honourable member over a number of years. We would therefore be most grateful for her cooperation in that sense.

My own view is that it is not only the guidelines that may be a difficulty but also the attitudes of the people assessing these applications. The last time I looked at the Government's nominations from around Australia to the official committee that assesses the Australian awards I noted that all but one were men. I think it is more than the guidelines: it is a matter of attitudes and perceptions.

I raise this matter because in the past I have been disappointed. On one occasion I was even angry when a nomination form that I had submitted was returned to me with a request that I provide more information about a woman's career in the first six years after her marriage, when she had two children. She had subsequently gone on to head Federal committees and State boards and to be a very senior figure within the South Australian community. However, the questions were related to that five or six-year period of her career during which she was bringing up two children.

**The Hon. Anne Levy:** Typical!

**The Hon. DIANA LAIDLAW:** It was a disgrace. I did do my block, because it was so typical of attitudes that one considered might be present but hoped one would never have so blatantly demonstrated. However, that has not occurred in relation to all further nominations that I have submitted.

A lunch is held for all South Australian women recipients of Australian awards to which all women members of Parliament are invited to attend. On such occasions all women who attend are encouraged to nominate other women whom they know and respect. It is important that, if we are to increase the numbers of women being nominated, women themselves make a start in this respect. Only then will we gain some momentum and change in this field. I welcome the review that is being undertaken. I will give some consideration to a Government submission. Certainly it is my intention to make one personally.

### TRANSPORT POLICY

**The Hon. BARBARA WIESE:** I seek leave to make a brief explanation before asking the Minister for Transport a question about the public transport policy paper.

Leave granted.

**The Hon. BARBARA WIESE:** Yesterday in her union bashing statement on the future of bus services, the Minister referred to her intention to release very soon a major paper that will outline comprehensive proposals that will apply to all future service contracts put out to tender by the Passenger Transport Board.

In speaking about the paper, the Minister made it clear that the major issues involved in the tendering process are resolved; it is now just a matter of releasing the paper. Clearly, as we have seen in recent days, the Government's reorganisation of the public transport system is controversial: there will be winners and losers.

From announcements already made, we know that those living in outer suburban areas will be paying higher fares. We also know from the budget papers that some existing services will be withdrawn in order to accommodate the new system. It comes as no surprise, then, that the Opposition has been informed that the Minister has delayed the release of her paper from this week until next week so that the electors of Taylor will not hear what is in store for them before the by-election on Saturday.

*Members interjecting:*

**The PRESIDENT:** Order!

**The Hon. BARBARA WIESE:** My questions to the Minister are:

1. Will the Minister confirm that she has delayed the public release of her paper to avoid the by-election?
2. Will she now come clean and tell the public of South Australia, including those in Taylor, what she plans for them?

*Members interjecting:*

**The PRESIDENT:** Order! The preamble to questions really should not contain opinion. There were several points of opinion in that preamble. The former Minister has been here for a long time and she should understand that. I remind all members that questions do not really require preamble containing opinion.

**The Hon. DIANA LAIDLAW:** The only accurate bit of information that it is possible to glean from the honourable member's question is the fact she is so badly misinformed. The paper will be released shortly. In fact, it was always going to be released sooner rather than later. When it is

released the honourable member will be disappointed because she will find out that her information is so inaccurate.

The honourable member may come and apologise to me and to the Parliament for providing such scandalous misinformation. However, she may also wish to look for better informants. I would not want the honourable member to be so humiliated so often in this place because of the quality of the information that she receives—she has been misinformed, yet again.

I want the people living in Taylor and elsewhere in the State to have services that run more frequently and that operate on weekends and after hours, and these are the services that the honourable member cut when she was Minister, as did the Labor Government as a whole.

I have already indicated that, in terms of rail, we will be introducing passenger assistance, a user-friendly customer service, and a human face on the trains in addition to the driver. Such a service has not been provided in any form since Labor got rid of guards on trains. We can only go forward in relation to the state of the public transport system—rail, bus and tram—compared with the condition in which Labor left it. We will go forward and provide more services through competitive tendering, and people will again wish to use them. We will stop the decline and rot in public transport. That is the promise that I made before the last election, and I will keep it, and that is the promise I make to the people of Taylor before the by-election.

### INERT INGREDIENTS

**The Hon. M.J. ELLIOTT:** I seek leave to make a brief explanation before asking the Minister representing the Minister for Health a question about inert ingredients.

Leave granted.

**The Hon. M.J. ELLIOTT:** Many of us are aware that, if you pick up a spray can of insecticide or the like, you will see a list of active ingredients. I have an article from an American publication *Newsday*, which looks at the question of inert ingredients, in other words the ingredients that are not considered to be active. It is self-evident. I have to make quite clear that this is the American experience. The point is that I want to relate the American experience to see whether or not it is true in Australia. Public health officials in the United States have warned that secret ingredients are largely unregulated and untested—and can be just as hazardous as the active ingredients in pesticide products. The article states:

The inerts are the solvents and other substances that dissolve, propel and otherwise enhance the active ingredients in pesticides. Growing evidence suggests that some of these substances are highly toxic and cause thousands of the pesticide poisonings reported nation-wide each year.

Some of these same toxic chemicals are also found in other consumer products, including paint remover, spray shoe polish and hair sprays. Poison control officials, Government health workers and medical specialists have expressed concern over the widespread use of these compounds, as their health effects have not been well studied.

The toll in poisonings from inerts in pesticides alone may be substantial. Of the 1 000 cases of pesticide poisonings logged annually at the Delaware Valley Poison Control Centre in Philadelphia 'at least 50 per cent are due to the inerts', says Executive Director, Tom Kearney.

Further, the article states:

The Environmental Protection Agency estimates that at least 1 200 inerts are used in 50 000 pesticide formulations on the US market. About 100 inerts are known or suspected health hazards. Their effects include cancer, central nervous system damage and skin rashes.

Toxicology data is lacking for an additional 800 inerts. Only about 300 inerts, or a quarter of those in use, have been cleared by the EPA as safe.

Later, the same article talks about methylene chloride, which is a particularly dangerous substance that is used in paint strippers and as a propellant by pest controllers. It is quite frequently used and sometimes at quite high levels. Some spray shoe polishes and spot removers also contain 50 per cent methylene chloride, and paint strippers contain 78 per cent. Sometimes they are used in confined spaces. The article continues:

The EPA is now trying to formulate a policy for regulating inserts and pesticide products. The agency has released lists of 55 inert ingredients 'of toxicological concern' and 51 inerts with chemical structures 'suggestive of toxicological concern'. The EPA has sent letters to manufacturers recommending they remove inerts of toxicological concern from their formulae.

As I said, this is the American experience. I ask the Minister for Health: what work has been done at either a State or a Federal level in relation to the so-called inert ingredients? What controls are in place? What other information can the Minister supply on that general question?

**The Hon. DIANA LAIDLAW:** I will refer the honourable member's question to the Minister and bring back a reply.

#### TONSLEY PARK PRIMARY SCHOOL

**The Hon. G. WEATHERILL:** I seek leave to make a brief explanation before asking the Minister for Education a question about the Tonsley Park Primary School closure.

Leave granted.

**The Hon. G. WEATHERILL:** After 28 years, the Tonsley Park Primary School is having a celebration to indicate its achievements over the years. The amalgamation of this school with the Mitchell Park Primary School has been approved by the Minister, and the school will move to the Mitchell Park site next year. The commemoration of this school, an opening day and a farewell, has been arranged for 5 December. Will the Minister attend the function on 5 December? Will the Minister guarantee that the redevelopment of this site will provide continuing open spaces and amenities for the nearby community?

**The Hon. R.I. LUCAS:** I thank the honourable member for his question. The parents and staff of Tonsley Park have been kind enough to invite me to their celebration of 28 years of service to the community down in the Tonsley Park area. I am trying to see whether I am able to attend its celebration. At the moment, I do have another engagement but, if I can reorganise my timetable to spend at least part of the time there, I will endeavour to do so to thank that community for the service it has provided.

This is an example of how the school closure policy has worked and worked pretty well. Two school communities from that area have come together and made a decision for the amalgamation of two schools. There has not been a mass uprising in the streets or mass protests in relation to the decision. It was a decision and a recommendation which came from the parents and the staff to me as Minister. Their recommendation to me was—and they make the decision only a month or so ago—that they did not want to hang around for 18 months for the final closure of the school. What they said to the Government and to me as Minister was, 'Look, we've made the decision; we want to move to the new school and close the school. It is pointless forcing us to stay open for 18 months.' They want to start off the new

1995 school year with a clean slate at a new school and enjoy the benefits of that new school.

I know that the Hon. Mr Weatherill is aware of that. He has had some involvement and contact with the community down there, and he is aware of their feelings in relation to this issue. For the benefit of the Hon. Mr Weatherill, the only reason I highlighted that is that, if we had agreed with the proposition that was put by the Hon. Mr Rann and supported by the Hon. Mr Elliott, in effect we would have had a situation at Tonsley Park where, contrary to the parents' and staff's wishes, we would have forced the Government and the school to be kept open for 18 months from August or September this year, whenever the decision was taken, until part way through the start of 1996. So, we would have had a situation where, all through next year, with virtually nobody at the school, because all the parents were going to move their children to Mitchell Park, since that is what they want to do, the school would have had to be kept open with the principal, school support staff and utilities and maybe one or two students. Also for part of first term of 1996 we would have been required, again, to keep open that school.

I am sure the Hon. Mr Weatherill understands the position, because he appreciates the parents' views at Tonsley Park. He has also been involved with another school amalgamation in the western suburbs perhaps four or five years ago under the previous Government. As I indicated, parents do not want to be forced to stay with a dying school, with a school in effect with virtually no students. Again, it does indicate the foolishness of the proposition that was put by the Hon. Mr Rann and supported by the Hon. Mr Elliott, to in effect require that a school stay open. I thank the honourable member for his question.

In relation to possible uses of the site, at this stage we are more interested in trying to resolve the needs of the students and the families down at Tonsley Park, rather than worrying about future uses for the site. When we have resolved the problems and the issues of the children who need to be educated and the transfer to Mitchell Park, we will obviously then be prepared to have a look at a number of options in relation to possible usage of the site. If it is to be some form of development, perhaps an alternative use of the existing site by other educational institutions or some measure of open space as part of that development, that would have to be funded in some way, perhaps by local councils or other agencies that might have an interest. We are prepared to look at all those sorts of options. As soon as we are in a position to provide the honourable member with any further information, I would be only too happy to do so.

#### ENVIRONMENTAL POLICY

**The Hon. T.G. ROBERTS:** I seek leave to make a brief explanation before asking the Minister representing the Minister for Local Government Relations a question about local government and the environment.

Leave granted.

**The Hon. T.G. ROBERTS:** A new production that has passed across my desk, and I expect the desk of other members, is a booklet called *Environment Business*, which is a complimentary copy and encourages us to subscribe.

*The Hon. T. Crothers interjecting:*

**The Hon. T.G. ROBERTS:** No, it was not delivered by a bus driver—I think it was delivered by Australia Post. One article is headed, 'Local government seeks to win recognition.' It raises a question delivered in this Chamber in the

middle of last evening by the Hon. Bernice Pfitzner about her concerns around local government's role in planning and the environment in relation to the hills face zone. The article says:

A push by local government to increase its role in environmental policy making will come to a head in the next few weeks as part of a determined campaign by councils to win formal recognition of their role within the three tiers of Government. There is strong, although not unanimous, support within local government ranks for an inter-governmental protocol to be negotiated with the Federal and State Governments. A motion of support for the protocol is expected to be proposed at the first national general assembly of local government to be held between November 6 and 8 in Canberra.

The articles within the paper itself go on to present a chart or table which compares the availability of information resources against the relative importance to councils in relation to environmental matters. It has a list of 16 items and they are: local data, technical information, expert advice, State policies, greenhouse related information, Federal policies, course updates between professions, own departments, community priorities, own administration, other councils, own profession, related professions, council management and libraries—an exhaustive list for anybody to put a priority alongside. The priority order of availability—and these are the concerns the Minister for Local Government Relations should share—are that, in priority 1, the councils require technical information; priority 2, they require their own administrations; priority 3, their own professions; priority 4, their own libraries; priority 5, their own departments; priority 6, expert advice; priority 7, courses and updates; and priority 8 (we finally reach it), community priorities. I share the concerns as expressed by the honourable member last night, and, in relation to this chart and table, we all need to have concerns. It could be that local government wants to set up its own bureaucracies before it starts canvassing the questions related to community priorities.

Does the Minister for Local Government Relations have any concerns about the results of the survey and will he analyse and act upon the survey result or will he be conducting his own survey with a view to discussing and setting priorities?

**The Hon. DIANA LAIDLAW:** I will refer the honourable member's question to the Minister and bring back a reply.

#### UNEMPLOYMENT

In reply to **Hon. T. CROTHERS** (2 August).

**The Hon. R.I. LUCAS:** My colleague the Minister for Employment, Training and Further Education has provided the following response.

During the recent Estimates Committee hearing, in response to a question from the Opposition, the Minister confirmed the generally buoyant employment conditions in South Australia over the last quarter. Comparing the January 1994 figures against the latest preliminary ABS data for September, seasonally adjusted full-time employment—which is acknowledged to be a reliable indicator of underlying labour market conditions—rose by 16 200 in South Australia.

#### GAS

**The Hon. T. CROTHERS:** I seek leave to make a brief statement before asking the Minister for Education and Children's Services, representing the Minister for Infrastructure, a question about the future of Adelaide's gas supplies. Leave granted.

**The Hon. T. CROTHERS:** Recently Santos at its Moomba location announced that it had discovered additional

reserves of gas in or around that area. Much has been said about the future supply of gas to Adelaide and its surroundings with respect to ensuring that we can keep it going for some considerable time. It has caused previous Governments and citizens of this State additional dollars to ensure that they can use what is a relatively clean and cheap fuel with respect to the utilisation of natural gas. One of the alternatives mooted is that we should interconnect with the pipeline (at some great cost) emanating out of the Northwest Shelf fields in Western Australia—another smaller on-shore Western Australian field.

With regard to future supplies, and with respect to increasing the period of time that we know that we now have, what effect will the recent discoveries of additional gas by Santos at Moomba have on extending the amount of gas that we can expect to achieve from the Moomba fields relative to a time period whereby Adelaide can continue to be assured of gas supply?

**The Hon. R.I. LUCAS:** I will refer the honourable member's question to the Minister and bring back a reply.

#### PERSONAL EXPLANATION

**The Hon. A.J. REDFORD:** I seek leave to make a personal explanation.

Leave granted.

**The Hon. A.J. REDFORD:** Last night in the debate comment was made by the Hon. Ron Roberts, and I will quote *Hansard* as follows:

Members like the Hon. Mrs Schaefer, the Hon. Legh Davis and the Hon. Angus Redford, who comes from a country area I am told and has been in business, although it failed. . .

I am not sure what the Hon. Ron Roberts meant, but if he implied that I have been in business and that that business failed, he is absolutely wrong. It is absolutely incorrect: I have never been in a business that failed.

#### VOCATIONAL EDUCATION, EMPLOYMENT AND TRAINING BILL

Adjourned debate on second reading.

(Continued from 1 November. Page 658.)

**The Hon. CAROLYN PICKLES (Leader of the Opposition):** The Opposition supports this Bill. It was passed in another place with a considerable degree of cooperation between the Parties. The Opposition and the Government are both committed to updating the system for vocational education and training in South Australia in line with national developments in this area. The other important aspect of this Bill is the creation of a mechanism whereby employer groups and unions can influence Government policy with respect to employment, education and training issues.

The Opposition has made compromises with respect to several aspects of the Bill in the interests of assisting its passage in another place. The Opposition concerns were generally met with Government acceptance of amendments moved on our behalf in the other place, or alternatively our concerns were met by assurances from the Minister for Employment, Training and Further Education. There is one

outstanding concern in respect to the composition of the VEET Board. We consider it essential that there be an appropriate balance of employer and employee representatives on the board. I will expand on that issue further in Committee when dealing with the Opposition amendment to clause 7. It is important to highlight the concerns which the Opposition has previously expressed in relation to the Bill. These are concerns that we have put to one side in a sense because of the assurances given by the Minister.

With respect to clause 4, we still have some concern that the Minister is nominated as the State trainee agency rather than VEET itself. If VEET was specified as a State training authority, it would also make a clear statement that VEET is more than TAFE, that DETAFE (the Department for Employment, Training and Further Education) is responsible for profiling State training, recognition and accreditation of training and training providers, development of training policies and procedures and gathering of statistics relevant to training programs.

There may be seen to be a conflict of interest if the department also administers public TAFE systems. The Minister has not entirely met these concerns but he has repeatedly stood by his position that the appointment of VEET as a State training agency would lead to unnecessary bureaucracy and duplication. Ultimately on this issue we are prepared to wait and see how the system works and whether any conflict of interest does eventuate. We have at least registered our concerns.

Secondly, the Opposition remains concerned that there is no guarantee as to the equality of gender representation on the VEET board. At least clause 7 provides the minimum that one man and one woman must be on the board. But it is undeniable that there are issues specific to women as well as to men in the field of vocational education and training. Accordingly, it is essential that women are adequately represented on the VEET board. I note that there are four women out of 12 members on the interim board. Without going on at any length to make my point about the necessity for equality of gender representation in this area, at the end of the day the Opposition is satisfied by the Minister's assurances in this regard. The Minister in another place said, 'It would be my very firm commitment that we have as far as possible 50/50 representation on the board.' Again this is another issue which the Opposition will monitor and evaluate in due course.

Our third point of concern relates to the autonomy of the VEET board. Members will be aware that the Opposition in another place successfully moved an amendment to clause 9 with a view to ensuring that the Minister would provide the VEET board with sufficient resources to properly fulfil its function, with the board to have liberty to engage staff or consultants as considered necessary by it from time to time. The result was another compromise between the Government and the Opposition—that is to say, the Opposition accepted the Minister's amendment to our amendment so that it was discretionary and not mandatory for the Minister to provide resources as reasonably required for the proper performance of the board's function.

In the end, we accept that it might be appropriate for the Minister to retain the power of discretion in a matter such as this. After all, the Government will always have a certain control over statutory authorities such as the VEET board through budgetary allocations. We are going to have to trust the Minister to do the right thing and allow a certain inde-

pendence with respect to the board managing its own affairs within reasonable limits.

The Opposition has had a number of concerns about the Bill, most of which have been allayed by the Minister's assurances with respect to these matters. They are not Ingerson promises, they are Such promises, and as such we are prepared to accept those assurances. It only remains for me to mention some concerns raised by the South Australian Food and Beverage Industry Training Council Incorporated. A submission regarding this Bill was faxed to me on behalf of Mr Des Brown this morning. I raise a number of questions with the Government with respect to that submission as follows.

To what extent has the Government consulted with the South Australian Food and Beverage Industry Training Council and other industry training advisory bodies with respect to preparation of the Bill? Does the Government consider that clauses 9(6) and 14(4) should be amended to specifically ensure that industry training advisory bodies established by the Australian National Training Authority should be consulted with respect to VEET and accreditation and registration matters?

The submission also points out that there is no obligation for the Adult Community Education Council to consult with industry training advisory bodies with respect to clause 18(4). I would like the Minister to respond to these issues in his reply. With respect to the issue of parity between employer and employee representatives on the VEET board, I will take that issue further in Committee. I have tabled an amendment to effect a change there. With those few comments, I support the second reading.

**The Hon. R.D. LAWSON** secured the adjournment of the debate.

#### **SMALL BUSINESS CORPORATION OF SOUTH AUSTRALIA ACT REPEAL BILL**

Adjourned debate on second reading.  
(Continued from 20 October. Page 519.)

**The Hon. CAROLYN PICKLES (Leader of the Opposition):** The Opposition supports the Bill. However, I will reiterate some of the concerns which the Opposition has in relation to the Bill and which were raised by my colleague in another place. The Bill abolishes the Small Business Corporation of South Australia which was and continues to be an excellent vehicle for small business policy formulation as well as service delivery through the Business Centre. As I understand the commitments made by the Minister for Industry, Manufacturing, Small Business and Regional Development in another place, the Government is saying, 'All this will continue—we are just going to do it differently.'

The problem arises because the Government in its first year of office has established a reputation for being generous to big business while leaving small business operators out in the cold. The two most glaring examples are the increases in taxes, such as land tax and payroll tax, and deregulation of shopping hours. Both these measures were in direct contravention to promises made by Government Ministers. The Hon. John Olsen has made an absolute commitment to the establishment of a Small Business Advisory Council which would report to and advise the Economic Development Authority. I understand that the Leader of the Opposition (Hon. Mr Rann) has had discussions with the Minister about



this proposal and there may yet be further discussions to ensure that the Small Business Advisory Council will be effective.

There are probably four crucial issues concerning the relationship between small business in South Australia on the one hand and the South Australian Government on the other hand. I consider these issues to be as follows.

First, it is essential that there is a vehicle for the interests of small business to be communicated to Government and for those views to be considered when legislating or making policy which will affect those small business interests. An important characteristic of small business in this State is that it has given rise to a variety of representative bodies, many of which overlap with respect to their constituencies. Considerable care and diplomacy therefore needs to be utilised to see that the proposed Small Business Advisory Council will properly represent the interests of the great variety of small business in this State.

Secondly, there must continue to be Government sponsored business development services provided to the small business proprietors in this State. The Business Centre, a Labor Government initiative, has been fulfilling this role effectively for many years. I note the Minister's commitment to the continued operation of the Business Centre. I am pleased to see that commitment.

Thirdly, the Government must recognise that there are special needs relevant to small business. Many small businesses are family businesses, the budget for employment of staff is very tight, the number of hours which small business owners must commit to the business is often out of proportion to the financial rewards received, and so on. This Government has yet to demonstrate that it is attuned to the unique aspects of small business operation, despite the Minister's personal experience with that area.

Fourthly, given the plethora of small business organisations, it is very important that there is no favouritism, in other words, patronage of one group of small business ahead of another simply because one group has managed to get onto the Small Business Advisory Council ahead of this or that other group. This is one of the concerns that has led the Opposition to the view that it would be more appropriate for the Small Business Advisory Council to be given a structure and role defined by statute, preferably in the Economic Development Act.

In any case, we support the Bill at this stage and we have obviously not proposed any amendments. We will be keeping a close eye on the establishment and operation of the proposed Small Business Advisory Council. If there is any suggestion that the issues I have raised today are not being addressed by the Minister's proposal, I hope that a bipartisan approach will see appropriate amendments to the Economic Development Act to ensure that the Small Business Advisory Council concept is workable. The Labor Party is just as keen as the Government to promote and encourage small business in this State—we just do not get as much thanks for it. I support the second reading.

**The Hon. L.H. DAVIS:** The repeal of the Small Business Corporation of South Australia Act 1984 one decade on is more than mere symbolism: it reflects a new approach under a new Government to the very important role that small business has to play in the South Australian community. There are some 60 000 small businesses in South Australia and, although the Australian Bureau of Statistics is lamentably lacking in information about small business, at least

anecdotal information would suggest that small business is the most rapidly growing sector in the Australian economy and, within that sector, home business is probably the most rapidly growing employment sector in the whole community.

I have had the good fortune to have followed small business and the challenges in a legislative and regulatory sense over the years, and I have taken a special interest in the approach in both Canada and the United States to small business both within the public and the private sector. I must say that, over the period of a decade of Labor Government, small business was more often forgotten than included when it came to legislation. Under the Labor Government there was never any attempt to establish meaningful dialogue with small business. There was, for instance, no attempt to look at the impact on small business of Government financial measures, and very little appreciation of small business by a Government that, of course, had no one person in its Cabinet with a business background. That reflected in bigger fish that were eventually caught to the expense of all South Australian taxpayers.

But this measure, which introduces a new Bill to cover small businesses in South Australia, is more than just legislation. I hope it represents a new beginning and new opportunity for small business in this State. The Government has made a commitment not only to reform the legislative process under which small business operates but we have committed ourselves to reviewing all laws and regulations. We are committed to consolidating Government agencies such as the Centre for Manufacturing and the Economic Development Authority, to make them more meaningful not only to big business but also to small business. Most importantly, this Government is about creating a climate of opportunity for business, be it big or small.

One of the key features of this legislation is the establishment of a Small Business Advisory Council, a sounding board for Government, with staff assisting it provided by the Economic Development Authority. That is an important move, because one of the dilemmas always in the small business sector is that, if you asked 20 small businesses for an opinion on a particular matter, you are more likely than not to receive 25 differing views. That has always been the difficulty with small business in this State and in the nation. They are a bit like taxi drivers and farmers: they are wonderfully independent, sometimes bloody-minded and have many differing views. Obviously, the attitudes of retailers will be quite different from the views of people involved in the computer industry or in the financial services industry. So, to try to get coherent, consistent, heterogeneous views from a widely disparate small business community will always be difficult.

But the Small Business Advisory Council, which I imagine will be a very broadly representative group, at least will give the Government the opportunity for two way dialogue. It will give the Small Business Advisory Council the opportunity to respond to Government initiatives, Government concerns and inquiries, and that council will be able to feed in information from the membership of the small business community in South Australia, so that Government keeps in touch with the needs and problems of small business in this State.

The Business Centre, which has been operating for many years under the general management of Ron Flavel and Chairman Jack Tune, of course, deserved a high reputation for the work that it did. But the fact was that, under the Labor Government it had less money per capita than any other State

in Australia. Under a Labor Government, South Australia was the last State into the field in terms of providing a business licence information centre. The other five States and two Territories all had a centralised licence information centre ahead of South Australia. We trailed the field in that and so many other respects. It was perhaps not surprising to see the Labor Government not tamper with the Small Business Corporation legislation over its dying years—and it took some time to die. If you look, for instance, at one particular clause, there was provision for small business to receive loans of up to \$75 000 from the Small Business Corporation but, to my recollection, not one loan was provided to small business under that provision in the past two or three years.

The big developments that have occurred in small business in the past few years have undoubtedly turned on the great strides made in information technology. Now it is possible for people to sit at home, sit in an office, communicate by fax and by computer, and that has really changed the way in which information is communicated. In fact, in America, in the city of Seattle, someone can sit at home, plug into the computer and pull up a marketing program, instructions on how to set up financial systems, how to obtain suppliers in the particular industry in which they operate, and a range of data that has been available for many years. South Australia has been moving rapidly in that direction and that, certainly, is to be encouraged.

Given that development in information technology, it is highly appropriate that we are decentralising the sources of information for small business. No longer is it just the Business Centre on South Terrace. The Labor Government, to its credit, initiated the strengthening of regional economic boards, which acted as supply points for small businesses seeking information and support. This has been further strengthened by the accredited Ausindustry system, which provides expert information centres and databases in a network both in the metropolitan area and in the country areas. There will be an increasing ability for small business throughout South Australia to access Ausindustry.

Obviously, export advice, licence advice and a whole range of information, networking, regular lectures on areas of importance in the tax area, in legislation and in regulation will be helpful to small businesses, whether they be new or existing businesses. I am pleased to see that this Government has given priority to small business, and I think the Act has been thoroughly canvassed with small business. I am not surprised to find that there are people who do object, particular industries that might object to some aspects of the Bill, but that reflects more the nature of small business rather than any inherent problem or weakness with the legislation. I support the second reading.

**The Hon. M.S. FELEPPA** secured the adjournment of the debate.

## APPROPRIATION BILL

In Committee.

(Continued from 2 November. Page 726.)

Schedule.

**The Hon. R.I. LUCAS:** The Leader of the Opposition asked some questions in the second reading contribution, and I undertook to give as many replies as I can by the Committee stage of the debate. I have been able to get responses to 11 of the 13 questions asked by the Leader of the Opposition.

Questions 11 and 12 have been referred to other Ministers, and I do not have replies as yet to those particular questions, but, as I previously have done, I give another undertaking to follow those through expeditiously with the appropriate Ministers or agencies and correspond with the Leader over the next week if that is possible, but certainly, if that is not possible, have them available when next we sit.

With your concurrence, Sir, and that of the Committee, I seek leave to have the answers to 11 of the 13 questions asked by the Leader of the Opposition incorporated in *Hansard* without my reading them.

Leave granted.

### Question 1

A preliminary budget analysis of the possible \$8 pay increase for teachers during 1994-95 has been made and the possible cost could be up to \$3.6M. No decision has been made at this stage as to possible ways of offsetting these costs.

### Question 2

The Industrial and Employee Relations Act, 1994, requires the employer, before beginning negotiations on the terms of an enterprise agreement, to inform employees of their right to representation in the negotiation, and proceedings for approval of the agreement and, in particular, that an employee may be represented by the Employee Ombudsman, an agent of an employee's choice, or an association of employees.

The Single Bargaining Centre to be established in the Department for Education and Children's Services will provide for membership constituted of the management, union and employee representatives who are elected to develop and negotiate an enterprise agreement. The Single Bargaining Centre will be responsible for conducting the enterprise bargaining negotiations.

The Single Bargaining Centre will be established in the Department for Education and Children's Services no earlier than at least fourteen days after employees have been informed that negotiations are due to begin. I expect to be informing all employees of their rights in this process within the next week or so.

The Single Bargaining Centre will be established within the Department for Education and Children's Services. Its membership will include representatives of both management and employees. There will not necessarily be equal numbers of management/employee representatives on the Single Bargaining Centre and no party has the right of veto.

### Question 3

As I have stated in the budget question, no decisions have been made regarding offsetting costs. There will not be any cuts to teacher numbers as a result of the circumstances outlined by the member.

### Question 4

The management of curriculum in any school is the responsibility of the School Principal, who is accountable to the District Superintendent of Education. Schools not only have access to face-to-face teachers but are also able to offer varied curriculum through the Open Access College. The Department for Education and Children's Services will work together with schools to try and maximize choice and access to subjects.

### Question 5

The number of Targeted Separation Packages that will be offered will depend on the number of teachers who are identified as surplus during the current teacher placement exercise for staffing schools in 1995.

No Commonwealth funding is specifically allocated for Targeted Separation Packages. However the Government has set aside funds for Targeted Separation Packages in 1994-95.

The estimated cost of paying termination entitlements excluding the separation package cost for each full time teacher who accepted a Targeted Separation Package is up to \$15 000 and of course depends on the amount of leave accumulated by each individual teacher. 1431 teachers have requested a Targeted Separation Package since the August Budget.

### Question 6

The criteria for making an offer in response to a request for an offer from a teacher is that the teacher is surplus. Management of the process of offering Targeted Separation Packages is controlled by the Commissioner for Public Employment.

Offers are being made to teachers on a progressive basis throughout the placement exercise as soon as they are identified as being surplus. The majority of offers will be made to teachers by mid November. I am advised that the intention is that teachers will be

notified of their placement for 1995 by December 9. Those teachers who will not be made Targeted Separation Package offers will be notified shortly after the 1995 placement information is released on December 9.

Teachers who have been appointed to positions for 1995 will not be given Targeted Separation Packages unless they are in a category where there is a surplus and their position could be used to place a surplus teacher from the category such that the curriculum offerings for the school concerned can be maintained.

#### Question 7

The number of teachers employed under contract positions is dependent upon the number of positions remaining after all permanent teachers have been appointed.

The number of contract teaching positions offered varies considerably through the course of the year. In term one 1994, there were very few contract positions offered in the secondary sector in the metropolitan area. By term three, as more positions became available, the number of contracts increased.

Under the current industrial agreement agreed between the South Australian Institute of Teachers and the previous Labor Government the percentage of teachers employed under contract is to be reduced. However the Government has indicated the desirability of increasing the number of contract teachers to provide much needed flexibility in the teacher placement exercise. This matter will need to be discussed with teacher representatives as part of the enterprise bargaining.

#### Question 8

Receipts from sale of surplus properties in 1994-95 are estimated to be \$18.040M. There is no estimate available for receipts in 1995-96 at this stage.

The following properties have been declared surplus to requirements, are valued in excess of \$100 000 and receipts are expected in 1994-95.

Property	Estimated Value \$
Playford High School	1 500 000
Kidman Park High School (Balance)	120 000
West Lakes High School	2 450 000
Adelaide Girls High School (Grote St)	3 400 000
Woodcroft Primary School (part)	250 000
Seaton North Primary School (oval)	1 350 000
Challa Gardens Primary School (part)	140 000
Paralowie School (part)	151 000
Edwardstown Primary School (part)	140 000

Other properties have been identified as potentially surplus to requirements but due to the complex and sensitive nature of the negotiation/consultation process it is inappropriate to release details until the properties are formally declared surplus.

#### Question 9

The contract being negotiated between the Government and EDS covers Information Technology Infrastructure only, ie large scale mainframe processing, local (mid-range) processing and Data Networks.

The only systems operated by this Department which are affected by this proposal are those in the category of large scale processing currently being carried out by Southern Systems. All these systems will be transferred for processing by EDS although the systems themselves will remain under total control of the department. The annual cost to the Department of processing the systems is \$1.8 million. EDS will not be involved with the introduction of EDSAS into schools.

The department has not identified the savings from outsourcing Information Technology as all negotiations are being carried out by officers of the Office for Information Technology.

#### Question 10

My colleague the Minister for Employment, Training and Further Education has provided the following response:

Agreement has been reached in principle between the Murray Institute of TAFE and the Gawler Town Council to exchange sites to enable a new Gawler Campus to be constructed and provide the Town Council with an opportunity to develop its shopping complex on the old TAFE site.

The new \$3.25m campus is being constructed by the Town Council and the Department for Employment, Training and Further Education will have free-hold title over the property in exchange for its current site valued at approximately \$2.5m. The exchange of properties however will include a number of conditions which are currently being negotiated and which will require mutual agreement between the two parties. Further negotiations will be necessary to:

(a) agree to the value of the current TAFE facility and the proposed new TAFE facility;

(b) establish a cost premium the town council is paying for the exchange of properties with DETAFE;

(c) agree to an arrangement with the town council on future sale of the new site whereby the town council would have first option to purchase;

(d) agree to an arrangement with the town council on future land purchases by DETAFE to expand the new site should the need or opportunity arise.

Occupation of the facilities built by the Gawler town council will be owned and operated by DETAFE until, by mutual agreement at some period in time the property can either continue to operate on a free hold basis; be sold to the town council, or additional property be purchased by DETAFE from the town council to expand the campus.

The Commonwealth Government has not been and does not have to be consulted on this project because no Commonwealth funding is being sought. There is no scope in the current Commonwealth funded Capital Program to fund elements of this project. The State Government is however, contributing \$250 000 towards a fit-out cost of the building through DETAFE's minor works allocation.

#### Question 13

The Triennial Review was completed in May 1994. Its purpose was to review the long term financial viability of the Trust. The review explored a range of financial projections based on various policy mixes including levels of stock and amenity upgrade, debt reduction, sales and changes to pricing policy. The review made no specific recommendations. On the question of pricing policy it explored the implications of increasing rent for full rent payers by 2 per cent and by \$5 per week. The review does not canvass rent increases for rebated tenants.

The Government is currently considering the full range of matters raised in the review and will present the report to the Governor and subsequently to Parliament in the near future.

The only change to the original report was the addition of the caveat recommended by the Auditor-General that some of the assumptions in the review may not be consistent with the provisions of the Housing Assistance Act 1989 and thus with the terms of the CSHA pursuant to that legislation.

Schedule passed.

Title passed.

Bill read a third time and passed.

### STATE LOTTERIES (SCRATCH TICKETS) AMENDMENT BILL

Adjourned debate on second reading.

(Continued from 2 November. Page 718.)

**The Hon. CAROLINE SCHAEFER:** I will not be supporting either the Hon. Trevor Crothers' amendment or the clause in the Bill which provides for an age limit of 18 years. I have argued bitterly about whether someone is or is not old enough to make a life and death decision at 18, and I am astonished to think that the buying of a scratch ticket can be compared. I have not been at any stage lobbied by anyone who has any objection to anyone buying a scratch ticket at any age. I cannot understand why this has been brought before us.

There was one article in the *Sunday Mail* suggesting that we had hordes of children being addicted to gambling by the buying of scratch tickets, but, other than that, I have not seen any evidence that that is the case. If we begin to bring in age limits for the purchase of scratch tickets, where do we then go? Do we then ban the purchasing of raffle tickets? Do we ban the local chook raffle? Do we ban old ladies going to bingo because maybe they are too old to understand the risks that they are taking? I wonder where Parliaments are going to stop. Certainly, we have a moral duty to make some guidelines for society, but I cannot see that that is an issue large or wide enough that we need to stick our noses into it.

**The Hon. L.H. Davis:** There would be no age limit for radiant Ron's rooster raffle.

**The Hon. CAROLINE SCHAEFER:** That is true; there probably would not be any age limit for a chook raffle, regardless of who ran it, and I hope there never will be. There is a difference between addictive gambling, which concerns us all. Had I been in this place I would not have supported the introduction of poker machines, because we have seen the deleterious effects of the addictive use of poker machines in other States. However, I cannot see that buying a scratch ticket for a bit of fun is anything more than a bit of fun.

In fact, I stand here and quite openly confess that I have been known to put a scratchie ticket inside the birthday cards of some of my quite young nieces and nephews. Perhaps I am corrupting them; I am not sure. But certainly their parents have not mentioned to me that they are concerned by that habit.

**The Hon. L.H. Davis:** They are probably taking the tickets off them and collecting the winnings.

**The Hon. CAROLINE SCHAEFER:** That is a possibility, but they have never won much. The Hon. Mr Davis interjects that my brothers and sisters may be taking the winnings off the children, so they are protecting them in that way. The only people for whom I am concerned by this clause are those people who sell scratchie tickets and who will have to make a decision as to the age of the purchaser and will be liable for a fairly hefty fine if their judgment of the age of the purchaser is not correct.

As we know, these tickets are readily available at local delicatessens and at most newsagents, and those small businesses have more to do with their time than to try to assess the age of a purchaser of a scratchie ticket. Certainly, we have brought in age limits for the purchase of cigarettes, but cigarettes, as we also know, are an addictive threat to one's health. I am yet to be convinced that the purchase of a \$1 scratchie ticket rates in the same category at all and I will not be supporting that clause in the Bill.

**The Hon. R.R. ROBERTS:** I support the Bill. I believe that the introduction of this legislation in respect of the age of a person participating in State-run lotteries is somewhat of an anomaly that has been there for some time.

I think it is pertinent at this stage to rectify that anomaly. However, the view that I take in respect of scratch tickets is somewhat different from that which I take in relation to some other forms of gambling. For instance, when a person buys a scratch ticket they do not go into a casino or a hotel; in most instances they go into a newsagency. However, I believe that scratch tickets are being sold in some hotels.

I believe that the age at which a person ought to be able to participate in these pursuits should be 16. However, in respect of penalties, I am inclined to support the proposition which I understand is proposed by the Hon. Anne Levy. If adults in society are going to provide these sorts of pursuits—and when we provide them we recognise that there is some danger to minors—then it is the responsibility of the adults. Most forms of gambling are provided by adults, and they do so for various reasons, including income for the State, enjoyment and entertainment.

However, I believe that if adults introduce them and recognise that they hold some danger for minors, they should be responsible for policing the situation and ensuring that the perceived dangers to youths are under control. Therefore, I support this proposition which is reflected in the sale of

tobacco products. It is illegal to sell tobacco products to a minor; however, it is not illegal for a minor to purchase them.

I believe that the proposition promoted by the Hon. Anne Levy in respect of this matter is proper, and I intend to support it. However, I have some thoughts in respect of penalties. It is my view that income derived from the policing of this legislation ought to go into the Gamblers' Rehabilitation Fund. However, an amendment to that effect has not been moved in this case. I did not avail myself of the opportunity to speak on the motion that was passed recently in the Council in respect of gamblers' rehabilitation. However, I believe that this Bill constitutes a recognition by this Parliament that there are some inherent dangers for people who become involved in gambling and that it would be appropriate if moneys collected from fines went towards the rehabilitation of gamblers in South Australia.

In summary, I support the propositions embodied in the proposed amendments of both the Hon. Anne Levy and the Hon. Trevor Crothers. I support the second reading.

**The Hon. ANNE LEVY:** I rise to support the second reading of this Bill. The only contentious part is the clause which deals with prohibiting minors having access to scratch tickets, so I will confine my remarks to that clause and not mention the other clauses which I support wholeheartedly.

I say at the outset that I think it is absolutely absurd to prevent minors from buying scratch tickets. I know of no community agitation for the prohibition of access by minors to scratch tickets. There was one article in the *Sunday Mail*, but that newspaper is well-known for beating up trivial stories into major crises on the basis of little or no evidence whatsoever. It is absurd that we are moving in this way to prevent minors from buying scratch tickets—the ultimate in the nanny State!

I certainly draw a distinction between minors being able to obtain scratch tickets and their being able to enter places which are intended solely or primarily for gambling. I do not in any way object to the current law which prevents minors from entering the Casino, the Lotteries Commission or TAB offices. They are places for gambling, and I see good reason why as a community we should feel that these are not suitable places for minors. However, scratch tickets are not available only in places for gambling; they are available at every local newsagency and in many delicatessens—places which it is perfectly proper for minors to enter.

I feel we are in danger of making ourselves look ridiculous if we start prohibiting minors from buying a perfectly legal product such as a scratch ticket when they enter a newsagency. Consequently, I will oppose that clause. However, if a majority of members of the Council feel it is necessary to have some imposition on the availability of scratch tickets to minors, I will support the Hon. Mr Crothers' amendment that the age at which they should become available is 16 and not 18. As the honourable member indicated in his contribution to this debate, there are 16 year olds who are independent, earning their own living and paying their own taxes, and I certainly do not see why they should not be able to buy a scratch ticket, particularly as last week the Council agreed virtually unanimously that 16 year olds should be capable of making far more important decisions regarding their own health and welfare.

In respect of matters such as whether they are to have contraception or a test for the HIV virus and a whole lot of other far more important matters, this Council decided, quite rightly, that at the age of 16 they should be able to make these

decisions for themselves. If we are to have an age limit for scratch tickets, I think 16 is far more appropriate than 18.

I also have on file an amendment which would remove the penalty on the minor whilst still leaving a penalty for the adult who provided the scratch ticket to the young person. It seems to me that this is far more appropriate and very much in line with the legislation that is currently the law in this State regarding cigarettes. While it is illegal to sell cigarettes to minors, and while any shop that sells cigarettes has a large sign to that effect displayed prominently so that everyone in the community would be well aware that it is an offence to sell cigarettes to minors, if someone does so the penalty falls only on the person who has made the sale. There is no penalty for the minor who has purchased the cigarettes. The offence is selling the cigarettes, not purchasing them.

If we are to have impositions on minors regarding scratch tickets then the same conditions should apply. If there is to be a penalty it should be on the person who sells the scratch ticket to the minor, in the same way as the penalty is on the person who sells cigarettes to a minor. There should be no penalty on the minor who actually purchases the ticket, in the same way as there is no penalty on the minor who purchases cigarettes. The analogy between cigarettes and scratch tickets in this case is justified in terms of the penalties. However, I reiterate that the whole question of prohibition of scratch tickets for minors is absurd and this Parliament runs the risk of making itself a laughing stock. I support the second reading.

**The Hon. BARBARA WIESE:** I, too, rise briefly to place my views on this matter on the record. I support the second reading of this Bill and I support the measure that was introduced to correct a difficulty that exists with the legislation. However, like the Hon. Anne Levy, I think that to introduce a prohibition on the purchase of scratch tickets is rather absurd. The honourable member took the words right out of my mouth. It seems to me to be the ultimate in the nanny State that we should be legislating in relation to a matter such as this. However, I also agree that if a majority of people in the Council feels that the introduction of such a measure is desirable then I will support the amendment that has been put on file by the Hon. Mr Crothers to reduce the age at which this would apply from 18 years to 16 years.

*The Hon. R.I. Lucas interjecting:*

**The Hon. BARBARA WIESE:** Yes, that is what I said.

*The Hon. R.I. Lucas interjecting:*

**The Hon. BARBARA WIESE:** No, I said before that I do not support having a limit at all. However, if a majority does, then I will go for 16 years rather than 18 years. I also agree with the Hon. Anne Levy's amendment that seeks to do away with the penalties that would be applied to minors who were caught in this situation, because it seems to me to be the wrong way of going about things.

If one feels that this is an action that should not occur then the adult who sells this product to minors should be penalised, not the young person. If it were firearms or drugs, or something very serious, then it might be a different situation. However, we are talking about scratch tickets, for goodness sake. It seems rather stupid to me to want to penalise the young people who are buying them.

I remind members that scratch tickets seem to have become part of the culture. Just a week or two ago I walked into a jewellery store and, along with every other person who walked into the store, I was handed scratch tickets by the proprietor. When I scratched the ticket I was entitled to 20 per

cent off any item that I purchased in the store if I scratched three boxes that revealed the same percentage figure. I was very lucky that I achieved my 20 per cent reduction. The problem was that I could not find anything I wanted to purchase. However, every other person, including minors, who walked into that store would have been given a scratch ticket. As I said, it seems to have become part of the culture. I cannot see how it will be policed.

*The Hon. R.I. Lucas interjecting:*

**The Hon. BARBARA WIESE:** It was a jewellery store in the city. I cannot see how this measure, if introduced, will be policed. I will therefore be voting against that aspect of the Bill.

**The Hon. L.H. DAVIS:** I had not intended to enter this debate, but because it is a conscience vote it has awakened the passions of most members, and I must say that I am one of them. It really is a different world from that of 1964, when Sir Thomas Playford, who, of course, had a record-breaking term as Premier of South Australia and who developed the economy in this State in a remarkable fashion, stated in reaction to attacks on his conservatism on social matters that allowing gambling in this State was like putting fire in the hands of little children. Of course, when the Labor Party came into government after being out of office for more than three decades it initiated social reform that included the introduction of off-course betting, a lotteries commission and liberalisation of drinking hours.

These issues always excite passions and one has to respect that there are wildly and widely differing views on matters of conscience such as the one we are debating today. However, in the real world of 1994 as legislators we cannot ignore realities. The fact is that one can go into any number of retail outlets and obtain goods and services, and one of the inducements in obtaining those goods and services is that one may receive for nothing, generally speaking, a scratch ticket that may or may not provide a prize.

In fact, I was flying back on Ansett from interstate not so long ago and in the meal that was served on a plastic tray was a fortune cookie. I opened this fortune cookie, because there were very big prizes available, including many trips to Hong Kong.

**The Hon. Anne Levy:** Did you declare it in your register of interests—one fortune cookie?

**The Hon. L.H. DAVIS:** No, I haven't had to yet; this is the current financial year. Now that I have everyone's attention, I will proceed with the story. I ate the fortune cookie and there was the piece of paper. I opened it and it said:

You are lucky today. You are about to meet someone who is beautiful and whom you admire. Unfortunately, this person does not think much of you. Sadly, you have won nothing today.

That was a bit of a put down; I was very disappointed. It was not very subtle advertising: they knocked me over twice in one sentence.

Undoubtedly there are many minors who participate in scratch tickets at fast food outlets, petrol stations and retail chains. It is a way of marketing and promotion in 1994. Generally speaking, those promotions are free. However, I do see a difference between that style of promotion, which may induce young children to drag their reluctant parents into one store in preference to another because of the scratch ticket's being available, and the possibility of winning a prize. I make a comparison between that example and the

matter we are debating today, where money has to change hands, where there has to be consideration for the ticket.

We have two propositions running in this debate today. The first proposition is that there should be an age limit on scratch tickets, and the debate is centring on whether it should be 18 or 16. The other debate raging is: should there be an age limit at all? Should there be no limit?

**The Hon. Anne Levy:** If there is an age limit, should there be a penalty on the minor?

**The Hon. L.H. DAVIS:** That's right; the Hon. Anne Levy has raised a supplementary argument which I accept as a legitimate concern: if there is an age limit, should there be a penalty on the minor; should not a penalty flow through to the supplier of the ticket?

**The Hon. Anne Levy:** Only to the supplier.

**The Hon. L.H. DAVIS:** Yes, only to the supplier of the ticket. Let us pose this scenario: a five year old has broken into his elder sister's piggybank, got \$10 and toddled off to the local store and bought \$10 worth of scratch tickets. I really do not believe legislators are about making that an option. If there is no age limit, you do not draw the line anywhere. You can have a six or seven year old saying, 'I won a hundred bucks worth of scratch tickets' and the supplier of that scratch ticket cannot look behind that transaction.

**The Hon. Anne Levy:** How many seven year olds have a hundred bucks?

**The Hon. L.H. DAVIS:** But it might be that they have taken that hundred bucks because they are turned on my scratch tickets. I am just hypothesising, but it is quite feasible. Whether it is \$5 or \$100 is not important, it is—

*The Hon. Anne Levy interjecting:*

**The Hon. L.H. DAVIS:** The point I am making very simply is that, if there is no age limit—

*The Hon. Anne Levy interjecting:*

**The Hon. L.H. DAVIS:** Can I be protected from the Hon. Anne Levy?

**The ACTING PRESIDENT (Mrs Schaefer):** Order! I would like to protect the Hon. Legh Davis from the Hon. Anne Levy, but I have a feeling that he is pretty capable of protecting himself at this stage.

**The Hon. L.H. DAVIS:** The Hon. Anne Levy is having withdrawal symptoms: she obviously has not scratched a ticket for some time. My concern is that, if you have no age limit, a five or six year old can front the counter with \$5, \$10 or \$100 and the shopkeeper will provide those scratch tickets. If they refuse, does the five or six year old bring an action against the shopkeeper? The answer in law is 'No' because it is only an invitation to an offer, and there is not a contract; the shopkeeper does have a right to refuse to accept the money.

**The Hon. Anne Levy:** Even if he is buying Kit Kats?

**The Hon. L.H. DAVIS:** Indeed, even if he is buying Kit Kats; we are talking about scratch tickets today. I draw the line at having no age limit on scratch tickets, because if you argue logically that there should be no age limit on scratch tickets presumably you will then be arguing that there should be no age limit on the TAB. One can have visions of a seven year old girl in pigtails going up to the TAB, looking the lady behind the counter straight in the eye and saying, 'I'm going to have \$10 straight out on the favourite on the fifth at Morphettville.' As a legislator, I would not buy that scenario, so I want to put myself on the side of those who argue that there should be an age limit. I believe that that age limit should be 16 rather than 18. I accept that proposition. I also

have some sympathy with the Hon. Anne Levy's proposition that there should be some onus on the supplier of the goods. That occurs in liquor laws. So, I support that proposition.

**The Hon. J.C. IRWIN** secured the adjournment of the debate.

## GAMBLING

Adjourned debate on motion of Hon. R.I. Lucas:

That the Social Development Committee be required to inquire into and report on:

1. The extent of gambling addiction that exists in South Australia and the social and economic consequences of that level of addiction;
2. The social, economic and other effects of the introduction of gaming machines into South Australia; and
3. Any other related matters.

(Continued from 27 October. Page 628.)

**The Hon. T. CROTHERS:** I rise on behalf of the Opposition to indicate that the Opposition will support this measure. I must say that we view the matter as something that is required to be dealt with, simply because there exists amongst some of us a difference with respect to quantum of funds that might be applied with respect to people who are gambling addicts and the subsequent treatment that they might require as a consequence of that malady. The previous Parliament had a guarantee from the then Government that some \$2 million would be forthcoming, and to that end it set up a select committee, which is along similar lines as those which were pronounced in the Leader's motion to refer the matter back to the Social Development Committee.

Perhaps there is a view amongst some that it could again, as was the case with, say, the Stirling bushfire and Marine-land select committees, have been better to reactivate the select committee into gambling addiction. But the Opposition is fairly ambivalent about that because we would have to say that the Social Development Committee was not really in existence at the time that select committee was set up. We hope and trust that it will discharge its functions appropriately and that it will not discharge its functions based along Party lines, given that the Government has a majority of members that sit on that committee, whereas had a select committee been set up here our Standing Orders provide that five is the order of the day for select committees.

This Council could, of its own motion, enhance that number. However, we would trust that the numbers will not be used on the Social Development Committee to advance a particular point of view. We also hope that the committee does genuinely inquire into the position of people who are addicted to gambling. I certainly voted for the legislation that introduced gaming machines; I have been an Asquithian liberal in my viewpoint with respect to gambling Bills that have come before this Council on previous occasions, not just poker machines. Having said that, I believe we have had to give some recognition that it is only by legislation and whether we carry or defeat it that people are perhaps to some extent exposed to the vagaries of different forms of gambling.

With all those things in mind, as I have said the Opposition supports the motion. We are conscious of the fact that in my view it has been pretty gratifying for us to see the Government do that. There was and has been a difference between the major Parties on the quantification of moneys available—not a great deal, \$1.5 million versus \$2 million. At least the \$1.5 million was recognition by the Government

that the path down which the previous Labor Government had trod, relative to advancing that money for the use of people who are gambling addicts, was right.

However, it may well be that as a consequence of the Social Development Committee's findings and peregrinations on the matter it may be that an additional sum of money over and above \$2 million may emanate from that parliamentary body as being that which is necessary. On behalf of the Opposition, I support the motion of the Minister for Education and Children's Services and Leader of the Government in this place and ask other members to do the same.

**The Hon. BERNICE PFITZNER** secured the adjournment of the debate.

#### SHOP TRADING HOURS (EXEMPTIONS) AMENDMENT BILL

Read a third time and passed.

#### STATE LOTTERIES (SCRATCH TICKETS) AMENDMENT BILL

Second reading debate resumed.  
(Continued from page 764.)

**The Hon. A.J. REDFORD:** I rise in support of the Bill, but indicate at this early stage that I oppose clause 4 of the Bill and that I propose to take the path chosen in this legislation by Mr Brindal and the Hon. Frank Blevins in another place. It seems that this Parliament should think very carefully before it passes laws and, in particular, should think carefully whether those laws are necessary. We should all look at legislation that comes before us and ask whether this legislation is necessary. Only some .86 per cent of tickets sold are sold to people under the age of 18 years and, if one excludes the number of children who claim to have purchased those tickets on behalf of their parents, we get back to some .1 per cent of tickets sold being sold to people under the age of 18 years for what, on the face of it, is an illegitimate reason. That is one person in 1 000. It appears that to have legislation prohibiting children from buying these scratch tickets is not a moral issue but whether or not it is necessary for the legislature to intervene. It seems that the issue of scratch tickets and gambling is really a community problem. It is a problem that should be dealt with by way of community education and parental responsibility. I cast my mind back to when I was 16 or 17 and a drinking age of 18 years.

*The Hon. R.I. Lucas interjecting:*

**The Hon. A.J. REDFORD:** It was not as long ago as for some members in this place. In fact, I think I could lay claim to the fact that I am closer to that age than anyone else in this place. But when I cast my mind back to that age, it was almost a dare, a challenge, to go out and acquire alcohol under the age of 18 years. If we start putting prohibitive measures on the purchase of scratch tickets for those who are young, we are simply creating an environment where people who are prohibited from doing something, namely, young people, they will see that there is a dare or a challenge to go out and purchase these scratch tickets. There is nothing more invigorating or exhilarating to a young person than breaking some innocuous or harmless law.

We see in our community too often people thinking that by simply passing a law we will change human behaviour. At the end of the day, if a child of 16 or 17 years wants to buy

a scratch ticket, whatever law we pass will not make any difference, except that those who do will have that feeling of confidence, power or strength and at the end of the day I cannot see how legislation or a clause of this nature will do anything for young people and indeed I cannot see how it will prevent those very few people, those one in a 1 000 people from acquiring scratch tickets.

At the end of the day it goes back to individual responsibility and parental responsibility. Where there is a failure on behalf of parents to properly educate, control and supervise their children, it is not for the Parliament and the law to pick it up because at the end of the day it is the law and the Parliament that is shown up to be almost irrelevant in the whole process. One point I can make concerns the issue of illicit drugs. Since the early 1950s in this country we have done nothing but pass stronger laws with higher penalties discouraging the use of drugs. The net effect is that drug taking in this country has never been at a higher level. There has never been any example where simply passing a law to discourage some form of human behaviour has that effect.

In some cases it has precisely the opposite effect. For us in this place to say to 16 and 17 year olds 'You cannot buy scratchy tickets' is almost an invitation or a dare to young people to go out and buy these scratch tickets. At the end of the day I cannot see how this legislation will make one zot of difference to the behaviour of young people. If this legislation does succeed I look forward to seeing the statistics in three or four years about the level of purchase of scratch tickets by 16 and 17 year olds and perhaps those even younger. I can guarantee there will not be one jot of difference. At the end of the day the parents will say to their children—with some legitimacy—'You cannot buy scratch tickets, because it is illegal', they will abrogate their parental responsibility and there will be an increase in the purchase of scratch tickets. I do not believe this Parliament is here to enable parents to abrogate their responsibility towards their children and their responsibility to educate and bring up their children properly. I cannot see how clause 4 will advance the cause of anyone in any way, shape or form. At the end of the day, it is all very well to stand up here and moralise about gambling, but gambling is so widespread and commonplace in almost every public place we go to—and there are many opportunities and many suggestions that that ought to be to extended—that to sit there and ban the acquisition of scratch tickets by children borders on the hypocritical.

Finally, I might just make a comment about the *Sunday Mail* and its campaign to encourage this place to adopt the provisions as set out in clause 4. In an editorial the *Sunday Mail* claimed to represent an extraordinarily large number of readers and used that to claim some form of mandate. I do not mind if the *Sunday Mail* wants to claim a mandate but at the end of the day it should also claim the responsibility that goes with that mandate. Perhaps we could have full disclosure of all journalists' and media proprietors' interests, as we have to disclose ours. Perhaps we could have a full disclosure of all the lurks and perks—the gifts, the free tickets to the basketball they all get given—so the South Australian public can assess this mandate that the *Sunday Mail* has claimed for itself.

We could bring in all the rules and controls that apply to us as members of Parliament, because after all from time to time we have all been known to claim a mandate. Then we would be able to look the *Sunday Mail* in the eye and when they print an editorial to say that we must do this or that they can legitimately claim a mandate. When I point that out to

some of the journalists I know they see the absolute ludicrousness of the *Sunday Mail*'s claim for a mandate. Another aspect of being a politician is that we are not here to react to what newspapers say. We did not get elected by newspapers; we are not here simply to abide by the whims—

**The Hon. R.R. Roberts:** They didn't actually do you any harm.

**The Hon. A.J. REDFORD:** They did not do us any harm on the last occasion, but there have been occasions when they have done us harm. In the Federal sphere I know a number of my Federal colleagues would say that certain aspects of the print media do them harm. I think I will be here long enough to see the swings and roundabouts. I am sure the print media will not adopt a particular line or have a consistent, perceivable bias one way or the other and I am sure it will swing backwards and forwards. At the end of the day, as elected members of this place we have a responsibility to react to the general public not to a one-man newspaper campaign. It seems to me that there is no great demand out there. As we debate clause 4 in Committee I will be interested to hear how many cards, letters and phone calls members have had to try to introduce an age limit on this scratch ticket issue.

**The Hon. R.I. Lucas:** Have you been flooded?

**The Hon. A.J. REDFORD:** Flooded? I am sitting there with my feet on the desk waiting for all the cards and letters to come in and I have to say I have not got any. Perhaps my name is harder to spell and 'Lucas' being an easier name to spell they have all come to the Hon. Robert Lucas.

**The Hon. R.I. Lucas:** I have not had one, either.

**The Hon. A.J. REDFORD:** You haven't had any either? We will have to find someone with a very simple spelling so that the general public out there can get their cards and letters in and tell us as their elected leaders whether or not there ought to be an age limit on scratch tickets. The only one I have seen is the editorial in the *Sunday Mail*. I picked up the *Sunday Mail* the following Sunday and I went through the letters to the editor with a great deal of interest, knowing the *Sunday Mail*'s views and the fact that it was claiming a mandate. As a politician I know that when you claim a mandate and you get a few people supporting you, you make sure everyone else gets to hear about it. But there was not one letter to the editor. So, this great social issue that is out there burning up South Australians, that is, 16 and 17 year olds buying scratch tickets, has not been sufficient to cause one person to write one letter to any of us (although I would stand corrected), or one person to write a letter to the editor. It seems to me that this is just an absolute furphy designed to sell a few newspapers. That is what they are there for and I make no criticism of the *Sunday Mail* for that, but if we are to act as independent politicians and command and demand the respect of the community, I suggest it is not for us to jump to every whim of every newspaper proprietor or journalist as he may assert from time to time. I must say that, having read the debates in the other place, I find this whole topic somewhat bemusing.

**The Hon. BERNICE PFITZNER** secured the adjournment of the debate.

#### ADJOURNMENT

At 4.36 p.m. the Council adjourned until Tuesday 15 November at 2.15 p.m.