

HOUSE OF ASSEMBLY

Tuesday 2 April 1985

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

PETITION: WEST BEACH GOLF COURSE

A petition signed by 80 residents of South Australia praying that the House urge the Government to oppose the closure of the existing Marineland Par 3 golf course, West Beach, until a new course is completed was presented by Mr Becker.
Petition received.

PETITION: HOTEL TRADING

A petition signed by 59 residents of South Australia praying that the House reconsider legislation allowing hotels to trade on Sundays was presented by Mr Baker.
Petition received.

PETITION: RIVERLAND RACE BROADCASTING

A petition signed by 97 residents of the Riverland area praying that the House urge the Totalizator Agency Board to provide a race broadcast system to the Riverland area was presented by the Hon. P.B. Arnold.
Petition received.

PETITION: HOMOSEXUALITY EDUCATION

A petition signed by 60 residents of South Australia praying that the House oppose the South Australian Institute of Teachers policy on homosexuality within State schools was presented by Mr Trainer.
Petition received.

PETITION: ANTI DISCRIMINATION BILL

A petition signed by 20 residents of South Australia praying that the House delete the words 'sexuality, marital status and pregnancy' from the Anti Discrimination Bill, 1984, and provide for the recognition of the primacy of marriage and parenthood was presented by Mr Trainer.
Petition received.

PETITIONS: LIQUOR LICENSING BILL

Petitions signed by 218 residents of South Australia praying that the House amend the Liquor Licensing Bill to allow clubs to purchase liquor from wholesale outlets and provide for the sale to members of packaged liquor for consumption elsewhere were presented by the Hon. P.B. Arnold and Mr Whitten.
Petitions received.

PETITION: STA HOMES

A petition signed by 28 residents of Peterborough praying that the House urge the State Transport Authority to reconsider its decision to require Peterborough residents who

bought STA homes after 23 November 1984 to lease them back to STA was presented by Mr Gunn.
Petition received.

QUESTIONS

The **SPEAKER**: I direct that written answers to the following questions on the Notice Paper, as detailed in the schedule that I now table, be distributed and printed in *Hansard*: Nos 211, 327 to 339, 380, 386 to 397, 406, 434, 443, 445, 452, 453, 462, 472, 483, 484, 494, 497, 501, 506, 511 to 513, 516, 518, 521, 522, and 529; and I direct that the following written answers to questions without notice be distributed and printed in *Hansard*.

MASLINS BEACH

In reply to Mr **BAKER** (20 February).

The **Hon. R.K. ABBOTT**: The situation with regard to boats allegedly causing inconvenience to swimmers at Maslins Beach has been investigated and I believe that sufficient justification does not exist at the present time to ban boats from that area. The length of the beach in the area is approximately 1 km, and it is considered that there is ample opportunity for swimmers to avoid entering the area near any of the boats that are in the area. Any boats that are anchored close in shore would be limited in size because of the restricted depth of water available two to three metres from shore.

There are also those that travel to this locality by boat from other areas in order to enjoy the particular freedom available and it is considered that it would be unreasonable to ban their craft from the area. However, I have arranged for Marine Safety Officers of the Department of Marine and Harbors to pay particular attention to this area when on patrol of the South Coast beaches, especially on weekends and public holidays when weather conditions would be conducive to large attendances.

LANDS TITLES OFFICE

In reply to Mr **PETERSON** (27 February).

The **Hon. D.J. HOPGOOD**: It appears that the question refers to an application of a new amendment to the Land and Business Agents Act, passed in 1984, which provides protection for the vendor and purchaser in land transactions, in that a land agent is required to advise the purchaser on restrictions on the use and enjoyment of the land being purchased. The South Australian Planning Commission, as are other planning bodies, is required to provide information when requested. In this case the question refers to one of a number of inquiries made by the South Australian Housing Trust in January. The specific inquiry was received on 23 January 1985, and replied to on 28 February 1985. In that period the request was, with others, referred back to the Housing Trust for further land description information.

The Land and Business Agents Act (section 90) inquiries are processed by the same staff processing development applications under the Planning Act. The development applications are processed under statutory time constraints and, considering the nature of these applications which include land division proposals, a lower priority has had to be placed on the Land and Business Agents Act inquiries. Whilst there are no time constraints on the reply period for these inquiries they are scheduled for reply as soon as possible with a target turn-around for reply within one month as settlements may be involved. The feasibility of

recording the information on the Land Ownership and Tenure Systems (LOTS), and thus making it directly accessible, is presently being examined.

PAPERS TABLED

The following papers were laid on the table:

By the Minister for Environment and Planning (Hon. D.J. Hopgood)—

Pursuant to Statute—

Planning Act, 1982—Crown Development Reports by the South Australian Planning Commission on proposed—

Activity Hall, Streaky Bay Area School.

Borrow Pit, Penong.

Police Radio Tower and Communications Equipment, Hundreds of Kanmantoo and Macclesfield.

Erection of a Storage Shed, Daws Road High School.

Construction of Classrooms—

Cleve Area School.

Poonindie Primary School.

Wudinna Area School.

Streaky Bay Area School.

By the Minister of Transport (Hon. R.K. Abbott)—

Pursuant to Statute—

Metropolitan Taxi-Cab Act, 1956—Regulations—Transfer of Licences.

By the Minister of Local Government (Hon. G.F. Keneally)—

Pursuant to Statute—

Building Act, 1970—Regulations—Skimmer Boxes for Pools.

By the Minister of Community Welfare (Hon. G.J. Crafter)—

Pursuant to Statute—

Administration and Probate Act, 1919—Regulations—Administrator's Prescribed Amount.

Classification of Publications Act, 1974—Regulations—Videotapes.

MOTION FOR ADJOURNMENT: ROAD SAFETY

The SPEAKER: I inform the House that I have received the following letter from the Leader of the Opposition:

I desire to inform you that this day it is my intention to move that this House, at its rising, adjourn until 1 p.m. tomorrow for the purpose of discussing a matter of urgency, namely, that, in view of the proximity of the Easter Holiday period and the already escalating road toll in South Australia, this House appeals to all road users to exercise utmost care and responsibility during the Easter holidays and calls for the immediate implementation of a comprehensive road safety programme which directly attacks the causes of road accidents, improves the training of drivers and takes stronger measures to prevent drinking and driving.

I ask those members who support the motion to rise in their places.

Members having risen:

Mr OLSEN (Leader of the Opposition): I move:

That this House, at its rising, adjourn until 1 p.m. tomorrow, for the purpose of discussing a matter of urgency, namely, that, in view of the proximity of the Easter holiday period and the already escalating road toll in South Australia, this House appeals to all road users to exercise utmost care and responsibility during the Easter holidays and calls for the immediate implementation of a comprehensive road safety programme which directly attacks the causes of road accidents, improves the training of drivers and takes stronger measures to prevent drinking and driving.

Road safety ought to be an issue approached in a completely bipartisan way. Governments cannot legislate to prevent all the carelessness and irresponsibility which are the cause of many accidents. Governments cannot stop all road deaths. My Party has taken this view consistently in its approach to road safety. We have sought a bipartisan policy.

In October 1983, we moved in a bipartisan way for a Select Committee of another place to examine random breath testing. We supported the major road safety forum held by the Government in March 1984. Indeed, my colleague the member for Davenport, the shadow Transport Minister, participated in that forum. With one exception, we supported the package of major road safety reforms announced by the Premier in August last year. But the Premier has thrown down the challenge for this debate by declaring in his hysterical attack on the Opposition recently that we have attempted to undermine the Government's road safety initiatives.

Nothing can be further from the truth. The allegation is demonstrably false because there have been no actions of any substance to undermine. We participated in the road safety forum. Today, I throw that allegation back to the Premier by proposing an all-Party Standing Committee of this Parliament on road safety. That is how concerned I am to ensure a bipartisan approach to road safety. It is time for action—decisive action. This Government has attempted to coast along on the freeway of a fast promise. But, in reality, any action has been diverted into the dead-end street of incompetence which marks the administration of road safety by the Minister of Transport.

Let the House first consider random breath testing. It was introduced by the former Government in 1981. Despite some significant opposition to the proposal, some of it from within the Australian Labor Party here in South Australia and in this House, the former Government proceeded because of its view that the measure would act as a deterrent to drinking and driving. It was one of a package of major road safety reforms which the former Government not only talked about but introduced. I will mention others later.

Soon after this Government came to office, the Minister of Transport said, in January 1983, that a review of random breath testing would be carried out during that year. In May 1983, the Minister formally announced that an independent committee would undertake the review, and that it would report by the end of the year. Six months later, when there had been no further action (not even membership of the committee had been announced), the Leader of my Party in another place moved for a Select Committee to deal with the matter. It is highly likely that, had we not taken that action in another place, random breath testing in South Australia would have come to an end by default.

But this is only one of many examples of lack of positive commitment by this Government to road safety. I have referred to the major road safety forum convened by this Government in March 1984. When he announced the forum on 20 February last year, the Premier said his Government was most concerned to launch a sustained and effective attack against road accidents. He said that the Government would review the results of the forum and, if consensus had been reached on steps to be taken, the Government was prepared to initiate tough measures to tackle the road accident problem. In opening the forum, the Premier said the Government was serious about road safety and would take action. As I have pointed out, the Opposition supported the forum and participated in it.

Following the forum, a high level committee chaired by the Director General of the Premier's Department was given the responsibility to work on a package of proposals to improve road safety. As a result, by August the Premier was able to announce what he called 'a package of major road safety reforms approved by State Cabinet'.

The Premier promised the Government would: cut the open road speed limit; impose a zero blood alcohol level for all novice drivers; introduce a driver intervention programme; upgrade regulations for riding motor cycles; and introduce a motor cycle training programme. I responded

to that announcement by fully supporting all the proposals other than the reduction in the open road speed limit.

The Opposition has given this Government considerable support and opportunity to implement its road safety promises. But, any responsible Opposition cannot simply sit by and watch promise after promise of strong action disintegrate into the sort of inaction and ineptitude with which we are now faced. Let us consider what has happened to the two major proposals announced by the Premier last August. In regard to cutting the open road speed limit, it has become clear that this announcement was made in haste, without any adequate thought or research. As recently as three weeks ago, in the *Advertiser* on 12 March, the Minister said the Government was still examining the proposal. So much for the decisive action which the Premier promised!

Although the Premier made the proposal in the name of road safety, there is no evidence that it will reduce road deaths. As to the zero blood alcohol limit for novice drivers, the Premier's press statement last August said:

This tough step has been taken in an attempt to lower the road toll in the 16-20 year old high risk group. I hope parents will support the Government in this move.

The Opposition certainly did support the Government. Indeed, we had first proposed the move five months earlier than the Premier's announcement. The Premier's statement was couched in terms suggesting that legislation was imminent. But it still has not been introduced to this very day.

Last Tuesday in this House the Minister of Transport made the appalling admission that it had not been introduced because three Government members of the Select Committee on Random Breath Testing had made clear that they would frown on any Government action before the Committee's report. I ask the House: who is running the administration of road safety—the Government or the three members of the other place? This proposal has been strongly recommended over a long period. It should have been introduced before now. Too many of our young people are dying on the roads in the absence of a stronger deterrent to drinking and driving. About two-thirds of those killed on our roads so far this year were under 30, and about half of the fatal accidents involved alcohol and speed.

The reality about the major road safety reforms promised by the Premier last August is that not one of them has been introduced into the Parliament. Of course, one area where the Government has been prepared to move in a decisive way affecting the motoring public is to bleed them white with higher taxes and charges. Revenue taken from motorists through the State fuel tax has increased by 56.5 per cent since this Government came to office. Motor vehicle registration and drivers licence fees—the higher taxes the Premier imposes when he is not imposing a higher tax (we remember the Premier's statement)—

The Hon. B.C. Eastick: The Clayton's tax.

Mr OLSEN: That Clayton's tax happened to bring in 33.6 per cent more than three years ago. Of course, there has been a 15 per cent rise in third party insurance premiums this year. Changes to the administration of the Highways Fund mean taxation once specifically earmarked for road construction and maintenance is being diverted by this Administration to general revenue. This year, about \$18 million in fuel tax funds will be directed away from road construction.

The matters I have put before the House overwhelmingly demonstrate the failure of this Government to implement a consistent and comprehensive policy for road safety. We need action to change the behaviour of drivers—a comprehensive plan of action involving all road, vehicle and law enforcement agencies. In South Australia last year 232 people were killed in road accidents—132 on country roads and

100 in the metropolitan area. Seventy people have died so far this year—20 more than at the same time last year. The police said yesterday that we could have a toll of up to 300 this year, the highest since 1979. Eighty of last year's victims had been driving a car. Thirty-five of them—or 44 per cent of those drivers—had a blood alcohol reading in excess of .08 per cent.

From the research done on a national basis certain trends stand out. The 17 to 25 year age group comprises 17 per cent of the population, yet it accounts for some 41 per cent of all killed and injured in road accidents. One in every two drivers killed on the road has a blood alcohol level of greater than .05 per cent. Nearly 40 per cent of all pedestrians killed are aged 60 or more, yet this age group comprises 13 per cent of the population. The risk of death and injury among motor cyclists and pillion riders is seven times greater than that among drivers and passengers in motor vehicles. Almost three out of every four motor cyclists killed are aged between 17 and 25 years.

It is important that I put down a direction a Liberal Government will take and the sort of measures we will introduce as a package in a comprehensive road safety programme which these trends to which I have referred demand. In particular, Liberal policy will require motor cyclists to undertake an off-road practical training course before being issued with a licence; completion of a first aid training course by an applicant before being granted a provisional driver's licence; development of a more comprehensive training and testing procedure for new drivers and special attention to road and roadside design to improve safety.

Action will be taken to protect vehicle occupants from roadside hazards, such as Stobie poles and trees in critical locations. The maximum blood alcohol level for learner and probationary drivers will be set at an effective zero, which means that they will be unable to drink and drive. Through the provision of a special advisory service, local councils will be encouraged to devote increased attention to road safety, both in the country and in the metropolitan area, particularly at intersections in residential areas. Improved engineering of traffic lights, lanes, islands, road signs and other devices will be used to improve traffic flow and to reduce collisions. That will include a comprehensive review of the location and use of pedestrian crossings to reduce the danger to young and old pedestrians. The role of the Road Traffic Board will be reassessed.

A concerted effort needs to be made with other State Governments to establish uniform national road laws. For example, turning right rules at intersections vary throughout Australia, and that is indeed confusing to interstate visitors. The safety of cyclists will be promoted by highlighting the safety aspects of the Adelaide Bicycle Plan and by hastening its construction. Cyclists will be encouraged to wear helmets.

Funds would be provided to undertake research into the role that narcotics, especially cannabis, play in causing road accidents in South Australia and give effective priority to increasing the efficiency and effectiveness of random breath tests in South Australia. I believe the high deterrent effect of random breath testing has been amply demonstrated over the past 3½ years, but we need to support action to deter and to apprehend drinking drivers, with tougher measures against those prosecuted.

Those who drink and drive obviously regard a driver's licence as a right—not a privilege. They need to be reminded of their obligations to other road users. It should be made more difficult for them to get back on the road, particularly those who repeatedly drink and drive. For some time, my Party has been considering the value of appointing an all-Party standing committee of this Parliament on road safety.

Recently, I had discussions in Sydney about the operation of the New South Wales Parliament's committee on road safety. My colleague the member for Torrens appeared before that committee in 1981, as then Minister of Transport, and was actively considering the appointment of a similar committee in South Australia at the time of the last election. Such a committee would be beneficial and would ensure a bipartisan approach to road safety—

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

The Hon. D.J. HOPGOOD (Minister for Environment and Planning): The Leader of the Opposition began his remarks by saying that matters of road safety should always be considered in a bipartisan spirit. Then, in order to engender that bipartisan spirit, he began by attacking the Government and members on this side. I find that approach rather strange but, in view of the position that we have on the calendar right now, I shall turn the other cheek and rather address myself to the matters of substance in regard to road safety.

I have no quarrel with the Leader's presenting his shopping list, as it were, at the end of his speech as to the sorts of things that his Party might do 10 or 15 years hence when it might be in office. What is important is that we address ourselves to the substance of his motion—and not to what he said—because the idea of there being an opportunity for Parliament to debate road safety virtually on the eve of potentially one of the worst times of the year, when there is a heavy usage of our roads and a high incidence of road trauma, is an excellent one.

This Government will always endeavour to facilitate debate in this place and wherever else we are in a position to facilitate debate on matters of road safety. When I saw the substance of the motion it seemed to me that it was a good opportunity for us to address these matters in place of what might well have been a somewhat sterile Question Time that we would otherwise have had. Everyone should be concerned about the carnage on our roads, and everyone should be concerned to explore every avenue to minimise that carnage. There are those of us who cut our political eye teeth demonstrating—sometimes in the streets—about the needless loss of Australian lives in Vietnam. We were always prepared to concede, however, that needless loss of lives within this country was much higher than that, purely because of the inattention, abuse of alcohol, in some cases poor design of roads, road conditions and regulations that were often inappropriate, and so on.

There are those who might say that it is miraculous that there are not more injuries and deaths on our roads. We cram many high speed vehicles into narrow spaces. People have an expectation that they should get from point A to point B in the shortest possible time and then find it rather extraordinary when from time to time some of these high speed hard objects collide.

I am reminded that Queen Victoria's physician warned her, for the sake of her health, never to go faster than 12 miles an hour. The physician sort of got it wrong: it is not speed, but sudden change of speed that is responsible for road trauma. As is appropriate, the Minister of Transport will outline in some detail the Government's approach to these matters.

Of course, some of these problems have long been recognised. I notice that the Leader of the Opposition referred to the fact that holding a driver's licence should be a privilege and not a right. I fully support that. In fact, a former Minister, whom I saw in the lobby only a few minutes ago (Mr Geoff Virgo), wrote to all licence holders many years ago along those lines, bringing some criticism upon himself. I thought that that was a highly laudable action on his part.

It is necessary to isolate the causes of the road toll and to look very closely at the type of accidents that occur, the location of accidents as they occur, and at particular target groups. For example, we know that a very high proportion of deaths as a result of road accidents occur in country areas, and we know that that is related to at least two prime matters: the first, of course is the high speed at which people travel; secondly, there is inattention, lack of concentration, and loss of concentration after having been at the wheel for quite some time.

We know that there are various sorts of target groups. The Leader of the Opposition referred to cyclists, motor cyclists and pedestrians being particularly at risk, because they do not have that protection, small as it might be, of some steel completely surrounding their bodies. We are also aware of certain driver groups within the community that are particularly at risk. For the amount of time that they spend on the road, professional drivers are not represented very highly in the statistics, because, of course, it is their job and they know they have to get from point A to point B with minimal risk to themselves and to the cargo that they may be carrying.

It tends to be the young, the adventurous, and the irresponsible who are overly represented in the statistics. For example, we know that adult males from the age of about 18 to 25 years are very highly represented in the statistics, and a programme aimed particularly at that target group would enormously cut into the statistics that horrify us all. It is true that possibly no amount of effort by the Government, no matter how Draconian legislation is, or what is done about the design of roads, will completely eliminate the road toll. However, we do know that it is unacceptably high and that we must explore all possible avenues in order to reduce it.

I turn now to the special problem of alcohol. Many years ago I was invited by AA to address a seminar, at Hillcrest I think it was, on the impact of alcohol abuse on road traffic behaviour and the road toll. At the time I did a good deal of research into this. Dr Birrell, from Victoria, at the time was well known in this field and had done quite a bit of work on it, as had others. Now we have an even better appreciation of the statistics, because far more of them have been collected. For example, we know that alcohol is a very significant factor in one-vehicle accidents; possibly more than three-quarters of all one-vehicle accidents are related to alcohol abuse.

In any event, we know that in all forms of accidents alcohol forms a very high component indeed. Various countries around the world have gone much further than we have in relation to the control of these matters. I rather feel that there is still something of a frontier mentality which characterises the Australian population, in relation to alcohol and its impatience regarding the controls which from time to time were placed on people. This is probably more true of the male sex than it is of the female. However, people have to expect that, where irresponsible behaviour persists, despite education campaigns and all that sort of thing, increasingly Draconian controls will have to be applied to ensure that this prime cause of road trauma is eliminated.

The Random Breath Test Select Committee will report to the Legislative Council tomorrow, I believe. It is not my purpose, nor would it be proper for me, to canvass what the contents of that committee's report might be. I think it is quite proper that the Government should consider very carefully the contents of that report, and it would seem to me to be at best quite odd, and at worst perhaps inappropriate, that the Government should legislate in advance of the contents of that report. A considerable amount of work has gone into that Select Committee and an enormous amount of information has been made available to its mem-

bers. I would expect that the Government would look very closely at the Select Committee's report.

Of course, I cannot say that the Government would be prepared to endorse the contents of that report because I am not in a position, quite properly, to be privy to the contents of that report. Obviously, however, the Government will look very closely at the report, and it will take into account its recommendations in relation to changes to the law that may be desirable, possible changes to the design of roads, of intersections and that sort of thing (if indeed the committee gets into that area) and, indeed, changes to the education programmes which have to continue. What we need is a continual monitoring of the effectiveness of the controls that we already have in the light of the statistics which keep coming forward.

We also need a continuing education programme. I guess we have to accept that there will always be some element of consensus written into those controls, but we may draw back just a little from the strongest possible controls that we might impose if, in fact, we see that there are controls which will simply be disobeyed by the motoring public because they do not accept that they are appropriate. It is necessary that we strike a balance between, on the one hand, giving a lead by being as tough as we possibly can in the light of the horrifying statistics which continue to front every Government in this country and indeed those throughout the Western world and beyond, but at the same time appreciating that, as tough as we can be, it will always involve an element of what the motoring public is prepared to responsibly cop. For example, we do not place a stop sign on every possible intersection because we know that that eventually leads to a debasing of the coinage and the chance that most of the signs will be disobeyed. I believe that that unfortunate occurrence was experienced in Victoria some years ago.

The Government has been quite happy to facilitate this debate and looks forward to the contributions which other members will make to it in the time that is still available. I take this opportunity on behalf of not only all Government members but also (and I am sure that I would be in order in saying this) all members of the South Australian Parliament in appealing to the people of South Australia throughout this coming Easter weekend to be very careful to understand that it is other people's lives as well as their own that they are putting at stake in the case of irresponsible behaviour and indeed to avoid the explosive combination of drinking and driving. Let us set a new record this Easter: let us have the lowest road death toll in history.

The Hon. D.C. BROWN (Davenport): The road toll is the worst kind of accident and trauma that mankind can possibly inflict upon himself. We face this coming weekend the worst weekend in the year. We all know that. We have all asked for some months now for the Government to take positive action on the road toll. Then we have a Minister, the lead speaker for the Government on this crucial issue, just before Easter, standing up making such a pathetic speech that reflects the pathetic inactivity of the Government over the past 12 months.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order!

The Hon. D.C. BROWN: The Minister has said what he and his Government need to do, and I quote him: 'We need to continue to monitor the action already in train.' That is what I, the Leader of the Opposition and the Liberal Party have been talking about for some months, but no action whatsoever has been taken by this Government. Look at the motion before the House. It asks for two things. First, it appeals to motorists to be extremely cautious this weekend to ensure that they do not have an accident on the roads.

That plea is made because the Government has done absolutely nothing to help the motorist have a safe weekend.

Ms Lenehan interjecting:

The Hon. D.C. BROWN: The honourable madam on the back bench groans in agony, but I wish to point out to her that the record of her Government on road safety is pathetic, to say the least.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order! The appropriate words are either 'honourable member' or 'the honourable lady'.

The Hon. D.C. BROWN: Secondly, the motion calls on the Government to implement immediately a constructive and an effective road safety package in South Australia, and it puts forward a number of suggestions that have already been enlarged on by the Leader of the Opposition. This matter concerns me, and I know that it concerns many South Australians. Just listen to the talk back programmes over the past couple of weeks to share the concern expressed—radio announcers have said that they have never had such a response on talk back radio concerning the Government's inactivity in this area. Look at the record. Twelve months ago the Premier conducted the excellent idea of a road safety seminar. Opening that seminar, he said (in March last year):

It is quite clear that Governments must take firmer and more effective measures to reduce the number of road accidents. My Government is committed to taking action in this area.

That was fine, bold stuff from the Government 12 months ago, but what action has been taken since? The Premier continued:

I am pleased to announce this morning that the Government has approved the establishment of a road trauma task force which will consider and make recommendations upon the following:

- (1) The need for drivers to be compelled to learn a basic first aid programme.
- (2) Medical and psychological aspects of fitness to drive including drug abuse factors and programmes to modify the behaviour of drivers.
- (3) The effectiveness of treatment and rehabilitation measures on road trauma victims.
- (4) The programmes for the treatment and rehabilitation of young brain-injured.
- (5) The resources required to implement these initiatives.

The Premier went on to say, 12 months ago, that the task force had been directed to report on these aspects sequentially from 30 April to 31 October last year. Nothing has occurred or been said or done by the Government since then, despite the deadline laid down by the Premier (who, unfortunately, cannot be here today), for the first reports to come in by 30 April last year.

Let us look at the Government's record on a number of these measures. Two years ago, Red Cross, St John Ambulance and the Australian Medical Association put a joint submission to the State Government, through the Minister of Transport and the Minister of Health, for compulsory first aid training courses. I have a copy of that letter. That was two years ago, and 12 months ago the Premier set up a task force to report on the first of those measures by 30 April.

Eleven months later, not a single action had been taken by the Government to implement that measure even though, I understand, it has widespread support within the Public Service ranks, in the advice given to Government, and certainly from the Opposition. We put it in our policy in March last year. What has the Government done? Absolutely nothing! Let us look at the other actions, because the Premier, in the second part of his statement, said that it must be ensured that the resources were acquired to implement these initiatives. Perhaps one of the most important programmes that any Government can have is road safety instruction for our schoolchildren—the future motorists—the kids who

use the roads to go to and from school and the people who need tuition during their formative years.

What is the record of this Labor Government on road safety as far as instructors are concerned? In the last 12 months, believe it or not, despite the Government's promises, the number of instructors in the road safety centre has been reduced from 18 to 12 due to lack of funds—an actual reduction in the number of road safety instructors. As a consequence, I have letters from several schools in Whyalla, bitterly criticising the reduction in road safety seminars being carried out at their school. I refer, for instance, to the Memorial Oval Primary School at Whyalla. I am sorry that the member for Whyalla is not here: he has taken no action to rectify the situation. That school has had the number of road safety instruction periods for schoolchildren reduced in the last 12 months from 11 a year down to one a year, with 40 children attending one instruction period a year. The parents, the council and the people of Whyalla are all upset. The Minister and the Premier have been written to on a number of occasions.

What action has been taken? There has been absolutely none, except a further reduction of two road safety instructors in the last three weeks. That is the record about which we are talking and the sort of activity which should be monitored by the Minister and revealed to the public. I agree entirely with what the Leader of the Opposition has said. Road safety is one issue on which there should be a bipartisan approach. We have attempted to do that. Twelve months ago I laid out a Liberal Party policy on road safety on behalf of that Party and invited the Government to adopt it. We put it forward quite openly before the road safety seminar that was announced by the Government. We praised the Government's seminar and put forward our policy in the hope that the Government, with the support of the Opposition, would have the courage and initiative to take up those proposals. What has occurred? Absolutely nothing! That is the part that concerns me.

A point is reached where, if we as a Liberal Party remain silent on this important issue any longer and fail to reveal the inactivity of this Government, we ourselves would be negligent if we did not expose the hypocrisy that is taking place. It is our responsibility, after 2½ years of inactivity, at least to stand up and tell the South Australian public that they have been fooled because nothing whatsoever has been done by this Government. Let us look at the continuing saga of promises made and inactivity evident. The Leader of the Opposition highlighted the fact that motor cyclists and their pillion passengers have seven times the chance of being killed on our roads than the ordinary motorist. We all know that. One organisation that overwhelmingly represents motor cycle riders of this State is the Motor Cycle Riders Association. Several months ago it produced 7 000 members outside this House and invited the Minister to come along and talk to them on another matter. He did not front.

That Association represents the broad interest. More than two years ago (in February 1983) it put a submission to the Minister (I have before me a copy of the letter), asking the Minister to introduce a compulsory off road practical training course for motor cycle riders before they were allowed to obtain their licence. That was over two years ago. After 12 months of procrastination, the Minister said that he thought that it was a good idea and that the scheme would be operating by April 1985. It is now April 1985, but where is the scheme and where is the legislation? It is not here, and I understand that it will not be here until, at the earliest, late this year because the Minister has said that no legislation would be introduced until the Budget session of Parliament.

So, another blatant promise has been breached: it is yet another case where members of the community are crying

out for action to be taken. The motor cycle riders want it, as they believe that their members are endangered unless new members are required to undertake such training, but there is absolute inactivity, almost as though the Minister, the Premier and the Government are fearful of taking any action whatsoever.

I would be the first to congratulate any Government that took some action. I would not criticise that Government even if the action it took failed eventually to reduce the road toll. We cannot legislate to stop people killing themselves on the road, but the great pity of the present case is that this Government has not done anything. It has made promises, promises, promises! But it has dithered and procrastinated, being afraid to act for fear perhaps that it might be wrong.

My plea to Government back-benchers today is this: prod your Premier and your Minister of Transport to make sure that they take some decisive action, because South Australians are asking for it to be taken. If Government members have been listening to the media over the past four or five weeks they will know that people have been crying out for action. The Minister sits there and says, 'We'll monitor the situation and the action already taken.' In responding to the Leader of the Opposition this afternoon, the Minister said that it was alcohol, young drivers and speeding that were killing people on the roads. There is no argument with that. However, the pity of the Minister's reply today was that he simply came out with a great number of platitudes with which everyone agrees, but we want some action taken on those findings already known.

The important thing about road safety is that good statistics are available. There are some clear areas in which action can be taken very effectively. Although in the past many road safety gimmicks have been introduced, I hope that in looking to the future we take action in those areas in which the greatest response can be achieved: alcohol; young drivers; and, associated with both those areas, speeding.

It is very clear that one can pick out programmes that will help in those areas, hence the need for a very severe tightening of random breath testing and the need to take urgent action to stop young people—L and P plate drivers—from being allowed to drink or having a positive blood alcohol level. On 29 August last year members of this House heard the Premier make a detailed speech in which he promised that his Government would introduce that legislation forthwith. That is over six months ago. Where is the legislation?

Several weeks ago I asked the Minister of Transport to implement such a programme when there was still time before Easter, knowing that it had had the support of the Liberal Party and the Leader of the Opposition as of March last year, of the Premier and his Government as of August last year and of the random breath testing Select Committee (whose members have been advocating it as individuals) for a considerable time. If the Minister wanted to get a detailed recommendation from that Select Committee he could easily have asked it for an interim report. The fact is that the Government has done nothing on that score, either. I am concerned that the programme outlined this afternoon by the Leader of the Opposition should be implemented by the Government as soon as possible. No longer can we put up with the inactivity of this Government.

No longer are members of the public prepared to endanger themselves, their children and their families through the inactivity that has been highlighted in the House this afternoon. My plea to people again this Easter is to be ultra cautious and careful on our roads, because I am afraid that they are out there on their own fighting against the Government's inactivity in reducing our road toll. The toll could be reduced considerably this Easter if the Government had

taken some action, and there could be many happier families out there enjoying Easter.

The Hon. R.K. ABBOTT (Minister of Transport): It is very good to hear the Opposition taking some interest in the road safety area. I hope sincerely that the Opposition is serious about this matter and that its purpose in moving this motion is to make some worthwhile and detailed suggestions to improve the safety on South Australian roads. I was interested to hear the Leader of the Opposition talk about a bipartisan approach to this matter and then suddenly move straight into condemning me as Minister of Transport and say that I had been so incompetent in this matter.

All members recall when the Leader of the Opposition was Chief Secretary in the former Liberal Government, because no-one in that Government was more incompetent than he as Chief Secretary. Certainly, I would hate to think that this exercise was just another cheap political stunt to allow another broadside of negative and destructive criticism.

I was interested to hear the comments of the member for Davenport about the reduction in the number of field officers at the Road Safety Instruction Centre at Oaklands Park. The truth of the matter is that the reduction in the number of field officers at the Road Safety Instruction Centre occurred during the period of the former Government.

Members interjecting:

The Hon. R.K. ABBOTT: I remind the House how that came about. The member for Davenport was a member of the former Government's infamous razor gang committee, which recommended that the number of field officers at the Road Safety Instruction Centre be reduced.

Members interjecting:

The Hon. R.K. ABBOTT: This week every occasion will be taken to publicise the need for care—

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order!

The Hon. R.K. ABBOTT: —especially in regard to planning ahead. In talking about the Easter week and the Easter campaign—

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order! The Minister should be heard.

The Hon. R.K. ABBOTT: In an effort to get the message over to the community in South Australia for the Easter week, the Easter campaign will include the 'Mr Hyde' campaign, which was a very successful campaign previously. It will receive another exposure. The Road Safety Division is preparing specific road safety announcements, and these will be provided to all television and radio stations. The Police Department is mounting an intensive campaign, as usual, and there will be continuing liaison with daily newspapers to continue their excellent efforts on the road safety issue.

We all know that drink driving and speeding are the major factors in the road toll. I want to quote some suggestions that I have made repeatedly. Alcohol is unquestionably one of the most important contributing factors in road crashes. Of the drivers who die on South Australian roads, 40 per cent have a blood alcohol level over the legal limit. In single vehicle accidents the figure is up to 70 per cent. We need much courtesy, caution and common sense. The precautions that should be taken include ensuring that the vehicle is in a safe condition, with good brakes and tyres, and people planning their journey giving plenty of time to travel, and not setting tight schedules that force them to travel fast. Everyone should take their time and not drive when they are tired, and certainly not drink and drive. In fact, if one is driving one should try to drive with a zero blood alcohol level if that can be done. People should not travel with a driver who has been drinking. If it is

anyone's choice to do so, their decision can save a life and even that of a drinking driver.

Drivers should not exceed the speed limit on the open road, as that is not at all necessary. They should keep to the left and let faster cars pass them if the drivers in question wish to do so. Drivers should stay well back from the car in front and should leave room for a car that might be caught in an overtaking manoeuvre. Drivers should take special care when towing trailers or caravans, and should pull over whenever possible and let other cars pass safely. It is also very important that motorists be courteous to fellow road users and ensure that everyone travelling in a car uses a seat belt, including children.

The review on the operation of random breath testing by a Parliamentary Select Committee was extended on two occasions. We are aware that the question of imposing a zero blood alcohol limit was given very serious consideration by the Select Committee, which was appointed on 26 October 1983.

Mr Olsen: By the Liberals.

The Hon. R.K. ABBOTT: Yes, by the Liberal Government, and with the support and help of the Labor Party. I do not think that any member of either House realised that the review of random breath testing in South Australia would take so long to complete. The present Government made it quite clear that it would introduce a zero blood alcohol level limit for probationary and learner drivers, following receipt of the committee's report. I understand that the report is not ready at the moment but that it will be handed down tomorrow. We had a lengthy discussion at our Caucus meeting about whether the Government should take action, and of course we expected that the report would be handed down earlier. It has not been through any fault of the Government that the report has taken so long to prepare.

The Government provided every possible assistance to the Select Committee in the preparation of submissions from relevant statutory agencies, including the Police Department and the Road Traffic Board. A number of papers on research which were of interest to the committee were prepared by the Road Safety Division. In relation to research, the Government has taken a completely new approach to the State's road safety effort, and in one word, the Government has made it more professional.

The upgrading of the Road Safety Division and the establishment of a high level Road Safety Advisory Council have provided the framework and the people to enable a co-ordination of matters relevant to all Government departments. A most important change in direction is an emphasis on research. Previously there was practically no research at all, but the Government is placing a high priority on this matter. For the first time we are finding out what the real situation is before spending money and undertaking various campaigns.

The road safety research programme now being implemented will identify issues to be addressed and new ways of addressing old issues. Although too early to be specific about the format of public and school road safety education programmes, I can indicate that our research already undertaken has shown that matters such as safety on country roads, helmets for cyclists, motor cyclist conspicuity, child and pedestrian safety, the use of seat belts and child restraints, and alcohol abuse, are all amenable to the public and school education campaign. The Opposition has alleged that we are not acting and not introducing measures. We will see what support the Opposition will give us when this research is completed.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order! There is too much interjecting across the benches.

The Hon. R.K. ABBOTT: We have introduced a driver intervention programme which identifies high accident and offender risk drivers and requires them to attend retraining sessions. A similar scheme operating in California has resulted in a 23 per cent reduction in accidents involving this very high risk group. That is a complex area and it will take some time, but we do not want to rush into this willy nilly and introduce measures just to satisfy the Opposition.

We are looking at a pre-licence motor cycle training scheme which involves learner motor cyclists undertaking a skill based training course before the issue of a learner permit. The Government intends to undertake a significant promotion and publicity campaign during the latter part of this year relating to the use of bicycle helmets with the objective of increasing the use of such helmets. A number of studies have demonstrated that motor cycle conspicuity is significantly increased by the use of headlamps during the day-time. The Government is to implement a mandatory bus maintenance scheme commencing on 1 July 1985.

There is a working party looking at vehicle speed limits as well as the question of a bassinette restraint rental scheme. It is also looking at centre mounted brake lights. We will introduce an annual young driver of the year award that will be run in South Australia as a joint project between the South Australian Government, the private sector and a service club. The Government's interest in this scheme is based on the very serious over-representation of young people in traffic accidents in South Australia and the fact that most road safety measures directed towards young people tend to be punitive in nature. It is considered that the effectiveness of other measures could be enhanced if balanced by more positive activities such as this.

At the same time it is hoped that safe driving attitudes and practices can be imparted to a significant proportion of the young driver population. It is also proposed that the award programme be organised and supervised Statewide by a service club in three stages: an area elimination series, a regional final and a State final. Each stage would be in three parts: a written examination on road law, first aid, car care and defensive driving lasting 15 minutes to one hour; a short on road defensive driving test; and a short practical off road test of driving skills. It would be open to persons aged between 16 and 25 years and would be held on an annual basis. We hope to be introducing that award soon. I realise that my time is running out fast—

An honourable member: That's for sure!

The SPEAKER: Order!

The Hon. R.K. ABBOTT: It is interesting to look at some of the figures relating to deaths resulting from accidents and compare them with the figures to 1 April in each year: in 1980 there were 63 deaths from 57 accidents; in 1981 there were 59 deaths from 54 accidents; in 1982 there were 68 deaths from 63 accidents; in 1983 there was 71 deaths from 64 accidents; and in 1984 there were 50 deaths from 45 accidents.

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

The Hon. MICHAEL WILSON (Torrens): The Minister has just said that his time is running out fast. It certainly is, because the Minister, in his response, has told us that for 2½ years he has been looking at things. The Minister has given us a list of things which he is looking at but on which he has taken no action. What a pitiful response to a very important motion, and what a pitiful justification of the Government's actions. How embarrassing to members of this House is the Minister's response.

Let us put some things into context: when the Minister was confirmed in office he inherited from the previous Government random breath testing, which was introduced

by the former Government at the risk of political unpopularity because that Government thought it was the right thing to do. He also inherited a system of provisional licences introduced by the previous Government. The Minister inherited a revamped Road Safety Council, to which I will refer in a moment. He inherited compulsory seat restraints for children in cars. That is part of the record of the former Government. The Minister inherited an upgraded funding programme for the Road Accident Research Unit at the University of Adelaide. He inherited a new Division created specifically to handle road safety: the Division of Road Safety and Motor Transport. He inherited that from a Government which supposedly did nothing for road safety. He inherited the Adelaide Bike Plan, which had been implemented before he came to office.

Let us look at what the Government did. First, immediately upon coming to office the Minister because of ideological reasons restored the Road Safety Council to what it was previously. The Road Safety Council that he inherited had been taken away from the Road Safety Centre at Warradale and brought in to meet in the Minister's office to give particular advice to the Minister on road safety matters. What is more, the membership of that council had been changed: rather than selecting people to be members of that Road Safety Council because they represented a particular organisation, they were selected by the previous Government because of their expertise in the community on road safety matters. When the Minister came to office, he sacked them and sent them back to Warradale, where they oversee driver training and nothing else. In the past few weeks, the Minister has changed all that again. By his own actions he has admitted that the actions he took when he came into Government were wrong.

The Hon. D.C. Brown: Two wasted years.

The Hon. MICHAEL WILSON: Yes, two wasted years, as my colleague the member for Davenport says. The Minister dissolved the Division of Road Safety and Motor Transport which the previous Government had set up because it wanted expertise in one particular Division to concentrate on road safety, to bring in expertise on advertising, to hire consultants, to put suggestions forward, to act as a secretariat for the Road Safety Council. But the Minister dissolved that committee and changed it back to what it was previously. That has been the action of this Government, and the Leader of the Opposition and my colleague from Davenport have catalogued the inaction of this Government in the field of road safety.

Do not let us have the Minister accusing the Opposition of a cheap political stunt (and he read that off a prepared speech, incidentally) when, in fact, he has no record at all in this field. The Minister referred to the high priority that he had given research. Admittedly, Dr McLean and the Road Accident Research Unit are getting support now, but that support was started by the former Government and for the first time in Australia (and, I understand, in the world) research was undertaken in South Australia at the instigation of the Tonkin Government before random breath testing was introduced in this State, and afterwards. Of what value that research must be to the Select Committee which, we understand, is to report tomorrow.

The Hon. R.K. Abbott interjecting:

The Hon. MICHAEL WILSON: I agree with the Minister that there was precious little research in the Department when we came to Government, and we acted to see that Dr McLean had the money to carry out the research. The Leader of the Opposition said that we supported a bipartisan approach to this problem and that a Liberal Government would set up a Parliamentary Standing Committee into road safety. In New South Wales, a Parliamentary Standing Committee into road safety has operated for some time and has

done much work over a number of years. I had the pleasure of appearing before that committee after we had introduced random breath testing in this State. The New South Wales committee was considering its introduction in that State and visited South Australia to see how it was operating.

From my experience with that committee, I know that it acted in a bipartisan manner: its discussion was frank and very responsible. While here, it took the opportunity to investigate thoroughly random breath testing. I pointed out to the committee certain things that would have to be considered in introducing random breath testing in New South Wales because we had already introduced it here and it was necessary to learn from that experience. I hope that, when the Select Committee reports, it will make specific recommendations on random breath testing in this State. The bipartisan committee to which I have referred returned to New South Wales and recommended the introduction of random breath testing. It was introduced and has since had a marked effect by reducing the road toll in that State.

I commend to the House the suggestion of the Leader of the Opposition that there be set up a bipartisan committee that will be a continuing Select Committee into road safety, and so it should be. In conclusion, I believe that road accidents, with the attendant road trauma, constitute the most serious problem facing our society today. The cost in human misery is almost unquantifiable and the cost in financial terms on the health budget is enormous. The Leader's motion deserves the support of every member of this House and I urge all members to support it so that at least we can achieve an Easter when road accidents will be minimised and there will be no road deaths.

Mr HAMILTON (Albert Park): So much for the bipartisan approach of the Opposition! Last week, when the Minister had a briefing in this House on red light cameras, how many Opposition members were present at that briefing? Very few! So much for Opposition members' talk about red light cameras and road safety in South Australia. We are all aware of the need for red light cameras in this State.

Members interjecting:

Mr HAMILTON: Members opposite do not like the truth when that truth shows them up for what they are. They were not prepared to forgo their Party meeting to attend this function. It is on record that they were not there.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order! As there is a message from His Excellency the Governor, the honourable member will resume his seat.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order!

ASSENT TO BILLS

His Excellency the Governor, by message, intimated his assent to the following Bills:

Carrick Hill Trust,
Children's Services,
Classification of Publications Act Amendment (No. 2),
Coast Protection Act Amendment,
Long Service Leave (Building Industry) Act Amendment,
Ombudsman Act Amendment (No. 2),
Police (Complaints and Disciplinary Proceedings) (1985),
Police Regulation Act Amendment,
Roads (Opening and Closing) Act Amendment.

STATE SUPPLY BILL (1985)

His Excellency the Governor recommended to the House of Assembly the appropriation of such amounts of money as might be required for the purposes mentioned in the Bill.

PERSONAL EXPLANATIONS: MEMBER'S REMARKS

Mr S.G. EVANS (Fisher): I seek leave to make a personal explanation.

Leave granted.

Mr S.G. EVANS: My personal explanation concerns two matters. The first relates to last week's meeting. The Minister knows why none of our Party could be there. That will be further explained by others. The other part of my explanation refers to compulsory first aid. I support the view that has been expressed earlier. Indeed, I personally hold the view strongly that, if that policy is implemented (and where a person using first aid to help someone in an accident and is subsequently sued if something goes wrong with the patient—

The SPEAKER: Order! I ask the honourable member to restrict his remarks to his personal explanation.

Mr S.G. EVANS: I am, Sir. This is a personal view on something that has been put to the test in this House: that the Government should provide the legal aid for that person if he is subsequently sued for his action.

The Hon. D.C. BROWN (Davenport): I seek leave to make a personal explanation.

Leave granted.

The Hon. D.C. BROWN: The member for Albert Park, in a manner that has become almost traditional for him in this House, has made certain accusations concerning a briefing last week by the Police Department on red light cameras at a meeting which I did not attend.

Mr Mayes: And you are shadow Minister!

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order! There is no point in the honourable member for Davenport's continuing when there is a consistent barrage of interjections across the Chamber. I ask that those interjections cease. The honourable member for Davenport.

The Hon. D.C. BROWN: Five weeks ago I was invited to a half day briefing by the Police Commissioner on the activities of the Police Department. At that briefing I specifically asked whether Liberal Party members could be informed in detail on the operation of the red light cameras and the results that have come out of the so-called trial period. As a result of that, I understand that the Police Department, through the Minister of Transport (which is the appropriate channel), arranged for such a briefing, on the basis that the Minister himself arranged the time and place for that briefing. The Minister, unfortunately, arranged the briefing right in the middle of what is traditionally the Liberal Party Party room meeting on Tuesday mornings.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order!

The Hon. D.C. BROWN: On receiving the invitation from the Minister I immediately rang him and pointed out, first, that he had arranged the meeting right in the middle of a regular weekly meeting of the Liberal Party, which could not be disputed whatsoever. I asked the Minister to apologise in relation to me and other Liberals who would therefore be unable to attend the meeting. I also asked the Minister of Transport to arrange, in consultation with me, a subsequent date when that briefing could take place. I point out that I not only asked for the original briefing to

take place when I was at the Police Department (and it was done on my initiative) but also that I specifically asked the Minister of Transport (and I am sure he will verify it) for a subsequent briefing so that I and other members of the Liberal Party could attend.

The Hon. D.C. Wotton: And the Minister agreed to that?

The Hon. D.C. BROWN: Yes, the Minister agreed to that. That puts an entirely different light on what the member for Albert Park has claimed in the House this afternoon.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order!

Mr HAMILTON: On a point of order, Sir, I ask whether it is Parliamentary for the member for Kavel to call members of the Government sewer rats.

The SPEAKER: Order! The House will come to order. Whether or not it is strictly unparliamentary, it is certainly the most undesirable and unpleasant language, and I hope that such language will cease in the future.

Mr HAMILTON: I therefore ask that the member for Kavel withdraw his statement, when he called me a sewer rat. He did it again whilst you, Sir, were speaking. I ask him to withdraw, as it is most unparliamentary.

The SPEAKER: Order! No direct precedent is available to me, but I rule that it is unparliamentary, in addition to the other comments that I have to make. I therefore ask the member for Kavel to withdraw the remark.

The Hon. E.R. GOLDSWORTHY: I was going to withdraw in deference to the sewer rat.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order!

The Hon. E.R. GOLDSWORTHY: In light of the behaviour of the honourable member on two occasions recently, I think—

The SPEAKER: Order! The position is that either the member withdraws or he does not withdraw. I ask the member to withdraw the remark in question.

The Hon. E.R. GOLDSWORTHY: I withdraw that expression and substitute the statement that the honourable member's behaviour is quite unconscionable and unacceptable in the judgment of the Opposition.

PUBLIC ACCOUNTS COMMITTEE

The Hon. D.J. HOPGOOD (Minister for Environment and Planning): I move:

That, pursuant to section 15 of the Public Accounts Committee Act, 1972, the members of this House appointed to the Public Accounts Committee have leave to sit on that committee during the sittings of the House today.

Motion carried.

EXECUTORS COMPANY'S ACT AMENDMENT BILL

Returned from the Legislative Council with the following amendment:

Page 1, lines 16 and 17 (clause 2)—Leave out 'Crown, or an agency or instrumentality of the Crown' and insert 'State Bank of South Australia'.

Consideration in Committee.

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

That the Legislative Council's amendment be agreed to.

The amendment was agreed to by the Government in the other place. It specifies a particular instrumentality—that referred to in general terms in the Bill. The amendment does not therefore alter the substance of the Bill, and the

Government is happy to recommend to the Committee that the amendment be agreed to.

Motion carried.

SOUTH-EASTERN DRAINAGE ACT AMENDMENT BILL

Returned from the Legislative Council without amendment.

DANGEROUS SUBSTANCES ACT AMENDMENT BILL

Returned from the Legislative Council without amendment.

BOILERS AND PRESSURE VESSELS ACT AMENDMENT BILL

Returned from the Legislative Council without amendment.

TRESPASSING ON LAND ACT AMENDMENT BILL

Received from the Legislative Council and read a first time.

The Hon. G.J. CRAFTER (Minister of Community Welfare): I move:

That this Bill be now read a second time.

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

Leave granted.

Explanation of Bill

It seeks to increase penalties for conduct which is in breach of the Trespassing on Land Act, 1951. That Act came into effect on 6 December 1951 and created certain criminal offences. In particular, section 5 laid down penalties for unlawful entry on an enclosed field; section 6 for remaining on such a field after being requested to leave; section 7 for the offender refusing to state his name and address to the person making the request or for giving a false name and address; and section 8 for a person falsely stating that he is the owner or occupier of the enclosed field or an employee of such owner or occupier.

It is quite apparent, from recent statistics furnished by the Commissioner of Police, that this Act is regarded as having a present and continuing relevance to the prosecutorial armoury. But, it is equally apparent that the penalties, which were laid down in 1951 and which have not been upgraded since then, are quite inadequate. They are penalties which could not be described as having any value as either a specific or general deterrent. Therefore, the penalties are increased in some instances by as much as 25-fold. In May, 1984 this Government secured amendments to the Police Offences Act to deal with aspects of unlawful entry on land. Heavy penalties were prescribed for the offences established.

The penalties proposed pursuant to this Bill are therefore closely aligned with the magnitude of the penalties laid down pursuant to sections 17a and 17b of the Police Offences Act. It is anticipated that these new substantial penalties will provide the appropriate deterrent value against those who seek to flout the law and conduct themselves in an anti-social manner upon the enclosed lands of others.

In conclusion, there are two other matters which I would draw to the attention of honourable members. First, the principal Act still only applies to unlawful entry on land and does not encompass by itself simple trespass, that is, trespass as it is known to the civil law. It is the Government's intention that such simple civil trespass not become the subject matter of criminal proceedings. Therefore, the sort of conduct proscribed by the Trespassing on Land Act is trespass accompanied by circumstances of aggravation (for example, illegal or immoral conduct). Secondly, the Government has acted promptly to ensure that these revised penalties will apply to offenders who have caused, in recent times, considerable concern to landowners in the Adelaide Hills. In particular the Government has in mind the trouble caused to landowners and others during the so-called 'magic mushroom' season in autumn.

Clause 1 is formal. Clause 2 upgrades to \$500 the penalty for trespassing for a first offence and to \$1 000 for a subsequent offence. Clause 3 upgrades to \$1 000 the penalty for remaining on land after having been requested to leave for a first offence and \$2 000 for a subsequent offence. Clause 4 upgrades to \$1 000 the penalty for failing to state one's name and address upon request. Clause 5 upgrades to \$1 000 the penalty for a person falsely stating that he is the owner or occupier of an enclosed field.

The Hon. B.C. EASTICK secured the adjournment of the debate.

FOOD BILL

In Committee.

(Continued from 28 March. Page 3681.)

Clause 17 passed.

Clause 18—'Standards with which food must comply.'

The Hon. JENNIFER ADAMSON: Will the Minister clarify the responsibility of the Health Commission and local government respectively in relation to standards of food for export?

The Hon. G.F. KENEALLY: Could the honourable member be more specific in the clarification she seeks? Paragraphs (a) and (b) of subclause (1) specify the intent of that clause.

The Hon. JENNIFER ADAMSON: In my second reading speech I identified large sections of the South Australian food industry that export food. Will local government or the Health Commission be responsible for ensuring that such food is fit for human consumption and that it complies with prescribed standards? Also, what procedures will be undertaken to ensure that all processed food that is exported from this State complies with standards that are laid down?

While the Minister is obtaining that reply I point out (although the Committee would scarcely need it to be pointed out) that extreme anxiety is felt by sections of the crayfish exporting industry in relation to the possibility of contamination through the Government's failure to install sewerage works at Finger Point, which is a case in point and which highlights the absolute necessity for all food exported from this State to be guaranteed safe for human consumption. If any crayfish were to leave our borders in a contaminated state, South Australia would lose an industry that is worth more than \$70 million a year. I want to know, and I believe the Committee is entitled to know, who is responsible for ensuring that that food leaves our shores safe for human consumption.

The Hon. G.F. KENEALLY: Food for consumption within South Australia, which is not the honourable member's question, is the responsibility of local government at a retail level, but food exported from South Australia is the respon-

sibility of the Health Commission at the manufacturing level. So, there are two levels of responsibility: local government has a responsibility at the retail level for food consumed within South Australia, and the Health Commission has responsibility at a manufacturing level for food that is exported from South Australia.

Clause passed.

Clause 19 passed.

Clause 20—'Obligation to label food.'

The Hon. JENNIFER ADAMSON: This clause will apply to food of a kind required by the regulations to be labelled in accordance with requirements laid down by the regulations. It further provides that a person who sells food to which this clause applies that is not labelled in accordance with the regulations shall be guilty of an offence. I understand that the present regulations require food manufacturers to label their products with the name and address of the manufacturer.

Will the Minister say how he can reconcile that requirement with the statements of the Minister of Community Welfare on the Liquor Licensing Bill that the Government did not in any way want to be regulatory and impose a requirement on the manufacturers of wine and beer to label their products with the name and address of the manufacturer? The Minister said words to the effect that this would be unduly regulatory and that he and the Government did not propose to impose that burden on wineries and breweries.

I find it remarkably inconsistent that one Bill should impose such a regulation and that in the other the Minister should actually refuse an amendment moved by the Opposition to make such a requirement. I would be grateful if the Minister could explain the discrepancy and inconsistency in his Government's attitude to these two products both of which, in terms of this Bill, are identified and defined as food.

The Hon. G.F. KENEALLY: The Government and I are concerned that the legislation applies under the Food Act. The honourable member can take up that matter with the Minister at the appropriate time. Here we are applying legislation that has been applied in all other States. It is model legislation for the control of food throughout Australia, and it is appropriate in this Act. I do not think that the honourable member is saying that she objects to this clause: she just wants to draw what she sees as a contradiction between the Government's action here and what she alleges is the Government's action in another area. She can take up that matter at the appropriate time. This clause is appropriate in this legislation and it should be supported.

The Hon. JENNIFER ADAMSON: I also believe that the clause is appropriate and that it should be supported. However, it conflicts with the Government's refusal not to incorporate such a clause in the Liquor Licensing Bill. As wine comes under this Bill in, terms of its requirement to be labelled, why has the Government not been consistent in its attitude to such labelling?

The Hon. G.F. KENEALLY: The honourable member should take up the matter at the appropriate time when the legislation to which she now refers is before the House.

Clause passed.

Clauses 21 to 23 passed.

Clause 24—'Powers of entry and inspection.'

The Hon. JENNIFER ADAMSON: I move:

Page 9, line 16—After 'class' insert '(not being documents or records that set out the formulation, or method of preparation, of any food)'.

This amendment will ensure that an authorised officer in the course of carrying out an inspection under clause 24 does not have access to what, in effect, are trade secrets. During the second reading debate, I emphasised that food manufacturers were still not happy, notwithstanding the fact

that the Minister made some concession towards their wishes through accepting amendments moved by the Opposition in another place. They still feel that this clause, which provides to inspectors powers of entry and inspection, makes them very vulnerable to the loss of trade secrets upon which their businesses depend.

If the documents that can be inspected exclude those which contain the essence of a trade secret, namely, those documents dealing with formulation or method of preparation of any food, the anxieties of food processors and manufacturers will be considerably diminished. They have no quarrel with the fact that they should, like everyone else, be liable to inspection, but they have natural anxieties which I believe are well founded about the kind of documents that can be seized and the risk of business failure, if one likes, that can be associated with the seizure of such documents unless some protection is given to them. I am not aware at this stage whether the Government will accept the amendment. I hope that it does and I urge all members to do so.

The Hon. G.F. KENEALLY: The Government does not accept this amendment, which was subjected to extensive debate in another place, where many of the points at issue raised in this debate were dealt with. The honourable member acknowledged that this clause was the subject of considerable discussion with the industry.

In fact, the original clause, which has been amended in another place at the request of industry, provided for far more stringent restrictions. This clause provides more restrictions on the power of unauthorised officers and other acts. I understand that industry is happy with the powers as they stand. Authorised officers will be able to have access only to records prescribed by regulation. It is not the Government's intention to prescribe records that contain trade secrets.

I suggest that the honourable member's amendment goes further than dealing just with trade secrets and could restrict access to information required by an authorised officer. The Government has considered at length the amendment moved by the Opposition in this Chamber and in another place and has had considerable discussions with industry and made a number of concessions, which have been acknowledged by the honourable member.

We believe that the legislation as it now stands is appropriate, workable and acceptable, and that it cannot be weakened any further. We have a responsibility to South Australian consumers—we acknowledge a responsibility to the industry, and we balance that up with the needs of consumers. My information is that this is an acceptable compromise. Industry is aware of it and is prepared to accept it.

The Hon. JENNIFER ADAMSON: I disagree with the Minister on several points. The first is his claim that industry is happy. I suppose it depends on one's interpretation of 'happy'. My understanding direct from key industry members is that there is still a level of anxiety about the clause. If that were not the case I would not be moving this amendment. I assure the Minister that I am not doing it for my own entertainment but in what the Liberal Party and I believe to be the interests of the industry.

The fact that a document can be prescribed and that the Government does not intend to take in trade secrets in its definition of prescribed documents is quite meaningless. Whatever the Government does or does not intend, the Food Quality Committee will determine what goes in, what the word 'prescribed' defines and what it does not define. Without the requirements and provisions of this Bill, unless the word 'prescribed' is circumscribed and qualified in the way that I am recommending, the Food Quality Committee can virtually do what it likes. In fact, it is given the power in the Bill to do just that.

It is an enabling Bill, and enormous powers are given to the Food Quality Committee. It is not good enough to accept the Minister's assurance in Committee that such and such is the Government's intention, because we all know that, once the Food Quality Committee goes into session, all the powers lie there. We believe that the word 'prescribed' should be qualified in the way that I have outlined in the Bill so that there is no doubt in anyone's mind.

I should add that the wording of my amendment has been most carefully phrased in order to ensure that inspectors have the powers they should have to enable them to discover, for example, whether any ingredient is possibly harmful (I am talking about formulations and methods of preparation of food). Therefore, the amendment in our view is a reasonable one: one that would protect the industry and would meet the anxieties which, as I have stated, presently exist.

The Hon. G.F. KENEALLY: I point out to the Committee that the role of the Food Quality Committee is to consider and report to the Commission on proposals for the making of regulations under the Act. The responsibility of legislating is still with the Government, and the manner of legislating, as the honourable member is aware, is through the Subordinate Legislation Committee. The regulations will have to run the gamut of Parliament through the Subordinate Legislation Committee.

I point out to the honourable member that an undertaking will be given that draft regulations will be provided to the industry for its comment. There is no intention of riding roughshod over the rights of the industry without giving it an opportunity to contribute to the drawing up of regulations and to the prescriptions that will flow from the passing of this Bill.

Therefore, I do not accept the honourable member's concerns about the Food Quality Committee making decisions on its own without the Government being involved. Those concerns are not relevant, and I can assure the honourable member that, along with other members of Parliament and the industry, she will have the opportunity to have the regulations looked at closely when they come before this place by way of the Subordinate Legislation Committee.

The Committee divided on the amendment:

Ayes (19)—Mrs Adamson (teller), Messrs P.B. Arnold, Ashenden, Baker, Becker, D.C. Brown, Chapman, Eastick, S.G. Evans, Goldsworthy, Gunn, Ingerson, Lewis, Mathwin, Meier, Olsen, Rodda, Wilson, and Wotton.

Noes (21)—Mr Abbott, Mrs Appleby, Messrs L.M.F. Arnold, Crafter, M.J. Evans, Ferguson, Gregory, Groom, Hamilton, Hemmings, Hopgood, Keneally (teller), and Klunder, Ms Lenehan, Messrs, McRae, Mayes, Payne, Plunkett, Slater, Trainer, and Whitten.

Pairs—Ayes—Messrs Allison, Blacker, and Oswald.
Noes—Messrs Bannon, Peterson, and Wright.

Majority of 2 for the Noes.

Amendment thus negatived; clause passed.

Clause 25—'Power of the Commission to prohibit sale, etc., of food.'

Mr LEWIS: I should like to know how this measure will affect two sections of the food industry, using the term 'food' as defined earlier in the Bill. The penalties prescribed here are different from those applying to the Meat Hygiene Authority in relation to offences committed in carrying meat in the wrong type of vehicle. I refer also to the wine industry, where it is quite impossible for vignerons to be able to guarantee what the juice that forms the musk, and finally the wine, will contain, in that they cannot examine all the bunches of grapes before they go into the crusher. If, inadvertently, a bird, rodent, or some other creature found its way into the crusher, the whole batch of wine could ultimately be rejected, and thereby under this provision considerable expense would be incurred if such vexatious

prosecutions were taken against vigneronns who inadvertently committed such a breach.

I can assure members that that could be easily identified, in that protein dialysis would reveal animal protein in the must or the product ultimately found in the bottle, and by fingerprinting the amino acid in the wine it would even be possible to identify the species of animal actually involved. In these circumstances, would this provision ever be applied in that way? I want an assurance from the Minister on this matter. The likelihood of anyone receiving any ill effect or illness from such a cause would be fairly minimal. So, how does this affect and relate to the present laws on the sale of meat and the use of containers and vehicles that carry meat, and what effect will it have on winemakers?

The Hon. G.F. KENEALLY: I understand that the wine industry is currently covered by the legislation anyway. Although this Bill is broadening the controls in relation to food, wine is still covered by this legislation. Up to the point of slaughter, meat is covered by the Meat Hygiene Act. From the point of slaughter to the point of sale at retail outlets it is covered by the Food Act. Therefore, there will be no conflict between the two Acts, and in so far as meat is covered by the Meat Hygiene Act it will be exempt from this proposed Act. Therefore, there will be no conflict between the two Acts.

Mr LEWIS: Either I am or the Minister is mistaken in this regard. As far as I am aware, the Meat Hygiene Authority has powers which extend beyond the point of slaughter. Indeed, the Meat Hygiene Act details how the meat can be carried and then cut down and sold by those people who have licences to engage in any of those commercial activities. Therefore, it is still difficult to understand which of the two pieces of legislation would apply to the circumstances to which I referred. I would like the Minister to clarify that.

The Hon. G.F. KENEALLY: In so far as the slaughter and handling of meat is covered by the Meat Hygiene Act, it will not be covered by the Food Act, so there will not be a conflict between the two Acts controlling the handling of meat. The honourable member has acknowledged that the Meat Hygiene Act covers the handling of meat up to the point of slaughter. I imagine that, in relation to the handling of meat after slaughter and its delivery to the retail trade, the honourable member wants to know whether those aspects are covered by either the Meat Hygiene Act or the new Food Act. My advice is that the Meat Hygiene Act will cover the handling of meat until it reaches the retail level.

As the honourable member knows, the Meat Hygiene Act covers the licensing of abattoirs, etc., and the establishment of standards for handling meat within those premises, as well as the delivery of meat from those premises to the retailer or wholesaler. Up until that point, it is my advice, it is covered by the Meat Hygiene Act but once it becomes the property of the trade for consumption by humans, whether here or elsewhere, the new Act would apply. If the honourable member would like more specific information on that point (I appreciate his concern and that of his constituents) I will get a more definitive explanation for him.

Last week I undertook to obtain for the member for Coles more information regarding two questions which she asked in Committee and to which I was unable to give a reply either to her satisfaction or that of the Committee. The Minister has written to the honourable member, giving a full explanation in response to the questions she asked. I undertake to refer this query to the Minister of Health if he believes that I have not given a complete answer.

Clause passed.

Clause 26—'Power to destroy food in certain circumstances.'

Mr LEWIS: This Bill does not state that its provisions will not apply where the Meat Hygiene Act does; there is no specific exemption for meat in this regard. The other matter to which I drew attention was the problem which could arise with winemakers who receive harvested grapes in bulk from the vineyard. The grapes go straight into the crusher, and the winemakers would certainly run the risk of losing their wine stock if the wine (in the form of must or even at a later stage as blended fermented juice then sold as wine) was found to contain foreign material which was considered to be inappropriate, having quite innocently included that animal protein.

These days there is a lot of mechanical harvesting and the quantity of wine produced in this State from grapes harvested mechanically is increasing enormously every year. Quite clearly, manual harvesting of grapes will disappear completely at some time in the immediate future. Because the grapes are harvested at night, birds and rodents which nest in the vines will easily be knocked from the vines into the harvester and find their way with the grapes into the crusher. The winemaker in the terms of this Bill will be guilty of an offence through contamination: it would be impossible to identify that the wine contains animal proteins, and that is forbidden. If the provisions of this Bill are brought to bear against such a winemaker, the wine-maker could end up losing an enormous amount of money by having this wine confiscated. If it is seized and destroyed, notwithstanding the fact that there may be no prosecution made or any significant fine against him, he will lose. The loss would be enormous, and I want the Minister to understand that it is not reasonable to allow the blanket provisions of this Bill to apply in those circumstances without there being some sensible and sensitive understanding of what has and could happen (in the hypothetical context).

I want an assurance from the Minister that an amendment will rectify that anomaly. If it cannot be done right now, I very much regret that the Bill takes its present form without foreseeing that difficulty and I trust that in no circumstances will the Government leave it unattended for any length of time but bring in additional amendments to address that problem. I again draw the Minister's attention to those two anomalous situations. The first is the Meat Hygiene Act, which is different—the provisions of which are not excluded from the provisions of this Bill. The penalties are different, and this Bill clearly covers that situation. Secondly, I refer to the case of the wine industry where it is just not possible for the winemaker to be sure that no animal proteins have found their way into the must.

The Hon. G.F. KENEALLY: Just to give a little more information, as the honourable member has referred back to the Meat Hygiene Act, I think that the clear explanation is that, after the meat leaves the slaughterhouse and it is delivered by a vehicle owned by the abattoirs, it is covered by the Meat Hygiene Act: if it is transported in a vehicle owned by the meat trade, it is covered by this Food Bill. Once the transfer of the property of the meat takes place the responsibility is transferred from the Meat Hygiene Act to the Food Bill. The problems in relation to the wine industry were not overlooked. The Minister, his Department and the industry were not unaware of the matters the honourable member has raised.

The grapes sold for wine production are not grapes sold for human consumption under this Bill. Grapes sold for human consumption directly to the trade (through the greengrocer) would be covered by the Food Bill. Grapes sold to the wineries for the production of wine would not be covered by this Bill. If a foreign body finds its way into the finished product the defence would be the same as the defence of any manufacturer of food: every precaution had been taken by the winemaker to prevent such an occurrence.

If the customer, the consumer, had cause to bring to the attention of the authorities a product that they felt had sufficient foreign matter in it that would be inappropriate for the product purchased, that would be a defence.

The honourable member questioned whether or not this Bill would be a disincentive to wineries in that it could result in a whole wine batch being destroyed. I have absolute confidence in the wine industry in South Australia, and I have no reason to believe otherwise: their defence would be that they had taken every precaution to ensure that the quality of the product meets the standard required of it. Under those circumstances, they would have no need to fear this legislation.

The Hon. JENNIFER ADAMSON: I can accept the explanation about the wine producer having a defence, but my understanding of the member for Mallee's question was that he was really concerned about the huge financial losses that could be incurred when wine in this case is removed and destroyed if it is contaminated.

The concern relates not so much to prosecution, because the winemaker would have a defence against prosecution in that he had taken all reasonable measures. If a large batch of wine were to be destroyed because a bird or rat was in it, that is a pretty heavy penalty. Is the only redress open to the winemaker to increase his insurance premiums to cover the possibility of such an event? Is there no redress for a winemaker who is placed in this situation other than meeting, through insurance, the damage caused by the destruction of large quantities of his wine?

The Hon. G.F. KENEALLY: I am sure that the member for Coles has now been told by her colleagues the members for Mallee and Murray that the contamination of such a batch of wine is unlikely because of the nature of the manufacturing processes which are, by and large, designed to ensure that the best product comes on to the market. The real test is whether or not a food or beverage has been contaminated and, if it has been and it is unfit for human consumption, the only thing to be done with that food or beverage is to destroy it. One could not justify trying to make contaminated food uncontaminated and thereby suitable for human consumption.

In South Australia, we are proud of our wine industry, which is competitive both in Australia and internationally. If we are to supply our growing markets, we should have the best possible product, and to ensure that we have that quality we have the best manufacturing processes, which are such as to minimise the potential for the contamination of wine. That should be a reassurance for us, but I understand the concerns raised by the honourable member. They are appropriate and should be discussed in Committee. I trust that my reply goes some way to allaying the honourable member's fears.

Clause passed.

Clauses 27 and 28 passed.

Clause 29— 'Offences.'

The Hon. JENNIFER ADAMSON: Subclause (2) provides:

Where a body corporate is convicted of an offence against this Act, each director shall be guilty of an offence and liable to a penalty.....unless he proves that he could not, by the exercise of reasonable diligence, have prevented the commission of the offence by the body corporate.

My question relates to that subclause and also to the definition of 'to sell' in clause 3. If a body corporate, which could be an incorporated association (namely, a voluntary body), in the course of catering on a voluntary basis, but charging for that catering in accordance with the definition of 'to sell' in clause 3, inflicts food poisoning on the people to whom it is selling food (or even giving it under this

clause), what is the liability of the board, council or committee of that association under clause 29 (2)?

The Hon. G.F. KENEALLY: I understand the honourable member's concern about the legal position, under clause 29, of an organisation that may be working voluntarily for charity and selling the results of its work to benefit a charity or other worthy cause.

The Hon. JENNIFER ADAMSON: Given that they have been negligent.

The Hon. G.F. KENEALLY: The organisation would be charged. If it sold food that caused food poisoning, as the honourable member has pointed out, it would be appropriate under this legislation for that organisation to be charged, but it would be a defence (and I imagine that this defence would be used frequently with success) if the food poisoning was caused by factors over which the organisation had no control and if it had taken every reasonable precaution. Under such circumstances, I believe that that defence would be successful. Under clause 3, the term 'to sell' includes a voluntary organisation selling food to benefit charity. The honourable member is correct in drawing together clauses 3 and 29. Under the legislation, any person or body selling food which is unsuitable for human consumption, and which as a result causes food poisoning, could have action taken against them but could rest upon the defence to which I have referred.

Clause passed.

Remaining clauses (30 to 34), schedules and title passed.

Bill read a third time and passed.

REAL PROPERTY ACT AMENDMENT BILL (No.2)

Consideration in Committee of the Legislative Council's amendment:

Page 3 (clause 7), after line 31—Insert new paragraphs as follow:
(c) by inserting after paragraph (a) of subsection (6) the following paragraph:

(ab) a lease, licence, agreement to grant a lease or licence or any dealing with a lease or licence if the lease, licence, agreement or dealing is subject to the written approval of the South Australian Planning Commission;

and

(d) by inserting after subsection (6) the following subsection:

(6a) The South Australian Planning Commission may attach such conditions as it thinks fit to its approval of a lease, licence, agreement or dealing referred to in subsection (6) (ab).

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

That the Legislative Council's amendment be disagreed to.

There has been a good deal of consultation on this Bill between the President of the Law Society and the Hon. Mr Griffin in another place and on certain amendments to the Planning Act, about which more will be said later. The Hon. Mr Griffin has accepted that, as the substance of the amendment is already represented in regulations, it is not necessary for it to be part of the legislation. I can confirm, for the benefit of members of the Committee, that the leases are totally exempted under regulation 48 of the land division regulations under the Real Property Act, and my understanding is that, if the Assembly disagrees to the amendments, the other place will not further insist on its amendment. I commend my motion to the Committee.

The Hon. D.C. WOTTON: I express some disappointment in this motion because, up until a few moments ago, I believed that this matter was to be postponed until May. I have only just had a brief opportunity to discuss the matter with my colleague in another place, the Hon. Mr Griffin, who raised the issue. He is tied up with another piece of legislation and has indicated that, whilst he is prepared for the matter to be dealt with here and for it to be accepted

on that basis (purely because we do not have the numbers), he certainly will not take it as read when it reaches another place. He intends going back to those who advised him on the matter to recheck some of the facts.

It is rather interesting to note that the Minister in another place, the Hon. Dr. Cornwall, said that this amendment appeared to be very sensible and that the Government had had no difficulty in accepting it. I know that it is very technical; I am very much aware of that. Obviously, advice has been received by both sides. I have not had the opportunity to have the discussions that my colleague the Hon. Mr Griffin has had, and I am prepared to go along with what the Minister is attempting to do in this place to ensure that the matter is dealt with in more detail by my colleague in another place.

The CHAIRMAN: Before putting the question, I point out to the Committee that this is not the first time, although I hope it will be the last time, that, when amendments from another place are put before the Committee, invariably members are entering into a debate about what happened or is likely to happen in another place. I am not blaming one side of the House any more than the other side as both sides have been doing this. However, it is quite out of order, and in future I will rule that such comments are out of order.

Mr BAKER: On a point of clarification, what is the tenor of the amendment before us? I understood that it was supposed to be distributed prior to the debate.

The CHAIRMAN: Order! I point out to the member for Mitcham that in this case it is quite out of order to be either asleep or out of the Chamber and to come back and suggest to the Chair that, for some reasons unknown, a matter that is on file is not on file.

Mr BAKER: On a point of order, I think that that attack was entirely unwarranted. I have been sitting here listening to the Food Bill debate and have listened to the debate on this subject.

THE CHAIRMAN: Order! The Chair will not cop that sort of comment, either. The business of the day is on file, and every member is given the programme. It is up to the member to be aware of what is going on in the House. The Chair should not have to be held responsible for what the honourable member wants to do.

Motion carried.

The following reason for disagreement was adopted:
Because the amendment is unnecessary.

STATUTES REPEAL (LANDS) BILL

Adjourned debate on second reading.
(Continued from 21 March. Page 3457.)

The Hon. P.B. ARNOLD (Chaffey): The Opposition supports the Bill. As indicated by the Minister in his second reading explanation, it forms part of the Statutes repeal legislation prepared in 1980 by the previous Liberal Government. As such, the Opposition has no argument with the Bills to be repealed on this occasion. The Camels Destruction Act is clearly no longer required. The Eyre Peninsula Land Purchase Act came into being in regard to the area around Tumby Bay. The Pooindie Exchange Act goes back to the last century, such legislation being fulfilled back in 1899. There is therefore no further need for it. The Nomenclature Act dealt with the change of names during the First World War, and related, in particular, to Klemzig, Hahndorf and Lobethal. As the names were restored following the close of hostilities, that legislation serves no purpose in remaining on the Statute Book. The Opposition is therefore more than happy to support the legislation.

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

LAND AND BUSINESS AGENTS ACT AMENDMENT BILL (No. 2)

Adjourned debate on second reading.
(Continued from 28 March. Page 3673.)

Mr BAKER (Mitcham): This measure is consequential on the Liquor Licensing Bill. The Government should be congratulated for reducing the licensing procedure, as we said during the debate on the major Bill before the House, which most members of this House and the other place certainly endorsed. The reduction in the licensing procedure for brokers heads the legislation in the right direction. As we all agree, it is a waste of everyone's time and money and Government expense if we have requirements that are no longer necessary. As a result of other changes that have taken place in the liquor licensing area, the extra licence is now redundant. The Opposition supports the Bill.

The Hon. G.J. CRAFTER (Minister of Community Welfare): I thank the Opposition for its support of this measure.

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

TRESPASSING ON LAND ACT AMENDMENT BILL

Adjourned debate on second reading (resumed on motion).
(Continued from page 3757.)

The Hon. E.R. GOLDSWORTHY (Deputy Leader of the Opposition): The Opposition reluctantly supports this Bill, I have merely to open my mouth and it is a source of amusement to members opposite. I repeat: we very reluctantly support this Bill, because it is weak. The Government is pussy footing around, as it always does when it has a difficult problem: not knowing which way to jump, it follows a weak course. This is a weak Bill, which is typical of the Government. I could cite numerous examples of the Government's pussy footing around. It is weak.

The list of measures where the Government has had to be screaming up to the barrier, propelled and shoved to come to grips with a very real problem is legion. We have had the Police Offences Act, the original draft of which was about as strong as the description of the Premier that was circulated last year—about as strong as orange flower water. The Government suddenly realised that the public at large is interested in the question of law and order and in seeing that something a bit firmer is done than this Government, by its natural inclination, wants to do. So, we saw finally a redraft of the Liberal Party Bill in relation to that matter. There have been a number of others.

There is the question of the unsworn statement. In no way can we get the Government up to the barrier to get rid of that. Anyone can get up in the dock and mouth the biggest pack of lies that they like and yet they cannot be questioned about it. As to the question of video porn, the Liberal Party was advocating for about 18 months that there should be—

The Hon. G.J. CRAFTER: I rise on a point of order.

The Hon. E.R. GOLDSWORTHY: Is the Minister going to ask what this has to do with the Bill?

The Hon. G.J. CRAFTER: That is correct.

The Hon. E.R. GOLDSWORTHY: I am about to link it up.

The DEPUTY SPEAKER: Order! I think it might be better if we came back to the Bill.

The Hon. E.R. GOLDSWORTHY: I am pointing out that this is a weak law. The Minister understands about this because he has been on the land rights kick. He has been saying that we must have strong laws, with which I agree. We must have strong laws, but the Labor Party does not want strong laws. It brings weak laws before us. The Bill under discussion is weak, so we are only supporting it—

Mr Ferguson: Half heartedly.

The Hon. E.R. GOLDSWORTHY: We are supporting it, but under protest, because it is this or nothing.

Mr Trainer: I can see your hands held behind your back.

The Hon. E.R. GOLDSWORTHY: If I was in the honourable member's Party, I would have had my neck broken long before this, I am quite sure.

The DEPUTY SPEAKER: Order! The Chair is finding it very difficult to link the remarks with the Bill. I do not think that Government members are making it any easier by interjecting.

The Hon. E.R. GOLDSWORTHY: The problem is that Government members are making these rather foolish comments, which are very hard to ignore. It took about 18 months to get the Government up to the barrier and to come up with some kind of firm proposal in relation to video porn: then it caved in and agreed to what the Liberal Party had been proposing for 18 months.

Here we have legislation that is pathetically weak. The history of this measure goes back to 1978, when I, as a member representing a major part of the Adelaide Hills and when the Liberal Party was previously in Opposition, introduced a private member's Bill to try to tighten up the law of trespass, because there was a growing problem in that area, particularly in relation to this business of magic mushrooming. That private member's Bill was defeated by the then Labor Government because it said that it would review the whole scene. That is seven years ago. When in Government, amongst my other numerous duties, I raised the question and we had a report from the Attorney-General's Department telling us that the Act needed to be amended on two counts. This related to penalties and the compass of the Trespassing on Land Act, which should have had a broader scope. We also had a memo from the then Commissioner of Police (Mr J.B. Giles) agreeing that the Trespassing on Land Act needed amendment.

We sent it off to the Parliamentary Counsel with instructions to draw up a Bill. Unfortunately, the 1982 election intervened, with such a disastrous result for South Australia. The end result was that nothing happened in relation to the law of trespass. The problem has been with us for years and has increased in its intensity: it has become magnified. We saw banner headlines in one of our newspapers last year suggesting that vigilante groups of landholders roaming with guns would be set up. They were going to come to terms with this problem because the law was quite deficient and they had completely lost control of their own properties. They were dramatic headlines. It then entered the consciousness of the Government that perhaps there was a problem.

I took a deputation of landholders to the then Attorney-General (Hon. Mr Sumner). There was a representative from the United Farmers and Stockowners, who pointed out just how serious this problem was. At that time no fewer than 40 people during the course of 24 hours at any time of the day or night would go on to a property in search of these magic mushrooms. In addition, one of the residents of the Adelaide Hills area happens to be a senior police officer who was concerned about that. It so transpires that, when a number of these people were questioned, they had criminal records, and some of them fairly serious, I understand.

These are the sorts of people who have been coming in hordes on to rural properties in search of this drug. It is the members of this drug subculture who start appearing on rural properties in the Hills in increasing numbers from the beginning of April (depending on the season after the first rains) and continue going on to properties until September or October (if the season is long enough). That has created an enormous problem and nuisance as well as a danger to womenfolk and others in the Adelaide Hills. The Liberal Party sought to impress on the Attorney-General that something needed to be done to strengthen the law of trespass. This was advised and recommended by an officer of the Attorney-General's Department in 1981-82 and reinforced in a minute by the then Police Commissioner.

The Hon. G.J. Crafter interjecting:

The Hon. E.R. GOLDSWORTHY: If the Minister had paid attention to what I said, I would not have to repeat it.

The DEPUTY SPEAKER: If the Minister did not interject, there would be no reason for the Deputy Leader to repeat himself at all.

The Hon. E.R. GOLDSWORTHY: If the Minister kept his ears open he would have heard what we did about it. The Minister did not hear, because he was not listening. That is the Minister's problem. I suggest he take time off to read the *Hansard* proof, because I went through the history of these events. The Liberal Party sought to strengthen this legislation by moving a series of amendments in another place, amendments which would come to grips with the problem. As I understand it, the first of those was put and carried and, in a most extraordinary fit of pique and petulance, the Attorney-General said that he would not carry on with the Bill.

I find that amazing. The Attorney-General introduced the Bill in order to come to grips with this serious problem and, because one amendment was carried in another place, he said he would drop the Bill. Obviously, there was some publicity as a result of that situation and the Attorney-General has had second thoughts. As I understand the sequence of events, the Attorney-General went off and started wooing the balance of reason in another place (I understand that that is how the system works up there) to support his original proposal. I might add that I think the balance of reason with whom that he had to negotiate was their rural spokesman. If ever there was someone who sells the rural community down the drain, it is that member of the brotherhood of the balance of reason.

Anyway, the Attorney-General conscripted or cajoled them and got them on side and continued with his weak Bill, defeating all the Liberal Party's amendments. The measure has now come to us with none of those amendments. What did the Liberal Party seek to do with the Bill? First, we wanted to see that it covered the land in question. One of the recommendations of the Attorney-General's Department's officer and the then Police Commissioner concerned the fact that the Trespassing on Land Act talks about an enclosed field, and mention is made that there needs to be stock in the field. However, in the Adelaide Hills most orchards are not fenced, simply because they have to spray those orchards on a 10-day cycle. Orchardists move in and out with bulk bins in the picking season, and fences are a complete nuisance.

Mr S.G. Evans: Not only a nuisance but one loses the use of land.

The Hon. E.R. GOLDSWORTHY: Of course. On many properties where trespass occurs there are no fences, and the same applies to vineyards. Few vineyards in South Australia are fenced. The law of trespass does not apply to those areas. The Attorney-General could not even get up to the barrier to accept that amendment. Getting close to the real heart of the problem, the Act stipulates that the land-

holder can request a person to leave. However, that poses a problem if the landholder is absent and his agent—in most cases his wife—is required to make that request. As members know, an increasing number of people live in the Adelaide Hills on hobby farms where the breadwinner commutes daily to the city.

Trespassers turn up day and night on properties, and there is a problem. Once trespassers have left the property, there is nothing to prevent their coming back again. One of the Liberal Party's amendments was that once requested to leave, trespassers should not come back again within 24 hours. The Attorney-General did not like that amendment, and it went out the window. I guess the matter which has caused him most trouble, involving the amendment that we believe is most important in terms of coming to grips with this problem, is that we think it is not unreasonable for people who want to come on to a property, particularly in the Adelaide Hills where this problem exists, to try to obtain permission to stay on the land.

We are not talking about people who just walk through a rural property wishing to get from point A to point B: we refer to people who may want to have a picnic or barbecue or to collect magic mushrooms. We are not talking about people who want to come on to the land and collect for Red Cross or, for some other reason, come to the house. The people about whom we are talking are those seeking to come on to relatively small properties in the Adelaide Hills and stay there. The Attorney said that people would become criminals if they walked on to such properties. What an absurd exaggeration. That was the last thing we were suggesting, but that was the colourful nonsense the Attorney was using to seek to rebut what we were attempting to do.

I ask Government members of the Committee whether it is unreasonable, if people want to set up a barbecue on someone's front lawn, that they should first come to the front door and obtain permission. It is exactly the same situation. If people see mushrooms growing on the front lawn surely they should not just walk in and take them. That is an analogous situation, which bears on small rural properties in the Adelaide Hills on which someone earns a living. We sought to move an amendment to allow people to come on to a property and see the householder on a legitimate basis. Of course, if people come on to land and want to stay there they should attempt to seek permission. The Government claimed it would not work because it would turn people into common criminals. That suggestion of the Attorney-General is absurd. Indeed, it was the Labor Government which amended the gun laws with which we used to have trouble regarding shooters in the Adelaide Hills and elsewhere in the rural community. It was the Labor Party, since I have been in Parliament, that amended the gun laws which dictate that, if people want to come on to a property to shoot, they must first get the owner's permission in writing.

Mr S.G. Evans: The same applies in regard to wildlife—

The Hon. E.R. GOLDSWORTHY: They have to get permission in writing. Landholders are entirely happy with that and would rarely demand that the law be satisfied in full. As long as rural landholders know who is on their property and what they are up to, they are satisfied. In 99 per cent of cases when they know about the situation they would be entirely happy.

If rural landholders know who the shooters are and what they are up to, they do not require them to seek written permission to enter the property. The shooters are able to enter the property unless there is some very good reason against it. That is a case where the law has worked well. I do not see the necessity for their having to seek written permission. Shooters come on to the property adjacent to where I live, and if the landholder knows that they are there

and who they are he is satisfied. In this regard we are talking about people seeking written permission from landholders not to have a barbecue or to come and pick magic mushrooms but to stay on a property.

However, the Attorney-General threw that proposition straight out the window. I maintain that the rights of rural landholders are no different from those of anyone else. If someone wanted to pitch a tent on the Minister's front lawn he would be pretty sore about that, and would suggest that that person ought to seek permission to do so. But what is good enough for a Minister is not good enough for rural Hills dwellers. In that area people can do and have done an enormous amount of damage, but the Government is saying that it is unreasonable to expect those people to ask if they can stay on the property. As I have pointed out, we are not referring to people simply walking across land, although I am sure that the Minister would get a little excited about someone taking a shortcut across his back yard. We are not pushing the matter that far, but the Attorney-General has talked about creating criminals, and the like. I have never heard so much garbage in all my life.

This is weak legislation, but because of the attitude of the Government, and the Attorney-General in particular, the Opposition has no option but to support it. If we do not support it, we will have nothing. The Bill simply increases a range of penalties in the parent Act. I understand that these penalties have not been increased since 1965.

The Hon. G.J. Crafter: Earlier than that.

The Hon. E.R. GOLDSWORTHY: Perhaps it was 1956—I may have got it the wrong way around. The penalties and the compass of the Bill are quite inadequate. This weak Government has to be propelled screaming to the barrier to do anything in terms of toughening the law, and in relation to this Bill it has baulked once again. The Government should not be surprised to learn that the Hills residents in my electorate and neighbouring electorates are most irate with the Government for its weak response to what is a very real problem in that area. Having said that, I repeat that the Opposition supports the legislation simply because it is better than nothing, but not much.

Mr S.G. EVANS (Fisher): I support the legislation for the same reason as that referred to by the Deputy Leader. Over the years I have been aware of this situation, as have most people who live in the Hills. This matter concerns many people who own properties in the rural areas not far from the city. Those owners recognise that their properties are a convenient distance from the city and that people who live on the Plains in highly populated urban communities appreciate visiting the Hills areas and taking in some open air and space. We recognise that people like to walk through rural areas. Perhaps people could experience similar pleasure by walking in some of the Adelaide park areas, where there is some 350 acres of irrigated lawn area. These are cultivated open space areas that people can walk on, although they cannot take wood, plants or flowers from those areas. I suppose that people could pick mushrooms if they were there, but fortunately (or unfortunately) the Adelaide City Council has not yet learnt to cultivate magic mushrooms to provide a supply close by for people wishing to reach a high.

Those people who live in the Hills and on farms understand why people like to move around on their land, but they cannot understand why Parliament views the matter as it does. People on those properties have bought the land and have either a title to it or a lease from the Government. A lease arrangement with a Government agency specifies that they have a responsibility to care for the land properly, and several Government agencies are involved. Landowners also have a responsibility to their families, particularly if

the property is the source of obtaining a living, and to their neighbours.

However, because mushrooms, blackberries or firewood (which is often sought now due to an increase in the number of potbelly stoves and open fires in use) may be available, many people seem to think they are entitled to enter a property and take them. Further, a person with a pony stabled in a small paddock might decide to exercise the pony in a bigger field, open a farmer's gate and take it for a ride across one of his fields. Sometimes people enter by way of a back gate thinking that that will not annoy the farmer. However, in so doing, although more considerate people close the gate behind them, people often do not bother to close the gate after having entered the field or when they leave. Then there are people who ride motor bikes on rural properties.

It is easy for us to say that people are trespassing and can be asked to leave, with no further problems arising, and that, further, the penalties in legislation will be increased. However, it is damned annoying for people who may want to leave their property unattended over the weekend. They are certainly unable to leave their properties at a time when the sheep are getting to the point of lambing, or where they have pedigree cattle, horses, goats or animals that tend to be more flighty than other animals that have had to rough it a bit. In those cases a landowner cannot afford to leave a property unmanned, particularly on weekends, because of trespassers who think that they have a divine right to enter land and do whatever they think is good fun or enjoyment.

The Deputy Leader questioned what would happen to people from nearby rural communities if they ventured on to private property in the city areas. Sometimes property is fenced off, but many properties do not have front fences. What would happen to people if they entered private property in the city and sat on the back lawn and perhaps used the swimming pool or picked any available mushrooms? Some people swim in man-made or natural dams on a rural property, whether those people may be wearing suitable attire or not. What would the police do in the circumstances to which I have just referred in relation to suburban properties? On the other hand, would they order the people concerned to leave a rural property immediately and to never return? Would they go to a property and take that action?

I can assure members that the Police Department does not have the numbers in the Hills to carry out that sort of control. If as many people trespassed in the city as they do in the Hills, we would find more action being taken. We tried, through our colleagues in another place, to change the law in relation to seeking permission before going on to a property. We would have liked the Bill to be changed to cover the situation of a person wanting to make use of property (in this case, land) needing to obtain permission to do so. No member, I am sure, would pass legislation that allowed a person to use his (the member's) motor car without permission. The Government rejected that request in another place. Is that an unreasonable proposition?

I believe that, even in the city, to have the full protection of the law a person can approach only the front door of a house. If a person uses a side gate to gain access to the back of the house, and if something happens to that person, the law changes in the concept of people not carrying out some commercial exercise or seeking advice. The law can then take a different course and they can be charged. I know of a recent case at the Christies Beach police station in which some people were locked in the cells for the night as a result of an incident at a hotel. A friend of those people ventured around the back of the police station to try to get keys for motor bikes from the people in the cells. That person was charged either with being unlawfully on the premises or

being on premises for an unlawful purpose. When people trespass on Government property there is no hesitation to taking some firm action against them.

I think it is quite reasonable to expect that, if you own something and someone wants to use it, they should seek your permission before they use it. I am sure every member of this Parliament would get very excited if someone they did not know used something they owned without their permission. If it was a motor car, for instance, they might think of taking action to have the person charged with joy riding, or something more serious.

I know of some funny incidents that have occurred through trespassing. In one case a city family went to the Hills, pulled into a driveway about 20 metres from a house, and went into that person's paddock to have a picnic. They had their pet dog with them (they kept it under control, much to their credit). The owner of the property took note of that. When the owner's wife said to the owner, 'They are out there pinching our blackberries, and we were keeping them for friends to pick later', the owner said, 'Let them go.' He knew someone who was able to get the name and address of the owner of the vehicle. He worked in the city in order to supplement his income from the property, so he went to the trouble of making sure that he had the right address.

On the following Sunday he took his family and parked on the gentleman's lawn (in the eastern suburbs) and had a picnic. The owner came out and got very excited, and the picnicker explained to the owner (who had just arrived home from church) that he was doing only what the owner had done the previous Sunday. Those people are now the best of friends and in the blackberry season the people from the city go to the Hills to pick blackberries. They got the message, and they understand that they really were using someone else's property.

In the second incident, trespassers went into a landowner's shed and took a ladder to enable them to pick blackberries. The owner of the land challenged them about being on the property and recognised his ladder. He got excited about it and that person from the plains said, 'What are you getting angry about? The blackberries grow wild.' The owner said, 'I am growing b . . . wild too.' He not only took the ladder but he took the blackberries that had been picked and the containers, and did not return them. He gained a few containers and heard a few more Australian adjectives. We are not talking in these cases about the magic mushroom pickers.

The taking of wood is becoming prevalent, because wood is expensive. There is a growing demand for it, more and more people are putting in potbelly stoves, and they have to be cautious about what they burn because we have changed the law about burning materials that smoke too much. More people now are taking wood illegally from properties, and a lot of wood is now being taken from council owned land. I know those people are breaking the law by stealing the wood, but the farmer does not have a lot of rights when it comes to getting them off the property before they start to steal the wood.

We have made laws in relation to hunting, quite rightly, that the intending hunter should approach the landholder to get permission in writing to go on to the property. We have also made a law that only those who own the land or those who have had permission from the landowner can take flora and fauna from it (some species are protected in total). In particular, that is the case with the wild daisy that comes up after bushfires or other native species landholders can sell to florist shops. We are prepared to make laws in those areas: because the State thinks conservation of our native species is important, permission must be obtained. In the case of hunting, because people use guns, we made

the law because of the damage the idiots were doing to stock, signs and water tanks.

Anyone in the rural industry will make the point strongly that enormous damage can be caused by disturbance to ewes getting close to lambing, or to pedigree stock. I know of a case where trespassers went on to a property to take nothing, but having with them two dogs. Horses on the property went off in fear, whether of the dogs or the people the owner does not know, and one horse impaled itself on a fence and had to be destroyed. What recourse did the owner have? The people went through the paddock, he had to go in a vehicle to catch them, and by the time he did that they had gone. Neighbours saw them, but were unable to get the registration number of the vehicle. He lost a horse, and there was no recourse to compensation. If those people had had to get permission before going on to the property, the owner might have said, 'Yes, but leave your dogs in the vehicle.'

The Government has taken a little step, but it has not stumbled on to the problem, and I hope that at some time in the future the Government will wake up, make sure, and take a bigger step to show that a person who owns something at least have the right to have other people ask them before they use it. That is all the landholders are asking for. I support the Bill because it is an improvement, but it is not a great improvement.

Mr LEWIS (Mallee): I have the same concerns as those already expressed by other Opposition members. In the second reading explanation, the point was made that in May last year the Government secured amendments to the Police Offences Act to deal with aspects of unlawful entry on land. Really, that is deceitful: that was the private member's Bill drawn up by the former Attorney-General (Hon. Trevor Griffin).

The Hon. E.R. Goldsworthy: They watered it down, too.

Mr LEWIS: Yes, in the process they did so. It would not have been so bad had they taken the Bill in the form prepared for Mr Griffin, but they chose not to do so. The Government spokesman on the matter has made the point that the Government intends to make simple civil trespass something that does not become part of criminal proceedings, but I cannot imagine anything more stupid or ridiculous. It is a kind of tatty half-witted approach, 'Slap the back of the hand and say "Naughty boy, don't do it again."' That sort of approach continues to get this community into greater difficulties and is bringing people into confrontation with each other, whereby those who are offended, and against whom the offence is committed, feel increasingly frustrated by the inability of the law to deal with the problem. That is causing them, therefore, to take matters into their own hands.

I hear an increasing number of people saying how they will do that, given that the law does not provide them with the measure of security and protection for which they believe they have paid when they purchased the property and which they are entitled to enjoy. In my judgment, it is unfortunate that Government members fail to recognise the legitimacy of the rights of property owners outside the metropolitan area to the peaceful enjoyment of their property without the harassment of trespassers from elsewhere who come, without permission, to do as they please with the landholder's possessions, both the land itself and the things on it.

Let me give examples. This is a problem in the Mallee, because we are still engaged in stabilising sand dune systems that arose as a consequence of over-stocking, over-cropping and over-cultivation as far back as the late 1920s. Most of the work to stabilise the drift sand in the Mallee is well and truly in hand, and very little remains to be done. However, in recent times we have seen the increasing advent of off-

road vehicles as a recreational activity (an activity which I do not support unless it is undertaken in the same way as people play golf and tennis, join a club and pay green fees and maintain the condition of the land that they are using for their recreational activity). I cannot see why trail bike riders cannot do likewise and buy themselves a patch of country, tear the guts out of it, and pay the cost of maintaining it in a condition that will give them the joy of tearing the guts out of it again next weekend, in the same way as the golf player recognises the need to replace his divots and pays green fees to maintain the greens and fairways in an adequate condition for playing golf.

I do not think that anyone who can afford to buy a trail bike and meet the fuel costs involved, as well as the travelling costs to and from the places to which the trail bike is taken for off road recreational activities, should be necessarily entitled to expect that the rest of the taxpayers should provide him with those facilities so that he can derive no more or less pleasure from his recreation than does the golfer or tennis player or anyone else but without paying himself. I make that point in passing.

In the Mallee, they simply drive into the bush, find a nice sandhill, stop the car, roll the bike off the trailer or the back of the car, and start tearing the guts out of the sand dune on which we have already started work and spent taxpayers' money trying to stabilise the dune system. They tear up the rye or anything else that has been planted, and consequently destroy years of hard work with bulldozers in the stabilisation programmes of the kind to which I have referred, such as rye planting, etc. When property owners and other concerned citizens in the locality, noticing these activities, approach the people who are engaging in them to just explain the damage they are doing (not even asking the trespassers to leave), they are simply told. 'It's only a bloody sandhill. What's your trouble, mate?' as though the landholder is really making an unreasonable request in asking them to desist from what they are doing.

Where the law fails in this instance is that it does not go far enough, and prevents those people from being prosecuted for trespassing. Signs have been erected and the trespassers know that they should not be doing what they are doing. The signs clearly spell that out. That is additional expense in the stabilisation programme which has become necessary only since this larrikin behaviour has crept in and been allowed to continue with the watering down of the law of trespass, and the hours of work and anguish that the farmers have been involved in have been lost.

That is the first illustration. The second one, referred to in some part by the member for Fisher, relates literally to the stealing of produce. Indeed, it can be seen in that light. These days, mallee roots are increasingly valuable. Farmers and their children derive a considerable income, for pocket money and other purposes, when other work on the farm has been completed (in a seasonal fashion) by picking stumps and selling them. They are increasingly under pressure to do that because the costs of everything that they buy are increasing, outside their control and largely due to the irresponsible fashion in which wage costs have been allowed to escalate in this country, unrelated to the capacity of the country to maintain its standard of living which those wage levels imply and unrelated to the capacity of exporters, largely rural producers, who must underpin that life style by providing the export income derived from the products of their labours on the farms.

These people now find that to stay afloat they must pick mallee stumps and sell them. Accordingly, they find it offensive when a visitor simply rolls up, drives through the gate and around the paddock, picks up a heap of stumps which the farmer and his family have gathered and which are waiting to be thrown on to the semi-trailer when it arrives.

Once the visitor has filled his trailer, he and his companions drive out of the paddock and off home. When accosted by the landholder, such people are indignant that he should be so ungrateful for their clearing the stumps away. That is the attitude taken by these trespassers. First, they say, 'We are doing you a favour by getting these stumps off your paddock.' Then they say, 'What right have you, the landholder, to complain under law anyway? If you are going to prosecute, go ahead. Ha, ha!'

The general public knows that, in its watered down form, this law of trespass gives considerably greater latitude to them. This is another instance of where tension is increasing, especially in the areas where mallee stumps are to be found nearer to the metropolitan area.

I feel for the landholder. It would not be half so bad if these people would gather the stumps from across the broad acres, but they do not do so. They simply drive in beside the heaps that have been collected by the farmer or his family, the Lions Club, the Rotary Club or the local football club that is raising money for one or other cause, pick them up, and tell the hapless owner to 'Go fry your face,' when confronted.

Another instance involves me, in particular. We have laws, where hunting is involved, presumably to require members of the general public to obtain the written permission of the landowner when the person desiring to go hunting seeks that approval. However, as the law stands it does not really cover wet land swamps. I happen to be the owner of a substantial area of wet land swamp adjacent to the main channel of the Murray River at Taillem Bend. I bought that land at the time I met the obligation and undertaking that I gave to my constituents when I was elected, namely, to procure my principal place of residence—indeed my only place of residence—in the electorate that I represented. The property was on the market at the time and seemed eminently suitable. Upon purchasing it I undertook, in response to a request from my neighbours, to honour the gentleman's agreement between the people on that part of the land adjacent to the river to not shoot or allow anyone else to shoot or hunt the birds on that wetland swamp.

However, I now find that I am the only landholder for several kilometres along that stretch of river who has a gap in the willows between the main channel and the wetland swamp. So, every birdwatcher, ostensibly birdwatcher, or would-be duck shooter has to gain access to that swamp by boat from the river and through the gap in the willows on my property. They do not respond at all to the request that is clearly displayed on a sign at the entrance of the willows not to disturb the birds and rookeries when they are nesting and not to trespass on my land. They simply drive in, but they are in an off-road vehicle—a boat. They claim that they are not really on the land—they are on the water.

I do not know what the law says about that, but all the same they take umbrage at my yelling at them from the shore asking them to leave, be they people attempting to shoot the ducks or simply wishing to watch the birds. I wish they would take the trouble to seek my permission to do that and come into the swamp from the land side through my property entrance from the Princes Highway. They could do it just as easily. Notwithstanding that, I am placed in the position of being unable to require them to leave or prosecute them if they do not. They can thumb their nose at me. Of course, the other thing that really vexes me is that they do not need written permission from me to go fishing. They must have written permission from me to go hunting, but they argue that they are not on my land. They are on my title, but they are on my water.

I am not going to get involved in an expensive legal action to try to prove whether or not they are indeed

trespassing on my water. The law ought to be more explicit and make such actions unnecessary, thus averting the necessity to waste public money and the time of the courts in determining such an inconclusive point that might be argued both ways by the kinds of people that too many lawyers are. I am not the only member of the general public who is affected in this way. A large number of other people have properties adjacent to public wet lands. The public wet land to which I am referring is the lakes around Lakes Alexandrina and Albert and the Coorong. Of course, the private property begins at the shoreline. The precise location of this surveyed line can be established; indeed it is established.

However, recreational boaters on the river and around the lakes believe that, if they wish to pull up on the shore, they are entitled to do so. Indeed they are. However, they are not entitled to trespass beyond that point. However, they do not care much about that. They seem to think that it is public land if one can get to it from the river, and they set up their picnics and what-have-you wherever they please. The way in which they behave in some instances leaves a lot to be desired, as does the way in which they treat landholder's property and the landholders on whose land they are trespassing.

Altogether, the Government ought to accept the amendments put before it in the other place so that not only those people who have their land fenced but also people like myself who cannot fence their land will be protected by the law and have the peaceful enjoyment of their property according to their inclinations. It relates not only to the circumstances to which I have referred but also to horticultural cropping lands where the fences have been removed, be they orchards, vineyards or market gardens. It is not sensible to leave the fences in place. It ought to apply equally in circumstances where the fences have had to be removed for reasons of soil conservation such as stabilising drift sand in the Mallee in circumstances that I illustrated earlier in my remarks.

The law should also make it an offence if the trespasser refuses to leave the property, does not do so immediately or does not stay off for 24 hours or some other reasonable period once requested to do so. It is not good enough for me every Sunday to have to go out to my swamp and ask people to leave. It is not fair to vineyard owners to have to do the same thing and to have to ask again and again. Where does it end? What kind of law is it that places that burden on the property owner? It is just not fair!

Finally, I believe that it ought to be an offence to remain on a property unless permission is given to so remain. This measure is grossly inadequate in that respect, and the Government deserves the condemnation that it will receive if it does not accede to the requests from reasonable property owners. I say to the Government that, if someone gets shot as a consequence of this and as a result of the failure of the Government to provide the necessary remedies to prevent this kind of behaviour, it will be on the Government's head and not on mine. It is getting to the point where violence is likely.

The Hon. G.J. CRAFTER (Minister of Community Welfare): I thank the Opposition for its clear indication of support for this measure, which relates to penalties with respect to trespassing on land. I seek leave to continue my remarks later.

Leave granted; debate adjourned.

ART GALLERY ACT AMENDMENT BILL

Returned from the Legislative Council without amendment.

**SOUTH AUSTRALIAN MUSEUM ACT
AMENDMENT BILL**

Returned from the Legislative Council without amendment.

**ADELAIDE FESTIVAL CENTRE TRUST ACT
AMENDMENT BILL**

Returned from the Legislative Council without amendment.

ADJOURNMENT

The Hon. G.J. CRAFTER (Minister of Community Welfare): I move:

That the House do now adjourn.

The Hon. D.C. BROWN (Davenport): Whenever I possibly can, I watch rather fondly a television programme called *Minder*. We all know that the two characters involved are dear Arthur Daley and his close associate and friend, Terry McCann. I would like to relate to the House something that one would almost believe is one episode of that series. The only trouble is that it is a real drama which is causing a great deal of distress to the people concerned.

Whilst I enjoy watching *Minder*, I certainly have no joy whatsoever this evening in bringing to the attention of this House the series of events that involves very similar names. A person has come to me saying that she was trying to sell her car through a private sale. She advertised the vehicle in a newspaper, and the next day a woman rang this person and asked whether or not they had successfully sold the car. They said 'No'.

She said that she was speaking on behalf of Arthur Daley Motors, Blair Athol, and offered to sell the car on consignment on behalf of the woman who was trying to sell the car and who went to Arthur Daley Motors, at 442-446 Main North Road, Blair Athol. Printed on some of its forms were the words, 'The firm you can trust: telephone number 262 6254'. The woman concerned filled out an appropriate form on 28 November 1984. This was a consignment car form which allowed Arthur Daley Motors to try to sell that motor vehicle, a 1977 Mazda 323, on consignment on behalf of this person.

It would appear that the person who was involved in running Arthur Daley Motors—and his exact involvement is hard to establish—was one Bruce Kingsley McAllister. The car was then transferred, it would appear, after a brief telephone call to the then owner, across to a Terry McCann Motors of 189 Main North Road, Nailsworth. It is interesting that this is just down the road from Arthur Daley Motors.

It is almost as though this is part of the TV series, but the trouble is that it is a real life drama which has left many people owed a lot of money. It is rather unfortunate. It turns out that Terry McCann Motors, which is probably no more than a trade name, is owned by a company called Bannco Pty Ltd. Further, it appears that this Bruce Kingsley McAllister, who seems to have a reputation almost fitting with the original TV series, is one of the directors of Bannco Pty Ltd.

Those people pushed and pushed to find out what was happening with their car. They were eventually told that the car had been sold. They then asked for payment and eventually payment was made to them in the form of a cheque made out on 18 February 1985. That cheque was signed by McAllister, the person to whom I referred, and it

was made out under the name of Bannco Pty Ltd, trading as Terry McCann Motors, and was to the value of the car, namely \$3 900. The cheque was immediately presented to the bank that same day and it bounced. These people have been to Consumer Affairs and the police. They found out a number of things: that at least eight other people had also sold their cars initially to Arthur Daley Motors, after which the cars were transferred to Terry McCann Motors. All nine parties involved have failed to receive any money for their vehicles and have, of course, lost them. The whole thing seems to be extremely complex. It would appear that McAllister is a person of questionable character. Apparently, he has a criminal record as he is on a bond at present for fraudulent conversion. I understand that he has gone to ground, is on the run and is probably in New South Wales, owing what appears to be a substantial amount of money for nine vehicles that he sold.

The whole practice seems to have been carried on in a very shrewd manner with some shrewd shuffling of papers and the transfer of vehicles between one car yard and another without knowing exactly who were the owners of the vehicles at any one time. I cannot give the full details for all nine cases. I have spoken to some of the people affected, and it would appear that no-one can give that sort of detail, because there is a great deal of confusion as to who were the owners of the vehicles at different stages; this is a result of the very tricky manner in which this McAllister operated and juggled the cars between the two companies involved—Arthur Daley Motors and Terry McCann Motors.

Incidentally, Arthur Daley Motors appeared to have a secondhand motor vehicles dealers licence, because when the woman first took her car out there she asked to see it. However, I understand that Terry McCann Motors, the secondhand dealer to which the car was transferred, did not have a licence. That is because Consumer Affairs was considering whether or not to renew the licence for Terry McCann Motors.

My concern is this: at least some of the people have been to the police and Consumer Affairs. The police told them that at this stage it appears that no action can be taken. I find that incredible, but the police apparently have told those people that no action can be taken. Equally, Consumer Affairs has told those people that apparently no action can be taken. Yet, it would appear that in one case \$10 000 is owing to a person and in the case I have before me, where the cheque bounced, I see that the figure is \$3 900.

So, literally tens of thousands of dollars are owed to people. However, both the police and Consumer Affairs are claiming that no action can be taken against this individual, who apparently is a criminal, who has gone to ground and who was openly trading in secondhand cars on consignment. Apparently, no action has been taken, particularly by Consumer Affairs, even though it must have been known that the man had a criminal record.

My understanding is that people with criminal records are not allowed to trade in secondhand motor vehicles or to hold the appropriate licence. That matter needs to be investigated. My challenge is to the Attorney-General and the Minister of Consumer Affairs to fully investigate all the instances involving these companies or business names—Arthur Daley Motors, and Terry McCann Motors, and Bruce Kingsley McAllister—and to ascertain whether or not what he was doing was legal, and, if it needs an amendment to the law, to come forward fairly quickly with recommendations so that the loophole in the law is covered as quickly as possible.

My advice to the public in the meantime is to be very careful when selling vehicles on consignment through a secondhand dealer, and ensure that that dealer is a reputable company. I would even suggest that the people who are

about to sell their vehicle in that manner should telephone the Consumer Affairs division to check on the company. There is a major obligation on the Minister of Consumer Affairs (and also in his role as Attorney-General) to clear up the law in this regard, and do it quickly. Although the Minister has known about the situation, there is no evidence yet that he has taken any action to correct it, and I ask him to do so.

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

Mr TRAINER (Ascot Park): This grievance debate on the motion to adjourn is one of the best parts of our Parliamentary procedure, and it is unfortunate that the Standing Orders under which we operate, and the way in which Parliament has operated in recent years, have not allowed us the opportunity to have as many such debates as should have been the case. For example, the speech just delivered by the member for Davenport is a good example of how a grievance debate can be used to raise issues of concern to individual members.

I also would like to take this opportunity to raise some matters of concern to me, and they deal mainly with the operations of this House. I understand that in touching on this subject last week I may have touched on one or two raw nerves opposite. Possibly I may do so again tonight. I would like to open my 10 minutes now with some remarks about Standing Orders in general. In order to do so, I would like to borrow some words used by the member for Davenport on 13 March, when he stated:

Some months ago now (in fact, early last year, I think it was) a Select Committee of both Houses of Parliament was established to look specifically at the Parliamentary procedures.

The honourable member opposite is much in error in regard to the timing: it was not just early last year but on 1 June 1983—nearly two years ago—when the Joint Select Committee into Parliamentary Practices and Procedures was established. The member for Davenport went on to state:

The whole purpose of that Select Committee ... was to look at how we can smarten up our procedures to have reasonable hours for Parliament, to ensure that we do not sit here and have extremely late nights, night after night ...

He continued:

I find it incredible that that Select Committee has not met now for approximately six months and, as a result of that, this Parliament is still staggering on under the same old procedures.

He then went on to describe the situation as being ludicrous and a farce. Last month the member for Semaphore in some more detail discussed the inadequate Standing Orders under which we operate and the time-wasting procedures with which we are stuck, and he went over some of the steps that have been attempted in the last couple of years to try to overcome that problem.

The first was the establishment of the Joint Select Committee on 1 June 1983 that was referred to by the member for Davenport. Unfortunately, its terms of reference were somewhat ambitious, and it was over-extended. After a period of frustration in tackling the procedures of both Houses of Parliament, the Joint Committee decided that its best chance of some sort of success or progress was to concentrate on the Standing Orders of this House to see what alterations could be made.

A bipartisan subcommittee was formed. The word 'bipartisan' was used in a somewhat loose manner this afternoon, but I am using it in a much more accurate sense, I hope. On 26 April last year—nearly a year ago—that subcommittee held its first meeting to look at time-wasting procedures and the late night sittings occurring under our Standing Orders. After it had gone over the subject for a while, some bipartisan suggestions were circulated to all members of

Parliament and I think from memory they were circulated on 1 May last year. Copies went to all members, and it was anticipated that Independent members and both major Parties would go over these proposals, work out what possibly might be acceptable to them and respond to the subcommittee. Nothing much happened after that working paper was circulated.

The Hon. B.C. EASTICK: I rise on a point of order, Mr Speaker. I seek your ruling on whether a member of a Select Committee reporting on the activities of that Select Committee can do so before the Select Committee has made its final report to the House.

The SPEAKER: I would adopt the ruling given by the member for Light when he was Speaker. Any reference to the deliberations of the Select Committee is out of order. In other words, the frame can be discussed but certainly not the internal deliberations.

Mr TRAINER: The frame within which the Committee operated attempted to achieve some sort of bipartisan consensus. Unfortunately, to achieve that consensus one needs the agreement of more than one Party. We are in a position now where Parliament, in effect, is waiting for some sign of agreement, or whatever is necessary from Opposition members. We are in a position where I suppose we are a bit like the famous play *Waiting for Godot*, where everyone spends their time waiting for Godot who never shows up.

Mr Mathwin: In all these previous attempts back-benchers always missed out and were disadvantaged.

Mr TRAINER: The back-bencher opposite certainly does not miss out, because he gets in more interjections than anyone else.

Mr Mathwin interjecting:

Mr TRAINER: That is probably the best speech the member for Glenelg has made in his career, and it is by interjection. Certainly, the public is waiting for us to do something about our Standing Orders, and that sort of progress relies entirely on our getting some sort of positive response from members opposite. It is not really practical in the way—

Members interjecting:

Mr TRAINER: It is certainly preferable to achieve bipartisan solutions to the Standing Orders' inadequacies that we face. Without some sort of consensus it is difficult. It is not the only way, however, in which Standing Orders can be reformed. Members of the public are not only waiting for improvements to Standing Orders because, more urgently, they are waiting for some sort of improvement in the behaviour of members, particularly members opposite.

I do not try to put myself above reproach, and I am sure that more than once I have interjected or been in breach of our proper procedures, but members on this side have never descended to the level of the undisciplined rabble who face us opposite. Recently we have seen how they tried to sabotage the House with their frequent quorum calls by absenting themselves from the House deliberately to reduce their numbers to two or three, so that the nine or 10 Government members here at the time, when there were only two or three Opposition members in the Chamber, could not possibly provide a quorum.

I do not deny the right of any member in this place to call for a quorum: that is the right of every member, but it is a privilege that should be used with discretion and not abused deliberately as was the case recently with members opposite. There are all sorts of good reasons why members are not always in the Chamber. I can think of some good reasons why the member for Glenelg should not be here, but that is not the point.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order!

Mr TRAINER: From time to time, members are obliged to make calls of nature, to take telephone calls, to meet constituents individually, or to meet delegations of constituents. There are committees in which they must participate, and they have research to do. As a result, we all understand why it is not possible to maintain a large number of members in the House at all times.

Mr Lewis interjecting:

Mr TRAINER: There is certainly something wrong when there are frequent quorum calls. A strange voice from the ghost gum in the corner is distracting me at the moment, but it is peculiar that we should have had so many quorum calls as we had last week, as I have indicated, deliberately sabotaging the workings of the House. I do not know what they thought they would achieve. Perhaps they thought with enough ringing of the bells we would all think we were punch-drunk boxers, or the like, but it did not have that effect, because Government members were too disciplined. We operate with teamwork, camaraderie and *esprit de corps* on this side of the House in a way which is totally alien to Opposition members, who cannot understand what it is like to be part of a team.

Mr Mathwin interjecting:

Mr TRAINER: The member for Glenelg, who is interjecting now, knows how well he got on with his colleagues and how they have tried to shaft him in his electorate on more than one occasion. I point out that we helped the honourable member. We thought him such an asset to us in the House that we could not have John Mathwin miss out on preselection.

The SPEAKER: Order! The honourable member must withdraw the words 'John Mathwin' and say 'the member for Glenelg'.

Mr TRAINER: I withdraw, gladly. Members opposite have not only breached or misused the procedures of the House with their quorum calls but they have obviously set out to try to intimidate the member for Albert Park for drawing attention to their inadequacies. Rather than being ashamed and thinking that they had to lift their game a little and put in their attendance in the Chamber, contribute more positively and stop interjecting and carrying on like larrikins, they sought to intimidate the member for Albert Park.

One very bad example of that was the way in which the honourable member was attacked today by the Deputy Leader of the Opposition. Of all the members opposite who have been very bad in their conduct in the House, he would be the worst example of them all. The sort of terminologies that he continually uses are indicative of a very poor vocabulary; he refers to people as being sewer rats, smart arses, and uses similar words which I consider should be withdrawn and which, fortunately on most occasions, have been withdrawn. That behaviour indicates an inadequacy on his part.

Mr LEWIS: On a point of order, Sir, I ask you to rule on whether or not you consider the terms just used by the member for Ascot Park are Parliamentary or otherwise.

The SPEAKER: I rule that they are unparliamentary, as I did this afternoon, and I ask the member for Ascot Park to withdraw, even though he was drawing attention to something that happened earlier.

Mr TRAINER: I always try to oblige the Speaker's rulings, and I do so, Sir, even though I was merely quoting terms that had been used by another honourable member.

Mr S.G. EVANS (Fisher): I did not intend to refer to matters raised by my counterpart, the Government Whip, although I consider that I must refer to them briefly. The honourable member was unwise in suggesting that the action of the member for Albert Park was something that we should condone, that it has happened in the past, or that

there was any serious breach at all on the part of the Opposition. There is no doubt that it was a smart alec move by the member for Albert Park, but I thought that the member for Ascot Park, the Government Whip, had more understanding of the circumstances that prevailed at the time, and more intelligence than to try to debate what should happen under Standing Orders.

I have been in this place for a long while, and I can remember incidents that have occurred in relation to both sides of the House of which none of us were proud at the time. If the honourable member wants us to furnish a list, that could be done, although that would do nothing to benefit Parliament. In relation to the incident referred to, we know that on that evening the House was engaged in a grievance debate, and the only vote that can be taken is if at the end of the debate a member calls 'Divide'. If the resultant division was lost by the Government, Parliament would continue to sit. That would have been the result had anyone wanted to stay here.

There is nothing in Standing Orders which stipulates that a member must stay here and listen to another member's contribution. In relation to responsibility of members, all 47 members of the House are involved. It is not a Party thing; members are elected under the Constitution as individuals, not as members of a Party. The Constitution does not even recognise Parties. All members must exercise the responsibility individually. I point out to the member for Albert Park that, on the occasion referred to, a significant number of members of his own Party were not interested in what he was talking about because they were not present at the time.

Subsequently the honourable member did not mention in any comment that he made on radio or anywhere else that in each room there is a speaker which broadcasts the debate. I heard the honourable member's comment at the time and I immediately thought to myself that he had set a precedent.

Mr Groom interjecting:

Mr S.G. EVANS: I did not have to come down to listen. The member for Hartley, who talks about Standing Orders, interjects while out of his seat. He knows the rules, but interjects when out of his seat. He breaks the rules more readily than other members; he gave an example of that here tonight. The member for Albert Park knows, as we all do, that we do not have to be in the Chamber to hear a debate. There are speakers in the rooms, and on the occasion in question there was no chance of a vote being taken. In relation to the calling of quorums, what the honourable member did at the time was childish and he was just trying to be a smart alec.

I have argued for a long time that, in relation to procedures applying to Question Time, Standing Orders permit one of the biggest abuses of the system that I know of. In the British Parliament, for example, something like 15 questions can be dealt with in about 22 minutes. However, here we are lucky to get two questions asked and answered in that time. This is where the abuse of Parliament is occurring, and it is why members cannot convey to Parliament the views expressed by their constituents.

I am not playing politics, but in the early 1970s the Government of the day changed the rules, and used its numbers to bring back to one hour the time allowed for Question Time. Even before that time there was abuse of the system by members asking questions: there was no time restriction and a member had the opportunity to explain a question first and then ask it. Therefore, members gave a long explanation that had no direct relationship to the question.

Quite rightly, Parliament changed the rule so that members had to ask the question first and then explain it, which cut out the opportunity for the questioner to go into a lengthy

explanation on matters outside the terms of the question. The situation now is that Ministers (and this applies to Governments of either persuasion) give a long answer which very often has no relationship to the question and which is nothing more than political debate or comment to gain a point.

I did not intend to talk about these matters. I think that after he has been here a little longer the member for Ascot Park will realise that getting into this area and encouraging the sort of activity in which the member for Albert Park indulged is unwise in the long term. It might gain something outside in the short term, but in the long term that sort of activity will be seen for what it is worth.

I turn now to a matter to which I referred briefly in a personal explanation. Some members interjected and said that I should not speak in that vein. I refer to Liberal Party policy that everyone should be compelled to undergo a first aid test and pass that before being able to obtain a driver's licence. I support that concept, but if a person uses that first aid experience at an accident scene on an individual whom they do not know, and subsequently the injured person institutes a common law claim of, say, many thousands of dollars against them, the Government of the day should pay the legal costs of the person who rendered the first aid at the scene of the accident due to the obligation placed on the individual by the Government to do so.

I am referring not simply to compensation but to the legal costs involved in that person's being represented in court. It is all very well for lawyers to maintain that a person acted in good faith in providing first aid, that they

were not negligent in any way and that they will win a court case, but who wants to end up in court? All we are doing is lining the pockets of lawyers and sustaining a huge expense that most people cannot afford. I would not go to help a person involved in an accident unless I knew that person or the person was a member of my family. I know of a case where a person is being sued, and is fearful of losing the family home. This arose from that person trying to do the right thing.

The Hon. Michael Wilson: Do you think that there is a case for good Samaritan legislation?

Mr S.G. EVANS: That might be all right. In supporting my Party's policy on this issue, I think we should also include a provision that the Government has the responsibility to pick up the legal costs of anyone who is subsequently charged following their trying to provide first aid to a fellow man.

I wanted to refer to other matters about road safety, but time is a killer tonight. We all know that, by passing that law to provide for more drinking hours on Sundays or at other times, we have increased the likelihood of people being killed in motor accidents. We all recognised that, but we did not have the courage to front up to it. We shall wait and see what the end result is, but I did not support that move, and I still object to it.

Motion carried.

At 5.59 p.m. the House adjourned until Wednesday 3 April at 2 p.m.

HOUSE OF ASSEMBLY

Tuesday 2 April 1985

QUESTIONS ON NOTICE

WORKERS COMPENSATION

211. **Mr BECKER** (on notice) asked the Deputy Premier:

1. How many workers compensation claims have been made by persons employed under the wage pause and community employment programmes?
2. What is the estimated total cost of such claims?
3. How many claims have been settled and what is the total amount paid?

The Hon. J.D. WRIGHT: The replies are as follows:

1. Wage pause programme	312	
Community employment programme	425	
2. Wage pause programme	\$1 619 483	
Community employment programme	\$1 898 730	
	No.	Total
	Settled	Amount
3. Wage pause programme	258	\$277 504
Community employment programme	136	\$215 112

GOVERNMENT ADVERTISING

327. **Mr BECKER** (on notice) asked the Premier:

1. Who are the advertising agents and what is the advertising budget for each department and statutory authority within each portfolio under the Minister's control?
2. Are those advertising agents South Australian owned and controlled and, if not, why was preference not given to a local company?

The Hon. J.C. BANNON: The replies are as follows:

Public Service Board

1. Neville Jeffress Advertising Pty Ltd; \$85 000.

2. No; Neville Jeffress Advertising Pty Ltd was selected as the most suitable to carry out the Board's advertising programmes.

Ombudsman

1. No advertising agency employed; \$500.
2. Not applicable.

Department of State Development

1. Ogilvy and Mather; \$180 000.

2. No; Ogilvy and Mather was selected as the most suitable to carry out the Department's advertising programmes.

Jubilee 150 Board

1. Michells Warren; \$3 100.
2. Yes.

Lotteries Commission of South Australia

1. Barr, Wollard Cawrse Advertising Pty Ltd; \$1 050 000.
2. Yes.

State Bank of South Australia

1. Clemenger Adelaide Pty Ltd; for reasons of commercial confidentiality details of the advertising budget will not be publicised.

2. No; Clemenger Adelaide Pty Ltd was selected as the most suitable to carry out the Bank's advertising programmes.

SGIC

1. Clemenger Adelaide Pty Ltd; for reasons of commercial confidentiality, details of the advertising budget will not be publicised.

2. No; Clemenger Adelaide Pty Ltd was selected as the most suitable to carry out the Commission's advertising programmes.

SAFA

1. George Patterson Pty Ltd; for reasons of commercial confidentiality, details of the advertising budget will not be publicised.

2. No; George Patterson Pty Ltd was selected as the most suitable to carry out the Authority's advertising programme.

Most major advertising agencies operating in Adelaide are nationally or internationally owned. However, the following information on advertising agencies used by the South Australian Government demonstrates the commitment which this Government has to South Australian based agencies.

Neville Jeffress Advertising has an office in Adelaide, employing local people.

Four of the five Directors of Clemenger Adelaide Pty Ltd live and work in South Australia. Clemenger Adelaide, although wholly owned by Clemenger Australia Pty Ltd, functions as an autonomous operation.

Although Doyle Dane Bernbach Pty Ltd is U.S. owned, it is entirely South Australian staffed.

D'Arcy-MacManus and Masius was formerly the South Australian owned "MacNamara". Its Adelaide office is staffed by 24 permanent residents of South Australia.

McCann-Erickson Advertising Pty Ltd was formerly a South Australian owned agency.

328. **Mr BECKER** (on notice) asked the Deputy Premier:

1. Who are the advertising agents and what is the advertising budget for each department and statutory authority within each portfolio under the Minister's control?

2. Are those advertising agents South Australian owned and controlled and, if not, why was preference not given to a local company?

The Hon. J.D. WRIGHT: The replies are as follows:

Country Fire Services

1. Rex Leverington and Eric White Associates; \$15 000.

2. Yes.

Department of Labour

1. None; \$24 500.

2. Not applicable.

Metropolitan Fire Service

1. None; \$1 250.

2. Not applicable.

329. **Mr BECKER** (on notice) asked the Minister of Community Welfare representing the Attorney-General:

1. Who are the advertising agents and what is the advertising budget for each department and statutory authority within each portfolio under the Minister's control?

2. Are those advertising agents South Australian owned and controlled and, if not, why was preference not given to a local company?

The Hon. G.J. CRAFTER: The replies are as follows:

Department of Public and Consumer Affairs

1. Doyle Dane Bernbach Pty Ltd; \$88 232.

2. No; Doyle Dane Bernbach Pty Ltd was selected as the most suitable to carry out the Department's advertising programmes.

State Electoral Department

1. Pym-Bruer Advertising; \$10 000.

2. Yes.

330. **Mr BECKER** (on notice) asked the Minister for Environment and Planning:

1. Who are the advertising agents and what is the advertising budget for each department and statutory authority within each portfolio under the Minister's control?

2. Are those advertising agents South Australia owned and controlled and, if not, why was preference not given to a local company?

The Hon. D.J. HOPGOOD: The replies are as follows:

Department of Lands

1. None; \$1 000.

2. Not applicable.

Department of Services and Supply

1. None; \$61 100.

2. Not applicable.

Department of Environment and Planning

1. Barr, Wollard Cawrse Advertising Group; \$162 000.

2. Yes.

Botanic Gardens

1. None; \$3 000.

2. Not applicable.

S.A. Urban Land Trust

1. None; \$15 000.

2. Not applicable.

331. **Mr BECKER** (on notice) asked the Minister of Transport:

1. Who are the advertising agents and what is the advertising budget for each department and statutory authority within each portfolio under the Minister's control?

2. Are those advertising agents South Australian owned and controlled and, if not, why was preference not given to a local company?

The Hon. R.K. ABBOTT: The replies are as follows:

Department of Transport (Road Safety Council)

1. Clemenger Adelaide Pty Ltd; \$265 000.

2. No; Clemenger Adelaide Pty Ltd was selected as the most suitable to carry out the Department's advertising programmes.

Department of Marine and Harbours

1. McCann-Erickson Advertising Pty Ltd; \$59 000.

2. No; McCann-Erickson Advertising Pty Ltd was selected as the most suitable to carry out the Department's advertising programmes.

332. **Mr BECKER** (on notice) asked the Minister of Tourism representing the Minister of Health:

1. Who are the advertising agents and what is the advertising budget for each department and statutory authority within each portfolio under the Minister's control?

2. Are those advertising agents South Australian owned and controlled and, if not, why was preference not given to a local company?

The Hon. G.F. KENEALLY: The replies are as follows:

South Australian Health Commission

1. Neville Jeffress Advertising Pty Ltd, Doyle Dane Bernbach; \$542 351.

2. No; Neville Jeffress Advertising Pty Ltd and Doyle Dane Bernbach were selected as the most suitable to carry out the Commission's advertising programmes.

333. **Mr BECKER** (on notice) asked the Minister of Education:

1. Who are the advertising agents and what is the advertising budget for each department and statutory authority within each portfolio under the Minister's control?

2. Are those advertising agents South Australian owned and controlled and, if not, why was preference not given to a local company?

The Hon. LYNN ARNOLD: The replies are as follows:

Education Department

1. None; \$14 600

2. Not applicable.

Department of Technical and Further Education

1. None; \$134 242

2. Not applicable.

SSABSA

1. Jim Robinson & Co.; \$10 000

2. Yes.

334. **Mr BECKER** (on notice) asked the Minister of Tourism:

1. Who are the advertising agents and what is the advertising budget for each department and statutory authority within each portfolio under the Minister's control?

2. Are those advertising agents South Australian owned and controlled and, if not, why was preference not given to a local company?

The Hon. G.F. KENEALLY: The replies are as follows:

Department of Local Government

1. D'Arcy-MacManus and Masius; \$55 000

2. No; D'Arcy-MacManus and Masius was selected as the most suitable to carry out the Department's advertising programmes.

Department of Tourism

1. Clemenger Adelaide Pty Ltd; \$2.44 million.

2. No; Clemenger Adelaide Pty Ltd was selected as the most suitable to carry out the Department's advertising programmes.

South Australian Waste Management Commission

1. None; \$14 000

2. Not applicable.

West Beach Trust

1. None; \$84 000

2. Not applicable.

335. **Mr BECKER** (on notice) asked the Minister of Mines and Energy:

1. Who are the advertising agents and what is the advertising budget for each department and statutory authority within each portfolio under the Minister's control?

2. Are those advertising agents South Australian owned and controlled and, if not, why was preference not given to a local company?

The Hon. R.G. PAYNE: The replies are as follows:

Australian Mineral Development Laboratories

1. Burson-Marsteller; \$89 000

2. No; Burson-Marsteller was selected as the most suitable to carry out AMDEL's advertising programmes.

Electricity Trust of South Australia

1. D'Arcy-MacManus and Masius; \$550 000

2. No; D'Arcy-MacManus and Masius was selected as the most suitable to carry out the Trust's advertising programmes.

Department of Mines and Energy

1. McCann-Erickson Advertising Pty Ltd; \$25 000

2. No; McCann-Erickson Advertising Pty Ltd was selected as the most suitable to carry out the Department's advertising programme.

336. **Mr BECKER** (on notice) asked the Minister of Community Welfare:

1. Who are the advertising agents and what is the advertising budget for each department and statutory authority within each portfolio under the Minister's control?

2. Are those advertising agents South Australian owned and controlled and, if not, why was preference not given to a local company?

The Hon. G.J. CRAFTER: The replies are as follows:

Department of Community Welfare

1. None; \$6 500.

2. Not applicable.

337. **Mr BECKER** (on notice) asked the Minister of Water Resources:

1. Who are the advertising agents and what is the advertising budget for each department and statutory authority within each portfolio under the Minister's control?

2. Are those advertising agents South Australian owned and controlled and, if not, why was preference not given to a local company?

The Hon. J.W. SLATER: The replies are as follows:

Engineering and Water Supply Department

1. Clemenger Adelaide Pty Ltd; \$77 000.

2. No; Clemenger Adelaide Pty Ltd was selected as the most suitable to carry out the Department's advertising programmes.

Department of Recreation and Sport

1. None; \$2 000.

2. Not applicable.

South Australian Totalizator Agency Board

1. Hocking Advertising Pty Ltd; \$225 000

2. Yes.

Betting Control Board

1. None; \$400.

2. Not applicable.

338. **Mr BECKER** (on notice) asked the Minister of Housing and Construction:

1. Who are the advertising agents and what is the advertising budget for each department and statutory authority within each portfolio under the Minister's control?

2. Are those advertising agents South Australian owned and controlled and, if not, why was preference not given to a local company?

The Hon. T.H. HEMMINGS: The replies are as follows:

South Australian Housing Trust

1. D'Arcy-MacManus and Masius; \$90 390.

2. No; D'Arcy-MacManus and Masius was selected as the most suitable to carry out the Trust's advertising programmes.

339. **Mr BECKER** (on notice) asked the Minister of Education representing the Minister of Agriculture:

1. Who are the advertising agents and what is the advertising budget for each department and statutory authority within each portfolio under the Minister's control?

2. Are those advertising agents South Australian owned and controlled and, if not, why was preference not given to a local company?

The Hon. LYNN ARNOLD: The replies are as follows:

Department of Woods and Forests

1. None; \$8 000.
2. Not applicable.

LIVER TRANSPLANT UNIT

380. **Mr BECKER** (on notice) asked the Minister of Tourism representing the Minister of Health:

1. When and at which hospital will a liver transplant unit be established?

2. What is the estimated cost of establishing such a unit and how will it be financed?

3. What is the estimated annual recurrent cost of operating such a unit?

The Hon. G.F. KENEALLY: The Commonwealth Department of Health recently established a clinical committee to examine the facilities for liver transplantation in Australia. The terms of reference of the committee were to inquire into and report on the existing facilities which could be developed into a national liver transplant unit and make recommendations as to the most appropriate site and necessary facilities for such a unit.

The committee released its report in December 1984 and recommended that a pilot programme be established at the Royal Prince Alfred Hospital, Sydney, in conjunction with the Royal Alexandra Hospital for Children. The committee considered that, depending on the success of the pilot programme, centres could be established in other States according to need.

The State Government supports the Commonwealth's approach and the committee's recommendation and does not intend to set up a liver transplant unit in South Australia at this time. For the honourable member's information the costings associated with the proposal submitted by the Royal Adelaide Hospital as quoted in the committee's report were:

About \$0.8 million in the first year including 'starting up' costs of \$63 600; variable costs of \$0.7 million and 'ongoing' fixed costs of \$273 200. The cost when the unit is fully operational would be \$1.5 million, \$1.2 million variable costs and \$273 200 fixed costs.

The Royal Adelaide submission does not include costs associated with patient assessment, donor location and organ removal, or travel for patients and relatives.

GOVERNMENT DEPARTMENT THEFTS

386. **Mr BECKER** (on notice) asked the Minister of Education:

1. Is the Minister aware that \$17 394 worth of equipment was stolen from the Technical and Further Education Department colleges (page 500 Auditor-General's Report for the year ended 30 June 1983) and what action has been taken to ensure proper care and control of equipment to prevent repetition?

2. What items were stolen from all sections of the Department for the year ended 30 June 1984, what was the value of each item and which were recovered?

The Hon. LYNN ARNOLD: The replies are as follows:

1. The Department of Technical and Further Education maintains records of all reported and known thefts of equipment and departmental property. It is departmental policy to report all such thefts to the Police Department and to advise the Auditor-General's Department accordingly. The Department offers over 2 200 subjects to students and operates from 27 major campuses and over 500 annexes throughout the State. Many classes are conducted outside normal working hours making security over property and equipment difficult.

The Department is concerned at the increasing number of thefts which would relate to a number of factors, including the portable and attractive nature of teaching equipment utilised, for example, videos, television and cameras. In the latter part of 1982 the Department developed a computerised asset control system as a means of maintaining tighter security over the Department's equipment. A major feature of the system is the allocation of equipment to responsible custodians which has developed a greater awareness by staff of the need to be accountable for equipment under their control. The Department also conducts stock-takes of equipment throughout colleges and branches on a regular basis, utilising the TAFE asset control system as a major management information base and audit mechanism.

The Department utilises the services of a number of security companies to patrol colleges and campuses and has in recent times increased the number of patrols to improve security. Security keys are changed regularly to reduce the incidence of theft and misappropriation internally within the Department.

In July 1984 the Department closed the Kilkenny branch of the Croydon Park College of TAFE following three break-ins into prefabricated buildings and relocated equipment and programmes being conducted to another campus to maintain tighter security over equipment to prevent repetition. In 1985 the Education Department will be developing further security measures and policy as a means of improving security throughout the Department.

2. Table attached.

PROPERTY AND CASH STOLEN/LOST BETWEEN 1 JULY 1983 AND 30 JUNE 1984

Report No.	College	Date of Loss	Resulting From	Item(s)	Value \$	Recovered
104	Tea Tree Gully	28-29.7.83	Break-in and entry	Electric typewriter	770	No
105	Port Augusta	22-27.7.83	Theft (possibly stolen during college business hours)	2 × Grinding wheels 2 × Slab diamond saws Pipework	40 60 5	No
106	Croydon Park	Not known	Missing (stocktake)	3 × Audio cassette recorders	96	No
107	Open	14.7.83	Theft—stolen from college vehicle	Camera Flash Lens Carry bag	225 95 95 30	No
108	Croydon Park	27.7-4.8.83	Theft (possibly stolen during business hours)	3 × Spray guns	350	No

PROPERTY AND CASH STOLEN/LOST BETWEEN 1 JULY 1983 AND 30 JUNE 1984

Report No.	College	Date of Loss	Resulting From	Item(s)	Value \$	Recovered
109	Education Resources Branch	2-3.9.83	Break-in and entry (Royal show grounds)	2 × Video cassette recorders	1 350	No
110	Naracoorte	23.8.83	Theft (possibly stolen while office unattended during business hours)	Cash	119	No
111	Open	Not known	Missing (stocktake)	2 × Jigsaws 2 × Sanders 4 × Soldering irons Electric iron Fan heater Electric knife Electric drill Tool kit Headphones Microphone	306 139 94 21 35 25 46 90 30 12	No
114	Croydon Park	Not known	Theft	Multimeter Calculator	180 190	No
115	Noarlunga	Not known	Theft	Fire extinguisher	63	No
116	EPUY—Campbelltown	7-8.11.83	Break-in and entry	2 × Computers 2 × Computer cassettes 2 × Expansion cartridge units Computer printer Colour television	468 134 138 336 387	No
118	EPUY—Port Adelaide	16-17.9.83	Theft (possibly gained entry into premises through unlocked window)	Computer Computer cassette Video cassette recorder Colour television Calculator Radio cassette recorder Expansion cartridge unit	234 67 900 552 22 70 69	No
119	EPUY—Enfield	7-8.10.83	Break-in and entry	Computer Computer cassette Expansion cartridge unit	234 67 69	No
122	Adelaide	27-30.12.83	Break-in and entry	Portapak unit Video cassette recorder Cassette recorder 10 × VHS video cassettes B/W video camera outfit	1 597 550 80 86 600	No
123	Gawler and Barossa	Not known	Theft	Cassette copier/player Shadehouse	1 916 450	No
126	Northern	5-6.3.84	Theft (possibly gained entry into college through unlocked rear door)	Cash Portable video cassette recorder 2 × Colour televisions Colour video camera 35 mm camera 18 × VHS video cassettes	13.10 1 300 588 1 100 216 188	No
127	Croydon Park	Not known	Missing (stocktake)	Fire extinguisher 10 × Chuck keys 13 × Chucks 20 × Tool post keys	94 290 608 206	No
128	Port Adelaide	23.3.84	Theft (thieves gained unforced entry into premises)	Electric typewriter 4 × Microwave ovens *(Value of microwave oven which wasn't recovered)	770 *415	Yes: 3 microwave ovens recovered.
129	Port Augusta	20-21.4.84	Break-in and entry	Video cassette recorder	560	No
131	Port Augusta	27-28.4.84	Break-in and entry	Radio cassette recorder Cassette recorder	150 60	No
132	Tea Tree Gully	15-16.5.84	Break-in and entry	2 × Stop watches Fire extinguisher	80 41	No

PROPERTY AND CASH STOLEN/LOST BETWEEN 1 JULY 1983 AND 30 JUNE 1984

Report No.	College	Date of Loss	Resulting From	Item(s)	Value \$	Recovered
133	Tea Tree Gully	1-2.6.84	Break-in and entry	Mini range Folding bed Mattress Bedding	140 36 23 40	No
134	Noarlunga	6-7.6.84	Theft	6 × Toilet mirrors	240	No
136	Murraylands	21-22.5.84	Break-in and entry	Cash Microcassette recorder	33 170	No
137	Croydon Park (Kilkenny Branch)	1-4.6.84	Break-in and entry	Colour television Video cassette recorder 2 × Sewing machines Radio cassette recorder Electric typewriter 2 × Portable typewriters 2 × Calculators Manual typewriter 2 × Sewing kits Guitar 8-10 pre-recorded video cassettes	800 800 1 000 150 1 000 700 88 260 160 ? 500	No

387. **Mr BECKER** (on notice) asked the Minister of Public Works:

1. Is the Minister aware that \$17 171 worth of equipment was stolen from his Department (page 500, Auditor-General's Report for the year ended 30 June 1983) and what action has been taken to ensure proper care and control of equipment to prevent repetition?

2. What items were stolen from all sections of the Department for the year ended 30 June 1984, what was the value of each item and which were recovered?

The Hon. T.H. HEMMINGS: The replies are as follows:

1. Yes. When a theft occurs, the departmental officer in charge examines procedures and practices in order to improve security precautions, where possible. In addition, the Manager, Supply and Transport, Public Buildings Department, may also investigate the circumstances in order to suggest additional security measures. For example, until the theft of the motor vehicle, all surplus vehicles were stored at the Richmond salvage branch whilst awaiting transfer to the State Supply Division for disposal. As a result of the review of procedures, all surplus vehicles are now stored at the Netley complex under 24 hour security supervision. For the honourable member's information, in August 1984 the Queensland Police Department recovered the motor vehicle reported as stolen in the Auditor-General's Report for the year ended 30 June 1983. The value obtained from the sale of the recovered vehicle was \$3 100.

2. The items reported to the Manager, Supply and Transport, Public Buildings Department, as being stolen from the Public Buildings in the year ended 30 June 1984 were valued at \$2 222 and are as under:

Item	Date stolen	Value \$
Safety Bollard	22.7.83	60.00
Battery	22.7.83	40.00
Drill	26.8.83	45.00
Clothing	6.9.83	46.00
Calculator	17.11.83	10.00
Trestle	6.12.83	99.00
Petrol	3.1.84	17.00
Saw	2.5.84	90.00
Wheelbarrow	4.5.84	89.00
Pop Riveter	18.5.84	40.00
Fire Extinguisher	14.5.84	60.00
Various Plant	13.7.83	318.00
Drill	20.10.83	100.00
2 Bicycles	9.2.84	300.00
Tarpaulin	17.3.84	300.00
2 Drills	18.3.84	320.00
Various Plant	28.5.84	288.00
Total		\$2 222.00

None of these items have been recovered. It should be noted that there has been a substantial reduction in theft from the Public Buildings Department over the last 12 months, which reflects favourably on the steps taken by departmental officers.

388. **Mr BECKER** (on notice) asked the Minister of Emergency Services:

1. Is the Minister aware that \$17 963 worth of equipment was stolen from the Police Department (page 500, Auditor-General's Report for the year ended 30 June 1983) and what action has been taken to ensure proper care and control of equipment to prevent repetition?

2. What items were stolen from all sections of the Department for the year ended 30 June 1984, what was the value of each item and which were recovered?

The Hon. J.D. WRIGHT: The replies are as follows:

1. The amount which appeared on page 500 of the Auditor-General's Report for the year ended 30 June 1983 includes damaged, lost and stolen equipment. The value of equipment stolen was \$374. The Police Department has systems to ensure safe custody of equipment. However, the nature of police operations is such that loss or damage to equipment cannot be prevented entirely.

2.

Item	Value \$
Camera	75
Radio Aerial	2
Rear Vision Mirror	20
Radios (2)	6 501
Stationery	22
Handcuffs	65
Helmet, Motorcycle Suit	222
Blue Dome Lights	440
Pistol	50

None of these items have been recovered.

389. **Mr BECKER** (on notice) asked the Minister of Transport:

1. Is the Minister aware that \$1 007 worth of equipment was stolen from his Department (page 500, Auditor-General's Report for the year ended 30 June 1983), and what action has been taken to ensure proper care and control of equipment to prevent repetition?

2. What items were stolen from all sections of the Department for the year ended 30 June 1984, what was the value of each item and which were recovered?

The Hon. R.K. ABBOTT: The replies are as follows:

1. Rims and tyres valued at \$685 were stolen from the Road Safety Centre, Oaklands Park. It is considered that maximum precautions have been taken to prevent theft by having a caretaker living on the site and the area is completely fenced and lit. Other sundry items to the value of \$322 were stolen. It is considered proper precautions have been taken to prevent theft in future.

2. In 1983-84, a two wheel trolley was stolen valued at \$109. To prevent this happening again the replacement trolley is locked when not in use and only used by known Departmental officers.

390. **Mr BECKER** (on notice) asked the Minister of Marine:

1. Is the Minister aware that \$2 543 worth of equipment was stolen from his Department (page 499, Auditor-General's Report for the year ended 30 June 1983), and what action has been taken to ensure proper care and control of equipment to prevent repetition?

2. What items were stolen from all sections of the Department for the year ended 30 June 1984, what was the value of each item and which were recovered?

The Hon. R.K. ABBOTT: The replies are as follows:

1. The Department of Marine and Harbors takes all reasonable precautions for the care and control of equipment including regular security patrols, but in such an organisation with numerous work sites (some in isolated areas), it is inevitable that some items will be stolen by thieves breaking and entering storage sheds, etc. Steps have been taken to improve the follow-up procedure of reports handed in of lost or stolen items of equipment.

	\$
2 radio hand phones	600
1 bicycle	150
1 chainsaw—motor driven	430
1 electric saw	116
2 fire branches	120
1 bicycle	110
1 fire extinguisher	100

All of the above items were reported stolen to the police and are still outstanding.

391. **Mr BECKER** (on notice) asked the Minister of Mines and Energy:

1. Is the Minister aware that \$498 worth of equipment was stolen from his Department (page 499, Auditor-General's Report for the year ended 30 June 1983), and what action has been taken to ensure proper care and control of equipment to prevent repetition?

2. What items were stolen from all sections of the Department for the year ended 30 June 1984, what was the value of each item and which were recovered?

The Hon. R.G. PAYNE: The replies are as follows:

1. Yes. The equipment concerned was a pocket calculator and camera. The calculator was inadvertently left on an aircraft on a flight to Sydney and despite reporting the loss to the airline company, it was not recovered. The camera was stolen from an officer's luggage while on an official trip in India. No further action was warranted in both cases.

2. Calculator—\$170—not recovered. Opal triplets (on loan to Agent-General)—\$300 not recovered. Tarpaulins (2), Crow-bar—\$248—not recovered.

Single Side Band Transceiver—\$1 400—not recovered.

Video Cassette Recorder—\$899—not recovered.

392. **Mr BECKER** (on notice) asked the Minister of Transport:

1. Is the Minister aware that \$24 615 worth of equipment was stolen from the Highways Department (page 499, Auditor-General's Report for the year ended 30 June 1983), and what action has been taken to ensure proper care and control of equipment to prevent repetition?

2. What items were stolen from all sections of the Department for the year ended 30 June 1984, what was the value of each item and which were recovered?

The Hon. R.K. ABBOTT: The replies are as follows:

1. Each theft of equipment is reported to the Police Department and a summary of thefts is supplied to the Auditor-General on a monthly basis. Senior officers investigate each incident and initiate appropriate remedial action.

2. Reported thefts from the Department for the year ended 30 June 1984 have been categorised as under:

	\$
Break-ins to departmental depots	3 830
Safety equipment stolen from roadworks ..	2 055
Traffic counters	680
Thefts from ferries	186
Sundry thefts	1 048

Very few items were recovered.

393. **Mr BECKER** (on notice) asked the Minister of Education representing the Minister of Fisheries:

1. Is the Minister aware that \$1 150 worth of equipment was stolen from his Department (page 499, Auditor-General's Report for the year ended 30 June 1983), and what action has been taken to ensure proper care and control of equipment to prevent repetition?

2. What items were stolen from all sections of the Department for the year ended 30 June 1984, what was the value of each item and which were recovered?

The Hon. LYNN ARNOLD: The replies are as follows:

1. (a) Yes.

(b) * More secure premises are being provided for storage of equipment in country stations.

* The Department's head office is being relocated to more secure premises in Pirie Street.

* Regular internal audits of departmental equipment are being carried out.

* Departmental staff are being instructed to ensure proper care and control are maintained on departmental equipment.

2. Items stolen during 1983-84:

A total of \$1 170 worth of sundry equipment was stolen during 1983-84, consisting of:

	\$	
Calculator HP33E	250	Stolen from Grenfell Centre.
Calculator 'Casio'	60	Stolen from Grenfell Centre.
Gate Valves	150	Stolen from Gawler Field Station.
Marine Radio	300	} Churchill Road break-in.
Fire Extinguishers	140	
Codan Aerial	70	
Motorola Pager	200	Stolen from vehicle.
	<u>\$1 170</u>	

None of these items has yet been recovered.

394. **Mr BECKER** (on notice) asked the Minister of Water Resources:

1. Is the Minister aware that \$24 496 worth of equipment was stolen from his Department (page 499, Auditor-General's Report for the year ended 30 June 1983), and what action has been taken to ensure proper care and control of equipment to prevent repetition?

2. What items were stolen from all sections of the Department for the year ended 30 June 1984, what was the value of each item and which were recovered?

The Hon. J.W. SLATER: The replies are as follows:

1. Yes. The Department takes all necessary precautions to ensure security is maintained to safeguard its property. These precautions include locking away equipment in mobile caravans, tool sheds, compounds, vehicles, and so on on completion of a days work. However, the majority of thefts occur from worksites outside of working hours and as work-

sites are often located in 'out of the way' or 'uninhabited' places thefts of equipment and damage to departmental property is difficult to prevent.

2. A list is provided showing the items stolen and their value for the year ended 30 June 1984. Two items were

recovered, namely, a Holden utility valued at \$5 000 and a pneumatic drill valued at \$300. In summary, the total value of items stolen for the 1983-84 year was \$23 869 and the value of items recovered amounted to \$5 300, giving a net stolen items value of \$18 569.

ENGINEERING AND WATER SUPPLY DEPARTMENT

PROPERTY STOLEN DURING THE PERIOD

1 JULY 1983 to 30 JUNE 1984

Qty	Item	\$ Value	Branch Location	Where Stolen From
1	Outboard Motor	600	Riverland—Berri	Departmental Building
2	L.P.G. Gas Bottles	90	M.O.B. North—Elizabeth	Worksite Caravan
1	L.P.G. Gas Regulator	27	M.O.B. North—Elizabeth	Worksite Caravan
1	Engine Driven Vibratory Rammer	1 000	M.O.B. North—Elizabeth	Worksite Caravan
Qty	Small Tools and H/D Battery	391	Northern—Crystal Brook	Tank Site
Qty	Small Tools and Consumables	498	M.O.B. Central—Marden	Worksite Caravans
2	Ladders—Fibre Glass	498	M.O.B. North—Elizabeth	Departmental Truck
2	Wheels complete w/tyres	200	M.O.B. North—Elizabeth	Departmental Mobile Toilet
Qty	Small Tools	263	M.O.B. Central—Marden	Worksite Caravans
1	Electric Power Generator	510	M.O.B. North—Elizabeth	Departmental Van
1	Trailer—Small	460	Plant and Workshops	Depot Area
4	Traffic Cones	60	Northern—Crystal Brook	Departmental Truck
1	Pump Engine Driven	370	Northern—Crystal Brook	Tank Site
1	Wheelbarrow	50	Northern—Crystal Brook	Worksite Caravan
1	Wheel complete w/tyre	50	M.O.B. Central—Marden	Worksite Trailer
1	Boat—Aluminium	300	M.O.B. Central—Marden	Worksite Compound
1	First Aid Kit	50	M.O.B. South—Happy Valley	Worksite Caravan
1	Engine—Petrol Driven	180	Plant and Workshops	Worksite Concrete Mixer
1	Pocket Calculator	60	Design Services	Departmental Brief Case
1	Ladder	140	M.O.B. Central—Marden	Worksite Caravan
1	Wheelbarrow		M.O.B. Central—Marden	Worksite Caravan
1	Electric Power Generator	450	M.O.B. Central—Marden	Depot Shed
1	Chain Block	150	Riverland—Berri	Departmental Pumping Station
Qty	Small Tools	150	M.O.B. Central—Marden	Worksite Caravan
1	Drill—Pneumatic*	300	M.O.B. North—Elizabeth	Departmental Truck
1	Wheelbarrow	50	M.O.B. Central—Marden	Worksite Compound
Qty	Small Tools	45	M.O.B. Central—Marden	Departmental Tractor
1	Electric Drill	100	M.O.B. North—Elizabeth	Tool Box
1 set	Socket Wrenches	100	M.O.B. North—Elizabeth	Departmental Truck
1	Brush Cutter	550	M.O.B. North—Elizabeth	Depot Shed
1	Electric Stove	355	M.O.B. Central Services—Thebarton	Condemned Departmental House
1	Engine—Diesel	1 500	M.O.B. Central—Marden	Departmental Pump on Worksite
5	Jacks—Lifting	250	Construction Services—Berri	Worksite Caravan
1	Pump—Engine Driven	250	Construction Services—Berri	Worksite Compound
1	L.P.G. Gas Bottle	17	M.O.B. Central—Marden	Worksite Caravan
1	L.P.G. Gas Burner	20	M.O.B. Central—Marden	Worksite Caravan
12	Lamps—Road Warning	264	M.O.B. Central—Marden	Worksite Caravan
1	Engine Driven Vibratory Rammer	1 700	M.O.B. South—Happy Valley	Worksite Caravan
1	Pump—Engine Driven	700	M.O.B. South—Happy Valley	Departmental Truck
1	Furnace Lead		M.O.B. South—Happy Valley	Departmental Worksite
1	L.P.G. Gas Regulator	55	M.O.B. South—Happy Valley	Departmental Worksite
1	Chain Saw		C.O.B. Murray Mallee	Departmental Pumping Station
Qty	Small Tools	400	C.O.B. Murray Mallee	Departmental Pumping Station
1	Lifebuoy	70	M.O.B. South—Happy Valley	Departmental Reservoir
8	Lamps—Road Warning	144	M.O.B. South—Happy Valley	Departmental Worksite
1	L.P.G. Gas Bottle		M.O.B. Central—Marden	Departmental Caravan
1	Vice—Engineering	184	M.O.B. Central—Marden	Departmental Caravan
1	Electric Drill	40	Construction Services—Kangaroo Creek Dam	Departmental Caravan
1	Electric Jigsaw	50	Construction Services—Kangaroo Creek Dam	Departmental Caravan
Qty	Small Tools	160	Construction Services—Kangaroo Creek Dam	Departmental Caravan
6	Air Conditioners	1 482	Construction Services—Berri	Departmental Camp
Qty	Small Tools	54	C.O.B. South East	Departmental Truck
1	Drill—Electric	70	C.O.B. Northern—Crystal Brook	Departmental Shed
Qty	Small Tools		C.O.B. Northern—Crystal Brook	Departmental Shed
2	Ladders	150	C.O.B. Northern—Crystal Brook	Tanksite
2	Wheels w/tyres	54	C.O.B. Northern—Crystal Brook	Worksite—Mobile Toilet
2	Jerry Cans	33	C.O.B. Northern—Crystal Brook	Departmental Truck

Qty	Item	\$ Value	Branch Location	Where Stolen From
1	Motor Vehicle (Holden Utility) *	5 000	M.O.B. Happy Valley	Depot Area
2	Mobile 2 way Radios	2 500	M.O.B. Happy Valley	Departmental Vehicles
1	Mobile 2 way Radio		Construction Services—Happy Valley	Departmental Vehicles
1	Chain Block	350	C.O.B. Northern—Whyalla	Departmental Building
1	Safety Harness	150	M.O.B. North—Elizabeth	Worksite
1	L.P.G. Gas Cylinder	30	C.O.B. Eyre—Port Lincoln	Departmental Caravan
16L	Petrol	45	M.O.B. North—Elizabeth	Fuel Storage Tank
50L	Distillate	100	C.O.B. Eyre—Port Lincoln	Fuel Storage Tank
	* Recovered item			
TOTAL		23 869		

SUMMARY

Total Value of Items Stolen	\$ 23 869
* Less Value of Items Recovered	5 300
Net Value of Items Stolen	<u>18 569</u>

395. **Mr BECKER** (on notice) asked the Minister of Education:

1. Is the Minister aware that \$218 392 worth of equipment was stolen from his Department (page 499, Auditor-General's Report for the year ended 30 June 1983) and what action has been taken to ensure proper care and control of equipment to prevent repetition?

2. What items were stolen from all sections of the Department for the year ended 30 June 1984, what was the value of each item and which were recovered?

The Hon. LYNN ARNOLD: The replies are as follows:

1. I am aware of the cost of equipment stolen from the Education Department and I assure the honourable member that departmental officers take all proper care and control of equipment. However, as he would be aware, even the best possible care and most sophisticated security controls may not necessarily thwart a determined thief. The main action to combat theft of equipment from schools has been security patrols and the installation of silent monitored alarm systems, the installation programme for which commenced in 1984. Security patrols have always been a deterrent to theft, vandalism and arson and early indications are that the loss of equipment has reduced in the alarmed schools.

2. It is not practicable to list individual items and their cost. However, items ranging from potato chips and sweets in school canteens, to colour televisions, video cassette recorders and computers were stolen during 1983-84. The total cost of replacements for stolen items was \$241 172.08. Items recovered were valued at \$8 770.98.

396. **Mr BECKER** (on notice) asked the Minister of Community Welfare:

1. Is the Minister aware that \$5 815 worth of equipment was stolen from his Department (page 499, Auditor-General's report for the year ended 30 June 1983) and what action has been taken to ensure proper care and control of equipment to prevent repetition?

2. What items were stolen from all sections of the Department for the year ended 30 June 1984, what was the value of each item and which were recovered?

The Hon. G.J. CRAFT: The replies are as follows:

1. Yes. All occurrences of loss through theft have been reported to the Police and to the Auditor-General's Department. Security has been reviewed and is in the process of being upgraded at all offices.

2. August 1983

Kandarik Cottage—money, approximately \$500, stolen from the purses of employees.
Port Pirie Community Welfare Centre—wall hanging, value circa \$50 disappeared.

September 1983

Unley Branch Office—Pocket memo, value circa \$100 disappeared.

November 1983

Youth Project Centre, Magill—petty cash, \$47.90 stolen.

March 1984

Youth Project Centre, Marion—petty cash and stamps, \$122.91 stolen.

May 1984

Youth Project Centre, Magill—petty cash, \$50 stolen.

June 1984

Norwood District Office—Typewriter (\$525), car battery, \$50 stolen.

None of the above were recovered.

397. **Mr BECKER** (on notice) asked the Minister of Education, representing the Minister of Agriculture:

1. Is the Minister aware that \$300 worth of equipment was stolen from his Department (page 499, Auditor-General's Report for year ended 30 June 1983) and what action has been taken to ensure proper care and control of equipment to prevent repetition?

2. What items were stolen from all sections of the Department for the year ended 30 June 1984, what was the value of each item and which were recovered?

The Hon. LYNN ARNOLD: The replies are as follows:

1. In terms of Audit Regulation 108, the Auditor-General and police were advised of the theft of one McCulloch chain saw valued at \$300 from the Northfield campus. Whilst it was considered that adequate security measures were in force at the time of the theft, steps were taken to reaffirm to staff the policy that tools not in use be kept in a lock-up shed.

2. The following items were stolen from the Department during the year ended 30 June 1984:

	\$
95 litres of petrol	41
1 radiator cap	3
1 car cigarette lighter	5
1 dashboard clock	24

The above items valued at \$73 were stolen from four Department vehicles located at the Pest Eradication Unit at Prospect. The items have not been recovered.

SUSAN JANE INGLIS

406. **Mr BECKER** (on notice) asked the Minister of Community Welfare, representing the Attorney-General:

1. What action has been taken by police and AMDEL to ensure that scientific tests are not delayed in future through

illness of staff as occurred in an investigation into the death of Susan Jane Inglis who died in a motor vehicle accident on 2 August 1981?

2. On how many occasions have similar incidents occurred during the past three years?

The Hon. G.J. CRAFTER: The replies are as follows:

1. Upon requesting scientific services from independent laboratories, including AMDEL, the Police Department specifies a date by which the report is required. The amount of time allowed varies in each case according to the relative urgency of the request.

In the event of any delay occurring, the Sergeant-in-Charge of the Police Laboratory liaises with the independent laboratory to ensure the examination is completed within a specified time. If, as occurred in the case involving Susan Inglis, a delay is caused by illness of the scientist conducting the tests, the Police Department will seek the transferral of the case to another scientist.

2. The incident concerned with the death of Susan Inglis is the only case during the past three years where the late return of an analysis has precluded the Police Department from laying a complaint.

TAFE FEES

434. **Mr BECKER** (on notice) asked the Minister of Labour: Has the Minister examined the charging of a general service fee of \$25 or any other fees for apprentices undertaking basic trade courses at TAFE colleges in the light of the Prices and Incomes Accord, Third Progress Report released in December 1984 and, if so, what action does the Minister propose to take on behalf of apprentices?

The Hon. J.D. WRIGHT: The general service fee is not a tuition fee as described in the Third Progress Report on the Prices and Incomes Accord.

RETAIL DEVELOPMENT

443. **The Hon. D.C. WOTTON** (on notice) asked the Minister for Environment and Planning:

1. Has a report on retail development been prepared recently or is a report being prepared for the Government and, if so, who is preparing it and why?

2. Has a committee been established recently to look into matters relating to retail development and, if so, who is on that committee and for what reason, and what are the objectives?

The Hon. D.J. HOPGOOD: A report on retail development has not recently been prepared for the Government, nor has a committee been established to look into matters relating to retail development. However, an interdepartmental committee comprising representatives of the Department of Environment and Planning, Department of State Development and the Department of Local Government has been considering the economic impact of new shopping centres.

HERITAGE SIGNPOSTING

445. **The Hon. D.C. WOTTON** (on notice) asked the Minister for Environment and Planning: What stage has been reached regarding the preparation of a heritage signposting policy and when will the Hahndorf Traders Council be able to take action through the relevant planning authority to signpost Hahndorf as an historic town?

The Hon. D.J. HOPGOOD: As heritage signposting will no doubt prove to be popular throughout the State, care must be exercised to ensure that the criteria are correctly formulated and applied. In this regard, discussions have been held between officers of the Highways Department, Department of Tourism and the Heritage Conservation Branch of the Department of Environment and Planning concerning the preparation of a heritage signposting policy in South Australia. The Government is now in the process of drafting the final policy and this should be completed by mid-1985. The Hahndorf Traders Council will be able to seek relevant planning approval following formulation of the policy.

LITTERING

452. **Mr BECKER** (on notice) asked the Minister of Emergency Services:

1. How many persons have been apprehended and prosecuted by the police for 'littering' in each of the past three years?

2. Have the police requested an increase in the maximum amount of 'on the spot' fines for littering and, if so, to what amount and, if not, will the Minister seek a proposal from the Police Commissioner and, if not, why not?

The Hon. J.D. WRIGHT: The replies are as follows:

1. The Police Department does not maintain statistics of the number of persons who have been apprehended for 'littering'. Legislation controlling the depositing of litter is contained in section 748 of the Local Government Act (No. 2), 1975, where provision is made for the expiation of offences through the issue of an 'offence expiation notice' by an 'authorised officer'. Police officers are 'authorised officers' under the Act and do, in fact, issue notices in the course of normal police patrol activity. However, enforcement is, in the main, the responsibility of the various local government authorities.

2. No official request has been made by the Police Department to increase the expiation fee for littering offences nor does the Commissioner of Police consider it his function to do so. For reasons as detailed in part 1 above it is not considered appropriate for the Minister of Emergency Services to approach the Commissioner of Police in relation to a fee increase.

453. **Mr BECKER** (on notice) asked the Minister of Local Government:

1. How many persons have been apprehended by local government authorities in each of the past two years and fined for 'littering'?

2. Does the Government propose to increase the maximum limit for 'on the spot' littering fines and, if not, why not?

3. What other action does the Government propose to take within local government to ensure the continual reduction of littering throughout the State?

The Hon. G.F. KENEALLY: The replies are as follows:

1. Records of persons apprehended for littering offences are not maintained by the Department of Local Government. Local councils administer the littering provisions of the Local Government Act and it would be necessary to survey councils to obtain the information. It is not proposed to undertake this survey at the present time.

2. There is no proposal to amend section 748d of the Local Government Act, 1934, which provides for an expiation fee of \$20. However, the question of the adequacy of the expiation fee and level of penalties which may be imposed by a court will be investigated when that part of the Local Government Act is reviewed during the overall review of the whole Act.

3. With regard to this part of the question, my colleague the Minister for Environment and Planning, has advised that the Government has supported KESAB's activities which assist local government in its efforts to combat litter. A grant of \$128 000 was provided in 1984-85. It is expected that the Government will continue its support in the future.

STATE GOVERNMENT CONCESSIONS

462. **Mr BAKER** (on notice) asked the Minister of Community Welfare: What is the composition of the task force which has been set up to review State Government concessions to pensioners, students and low income people, and when will it provide a report to the Parliament on its deliberations?

The Hon. G.J. CRAFTER: The Concessions Review Committee consisted of:

Mr W.H. Beattie, Director, Resource Services Division, Department for Community Welfare (Chairman);

Mr P. Edwards, General Manager, South Australian Housing Trust;

Mr T. Lawson, Cabinet Officer, Department of the Premier and Cabinet;

Mr G. Foreman, Director of Budget, Treasury Department;

Mr R. Heath, Chief Traffic Manager, State Transport Authority;

Mr K. Gamble, Manager, Revenue, Engineering and Water Supply Department;

Mr K. Thomas, Deputy Director, Road Safety and Motor Transport, Department of Transport; and

Mr J. Beruldsen, Department of Social Security (was Executive Officer).

The report was released for public comment in August 1984 and tabled in the House of Assembly on 30 August 1984.

ROAD ACCIDENTS

472. **Mr BAKER** (on notice) asked the Minister of Transport: From investigation of road traffic accidents which have occurred so far in 1985, what factors have been identified as contributing to the increase in fatalities?

The Hon. R.K. ABBOTT: The increase in the toll this year appears to have occurred mainly in city areas, amongst young drivers and passengers (under 25 years old). There have also been a disproportionate number of multiple fatalities. Speed and alcohol are considered to be the major contributing factors. The figures, however, do not necessarily indicate a worsening accident situation in the longer term as other low accident years (e.g. 1981) have shown high accident frequencies for the first quarter.

CEP SCHEMES

483. **Mr M.J. EVANS** (on notice) asked the Minister of Labour: Since the commencement of the CEP scheme, what is the total value of Government funds allocated or approved for allocation to each of the Cities of Salisbury, Tea Tree Gully, Elizabeth and Munno Para, and what is the total of the respective sponsor contributions proposed in respect of each of these councils?

The Hon. J.D. WRIGHT: The figures are as follows:

Sponsor	Grant	Sponsor Contribution
	\$	\$
C.C. Salisbury	64 264	20 812
C.C. Tea Tree Gully	492 119	195 454
C.C. Elizabeth	1 419 034	1 258 233
C.C. Munno Para	1 771 601	623 364

HOUSING TRUST REGIONS

484. **Mr M.J. EVANS** (on notice) asked the Minister of Housing and Construction:

1. What is the 1984-85 revenue budget for the maintenance of rental houses in each Housing Trust region?

2. How many single unit and double unit houses are located within each region?

3. What is the available balance of maintenance funds for expenditure during the remainder of the year 1984-85 in each region?

4. Has there been any transfer of maintenance funds between regions since 1 July 1984 and, if so, what are the details?

The Hon. T.H. HEMMINGS: The replies are as follows:

1. The current 1984-85 maintenance budgets for revenue items in each Housing Trust region are as follows:

	\$
Metropolitan South	2 695 185
Metropolitan North	3 547 800
Central	8 063 133
Northern	2 253 260
Eyre	4 818 006
Southern and Riverland	1 614 135
South Eastern	1 387 320
Inner Metropolitan	1 949 605
Metropolitan North East	2 400 010

2. The numbers of single unit and double unit dwellings in each region at 31 December 1984 were as follows:

	Single Units	Double Units
Metropolitan South	405	2 068
Metropolitan North	313	5 200
Central	2 859	7 009
Northern	976	1 588
Eyre	949	5 067
Southern and Riverland	2 575	854
South Eastern	1 125	959
Inner Metropolitan	121	1 495
Metropolitan North East	1 111	1 458

3. The available balance of maintenance funds for expenditure during the remainder of the year 1984-85 in each region is:

	\$
Metropolitan South	789 558
Metropolitan North	1 114 120
Central	2 172 167
Northern	510 082
Eyre	1 577 494
Southern and Riverland	590 052
South Eastern	586 449
Inner Metropolitan	647 218
Metropolitan North East	717 369

4. The maintenance programme is heavily influenced by a number of variables including the incidence of minor maintenance claims (e.g. blocked drains, failure of stoves, hot water systems) and the incidence of vacancies. The initial budgets for each year are therefore kept under review and modified as necessary. As a consequence of a major review towards the end of 1984 the budgets for all regions were reduced, except the Central region which was increased by approximately \$1 million.

STAMP DUTY

494. **The Hon. B.C. EASTICK** (on notice) asked the Treasurer:

1. What number of persons have been required to pay stamp duty on the aggregated value of separate parcels of land where there is a linking clause in the contract documents dealing with each parcel of land in each of the years 1982-83, 1983-84 and 1984-85 to date?

2. What were the respective values of the separate parcels of land in each case, what would have been the stamp duty on each parcel separately and what was the stamp duty on the aggregated parcel?

The Hon. J.C. BANNON: The replies are as follows:

1. The State Taxation Office does not maintain statistics on the number of persons required to pay stamp duty on transactions caught by section 66ab of the Stamp Duties Act. Since contract documents are not usually retained once duty has been determined it would not now be possible to extract the information requested.

2. See 1. above.

IRRIGATION LICENCES

497. **The Hon. P.B. ARNOLD** (on notice) asked the Minister of Water Resources:

1. How many irrigation licences currently exist for the diversion of water from Lake Albert?

2. How many licences have been transferred away from the lake since the commencement of the transfer arrangements?

3. What effect will the Government's policy have on the viability of irrigation from the lake?

The Hon. J.W. SLATER: The replies are as follows:

1. 40.

2. None.

3. The Government perceives no adverse effect.

LITTERING

501. **Mr BECKER** (on notice) asked the Minister of Emergency Services: Will the Government instruct the Police Department to issue more 'on the spot' fines to persons littering city streets and, if not, why not?

The Hon. J.D. WRIGHT: Legislation controlling the depositing of litter is contained in section 748 of the Local Government Act (No. 2), 1975, where provision is made for the expiation of offences through the issue of an 'offence expiation notice' by an 'authorised officer'.

Police officers are 'authorised officers' under the Act and do, in fact, issue notices in the course of normal police patrol activity. However, enforcement is, in the main, the responsibility of the various local government authorities.

Current instructions to members of the Police Force are to exercise discretion in policing the litter legislation. The Commissioner of Police has indicated that to countermand these instructions now would result in a diminished attention to patrol activities more central to the primary police role. For that reason, the Commissioner opposes any change to the present situation.

GOVERNMENT POLICY

506. **Mr GUNN** (on notice) asked the Premier: Has the Government set any guidelines in relation to members of Parliament seeking information from public servants on matters of general policy and administration?

The Hon. J.C. BANNON: The Minister for Environment and Planning has provided information on this matter in his letter to the member for Eyre, dated 18 January 1985. Public Service Board Memorandum to Permanent Heads No. 183 issued in November 1979, provides guidelines covering access by members of Parliament to public servants and other public officials. The guidelines encompass well

established conventions regulating contact between officials and members of Parliament. The guidelines were approved by the then Cabinet and remain in force.

Public Service Board Memorandum to Permanent Heads No. 236, issued in November 1981, encompasses guidelines for public servants appearing before Parliamentary committees. The guidelines were formally adopted by both Houses of Parliament in 1981 for use in committee proceedings.

CORRESPONDENCE SCHOOL

511. **Mr INGERSON** (on notice) asked the Minister of Education:

1. In relation to the Minister of Education's assurance in 1983 that a new social studies programme for Year 6 of the Correspondence School had been written, is it a fact that—

(a) during 1984 one teacher worked full-time on the writing of that Year 6 course;

(b) a second teacher assisted on a half-time basis on writing that same course;

and

(c) the manuscript of that course is still not complete and has not yet gone to the Government Printer?

2. When is the course likely to be completed?

3. When is the course likely to be placed in the hands of the children?

4. What is the cost to date, in salaries, to produce the manuscript?

The Hon. LYNN ARNOLD: The replies are as follows:

1. (a) Yes.

(b) Yes; the half-time teacher wrote the section on Aborigines in South Australia.

(c) The manuscript is completed; part is still being illustrated; part is in the hands of the Government Printer; part has been printed.

2. During 1985.

3. Early in 1986.

4. Total salary costs are estimated at \$62 500.

YOUNG DISABLED

512. **The Hon. D.C. BROWN** (on notice) asked the Minister of Education: Why has the Minister refused to see a deputation from the Regency Park School for Young Disabled concerning the school's urgent need for computer equipment to assist severely disabled children to be able to communicate with other people?

The Hon. LYNN ARNOLD: I refer the honourable member to my response tabled in the House on 13 March 1985 which outlines clearly the current methods by which funding is being sought for the purchase of high technology equipment for use in special schools. As I have already advised the honourable member through my answer and through discussions I have had with him, the particular needs of Regency Park School for Young Disabled are being taken into consideration in the process outlined in my answer to the House. I am confident that, in 1985-86, we will be able to assist to a greater degree the needs of Regency Park school. With respect to his request for a deputation from the school, the member seems to impute a reluctance on my part that would more befit my predecessor than me. With respect to the various motives the member may be attaching to my decision, I respond as follows:

(1) political partisanship: unlike my predecessor, at least 50 per cent of the school council deputations I have received have been brought by Opposition members of Parliament (including the honourable member for Daventry).

(2) unwillingness to receive deputations: my record for being willing to meet deputations when there is a practicable purpose for doing so cannot be challenged when compared with the large number of deputations I have received since becoming Minister. This is particularly so when the record of my predecessor is taken into comparison.

(3) convenience: the issues raised by the member on behalf of Regency Park have required investigation and action earlier than might have been possible had such follow-up had to wait upon when a time for the deputation could be fitted in my very busy schedule.

I am aware of the needs of Regency Park with respect to special technology equipment; that awareness results from my own knowledge of the school, departmental advice I have received and the representations of the honourable member. As a result of my awareness of those needs, I am endeavouring to achieve within the constraints of available resources and competing demands the best possible solution for Regency Park.

LINDEN PARK PRIMARY SCHOOL

513. **The Hon. D.C. BROWN** (on notice) asked the Minister of Education: Why has the Minister refused to see another deputation from the Linden Park Primary School concerning the urgent need to redevelop the buildings at the school and why has he not yet responded to the same matters raised by a deputation from the school in 1984?

The Hon. LYNN ARNOLD: My secretary responded to the school on my behalf on 31 January 1985 and 8 February 1985, in addition to the letter I wrote to the member for Davenport on 1 October 1984 outlined the current status of the school's redevelopment. I have visited the school and am aware of its needs. The situation outlined in the letter of 8 February 1985 is the best that can be done in the current financial situation given that we must maintain a Statewide perspective. I declined to receive a deputation on the grounds that the purpose of any such meeting would be to inform me about the school's needs (and of those needs I am already aware) or to discuss the relative priority of the school in relation to available capital funds (again I am aware of the school council's view on this and in the present pre-budget context I am not able to give any commitments). The point must be made, however, that as Minister I have endeavoured to receive as many deputations as possible where there was a practicable purpose to such a meeting. Indeed, after only 12 months in the job as Minister I had received more school council deputations than my predecessor in his 38 months as Minister.

GOVERNMENT EMPLOYEES

516. **Mr OLSEN** (on notice) asked the Premier: In relation to employees in Government departments and State public sector employees, respectively, what were the actual numbers of persons employed as at 31 December 1984 and what are the current estimates for 30 June 1985 for each of the following:

- (a) employees in departments:
 - (i) full-time equivalents; and
 - (ii) persons; and
- (b) employees in the State public sector:
 - (i) full-time equivalents; and
 - (ii) persons?

The Hon. J.C. BANNON: The actual number of persons employed in departments and State public sector organisations is collected in June each year, together with other

employment details. Full-time equivalent levels are collected on a monthly basis from departments and less frequently from statutory authorities. The time and cost of a special collection of actual persons employed in these organisations for December 1984 is not considered to be justified. Estimates of likely full-time equivalent employment levels in departments for June 1985 are given in the table of approved June 1985 target employment levels in the attached Appendix A. As June target levels are expressed in full-time equivalents, the estimated number of persons is not available. As many statutory authorities require greater flexibility in employment numbers to respond to changing requirements, target employment levels are generally not used for these organisations.

Appendix A

Target Employment Levels (Full-Time Equivalent) in Departments for June 1985.

Department	Employment (FTE)
Agriculture	1 066.6
Arts	172.7
Attorney-General	188.5
Auditor-General	85.0
Community Welfare	1 208.0
Corporate Affairs	96.0
Correctional Services	783.0
Courts	550.2
Education	18 806.6
Electoral	16.4
E & WS	4 752.0
Environment and Planning	735.0
Fisheries	99.5
Highways	2 742.0
Labour	362.4
Lands	917.5
Local Government	355.5
Marine and Harbours	780.0
Mines and Energy	423.0
Police	3 839.2
Premier and Cabinet	134.3
Public Buildings	2 139.7
Public and Consumer Affairs	438.5
Public Service Board	161.1
Recreation and Sport	64.6
Services and Supply	782.6
State Development	66.5
Technical and Further Education	2 384.2
Tourism	121.4
Transport	504.5
Treasury	251.7
Woods and Forests	1 426.0
Ministry of Technology	19.6
Special W. Paid Line	139.0
Other	38.0
Total	46 650.8

MORPHETT VALE EAST PROJECT

518. **The Hon. D.C. WOTTON** (on notice) asked the Minister for Environment and Planning: Is it the intention of the Government to appoint a co-ordinator for the Morphett Vale East project and, if so, what will be that person's responsibilities?

The Hon. D.J. HOPGOOD: Yes, as I announced by way of an answer to a question in Parliament and by a media statement on 28 February 1985. The project officer will co-ordinate community and human services in both the housing developments of Golden Grove and Morphett Vale East. The project officer will:

act as Executive Officer to the Human Services Planning Group of the S.A. Public Service;
ensure that there is adequate communication between the Human Services Planning Group and the various community groups which represent human services needs.

With particular attention to the proposed new community developments at Golden Grove and Morphett Vale East—

liaise with community groups to ensure that the needs they perceive are communicated to those responsible for planning and development;

provide assistance in the establishment of relevant community groups in these new areas;

assist in the establishment of co-ordinating mechanisms between these organisations, both government and voluntary, which provide human services in those areas;

advise on the range and extent of services needed in the areas, and on the timing of their provision.

HYDROELECTRICITY

521. **The Hon. E.R. GOLDSWORTHY** (on notice) asked the Minister of Mines and Energy: Are there any plans to produce hydroelectricity from an enlarged Warren Reservoir and, if so, what details are available and what time scale is envisaged?

The Hon. R.G. PAYNE: The Electricity Trust as part of its long range planning activities, to identify possible generating options for the future, has kept under review pumped storage as a possible means of providing peak load power. A number of pumped storage schemes have been investigated over the years, the latest being a scheme involving the Warren Reservoir. Such a scheme would involve the construction of a new enlarged multi-purpose Warren Reservoir to provide the upper storage. The existing South Para Reservoir would provide the lower storage.

One of the requirements for a pumped storage scheme is the availability of low cost off-peak electrical energy to drive the pumps. Such energy is not available from existing plant but might become available at some time in the future. In addition, I am advised by the Minister of Water Resources that the prospect of a new and larger storage at the Warren Reservoir site was highlighted in the Metropolitan Adelaide Water Resources Study in 1978. This report commented on the need for major headworks augmentation north of Adelaide and stated that the cheapest solution would be to upgrade the Warren Reservoir. However, I am informed

that it is not expected that such a reservoir will be needed for water supply purposes until well into the next century.

TAB SUBAGENCY

522. **The Hon. D.C. WOTTON** (on notice) asked the Minister of Recreation and Sport: In relation to the recent transfer of the TAB subagency from the Balhannah delicatessen to the Oakbank Hotel:

(a) why was the subagency relocated;

(b) does the Oakbank Hotel provide longer agency hours than the previous location; and

(c) what form of notice was given to patrons of the former subagency of the proposed transfer of facilities and when was it given?

The Hon. J.W. SLATER: The replies are as follows:

(a) The Balhannah delicatessen was sold.

(b) Yes.

(c) No official notification was given by the TAB. Local media outlets provide such information.

5AA

529. **Mr BECKER** (on notice) asked the Treasurer: Have the quarterly interest payments due and payable in December 1984 and March 1985 been paid in terms of the original loan by the South Australian Financing Authority to Festival City Broadcasters Ltd, operators of Radio 5AA and, if so, on what dates were the payments effected?

The Hon. J.C. BANNON: The South Australian Government Financing Authority has not provided a loan to Festival City Broadcasters Ltd. On 4 September 1984 funds were advanced to the South Australian Totalizator Agency Board to assist with the acquisition of the abovementioned company. Interest payments on the total debt of the TAB to SAFA (including the above advance) were received on 17 December 1984 and 15 March 1985.