HOUSE OF ASSEMBLY

Thursday 20 August 1987

The SPEAKER (Hon. J.P. Trainer) took the Chair at 11 a.m. and read prayers.

MARIJUANA

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

That the regulations under the Controlled Substances Act 1984 relating to expiation of simple cannabis offences, made on 30 April and laid on the table of the House on 6 August 1987, be disallowed.

This resolution to disallow the Government's regulations under the Controlled Substances Act is a further invitation to members of the Government to reassess their support for the introduction of on-the-spot fines for some marijuana offences. The Liberal Party is providing a further opportunity for Labor Party members to re-examine their consciences, to hark back to the strongly-held views of their constituents when the marijuana debate created so much controversy last year.

The reason for the controversy will be easily recalled, particularly by those marginal seat holders on the Government side whose nerves were to the fore after the Premier and the Minister of Health so callously ignored the great weight of public opinion against the move, and so arrogantly prevented one of their own members from expressing the view so strongly put to him by his electorate in this House. The simple fact is that the Government's move to decriminalise some marijuana offences was a policy never put to the electorate, never mooted by the Premier in the lead up to the State election campaign in 1985—just a personal whim of the hapless Minister of Health with which the Premier found himself stuck.

The public did not ask for on-the-spot fines for marijuana use, and the public did not support this action when the Government first indicated its intention to legislate for on-the-spot fines. On what other issue can the Premier remember having to defend a policy universally condemned by groups as diverse as those representing parents, teachers, church, police and service organisations?

If the Premier was so sure he was right in entering this distinctly Dunstanesque phase, why did he not put his passion for marijuana reform out for public consumption as part of official ALP policy before he was voted back in? The simple answer is that the Premier and the Minister of Health knew that they were wrong in individually pushing for legislation which raised the ire of the vast majority of South Australians who did not want to see their State being used for the sort of social experimentation reminiscent of the Dunstan decade.

The Minister of Health, on the one hand, was apparently oblivious to the community concern that his radical proposal evoked. The Premier, on the other hand, took some kind of impish delight in informing the media that he had tried marijuana 25 years ago which, according to my source, means that the Premier, John Bannon, must have been one of the first to dabble in the Adelaide marijuana market which, after all, in 1961 was in its infancy, while the Premier was still at school. In other words, he got it wrong yet again. Like a number of political commentators, I am unsure whether the Premier was practising his new found arrogance in his handling of this issue or whether he was just plain naive. Whatever the correct interpretation, and it is interesting to note the response of marginal seat members, who well understand the implication, of this legislation in their electorates and well they would—

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order! Would the honourable Leader of the Opposition resume his seat for a moment. I ask those members interjecting from the other side of the House to the Leader of the Opposition to cease doing so and allow him to be heard in relative silence. The honourable Leader of the Opposition.

Mr OLSEN: Thank you, Mr Speaker. Whatever the correct interpretation, the simple fact is that the good news Premier made a big blunder by aligning himself with an issue which rapidly turned into really bad news, and left him way out on a particularly fragile limb on this issue, sitting alongside the Minister for Mayhem, John Cornwall, with public opinion definitely not on his side. This was undoubtedly uncomfortable for the Premier but, rather than admit he has made a mistake, he stubbornly pressed on, incurring the wrath of his closest supporters on the way.

As he insisted, day after day, that his Government was not going soft on drugs, and that marijuana did not lead to hard drugs, and that there was no way this measure was decriminalisation anyway, others attempted to set him on the right track. The mother of a convicted heroin trafficker, Barbara Barlow, said of the Government's legislation:

It's ridiculous. It starts as innocuously as smoking a joint and later marijuana is not enough and they go to harder drugs.

And who said, 'By just continuously handing out spot fines, it appears as if the Government is almost approving the use of marijuana'? None other than the Premier's colleague and a man who has proved to have the courage of his convictions despite Partyroom efforts to silence him—the member for Price, Murray De Laine. But perhaps the seal was put on the community's outrage against the Government's move when the Premier—

Mr FERGUSON: I take a point of order, Sir. I refer to Standing Order No. 52, which states:

No member shall refer to any other member by name except for the purpose of distinguishing him from other members returned from the same electoral district.

I ask you, Sir, to rule on that matter and instruct the Leader of the Opposition accordingly.

The SPEAKER: Can the honourable member for Henley Beach cite the particular instance in which he believes that the Leader of the Opposition—

Mr FERGUSON: Yes. I understand that the Leader of the Opposition is referring to members on this side by their name, and I ask him to refrain from doing so.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order! I take the point of order and ask the Leader of the Opposition to refrain.

Mr OLSEN: I in fact referred to the honourable member's electorate. I said 'the member for Price'. But perhaps the seal was put on the community's outrage against the Government's move when the Premier chose to ignore not just all of them but also one of the people he most admires and trusts—his mentor, Clyde Cameron, who said:

If you are going to decriminalise marijuana—and that's what it amounts to . . . you are going to get more of it happening.

But, despite those words of warning from a former employer, the Premier and his Government managed to push their ill-conceived legislation through Parliament in circumstances which have gone down in political history as being, at the very least, highly suspect. The fact that the legislation needed rescuing by the Speaker's casting vote on several occasions is evidence of the degree of opposition the proposition attracted. Indeed, the Government was involved in a further manipulation of the parliamentary process by delaying the regulations until Parliament recessed—thereby denying

members the opportunity to vote on them before they became operative.

The Premier's second offence related to the other and more palatable section of the legislation dealing with increased penalties for drug pushers. He claimed that the real intention of the legislation was to catch the Mr Bigs—the pushers and producers—while allowing smokers off without fear of conviction.

An honourable member: Where do they get it?

Mr OLSEN: That is the point. Is the Premier blissfully unaware that the livelihood of the pushers and producers is totally dependent on their regular sales to the very smokers whom the Premier is seeking to protect from the due processes of the law? Another tactic employed by the Premier in his defence of on-the-spot fines was the use of the term 'simple' in relation to those marijuana offences that were to be covered by fines only. This term was subsequently picked up by some sections of the media, thereby assisting the Government in its attempt to dissuade the public from believing the truth. The Government's actions amounted to the decriminalisation of marijuana.

One cannot honestly refer to a system of fines for 'simple' offences and at the same time expect the public to believe that the offence remains a significant offence. It is like introducing on-the-spot fines for offences to be known as 'simple' shoplifting or 'mere' assault.

Another interesting comment attributed to the Premier during his efforts last year to woo the public back on side was this gem in the *News*, in which he said that the new laws would:

> . . . in fact result in a decrease in the general use of marijuana by helping to eliminate the black market.

Apart from the fact that the statistics have proved the Premier wrong on the first score, he has been unable to explain exactly from where marijuana users will gain their supply if not from a clandestine operation. The first sign of the Government's belatedly recognising community alarm about on-the-spot fines came in November, with a remarkable turnaround by the Premier on the question of monitoring the fines system. On 10 November, the *News* ran a story stating:

> A suggestion that marijuana fines should be recorded on a register to provide increased fines with repetitive offences received a cool reception from the Premier today.

The turnaround came just 11 days later, with another story in the *News*, which stated:

> A pot register of people issued with on-the-spot marijuana fines in the first 12 months of the new law will be kept by the Bannon Government. The Premier, Mr Bannon, today gave an undertaking to adjust the new law if the statistics and the first year of operation showed it was not working.

An honourable member: Another back flip!

Mr OLSEN: Indeed it is. I turn now to the crux of today's debate on the regulations governing the new marijuana laws. It took a while but the Premier finally agreed to throw out this foolish fines system if the statistics proved that he should or that the system was not working. If the Premier is to stand by that statement, he will encourage members on his side of the Chamber to vote according to their conscience and in accordance with the wishes of their constituents. He will remove his former threats so that the true will of the Parliament and the people it represents can be reflected in the vote on this motion.

Since the Government embarked on this reform, which was in complete contradiction of the Premier's own promise at the national drug summit, and moved in the opposite direction to the national drug offensive which has been waged at such enormous cost across the nation, we have had some months to take stock of the situation. We have statistics and opinion polls, and some events have occurred in this State since the Premier and the Health Minister got their way.

Let us start with the opinion polls upon which the Government has always placed so much importance in the past. The McGregor Harrison survey last November revealed that 59.1 per cent of those surveyed disagreed with on-the-spot fines for marijuana. A survey one month later in the *Advertiser* put the level of disapproval even higher—at 68.63 per cent. I ask members on the Government benches to dwell on those figures: between 60 per cent and 70 per cent of their electorate is dead against on-the-spot fines for marijuana use. Members opposite are being given another chance to reconsider the way they vote on this important and unwelcome reform.

The newspaper surveys were followed by further medical reports about the ill effects of smoking marijuana, ranging from effects on pregnant women and their unborn babies to the problem of youth suicide. The Liberal Party called on the Government to accompany its launch of on-the-spot fines with an extensive program to publicise the health risks associated with the use of the drug. The Government ignored that request.

It is also worth noting that the national drug offensive phone-in conducted in January 1987, shortly after the Government's measure was passed in State Parliament, attracted more inquiries from people wanting information on marijuana use than about any other drug. Within weeks of the passage of the legislation a handful of marijuana busts occurred in rural areas of South Australia, including an $8 million plantation discovered growing on land owned by the Government near Loxton.

Of greater concern were the events which unfolded in just a few weeks of the new system coming into force. Almost immediately, Mitsubishi management was forced to circularise all employees following an alarming incidence of marijuana usage at work which was affecting quality control and efficiency, but, more importantly, creating dangerous working conditions for those affected and those working alongside. The situation at Mitsubishi with regard to marijuana smokos became so bad that management had to threaten offenders with the sack for more than one marijuana offence. The workers had clearly gained the impression that the Government had given the go-ahead to the use of pot, and felt that on-the-spot fine was a small enough risk to take.

Within days, it was reported that South Australian members of the Aviation Department staff were using marijuana before, during and after work. An internal departmental report confirmed this. The Executive Director of the South Australian Employers Federation, Matthew O'Callaghan, said publicly that there had been a number of sackings in the South Australian work force as a result of employees smoking marijuana since the new laws had been passed by Parliament, and a few weeks later a cadet police officer resigned from the Fort Largs Academy after receiving a cannabis infringement notice for smoking marijuana.

Can it be just coincidence that these events all occurred within a short period of the Government's announcing the commencement of on-the-spot fines? I think not. Any lingering doubts that the Premier may have had about the advisability of going down the decriminalisation track were then totally wiped out by the release of the figures related to the issuing of on-the-spot fines. In the first 28 days of operation, 235 people had been issued with cannabis infringement notices. That was slightly more than eight a day. In the following month of June—only the second month of the new scheme's existence—this figure had dou-

bled to 15 offences a day, and nearly 700 people had been found indulging their marijuana past time in just 60 days.

Now I would ask the House to recall two of the Premier's statements in defence of this legislation. First, he said that the general use of marijuana would decrease as a result of on-the-spot fines. He was wrong. Secondly he said that the Government would monitor the spot fines system through data collection and analysis. But what happened when the Opposition asked for the Government to release certain details about the circumstances leading to the fines? The Government refused; it refused point blank, with no reasons given. Was the Government embarrassed to reveal this information? What could be so damning about the circumstances leading to the fines that the Government could not, or would not, answer relevant question such as the following in what sort of locations were marijuana offences detected; how many were in private homes, and how many in public places, like restaurants, hotels and discos; what quantities of marijuana were involved; what age were the offenders; and were any repeat offenders? There is no excuse for the Government to withhold this information.

The Hon. B.C. Eastick: Unless it has something to hide.

Mr OLSEN: Unless it has something to hide. But then, there was no excuse for the Government foisting this ludicrous and unwanted system on us in the first place. Since the Bannon Government implemented this farcical system, South Australia has been in the spotlight on two other occasions in relation to its reputation as far as drugs are concerned. On the first occasion, the highly respected *Age* newspaper of Melbourne reported on South Australia's significance as a drug centre of this nation under the heading 'Marijuana trade thriving in the city of churches'. As if that headline was not bad enough for this State's reputation nationwide, our former Premier Don Dunstan weighed in in international print last week to reinforce the perception of South Australia as some kind of druggies paradise. There was Don for all to see advocating the legalisation of marijuana in New Zealand—his own form of perhaps one-upmanship over the current Premier's mere decriminalisation of the drug here.

Did our Premier leap to the defence of our State's reputation? Did he attempt to set the record straight as much as possible, given the problems caused by his own on-the-spot fines legislation? Of course he did not; he did not even attempt to do so. What he had to say was simply, 'Mr Dunstan can do what he likes . . .' Well, I would like the Premier to extend that directive to all Government members.

Unlike the last occasion on which a vote was taken on these regulations, I urge the Premier to say to the members for Adelaide, Newland, Fisher, Bright, Hayward and Unley, 'You can do what you like on the vote in this House.' Because, given the opportunity to exercise their votes with conscience and regard for the well-being and wishes of their communities, those members will join the Liberal Party, the Independent Liberal and Labor members and the National Party member, the Minister of Technology and Further Education, the member for Price and the member for Playford and will vote against the regulations covering on-the-spot fines. Having considered the doubling of marijuana offences in just two months, the new problem of marijuana smoking in the work force and the overwhelming message to the Government in opinion polls, every member of this House should find no difficulty in supporting my motion. It may be the last chance to do so before we next go to the polls.

The Hon. D.J. HOPGOOD (Deputy Premier): I oppose this motion and urge all members of the House to do likewise. It is implicit in what the Leader of the Opposition says and indeed implicit in the action of his Whip, in asking the House to give priority to this matter today, that the Opposition sees this as a very urgent matter which should be brought before the House at the very earliest opportunity so that the subject of the motion, which they regard as a scourge in our community, can quite possibly be ended by a vote of this House. Let us test the sincerity of members opposite in this matter. The Government is happy to proceed to a vote this morning. We are prepared to facilitate the passage of this matter so that we can vote on it immediately and the whole matter can be concluded if, indeed, the numbers are there.

Members interjecting:

The Hon. D.J. HOPGOOD: I am not quite sure what the Opposition is on about. Is this a matter of urgency or not?

Mr Oswald interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order! The honourable member for Morphett and the Minister will resume their seats. I requested honourable members on my right not to interject when the Leader of the Opposition was addressing the House, and I anticipate that the same courtesy will be extended to the Deputy Premier.

The Hon. D.J. HOPGOOD: In order to assist you in controlling the House, Sir, I assure honourable members that the matter is in their hands. If they desire not to have a vote on this matter this morning, they may indicate that fact by way of the sort of interjection that you will probably tolerate, Sir, and I will get the message. I will then speak to the House about certain things; I will seek leave to table a document; and I will then seek leave to continue my remarks later—and the matter will continue. No doubt, next week one or two more members will get to their feet and speak for a while and four, five or six weeks down the track or after Christmas during the New Year part of the session eventually there will be a vote on this matter. That will be a test of just how sincere honourable members opposite are and how important they think it is that this legislation should be wiped from the statute book of this State.

I need some sort of indication as to whether I will merely seek leave to continue my remarks after I have given this House—and, through the House, the people of South Australia—some information I think it should have, or whether I should complete my remarks and we proceed to the sort of debate which would allow members on both sides of the House to address themselves to it, and vote this morning, thus resolving the matter one way or another.

Mr S.G. EVANS: I rise on a point of order. This is a private members' day, and the Deputy Premier is suggesting that the Government, by its actions, can take the business out of members' hands. If this matter goes to debate, I will seek to have it adjourned so that the arrangement that was made to get this matter up front will give the opportunity for those who will sacrifice that to put forward their private members' business.

The SPEAKER: Order! The honourable member's point of order is not accepted. As the Chair understands it, the Deputy Premier has suggested putting this matter, in effect, in the hands of the House as a whole.

The Hon. D.J. HOPGOOD: I could not put it any better myself. I am inviting members to tell me what is their desire. What the honourable member has done by his point of order is really let his former colleagues off the hook. He is saying, 'I am prepared to carry the odium of this thing being on the statute books because I want longer to talk about it.'

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order! The honourable member for Davenport.

Mr S.G. EVANS: The Deputy Premier is suggesting or implying that, because I raised the point of order, which you, Sir, said was not a point of order (and I accept that), I had an ulterior motive, but I did not.

The SPEAKER: Order! The honourable member for Davenport has risen on a point of order. He will come to the point of order straightaway.

Mr S.G. EVANS: I ask the Deputy Premier to remove or withdraw the imputation that I raised my point of order in order to get my previous colleagues off the hook.

The SPEAKER: Order! I interpret the comment of the honourable member for Davenport as meaning that he wishes to have an imputation against him withdrawn.

The Hon. D.J. HOPGOOD: I withdraw unreservedly. Let me explain, by way of apology to the honourable member, that I recognise his position as father of the House. The honourable member has been here longer than I have. He is the most experienced of us, and I would have expected him to understand the orders under which we operate in this Chamber. As such, therefore, it seemed strange to me that, with all his experience, he should raise a point of order which was not a point of order.

I therefore assumed that he had something else in mind: he was cheer chasing with his former colleagues and was saying, 'You needn't come to the agonising decision that you are being invited to take in this matter by the Deputy Premier.' However, I accept his explanation, and I unreservedly withdraw. It appears that it will not be possible for us to have a vote on this this morning because there is a member who wishes to consider this matter further. Therefore, I will not be completing my remarks. I will speak briefly, and will give to the House information which I think it should have, information which the Leader of the Opposition was in effect requesting, and information which I think will be of considerable assistance to members in the further consideration of this debate.

But, it does mean that the matter will not be resolved today, and I guess that for the Leader of the Opposition that is a disappointment, because he would have liked the first opportunity to be able to test the Government on this and, possibly, to have removed it from the statute books. That is a great pity, but that is something that he can take up with the honourable member who, by his actions, has indicated that the thing will stay on the Notice Paper for some time.

I have in my hands something which I think members opposite and the people of South Australia would like to have. Dated 19 August of this year, and put out by the Office of Crime Statistics, South Australian Attorney-General's Department, it is a preliminary report on the first three months of the cannabis expiation notice system in South Australia. I want to share certain matters in this report so that they can be in *Hansard*, but I will then seek your leave and that of the House, Mr Speaker, to table the report so that it is available to all members. First, I draw members' attention to page 3 of the report which indicates in all honesty that this is preliminary data and, of course, is subject to further updating.

The Hon. B.C. Eastick: What is the date of that?

The Hon. D.J. HOPGOOD: I thought I had already said that—19 August is the date on the front page of the report. I will quote from paragraph 4 on page 3 as follows:

> Whilst the analysis covers CENs issued during the first three months of the system, only sketchy data is available on the outcome of these notices. Defendants have 60 days in which to expiate offences, after which the Police Department will normally prosecute if the fee remains unpaid. Normally a court hearing will not be scheduled closer than four weeks from expiration of the 60 day period. Consequently, whilst some fines have been paid, and for some the 60 days have expired, most of the notices have not been finalised.

Parenthetically, I point out that that is irrelevant to the matter of the number of offences or alleged offences occurring in the community. The issuing of the notices—on the tests that have been suggested by the Leader of the Opposition—is the valid statistic at which we have to look. It further states:

> For notices issued in the first month of the system, the 60 day expiation period has expired, and most of these have either been expiated, or a decision has been made to prosecute. However, some 45 per cent of all notices issued in the first month will go to a court hearing. It is not clear at this stage why the number of unexpiated notices is so high.

That in itself is an interesting statistic indeed. It does not suggest that the people of South Australia see the CEN as being any easy avenue. A significant proportion of people are exercising the option of putting the matter into the courts. Again that does not bear directly on the matter of the incidence of offences or alleged offences.

Page 4 of the report contains a table entitled 'Table 1'. It is the only table that I will seek to have incorporated. A further table is, in effect, a bar graph and is a little difficult to describe verbally. People will be able to read it for themselves. Table 1 is headed 'CENs issued in first three months (provisional)'. There is a column headed the 'Outcome' showing those undetermined, expiated to be prosecuted, or withdrawn and it shows the months of April, May, June, July and the actual total. The total for April was four, which does not mean anything as it was when the system was introduced. The totals were 334 for May, 298 for June and 267 for July giving a total of 903. There are notes at the bottom of the table stating:

> 1. The system came into operation on the last day of April.
> 2. The total for May is not expected to vary by much. However, notices issued in June and July are still being received, as are notices of re-issues and withdrawals.
> 3. The notice shown as 'withdrawn' was issued to an unemployed person of no fixed adress, subsequently leaving insufficient details to enable a summons to be served.
> 4. This table does not include notices which have been withdrawn for the purposes of correction and re-issue. (The re-issued notices are, of course, included.) Nor does the table include notices which have been withdrawn because the offence was judged not to be expiatable.

I seek leave to have incorporated in *Hansard* that table and the explanatory notes. They are purely statistical.

The SPEAKER: At this point the Chair always asks the honourable member whether or not the material is purely statistical. Because of an incident that arose the other night, I draw the Minister's attention to the fact that *Hansard* and the Government Printer cannot accept graphs. However, the Minister or his staff is able to convert the graph to statistical data in tabulated form, I am sure that leave will be granted.

The Hon. D.J. HOPGOOD: I will explain. With respect, Sir, you might have misheard me. A further table is a graph that I will not seek to have incorporated for the reasons that you have just indicated. This table is purely statistical.

Mr LEWIS: On a point of order, I did not understand what you, Sir, were saying to the House but obviously I want to understand what arrangement you, Sir, have made outside this Chamber with the Deputy Premier with respect to the inclusion of graphs and histograms, as there has previously been the ability to incorporate such things in the record. For some reason, arbitrarily and subjectively without notice, the House now finds itself in a position of having you, Sir, decide to refuse leave to incorporate such things. I point out, Sir, that in consideration of this matter that such tables are still incorporated by leave of the other

Chamber into the record side by side with the record of this House in the weekly volume.

The SPEAKER: In accordance with the ruling made by the Deputy Speaker both before and after consultation with me last week, I am ruling that bar graphs, pie charts and any other pictorial material will not be accepted by *Hansard*. If members seek leave to incorporate statistical material, it must clearly be in tabular or text form. Moreover, there was no prior arrangement of any nature between me and the Minister.

Mr Lewis: Is that a fact?

The SPEAKER: I ask the honourable member to withdraw that imputation immediately.

Mr LEWIS: Mr Speaker, I withdraw that imputation, so long as you can assure me—

The SPEAKER: Order! The honourable member will withdraw the imputation without reservation.

Mr LEWIS: I withdraw the imputation without reservation. May I ask you, Sir, how it was that the Deputy Premier adverted to a matter that he said he had in his possession, of which you seemed to have some knowledge?

The SPEAKER: Order! The honourable member for Murray-Mallee's recollection is completely in opposition to the facts of the matter. If there were any basis whatsoever for the suggestion that the Chair had had prior consultation with the Deputy Premier, the Chair would not have made the error of assuming that the Deputy Premier was seeking leave to incorporate material that included a graph.

Mr LEWIS: On a point of order, Sir, what was it that provoked you to make a comment about graphs?

The SPEAKER: Order! The Chair clearly has ruled on this matter. I call on the Deputy Premier to proceed.

The Hon. D.J. HOPGOOD: I give an assurance that I have indicated already that I will seek leave to table the document, and it will therefore be childishly simple for anybody to be able to compare what I have said—and the *Hansard* report of that—with what is in the document. Surely, that will eliminate any suggestion of any editing or glossing over on my part of any of the material contained in it. Page 5 contains this now infamous bar graph, which simply indicates the number of notices issued week by week and there are notes about that. I will read those notes, because they encapsulate the essence of the graph and they draw some conclusions. Note 1 states:

> The 'high' weeks, in which 86 and 82 notices were issued, coincided with the Adelaide Cup and Queen's Birthday long weekends.

Note 2 states:

> The pattern revealed above appears to be consistent with between 65-80 notices issued weekly (more returns are expected for the later weeks). This extrapolates to an annual level of the order of 3 300-4 200 notices. By comparison, the number of similar cases going before the courts annually under the previous system is estimated at about 3 000 to 4 000.

Note 3 states:

> There is little evidence in the above graph for a generally rising trend of issue of notices. However, there is insufficient information to discount such a trend.

The whole point is that the Leader of the Opposition has jumped in too early. In his anxiety to have a vote in this House, he jumped in before there was an opportunity really to gauge a trend but, at this stage, the Office of Crime Statistics says that there is little evidence for a generally rising trend in the issue of notices. It goes on to say—

Mr Lewis interjecting:

The Hon. D.J. HOPGOOD: The honourable member will be able to read it for himself when he has this report in his hot little hands. The report states:

> In the past decade, figures for minor drug offences have tended to rise from year to year, despite a fall in some figures in the year 1985-86: the first full year of operation of the Controlled Substances Act.

The report then continues to mention some very interesting things. At this stage I do not want to detain members any longer. It is unfortunate that we cannot have a vote on this matter. I seek leave to table this document.

The SPEAKER: The Minister does not require leave; he has the ministerial prerogative to do so.

The Hon. D.J. HOPGOOD: I seek leave to continue my remarks later.

Leave granted; debate adjourned.

WINE AND CITRUS TAX

The Hon. P.B. ARNOLD: I move:

> That this House condemns the Hawke Government for destroying the viability of the wine and citrus juice industries by the irresponsible introduction of an unsustainable level of taxation which has caused a significant fall in sales and resultant hardship for growers and, therefore, this House demands that the Federal Government abolish the citrus juice tax and reduce the wine tax to 10 per cent forthwith.

The Hawke Government came to power on a promise that was clearly made in this State by the Prime Minister that no tax would be imposed on the wine industry by a Labor Government. Since that time we have seen not only the introduction of a wine tax but also we have seen it increase from 10 per cent to 20 per cent; a citrus juice tax imposed on the citrus juice industry; and Federal Government maintaining outrageous level of taxation (or excise) on the brandy industry, and it continues to increase virtually year by year.

The effect on the wine industry and grape growers can clearly be seen from the submission that was made to the Federal Government by the Wine and Brandy Co-op Producers Association when it made the point that the doubling of the tax in 1986 had created an immediate and dramatic downturn in total wine sales. The Government will end up with less revenue from its sales and income tax collection, coupled with a higher level of social welfare expenditure, if the tax remains at its present rate of 20 per cent.

Many Australian grape growers are being crippled by the present high taxation, and will be forced to fall back on social welfare. The imposition and consequent doubling of the sales tax on wine in a two year period has seriously eroded the incomes and returns of the grape growing and wine producing sectors, and the economies of the decentralised regions in which they operate. Their concern can be seen by the motion that was carried recently by members of Consolidated Cooperative Wineries at Berri. Such was the concern of growers in the South Australian Riverland that on 30 April 1987 at the Annual General Meeting of Consolidated Cooperative Wineries Limited the following motion was unanimously carried:

> The 1 100 grape grower shareholders of Consolidated Cooperative Wineries Limited cannot bear any further increase in taxation on wine, and any attempt by the Federal Government to impose further revenue raising measures on either health or equity grounds relative to other alcoholic beverages will ultimately lead to our total demise. Similarly, an across the board excise tax will single out and unfairly discriminate against the wine cask, and hence the whole of this regional economy.

That sets out the position perceived by Riverland grape growers, and the effect that it is having on their daily livelihoods. The position is also clearly set out by the Australian Wine and Brandy Producers Association when it referred to the impact on the white wine soft pack (or the bag in the box as it is often referred to). The significance of this market is that 138 million litres represents 66 per cent of the white table wine market of 209 million litres,

54 per cent of the total table wine market of 256 million litres, and 42 per cent of the total wine market of 328 million litres.

In fact, it represents 40 per cent of the 1987 vintage crush. The increase in sales tax on wine from 10 per cent to 20 per cent in the August 1986 Budget has had a negative impact on the sales of white table wines in soft packs—the major category, which represents over 42 per cent of Australian wine sales. The white wine soft pack market has already created falling growth rates throughout 1985—before the advent of the doubling of the sales tax in August 1986.

At the retail end of the wine market, during 1985 the increased competition for sales and the depressed demand saw wine products caught between a declining real price of wine and declining sales growth of wine. The increase in sales tax in 1986, which saw the retail price index price rise by 1.9 per cent and 5.5 per cent in the September and December quarters of 1986, simply accentuated and compounded the problems of the white wine soft pack market. That upward movement in the retail price of wine, particularly in the December quarter of 1986, is now, after a lagged response, having a negative impact on the sales of white table wine in soft packs in 1987. Sales of white table wine in soft packs fell by over 4 million litres, or by 7 per cent, in the five months to May 1987, compared with sales in the corresponding period of 1986.

This reduced demand for soft pack white table wine is causing increasing concern among people in the industry and, it should be noted, by the grapegrowers sector. The seriousness of the decreased demand for white table wine in soft packs should be seen against the usage of 185 000 tonnes of grapes, used for that market in the 1987 vintage. This unintentional stock build-up of over 4 million litres could well be reflected in reduced demand for grapes in the coming vintage. If that occurs, that will be a further tragedy for people, particularly in the Riverland of South Australia as well as in the other grape producing areas of this State.

Should this downturn trend continue throughout the remainder of 1987, the resulting build-up of stocks could see a further reduced demand for grapes in 1988—that will have an adverse flow-on effect to grapegrowers. The regional economies of areas such as the Riverland, the Sunraysia district and the Murrumbidgee irrigation areas are dependent, to an extent, on income received from grapes sold for the white wine soft pack market. Any reduction in demand for grapes will exacerbate the difficulties of these regional economies, and make even more likely the need for Government financial involvement to assist in improving problems caused primarily by taxation imposts. This was clearly indicated by the need for a vine pull scheme, created purely by the excessive level of taxation, which has been imposed by the Federal Government on the wine and brandy industries.

In summary, it would be fair to say that, at the time of the 1984 Federal budget, the Australian wine sales growth rate was at +5.6 per cent. As at May 1987, it had dropped to +1.2 per cent. In the five months to May 1987, total wine sales were down by −3.8 per cent, compared to the same period in 1986. May 1987 sales were down by −12.8 per cent on the May 1986 figures. White wine in soft packs, which held a 42 per cent share of the total wine sales and a 54 per cent share in the total table wine category, was subject to a contracting growth rate to May 1987 of +.9 per cent, compared to a growth rate of +9.9 per cent in August 1984.

The Federal Government had a devastating effect on the wine industry not only in South Australia but also in the whole of Australia. Its action in relation to the brandy industry has destroyed that industry over a period of time and its action in continuing to increase the level of excise on brandy is absolutely astounding. I refer to an *Advertiser* report of Thursday 2 April headed 'Canberra Crippling Brandy Industry', which states:

> The Federal Government was crippling the brandy industry with 'unrealistically high' excise and taxation charges on brandy, the producer of one of Australia's best-selling brandies said yesterday. The Managing Director of the South Australian company Angove's Pty Ltd, Mr John Angove ... [said] ... the brandy produced from the average tonne of grapes sold for $3 315. Of that, the Federal Government took $2 500, the producer $640 and the grower $175.

I just make the point once again: for every tonne of grapes that goes into brandy production in Australia, the Federal Government claims $2 500, yet at the same time growers are lucky to get $175 a tonne. In 1980-81 the Federal Government received more than $39 million in total revenue from Australian brandy sales. In 1985-86 that level was reduced to just under $37 million.

It is interesting, if we index those figures, to note evidence of the effect of over-taxing a product; it is clearly shown in relation to the revenue obtained from increases in excise on Australian brandy. The revenue raised from brandy excise in 1985-86 was less in actual dollars than that raised in 1980-81. The effect is even more pronounced when the actual dollars are converted into constant terms, as follows: in 1974-75 the Government would have received, in 1980-81 dollar terms, $44.9 million, yet in 1980-81 it received $39.1 million and in 1985-86 it received $24.8 million in excise.

Effectively, in the past 10 years the Federal Government has halved its revenue from the excise on Australian brandy. It has virtually destroyed the industry and put thousands of people out of work. At the same time it has halved its own income. Mr Speaker, I have a statistical chart indicating the decline of the Federal Government's income by way of brandy excise, and I seek leave to have it inserted in *Hansard.*

Leave granted.

Excise Collected on Australian Brandy

Year	Excise rate (at end of year) $ per lal	Total revenue (absolute terms) $'000	Total revenue (real terms *(a)*) $'000
1972-73	3.08	11 588	28 058
1973-74	6.00	17 366	37 186
1974-75	8.95	24 471	44 901
1975-76	10.21	26 289	42 746
1976-77	10.21	28 122	40 117
1977-78	10.21	29 051	37 824
1978-79	18.75	38 362	46 219
1979-80	16.00	37 510	41 039
1980-81	16.00	39 191	39 191
1981-82	16.00	37 501	33 968
1982-83	16.00	35 566	28 392
1983-84	16.69	34 541	26 247
1984-85	17.82	35 733	26 044
1985-86	19.30	36 956	24 853

(a) in 1980-81 dollars, using the CPI.
Source: ABS.

The Hon. P.B. ARNOLD: To summarise what I have just been saying about the effect of the brandy excise over this period of time, Australian brandy production in 1985-86 was 1.255 million lals, the lowest for 33 years. Australian brandy clearances in 1985-86 were 1.997 million lals, the lowest for 27 years. Clearances in the 12 months to April 1987 fell by −6.3 per cent compared to the corresponding period ending April 1986. The April 1987 clearances were down by −20 per cent on April 1986. Australian brandy

held in bond of 7.81 million lals is the lowest level held for 30 years.

The excise on Australian brandy held at $3.08 per litre for seven years to 1973. Excise then rose progressively to $16.69. From February 1984 the rate has increased through automatic indexation to $21.19, and a rise of $4.50 in the three years to February 1987 represents an increase of 27 per cent. High excise rates and the introduction of automatic indexation have been the principal factors for the decline in brandy clearances. Consumers are now paying up to 70 per cent of the retail price in excise and Government charges. What is more, imported brandy now holds a 27 per cent share of the total Australian market. So, we have seen the Australian market decline enormously. We have seen the Federal Government's income from brandy excise halved over a 10-year period and, of the brandy being sold in Australia today, 27 per cent comes from overseas. It is an imported product and many of the producers in Australia have not only grapes but brandy making equipment lying idle while this is occurring.

I now move on to the Federal Government's action in relation to the sales tax on the citrus juice industry. First, I refer to an article in the *Murray Pioneer* of Tuesday 12 May 1987 headed 'Sales tax must go—Wood'. It states:

> The only money making body in the citrus industry is the Federal Government according to Berrivale Orchards chief executive. Mr Peter Wood, and he says the sales tax must go. Mr Wood said the new '10 per cent juice tax' would collect about $35 million from citrus beverages, which was $70 for every tonne processed. 'It's intolerable that the Government, with absolutely no financial commitment or investment risk can make $70 a tonne profit while those in the industry, the growers, processors and juice manufacturers invest the capital, take the risks and work hard for no reward.'

That clearly indicates the effect that the Federal Government's action has had. I also refer to an article in the *Advertiser* of Wednesday 13 May 1987 headed 'Citrus industry faces collapse'. It states:

> Australia's $400 million citrus industry faces collapse unless the Federal Government withdraws its 10 per cent sales tax on citrus beverages.

This situation is highlighted in a submission that was made recently to the Federal Government and the Minister for Primary Industry by the Australian Citrus Industry Council. In that submission, the council stated:

> The Government's decision to impose a 10 per cent sales tax on fruit juice products containing not less than 25 per cent Australian fruit juice has hit the citrus industry at a time when it is already reeling from the collapse of world orange juice prices and an overall decline in grower and processor incomes.
>
> In a highly competitive and depressed beverage market, attempts by the industry to include the cost of the tax in the retail price have resulted in a dramatic slump in sales volume. Therefore, juice manufacturers have so far been forced to absorb the tax into their cost pricing structure estimated to cost the industry about $33 million in a full year.
>
> This added industry cost is being reflected in continuing low returns to growers and other sectors of the industry, with dire economic consequences for the industry in its efforts to recover from the disastrous situation of last year. Manufacturing companies are reporting a necessity to reduce their employment levels because of the reduction in sales and income. The major citrus juice manufacturer, Berrivale Orchards Ltd, has recently been forced to stand down 50 employees in a period which is normally a busy part of the season.
>
> Of major concern to the industry has been the fact that the 1986 decision imposed a sales tax on 100 per cent fruit juices and concentrates. These products are recognised by all Australians as foods with significant nutrition and vitamin benefits. The industry considers they are in the same category as plain milk and should not have been singled out as a taxable commodity. They bear no direct relationship to carbonated soft drinks and mineral waters, which in many cases, might only contain a maximum of 5 per cent Australian fruit juice.

The Citrus Industry Council requested that, in view of the serious economic effects of the August 1986 sales tax decision, the Federal Government restore all fruit juice products to the sales tax exemption list, which was the position prior to August 1986. How on earth can we stand by and watch an industry foundering under an impost of $33 million? The growers are going broke. The Government readily acknowledges that the cost of production is in excess of $100 per tonne, and the figures I will give the House indicate what the growers are receiving in their returns.

In 1983-84, growers received $155 per tonne for Valencia oranges that were processed for juice. In 1984-85 they received $159; 1985-86, $156; and in 1986-87, as a result of the Federal Government tax on the citrus industry, $105. The drop was from $156 to $105. The situation for the growers of navel oranges that are used in juice production is much worse. In 1983-84, growers received $130 per tonne; in 1984-85, $138; 1985-86, $143; and, in 1986-87, $65. As I said, everyone is aware that the cost of production is well in excess of $100 per tonne. While growers receive $65 per tonne, the Federal Government is reaping something like $70 per tonne from the industry and the growers.

To make it quite clear that the figure of $33 million has not been pulled out of the air by the citrus industry, I will provide some more figures. Approximately 310 000 tonnes of fruit used in juice, representing 155 million litres of juice, is taxed by the Government at 9c per litre, and equates to $13.95 million. Approximately 140 000 tonnes of fruit, representing 75 million litres, is used for drinks and is taxed at the rate of 22c per litre, which equates to $15.4 million. A further 30 000 tonnes of citrus fruit, representing 15 million litres of juice, is used for cordials and is taxed at the rate of 26c per litre, which equates to $3.9 million.

That gives a total of 480 000 tonnes of citrus being used in citrus juice and juice drinks, with a total sales tax of $33.25 million. That is an absolutely unsustainable situation. The growers and the industry concerned are going broke and, unless the Federal Government acts to relieve the growers and the industry from this impost, the economy and the living standards of all concerned will decline dramatically. I commend the motion to the House and I anticipate total support from the members of the House of Assembly.

Mr LEWIS secured the adjournment of the debate.

STATE TRANSPORT AUTHORITY ACT AMENDMENT BILL (No. 2)

Mr INGERSON (Bragg) obtained leave and introduced a Bill for an Act to amend the State Transport Authority Act 1974. Read a first time.

Mr INGERSON: I move:

That this Bill be now read a second time.

This amending Bill is introduced today because of the concern expressed to me by many South Australians about strikes in the public transport system of our city. They believe that the consumers who are using our public transport system, which is controlled and managed by the State Transport Authority, need to be protected from unreasonable behaviour by union leaders. The community believes that when unions and their members are in a monopoly position and are involved in an essential service, as they are when employed by the State Transport Authority, they should be required to undertake special procedures before they strike. The travelling public are fed up with being stranded by public transport strikes called without warning.

The Liberal Party, in moving these amendments, believes that the public should be given more consideration. I would like to quote from a couple of letters written to the Editor of the *Advertiser*. The first is dated 1 August and states:

I am writing to protest about the state of Adelaide's public transport. The problems, past or present, that cause these disruptions are the problems of the STA and for Mr Keneally, the Minister of Transport—the problem should not have to affect the public. Public transport should be just that—public transport. The problems should be sorted out without delays to the public.

Then it goes on to talk about the part-time problems of the individual. The second letter from which I would like to quote is dated 17 July and states:

I am writing concerning the appalling situation with STA employees. I run a husband-and-wife hairdressing salon in the city and over the past couple of years the STA drivers have cost me a lot of money. I rely on the STA transport to come to work, and after I find my own way to work, when there is a strike, I lose up to 80 per cent of my business through people not coming into the city.

We are only a very small business and we live from week to week. Some of the stirrers who work for the STA should come out into the real world to try to make a living.

As members of this House would know, these two examples of letters to the Editor, published in the *Advertiser*, are examples of many from which I could have chosen, whereby members of the public are expressing their concern regarding public transport strikes.

There have been numerous strikes in the past five years that have disrupted the public transport system. We believe that these procedures, if adopted, will alleviate the public's concern and still enable the union members to strike, as is their right, if it is the last resort. We do not attempt to take away the right of the employed person to withdraw labour by striking, but we seek purely to set specific rules that should apply to all essential public services, such as our public transport system, before this course of action can take place. I will now quote from several newspaper articles to support my comments in relation to strikes. I refer to an article of 21 June 1985 with the headline 'Some southern buses will stop running', as follows:

All bus services from the southern suburbs which normally would arrive in the city at 8.30 a.m. today will be halted for about three hours when the drivers of the STA Lonsdale depot stop work.

That was an inconvenience for the public. An article of 16 December 1985 headed 'Bus-tram halt hits thousands' states:

Adelaide buses and trams will not start running before late this afternoon. More than 900 striking drivers will meet this morning to decide whether to follow the union recommendation to return to work.

An article in the *Advertiser* of 18 December 1985 with the headline 'Bus strikers join official opening' states:

Striking Elizabeth bus drivers mingling with politicians, STA officials and guests added a note of incongruity to the official opening yesterday of Salisbury's new $1.8 million rail/bus exchange. The strike, which will continue indefinitely, has stopped all bus services between the city of Salisbury, Elizabeth and Para Hills.

On 17 December an article mentioned that the union had warned that more bus and train strikes were likely. An article of 16 December 1986, with the headline 'Traffic chaos as buses stop', states:

Adelaide's bus and tram system ground to a halt today as the city's 1 500 drivers went on strike and held a mass stop work meeting at the Morphettville Racecourse. Thousands of workers were forced to find alternative transport, and Christmas shoppers, schoolchildren and sports fans were again left stranded.

On 6 May 1986 an article with the headline 'Now all buses and trams are out' states:

Adelaide people will be without buses and trams this morning following a midnight strike by all drivers last night in their roster dispute with the STA. Drivers from all STA depots will meet today when they will decide whether to continue their strike.

In an article of 7 March 1986 retailers complained about a $16 million loss because of the bus strike. On 26 May 1986 an article headed 'Drivers defiant as buses go out' stated:

Adelaide's public transport dispute is heading for a showdown as drivers defy the State Government and go ahead with a strike which has stopped all buses and trams until tomorrow.

On 21 May there was another article about the roster row and the fact that the buses would not be running. On 16 June 1986 an article headed 'Buses and trams will stop again tomorrow' stated:

Adelaide's buses and trams will stop tomorrow because of a roster dispute.

On 1 August 1986 an article headed 'Drivers will stop all trains again today' stated:

All suburban trains and all Australian National passenger and freight rail services across the country stopped last night as drivers went on a indefinite strike.

In February 1987 an *Advertiser* editorial headed 'Strike beyond reason' stated:

Adelaide's bus and tram drivers and their union leaders especially deserve no sympathy or support for the revived dispute with the State Transport Authority, a dispute ostensibly about roster changes but really about an unrealistic $30 wage increase. The decision to hold rolling 24-hour strikes this week has provoked an understandably angry reaction from an inconvenienced public which does not care for the wage demands and union politics which are now guiding events.

On 15 July 1987 an article stated:

Adelaide's public transport system will stop for five hours tomorrow as members of the bus, tram and train unions attend a stop work meeting at Woodville. The unions have told the STA that they have held the stop work meeting over allowances for the new ticketing system.

On 28 July 1987, an article referred to the most recent strike that we have had and said that it would halt all trains. The *News* of 31 July 1987 stated that there would be no weekend services. Those quotes exemplify the public concern that union officials often call out their members without consultation. I have some quotes relating to that issue. On 24 February 1987 an article in the *Advertiser* under headline 'Union yet to tell drivers of strike days' states:

Adelaide bus and tram drivers have not yet been told by their union when to hold 24 hour stoppages planned this week.

On 25 February a *News* article under the headline 'Drivers: we don't want to strike' states:

Disruptions planned to Adelaide's bus services on Friday are not backed by all members of the Australian Tramways and Motor Bus Employees Association. There are signs that the union is not reflecting the desires of many of its rank and file. None of them was convinced that stoppages were a solution to their problems. 'I don't want to go on strike,' said one of the members. 'Let's get together and work it out; otherwise the public and drivers will be losers. The only way we'll get the STA to back down is to go on strike for a week, but they know that they have got us over a barrel because we would not want to do that. We've got mortgages. Every time we go out, the STA saves money. We lost seven days last year. This dispute over rosters has been going on for five years.'

Finally, on 14 March a headline read, 'Bus drivers in move against union leaders'. The article stated:

Adelaide's bus and tram drivers have moved against the leadership of their union over its handling of the long running dispute which was resolved yesterday. The drivers made the move yesterday in a rowdy 2½ hour meeting at the St Clair Recreation Centre, Woodville, during a 5½ hour stoppage which, retailers said, had dealt a severe blow to the city's normal trading.

There we have several examples of individuals complaining about decisions being made by union officials. As well, it has often been said to me that, if all decisions by members were taken by secret ballot, many of the decisions to strike would be different.

This Bill seeks to ensure that all persons employed by the STA, whether directly or on loan from Australian National, are required to carry out the following procedures before

they can strike. First, there is a need to call a meeting and make an advertisement of such, and then to pass by secret ballot a motion to strike.

Secondly, it will be necessary to advise the STA management of the decision, and they in turn will advise the public that a bus, train and/or tram transport strike will occur within the next 48 hours. If this procedure is not complied with, under the Bill severe penalties will be imposed on the individual employee. There is evidence that the public are sick and tired of unreasonable action by transport union officials, and this Bill is an attempt to solve that problem. I seek leave to have the explanation of the clauses inserted in *Hansard* without my reading it.

Leave granted.

Explanation of Clauses

Clause 1 is formal. Clause 2 provides for a new section 28a of the principal Act. Subsection (1) provides two definitions for the purposes of the section, an 'employee' being defined as including any person who works in the public transport service provided by the authority, and a 'strike' including any cessation of work or refusal to work taken with a view to compelling the authority to accept particular terms of employment, or to accept demands made on the authority. Subsection (2) provides that an employee must not take part in a strike unless a meeting is called to consider strike action, a majority of employees at the meeting have approved the strike and the authority is given at least 48 hours notice of the strike before it commences. Subsection (3) provides for a secret ballot to be held when the vote is taken on whether or not to strike. Subsection (4) provides for the giving of notice to the authority. Subsection (5) makes it an offence for an employee to strike in contravention of the provision.

The Hon. LYNN ARNOLD secured the adjournment of the debate.

CRIMINAL LAW CONSOLIDATION ACT AMENDMENT BILL (No. 4)

Mr S.G. EVANS (Davenport) obtained leave and introduced a Bill for an Act to amend the Criminal Law Consolidation Act 1935. Read a first time.

Mr S.G. EVANS: I move:

That this Bill be now read a second time.

The purpose of this Bill is to place on the statutes a law which clearly indicates to the court and to the public that, where the most horrifying of criminal offences are committed, the court is clearly given the power to have the offender put away for the term of his or her natural life. When this Parliament repealed capital punishment from the statutes, I stated that I supported the proposition that I now place before the House. Even though I have repeated that suggestion many times over the years, there has been a reluctance by Parliament to accept the proposition. I can understand that some will argue that it costs too much to keep a criminal in prison. I admit that it is expensive, but human life and the security of the general public is also very precious and valuable.

When people drive motor vehicles and, through their own negligence, place themselves in an institution for the rest of their life as human vegetables, that also costs a lot of money. Likewise, if a misfit in society, either for big money from criminal sources or because of a personality problem, kills or carries out planned or heinous crimes against other people, we, as a Parliament, need to give the courts a clear understanding that they can remove that person from society for all time without their being put to death. I am satisfied that if a referendum was held on this issue there would be overwhelming support for it.

I point out that it is still up to the courts whether or not they apply this penalty. We are here not interfering with the decision-making process of the courts. Once a court has made an order in conformity with this section, then that individual knows they are going to be held in Her Majesty's prison for the term of their life unless subsequently it can be shown that those who made the judgment of finding the person guilty were incorrect or that a resolution supported by both Houses of Parliament agrees to that person's release.

I accept the argument that a court could, at present, sentence a person to the term of their natural life but parole provisions and the power of a Government, through the Governor, to give a pardon is not conclusive enough. The public are crying out for us to give an expression of their concern to the courts. We can do that through this Bill without interfering with the courts' independence: surely, that is our duty.

We need not give such criminals all the luxuries that other offenders receive. The argument for supplying the luxuries to other prisoners is, in the main, that it helps them in preparation for moving back into society. The 'term of natural life' prisoners should only be given the bare essentials to live and could be kept in a separate and more easily secured area than other prisoners which would decrease the cost of their retention. Also, the courts will, if this Bill passes, be fully aware that the power for the Governor to issue a pardon is removed, but Parliament only will have the power to release a person convicted and sentenced under this provision, except for normal rights of appeal.

Of course, I was disappointed that Parliament rejected a similar Bill I introduced last year. But I do accept the argument that one member put to me, namely, that we must leave at least some chance of pardon or we could be encouraging more murders. For example, if a person convicted under this provision did find a way to break out with nothing to lose, then they would take action to kill anyone that got in their way. The chances are small, but I admit the risk would be there. Therefore, I have used the provision Western Australia is reported as supporting, that is, giving Parliament the opportunity to give a pardon.

I recognise that the independent member for Semaphore raised this matter in the press and said that he was interested in introducing a Bill as mine now provides, that is, that Parliament have a say on whether or not a person is to be released. It is an excellent provision and one that I had not thought of. Western Australia is reported to be looking at it but has not yet introduced the Bill, although I believe that that will occur. I give the member for Semaphore the credit for seeing the benefit of that provision and the benefit of bringing in the type of Bill that I have now introduced.

This provision will prevent a weak-kneed Government of the future requesting the Governor to use the prerogative of issuing a pardon. It is interesting to note that up until the 1970s it was quite common for the legal eagles to defend their clients and claim insanity. Of course, they had some success in having people placed in Z block at Parkside, because that was better than a hangman's noose.

In a speech that I gave last year I referred to two men whose names I will not give now. One committed a murder in the early 1940s and served the longest period of any prisoner in the history of the State until 1978. He was the longest serving prisoner up until that time. He was released about three weeks before his death. It must have been

traumatic for him to read that other people were being released after serving only a few years when they had committed far worse crimes than his single murder on the banks of the Torrens in the early 1940s. One man killed 10 people and he was released in a very short time. Imagine how this man felt when he had had to serve a sentence of about 37 years as a consequence of committing one murder on the banks of the Torrens during war time for just a few shillings. I think that members should understand my concern about the current practice but, more particularly, they should understand the community's concern.

The other case to which I refer occurred either in 1961 or in 1962 and it involved a person who suffered shell shock in the Ukraine. Further, in various camps he suffered atrocities that we all know occurred under regimes that were not interested in humanity. Eventually, he killed two people in Australia as a result of his belief that those people were having relationships with his lady love. He is still incarcerated, because in the early 1960s he was found criminally insane. At that time the lawyers believed that it would be better to argue that he was criminally insane rather than to face the possible alternative of their client's being sentenced to hanging. In the meantime he has probably witnessed many people being released for crimes which were much worse than those committed by him and, further, which were not crimes of passion. He is still under the care and control of the mental institution and of the gaol authorities. I give that example to indicate the injustice that prevails at the moment, but society is concerned about what is happening.

Once the death penalty was removed from the statutes, the defence of insanity suddenly disappeared; in other words, murderers today appear to be saner than those in the past. In fact, society knows that that is not the case. Society understands that lawyers now avoid the insanity plea like the plague, because it is better for a criminal to receive a penalty of 20 years gaol and be released on parole in less than 10 years than to spend a lifetime in an asylum. The lawyers' advice is obvious: with remissions, good behaviour and a few public appeals through the news media every now and again, under the present practice a criminal could be released within a very short time.

I am amazed that prosecutors do not attempt to argue and to prove that some of these criminals are insane. If the prosecutors did argue to that effect, at least the offenders might be incarcerated for the rest of their lives in asylums for the criminally insane. The opportunity to argue that case is still present, but to my knowledge prosecutors have failed to do that. I have no doubt that many people who commit these atrocious crimes in fact are insane and should be incarcerated in an asylum, and that is one reason why I have introduced this Bill. I make the plea to the prosecutors to think about presenting their cases along those lines and to argue that the person who has committed the offence be found criminally insane and, as a result, that person can then be admitted to a hospital for the insane. Of course, that does not happen. I believe that, when defence lawyers avoid the plea of insanity like the plague, the prosecuting lawyers should be fighting for that verdict. I hope that somebody receives the message along these lines.

Many people have requested me to introduce a Bill to reinstate capital punishment into the statutes. I am not prepared to do that (other members may try if they like) because, in this modern day and age, it is possible for very clever and/or rich racketeers to set up other individuals in such a way that a court may find them guilty of a crime they never committed. With the death penalty applied, if it is subsequently found that a person has been wrongly adjudged, it is too late. Therefore, I am asking Parliament to support this proposition as it is the toughest penalty that can be placed on the statutes, short of capital punishment.

I realise that a large section of society will be disappointed that I am not pushing for capital punishment; nevertheless, I share their concerns and disgust at the ease with which criminals of today are released before serving, in full, the original penalties which many in the public believe are too lenient anyway. I hold the view that it would be wrong to place on the statutes a provision that makes it lawful for one group of human beings to adjudge and then direct that another human being should be legally murdered. I ask the House to support this very necessary change to the law.

Clause 1 is formal. Clause 2 inserts a new section giving the Supreme Court power to impose a sentence of imprisonment for the term of a criminal's natural life, where the court is satisfied that the offence was exceptionally serious and that the penalty is necessary in the interest of ensuring the safety of the public. Where the court makes such an order, it may not be subsequently varied or revoked, except on appeal or a resolution of both Houses of Parliament supporting the individual's release.

Mr DUIGAN secured the adjournment of the debate.

ELECTORAL ACT AMENDMENT BILL

Mr S.G. EVANS (Davenport) obtained leave and introduced a Bill for an Act to amend the Electoral Act 1934. Read a first time.

Mr S.G. EVANS: I move:

That this Bill be now read a second time.

It seeks to remove from the statutes the compulsion for people to go to a polling booth and register that they have appeared to vote at State elections. The present Act does not compel them actually to cast a vote even though, in part, it states:

> It is the duty of every elector to record his vote at each election in a district for which he is enrolled.

Of course, under the Act 'he' also means 'she'. Presently that Act provides that an elector has a duty to go to a polling booth to cast a vote. One is duty-bound by the Act to cast a vote and has a responsibility to go to a polling booth. However, we are asking electoral officers to make serious inquiries after an election if a person does not vote. We say that electors should go and vote, but the Act states:

> The Electoral Commissioner, if satisfied that the elector is dead or had a valid or sufficient reason for not voting, need not send a notice.

In other words, the Electoral Commissioner has to go through the records and find out whether, for example, an elector has died during the election campaign or since the roll was last compiled. He has to write a letter to those people who he believes are still alive asking why they did not vote. The people concerned have to write back and explain that, for example, the car broke down two kilometres from the polling booth at one minute to six and there was no time to get to the polling booth in time to cast a vote.

The Electoral Commissioner must then decide whether or not the person is telling the truth or whether to ask for a statutory declaration that that indeed was the reason for not voting. So, all this inquiry goes on, when in fact the individual might have felt that none of the candidates were worthy of representing the electorate. Why should we force people to go to vote for any one of us if they do not think we are worth voting for, if they feel that it would be of more benefit to them as individuals to go fishing or to get a good position for the day at the football? They might not

want to be humbugged into deciding what happens in this place. Should that not be their right? We might hope that people would take an interest, that their taking an interest might be better for all of us in deciding the final outcome, but why do we do that? I thought a statement made in an article that I read was very interesting. It said:

> It is evident that our representatives in Parliament, whether they belong to the Government Party or not, are impressed by the usefulness of these laws in giving people the vote. With a relatively small expenditure of energy and Party funds, they are persuaded that it suits their most sinister interest not to remove this morbid appendix from the body politic.

South Australia was one of the last States in Australia to introduce compulsory voting. That occurred in the early 1940s. There is no doubt that the politicians of the time sat around and said, 'Well, other States have got it and to compel people to go to the polling booth is a great provision, as one does not really have to show one's face much in the electorate, especially if one is in a safe seat. One does not have to worry about apathy amongst voters and one does not have to go out there and mix with the people and work with them; one can sit back and take it easy.' There is no doubt that such thoughts went through the minds of politicians at that time. That is fair enough, as it is the truth, but is that democracy? Is it democracy to force people to go to the polling booths to vote for a member for whom those people do not want to vote or to force them to go to the polling booth, while knowing that they will not register a formal vote, that they will write on the ballot paper, 'Get lost' or such like, or put a blank ballot paper in the box?

Such people may well consider that, although it might cost, say, $20 or $50 if their excuse for not voting is not accepted, they will take the risk, because they have no respect for Parliament, parliamentarians, government, or whatever. That should be a judgment for the individual to make. Notwithstanding that, I do not condone it: I would hope that we could encourage everyone to vote, but we cannot do so, not even by compulsion. Thus, as a Parliament I think we should remove this compulsory aspect pertaining to so-called democracy.

In the speech that I made last year on this same subject (*Hansard*, 21 August 1986, page 533), I referred to the number of informal House of Assembly votes lodged in the past. For the 1979 election, 34 114 informal votes were cast. This figure applies to informal votes and does not relate to the people who failed to turn up to vote. In 1982 there were 46 888 informal votes lodged, and in 1985 there were 29 287. The actual non-votes—the people who failed to go along and vote—for 1979 was 57 506. For 1982 it was 59 457 and for 1985 it was 59 218. The Electoral Department sent out (and this is an interesting aspect that I will not debate today, nor did I last year) 30 000 'please explain' notices in 1985, whereas 59 218 did not vote. One has to ask who were the other 29 000 to whom the department decided not to send 'please explain' notices. They have not been revealed to me. This shows that there is some discretionary power that is readily used, although I am not saying that it is improperly used. In 1979, 1 100 people were summonsed and brought to court because they did not think any candidate was worth voting for or because they thought that the system was not worth supporting.

In 1982 no-one was summonsed, although 8 000 expiation notices were sent out (these are the notices sent out after the 'please explain' notices). Those 8 000 notices went out saying 'Cough up or else', but no-one was summonsed. I am advised that that occurred because an electoral redistribution was going on and the department was too busy to send out the summonses. Further, six months had expired, which was the time limit within which summonses could be issued. None were sent and, of course, those people were lucky, and were not found to be criminals: they were just forgotten.

It is easy for Parliamentarians to support a law requiring people to vote for candidates and all that that implies. Even if they do not believe that we represent them well or are worth supporting, we require them to make that trip to the polling booth. Sometimes people are not even in the country; they are overseas and must contact Australia House or another embassy to meet their voting requirements. Other people might be in the outback where communications are difficult. We admit that now through the Government's provision of mobile polling booths, but still people have to go out of their way in order to cast a vote. I doubt that any of us condone that as a fair and just procedure.

I spoke on this matter for a long while last year, and that speech is available to members to read if they wish. I know that some members will not have a bar of voluntary voting. Indeed, they claim that they would like to introduce compulsory voting for council elections (and do away with a little more of democracy). Those people will turn a blind eye to my proposition: they might not even bother to read what I said last year or this year. I accept that as parliamentary procedure by members on all sides of politics. That is even my situation when my view differs from that of someone else, and that is understood.

However, if we put this issue to referendum, the vast majority of South Australians would vote for it, and we all know that. Members here claim to represent the people and implement changes that they would like, except in regard to the abolition of taxation, which is not possible. However, voluntary voting is possible, and people in the community would hope that we implement it. We are elected to consider such measures. We are elected to do what we can for our electors, but when we are elected do we consider them? Do we make decisions for our own ease or do we leave legislation on the statute book as in the case of compulsory voting?

Voluntary voting is Liberal Party policy, and has been so for many years. I accept that, respect it and support it. I know that the Hon. Trevor Griffin introduced a similar Bill in another place last year and used a more detailed argument than I have used. I am assured that he will do the same this year, and I hope that the other place at least initially would pass it. I know what will come about. I know that the will of the people in the end will win—there is no doubt about that. I know the forces that try to stop the will from coming into practice, or fight it for as long as they can, provided they think they can win the election. But when the pressures become so great that they think they might lose the election, they might accept the will of the people. I believe that the next election will be the telling one.

I accept that in this place, while the ALP socialist views prevail, compulsion is essential, whether it be within unions or in voting generally. While those views are held and this Governemnt is in power, I know I cannot get the legislation through: I understand that. It is understood by the community, most probably, but when it becomes an overriding issue in the community especially if a political Party in Opposition is clever enough to tie it to the compulsory issue in unionism, I believe that the present Government knows that its members in the swinging seats will start saying to their colleagues, 'Hey, we have a problem. We are in trouble. The Libs and those so-called conservative forces like Evans are on a winner.'

I believe that that will come about, so I keep fighting the cause knowing that in the end, as with the other matters for which I have fought, including the Ombudsman and

drinking laws involving under-18s and so on, I will win. Governments at some time have to do an about face and say, 'We will do it now.' The news media will blow the record up and say the Government has done a great job but, while it involves only an individual, they see it as of no consequence. That is understood and acceptable: that is part of what our society is about.

In explaining the operations of the Bill and what it will achieve, all I need to say is that it merely removes that section which makes it compulsory for people to go to a polling booth, where the Act provides also that they shall carry out a duty to vote. I think it is a priviledge to vote and we should leave it that way. I think it is a moral duty, but Parliaments cannot impose laws on moral issues on society, nor should they. As much as I believe it is a moral duty to vote, I do not belive it should be a legal obligation. I ask members to support the Bill.

Mr DUIGAN secured the adjournment of the debate.

BRIDGEWATER TRANSPORT SERVICES

Mr S. G. EVANS (Davenport): I move:

That in the opinion of this House the Government has ignored the transport needs of many disadvantaged people and everyday commuters with its decision to remove STA public transport from Bridgewater and other Hills residential areas.

It is obvious that I will not be able to complete this matter today, but I will make some comments that I believe are important for the Government to consider. Following its decision—which I hope will be reversed, but at the moment it is a decision—to close the Belair to Bridgwater rail service, I want ALP members to understand that the residents of Bridgewater have had a public transport system provided by the State since the 1880s, and it has never failed except for an odd strike, a breakdown or bushfire. It has always been there. Almost 100 years after the service was provided, the Minister and those who support him have decided that they will take away that service. It has also been decided that the State Transport Authority bus service will not be extended 2.5 kilometres to serve the community of Bridgewater, a community which, in the majority of elections since the railways began, has supported the Australian Labor Party, not the Liberal Party or the Country Party.

A subdivision at the little settlement of Upper Sturt Estate, which is now referred to as Crafers West, was agreed to by all the authorities because its location adjacent to the railway station was convenient for the people who would live there. The estate began in the early 1870s in the days when the railway workers were there and when the school was built in preparation for the railway line. The settlement has grown gradually over time on the tiny allotments. Some are too small. It is difficult to build a house on the allotments which, in some cases, have been aggregated, and it is absolutely tortuous country to walk out of to get anywhere near Crafers or another transport route; yet the Government wants to take away the railway service. Some of the people are aged, and some members of this Parliament could not walk from that settlement to where the STA bus is now directed. I defy them to walk the distance and up the incline. If every member of this Parliament went up there, excluding those who are injured or suffering from some ailment, I am sure that some would not make it. However, despite that sort of country, the Government has said that it will not leave the railway service there.

The people of the area admit that the State Transport Authority has a loss factor. That is understood and acknowledged. That debt must be reduced. But, if the off-peak service is taken away, the Government will hear very few objections. If one service down and one back is provided on Sundays and Saturdays and if three services down and three back are provided during the week, the STA will cater for the workers, the shoppers and the school children and it will not incur a loss of $500 000 in that process. The loss is not anywhere near that amount; it would be less than $100 000.

I heard the member for Bright say yesterday that he was thrilled to have the new 3 000 class cars in his area. He is also thrilled about all the new car parks that have been built along the southern railway line. Of course he is thrilled. That is a swinging seat and both major political Parties like to win it and hold it, but does that mean that people in the Hills are denied the basics of transport? The reply will come back that the Government has provided a bus route on the Upper Sturt Road. I would like some members to ride that bus and experience some of the fears that school children have because it is a tortuous route. It was a bullock wagon track that was upgraded a bit in 1942 by the defence forces to run the troops through to Woodside. That is the only upgrading that has taken place on that road in more than 47 years. The two main hills—Peterson's Hill and Foote's Hill—are very steep. It is terrible country. The buses carry 30 students, sometimes more, standing on the steps or in the aisles and not wearing seat belts.

The bus does not even pick up some of them. It can't carry them; it leaves them on the side of the road in some of the most inclement weather that we suffer in this State, yet there is no expression of concern. If we say, 'Put on another bus,' the expense would be the same as if we continued running the three trains and cut out all the others. The Hills people offer the challenge: why do we still run those poorly patronised services to such places as Salisbury, Elizabeth or Noarlunga to the south or the O-Bahn to the north-east, when only a few people use them late at night? We understand that there are swinging seats in these areas, but do we have to play politics to the nth degree?

Take, for example, the situation of a man living at Heathfield. He bought his house (he is confined to a wheelchair), he is a member of a service club, and he found that he could go from his house to the railway station, a distance of 200 metres, manoeuvre himself onto the platform and onto the train, and in that way he could communicate and lead as normal a life as possible. Suddenly the Government says, 'You're finished.' He can't get his wheelchair onto a bus; he can't drive; he can't get to the city; he can't get anywhere. He becomes a total burden on society and becomes depressed. It is easy to say to him, 'Sell up and shift and do all the necessary modifications to a new home to suit yourself,' when he had thought that he could depend on a rail service. He was given that guarantee in 1985.

The aged will also be affected. There is the example of the lady in Bridgewater (and the member for Heysen would know about her) who cannot drive. There is no public transport service there at all. There is a private transport service. I have expressed these concerns in the strongest terms and I know that the member for Heysen supports me; he has proposed a similar motion. I seek leave to continue my remarks later.

Leave granted; debate adjourned.

SOUTH AUSTRALIAN FILM CORPORATION

Mr HAMILTON (Albert Park): I move:

That this House congratulate the South Australian Film Corporation board directors, Managing Director Mr John Morris, administration and staff for their ongoing contribution to the film

industry and the economy of South Australia and, further, this House congratulates the corporation on its success at the 1987 Moscow Film Festival with the film *Playing Beatie Bow* being voted as the 'Most Exciting Children's Film'.

It is with a great deal of pleasure that I recognise—and I believe this Parliament recognises—the fantastic and energetic contribution that the South Australian Film Corporation has made to the South Australian economy. It should not be forgotten that the SAFC has also gained recognition overseas for its contribution to the film industry. This has resulted in a greater awareness not only of our expertise in this field, but also in the making of millions of people in the Western world more aware of the tourist attractions that we have in this country. For example, I would like to quote from an article in *Time* magazine of 28 September 1981 under the title 'Movie boom from down under'. It quotes at length the number of films that have been made in Australia and, of course, mention is made of *Breaker Morant, Gallipoli* and many other films that were made in this country, and specifically in South Australia.

Before moving to the thrust of this motion, I believe it is important that the Parliament and the people of South Australia be reminded of the history and the formation of the South Australian Film Corporation. I seek leave to continue my remarks later.

Leave granted; debate adjourned.

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

PETITION: NURIOOTPA MOTOR REGISTRATION BRANCH

A petition signed by 3 150 residents of South Australia praying that the House urge the Minister of Transport to reject any proposal to close the Motor Registration Division office at Nuriootpa was presented by Dr Eastick.

Petition received.

QUESTION TIME

DRUGS

Mr OLSEN: Has the Minister of Emergency Services been briefed by the Police Commissioner on a report that the Commissioner has received from the Australian Bureau of Criminal Intelligence? The report refers to Adelaide and surrounding districts as being as important as Griffith in a nationwide network of families involved in drug trafficking; makes a direct connection between some of these families and political lobbying in South Australia; and, in this respect, alleges that these families dictate how some people should vote, with the leader of one such family having promised votes to a politician. If the Minister has been so briefed by the Police Commissioner on this matter, what further police investigations have been made based on the report and, in particular, have any prosecutions been launched as a result?

The Hon. D.J. HOPGOOD: In the form in which the honourable member has asked the question, I will reply 'No'. As Minister in charge of police, I have, of course, had a number of briefings from the ABCI concerning drug related crime and its incidence in various parts of Australia and South Australia. I have indicated my willingness to cooperate in any way on any information made available, as have the Commissioner and the Police Department generally. I do not think that I am at liberty to talk about the contents of those briefings, nor indeed has the Leader asked me to.

I simply say that, in relation to the specific matters that he has raised, I have not had a briefing in relation to what has been reported. I will certainly arrange for that to happen, and I will convey to the Leader the information that I think is appropriate. If the Leader is prepared to receive the information on a confidential basis, that makes things a little easier in terms of dealing with some of those matters that relate to police investigations and our desire that the information not be made public because to do so would be to tip off people who might be on the list for possible arrest. I make that offer to the Leader and no doubt we can discuss it privately. However, the reply to the question he asks is 'No. I have received no such briefing.'

NORTH ITALY TOURIST OFFICE

Mr GROOM: Will the Minister of Transport ask his colleague, the Minister of Tourism to consider establishing a South Australian tourist bureau office in northern Italy?

Members interjecting:

Mr GROOM: If that is the way you think—

The SPEAKER: Order! Interjections are out of order, and the honourable member for Hartley should resist the temptation to respond to them.

Mr GROOM: I will, Mr Speaker. The main thrust of the Australian Tourist Commission appears to be based in Frankfurt and London, and the only parts of Australia that appear to be publicised in Italy, through limited package tours, are Queensland, New South Wales and the Northern Territory. Last year South Australia gained through the migration program from the migration of a family from northern Italy. That family brought with them entrepreneurial skills to South Australia. Whilst in Italy last year, I assisted to gain the approval of that application and visited a family in Genoa, where I saw at first hand the potential for stronger tourist links between northern Italy and this State. Most Italian tourists find their way to the United States, South America, Africa, the Caribbean, and South-East Asia. The family to whom I have referred has already established a travel business in South Australia and is establishing other business here unrelated to travel.

Already this group has established links with several Italian operators of travel such as the Australia Travel Bureau in Rome, the Avoimar Travel Service in Genoa and Milan, and the Kaleidoscope Travel Service also based in Milan. Italy has a population of about 60 million people, and the establishment of the South Australian bureau office or indeed, the appointment of official representatives in northern Italy would give South Australia an advantage in attracting tourists from this relatively wealthy sector of Italy and, indeed, from adjacent parts of Europe.

The Hon. B.C. Eastick: You can't keep the Motor Registration Division office open at Nuriootpa, let alone open a tourist office in Italy!

Mr GROOM: Don't worry, Bruce—

The SPEAKER: Order! First, the interjection from the member for Light was out of order. It was also out of order for the member for Hartley to refer to the member, in response to the interjection, by other than the member's district.

Mr GROOM: Thank you, Mr Speaker. At present I am told that there is not enough South Australian presence in northern Italy to compete effectively for tourists. A South Australian tourist bureau office would provide the necessary focus and, having attracted to South Australia through the business migration program, the necessary entrepreneurial skills and talents, we should build on this to promote South Australia as an excitingly different holiday destination.

The Hon. G.F. KENEALLY: I would be very happy to refer the honourable member's question to my colleague the Minister of Tourism in another place, and would be delighted to convey to her the very well argued case that he makes for a presence of the South Australian Tourist Bureau in northern Italy. I expect that such a request would be given due consideration. Tourism is certainly a growing and important part of the South Australian economy, and potential exists to attract more people from Europe, the United States, and Japan to South Australia. South Australia is a multi-cultural society and the Italian component is a large and very important sector.

The Italian community in South Australia has made a significant contribution to the growth of this State. There are strong family and cultural links between South Australia and Italy, particularly northern Italy. As such I am sure potential exists to increase tourism from Italy to South Australia. I believe that significant work has been done by the Tourist Bureau, particularly in Milan and other cities of Italy as well as other key areas in Europe generally. I will be happy to refer the honourable member's question to my colleague the Minister of Tourism for her consideration.

DRUGS

The Hon. E.R. GOLDSWORTHY: Will the Minister of Emergency Services advise whether briefings he has had with the Police Commissioner indicate that a serious drug problem exists in Adelaide and South Australia and, if so, is it comparable with the problem that exists in Griffith? I do not expect the Minister to give confidential information, but the point made in the Leader's question was that the report suggests a problem, and that Adelaide was comparable with Griffith. Have the Minister's briefings indicated that fact?

The Hon. D.J. HOPGOOD: In terms of being comparable in degree of severity, I would have to say, 'No'. On the other hand, I would have to say that little doubt exists that there are links between the production of illicit drugs in this State and criminal syndicates. That is well known throughout all the police forces of the Commonwealth. We are not unique in that fact—it exists in every State. Again, I make the point that, if one wants to make any sort of comparison, to the extent that any comparison is valid it does not occur to the same extent here as it does in that unfortunate part of the continent.

ISLAND SEAWAY

Mr De LAINE: Will the Minister of Marine advise of the progress being made with construction of the *Troubridge* replacement vessel *Island Seaway*.

The Hon. R.K. ABBOTT: The new ferry, the *Island Seaway*, was launched at Eglo Engineering on Saturday 30 June on the new ship lift that cost $7.4 million. Some delays have been encountered with the construction timetable; I am sure that all members would agree that the weather has not been ideal for painting the vessel, and that is the major portion of the remaining work. However, the vessel will be built in accordance with the estimated cost. The incline test, the preparatory load test and the wharf trials have all been successfully completed and it is hoped that sea trials will commence tomorrow. The *Island Seaway* will be named officially by the Premier's wife on Wednesday next and the new ferry should be handed over by the end of this month.

DRUGS

The Hon. D.C. WOTTON: My question is directed to the Minister of Emergency Services. What action has been taken to ensure that ongoing police drug investigations are not compromised by the arrest of a senior officer on serious drug offences? The arrest of this officer and a suppression order on the publication of his name have raised serious public concern. I understand that one reason the Government applied to the courts for a lifting of the suppression order was the fact that its continuation will discourage people who may be able to assist in drug inquiries from coming forward.

In addition, drug investigations often have to rely on informants who seek assurances that their identity will remain confidential, and there is concern that allegations of police corruption may jeopardise this confidentiality and cut off sources of information to the police. This has particular relevance to the Operation NOAH exercise, which has bipartisan support and which, according to the Government's announcement yesterday, is to be held again this year. The question is asked in the hope that the Government can give assurances which will assist in ensuring that the exercise is a success again this year.

The Hon. D.J. HOPGOOD: I thank the honourable member for his sincerely put question, but it places me in somewhat of a dilemma, because I do not know how specific I can be without breaching the suppression order. At this stage all I think I can say is that people can be assured that, when they bring information forward it will be acted upon promptly and as thoroughly as possible but, if I were to embark on an exercise where I described to the honourable member the structural changes that have occurred as a result of the suspension of a particular individual, I would be sailing perilously close to inviting a guessing game as to who that individual is, or perhaps indeed even identifying that individual. There is a suppression order in force against which the Government spoke (it was certainly none of our doing, nor were we in favour of it), and there is nothing that the honourable member or I can do about it.

I thank the honourable member for giving me the opportunity of joining with him in indicating an assurance to the people of South Australia that they should continue to bring forward any suspicions or evidence that they have in relation to drug dealings.

The Hon. E.R. Goldsworthy interjecting:

The Hon. D.J. HOPGOOD: Of course. I am certainly prepared to give that assurance, but my understanding is that the honourable member suggested that I go further and indicate, if you like, the mechanics of that question or the people with whom they would be dealing. I do not think that I can do that without breaching the suppression order.

BUS TICKETS

Mr KLUNDER: Can the Minister of Transport indicate whether the two-hour transfer capacity that applies to bus tickets will apply also to the new system of multi-ride tickets?

The SPEAKER: Order! There is too much audible conversation in the Chamber.

Mr KLUNDER: I have received a letter from a constituent in which he advised that on the way to work in the morning he has to catch three buses and on the way home from work each day he has to catch two buses. He is concerned that he will have to pay a vast increase in travelling costs if the two-hour transfer period does not apply under the new system.

The Hon. G.F. KENEALLY: I can assure the honourable member—who in turn can assure his constituent—that the two-hour period that currently applies to a metropolitan transport ticket in Adelaide will apply under the new system. The fact that the honourable member has received such a query underlies the importance of the education program in which the State Transport Authority will be involved so that all citizens of Adelaide, all commuters and prospective commuters, can clearly understand this new ticketing system and what it means for them.

In addition, if the Leader of the Opposition listens to this education program it will enable him to understand more clearly what the system provides, and thus he will not go on shows like the Philip Satchell radio program as he did this morning, carrying on with this story that, if a married couple with two children want to travel into Adelaide from either the southern or northern suburbs on, as he said, a Saturday morning, the cost of fares would be $11.20. No matter how one looks at the fare system, one cannot come up with $11.20.

Quite obviously the Leader is not aware of the day trip benefit available to commuters. If a family took advantage of that, the cost of fares would be $7.20. Furthermore, if regular commuters—up to 10 times a year—bought a multi-trip ticket it would cost $7 a day, and if it was a one-off trip and a person bought the cash ticket (and this would be the worst option available, one that I think very few people would take), the cost would be $10.

The Leader of the Opposition, in going on State radio and being reported in the news items, as saying that the cost would be $11.20, quite clearly indicates that either he has misunderstood the situation, in which case he should keep informed so that he can give correct advice to the community, or that he does understand and, once again, is being mischievous with a campaign that can only affect the credibility of the STA in relation to the people of South Australia. Although we understand here that the Leader of the Opposition does not always get his sums right, he should ensure that he is perceived in the community as being someone who can get them right.

DRUGS

The Hon. B.C. EASTICK: I direct my question to the Minister of Emergency Services. Was the officer who has been charged with serious drug offences, and whose name has been suppressed privy to confidential information about police drug informants and, if so, what action has been taken to protect the anonymity of those informants? I ask this question because of the information put to the Opposition that police operations resulted in this officer being the sole custodian of the names of all police drug informants.

The Hon. D.J. HOPGOOD: I cannot answer that question—

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order!

The Hon. D.J. HOPGOOD: —for the reason that I found myself in the difficult situation in relation to the previous question to which I was asked to respond. It seems to me that the Opposition is embarking on some sort of adventure as to speculation as to who the person might be—and I think that that is improper. Whatever we may think of the suppression order, the fact is that it is there and it would be quite irresponsible of me to say anything that might identify the individual concerned.

All I say to the honourable member is that I have discussed with the Commissioner the matter of protection of both individuals and material that may be brought forward which could have any bearing on any drug prosecution, and he has given me assurances that we have put things in place in such a way that in fact people are protected and that people who have brought forward information are also protected. I do not think that I can go any further without playing the game that the member for Light seems to be inviting me to play—which would be for me to thumb my nose at a suppression order.

PUBLIC HOSPITAL PROCEDURES

Mr M.J. EVANS: I direct my question to the Minister of Transport, representing the Minister of Health. Will the Minister investigate recent changes in the procedures of some public hospitals concerning the supply of drugs to outpatients attending hospital clinics which have had the effect of seriously disadvantaging patients with long-term illnesses? I have been approached by a patient at the rheumatology department of the Queen Elizabeth Hospital. The patient concerned has a long-term illness with respect to arthritis and is an invalid pensioner. He requires a continuous supply of the drug Capadex which used to be provided for three months at a time. In May this year the hospital changed the practice to limit that supply to a month at a time. Accordingly, patients requiring ongoing supplies of such drugs must return each month for additional supplies.

I am further advised that this change was instituted by a number of public hospitals at that time but that it does not follow any change of Government policy but rather as a result of management practices to reduce drug inventories. For chronic patients this has resulted in more frequent trips to the clinics for no medically required purpose. I must emphasise that this matter is not limited to the Queen Elizabeth Hospital. I use that hospital only as an example.

The Hon. G.F. KENEALLY: I thank the honourable member for his question. It is an important one, and I will refer it to my colleague the Minister of Health for his investigation and for his reply. I just want to assure the honourable member and other members here that the Minister of Health and the Government are anxious at all times to ensure that no patient is disadvantaged, let alone those people with long-term illnesses. So, I will be pleased to refer that question to my colleague and bring back an appropriate reply.

SUPPRESSION ORDERS

Mr OSWALD: Does not the Minister of Emergency Services agree that the limitations which are placed upon him, and which he admitted in answer to the member for Heyson, in explaining what procedures have been taken to ensure that police drug investigations are not compromised by the arrest of a senior police officer on serious drug offences, show that this particular suppression order is an example of what the Attorney-General yesterday called 'the excessive use and inconsistency of court suppression orders' and, if so, does the Government intend to take further action in a higher court to have the order lifted?

The Hon. D.J. HOPGOOD: We have always been clear on the fact that we are concerned about the excessive use of suppression orders. As to any particular matters which might arise out of this case, I am prepared to take it up again with the Attorney-General. I know that the Attorney has looked at the matter fairly carefully. The honourable member has indicated to the House the attitude that the

Attorney took yesterday, but just how far members of this Parliament can push the thing as opposed to the rights of the judiciary is another matter. I am prepared to take it further with the Attorney. I will be guided by his advice as to what should be open to us. This Government is by no means coy about its unease concerning the over-use of suppression orders, and believe, there are instances to which we can point.

MILNE ROAD INTERSECTION

Mr GREGORY: Is the Minister of Transport able to advise the House when the Highways Department will commence work on the rebuilding and installation of traffic lights at the intersection of Milne, Reservoir and Ladywood Roads? This intersection has caused considerable frustration to motorists using it. In the past, the Highways Department has indicated that work will start, but it has not. Currently survey pegs are at this intersection and it appears that work may be imminent.

The Hon. G.F. KENEALLY: The honourable member has raised this matter with me on a number of occasions in this place, and I have been able to tell him that while the Highways Department and the Government are committed to the installation of lights at this intersection, I was not able to give him a definite starting date. In fact, I think on two occasions when I indicated that work would start on a certain date, it did not.

Today I am pleased to be able to tell the honourable member that work will start next week. I am sure that he and his constituents and those who use the intersection will be pleased to know that. I am unable to say what day next week work will start. However, he can be assured that it will start next week. If it does not, I expect that he will remind me of that. On this occasion, the forecasts are more accurate than they have been on the two previous occasions.

DRUGS

Mr MEIER: Can the Deputy Premier guarantee past informants that their security is assured in view of the fact that the senior police officer who was arrested was reported to be the sole custodian of the register of informants?

The SPEAKER: Order! The question seems to be very close in content to one asked previously, but I will accept it.

The Hon. D.J. HOPGOOD: I refuse to comment on the explanation because its content verges on the same area that was canvassed by other members opposite, but as a question, I can say that so far as it is humanly possible to make guarantees of safety to informants those guarantees can be made.

GOVERNMENT PRINTING DIVISION

Mr FERGUSON: Can the Minister of Transport, in his capacity as Minister in charge of services and supply, explain to members what plans the Government has for the future of the Government Printing Division? Yesterday, in answer to a question from the member for Mitcham, the Minister of Transport said that a major internal review into the operations of the Government Printer was under way. It has been put to me by people working in the industry that the content of the honourable member's question was the same as that of questions asked in this House for at least 30 years. Members of the printing industry have said to me that every time it is announced that new machinery will be installed at the Government Printing Division, people in private enterprise jump up and down. Figures provided to me indicate that the amount of work that has been contracted out to private enterprise by the Government Printer has increased—not decreased—as modern machinery has been put in at the Government Printing Division.

Mr S.J. BAKER: On a point of order, Mr Speaker, I comment on two aspects of the honourable member's question. First, because he was formerly involved in the printing industry, it seems to me that there is a conflict of interest. More importantly, the contribution contains comment.

The SPEAKER: Order! At the moment that the member for Mitcham rose to his feet, the Chair was about to draw the attention of the member for Henley Beach to the second point raised by the member for Mitcham. Although the concluding remarks of the member for Henley Beach were in order, the remarks immediately preceding them seemed to be the honourable member's point of view expressed by the artifice of attributing them to a member of the public. I call the honourable Minister to reply.

The Hon. G.F. KENEALLY: I welcome the question from the honourable member, because it gives me an opportunity to reaffirm the Government's commitment to the Government Printing Division, which I did not do sufficiently yesterday when I answered the question of the member for Mitcham. I was interested in the point of order of the member for Mitcham to which your attention, Sir, was drawn when he said that, as a person formerly involved in the printing industry, the member for Henley Beach might have a conflict of interest in asking a question about printing. Does that mean that if a member of Parliament happens to be a farmer he cannot ask questions about agriculture, or that if he is an economist he cannot ask questions about the economy? That seems to be strange logic indeed.

It is important that I reinforce the Government's commitment to the role and authority of the Government Printing Division. Every member knows that the division must operate as a viable manufacturing organisation, and balance its books each financial year. In this regard, I am happy to say that that break-even situation has been reached in each of the past 10 years and that, over that period, the division has been able to meet its charter. I believe that it is important for people, especially those working in the Government Printing Division, to know of the Government's commitment to the division's activity, and that its charter has been met.

In asking the question (and this also appears in the question that has been placed on notice by the Leader of the Opposition) the honourable member suggests that the Government Printer has purchased new and expensive technologically advanced printing equipment. However, members should note that the major purchase by the Government Printing Division in 1986-87 involved $851 000, all of which was approved by the Government Printing Board of Review. The Government Printer is considering new technology, because his division is required to compete effectively within the printing industry if it is to fulfil its charter to the Government.

The honourable member referred to a multi-colour press. In 1979, the Government bought such a press, and its purchase was supported by Mr Price, President of PATEFA, who was also Chairman of the Government Printing Studies Steering Committee. Mr Price was Managing Director of Griffin Press. As that multi-coloured press, which has been in place since 1979, is no longer doing the work required of it, the Government Printer is investigating whether or

not a similar piece of machinery should be purchased to replace the existing press, which has reached the end of its useful commercial life. As I pointed out yesterday concerning the future role of the Government Printing Board of Review, the board has not met this year, one reason being that I have asked it not to meet, and also it has not had any agenda items to discuss. When the Government Printer review has been completed, I shall consider the future of the Government Printing Board of Review, its new structure, its new terms of reference, and its membership.

DRUGS

Mr S.J. BAKER: Can the Premier confirm a report in the *Sunday Mail* of 24 May this year that Federal investigators had questioned a senior South Australian State politician on drug related conspiracy allegations?

The SPEAKER: Order! Has the honourable member completed his question? I was about to draw to his attention the fact that he was asking for a reply to a question based on a newspaper report. Will the honourable member approach the Chair with his question so that it can be asked again in another form?

MOTOR CYCLE LAMPS

Mr RANN: Will the Minister of Transport ask his recently appointed federal counterparts to request changes to Australian design regulations to ensure that new motor cycles are required to have daytime running lamps, as is the case in North America where daytime running lamps are compulsory for motor cycles in order to improve road safety?

It has been put to me that research in this State has shown that novice motor cyclists have a 20 times greater risk of being injured in an accident than do car drivers. The same survey also found that even experienced motor cyclists have a five times greater risk of injury in an accident than do car drivers. Two key factors in the variation between car drivers and motor cyclists are that riders are less protected and motor cycles less conspicuous. Experience overseas shows that daytime driving lights would substantially reduce this risk by making motor cycles more detectable.

The Hon. G.F. KENEALLY: I commend the honourable member for his continued interest in and concern for road safety in South Australia: his question today is another indication of that. Conspicuity of motor cycles is a problem on South Australian roads. Information available to me would indicate that motor cyclists are more conspicuous if the cycle headlights are on. I am aware that the Australian Transport Advisory Council endorsed a refined motor cycle safety package in June 1985 in which it supported the fitting of daytime running lights to motor cycles. The Vehicles Standards Advisory Committee has subsequently placed on its work program the development of an Australian design rule for new motor cycles based on modified turn indicators.

I have asked the Road Safety Division to conduct research during 1987-88 to determine the likely improvement in conspicuity that will result from the use of daytime running lights on motor cycles. To directly answer the honourable member's question, I will take up the matter with my new Federal colleagues, and the matter is likely to be placed on the ATAC agenda for the next meeting of Ministers. The honourable member has again raised a very important issue, which may, if the research available to me is accurate (as I believe it is), provide safer travel for motor cyclists.

DRUGS

Mr S.J. BAKER: Is the Premier aware of a report in the *Sunday Mail* of 24 May this year that the Federal Police Force has questioned a senior South Australian State politician on drug related conspiracy allegations? What action has been taken on this matter?

The Hon. J.C. BANNON: I certainly read that report. I made inquiries and the report was incorrect.

EMERGENCY MEDICAL SERVICES

Mr GUNN: Will the Premier initiate a Government inquiry into emergency medical services in the north of the State? The Opposition has received further most disturbing information about the response of emergency medical services to a serious road accident near Kingoonya last Saturday that cause us to repeat our call for this inquiry. Two men were injured in the accident, one sustaining severe head and spinal injuries. The Royal Flying Doctor Service at the Port Augusta hospital was called, but advised that it could not attend this accident.

The hospital advised the St John Ambulance at Whyalla of the accident but, for some reason, did not ask the St John plane to attend. Instead, the seriously injured man was transported to Port Augusta by the Woomera St John Road Ambulance. During the journey, which took more than six hours, the ambulance had a blow-out. The jack of the ambulance then failed, and the vehicle had to be rocked to remove the wheel—a vehicle which, I emphasise, was carrying a man with severe spinal injuries. At all times while this was occurring, the St John plane was available at Whyalla, only 30 nautical miles south of the accident scene, and could have been immediately called in to assist.

There are airstrips at Glendambo, Kingoonya, Coondambo and Woomera on which this plane could have landed to pick up the man. He could have been in Adelaide within two hours at the most. Instead, after finally being transferred from the Woomera ambulance to a plane at Port Augusta, he reached Adelaide almost 12 hours after the accident. Concern in the area at this breakdown in communications over the availability of emergency services, which apparently originated at the Port Augusta hospital, will see a public meeting held tomorrow at Glendambo. Those attending would be reassured by an indication from the Premier this afternoon that the Government will inquire into this matter.

The Hon. G.F. KENEALLY: As the Minister representing the Minister of Health in another place, I will take this question on behalf of the Government. The Government and the Minister of Health are very concerned about the circumstances that the honourable member has outlined to the House today. I think that one component in that whole incident that has not been fully explained relates to the fact that apparently some doctors, who may otherwise have gone to assist the two injured young people near Glendambo, would not go because of some industrial disputation that they believed they had with the Government. That, as well as the other circumstances outlined by the honourable member, was reported in the press.

The Minister of Health is looking very closely into this incident, because there are some very important issues at stake—important not only to the honourable member's constituents, who in the main live in the isolated parts of South Australia and who have an understandable requirement to believe in the reliability of the medical services that should be available to them, whether by way of St John Ambulance

or the Flying Doctor, but also to the rest of the people in South Australia who need to be reassured that medical practitioners who are available will attend to urgent accidents, such as this one. The fact that it took so long for those young people, particularly the person who sustained serious injury, to receive medical attention is a matter about which we all should be concerned. I can assure the honourable member—so that he can assure his constituents at Glendambo tomorrow night—that this matter is being taken very seriously by the Government and an investigation is being undertaken.

PARLIAMENTARY EDUCATION OFFICER

Mr DUIGAN: My question is to you, Sir, as Speaker. Are you able to provide the House with any information about the appointment of an education officer at Parliament House to assist as a liaison officer between schools, members of Parliament and other staff and to provide an in-service development program for teachers using Parliament House? Are you, Mr Speaker, able to indicate what, if any, progress has been made on the proposal to have prepared and published by the Joint Parliamentary Service Committee a flow-chart indicating the process by which a proposal is translated into law?

The SPEAKER: I thank the honourable member for Adelaide for drawing this question to my notice shortly before the House sat this afternoon. I have already had discussions on this subject with the Director of Old Parliament House (Dr Brian Crozier) and also made representations to the Minister of Education. I am sure that both of them will consider the points raised yesterday by the member for Adelaide in his contribution on this subject. Apart from the need for Parliament to have an education officer to assist in conducting some tours by the public, in liaising with Old Parliament House and in preparing educational materials for visitors (perhaps to include having the current leaflets reprinted at a more suitable reading level), an education officer could coordinate activities to mark the centenary, two years from now, of this House of Assembly Chamber, which was opened on 6 June 1889 after a ceremony on the previous day (5 June). Coincidentally, to the very same day, that date marks the fiftieth anniversary of the opening of the new Legislative Council Chamber at a ceremony on 5 June 1939.

Mr Oswald interjecting:

The SPEAKER: As was pointed out by that out-of-order interjection, as well as marking the birthday of the member for Morphett, that date in 1989 marks the centenary of the House of Assembly and the fiftieth anniversary of the Legislative Council Chamber, and those events will be celebrated on the same day.

As most of the Parliaments in the Commonwealth have educational videotapes to illustrate the procedures and traditions of their Parliaments, it would be appropriate for a videotape to be produced for use in schools, with the assistance of an education officer, to mark that occasion. Also, to mark the occasion it would be appropriate to produce a text on the history and traditions of the Parliament building. I trust that the Minister of Education and Cabinet will give careful consideration to the proposals of the honourable member for Adelaide in the context of general budgetary restraints, and perhaps an additional education officer could be shared with Old Parliament House for much of the period leading up to the 1989 centenary of the House of Assembly Chamber.

HOUSING TRUST TENANTS

Mr BECKER: Has the Minister of Housing and Construction formed a working party to make recommendations to the Government to deal with neighbourhood disruption and violence involving Housing Trust tenants and, if so, what recommendations has the working party made? In February this year I raised publicly the problem of the appalling vandalism of some Housing Trust homes. This issue was again taken up last evening by the *State Affair* television program. Over the past four years the Housing Trust maintenance bill has more than doubled: in the latest published figures it is now $44.5 million a year. There have been disturbing signs that a lot of maintenance work is required because of vandalism. I understand that, following the statements I made publicly in February, the General Manager of the Housing Trust recommended that the Minister should establish a working party, comprising senior Government officers with responsibility for law enforcement, health and community welfare, to formulate responses to this serious and growing problem.

The Hon. T.H. HEMMINGS: I thank the honourable member for the question. Before I give the answer, I want to make one thing perfectly clear. Although I do not think that the member for Hanson intended in his question to say that neighbourhood disputes are solely the province of public sector tenants, I can assure him that, in any event, that is not the case. Notwithstanding, there are certain people in the community who say that this occurs only in the public sector housing area, where they suggest you get second class citizens, people who cannot live at peace with their neighbours. That is not the case, and I realise that the member for Hanson did not intend to portray that point of view.

Mr Becker: No.

The Hon. T.H. HEMMINGS: But let me make it perfectly clear that, as Minister of Housing and Construction—

Members interjecting:

The Hon. T.H. HEMMINGS: I thought this was a very serious matter, and I am sure that the member for Hanson realises this.

An honourable member: Answer the question.

The SPEAKER: Order!

The Hon. T.H. HEMMINGS: In considering the number of restraining orders that are issued per year in this State—I do not have the figures but I am sure that the member for Hanson can himself get those figures—it must be realised that a fair percentage of those arise from neighbourhood disputes in the private sector. This occurrence is not the sole preserve of the public sector, and that is the point I want to make clear. Some time last year the member for Hanson raised in the media the problem concerning a rather naughty trust tenant who, before he left it, severely vandalised a trust home. At the time the member for Hanson probably did not realise how well I received that piece of publicity, because I was then able to point out that people in the public sector who did that sort of thing would be pursued and would pay the full cost of repairs. I can assure the House and the member for Hanson that this has occurred in that case.

The problem that I face, as Minister responsible for the South Australian Housing Trust, is that in relation to neighbourhood disputes involving trust tenants there is sometimes a reluctance on the part of the agencies which are there to provide protection, etc, to get involved, and therefore the responsibility falls into the hands of a trust officer working in this area. This concerns me, because it goes beyond the terms of reference of the duties of such an

officer. The General Manager of the trust quite correctly provided me with a report recommending that the Government look at this problem and at the matter of coordinating the agencies involved in this area, such as the Department for Community Welfare, the South Australian Housing Trust, the Police Department and the Health Commission, with a view to considering the whcle problem of neighbourhood disputes.

I have written to the appropriate Ministers, and agreement has been reached that a working party be set up. It will look at disputes not only in the Housing Trust neighbourhood areas but throughout the Adelaide metropolitan area. The working party is still in the early stages of discussing the problems involved, but I am sure that when it comes up with recommendations embracing all parts of the South Australian community the appropriate Ministers will act upon those recommendations.

WASTE DISPOSAL

Mr ROBERTSON: Will the Minister for Environment and Planning tell the House what recent steps have been taken to establish a permanent high temperature incinerator for intractable wastes in Australia? If no definite proposals have been agreed between the States, will the Minister indicate what other alternatives exist for the safe disposal of polychlorinated biphenyls and other non-degradable toxic wastes?

The Hon. D.J. HOPGOOD: It has long been recognised by the Commonwealth and the States that such a facility is required in this country, and a series of alternatives have been considered. It is possible that this may eventually yield to high technology. For example, chemical means of breaking down the wastes have been considered but organochlorides of this type are chemically stable, hence the problem that they persist so long in the environment. Also, I am told that at this stage it would not be a commercial proposition. Biodegradation is also a possibility which apparently is prospective, but we still have some way to go with that technology.

It really gets down to high temperature incineration on sea or land. Members would be aware of the ship *Vulcanus* that comes from time to time to take such wastes out to sea where they are incinerated at very high temperatures. This country has sufficient of a build-up of organochloride wastes that we really need our own facility. Various options have been investigated. The Western Australians were very interested in the Kalgoorlie-Coolgardie area, but we as a State were not keen on that because it would have meant that the bulk of the organochloride wastes would have had to be transported across the Murray-Darling Basin, across the State to that disposal facility. An area near Broken Hill was considered, but that was rejected, and also Botany, where most of the wastes are, has been considered from time to time. Also the Melbourne Board of Works was interested in such a facility.

Late last year the then Commonwealth Minister for the Environment (Mr Cohen) had discussions with Andrew McCutcheon, the Water Resources Minister in Victoria and Bob Carr, the New South Wales Minister for Environment and Planning, as a result of which a task force has been set up to identify an appropriate site in south-eastern Australia to examine the economics of the project.

An honourable member interjecting:

The Hon. D.J. HOPGOOD: That is yet to be determined, but somewhere near the centres of population on the Sydney-Melbourne axis, and to also indicate strategies which would have to be put in place to persuade the populations of those areas that it would be a desirable thing that such a facility should be built in that area. All Governments are awaiting the outcome of that task force.

DRUGS

Mr LEWIS: My question to the Premier is somewhat supplementary to that asked by the member for Mitcham a bit earlier about the details of the article referred to by the member for Mitcham. In what detail was the report in the *Sunday Mail* of 24 May incorrect?

The SPEAKER: Order! That, as was the original question of the member for Mitcham, is asking about the accuracy of a newspaper report. If the honourable member could bring it up, we may be able to find a way to rephrase it.

CHILDHOOD SERVICES

The Hon. H. ALLISON: Can the Minister of Education say why the qualification of nursing has been specifically omitted from those qualifications listed as either acceptable or desirable in the recently released Childhood Services Office circular on staffing? A considerable number of nurses already employed by the Childhood Services Office in child-care are responsible for many children still in napkins. I am quite sure that the Minister would agree with those nurses and parents of the children in childhood services care that nursing and caring are an essential part of looking after children, particularly in the very young and tender ages. Nurses from the South-East who have inquired at my office are simply concerned that, in future, the emphasis may be placed on teaching qualifications and that the very desirable qualifications of early childhood nursing will be phased out. I seek some reassurance from the Minister.

The Hon. G.J. CRAFTER: I thank the honourable member for his question and I will undertake to get a report on the circumstances surrounding that circular to see what are its consequences. Graduates are now coming out of TAFE colleges with qualifications in child-care whereas in the past that was not the case. This profession sought those with teaching, nursing and other appropriate qualifications to occupy positions in the field of child-care and those persons have, in the main, served that profession very well. It may be that there are now more suitably qualified persons to occupy those positions and I think that the honourable member said that those qualifications were desirable, within the context of that circular. I will need to check whether that excludes persons with other qualifications, and I will bring down a report for the honourable member.

SHOPPING CENTRE FLOORS

Ms GAYLER: I direct my question to the Minister of Education, representing the Minister of Consumer Affairs. Is it possible for the Minister to investigate whether there are any Government controls or measures by which very slippery floors in major shopping centres can be rendered safe? I know of a number of instances within my electorate of constituents who have come to grief on the very slippery floors at Tea Tree Plaza. One instance resulted in a public liability claim. Repeated efforts to try to have something done so that the shiny surface of the shopping centre floor is not so dangerous for women with high heels, elderly people and staff who work there have so far come to nought.

The Hon. G.J. CRAFTER: I thank the honourable member for raising this question. It is obvious from the level of comment in the Chamber that many other members have experienced similar requests for information from their constituents or know of persons who have received an injury as a result of slipping on such surfaces in public places and shopping centres in the metropolitan area. I will be pleased to refer the matter to my colleague the Minister of Consumer Affairs and also to the Minister of Housing and Construction, to see whether this matter involves building regulations.

DRUGS

Mr LEWIS: Can the Premier say whether the involvement of a member of Parliament from South Australia, senior or otherwise, in connection with a drug offence was investigated by the police in this State during the month of May or at any other time this year?

The Hon. J.C. BANNON: This question was asked by the member for Mitcham a minute ago. He referred my attention to an article of 24 May, asked whether I had seen it (to which I said that I had), and quoted a particular passage from the article, although I cannot recall the detailed wording of it. My response to him and my response to the member for Murray-Mallee is that the suggestion that a prominent politician was under investigation by the National Crime Authority in relation to drug offences was wrong.

INTEREST RATES

Mr ROBERTSON: I address my question to the Minister of Education, representing the Minister of Corporate Affairs.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order! Not only was the interjection by the Leader of the Opposition out of order but the Chair is of the view that it came very close to constituting a less than deferential attitude towards the Chair.

Mr OLSEN: On a point of order, Mr Speaker, to explain my comment. Two important questions have been asked from this side of the House and you, Sir, took the view that those questions could not be asked until you had considered them. My point was that that gave the Premier the opportunity for long-term consideration on how to answer those questions.

The SPEAKER: Order! The honourable member for Bright may continue with his question.

Mr ROBERTSON: Can the Minister of Education, representing the Minister of Corporate Affairs, say whether building societies are obliged to indicate changes in their interest rates to the public at large and especially to depositors and borrowers? If no such legal obligation exists, will the Minister say whether or not it is the practice of building societies to disclose publicly, for the benefit of their clients, any changes in lending and borrowing rates?

The Hon. G.J. CRAFTER: I thank the honourable member for his question. The Building Societies Act does not provide for any specific notification of interest rates increases by societies registered under the Act. The rules of the specific societies also do not provide any special arrangement for the notification of increase in interest rates. The honourable member may like to take up that matter with an individual building society. The practice in this State has been that, where an interest rate is to be increased by building societies, discussions are first held with the responsible Ministers within the Government, and adequate and detailed publicity is given to any changes that may be proposed. In short, it can be confidently stated that interest rate increases in this State have received wide media publicity prior to or at the time of the interest rate increases taking effect.

The SPEAKER: Call on the business of the day.

PLANNING ACT AMENDMENT BILL (No. 2)

The Hon. D.J. HOPGOOD (Minister for Environment and Planning) obtained leave and introduced a Bill for an Act to amend the Planning Act 1982. Read a first time.

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

That this Bill be now read a second time.

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

Leave granted.

Explanation of Bill

This Bill seeks to amend the Planning Act 1982, in two respects. First, the Bill seeks to change the provisions governing the composition of the South Australian Planning Commission and the Advisory Committee on Planning. Secondly, the Bill seeks to amend the procedures for preparation of amendments to the planning policy set out in the Development Plan under the Act, in so far as the process concerns referral to the Joint Committee on Subordinate Legislation.

The Bill seeks to enlarge the Planning Commission from three members to five. The current composition of the commission has created two problems. First, a membership of three does not enable the commission to reflect a wide range of views. Debate on proposals can become restricted, particularly when one member is disqualified from participating in a debate due to having an interest in a matter. Secondly, the Act currently provides for deputies to the members of the commission. While deputy members have performed very well in their role, it is clear that these members suffer from lack of continuity, particularly when an issue has been the subject of consideration over a number of meetings.

To overcome these problems, it is proposed to abolish the concept of deputy members, and enlarge the commission from three to five, with a decision-making quorum of three. The enlarged commission will then reflect the wider background in society. Is is proposed to retain the current planning professional and local government based members, and replace the current third member with an urban development/industry/design related person, an environmental/natural resources/community facilities person, and a second planning professional, who shall act as Chairman in the absence of the appointed chairman. The commission will then have a better balance, and continuity problems will be overcome.

The Bill also inserts provisions to attach liability against members of the commission, to the Crown, where that member acted in good faith in the performance of his or her duties. This is a common provision for statutory authorities such as the commission. The Bill also amends the composition requirements of the Advisory Committee on Planning to provide that the committee must still include a member who is a planning professional, but that this need not be the Chairman of the Planning Commission.

The second area of amendment refers to the role of the Parliamentary Joint Committee on Subordinate Legislation. Section 41 of the Act currently provides that proposed supplementary development plans must be referred to the Parliamentary Joint Committee on Subordinate Legislation before they can be authorised, and provides the committee with 28 days in which to examine plans. It is now evident that this has created problems from time to time for plans given interim effect under section 43 of the Act. This section enable plans to be given interim effect during the public display and authorisation process, thus preventing proposals from undermining the intention of such plans during the display period.

The Act currently provides that such interim effect expires after 12 months. Without implying any criticism of the Joint Committee, it is clear that many plans have still been at the Joint Committee stage when the 12 month limit has neared lapsing. To ensure that such plans do not lapse in these circumstances, it is proposed that the 12 months lapsing provision not apply once a plan has completed the full display process and been referred to the Subordinate Legislation Committee. Like regulations, such plans will then remain in effect until such time as the plan is disallowed, revoked or suspended.

The provisions of the Bill are as follows: clauses 1 and 2 are formal. Clause 3 amends section 10 of the principal Act in the manner already outlined. Clause 4 amends section 11 of the principal Act so that either the Chairman or the Deputy Chairman must be present at every meeting of the commission. Clause 5 inserts an immunity provision. Clause 6 removes the requirement from section 14 that the Chairman of the commission must be the Chairman of the Advisory Committee. Clause 7 makes the other amendment already discussed.

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

MARKETING OF EGGS ACT AMENDMENT BILL

Adjourned debate on second reading.
(Continued from 13 August. Page 215.)

Mr GUNN (Eyre): Opposition members support the Marketing of Eggs Act Amendment Bill and the Egg Industry Stabilisation Act Amendment Bill, the provision of both these Bills being in line with the comments made by Opposition members in both Houses in an earlier debate on similar measures. Unfortunately, however, the Government at that time did not see the errors of its ways and did not accept the reasonable proposals put forward by the Opposition. The fact that we now have these Bills before us clearly indicates that consultation with sections of the industry can result in improvements to statutory marketing authorities that have operated for a long time and need reviewing.

The Opposition supports the concept of the orderly marketing of primary products, if the statutory bodies and marketing authorities are effective and efficient and always operate in the interests of both the primary producer and the consumer. Such organisations should be efficiently and effectively managed and have available to them all the relevant information to ensure that they continue to operate for the reasons for which they were originally established.

Both Acts to which I have referred were designed to bring stability to the egg industry, to guarantee a reasonable return to those with a large investment in the industry, and to ensure that the consumers of this State would receive a high quality product at a reasonable cost. I am happy to see that the Opposition's suggestions for improvement of this legislation have been adopted by the Government, because those suggestions were based on our discussions with the industry. First, I refer to the reduction from seven to five in the membership size of the board. I remind members that it was the Labor Party that increased the size of the Egg Board to accommodate some of its political friends. A representative of the Consumers Association was appointed to the board. That association is a pro-Labor organisation comprising no more than 250 members.

The Labor Government then appointed as a member of the board a rather odd lady, a friend of the former member for Elizabeth (Hon. Peter Duncan). What expertise she brought to the board I cannot say, but the Labor Party decided to stack the board in this way.

However, the Government has now seen the light and has reduced the number of members to five and abolished the committee of the board that previously regulated quotas. The board will now make such decisions, and it was unnecessary to have two committees. The Opposition completely supports the move to increase from 20 to 50 the minimum number of hens required before a producer must hold a licence or permit. The Opposition also supports the exemption of schools, other bodies, and people who breed bantams or other exotic or specialised breeds.

The Opposition completely supports those provisions, as it supports the new arrangement of electoral districts that provide the framework and machinery for the election of producer representatives. The new provisions will be far more satisfactory than the old, because now the United Farmers and Stockowners will nominate two board members. Certain other provisions relating to the continuation of the board have been broadened to allow all commercial producers to take part, and this is completely in line with Opposition views.

The Opposition also supports the need for a 75 per cent vote in favour of a proposal to abolish the board, and it also supports the improved auditing and financial provisions in the Bill. After all, we must ensure that Parliament and the industry are given the information to which they are entitled, and that modern auditing methods are used. It is interesting to note that the quota now is 822 891, and that the board operates on about 80 per cent of that quota with a total of 658 000 hens at any one time. The Opposition also supports the clearer definition of a hen, with the alteration from six months to 22 weeks.

The Opposition is pleased to support the legislation, because it believes that the Minister hopefully has learnt a lesson. His negotiations in dealing with industry have not been particularly successful to date, and his previous attempts to legislate in the matter of eggs was an abysmal failure. It was a course of action that entailed the Minister telling the industry but not being prepared to listen or take into account the views of those people who were to be affected. The Opposition prepared a private members Bill similar to these proposals and, if the Government had not brought the measure before the Parliament by the end of next week, we would have brought into Parliament our own private members Bill to do many things that this legislation is going to put into effect, because we want to see effective and efficient organisations operating in South Australia.

We support the concept of orderly marketing, and do not want to see a situation created where, for example, egg producers in South Australia were in jeopardy with supplies brought in from New South Wales. The community at large would want to support a well organised, efficient and productive egg industry in South Australia.

One or two matters could be improved in this legislation, and at the appropriate time I will be moving amendments that I now foreshadow dealing with the right to give the packers representation on the Egg Board and requiring the Minister to have consultation with the United Farmers and Stockowners before the Chairman is appointed. After five years operation there should be a provision similar to that now in the Samcor legislation so that the community at large can be assured that this organisation is operating efficiently. The report of that inquiry should be tabled in Parliament, so that everyone is aware of its contents. There is not much point having inquiries report to Ministers because, if they do not like the contents of a report, they do not make them available to the public. This suggestion will overcome that problem.

From my discussions in relation to this measure, the United Farmers and Stockowners have made clear to me that they support these proposals. I thank them for their cooperation and assistance during the time in which I have been involved in this matter. I received a letter from one of the packers expressing concern that they have been eliminated. That is why I will be moving one of my amendments. I know that they have been in contact with the Minister, and I will read a letter that I received yesterday. It was to the Minister dated 3 August, headed, 'Re: proposed amendments to the egg industry legislation', and states:

As previously advised, we support the general thrust of the legislation proposed by the State Government. However, we are deeply concerned about one aspect, which we believe will produce an undemocratic and potentially harmful structure for the new Egg Board. Under the proposed legislation, the United Farmers and Stockowners of South Australia Inc. will be the sole producer organisation nominating appointees to the board. The other two producer organisations will not be consulted, one of which, Red Comb, is the only egg farmer cooperative. We would respectfully point out that Red Comb has around 60 per cent of South Australia's egg producers and some 50 per cent of egg sales.

The United Farmers and Stockowners Poultry Committee consists of a majority of producer agents and thus represents only around 25 per cent to 30 per cent of eggs sold in the market place, and even less in terms of the total number of producers. The other metropolitan grading floor collects the surplus that cannot be sold by these producer agents and from the remaining members of the United Farmers and Stockowners Poultry Committee. All three are, of course, in direct competition in a very competitive industry. At times, we may be asked to provide commercially sensitive information to our competitor sitting on the board, which we would not be in a position to discuss or defend.

A controlling body on which one direct competitor has a majority is not one which will achieve harmony or progress within the industry. The proposed board composition is an inherent fault, and potentially a disastrous one. It will certainly not help to achieve the objective of lower egg prices in this State. Red Comb is in full agreement with the State Government that the egg industry requires rationalisation. It believes, furthermore, that a restructured Egg Board is the best place to initiate it.

But the Government will be missing a golden opportunity to attain a sensible and fair rationalisation if it bows to pressure from United Farmers and Stockowners, and appoints an unrespresentative board. We believe strongly that a more representative structure for the Egg Board must be devised before the draft legislation comes before State Parliament. We look forward to discussing this with you at our meeting on 18 August, when we trust we can get a conclusive response to this urgent matter.

I have read the letter into the record as I have had those concerns expressed to me in detail, and believe that, when this matter is open for debate and discussion, we must ensure that these matters are considered because the industry at large has general agreement on the provision of this legislation, which is a good thing. I would like to ensure that all sections of the industry have their views taken into account. I therefore give notice of the first amendment standing in my name, as it will overcome such concerns. I hope that the Minister will give it his consideration and support. If he cannot agree to it in this House, hopefully he will agree to it in another Chamber after he has had time to study it further.

The Egg Board of recent times has taken a number of actions that have improved the operation. It allows producers to buy their cartons direct from the manufacturer. It has taken other initiatives that were long overdue, and will allow for improvements in efficiency. Discussion is still going on within the industry on whether it is appropriate or necessary for the Egg Board to maintain its pulping facilities. This is a matter that the new board should consider, but it would have to bear in mind the need to protect the interests of growers at all times. The surplus is a problem, and the only way that it can be effectively managed is to have it pulped. The industry must give it careful consideration, but the new board should consider the matter.

In relation to the cost of eggs, I have been provided with a piece of paper giving statistics on cost of production and cost of eggs since 1983-84. It mysteriously appeared on my desk, and it is appropriate to this debate. As it is of a statistical nature, I therefore seek leave to have it incorporated in *Hansard* without my reading it.

The SPEAKER: Does the honourable member give the usual assurances?

Mr GUNN: I certainly do, Mr Speaker.

Leave granted.

SOUTH AUSTRALIAN EGG BOARD

	Operating Costs $	Egg Production (dozen)	cent rate/dozen
1983-84	5 097 207	14 913 000	34 cents
1984-85	2 920 762	13 973 000	21 cents
1985-86	3 079 874	13 020 000	23.6 cents
1986-87	2 100 000	12 966 000	16.1 cents
1987-88 (Budget)	1 300 000	12 900 000	10 cents

Mr GUNN: The table sheds some light on the present situation. I do not believe that it is necessary for me to take a great deal more time of the House, because the proposals we are discussing meet the wishes of the 380 egg producers in South Australia. Since the Minister's legislation was defeated earlier this year, it has been the subject of wide ranging debate within both the industry and the community. The measures now before the House, with one or two improvements, will put into effect the desires and aspirations of the industry, as well as being in the interests of consumers—a course of action that all members would support.

The Minister ought to learn a lesson from this exercise and, before he proceeds to attack other marketing organisations, he should have the courtesy to enter into meaningful discussions. It disturbs me that he appears to have the attitude that he knows best and to hell with everyone else. He has run second a few times in this Parliament, and will run second in this legislation. Parliament ends up wasting a lot of time debating proposals that will not see the light of day. Many of the difficulties that the Minister has run into could have been avoided if he had had better discussion with the industry involved.

Such involvement has not worried me, as it has given me an opportunity to get to know the industry better. I appreciate the members of the department who have briefed me on these matters: they have been most courteous and helpful, and I thank the Minister for making these officers available. I believe it is very important in a democratic society that the Opposition is fully aware of how legislation will operate after it is passed in Parliament. On behalf of the Opposition I support the proposal and I hope that the Minister will support these rather minor amendments which will greatly improve its operation.

The Hon. M.K. MAYES (Minister of Agriculture): I think it is important to put this matter in its political context and I refer to the previous four or five years in which this issue has been of concern to the Government and, in particular, to the former Minister who, contrary to what the member for Eyre said, on numerous occasions raised with the industry the question of addressing the overheads and the method of regulation that the Egg Board adopted under its legislation. It is important to note that in 1983 there were discussions with the industry and the board about these very points. There were numerous conferences at which the Minister floated the very concepts which were brought before Parliament in the earlier period of this Government.

Unfortunately, those proposals were not given serious consideration by the Egg Board in particular, or the industry as a whole. I think it is important to record that, prior to my appointment as Minister, and particularly as Minister of Agriculture, there were extensive discussions with the industry and with the Egg Board. Unfortunately, I do not think that they took those comments from the former Minister (Hon. Frank Blevins) seriously. Consequently, Parliament was placed in a situation where it considered the deregulation of the egg industry (and I say that in a general sense, because the Bill provided for the total deregulation of the industry) and, in my opinion (and I still stand by this opinion, as I am sure do my colleagues), that was the best way to handle the matter.

In the discussions that I have had with the United Farmers and Stockowners and other industry representatives, concern was expressed in the industry (and not necessarily by the board) as to the style of operation and perhaps the heavy-handed way in which the board sluggishly reacted to the various industry and market signals. The question of the board and its efficiency had to be addressed, and that has happened. I make it clear that in my opinion that situation has come about because of the Bill that was previously before Parliament relating to the deregulation of the industry. The message was received loud and clear that in fact there was a need for a complete review of the structure and operation of the Egg Board. Nearly three years ago the Public Service Board of South Australia conducted a review into the administration and operation of that authority and it made some severe criticisms together with some useful and constructive suggestions. However, very few of those suggestions were adopted until after the Bill for deregulation came before Parliament.

I think that the message was received loud and clear by those board members who had their heads buried firmly in the sand that their time was up and that they had to undertake a review because the attention of the public was focused on their activities. There was interest in the board's activities not only by people who were interested in seeing less regulation in the industry, but also by people who actually had been quiet supporters of the board but who were beginning to think that it was time for a review of its operation.

As a consequence of extensive discussions, initially with the United Farmers and Stockowners, this compromise proposal has been presented. I make it very clear that it is a compromise and I say again that I would prefer to see the original Bill that was before Parliament passed by Parliament. However, that is not the case. Members in another place saw fit to prevent that situation occurring, so I adopt the pragmatic position and accept this compromise, because I believe that it has had an immediate benefit for the whole industry. I believe that most people (and certainly the industry leaders) now accept that there were direct benefits of the Bill that went before Parliament in that efficiencies have been introduced into the operation of the Egg Board.

There has been a review of the board's charter and the direction in which it has been going. Of course, the consumer has benefited directly as well as, to some extent, the producer in terms of reduction in costs. There has been a reduction in the levy together with a reduction in price to the consumer. There have been some dramatic price reductions. Only a fortnight ago I recall seeing extra large eggs for sale at one cut-price supermarket for $1.59 when, in fact, prior to the introduction of the Bill I recall that one supermarket had extra large eggs for sale at a price of $2.29. That demonstrates the dramatic price reduction that has occurred as a consequence of this whole question.

I gave an assurance to the UF&S that, when the proposal to reduce the levy and price to the consumer was instituted, I would pursue, with as much vigour as possible, the aim of passing the price reduction on to the consumer and that it would benefit not just the middle men, or the handlers of the product. It is important to note that in some cases those cost reductions were not passed on and, in fact, the industry was given a week to remove old stocks at the higher price from the market shelves, but unfortunately some of the supermarkets did not play ball and they kept selling at the higher prices. In fact, a couple of supermarkets actually increased the price of eggs after the price had been reduced from the producer through to the packer. That is a rather extraordinary state of affairs and I can assure members that those concerned received a fairly sharp response from my office.

Mr Lewis: You wouldn't expect that to happen with milk, would you?

The Hon. M.K. MAYES: It is interesting to see what the UF&S has said about milk deregulation. If the member for Murray-Mallee reads this week's *Stock Journal*, he will find that a very interesting approach is advocated. That organisation advocates total deregulation of the milk industry. I would not want to depend too much on that argument, because it may come back and haunt the honourable member. He may find that he will have a few lumps in his cream. I think that the Opposition has been floating on a policy of deregulation, and we can see how much it is committed to that policy when the question of deregulation arises—it backs away as fast as it can.

I now turn to the historic development that has led to this compromise relating to the marketing of eggs and, also, the egg industry stabilisation program. In relation to the size of the board, we hope to adopt what has been adopted generally as philosophy in terms of improving the quality of board participation. It should be borne in mind that it is always difficult to find people with the range of skills and background in the industry who can contribute usefully and constructively to such an important body that has such an important role to play in the community. I believe that the proposals that have been put forward in the Bill and in the second reading explanation outline the appropriate structure of the board. The proposal involves representation from the growers, and it involves people with expertise in marketing and finance together with a consumer representative, because it is the consumers who keep the industry going at the other end by purchasing the product.

I think that balance can be achieved, and I expect that it will promote a far more efficient, vital and interested group of people, working for the betterment of the South Australian egg industry. When these Bills have been passed by Parliament I look forward to getting on with the process of appointing members to the board, and of getting nomina-

tions from the United Farmers and Stockowners for their representatives on the board.

The member for Eyre mentioned a letter that he received from Red Comb. I find his amendment concerning this matter rather interesting, as I am not sure that it covers what Red Comb has in mind. In fact, the purpose of the discussion that I had with Mr Duncan and Mr Kay the other day, as a consequence of an earlier letter forwarded to me, was to address the issue of so-called grower representation. I have looked only briefly at the honourable member's amendment. I will not endeavour to debate the matter now, but I want to record details of correspondence received from both Red Comb and the United Farmers and Stockowners with regard to this very point.

The intention of Red Comb, as I understand it, was to actually broaden the grower representation on the proposed five member board. It was the matter of the two representatives of the growers, not the other two representatives, having skills other than direct grower skills or knowledge of the industry at that level that was being addressed. I believe that that is what promoted Red Comb to raise this issue with me. I also point out that from discussions with me I believe that Red Comb supports the total deregulation of the industry, and Red Comb's reference to that is quite clear in the letter that the member for Eyre has already read into *Hansard*.

I shall read into *Hansard* the letters from Red Comb and the United Farmers and Stockowners to make clear what I have done in addressing this matter. I thank Red Comb for raising the matter with me, as it concerns something that was in the back of my mind when we were first negotiating this matter. I think this very important point is one that has been addressed by the United Farmers and Stockowners. Red Comb has concerns about the extent to which the issue has been addressed: however, I believe that the issue can be adequately addressed by means of the current texture and design of the Bill. The letter of 19 August from Red Comb Co-operative Society Limited states:

> Thank you for the cordial meeting with our Chairman, Mr Duncan, and myself yesterday. However, we wish to emphasise two of the issues raised with you during our meeting and also in our letter of 3 August 1987.
>
> First, members of our cooperative, which represents around 60 per cent of South Australia's egg producers and some 50 per cent of total egg sales, will be disfranchised under the proposed amendments which restrict egg producer representation to those appointed by nomination of the United Farmers and Stockowners of South Australia.

Red Comb is endeavouring to address the matter concerning the two producer representatives referred to in the Bill. Reference is made particularly to the nominations that I will receive from the United Farmers and Stockowners, under proposed new section 5 (1) *(a)*, and this is a very important point to raise. The letter continues as follows:

> As a result of this proposed Egg Board composition, the industry will be split and this will have a detrimental effect on all the participants in the industry as well as on consumers. Red Comb is in full agreement with the State Government that the egg industry requires rationalisation. It believes, furthermore, that a restructured Egg Board is the best place to initiate this, and we certainly look forward to the new board making a positive contribution to the sensible and rational marketing of eggs in this State.
>
> Yours faithfully,
> (Signed)
> J.H. Kay, General Manager

I have raised this issue previously with the United Farmers and Stockowners, and I have received a letter from Mr David Dean, Executive Officer of the United Farmers and Stockowners, although I am not sure whether the member for Eyre has received this letter also. I want this letter on the record as well, as I think it answers, in part, the problem, although I might point out that it does not totally satisfy Red Comb in relation to its question of disfranchisement of its representation. The letter from the United Farmers and Stockowners of 10 August states:

> Dear Mr Mayes,
>
> Thank you for your letter of 10 August regarding the selection criteria for producer members of the board on the basis of amended legislation to those Acts pertaining to the South Australian egg industry.
>
> I confirm that it is our intention to advertise extensively for candidates to be nominated as producer members of the board. Any *bona fide* commercial egg producer, United Farmers and Stockowners member or otherwise, will be entitled to put forward his name for consideration by the selection panel which will comprise United Farmers and Stockowners members.
>
> It is our intention that the selection committee will then establish a short list of possible candidates and subsequently interviews will be arranged. It was our previous understanding that two nominations would then be put forward to you for appointment. We do not believe it is necessary to broaden the scope of the short list of nominations to four.
>
> Yours sincerely,
> (Signed)
> David Dean, Executive Officer

My understanding is that the United Farmers and Stockowners is prepared to accept nominations from all egg producers, obviously as long as they can show that they are *bona fide* egg producers. I think that that gives a reasonable basis for the nominations. The advantage of this is the elimination of the process which in the past, to a large extent, has led to some of the poor practices that have been adopted, because people can, of course, make promises to colleagues. It has been suggested to me that that has occurred in the past. It is the sort of thing that causes loss of direction of the board and of the industry as a whole, causing it to become very much sectarian and perhaps a microcosm of a poorly run marketing organisation. This can happen when poor practices are adopted by a marketing organisation when it is Government run. It has, of course, all these powers vested in it from the Parliament.

So, I hope that addresses the issue that has been raised by Red Comb. I have already indicated to Red Comb that I would record in *Hansard* my clear intention to ensure that the members of the board appointed under proposed section 5 (1) *(a)* have that representation. My understanding is that, although the nominations will be put forward by the United Farmers and Stockowners, the prospective board members need not necessarily be members of the United Farmers and Stockowners; they could be *bona fide* producers who have a very sincere interest in the wellbeing of the industry.

This is an issue that I would have to take up with the United Farmers and Stockowners if questions were raised by outsiders about any of the nominations made. I make quite clear that in my opinion that would be a very proper thing for me to do, in order to avoid the very type of split that has been suggested by Red Comb. We can do without that sort of factionalism within the egg industry, because I am sure that it would not lead to a constructive and developed process by which the egg industry in this State would be helped.

Finally, I believe that we have already achieved significant cost savings, perhaps already in the order of over $700 000, which savings have been passed on to the consumer, as a result of the introduction of the deregulation Bill. That has served as the catalyst for these further compromises and improved performances. I look forward to the Egg Board improving its performance, as I think history shows that it needs to do so quite significantly.

In Committee.

Clauses 1 to 5 passed.

Clause 6—'The South Australian Egg Board.'

Mr GUNN: I move:

Page 2, after line 11—Insert new paragraph as follows:

(ba) one must be appointed to represent the interests of persons who grade eggs on behalf of the board;.

The purpose of this amendment is to allow those people who are engaged in packing and grading operations to be represented on the board and play a significant role in the industry. I therefore believe that having a broadly represented board has a great deal of merit. As the Minister is aware, I read to the House a few moments ago concerns expressed by a representative of one of the packing houses, and I believe it is appropriate at this time, whilst all measures dealing with the marketing and selling of eggs are under discussion, that this measure should be considered. I sincerely hope that the Committee will support the amendment.

The Hon. M.K. MAYES: I have indicated in my second reading explanation that we have covered the position adequately in the undertakings given by the UF&S. To add this clause will throw out of balance the arrangements negotiated with the industry. The position at the moment is probably the most desirable balance that we can achieve. From my discussions, I think Red Comb understands and probably accepts that undertaking, albeit it probably would prefer to be mentioned under section (5) (1) *(a)* to nominate one of the representatives to the board. I think that would be its preference rather than adding another provision to the clause to initiate the changes.

Mr GUNN: I hope the Minister will further consider this before the measure reaches another place, because the Opposition intends to move these amendments in the other place, where it is likely that they will be incorporated in the legislation.

Amendment negatived.

Mr GUNN: I move:

Page 2, lines 15 and 16—Leave out subsection (2) and insert the following subsection:

(2) The Minister will, after consulting the United Farmers and Stockowners of S.A. Incorporated, appoint a member of the board to precide at its meetings.

It is important that there is general agreement within the industry as to who will be Chairman of this new board. That person must have a wide range of skills, particularly in the financial area, must be completely independent, and must not be a public servant. Under the previous arrangement, the Chairman, even though he did what he believed best, was placed in the difficult situation of being also a public servant. I think it is quite improper to have a public servant as Chairman of any board.

Mr Lewis interjecting:

Mr GUNN: That is a matter that does cause concern, but we will not go into that. The Chairman should be completely independent, so that he can objectively consider all the arguments around the board table and make the right decision. The provisions of the amendment will ensure that the appointee is a person suitable to the producers at least, and probably the rest of the industry. It has been suggested to me that a person whose name has been bandied about could become Chairman. That person previously worked in the Department of Agriculture—

An honourable member: Not Mary Beasley or Sue Vardon?

Mr GUNN: They do not work for the Department of Agriculture, to my knowledge. The person concerned is now retired, but has had considerable involvement in the Public Service Association, and that would be most inappropriate. I sincerely hope that the Minister will accept my most reasonable amendment. I have had it drawn in a manner which will make it easy to accept, because I am trying to be as cooperative as possible in the spirit of agreement we have had on this measure. When I put forward these amendments, I do so with the best will in the world, because I believe they will improve the legislation, help the industry, and make life easier for the Minister. I know he has had some trouble recently in other sections of industry, and I want to assist him, so that when he appoints the board no difficulties will arise from those decisions.

The Hon. M.K. MAYES: I thank the honourable member for his concern about my well-being, but I will look after myself, thanks very much, and enjoy doing it.

Mr Gunn interjecting:

The Hon. M.K. MAYES: I am going very well, thanks very much. I am enjoying this task, Mr Chairman, and I look forward to it. The speculation by the honourable member about who should or should not be Chairman is quite extraordinary. I have made no decision, as the Bill has not been adopted by Parliament or assented to. The honourable member is deep into speculation—that is his right—and I hope he enjoys it.

The concern would be that I do not know of other areas where Ministers are restricted in appointing independent persons, and that is a charge that has often been given. Rarely have I seen it qualified. To qualify it to the extent that one section of the industry would have the ultimate say about the Chairman is quite extraordinary. Given that the member has just read a letter from Red Comb, it would seem in total contradiction with the intention he had for the previous amendment. I am sure that, if Red Comb had seen this amendment, they would probably flip off the planet.

Mr Gunn: They have seen them all.

The Hon. M.K. MAYES: I am sure I will get some communication about that. Their concern would be that their members are not being given a franchise in saying what the Minister, whether it be me or anybody else, should consider in appointmenting a Chairman. I find it extraordinary to qualify a Minister. I am not aware of any other board of this sort where such a qualification is attached to the appointment. I will be looking for a person who can conduct appropriately the board, which is established in accordance with the charter issued under the Bill to control the appropriate and efficient management of the industry. Certainly, that would be done on the basis of advice and consultation. I cannot agree to this amendment: if it will do anything, it is very limited.

A large number of interested bodies have a direct interest in this industry. One of them, Red Comb, has been referred to, and the Trades and Labor Council have an interest. Many consumers have a very great interest in who will be the Chairman. It is a process that gets endless. The charter has always been to trust the responsibility of the Minister. He then wears the responsibility if things go wrong. I oppose the amendment.

Amendment negatived.

Mr GUNN: I move:

Page 4, after line 12—Insert new section as follows:

14. (1) Every five years the Minister will appoint a suitable person to examine the degree of efficiency with which the board carries out its functions under this Act and the Egg Industry Stabilisation Act 1973.

(2) The person appointed under subsection (1) must deliver a report to the Minister on his or her findings and the Minister must, within 12 sitting days after the delivery of the report, cause a copy of the report to be laid before each House of Parliament.

This important amendment will guarantee that the public of South Australia and the Parliament are fully aware of the operations of this board. One of the difficulties members of Parliament face is a lack of information about Govern-

ment instrumentalities and departments. If these organisations have to subject themselves on a regular basis to an objective analysis, and the Parliament receives that report, the Parliament can debate and discuss those matters, and the public is aware of any shortfalls which may be in the legislation. Therefore, I believe that this is an appropriate amendment which will greatly improve the legislation. A similar provision in the Samcor legislation has operated effectively and efficiently.

The Hon. M.K. MAYES: I would have preferred more notice about this amendment, although it does not cause me any great discomfort. I would like the department to go through it in relation to its application to the Bill and I would also like advice from Crown Law. I appreciate the point made by the honourable member about the Samcor legislation. On quick reflection, I think that it is almost identical to that clause. However, there might be a different amendment concerning further review that I would like to add, and that could be achieved in the other place.

For the benefit of the Committee, I point out that the Minister of Labour told me that, if the provision is there in five years, he will want to know why. He wants to know why we will bother with a review, but it may be that we might want to have a more frequent review of the operation of the board, but that involves expense. I am not sure what the member for Elizabeth will suggest. I know that clauses concerning the review by Parliament of the operation of statutory bodies are favourites of his, and I do not disagree with that. When I first saw the amendment today, I thought that a couple of provisions could be added to improve it, but I will listen with interest to what the member for Elizabeth has to add to the debate.

Mr M.J. EVANS: I favour amendments of this kind to legislation generally and to this particular Act, which has enjoyed so much controversy in recent years about its operations. It is most appropriate and its concept has my full support. The Minister is taking the correct course in looking closely to see whether the review should be more frequent than five yearly. I commend him for that attitude and, if he finds it more covenient to consider this matter in another place, I will go along with that strategy because it would be a way of achieving the clearly expressed objective of this amendment, which is to ensure that the Parliament and the Government are fully advised on the operation of the Bill and that everyone has the opportunity to review the way in which it has worked. It cannot be predicted whether it will be here in five years time but it would be wise for members to consider the Bill in the context that it might be because, if it is, we certainly would want those provisions to be there. That is the attitude that the Parliament should adopt in considering this amendment.

Mr GUNN: I am happy to accept what the Minister has said, and I will not push the issue any further. If it suits the Minister to have a review after four years, that is fine with me. It is a principle that should be in all legislation, because Parliament passes laws and creates bodies but it does not often have the opportunity to consider them on future occasions. I am happy with the Minister's response and look forward to the deliberations in another place on this clause.

Amendment negatived; clause passed.

Remaining clauses (7 to 10) and title passed.

Bill read a third time and passed.

EGG INDUSTRY STABILISATION ACT AMENDMENT BILL

Adjourned debate on second reading.

(Continued from 13 August. Page 216.)

Mr GUNN (Eyre): The Opposition supports the Bill for the reasons outlined earlier. It is completely in line with the comments made when the matter was under discussion on an earlier occasion. The Opposition supports all the provisions of the Bill, including the limit of one person holding 50 000 quotas only. The Opposition also supports all the amendments relating to the conducting of a poll and the abolition of the quota committee. In view of the preceding debate, the Opposition is happy to lend its support to this particular measure.

The Hon. M.K. MAYES (Minister of Agriculture): I thank the Opposition for its support. I will not delay the House, but I make the point that some people who keep chooks in their backyard may be interested in the amendments contained in the Bill. I am sure that the Hon. Murray Hill will be interested to know what the particular amendments contain and that the Premier will be able to declare the 19½ layers that he has in his backyard.

Mr Gunn: It was a good suggestion that I put forward very early in the piece.

The Hon. M.K. MAYES: I am sure that some people will be pleased, but they must comply still with local government by-laws. After all, 50 chooks is quite a number for anyone to have in their backyard. It is quite clear from my second reading explanation that the intention of this Bill is similar to that of the Marketing of Eggs Act Amendment Bill.

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

ADJOURNMENT

The Hon. M.K. MAYES (Minister of Agriculture): I move:

That the House do now adjourn.

Mr RANN (Briggs): Last week in my Address in Reply speech I briefly mentioned a New Zealand road safety program aimed at teaching young preschool children aged 3 to 5 how to be safe near traffic. It is called the Safe Playing Club and has been developed after nearly nine years of research by road safety authorities in the United States and New Zealand. I have received numerous inquiries from constituents and others about how the program works. Mr Warwick Hawker, the New Zealand Consul and Trade Commissioner in South Australia, has very kindly supplied me with more information, which I am very happy to share with this House and members of the public.

In New Zealand, as in Australia, roads are particularly lethal for young children. Across the Tasman, at least 1 200 preschool children are hit by cars each year. One out of every five children in New Zealand is struck before the age of five. The New Zealand mortality rate is 50 per cent higher than that of United States and Britain and 150 per cent higher than in similar countries such as Sweden. The Safe Playing program is designed to make playing safely more fun than going on the road. The simple truth is that young children find playing dangerously much more fun than playing safely. The New Zealand program is designed to try to change that approach.

Mr S.J. Baker: What about Australia?

Mr RANN: If the honourable member opposite is interested in road safety, as he obviously is, he would be also interested in learning from other countries, as members of this House have found that he is from many of his trips overseas. He has picked up quite a bit of data.

The New Zealand Safe Playing Club deserves the close examination of authorities in South Australia and in other

States, simply because it works. Pilot trials in the United States of America and in New Zealand show that the safe playing program actually reduces the risk of accident by up to 90 per cent. This means that 90 per cent of the children joining the program just do not go on to the road without holding an adult's hand and obeying the safety requirements. Essentially, safe playing rests on giving praise in a structured way. Rather than smacking or threatening to smack or punish the child for playing dangerously, the reverse procedure is applied. This is achieved through modelling safe behaviour for the children and by praising and rewarding them for copying it.

Parents are taught to praise their children by simply having them read the safe playing story books to them. In those books their own child is the central character and the books also star wellknown Play School television characters, including a Humphrey Bear type named Big Ted, who teaches the children the boundaries of safe play. These include staying on the footpath or grass and always holding a grown-up's hand when crossing the road. The child answers simple questions on where it is safe to play. Praise and other rewards for giving correct answers are built into the books, and this results in the benefits of safety being felt throughout New Zealand.

All this sounds very simple, yet the design of the books is extremely complex. They are based on what researchers call 'errorless discrimination procedures'. I see the member for Heysen nodding in agreement with this approach. The younger children have to get it perfect or they will not be safe. Researchers also found that just using the child's name in the book increases the child's interest by up to 100 per cent. Questions further increase this interest and comprehension and the praise builds the children's desire to succeed. The praise is vital, especially for higher risk children who are disproportionately language-delayed in terms of their educational development.

New Zealand researchers have found that, if praise is not built into the system, the children think that they are wrong and switch off. They then tend to make up answers, and the whole program is lost on them. To interest the children in the first place, New Zealand road safety authorities have designed a book to be read at kindergartens, child-care centres, and play groups. The children then go home and want mum or dad to read them their safe playing book. They want to be safe and their parents are involved.

Books with such gripping titles as *Tricycle Smash* are also read to the children at pre-school centres. These books again are designed to model safe behaviour and must be read on a one-to-one basis. Research shows that the books alone work dramatically. The children's behaviour changes within hours, but the effects are not long term. Without positive reinforcement, the children revert within three weeks to dangerous playing and their old habits. The trick is to push parents again to praise and reward their children by giving the parents free stickers to hand to the children after observation of safe play.

The New Zealand Ministry of Transport researchers have found that the children are desperate to win these stickers. There is a whole series of stickers and, after the young children, aged three to five years, have collected the whole series, they receive a free T shirt transfer stating 'Praise me. I'm a safe player'. Instead of being told not to do something wrong, the children are rewarded for safe behaviour.

However, the program does not stop there. There is also a safe helper promotion involving comics and prizes, in order to get primary school children to read safe player books to the younger children at home. This is a smart move, because too often older children act as negative models for younger children when they go on the road. This year in New Zealand high school students are also involved in reading safe playing books at kindergartens as part of the new high school health syllabus. Curriculum material and courses stress the academic aspects involving the use of praise and rewards in applied psychology to achieve behaviour modification. High school students are also being involved, because they are disproportionately the drivers of the cars that hit preschoolers and they are also the next generation of parents.

One cannot just introduce children to the safe playing books on a short-term basis and hope that they will change their whole behaviour on the roads. The message must be constantly reinforced through rewards. That is why there is a further useful series of books. The pilot programs in three countries have shown a 90 per cent improvement. Videos are distributed throughout the country and there is enormous support from the private sector, which has donated $350 000 to the program. In addition, the Ministry of Transport has donated $300 000. So, basically, I believe that Australian authorities should carefully study how this program is working in New Zealand.

Other benefits flow from the Safe Play program. Other problems with children can be helped with the principles of the program. Parents in Tauranga, in the Bay of Plenty area in New Zealand, report that, by using these behaviour modification skills, they have been able to stop everything from nightwalking to chronic squabbling among siblings. Basically, the safe playing program is really just a cook book. It is a recipe for a healthier, happier, family. One can use the basic ingredients and adapt it to one's own needs.

For instance, the number of accidents among children in New Zealand is higher than for those of children in every other western country across every category of child accident. I am not sure why that should be the case because New Zealand prides itself on being a healthy country for young people. One thing shown by the researchers is that one can apply the principles of the safe playing program to other areas by getting rid of the aggression and the hitting. Teaching parents alternative skills and the techniques of safe playing can even stop child abuse. A gentleman by the name of Embry, a leading New Zealand researcher, points to specific instances in recent projects where children who had been severely abused can actually live safely again with their parents. The principles of safe playing have also proved powerful in promoting such things as academic achievements, productivity, personal relationships, and mental and physical health, even crime reduction.

Recent research shows that there are actually very few late bloomers in crime. Poverty and all those other variables actually account for a very small slice of the problem, so one must look further down the chain, right back to home and early life. The things that prevent children from growing into criminals are clear limit setting, rewards for accomplishment and praise to build self-esteem. It is for these reasons that I encourage the Minister of Education to consider this New Zealand safe playing program.

Mr OLSEN (Leader of the Opposition): This afternoon, I wish to make a brief contribution in this grievance debate. Earlier today, the Opposition asked a series of questions about action taken within the Police Force following charges laid against a police officer and involving serious drug offences. Opposition members asked those questions because of the public concern that has been expressed about the effect of these charges on current and future police work.

In his replies, the Minister of Emergency Services admitted that he was constrained by a suppression order as to

what he could say about this case. Opposition members understand the difficult position in which the Minister finds himself and we do not criticise him for the answers that he gave this afternoon. However, we now call on the Government to give immediate and serious consideration to appealing to the full Supreme Court to have this suppression order lifted. The public is entitled to be told what action has been taken within the Police Force, as a result of these charges, to ensure that ongoing police investigations are not compromised and that the anonymity of police informants is protected.

This afternoon, the Minister indicated that there was more that he would like to say and that he would reveal more were it not for the continuation of the suppression order. The Opposition believes that the public is entitled to know more of the circumstances in which a question mark has been left hanging above the names of all honest and diligent police officers in this State. This is not to say that the officer charged is otherwise. That officer is entitled to the presumption of innocence until the charges have been heard by the courts. Nor is it to say that there must never be suppression orders. Many factors must be taken into account, but in this case the Opposition believes that public interest must be considered.

We have fully supported police moves to rid our community of the scourge of drugs. We have given our full support to the operation NOAH exercise. Another operation is to be held later this year and we hope that it will also be a success. However, public confidence and police drug work will be enhanced if the public is able to be given some of the information that we sought this afternoon in this place. I therefore urge the Government to do all within its power to ensure that this will occur. By so doing it should seek to appeal to the full Supreme Court to have that suppression order lifted in the public interest in South Australia.

Mr HAMILTON (Albert Park): I have the unexpected opportunity to say a few words. From time to time politicians are criticised for lack of work value in the community. I certainly object in a most forceful way to that sort of comment. It is very easy to pigeonhole people in the community and this has been done unfairly of politicians, not only in this State but also throughout Australia. It is with reluctance that politicians stand up in this place or outside and say, 'I am the greatest because I do this, that, or the other'. I know from my involvement in my electorate over the years and also from other community involvement before coming into Parliament that I, like many others, contribute to the local community and do it without seeking praise for such. Many years ago I was unfortunate enough to have been born with a hole in the heart. That was fixed up back in the middle of the 1960s. As a consequence I decided upon coming down from the country to give blood on a regular basis, as do many of my colleagues on both sides of the Chamber.

That leads me to refer to the haemapheresis unit at the Queen Elizabeth Hospital. In 1986 the Minister of Health, John Cornwall, opened this unit, and I was very much taken with the work carried out in that unit. A member of my wife's family died of leukemia so I had some interest in what they were doing at the unit. Suffice to say that after the opening of this unit I spoke to a number of the staff and to one of the doctors. I told them that if my blood was worth bottling, I would be happy to make myself available at the convenience of the unit to provide platelets that it needed for those persons suffering from cancer, leukemia or similar blood disorders.

My reason for raising this matter is not to praise myself on my involvement but to invite other members of Parliament and indeed the community of South Australia to recognise the tremendous amount of work being carried out in such units as the haemapheresis unit at the Queen Elizabeth Hospital. It only takes a couple of hours, once you have been called, to place yourself at the mercy of the staff. They attach you to a machine, extract a certain amount of blood, run off the appropriate platelets, and return the blood to your body minus those platelets. After I have been there I feel a great deal of satisfaction in being able to give something back to the community in this way.

I believe that honourable members in this place may give consideration to this very worthwhile cause. It is something that I have not seen advertised or promoted in the community. We all hear about donating of blood, which is a worthwhile cause, but I believe that members may wish to inquire and find out whether they have a rare blood type that may be required by the hospitals in South Australia. On a number of occasions the hospital in question has called me and asked me to come in quickly. I obtain a great deal of personal satisfaction from it as I can assist someone in need and it is a worthy cause. Perhaps other members may wish to give it the consideration it deserves.

Another matter put to me on which I have not undertaken research but believe it is worthy of consideration by Parliament and the Minister I will now detail. On numerous occasions, particularly leading up to the summer months, we hear of people who go out fishing or go out on the water and suddenly their craft breaks down. Relatives or family become very concerned if they have not returned home before dark. As a consequence search parties are sent out and the volunteer coastguard is brought into operation, together with the police, to try to find these people out on the water.

It has been suggested that the Government should give consideration to making it compulsory for a radio beacon to be fitted to all craft that venture out into the sea or large expanses of water. It has been suggested that, with modern technology available, it should not be too hard to have a piece of such equipment made available (if it is not already available) and for it to be installed in power boats and fishing vessels. That could save not only a considerable amount of money to the State Government but also make the life of our volunteer coastal protection people a lot easier. It is a worthy request and one that should be considered.

I have noted over the years people venturing out on very calm days in kayaks, canoes, and other small craft, ignoring weather forecasts that a storm will blow up later in the day. They get caught out in the middle of nowhere and search parties are then sent out to look for them. One should not forget the question of trauma created to those people on land, particularly where someone's life is lost. I hope that the Minister will consider this matter.

Last but not least, I am sure that we have all noted reports on a number of occasions relating to people who have earthed equipment to water pipes. Some time ago a young girl, who was known to me and to the member representing that area (Hon. Gavin Keneally), was electrocuted because of a faulty electrical connection to the water pipe. I raise this matter because, when I was in New South Wales, I perused a small booklet published by the Energy Authority in that State, entitled 'Electrical Connection to Water Pipes'. I think that this booklet should be brought to the attention of the Minister of Mines and Energy. I am unaware whether we have such a booklet in South Australia, but if not I hope that the Minister will give the matter careful consideration,

because many people who do not have a right to connect electrical equipment do so anyway. Indeed, I believe that this booklet would be a distinct advantage to those people who undertake such tasks legally.

The Hon. B.C. EASTICK (Light): Earlier this afternoon I presented to the House a petition containing 3 150 signatures from persons in the catchment area of the Nuriootpa Motor Registration Division. Those signatures were collected in less than 12 days from a community that has been galvanised into action by the attempt of the present Government to remove a service that they have utilised to quite a considerable degree. I say that they have utilised it to quite a considerable degree, because my colleague the member for Bragg, when addressing this matter last evening and referring to the social and financial costs to the whole community, referred to the number of transactions that take place in that office.

In fact, he indicated that the average daily cash transactions in that branch at Nuriootpa totalled 209, which amounts to more than 50 transactions above those which take place at Port Augusta (which has 156); and it is above the figure at Kadina, but it is a little below the figures associated with Port Lincoln and Berri. Murray Bridge and Mount Gambier tend to undertake more transactions. The 3 150 signatures is only the tip of the iceberg, because already I have had delivered to me this afternoon another batch of signatures and they will be presented to this House about the middle of next week, because a number of people still are making their representations to me.

The representations relate not only to the signing of a petition but also to letters which have been forwarded to me from the District Councils of Light, Tanunda, Truro and Angaston, and I know that in each instance a copy of the letter has gone to the Premier and to the Minister of Transport indicating that those councils, the area of government responsible in the local scene, have expressed their grave concern about the Government's actions. Apart from the councils, business associations, agricultural bureaus and senior citizen clubs have taken the opportunity of bringing to the attention of Government the effect that this decision will have on that community.

Further, my colleague the member for Bragg drew to the attention of the House the fact that the three examiners associated with this service will continue to live in the Barossa Valley area and that in their employment they will be required to commute to Elizabeth. As a result of the closure of this facility there has been no reduction in staff numbers but, rather, only redeployment. Because there has been no reduction in staff, one then starts to analyse and to ask in what area of the department will there be a benefit as a result of the closure of this facility.

One could have presumed that there would be a closure and therefore no rental to pay. Earlier this afternoon I was somewhat astonished to be advised by the owner of the premises in which the Motor Registration Division has conducted its affairs that the contract for that division to trade from its premises is current until December 1989. The department is about to close down a branch and then to continue to pay the rental for almost 27 or 28 months before it is able to gain any financial benefit from that move. Where is the rationale in denying to the community a benefit that it has used which will be a cost to the department and to the rest of the community by virtue of the fact that the same number of staff will continue to be employed and the premises will continue to attract rent?

One other interesting fact that flows from this issue is that, within the metropolitan area, branches of this department have been given a respite. One only needs to look at the Messenger Press this weekend to see what has taken place in relation to Tranmere. In fact, the member for Hartley stressed the importance of retaining the Tranmere branch when he asked a question in the House yesterday. My constituents say that, if it is good enough to retain the branch at Tranmere, it is good enough for the same to apply at Nuriootpa, because that branch undertakes a service to the community and it covers a very wide area of a densely populated agricultural district. I trust that the Minister will take heed of my comments.

Motion carried.

At 4.27 p.m. the House adjourned until Tuesday 25 August at 2 p.m.