HOUSE OF ASSEMBLY

Thursday 10 September 1987

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

Mr STEELE HALL

Mr HAMILTON (Albert Park): I move:

That this House applauds the Federal Liberal Member for Boothby, Mr Steele Hall, for his exposè and frank statement that the Federal Liberal Party was guilty of trying to buy votes with its tax cut promises.

In speaking to this proposition—

Mr Lewis: This could be a double-edged sword, don't you know!

Mr HAMILTON: It may worry the member for Murray-Mallee. Of course, these are not my words about the buying of votes, but rather they are the words of Mr Steele Hall. In an article that appeared in the *Advertiser* on Monday 13 July, he stated:

However, the public had not been able to swallow the 'radical policies' of the Liberal Party. 'We set 100 hares running in 100 different directions about our intention to tear up Medicare and most people knew that our tax promises could not be delivered,' he said.

Mr Tyler interjecting:

Mr HAMILTON: A Liberal politician with integrity—and I thank the member for Fisher for his timely interjection. It is quite clear that Steele Hall knew that the Liberal Party could not deliver, and yet the Federal Opposition continued to make these promises on television, on radio and through other sections of the media. When we began to talk to people in the electorate, we discovered that the credibility gap was rather remarkable.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order! There is too much audible conversation in the Chamber. The honourable member for Albert Park.

Mr HAMILTON: Thank you, Sir. Obviously, I have touched a raw nerve of the member for Eyre, who constantly tries to shout people down in this Chamber when we hit upon something that is to his dislike. Let me remind him that I have been in this Chamber for eight years, and I am not of the mould that will be shouted down by any member of this House, including the member for Eyre, so, if he is courteous enough to allow me to continue, I would be most grateful. I know that he is eager to speak on this matter and to applaud the kind of proper statements that have been made by Mr Steele Hall. I would welcome his support for my motion.

It is also worthwhile noting that Mr Steele Hall was a leading member of the Liberals wet faction when he called for a re-examination of the Party's policies in the wake of the election loss. It is quite clear from the result that the public at large rejected overwhelmingly the policies of the Federal Liberal Opposition. The Government's majority in the House of Representatives increased from 16 to a quite handsome 24.

Mr Gunn interjecting:

Mr HAMILTON: Here we go again; the member for Eyre is trying to shout me down again.

Mr Groom: Do you think that he is a supporter of Steele Hall?

Mr HAMILTON: Yes, I understand—

The Hon. J.W. Slater: He's not wet. He's only wet behind the ears.

The SPEAKER: Order! I call the member for Gilles to order. The member for Albert Park is quite capable of making his contribution without so much assistance from the Opposition or the Government backbench.

Mr HAMILTON: I thank you, Sir, for your protection. Being of a gentle persuasion, I am not one who likes to be browbeaten by the Opposition. That protection was not afforded to Mr Steele Hall by his own people. An article in the *Advertiser* of 16 July this year under the heading 'Liberal MPs attack Hall', stated:

Prominent South Australian Liberal backbencher, Mr Hall, was castigated yesterday by two senior Opposition frontbenchers. The former South Australian Premier—

Mr Tyler: They were speaking the truth.

Mr HAMILTON: Exactly, and I thank the member for Fisher for that timely interjection. They were speaking the truth. The article continues:

The former South Australian Premier on Tuesday blamed the Liberal Party's Saturday election defeat on the conservative direction taken by its Leader, Mr Howard, and his 'faceless men'.

I seem to recall that expression being used many times in the past. The article continues:

Mr Hall said the Liberal Party was guilty of trying to buy votes with its tax-cut promises, and Mr Howard should bear responsiblity for the defeat. The Opposition spokesman on industry, technology and commerce, Senator Messner, said yesterday both parliamentary and grass-roots members of the Liberal Party were appalled by Mr Hall's outbursts.

I do not believe that to be the case. Liberal members were severely embarrassed by Mr Hall's frank and honest exposè of the Liberal Party's policies.

An honourable member interjecting:

Mr HAMILTON: I think that he is a statesman. When he was in this Chamber many years ago he proved his honesty, and it eventually brought about a reorganisation and alteration to the Electoral Act in South Australia. This is another demonstration of the man's integrity and honesty when he talks about the falseness of the Liberal Party.

An honourable member interjecting:

Mr HAMILTON: No, I am a person who always gives credit where it is due. I remind my colleague that there are many honest members in this Parliament, including me. It is clear that the policies put forward by the Howard Opposition were a recipe for disaster. They would have resulted in massive social dislocation and a rapid rundown of health and support services. This would have had a particularly severe effect on the lower income earners in South Australia and in Australia. Since then, it has been remarkable to read that the Leader of the State Opposition (John Olsen) talks about his new found concern for the socially disadvantaged in this State; yet he was a great supporter of the Howard Liberal policies. It is quite clear that he has built up this false facade to try to win votes and to try to con people who we on this side have supported strongly for so many years.

One sees in the Liberal Party's policies this shameful grope for the very sensitive hip pocket nerve. Once again, members opposite try to buy votes. I recall that prior to the recent Federal election when I had an information booth at the West Lakes shopping centre in my electorate, a number of people asked me why there was a large difference between the amount that the Labor Party was to tax salary and wage earners when the Liberal Party's policy was one of taxing people 32c in the dollar. One very astute lady said to me, 'I just don't believe that the Liberals could be so stupid.' I said, 'Why do you say that?' She said, 'I do not believe that the average person in the community is going to be conned by this 17c in the dollar differential; someone has to pay and I am of the view that the people who will pay will not

be those on higher incomes but those in the lower and middle income groups.' I support those sentiments. We on this side all recall the Liberal Party's disturbing resurrection of the tax cuts policy. I can recall vividly that in, I think, 1977 the Liberal Party had an advertisement 'A fistful of fivers'.

The Hon. J.W. Slater: A fistful of dollars, it was.

Mr HAMILTON: They were five dollar notes, I remind my colleague. I must concede that it was a very effective television advertisement, which swayed many people through the old hip pocket nerve once again. The Australian people were conned once or twice by the Liberal Party, but not a third time, and they put their dislike of that Party in a forceful way. The member for Boothby, Mr Steele-Hall, was slammed and is looked upon as a leper by his own Party.

Members should not forget that in May this year Mr Howard threatened to hack $1.5 billion in Commonwealth funding to the States. We hear cries and bleating from members opposite about what they want in terms of those vested interests, particularly from the member for Murray-Mallee, who made the inane statement the other night that child-care centres were not for the needy but for the greedy and the yuppies. If ever a statement will live to haunt the Liberal Party, it is that stupid and inane statement made by the member for Murray-Mallee who, as is well known in this Chamber, cannot be controlled by his own Party.

We hear more cries and bleatings from Opposition members that the Government should provide more and more money, yet their Federal colleagues want to hack another $1.5 billion from Commonwealth funding to the States. Had they been successful, that would have severely constrained this State in providing the very facilities that that honourable member wants for the people in his patch.

Mr Tyler interjecting:

Mr HAMILTON: I do not think they got the figures right, and the people of Australia overwhelmingly demonstrated their rejection of the Liberal Party's Federal policies at the recent election. I seek leave to continue my remarks later.

Leave granted; debate adjourned.

TAFE PRINCIPALS

Mr S.J. BAKER (Mitcham): I move:

That regulations under the Technical and Further Education Act 1976 relating to principals, leave and hours, made on 6 August and laid on the table of this House on 11 August 1987, be disallowed.

The member for Albert Park has just wasted 15 precious minutes of private members' time. I hope that we can spend the remaining time far more profitably. I make clear from the outset that debate on this issue is about one thing and one thing only—that is, the performance of the Minister and the Government. These regulations are an attempt by the Government to change the conditions of employment in a piecemeal and divisive fashion. This motion signals the Liberal Opposition's demand that the Minister and the Government act responsibly. It has been said on numerous occasions that the situation regarding TAFE working conditions has developed because the Minister, one of the more thoughtful and astute on the Government benches, has resorted to extraordinary tactics over the past two months.

I can only assume that the Minister's actions have come from either one of two sources: first, that he has been poorly advised; or, secondly, that he is trying to display some strength of leadership and purpose to his colleagues with a view to ultimate leadership of the ranks on the opposite benches. In relation to the first point, the Minister prides himself on the fact that he keeps himself well informed on matters affecting his portfolio, so he cannot tell the House that he has been poorly advised because he would have obviously taken the opportunity to flesh out the questions and get detailed answers to some of the matters that he is trying to change.

Therefore, I fall down on the second side which is that the Minister is endeavouring to display some form of leadership to his colleagues. In this regard there is no doubt that he has been an absolute and abject failure. If I am wrong in this assessment I am sure that we will hear from other members opposite when they inform this Parliament exactly where they stand on the issue of negotiations in relation to TAFE working conditions. I understand that a number of members opposite have been contacted by people in the TAFE sector who are extremely perturbed and worried about the way in which this Government is approaching the problems that it is facing.

It is worthwhile reiterating what the new terms and conditions involve. It is important that people who read *Hansard* understand that what is being changed is very significant. It is not simply a minor matter. We are changing considerably the working conditions under which TAFE staff will be operating. The new changes include: the introduction of a new tutor demonstrator classification making it harder for a promotion between lecturer levels; the introduction of a new level of part-time instructor; a reduction in annual leave entitlements of principals, vice principals and heads of school from 49 days a year to 42; the retention of 49 days leave for lecturing staff with provision that two weeks be used for professional development; a reduction of the two-step pay scale for heads of school to a single salary; and the removal of time-and-a-half off in lieu of evening work and the removal of paid meal breaks.

What we have in these regulations is a small part of a very large package. For the Minister to attempt to pass through this Parliament a very small part of that larger package is, I believe, an exercise in very poor faith given the inevitable statements from the Government, ALP and ACTU sources that employers and unions should get together and negotiate.

A further condition which affects the TAFE colleges concerns the transfer of college principals to the Government Management and Employment Act. I want to address this last issue first because, as I have said, it is part of the package that the Minister has been attempting to implement. In the process of the transfer of principals to the Government Management and Employment Act, the Minister has attempted to subvert the will of Parliament. Every member in this House would understand that we passed this new Act to streamline the procedures operating within the public sector. Among the areas that were excluded from the operations of that Act was the technical and further education sector. That was done for a very good reason, and the matter was debated in both Houses of Parliament. The Minister now says, 'I really don't care what the Parliament has said; I am going to do it my way.' Thus, in the process, he has made an absolute mockery of this Parliament; he has inferred that what happens here really does not count; he has announced to everyone that the Parliament is irrelevant. That is the first point I wish to make.

As far as the other changes are concerned, members on both sides of the House would all agree that the changes are highly significant. No member of the ALP would tolerate any private employer taking the actions that the Minister has taken in this regard. Not one member opposite would condone the wholesale change in conditions that the Minister has put up. I refer to the rhetoric that continually

comes from members opposite, to their stance on industrial relations, and to the hypocrisy of the Minister in indulging in the tactics in which he has indulged over the past two months.

The Minister has said that he has tried to negotiate: he has not tried to negotiate but has simply said, 'This is what you are going to get; I don't care what you say; this is what you are going to have to accept.' There have been no meaningful negotiations on the conditions involved. I urge any member opposite who wishes to debate the point to do so; I urge all members on the Government benches to stand up and support the Minister.

There is no doubt—and we can refer to newspaper reports—that the Minister's stance on this matter has been quite clear. He said, 'I refuse to negotiate'—and he said it on 26 July, 22 July, 16 July, 18 July, 24 July, and even on 23 July. In fact, there is a continuum of 'I refuse to negotiate—the conditions have to be accepted by TAFE personnel.' The Minister has gone outside what I (and I would presume the populace at large) have perceived as being the ALP's demands and, indeed, the union movement's demands in this area.

One of the most perturbing aspects of this case, of course, is that, in the process of trying to win public support, the Minister has denigrated the people working within TAFE. The Minister of Employment and Further Education and, indeed, the Premier have, in a number of statements commented on the lack of work effort within the TAFE sector. That was done deliberately: it was a 'divide and conquer' mechanism. The Minister was saying, 'Look, we have all these bludgers in the system, we have got to fix it up. The Minister and the Premier have done less than justice to all those very many dedicated people who work within TAFE, who work their 50 and 60 hours a week, although they may indeed have only 20 hours of contact time.

The Premier went even further. He said on the Philip Satchell program that the Government was originally demanding a full 38 hours per week contact time! That is what he said to Philip Satchell. Of course, that means that the lecturers in TAFE would have to be working the most extraordinary hours of any employee in this country—in fact, possibly in the world.

The Hon. H. Allison: Even Casanova didn't have that record.

Mr S.J. BAKER: Even Casanova did not have that record, said the member for Mount Gambier! To say that the Premier was confused is perhaps being a little kind. Perhaps he did mean that TAFE lecturers should have 38 hours a week contact time. Of course, to further the problems he created for himself the Premier also said, 'Look: some are only working 10 hours a week'. At least the Minister of Employment and Further Education gave them 15 hours a week.

I wish to bring to the attention of this House the stance of the Minister when he was in opposition. I will read to the House a number of the contributions made by the then shadow spokesman on education relating to the education sector. On page 3 309 of *Hansard* of 3 March 1982, when talking about the Keeves Committee of Inquiry, the then member for Salisbury said:

> I hope that the opinions that are being sought from the community will be given proper and due consideration. For example, the Minister indicated today that he had asked the former President of the Institute of Teachers to make known his opinions.

Now this is the crunch:

> I hope that he will indeed listen to those opinions and take serious account of them.

That was the member for Salisbury in 1982. On 11 February 1982, when he asked a question of the Minister of Education, the Hon. Harold Allison, he said:

> I am further advised that many teachers are concerned that, whilst the final report of the Keeves Committee which was handed down in this House this week recommends a reduction in the number of teachers (it spoke of the possibility of saving $50 million in the years ahead as a result of cuts in teacher numbers), there is a proposal to boost the number of administrators.

And here is the crunch:

> As one teacher told me, 'Administrators at the expense of educators'.

He was putting before the House that there was some concern about the growing number of administrators. The number of administrators under his regime has expanded enormously—and we know that, during the past 13 years, the number of head office staff has grown from 70 to 300. On 22 July 1981 the Hon. Lynn Arnold said:

> Without belabouring that point, I would remind members of the comments I made on 3 June when I spoke about the fact that the disputation that took place was, from the teachers' point of view, educationally linked. The primary concern was for the quality of education, and industrial matters had little relevance as far as the teachers themselves were concerned. That is a point which I believe has been lost sight of many times in debate over recent months.

He is saying exactly what we are saying today but, of course, things are different when one is a Minister of the Crown. On 22 July 1981, he said:

> The school assistants dispute, for all the Minister says about negotiations taking place, has been a sad and sorry story of biased negotiations or non-existent negotiations at critical times. The times when negotiations were needed they did not take place. In times they were attempting to patch up the job, I acknowledge there were some negotiations then.
>
> I also believe that the Government has misread the character of public restlessness. I believe the Government attempted to play off parents in the community against teachers over the assistants dispute. I believe the Government felt that it could have the parents say that these teachers were nothing short of bludgers who were again wasting taxpayers' money and were not concerned about their children, so they would not support them in that issue.

This is what the Minister said in 1981, and how the wheel has turned. I would like all members of TAFE to be apprised of that information, as the Minister has perpetrated a number of injustices during this whole dispute. He has excluded arbitration as a means of settling the issue, when indeed his own Party has held on to this arbitration system. He has attempted to subvert the will of Parliament by the way he is not only trying to change the conditions under the Government Management and Employment Act but also in the piecemeal way he has approached this through these regulations. He has further—and this is probably the greatest crime of all—actively promoted the idea that lecturers are bludgers. That is totally hypocritical, and the Liberal Opposition will not be part of this fiasco. If we agreed to these regulations, we would be condoning and supporting the Government and the Minister, and we are not about to do that. I commend the motion to the House.

Mr DUIGAN secured the adjournment of the debate.

SUSPENSION OF STANDING ORDERS

Mr OSWALD (Morphett): I move:

That Standing Orders be so far suspended to enable me to move forthwith to rescind an Order of the House made this day.

Motion carried.

Mr OSWALD: I move:

That the Order of the House on the question that the Notice of Motion, Other Business No. 2, be made a Notice of Motion for Thursday 22 October be rescinded.

Motion carried.

SUPREME COURT RULES

Mr BLACKER (Flinders): I move:

That the Supreme Court rules under the Administration and Probate Act 1919 relating to disclosure of assets and liabilities, made on 4 June and laid on the table of this House on 6 August 1987, be disallowed.

First, I thank the indulgence of the House for allowing this matter to be brought on. I sincerely apologise for the inconvenience that I inadvertently caused. I might add that I was less than 3 ft from the door when it clicked at the opening of Parliament and, consequently, subsequent events have made it necessary that this matter be brought on.

I am seeking the indulgence of the Government and the Opposition to have this matter dealt with today. It is important that this takes place, because the parliamentary procedure relating to amendments under the Supreme Court rules requires that they be dealt with within 36 days. It does not have the same provisions that would apply for a normal regulation where, providing that notice is given within 14 sitting days, the matter can be further adjourned until such time as the House deals with the disallowance motion.

In this instance the amendment to the Supreme Court rules was laid on the table of this House on 6 August and therefore the 36 day period will effectively expire tomorrow, 11 September. It is for that reason that I formally request the Government and the Opposition to ensure that this matter is put to a vote and effectively dealt with today. Failure to do so would indicate a reluctance on behalf of members of this House to enable the due process of Parliament, as it relates to disallowance of Supreme Court rules, to occur, and therefore prevent me as a private member from having the opportunity to express my opposition and, hopefully, the opposition of this House to these provisions. I again thank the House for its cooperation thus far.

The provisions as proposed in the Supreme Court rules ensure that not only do trustees have to list the assets of the deceased, but also they have to list the values of those assets, and in all cases provide the means by which valuation is obtained. Where land is involved a Valuer-General's valuation must be obtained. Where other assets are involved, for example, stamp collections, the name of the licensed valuer must be included in the listing. The requirement to list the assets and to place the valuations on those assets has not been a requirement since the abolition of succession duties in this State.

However, an article that appeared in *Choice* magazine in 1982 did prompt questions to be asked, and subsequent report submissions were made to the Attorney-General to have amendments made to the legislation requiring that assets and liabilities be disclosed to the court as a condition of obtaining probate or administration. The amending Act was assented to on 15 November 1984, but the operation of sections 3 and 14 was suspended until a date to be fixed by subsequent proclamation. The court rules to which I am now effectively objecting put those regulations into effect and they were to become operative as at 1 July this year.

As we all know, it was determined several years ago by both State and Federal Government bodies that there should be no death duties or succession duties payable on an estate. However, it now appears that the present Government is aiming to reintroduce death duties by the back door method of regulation. In 1984, Act No. 76 of 1984, being an Act to which I previously referred, was amended, amongst other things to include section 121a, which provides:

A person who applies for a probate or administration in respect of the estate of a deceased person shall, in accordance with the rules, disclose to the court the assets and liabilities of the deceased person known to him at the time of making application.

The Act also provides that the court shall also have the power from time to time to make such rules as the said court shall appear expedient. In the *Government Gazette* of 4 June 1987, page 1445, new amendments under the Administration of Probate Act 1919 were gazetted to take effect as of the first day of July 1987. These regulations now require that any person nominated as an executor of a deceased estate shall, when applying for a grant of probate, lodge with the application an affidavit in the Form No. 33A in the First Schedule of the regulations disclosing the assets and liabilities of the deceased person at the date of his death known to the applicant at the time of making the application. It also provides for a further form where some assets have been overlooked at the time of making that declaration.

A person involved in the administration of deceased estates has indicated to me that, in his opinion, the above requirements will cause considerable delay in the winding up of any estate, as the nominated executor would have to ascertain the whereabouts of all assets of a deceased, and then arrange for values to be ascertained of such assets before he can apply for probate.

Although the affidavit states that, 'To the best of my knowledge information and belief, the said deceased died possessed of real estate in the State of South Australia, not exceeding in value the sum of X amount of dollars and a personal estate in the said State not exceeding in value the sum of Y amount of dollars, particulars of which are disclosed in the Affidavit of Assets and Liabilities to be lodged in the application for administration in respect to the estate of the said deceased,' the manner of ascertaining such values has also to be identified and stated. In the past it was not uncommon for a grant of probate to be made within six weeks of the date of death, but, where an executor has to ascertain to the best of his knowledge the total assets of the deceased and their values, the time involved could be considerably extended.

The regulation also provided a pro forma of the statement of assets and liabilities, a copy of which is attached to the regulations for all members to see. It is my view that the next step in this saga of 'government by regulation' will be that the courts will regulate that the fees for filing an application shall be on a sliding scale calculated on the net value of the estate. At present fees are set at $54 for an estate under $10 000 and $119 where the value of the estate exceeds $10 000.

The next chronological step would be to have an increased fee for estates of $20 000, $50 000, $100 000, etc. It will therefore be a simple matter for Governments to bring in a further regulation stating that the court fees are or shall be such and such and, although it is stated to be a court fee, one can see that 'death duty' could easily be established without reference to Parliament prior to the bringing in of such a duty. Whilst it is recognised that there are technical reasons for the requirement of listing of assets for the administration of probate, I believe that there are insufficient safeguards in the rules to which we are being asked to agree to prevent a Government (either this or future Governments) from introducing succession duties or death duties at some future time without reference to Parliament.

By acceding to these court rules, Parliament will, in fact, be setting the stage for succession duties and death duties at some future time. My chief objections to these regulations

are: first, it is a backdoor method of obtaining future taxes; secondly, it will cause additional hardship on estates and beneficiaries of estates in that more professional advice and expertise will be required to be employed to ascertain, first, the assets, secondly, the value of such assets and, thirdly, that during the time of obtaining all such information and obtaining grant of probate the assets of the estate are frozen and the executors will therefore be unable to satisfactorily administer the estate in the shortest possible time.

In addition to the added costs mentioned above, there are concerns that the information could unnecessarily be made public and also that there is no known reason for the introduction of these and no such examples actually given where the requirement is necessary. Also, it is setting the stage for the implementation of a hidden tax, such as is happening with fishing licence fees, where the formula for fees has become a wealth tax in as much as it is based on a percentage of the fisherman's income. Likewise in this case, the court fees could be applied to be based on the percentage of the assets of the estate and therefore, effectively, be estate duties.

From my reading of the regulations I do not believe that sufficient justification is given for requirements of this kind, and the concerns of the courts could well be better preserved in other ways without formally setting a stage for a future succession duty or death duty. I call on all members of the House to reject these regulations, as it is the only means that is available for me to make a protest against these imposts. As an Opposition backbencher I do not have the ability to amend the court rules. I can only move that they be disallowed and humbly request that more appropriate rules with greater safeguards for future generations be enacted in their place. I call on the House to support me in the disallowance of these court rules.

Ms GAYLER (Newland): I rise to oppose the motion for disallowance. I believe that the honourable member has misconstrued the purpose and effect of the Supreme Court rules. Provision was made in 1984 amendments to the Administration and Probate Act for rules of court to deal with the disclosure of assets and liabilities of deceased estates. The object of the 1984 amendments and the rules of court is to ensure the assets and liabilities of a deceased estate to be lodged with applications for probate or administration. This information will then be available from the court to those persons who can show a legitimate interest in the contents of the estate, for example, beneficiaries, auditors and those who may have a claim under the Inheritance Family Provision Act and others.

In the past this need was met by the non-contentious probate rules which, prior to 1977, required the applicant for a grant of representation to swear to the gross value of the estate left by the deceased in South Australia, and to set forth briefly particulars of the assets in an inventory annexed to the oath; and prior to the abolition of succession duties an audit of the assets of all deceased persons was made and interested persons could inspect the succession duties statements.

The need for disclosure is unfortunately not limited to the provision of information to persons with a legitimate interest, but it is also neccessary to protect the estate and the beneficiaries from any lack of disclosure by a person who may have an inclination towards misappropriating estate assets. Mandatory disclosure on the part of the personal representative of the assets and liabilities in a deceased estate will greatly discourage fraud and greatly assist in the discovery of fraud when in occurs. The need for such provisions was pointed out in 1982 by a report in *Choice* magazine. The report states:

> The abolition of probate duties in Queensland and of succession duties in South Australia has created a potential risk of theft from deceased estates. Before these duties were abolished the executor or administrator of an estate had to file a list of a testator's total assets with the appropriate duty collecting authority. A grant of probate could not be issued until all duties were paid.
>
> But with the abolition of these duties an executor in Queensland and South Australia no longer has to provide a detailed list of assets to obtain a grant of probate. Therefore, there is no official record of a testator's estate.
>
> Now an executor has control of the estate without anyone else having full knowledge of what it contains. A less-than-honest, or inept, executor could neglect to distribute all assets to the beneficiaries. He or she could even keep the whole estate if, for example, a testator lived alone and had left the estate to beneficiaries in another State or overseas.
>
> Similarly, a parent appointed as trustee of a deceased spouses's estate could take all the money and the children would know nothing about it.

The report, which went on to explain other disadvantages, concluded:

> So far no problems appear to have occurred in Queensland or South Australia. It would be difficult to tell when they had. But Queenslanders and South Australians should be particularly careful in choosing executors and trustees in whom they have complete faith.

In 1983, Mrs Mary Bleechmore, a solicitor appointed to manage the practice of Mr B. Hunter, a former Adelaide solicitor, wrote to the Attorney-General in these terms:

> My experience in winding up Mr Hunter's practice has given me knowledge of the dangerous hiatus in the South Australian law concerning the administration of deceased estates, brought about by the abolition of estate duty by the Australian Government and of succession duty by the South Australian Government.
>
> The present position is that the personal representative, in obtaining a grant of probate and in administering and distributing an estate, has no obligation to submit a list of the assets and liabilities of the estate.
>
> The result is that no one perusing an estate file is able to say, with certainty, whether all the assets of the estate have been disclosed by the executor and distributed. In Mr Hunter's case he was executor of some estates, either solely or with an executor who left the administration entirely to Mr Hunter. Even in estates where Mr Hunter was not executor, frequently he had had the conduct of the deceased's affairs prior to death and continued to administer them without any interference by the executors.
>
> In this climate it is only too easy for a personal representative or an estate's solicitor to exclude some of the deceased's property from the distribution of the estate. I am writing to you to suggest that the Administration and Probate Act 1919 should be amended so as to require an inventory of the assets and liabilities of the estate to be lodged with the application for grant of probate.

Mrs Bleechmore concluded that her experience led her to regard the matter as urgent. Later in 1983, in response to concerns expressed, the judges of the Supreme Court presented the Attorney-General with a paper suggesting that the Administration and Probate Act be amended to require such an inventory. This was done in legislative form in 1984. The rules of court giving effect to the amendments have been prepared by the judges of the Supreme Court, and the Registrar of Probates has been involved in extensive consultations regarding these rules of court.

The Government considers that probate practice that requires no disclosure of assets and liabilities of deceased estates is detrimental to the public interest and, in particular, to the interests of beneficiaries, auditors and others who might have a legitimate right to ascertain particulars of the estates of deceased persons. These rules of court will benefit beneficiaries, creditors and others with such a legitimate interest and will offer protection to the public from unscrupulous executors. The Parliamentary Joint Committee on Subordinate Legislation considered these rules of court, which have bipartisan support among Liberal and Labor members of this Parliament. I am advised that the

shadow Attorney-General in another place also supports these rules of court.

On a final point, Mr Blacker was a member of this House when the 1984 amendments to the Administration and Probate Act were made and he took no exception to the proposed amendments, which were designed to overcome this threat to the beneficiaries of estates and to the public interest. These rules do not open the way for the backdoor introduction of death and succession duties, and I urge the House to support these rules of court.

Mr MEIER (Goyder): I do not wish to canvass the pros and cons of the motion in any detail, because I think that the previous two speakers have done that, but I take issue with one point raised by the member for Newland when she said that this matter had been considered by the Subordinate Legislation Committee: unless I misunderstood what she said, I thought that she said it had been agreed by both Parties. If I am mistaken on that point, I am quite happy to apologise. To the best of my knowledge, no vote has been taken on the matter one way or the other and, therefore, I do not want to be placed in a situation where it appears that I, as a member of that Subordinate Legislation Committee, may or may not have supported the legislation.

Ms Gayler: You told me yesterday that your Party was supporting these rules.

The DEPUTY SPEAKER: Order!

Mr MEIER: Anything that might be said outside the committee has no—

The DEPUTY SPEAKER: Order! The honourable member will please resume his seat. The debate before the House involves Notice of Motion No. 2 as proposed by the member for Flinders. What happened elsewhere is not the business of this House. This debate relates to the motion that is before us and, as Deputy Speaker, I will make sure that that is the way the debate will flow.

Mr S.G. EVANS: On a point of order, Mr Deputy Speaker, are you ruling that when a person has spoken in this debate, having used certain material and referred to a certain committee, a member cannot subsequently take up what that person said?

The DEPUTY SPEAKER: No, I am not ruling that way. Suggestions have been made by way of interjections as to what may have been said elsewhere other than in committee meetings, and I am asking members (as I am entitled to do as Deputy Speaker) to come back to the motion before the House.

Mr LEWIS: On a point of order, Mr Deputy Speaker, during the time that you were in the Chair and the member for Newland was speaking she adverted to the fact that this matter had been considered by the Joint Committee on Subordinate Legislation and stated the position of the Liberal Party members of that committee.

Mr Deputy Speaker, I believe that you were in error in not hauling the honourable member up then, because it is not appropriate for details of how members of that committee voted to be reported to the House. More particularly, the honourable member having made that assertion, you, Sir, are now preventing the member for Goyder or any other member on this side of the Chamber from refuting what she said. If I am not mistaken, that is the position, and I therefore ask you, Sir, to rule on whether, in the first place, it was disorderly for the honourable member to have raised the matter in the course of her remarks; and, secondly, if it were to be orderly, why it is disorderly for Opposition members to defend their personal positions in replying to the assertion that she made.

The DEPUTY SPEAKER: Taking the second point first, I point out that the member for Murray-Mallee has cast a totally wrong reflection on the proposition that I put to the House. The member for Goyder may develop his argument along any lines he wishes, provided that he relates those comments to the motion before the Chair. That is what I said. In relation to the first point, I remind members that all interjections are out of order and I will not rule on them.

Mr LEWIS: My point of order to you, Sir, was that the member for Newland, in the course of her remarks when addressing the Chamber, not by way of interjection but as the second speaker to the motion, stated the position on this matter of Liberal Party members of the Subordinate Legislation Committee. I ask you to rule whether that was orderly or otherwise. That was the first point that I put to you, Sir.

The DEPUTY SPEAKER: I ask the honourable member to resume his seat. I do not propose to rule the member for Newland out of order. She developed her argument along the lines of the motion before the House and, as I understand it, the member for Goyder was developing his side of the argument on that motion, as he is quite at liberty to do. The honourable member for Goyder.

Mr MEIER: Thank you, Mr Deputy Speaker. The reason that I came into this debate was that the member for Newland brought up certain matters that supposedly had been discussed either at committee level or in the lobbies. If I am not allowed to refer to what may or may not have been dealt with at committee level, the least that I ask is that the member for Newland be asked to withdraw any reference to possible decisions made either within or outside the committee.

Ms GAYLER: I rise on a point of order.

The DEPUTY SPEAKER: I ask the member for Goyder and the member for Newland to resume their seats. The Chair is not stopping the member for Goyder from developing his argument using whatever material is at his disposal. If that implication were given by the Chair, the Chair apologises. I restate the position that I outlined about two minutes ago: the member for Goyder may develop his argument along the lines of the motion before the Chair in any way that he so desires. I am not gagging the member for Goyder's replying to anything that the member for Newland might have said in the first place. There is a dispute between the two members as to what might or might not have happened outside this Chamber. I hope that the House will come back to the debate before the Chair.

Mr MEIER: Thank you, Mr Deputy Speaker. I did not imply that you were trying to gag me. I make the point again that I entered the debate because of remarks made by the member for Newland. I was under the impression that it was a long standing parliamentary principle that matters dealt with in a committee—

Mr Lewis: The Subordinate Legislation Committee, in particular.

Mr MEIER: —the Subordinate Legislation Committee— were not to be brought into any debate here. However, the member for Newland has done that, and the least I can do is put on record that I refute some of her remarks on decisions that were supposedly made.

Ms GAYLER: I rise on a point of order. I did not say that the Subordinate Legislation Committee came to a decision. I was trying to assist the House by—

The DEPUTY SPEAKER: Order! I ask the honourable member to take her seat. I will not allow debate to continue by way of points of order. I do not accept that as a point of order. The honourable member for Goyder.

Mr MEIER: I have made my point on this issue. My only disappointment is that the member for Newland has not been required to withdraw the remarks that she made earlier.

Mr BLACKER (Flinders): I thank the members for Newland and Goyder for their participation in this debate. The main thrust of my opposition to this regulation was not the reason why the new court rules were introduced. I am not aiming to reflect upon the judges, as they have made a determination about what they believe is necessary to carry out their legal responsibilities. I am objecting to these regulations because they could have been framed in a better way and contained better safeguards for the general public so as to prevent future Governments using these court rules as a means of revenue raising without further reference to the Parliament.

Mention was made of costs. Since 1 July I have become aware of a deceased estate where the person died with few assets and large liabilities. The trustee, a professional person, was obliged to have licensed valuers' reports on those limited assets. Neither the valuer nor the trustee will be paid; their costs are added to the total costs involved. That is a minor consideration in relation to what I am talking about. The member for Newland referred to a 1984 debate in which I was involved as a member of this House and said that I could well have raised objections then. However, I have read and reread the debate and the second reading explanation, and never once was reference made to a listing of valuations. The matter of the listing of assets was raised in that debate, but more particularly in relation to the estates of handicapped persons. However, there was no reference to valuations.

The valuation aspect of these regulations is separate from the original debate. This debate has caused some members to pre-empt the way that they will vote. I do not for one moment believe that, because the House agreed to the Bill at that time, supporting this disallowance motion runs contrary to that support. I am saying that the value aspect of these regulations was not considered during the 1984 debate. I call on members to support my motion disallowing these rules which apply under the Supreme Court Rules Act.

The House divided on the motion:

Ayes (5)—Messrs P.B. Arnold, Blacker (teller), S.G. Evans, Lewis, and Oswald.

Noes (33)—Messrs Abbott, and Allison, Mrs Appleby, Messrs D.S. Baker, S.J. Baker, Bannon, and Becker, Ms Cashmore, Messrs Crafter, De Laine, Duigan, Eastick, M.J. Evans, and Ferguson, Ms Gayler (teller), Messrs Gregory, Groom, Hamilton, Hemmings, Ingerson, Keneally, and Klunder, Ms Lenehan, Messrs McRae, Mayes, Meier, Payne, Peterson, Plunkett, Rann, Robertson, Tyler, and Wotton.

Majority of 28 for the Noes.

Motion thus negatived.

CRIMINAL LAW CONSOLIDATION ACT AMENDMENT BILL (No. 4)

Adjourned debate on second reading.

(Continued from 20 August. Page 384.)

Mr DUIGAN (Adelaide): I have read the second reading explanation of the member for Davenport and I have also read his contribution when he introduced a similar proposition into this House on 30 October 1986. I found that there were no extra pursuasive arguments in the material last put to the House that would pursuade members on this side to change the position that we had adopted and had put to the House when the member for Davenport introduced the Bill in the previous session.

The main points raised by members on this side of the House on that occasion are relevant to the proposition that is before us now, and they revolve around two central features, one being a legal point and the other a penal point. In relation to the legal point, the option which the honourable member wants the judges to have available to them when sentencing and which the honourable member wishes this House to include in the legislation is, in fact, one that they have now. This point was made to the House by the Minister of Education, who represents in this place the Attorney-General. He indicated previously that it was very important not to be overly simplistic in approaches to the sentencing process.

The same point was made by the member for Fisher: in a previous debate on this matter, he stated quite simply, categorically, and in a very straightforward way that he did not support the Bill because it duplicated provisions that already existed and that, therefore, the Bill was redundant. I believe that that proposition still applies, as the provisions in this Bill are the same as those previously considered. There is nothing in the Bill that gives the judiciary more discretion or a larger series of options. So, on the grounds of the law as it stands, I oppose the Bill.

The second point made by contributors to the debate from this side of the House on the other occasion related to penal reform. Matters pertaining to this were picked up and dealt with at some length by the member for Fisher, who stated:

> In a modern society which has some responsibility for ensuring the workings of that society, it is important to have a rehabilitative model for our prison system and our penal system and that that reform or rehabilitative model involves a period of detention, which period of detention is accompanied by some training, some education and some attempt at rehabilitation, on the basis of the fact that people will inevitably have to return to society and make a contribution to society.

I believe that that is a very sensible, civilised, and humane approach to penal administration, but it is a model which, implicitly, is rejected by the amending Bill we are now considering. On those two bases, I oppose the Bill.

Mr OSWALD secured the adjournment of the debate.

ELECTORAL ACT AMENDMENT BILL

Adjourned debate on second reading.

(Continued from 20 August. Page 386.)

Mr DUIGAN (Adelaide): The proposition that the member for Davenport has again brought before the House in this Bill has been considered by the House several times. On those occasions the whole concept of voluntary voting was rejected. On a previous occasion, I canvassed the way in which the Australian political system at both the national and State levels has dealt with our parliamentary democratic processes, and with the way in which so-called compulsory voting has become part and parcel of our democratic tradition.

On this occasion I simply refer briefly to some comments made by the Hon. Kim Beazley, when amendments were being made to the Commonwealth Electoral Reform Act, that reinforced a number of the sentiments that have been expressed in this House by members on both sides over a long period. On that occasion, the Hon. Mr Beazley said:

The political legitimacy of Government—any Government—and its right to develop and implement policies for all its citizens must rest upon two inescapable and inseparable facts. Government must be elected by a majority vote, and that majority must be drawn from the maximum number of citizens eligible to vote.

That is the sentiment on which we are basing our argument: that it is necessary to ensure that the Government has the support of the majority of people rather than hoping that it has. I and members on this side believe that it is necessary that people are able and in a position to give the Government the authority it needs to operate on behalf of the whole community. Were it not for the full and active participation of all eligible citizens in that democratic electoral parliamentary system, there would always be the question hanging over the Government as to whether or not it had the support of all the community.

I believe that the consequences of having voluntary voting would be a greater harassment of electors; it would reduce participation in our democratic system of parliamentary democracy; it would increase the organisational effort that is put in by political Parties on non-essential or non-policy issues which is, after all, the essence of what an election is about in our parliamentary democratic system; it would open up the possibility of inducements; it would have a marked effect on the stability of Government; and it would put South Australia out of step with the whole democratic tradition to which we have become accustomed in Australia.

Voting is the most important and valuable right that a citizen has, and it should not be exercised at a whim. I believe that the system we have has stood the test of time. It has given us governments of both persuasions since compulsory voting was introduced into this State, and I believe that nothing positive would be served in terms of participation and better and more equitable Government by accepting the proposition that has been put forward to us, again, by the member for Davenport. I therefore oppose the Bill.

Mr OSWALD secured the adjournment of the debate.

BRIDGEWATER TRANSPORT SERVICES

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

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.

(Continued from 20 August. Page 386.)

Mr S.G. EVANS (Davenport): I spoke on this topic previously in introducing it, and I thought that by this time, at least, the Government would have done something positive about providing a proper transport service to those parts of the Hills from which it has taken away an established service and has continued to deny those people a service. I will not go back over the issue of those who are handicapped or disadvantaged—whether in wheelchairs, the aged or young mothers. In some areas buses have picked up what trains could not take or do not now take, but many areas do not have any public transport service, because it was taken away from them. I know, from the smug look on their faces, that Government members can say, 'So what? We are getting more and more. Your group is getting less and less.'

Well, people are even writing letters to the paper now. They have woken up to what has been happening. There is no way that I can correct it from my position in this place, because the power of an individual or an Opposition Party is nil in the type of democracy we are living in at the moment. In a democracy, if there is a fair and just cause, even an individual should be able to bring it before the Parliament and win the argument. However, that proves futile when we have a Government that arrogantly says that those people do not count. So, those people have to accept that argument.

I still have a motor car and a licence, and I can drive. The person confined to a wheelchair who bought a property at Heathfield because he was near a public service that he thought would never cease is finished. He has to sell his house and find another spot if he wishes to go into employment. People say that is an isolated case, but while that is happening the trains that were rostered to go to Bridgewater, express Blackwood, and then pick up all stations are still rostered for the same times. They go to Belair, express Blackwood, from Mitcham and wait in the Belair railway station for one hour—the time it takes a train to go to Bridgewater and back—with the engines running and the crew sitting there waiting to get back on time to come back to Adelaide. The damn train is still there.

On one occasion when I had one of my family travel on the train to check it out, it left Belair, picked up none, picked up nine at Blackwood, and then continued down on its way. Ironically, nine minutes after it left Belair, the normal 'pick up at all stations' train left and followed it back to Adelaide. Members opposite say it does not matter. The Minister ignores it by saying that they are trying to save money. Any child, even in grade 4, would know that is not commonsense, and would know that what we have been told is not fact. If it is not fact, it is not the truth, so what is it? Is it that the STA conned the Minister and the Minister is too pigheaded to see the error of the way that they have taken? Is that the truth? There has to be truth somewhere, because to say they are saving money by that process or saving all the money they can is not the truth. I am prepared to believe, after a clash I had with the Minister over another matter, that the STA is being ruthless and, I believe, unprincipled in the sort of approach it is taking on some issues. If that is cost efficient—

Mr Duigan interjecting:

Mr S.G. EVANS: I am told, by the member for Adelaide by way of an interjection, that it is cost efficient to have a train go to Belair to sit for one hour with its engines running. The time for that train to go to Bridgewater and back, picking up the few people who want to travel, is one hour—half an hour up and half an hour back. It then leaves that station nine minutes ahead of a 'pick up all stations' back to Adelaide. That is cost efficient! No wonder the ALP is broke and asking for public money! No wonder the State is in trouble, if that is the argument, if that is the sort of commonsense that is supposed to prevail with members opposite. If that is commonsense, it must be only common amongst the ALP. I am sure it is not common out in the community. I am absolutely amazed! At that point I shall finish, because my point has been proved by the member for Adelaide's comments. He is one of the main speakers in replying to private members' matters—particularly those of mine. He is the spokesperson who puts the point of view on behalf of the ALP, and he is saying that sort of operation is cost efficient. I will leave it for the community to judge whether or not we are getting a fair deal.

The motion will be defeated or amended—that is the usual practice. I accept that, but I hope that people in the Hills and elsewhere in South Australia understand what fairness is. The Federal Australian Labor Party brought in public funding of elections whereby, for every vote electors cast, they pay $1.15 in taxes. Therefore, every elector who

votes informally saves himself $1.15 and denies that amount to political Parties or individual candidates.

I hope that when they consider those factors, and remember that for a measly $150 a year this service has been taken away, those Hills people and others throughout Adelaide will say, as is now being said in New South Wales, that the ALP is bankrupt not only in monetary terms, but its philosophy and its honesty are bankrupt. I will not ask members to support the motion, because that would be a waste of time. Some members would support it, but the majority, being the ALP, would oppose it. It does not matter about the principle involved: they will oppose it.

Mr TYLER secured the adjournment of the debate.

CONSTITUTION ACT AMENDMENT BILL

Adjourned debate on second reading.

(Continued from 27 August. Page 550.)

Mr DUIGAN (Adelaide): I read with great interest the contribution of the member for Eyre when he introduced this Bill. He wanted to remove an existing impediment in the allocation of portfolios. I think that is a very sensible way in which to look at modern government. The impediment was placed in the way of Premiers in 1965 for reasons that now no longer apply. It is very important—as this Government has shown, as a result of its review of a range of Government departments and operations—to ensure that all modern management practices that are pursued by Governments are up to date and that the appropriate rationalisation can take place.

The proposition put forward to this House by the member for Eyre is sensible. It will allow the appropriate rationalisation of ministerial responsibilities to take place, if it is considered appropriate in the circumstances. Times do change and the impediment placed in the way of Premiers more than 20 years ago I believe no longer need exist. However, It is important to indicate that logic can change in relation to the appropriate alignment and the appropriate combination of ministries.

The Ministry of Agriculture does have an important relationship with a range of Government departments. It has an important relationship with the Engineering and Water Supply Department in relation to provision of water to farms in this State. It has an important relationship with the Department of Environment and Planning in relation to the conservation and maintenance of the agricultural resource base. The member for Eyre has already indicated the importance of the relationship with the Department of Lands.

But, there is also a relationship in the Department of State Development for the operation of regional development councils. Also there is an important relationship with Treasury and the Attorney-General's Department to ensure that the rules and regulations under which the Agriculture Department is operating are in line with the rules, regulations and other Acts of Parliament which operate for other departments. In one sense there is an extraordinary degree of logic in trying to bring all of these areas of Government administration to do with the management and husbanding of the resources of the land under one portfolio area as proposed by the member for Eyre. On occasions, that opportunity should be available to a Government and will undoubtedly on some occasions be taken up. There is also as much sense in rationalising Government departments in another way to achieve other objectives the Government might have for itself. Both the Government and in particular the current Minister of Agriculture are quite happy to explore the opportunities that the removal of this impediment would allow.

In conclusion, I indicate that the way a Premier makes a decision will be based on a variety of factors, some of which will be to do with the rationalisation of departments, some of which will be to do with the quality, abilities and skills of those people who are elected by their Party. On this side of the House members are elected by Caucus into the ministry and the Premier then allocates portfolios on the basis of the skill of the individual person elected to the ministry together with the most sensible alignment of administrative and ministerial responsibilities. Now that we have removed this impediment, the objective being pursued by the member for Eyre can be picked up if it is seen that both those things come together at a time when a new ministry is being appointed. I am happy to indicate to the House that I support the change to the Constitution Act as proposed by the member for Eyre.

Bill read a second time.

In Committee.

Clause 1 passed.

Clause 2—'Number of Ministers of the Crown.'

Mr LEWIS: In rising on this clause I simply make the point that older and wiser heads decided long ago to include this provision in the Constitution Act: that the Minister of Agriculture and the Minister of Lands should not be one and the same person at any time. I believe that they did so for very good reasons. I am concerned now that we are deciding to change that. Clearly, at the time they recognised the necessity for somebody in Cabinet to be capable of understanding not only the relationship between the agricultural portfolio and technological function that that implies society will pursue, but also that, since land is the most important raw material resource in economic terms, there should be two people in the Cabinet who could understand that and who were compelled to put a view to other Ministers.

It may be sound logic to support the proposition as brought in by the member for Eyre, but in administrative terms it may not be ultimately in the best interests of the State. Since the majority view seems to be that the provision as it stands presently ought to be abolished (and this measure under this clause does so), I will not stand in the way of that and delay the Committee in its will to change the Constitution in this way. I simply place on record my reservations about the wisdom of so doing.

Clause passed.

Title passed.

Bill read a third time and passed.

DEAF IMMIGRANTS

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

That in the opinion of this House, migration regulation 26 explicitly discriminates against people with hearing disabilities in that it restricts their entry into Australia by placing them in the same category as those with leprosy and syphilis; and that this regulation not only incenses those deaf people wishing to migrate to Australia but insults deaf Australians and their families who live normal lives and contribute to our society; and further, that until 'Deaf Mutism' is removed from the regulations it will continue to be a source of embarrassment, anger and insult to hearing impaired people and their families, whether abroad, living in Australia or hoping to do so.

(Continued from 27 August. Page 552.)

Mr KLUNDER (Todd): In contributing to the debate I must admit to a large degree of sympathy with the views

expressed by the member for Davenport. Clearly, bracketing deaf people or hearing impaired people or even to use the quaint term that has been mooted about of 'deaf mutism', bracketing people with that impairment, for instance, with some fairly nasty contagious diseases is archaic and discriminatory at best and it is stupidly vicious at worst. I know a considerable number of hearing impaired people and most of them are making a good and proper contribution to this society. I have no reason to suspect that those people in the same situation who would want to come into this country are in any different position.

In any case, I support the honourable member's motion that a proper judgment in this case should be made on economic worth as distinct from an arbitrary listing of handicaps. I appreciate the member for Davenport's avoidance of Party politics in this matter, as I believe and as obviously he believes, that this is not a matter of Party politics but involves removing a discrimination against some human beings who have done nothing to deserve that discrimination. Australia has a Migration Act and, like a Migration Act of any other country, it is there for the benefit of that country. However, we are not here to discuss the ins and outs of that. That properly is the province of the House of Representatives and the Senate.

The motion we are debating is concerned with discrimination against a particular group of people under a regulation of the Act. I believe the regulation is now an historical anomaly; it lists a hotch-potch of ad hoc diseases and conditions which are clearly outdated; for instance, it includes syphilis but does not include gonorrhoea, AIDS, Hepatitis B, and so on, which clearly shows that the list is no longer—

Members interjecting:

Mr KLUNDER: As my colleague says, it is out of date. It is no longer used by health authorities to vet people in regard to migration to this country. Nonetheless, the existence of that regulation is discriminatory as long as it exists or has the potential to be discriminatory. It can certainly be seen by people to be a highly insulting regulation, regardless of how it is meant or how it was intended.

I am not particularly enamoured of the bureacratic treatment meted out by bureaucrats in Canberra to various people who have tried to change that regulation over the years. As the member for Davenport outlined, ministerial replies frequently hinted at a short-term resolution of the situation, but that has not eventuated for some eight years. It is fairly cruel to string people along, especially when those people are often less capable of defending themselves than the average person in our community.

We now have a new Minister for Immigration who, it is generally agreed, is an energetic man with the drive and commitment to assist those who are underprivileged or discriminated against. We also have an immigration review going on at the moment, the first for 10 years. I believe that the combination of those two factors—a new and energetic Minister and the review—should persuade this House to look at the situation in a different light. The wording of the motion does nothing more than take a position, and I believe that we can do a little better than that. Accordingly, I move:

Leave out all the words after 'that' and insert in lieu thereof:

This House supports the review of migration regulation 26 as part of the immigration review conducted by the Department of Immigration, and that this House urges the Minister for Immigration to consider in particular the deletion of that section of regulation 26 which deals with deaf mutism as this House believes that section to be unjustly discriminatory against those with hearing handicaps and subsequent speaking handicaps.

The amendment will still allow the House to express its abhorrence at discrimination against people who, although handicapped, can and do make a considerable contribution to whichever country they happen to be in and, at the same time, will allow the Department of Immigration to reorganise its regulations according to a global design, instead of doing it piecemeal.

Mr ROBERTSON (Bright): I seek leave to continue my remarks later.

Leave granted; debate adjourned.

MILK

Adjourned debate on motion of Mr Gunn:

That this House calls on the South Australian Government to—

(a) support existing pricing arrangements for milk in the metropolitan area;

(b) allow continuation of existing delivery arrangements which have operated since the turn of the century and under the control of the Metropolitan Milk Board for the past 40 years; and

(c) release the milk price review report immediately to all interested bodies.

(Continued from 27 August. Page 554.)

Mr GREGORY (Florey): I will make a number of comments about Mr Gunn's motion and his contribution last week which was a historical fact finding exposition containing a number of unfounded allegations against the Government. The South Australian Government is well aware of the efficiency of the South Australian dairy industry, the low retail price of milk, the effectiveness of the Metropolitan Milk Board and the industry operated Metropolitan Milk Equalisation Committee Ltd. In particular, the South Australian dairy industry contributes significantly to the State's economy and employment. The issues confronting the dairy industry today involve pressure at the national and State levels, and I wish to clarify these issues.

First, nationally, the marketing arrangements for manufactured dairy products are administered by the Australian Dairy Corporation under Commonwealth legislation (the so-called Kerin plan). In summary, these arrangements levy all milk (including market milk) to provide support for exports of dairy products. The stability of these arrangements depends on orderly marketing of market milk. Because of disruptive trade in market milk between Victoria and New South Wales, the New South Wales Government has called for a dismantling of the Kerin plan, by activating the 'comfort clause'.

A meeting of Ministers scheduled for 2 October 1987 will decide the fate of the Kerin plan. The Minister and the South Australian Government are doing everything they can to support the South Australian dairy industry by negotiating to retain the Kerin plan. If the Kerin plan collapses, manufactured milk returns will drop by a minimum of 30 per cent in full and price cutting in the market milk industry will follow.

Secondly, on a State basis, our Government through milk boards or milk authorities, is responsible for regulating the marketing arrangements for market milk. Presently, South Australia has a fixed price for milk in the metropolitan area set by the Milk Board, and a maximum only price set by the Prices Commissioner outside the metropolitan area. Interstate milk prices are either a maximum only price, or a maximum and minimum price. If interstate milk discounting occurs in South Australia, the Metropolitan Milk Board and industry would not be able to compete on a price basis, because of the fixed price. The Metropolitan Milk Board completed its retail milk prices mechanism

review on 22 July 1987 and it made a number of recommendations, in which it stated:

In the long-term interest of consumers and in recognition of the concerns expressed in the submissions received and drawing on its own experience and an examination of developments interstate, the board recommends a minimum-maximum price for white milk. The difference between the minimum-maximum price should initially be small and be gradually increased to represent the additional cost of home delivery.

The board goes on to give the following reasons for its decision:

1. It continues to support the home delivery system on a 'user pays' basis.
2. It allows vendors and small shops to charge a service fee.
3. It allows supermarkets as well as vendors and small shops to sell at a lower price.
4. It gives consumers a choice.
5. It retains the advantages of orderly marketing which has benefited Adelaide consumers in the past.

The Government has accepted the board's recommendations and has agreed to implement a maximum-minimum pricing strategy at the next review of milk pricing by the Metropolitan Milk Board. This decision was relayed to the industry and to the press on 25 August 1987. In addition, the Government has agreed to look at giving the board the power to set a maximum-only price as a temporary defence mechanism against Victorian milk.

In respect of the matters raised in the motion by the member for Eyre, I make the following comments. In relation to support for existing pricing arrangements for milk in the metropolitan area, the only change being introduced at this stage is a maximum-minimum pricing strategy for retail milk, which will not affect processing margins or milk producers' returns. The pricing arrangements will affect retail pricing only, as recommended by the Metropolitan Milk Board. The additional option of a maximum-only defence pricing strategy will also be given to the Milk Board under a proposed amendment to the Metropolitan Milk Supply Act. This may enable the board to defend South Australian milk against intrusion by cheap interstate milk. If we did not have this mechanism it is fair to say that most of the Adelaide Hills dairy farmers would disappear and it is thought that over 30 to 40 per cent of our milk producers would cease to exist.

The member for Eyre calls also for the continuation of existing delivery arrangements. The Government has no intention of interfering with existing milk delivery arrangements. Thirty-eight per cent of milk is home delivered and no changes are intended in relation to milk delivery. The new pricing arrangements will allow a margin to be charged for milk delivery and for milk delivery to continue. The report of the Milk Board review was released to industry organisations at the meeting with the Minister on 25 August 1987. A press release and media conference followed this industry meeting. I indicate that I wish to move an amendment to the motion of the member for Eyre. I move:

Delete all words after the word 'House' and insert:

Congratulates the Government for its action in giving the Metropolitan Milk Board greater flexibility in pricing strategies, which will:

(a) ensure more equitable milk prices for consumers while at the same time maintaining viability for all sections of the milk industry; and

(b) assist the South Australian milk industry to resist interstate intrusion into the South Australian market.

Mr OSWALD secured the adjournment of the debate.

WASTE MANAGEMENT REGULATIONS

Adjourned debate on motion of Hon. B.C. Eastick:

That the regulations under the South Australian Waste Management Commission Act 1979 relating to prescribed wastes, made on 26 February and laid on the table of this House on 10 March 1987, be disallowed.

(Continued from 27 August. Page 555.)

Mr DUIGAN (Adelaide): I will speak briefly on this disallowance motion moved by the member for Light, and indicate that I oppose it. I do so because the particular issues that he has raised will be taken account of administratively through the Waste Management Commission, which will deal with the producers of waste about whom the member expressed concern that had been expressed to him by the Master Builders Association.

The primary objective of the regulations was to amend the schedules for the purpose of specifying more accurately the actual wastes that presented a significant risk to the environment as well as to the health and safety of those people who operate in the industry by collecting and disposing of those wastes. Particular concern related to whether all of those people who were manufacturing and disposing of certain classified and specified types of waste should pay a licence fee. The argument hinged particularly on whether the volume of that sort of waste would be taken into account in determining whether they needed to have the licence.

It was a fair and valid point to raise and I will read from a letter sent to the Executive Director of the Master Builders Association (Mr Gasteen) by the Director of the Waste Management Commission. In part, the letter states:

Before licensing an organisation, the commission needs to be sure that mishandling of waste produced could result in or threaten:

- a nuisance or offensive condition;
- conditions injurious to health or safety;
- damage to the environment.

Any effects arising from the disposal of ink bottles, pens, adhesives and paint containers are insignificant and do not warrant consideration by the commisison.

Therefore, a licence will not be required in that instance. A rider was attached to that assurance given by the Director of the Waste Management Commission as follows:

There are, however, companies in Adelaide which generate many thousands of litres of waste inks and adhesives which present a significant hazard due to their flammability. These companies are licensed.

What the commission is saying is that the quantity of waste that is produced, transported and disposed of will be taken into account by the Waste Management Commission in determining whether producers are to be licensed absolutely.

The Hon. Jennifer Cashmore: That was an interesting statement by the Environmental Protection Council about guidelines for prosecutions for waste and spillages, was it not, indicating the importance of that?

The DEPUTY SPEAKER: Order! Members will stop their conversation. The honourable member for Adelaide has the floor.

Mr DUIGAN: The issues raised by the Master Builders Association and brought to the attention of this House by the member for Light have been addressed administratively by the Waste Management Commission. The consequence of disallowing these regulations would be to revert to the provisions that were in force prior to these regulations, and they would not be able to take account of the concerns that have been expressed by the Master Builders Association. Therefore, disallowance as proposed by the member for Light is not really a solution, because it would weaken the commission's power to control a number of waste materials that are of significant concern to the public.

This Parliament ought to be addressing its attention to the public interest, and to the majority of people who will be affected by these regulations. The anomalies that have been brought to the attention of the House by the member for Light can now be taken account of while, at the same

time, securing the public interest in terms of the major damage and impact that might occur to the environment, or to the health and safety of individuals involved in the transport and disposal of the wastes referred to by the Master Builders Association. I oppose the motion.

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

CITY OF ADELAIDE CHARACTER

Adjourned debate on motion of Hon. Jennifer Cashmore:

That this House recognises the unique and distinctive character of the City of Adelaide and the need for development which is sensitive both to this character and to the needs of the city and therefore urges the Government to ensure gazettal of the 1986-91 City of Adelaide Plan as a matter of urgency.

(Continued from 27 August. Page 556.)

The Hon. JENNIFER CASHMORE (Coles): To recapitulate on the motion I moved on 27 August in respect of the urgent need for gazettal of the City of Adelaide plan, I point out that it is nine months overdue into the statutory five-year period for a City of Adelaide plan, which should have commenced at the beginning of 1987. In moving my motion on 27 August, I referred to the fact that the City of Adelaide had embarked upon a review in what it considered to be sufficient time to have the plan approved by the council, the City of Adelaide Planning Commission, the Minister and Executive Council in time for gazettal at the beginning of this year.

In fact, the plan was approved by council at the end of April, yet we are well into September and the plan is still with the City of Adelaide Planning Commission. It is relevant to ask what are the sanctions and penalties when a statutory period laid down by regulations under an Act of Parliament is breached by the authority that is supposed to observe those regulations? The simple answer is that there are no sanctions or penalties. Realistically, of course, there cannot be, because it is not feasible to consider fining the City of Adelaide, the City of Adelaide Planning Commission, the Minister, or Executive Council.

There is, in effect, no other penalty that could be brought to bear. However, there are penalties being suffered—not by those authorities, but by the city itself, its ratepayers, businesses, residents, and the people of South Australia. The penalties are many and varied, and we are already seeing them in the deep unrest that is evidenced about the fact that the proposals for a major development, namely, the redevelopment of the East End Market site is being submitted under a plan that is now long out of date.

That has rightly caused deep concern because it is quite clear that the application as first submitted would have had, notwithstanding the fact that it breached some of the principles of the existing plan, a better chance of success and approval under the existing plan than it would under the new plan. The irony is that this proposed development, and others which have been considered, is really very much wrapped up with the future of the city of Adelaide, not in the next five years or the next decade but well into the next century.

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

PETITION: COUNTRY TAX REIMBURSEMENT

A petition signed by 542 residents of South Australia praying that the House urge the Government to retain the payroll tax and land tax reimbursement scheme for country industry was presented by Mr Goldsworthy.

Petition received.

AUDITOR-GENERAL'S DEPARTMENT

The SPEAKER laid on the table the report on the operations of the Auditor-General's Department for the year ended 30 June 1987.

MINISTERIAL STATEMENT: *ISLAND SEAWAY*

The Hon. R.K. ABBOTT (Minister of Marine): I seek leave to make a statement.

Leave granted.

The Hon. R.K. ABBOTT: In the House yesterday the member for Mitcham asked a question concerning alleged shortcomings of the roll-on roll-off ferry MV *Island Seaway*, which is being built by Eglo Engineering Pty Ltd. It should be stressed that the attack made by the honourable member was not on any work carried out by the Government, but on the quality of the work carried out by Eglo Engineering. The management of Eglo has already answered each of the 11 points raised by the honourable member. The management has shown that each of the 11 points was in error. I refer members to the statement published in today's *Advertiser* by Mr Rod Keller (State Manager of Eglo Engineering).

I will refer, however, to one allegation which concerns the Government, and I quote from the honourable member's question:

The Auditor-General's report has revealed a blow-out of almost $4 million in the cost.

This statement by the member for Mitcham demonstrates clearly his inability to correctly interpret the Auditor-General's Report. When I appeared before the Estimates Committee in October 1986, the committee was advised that it was expected that the vessel would be completed within the total amount of $16.154 million set aside in the 1985-86 and 1986-87 capital budget as shown in the Estimates of Payments—Capital for the year ending 30 June 1987. This is still so, and is consistent with the figures in the Auditor-General's Report.

In concluding, I stress that Eglo was contracted to build the new MV *Island Seaway* because of its outstanding reputation in the engineering field. The honourable member's allegations made in this place yesterday represented a completely unjustified attack on the competence and integrity of a significant employer in this State.

PAPER TABLED

The following paper was laid on the table:

By the Minister of Transport, on behalf of the Minister of Mines and Energy (Hon. R.G. Payne):

Department of Mines and Energy—Report, 1986-87.

PUBLIC WORKS COMMITTEE REPORTS

The SPEAKER laid on the table the following interim report by the Parliamentary Standing Committee on Public Works:

Finger Point Sewage Treatment Works (Revised Proposal).

The SPEAKER laid on the table the following report by the Parliamentary Standing Committee on Public Works together with minutes of evidence:

Magill Home Replacement Facilities at Jarvis Road, Elizabeth Vale.

Ordered that reports be printed.

QUESTION TIME

The SPEAKER: Order! Before calling on questions I advise that the Premier will take questions that would otherwise have been directed to the Deputy Premier or the Minister of State Development and Technology; that the Minister of Public Works will take questions that would otherwise have been directed to the Minister of Labour; and that the Minister of Education will take questions that would otherwise have been directed to the Minister of Employment and Further Education.

NEW KANGAROO ISLAND FERRY

Mr S.J. BAKER: Will the Minister of Marine arrange to have tabled in this Parliament all the reports on the sea trials of the new Kangaroo Island ferry?

The Hon. R.K. ABBOTT: If there are any reports available on the *Island Seaway*, I will be happy to table them.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order!

The Hon. R.K. ABBOTT: However, I am not aware that there are any such reports as referred to by the honourable member.

STATE TRANSPORT AUTHORITY

Mr HAMILTON: My question is directed to the Minister of Transport. Is it true that the Chairman of the State Transport Authority believes that the STA is inefficient, and that the loss of ridership in 1986-87 was due to increased fares and unreliable services? Last night on Channel 10 news the interviewer claimed that Mr Rump agreed with the member for Bragg who had made these allegations.

The Hon. G.F. KENEALLY: I thank the honourable member for his question because it gives me the opportunity to put right what is at worst a mischievous report on Channel 10 last night and at best an inaccurate report. The Chairman does not agree with the member for Bragg in his criticisms of the STA and, of course, neither do I. Mr Rump has told me that he is quite incensed about the way in which a lengthy interview of some 20 minutes that he had with Channel 10 yesterday was edited in such a way as was reported on the Channel 10 news last night.

Every member of Parliament in this place understands what is likely to happen to a lengthy interview that is compacted into some 20 seconds or so in a news item. Members are not reflecting on me when making these sorts of interjections; they are reflecting on a very genuine, well regarded, and well respected member of the South Australian community in Mr Rump, who feels, quite justifiably, that he has been misrepresented in such a way as to do some damage to his personal integrity. Any chairman of a major South Australian statutory body who is quoted on a news item as being critical of his own organisation, when that criticism was not made during the interview, has a right to have his story put to the people of South Australia. As we all know, it is difficult as members of Parliament or as people who have responsibilities for Government departments to have their side of the story reported otherwise.

In responding to the honourable member's question I will make one or two comments about the allegations of the member for Bragg in terms of the drop in ridership, and I think that these factors ought to be taken into consideration when this matter is discussed. Certainly, there was a reduction of some six million passenger trips during 1986-87, and certainly that is a matter that the STA and the Government are rightly concerned about. However, some factors need to be put on record. For some years prior to July 1986 many concession riders in South Australia travelled free of charge.

It is very difficult to assess the number of riders during that period. There is a statistical formula that can be used that is fairly accurate but only in an indicative sense. This year all riders of the STA have been buying tickets, so we have a better grasp of the number of people using the service. Secondly, it is true that there has been a reduction in off-peak and inter-peak riding. There has been a maintenance of peak travel and, in fact, a marginal increase in fully paying passengers on the STA.

In fact, STA fare box revenue went up by 15 per cent, so people are paying for the trips they are taking. Prior to this year that was not the case. So, there has been a reduction as a result of that. I reinforce the point: peak-period travel has been maintained and marginally increased; off-peak and inter-peak travel has been down. We believe that that is as a result of the 20 cents a trip fare people would have to pay. Secondly, there has been a proliferation of car parking in Adelaide which has attracted people into driving their vehicles into metropolitan Adelaide.

Members interjecting:

The Hon. G.F. KENEALLY: Members opposite laugh at this, but the facts are clear: they are there, and they are irrefutable. One office worker who goes by motor vehicle to work and back instead of travelling by the STA means 500 paying trips a year. There have been a number of clear and identifiable factors which the Chairman of the STA put to Channel 10, but which were not reported. There are other factors, of course, that we are still investigating and will continue to investigate, because the STA is concerned that it is able to maximise the number of patrons who want to use what is still, I would argue and have argued in many forums, the best public transport system in Australia.

The other point that needs to be made is that, because there are six million fewer passenger trips—although not six million fewer patrons—the rationalisation the STA is involved in is following that trend. The argument has been put that passenger trips are dropping off because the services have been cut or the rationalisation has taken place. In fact, it is the other way round: it is because of the drop in the patronage of the STA that a responsible organisation would rationalise its service to allow for that drop in patronage. In any event, we will be doing what we can to turn this around—and we will turn this around, because we will have a major study available to us next year, which is designed to make sure that the public transport system in South Australia is not only efficient but also relevant to the 1990s and to the next century.

HOUSING TRUST PURCHASE SCHEME

Mr OLSEN: Will the Minister of Housing and Construction confirm that a scheme to allow Housing Trust tenants to buy their homes, which the Minister described as 'one of the first in the world' and promised would raise $7.5

million by the end of last financial year, has in fact been a major failure? The statements I have quoted by the Minister are from a press statement announcing the scheme on 7 September last year, and his Estimates Committee on 3 October last year.

However, the Auditor-General's Report reveals that up to the end of June this year, the 'time frame' stipulated by the Minister, more than nine months after the Minister announced the scheme, only eight out of the more than 11 000 Housing Trust tenants eligible to participate had in fact purchased a share in their homes, with the gross proceeds totalling $117 000 compared with the $7.5 million promised by the Minister—a failure on as grand a scale as the Ramsay Trust promised by the Minister in 1982.

The SPEAKER: Order! The last part of that was clearly comment.

The Hon. T.H. HEMMINGS: I thank the Leader for his question. The trust shared ownership scheme is, in the opinion of this Minister and this Government, a very successful scheme if tenants wish to take up that scheme. Whenever we talk about selling off Housing Trust homes, I must remind members of the House that it is the present policy of the Liberal Party to sell Housing Trust homes at 60 per cent—

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order!

The Hon. T.H. HEMMINGS: —of market value price, completely against the Commonwealth-State Housing Agreement—completely illegal—and I will remind members of that for ever and a day, until they publicly repudiate that policy. As I said, in the opinion of this Government it is a very good scheme for trust tenants to participate in: any failure is because trust tenants have not realised what a good scheme it is. It is obviously—

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order!

The Hon. T.H. HEMMINGS: I have 50 minutes to finish this question: I might as well do that.

The SPEAKER: Order! The Minister should not assume that the entire 49 minutes left is available to him.

The Hon. T.H. HEMMINGS: All this week all we seem to have had from the Opposition in its questions is a joke a day. I would have thought that, whatever their political persuasion, any scheme that a Government presents to encourage tenants to become home owners would be applauded. What are the criteria that the Opposition Leader bases his degree of success on? Can I tell the Leader that the South Australian Housing Trust has commissioned consultants Myles Pearce (very well respected in the Real Estate Institute), and its view is that, if marketed corrrectly, the scheme will go very well.

Members interjecting:

The Hon. T.H. HEMMINGS: If the Leader will be patient and see what happens over the rest of this year and next year, he will realise how we are giving our tenants an opportunity to become home owners. If he does not like what is happening, he can come back to see me in, say, six months, nine months, or a year and see what has happened, but do not wipe it off because, in the initial stages, trust tenants have not realised the virtue of using that scheme to become home owners.

NORTH-EAST SUBURBS ELECTRICITY

Ms GAYLER: Can the Minister of Mines and Energy say what action is being taken to improve electricity supplies to the north-eastern suburbs, and whether there is any threat of serious power cuts during the seven-day period when work is due to be carried out by ETSA at the Tea Tree Gully substation? Last year my suburbs were hit by a series of power cuts when ETSA was, I understand, bringing on stream additional supplies from the Northern Power Station. The additional demands being generated in the fast growing suburbs of Redwood Park, Surrey Downs and Golden Grove are further adding to the load. Work has been undertaken to install a 66 000 kV line along Hancock Road and at the Tea Tree Gully substation. If that work involves any risk of electricity cuts to my residents, shopkeepers and two large brick companies, I should like to be in a position to forewarn those people.

The Hon. R.G. PAYNE: I think I can fairly say that I do not anticipate there would be any serious power cuts during the period to which the honourable member referred in her question. I commend the honourable member for her obvious concern and interest in this matter, not only in relation to those domestic premises in her electorate: as members would know, she brought to the attention of the House her concern about business and other activities in the area. From 3 to 10 October the Tea Tree Gully substation will be shut down for a refit to enable it to carry the new Golden Grove development load.

The Holden Hill and Ingle Farm substation loads will be rescheduled to allow them to supply the area in question during the period to which I have already referred. The trust anticipates no problems during what might be termed an abnormal arrangement. The work is being done now so that the system will be ready and reinforced for the coming summer load.

Members will recall that peak loading of ETSA equipment as a whole now occurs in summer rather than winter, as used to occur previously. It is possible that there could be problems but, as I said, I do not anticipate them. I had wondered whether it would not be possible for ETSA to bring additional equipment into the area on a temporary basis and, in effect, provide a local supply to disconnected areas so that there would be a minimum of interference and problems in the area. However, if one considers that the total load concerned is of the order of 25 megavolt amps and the largest equipment normally available to ETSA that can be moved about is 25 kva, it is clear that we would have to move 1 000 of those generators into the area to take over the load during that period.

Clearly, that would not be possible or economic because naturally that sort of equipment is not held by ETSA. However, I can fairly tell the honourable member, so that she can pass it on to her constituents, that ETSA, which has always tried to minimise interference to consumers whenever possible (especially in situations such as this) will do so in this instance, which will benefit not only her constituents but householders generally throughout the Golden Grove area. ETSA will do all it can to ensure that there is no unfortunate interruption.

HOUSING TRUST PURCHASE SCHEME

Mr BECKER: As the Housing Trust purchase scheme announced by the Minister of Housing and Construction last September has resulted in only eight tenants buying shares in their homes, when the Minister's statements to Parliament suggested that the Government expected at least 500 tenants to participate, will he table the advice on which he based his original promises? If not, why not?

The Hon. T.H. HEMMINGS: The honourable member asks me to table my advice. The information that I received

from the Housing Trust involved a seminar at which the trust addressed a combined Housing Advisory Council, which included sections of community interests, building interests and Government agencies, etc., and where the idea of some form of shared equity scheme was floated. The idea was well received at that seminar. In fact, I recall the Chairman at that time saying that the scheme was similar to a scheme operating in the United Kingdom, which encouraged public sector tenants to get involved in home ownership. If the honourable member is asking whether there was a single document involved, the answer is 'No'. If he has read our Party policy on which we went to the people in 1985, he will know that part of the policy talked about shared equity.

I shall be pleased to go back and try to collate the documents, notes and details of discussions that took place within the Housing Advisory Council, both at the industry and community level, in an endeavour to get some form of briefing for the member for Hanson. I am not sure whether the honourable member quoted a figure like the Leader of the Opposition quoted, that is, on the question whether, if the scheme were successful in the sense of getting 500 tenants involved, we would get a certain amount of money. I will make that information available as soon as I can.

TAXI PHONES

Ms LENEHAN: Will the Minister of Transport investigate claims that the major taxi companies are demanding the removal of cellular or mobile car phones which have been installed by owner-drivers for the benefit and convenience of customers? While travelling home from Parliament late last night by taxi, I noticed a cellular car phone with a sign inside the taxi saying that calls were $2 for a minimum of three minutes. On questioning the driver about customer reaction to the provision of this innovative service, I was told that it had been well received and was widely used by customers.

On further discussion, the driver then informed me that the major taxi companies were demanding the removal of these phones despite the fact that drivers had installed them at their own expense and that they had the support of Telecom and the Metropolitan Taxi-Cab Board. On contacting a major taxi company this morning, my office was told that the removal of mobile phones was 'company policy' and that drivers might use the phones to 'tout for business'. In accordance with Standing Orders I do not wish to debate the issue, but I wish to inform the House that the taxi driver refuted these company claims and stated that every taxi in Adelaide still has to pay $52 to the taxi company each week for the services provided by the company. The provision of an efficient taxi service with a maximum of comfort—

The SPEAKER: Order! The honourable member seems to be canvassing the issue at this stage. I suspect that the House would rather have the Minister provide this information. The Minister of Transport.

The Hon. G.F. KENEALLY: I would be delighted if I were in a position to do that, but this is the first occasion that this matter has been brought to my attention. I am not aware of it, but I will certainly refer the honourable member's question to the Chairman of the Metropolitan Taxi-Cab Board and seek a report from him on the matter that she has raised here today. Quite obviously, it is a very serious matter, because in South Australia we need to have an efficient service with a maximum of comfort (and I believe that that is what the honourable member was going on to say).

In South Australia we are certainly trying to lift the standard of all aspects of public transport, of which the taxi industry is an integral part—although the industry itself sometimes wonders whether or not it is classified as part of the public transport industry. However, taxis are essential to the movement of people around Adelaide. Adelaide's increasing prominence not only as an Australian but an international destination means that people who come to this State expect the highest level of service and comfort from the taxi industry and, by and large, I believe that our taxi industry provides that service. However, if an added facility can be provided, I believe it should be looked at.

By and large, the taxi industry is the first point of contact for many visitors to South Australia and it is often the last contact they have when they leave, so the impressions they form about South Australia and Adelaide quite often come from the level of service they receive from the taxi industry. I am only too happy to take up this matter with the Metropolitan Taxi-Cab Board, have it investigated and report back on those investigations. I think it is a serious matter well warranting such an investigation.

HOUSING TRUST PURCHASE SCHEME

The Hon. B.C. EASTICK: In view of the commitment by the Minister of Housing and Construction in his press statement on 7 September last year to closely monitor the scheme to allow Housing Trust tenants to buy shares in their homes, and to determine 'whether adjustments could be made to further assist trust tenants in achieving home ownership', I ask what adjustments have been made in view of the complete failure of the scheme to attract the response expected by the Government and, if none has been made, will the Minister, as a matter of urgency, look at better means of giving trust tenants more incentive to buy their homes to ensure that this does not become yet another broken Labor Party promise to people hoping to realise the dream of owning their own home?

The Hon. T.H. HEMMINGS: To answer the last question first: if the honourable member means by further incentives that the Housing Trust, on instructions from the Government, would offer a reduced purchase price (that is, a discount) for the home, the answer is 'No'. I know that it is Liberal Party policy to sell these homes for 60 per cent, but that is not Government policy or CSHA policy. So, the incentive of a reduced price is just not on. I am pleased that my 1985 press releases are at last catching up with the Liberal Party. If members opposite are to talk about the Housing Trust's shared ownership scheme, they should not just repeat the press release: they should read what we have offered the trust's tenants.

The member for Coles would well appreciate this point because she spoke on this yesterday afternoon when dealing with urban consolidation and the way in which we should go in the next 50 years. The trust and the Government decided that we should launch a scheme whereby inner metropolitan tenants would not be allowed to purchase their trust homes, because those properties were of prime importance to the Housing Trust in its ongoing program of housing people in the whole of the metropolitan area. The adjustment to which I referred in the press release concerned the possibility, later, if everything else was proceeding well in respect of the urban consolidation program, of some inner metropolitan homes being available for purchase by trust tenants.

MODBURY OVERPASS

Mr GREGORY: Will the Minister of Transport take the necessary action so that pedestrians can use the pedestrian overpass at the Meadowvale Road end in Modbury? With the roadworks extension of the O-Bahn system to Tea Tree Plaza, the natural path taken by Modbury High School students is now a mud track and the bridge could be used if limited work were undertaken at the Meadowvale Road end.

The Hon. G.F. KENEALLY: I thank the honourable member for his question. Although I am not aware of the progress on the construction of that overpass or footbridge, I shall be only too happy to take up the matter with the department and get an urgent response to the question and, more particularly, an urgent completion of the work necessary to ensure that the access of students to their school is made as easy, as comfortable and as sound as it should be.

SHELTER FOR THE HOMELESS

The Hon. JENNIFER CASHMORE: Following his announcement in January that the Government would apply $1.4 million from the Residential Tenancies Fund for International Year of Shelter for the Homeless projects, can the Minister of Housing and Construction say whether any of this money has yet been provided for this purpose?

The Hon. T.H. HEMMINGS: I thank the honourable member for her question, because it is the first intelligent question that I have had from the Opposition today. Currently, about 12 capital works projects are before the Residential Tenancies Tribunal for funding as joint ventures with the Housing Trust, the State Government, local councils or, in one case, the Sisters of Mercy. Those projects are being considered by the tribunal and, as the member for Coles is well aware, because the legislation says that the funds must be spent for the benefit of tenants or landlords, a judgment must be written by the Chairperson of the tribunal. That is currently being done. I understand that it will be reviewed by the tribunal and that a decision will be made in about two weeks time.

It would be completely improper for me, in this Parliament, to publicly name those projects before the Residential Tenancies Tribunal has looked at them, and I am sure that the member for Coles would appreciate that. I would be only too pleased to let the member for Coles know as soon as the Chairperson informs me of the success of those projects.

I have mentioned to the member for Hanson that he will get an invitation to all announcements on International Year of Shelter capital projects. There was an unfortunate oversight when I announced the developmental grants, which totalled something like $160 000. I again apologise to the member for Mount Gambier for not inviting him when I was in Mount Gambier last week and launched the two very successful projects for IYSH. The member for Mount Gambier would be well aware of those: the House of Care, which looks after ex offenders, and Generic House, which is looking after singles and others. As soon as the information is available, and if the member for Coles is interested, I will make it available to her.

FRUIT FLY

Mr TYLER: Will the Minister of Agriculture inform the House whether the Department of Agriculture has an awareness program on the dangers of fruit fly in South Australia aimed at the tourism industry, particularly tour operators? I have been approached by a constituent who was alarmed by comments—

Members interjecting:

Mr TYLER: Members opposite find this funny. I think that that is surprising.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order!

Mr Lewis interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order! I call the member for Murray-Mallee to order for continuing to interject after the House has been called to order. The honourable member for Fisher.

Mr TYLER: I have been approached by a constituent who was alarmed by comments made by a bus operator about fruit fly in South Australia. It would appear that, on this bus re-entering South Australia, the bus operator trivialised the whole fruit fly question. My constituent believes that the department should operate an awareness program that sells the dangers of an outbreak of fruit fly in South Australia and is aimed at tour operators, as her experience has shown that there is considerable ignorance—along the lines of the member for Murray-Mallee—and complacency concerning the fruit fly issue.

The Hon. M.K. MAYES: I thank the honourable member for his question. Of course, this affects a very important part of South Australia's industry and an outbreak would have a million dollar impact on the commercial aspect of our industry not only in terms of horticulture but market gardening as well. In addition, an outbreak that was not checked and could not be controlled would have a horrendous domestic impact. We have been singularly successful over the years in controlling fruit fly entry into South Australia from both the west and north. This matter has been brought to my attention not only by the member for Fisher but by a constituent.

Members interjecting:

The Hon. M.K. MAYES: Mr Speaker, obviously members opposite are not interested in fruit fly, particulary the shadow Minister, who shows his obvious mirth with regard to this issue. I think it is very serious, and I am disappointed that he does not see it as being serious. Bus operators have been contacted by the Department of Agriculture Pest Eradication Unit and it came to my attention not only as a result of the question of the member for Fisher but from—

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order! The honourable Minister should be heard in relative silence.

The Hon. M.K. MAYES: The indication that we have had is that not only were some bus companies treating it in a light-hearted manner but also that on several occasions it was not being dealt with at all; there was no indication to passengers travelling into South Australia that there was a requirement for any interstate fruit to be deposited and, therefore, destroyed by the Department of Agriculture in accordance with our programs.

That is a serious consequence, particularly during the most vulnerable part of the season for our horticultural market industry. Consequently, through the Pest Eradication Unit of the Department of Agriculture, we have contacted all bus operators travelling into South Australia, to determine what action they take prior to reaching their point of destination, that is, the first fruit-fly road block. We also distribute pamphlets through roadhouses en route to South Australia so that people can be advised of our requirements in regard to the transporting of fruit into South Australia. The department has, as a consequence of my initial request several weeks ago, followed this through, and we will now

be asking each bus operator to make a clear indication to the passengers via the intercom system of the bus that they are not to bring fruit of any sort into South Australia from interstate.

Thus we do not face the situation of having outbreaks of either Mediterranean or Queensland fruit fly in South Australia. Of course, we have a very strict operation on the Western Australia border. We have introduced boom gate arrangements at the Western Australian border post and included all-night lighting, and the surveillance there is complete. We continue to maintain a movement index of all traffic from Western Australia so that we can trace back if need be. So I can assure all honourable members and the community that a very strict regime applies with regard to the transport of fruit into South Australia, and we are looking very carefully at all normal passenger routes to constantly review and upgrade our operations—particularly in regard to air travel, because that is another area which is most vulnerable, considering the speed with which people can travel to South Australia.

I thank the honourable member for his question, and I hope that he can assure his constituent that we are addressing this serious issue and will be maintaining a vigilant review of the processes followed by bus operators entering South Australia.

RESIDENTIAL TENANCIES FUND

Mr OSWALD: Before the Minister of Housing and Construction made his announcement in January that $1.4 million would be provided from the Residential Tenancies Fund for International Year of Shelter for the Homeless projects, did he consult with the Residential Tenancies Tribunal, the only body with the power to recommend the use of this money for such purposes, or the Attorney-General, who has ministerial responsibility for the tribunal and its administration of the fund, and, if so, did they support the Minister's proposal?

The Hon. T.H. HEMMINGS: To the first part 'Yes'. To the second part 'Yes'.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order! The Chair would appreciate it if members would not waste Question Time on noisy interjections. The honourable member for Bright.

STUDENT ACCOMMODATION

Mr ROBERTSON: I address my question to the Minister of Aboriginal Affairs.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order! The Chair would also appreciate it if the Leader of the Opposition and the Premier could desist from any dialogue across the floor of the Chamber.

Mr ROBERTSON: Can the Minister outline to the House the steps taken by his department to provide student accommodation for young people from Maralinga and the Pitjantjatjara lands who have moved to Adelaide to pursue studies or job opportunities in Adelaide?

The Hon. G.J. CRAFTER: It is appropriate that, during this very successful National Aborigines Day Observance Committee organised week, in which there are many activities in South Australia focusing on the Aboriginal community and its contribution to the well-being of our overall community, I should receive this question, because there is a program being conducted in two schools in South Australia that provides this very important and special program for young Aboriginal students from the more remote areas of the State.

That is known as the Wiltja program. School students come down for periods of about four weeks at a time in groups of eight and stay at Wiltja House at Millswood. Wiltja House is a large house owned by the Education Department and provides hostel accommodation for those students from the Pitjantjatjara and Maralinga lands. The Education Department pays the salary of a manager/ housekeeper and a cook, and the students who live there attend the Ingle Farm High School. Longer-term girl students who have successfully participated in the Wiltja program also come to Adelaide to attend courses at Woodville High School. These students stay at Kali Hostel, which is run by Aboriginal Hostels and has its own manager. This accommodation was arranged by the Woodville High School course supervisor.

Accommodation support for other training programs and short-term occupational courses comes from predominantly Commonwealth funding and frequently involves the use of Aboriginal Hostels for accommodation. I appreciate very much the very real understanding shown and the effort put into these programs by staff and students and the general school communities in the city schools and by all those people in the home schools. However, we very much need, I believe, to give further consideration to the establishment of a secondary school on Pitjantjatjara lands that can serve more directly the needs of those students living in the remote areas of South Australia who wish to pursue a secondary and higher education, to give themselves opportunities to take up the many clear options that, unfortunately, are now not available to them.

RESIDENTIAL TENANCIES FUND

Mr LEWIS: I wish to ask the Minister of Housing and Construction a question.

The Hon. J.C. Bannon interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order! The honourable member for Murray-Mallee has the floor.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order!

Mr LEWIS: I do not need time to understand what I am going to ask.

The SPEAKER: Order! Will the honourable member for Murray-Mallee proceed with his question.

Mr LEWIS: How does the Minister reconcile his claim, in answer to the previous question put to him by the member for Morphett, that he consulted the Attorney-General about the use of finance from the Residential Tenancies fund, because the Attorney stated in another place this afternoon that he was not consulted?

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order!

The Hon. T.H. HEMMINGS: I do not know how the question was phrased to the Attorney-General, but—

Members interjecting:

The Hon. T.H. HEMMINGS: I thought that being brief last time was what you, Sir, and the Opposition wanted. The amount of money that could have been made available under the International Year of Shelter for the Homeless received the full support of the Attorney-General and Cabinet. I should imagine that when the Attorney answered the question in the other place, it was in relation to particular projects that were going before the Residential Tenancies Tribunal. As I said to the member for Coles, they are before the Chairperson of the Residential Tenancies Tribunal and—

Members interjecting:

The Hon. T.H. HEMMINGS: I am a great friend of the Attorney-General. In fact, I am seriously considering making him my trustee when I die.

An honourable member interjecting:

The Hon. T.H. HEMMINGS: Before I die, yes. If one understands the legislation under the Residential Tenancies Tribunal, the Attorney-General in his capacity as Minister of Consumer Affairs cannot have any influence on what the Residential Tenancies Tribunal decides, so it would be grossly improper for me to seek support from the Attorney-General prior to the Residential Tenancies Tribunal looking at those projects. I thought that would have been perfectly clear to those intelligent members opposite.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order!

EDUCATION DEPARTMENT EXHIBIT

Mr PETERSON: Can the Minister of Education say what purpose is served by schools and the Education Department exhibiting at the Royal Show? As a constituent has contacted me and queried the usefulness and purpose of such participation, and as I am not in a position to explain the reason for the policy on such a matter, I ask the Minister for clarification.

The Hon. G.J. CRAFTER: I thank the honourable member for his question and for giving me notice of it, because I have been able to gather some information about the involvement of school students, of whom there are many figuring in the life of our annual Royal Show. I am very proud indeed of the contribution that students are making to the many exhibits, displays and activities at the Royal Show. It is an important learning experience for the students involved and for those young people who come each year to the show. It represents an extension of or supplement to their studies in the form of a practical application of their knowledge and skills, so much so that the Education Department's School Activities Centre was awarded first prize in the ANZ Bank 1987 marketing awards, that prize having been presented yesterday, I think, to the organisers and students involved in that quite magnificent display.

The display includes the *Showbiz* newspaper produced by students at the show using high tech methods, and it includes radio station 5WX run by Willunga High School's year 12 media studies class. Willunga High School is the only public school in South Australia with a licence to transmit such broadcasts.

The Education Department is also combining with the Commonwealth Bank, which generously sponsored an Agricultural Learning Centre, and I have visited and spent time there myself. Many hundreds of young people have been enjoying the exhibits, displays and the practical opportunities afforded students and young people generally who are attending the show. The led steer event was judged last Friday, and we saw 45 South Australian schools providing entries for that event.

The steers had been prepared, once again, by students for showing. So, there has been substantial cooperation with schools, the administration of the Education Department, the Royal Agricultural and Horticultural Show Society and many private sponsors, and this has enabled thousands of people in the community to learn about agriculture and current developments in schools, a process, of course, which many people have enjoyed.

It also draws attention to the diversity and importance of South Australia's agricultural industries and their links with education programs in schools, and it illustrates the impact of technology on agriculture and education. Further, it provides an insight for students into possible career opportunities and gives them experience of participating in a work-like environment. Above all, it highlights the excellence of South Australian schools.

TAKEOVER BIDS

The Hon. E.R. GOLDSWORTHY: My question is to the Premier.

Members interjecting:

The Hon. E.R. GOLDSWORTHY: The Minister of Housing and Construction is incapable of answering a question.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order! The Deputy Leader is out of order. He should proceed with his question.

The Hon. E.R. GOLDSWORTHY: I am replying to the Premier's interjection, Mr Speaker.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: The interjection, whatever it was, was equally out of order.

The Hon. E.R. GOLDSWORTHY: The question is as follows, Sir. Following concerns being expressed in South Australian business circles about certain activities of the Government's advisers, Dominguez Barry Samuel Montagu Limited, can the Premier confirm that senior officers of the Department of State Development, at a briefing earlier this year, gave information, some of which could well have been confidential to Dominguez Samuel, about major business houses, operations in South Australia which may have led to the takeover bids for Fauldings and R.M. Williams?

The Hon. J.C. BANNON: I am not aware of any such confidential information being passed on to DBSM, and I would be very surprised if it was. It was previously made quite clear in this place what is the basis of the relationship and consultancy with DBSM. I think it is a very sensible thing. Presumably one of the sources for the Deputy Leader's question has been the bit of flurry in the press that has been engendered by some consultancy firms based here in Adelaide which believe that they are possibly missing out on some business that they might otherwise get.

The facts are that, with a view to taking a strategic look at the operation of businesses in South Australia, the Department of State Development has placed DBSM on a consultancy for a limited term, which will be reviewed over coming weeks, to assist the department in handling some of the approaches and queries coming from companies subject to takeover threats and other activity. An important aspect of this is that, while the Government does not believe that it should in any way manipulate the private sector in its operations or interfere in the marketplace, equally it believes that it should not sit back twiddling its thumbs while our locally owned and controlled businesses are taken away from this State—as happened between 1979 and 1982 at great cost to this State.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order!

The Hon. J.C. BANNON: The inactivity and failure of the previous Government to do anything at all about the Bank of Adelaide takeover, when three or four constructive propositions were before it, was a tremendous setback for this State and a burden that we have only just begun to lift. I am on the record previously, and will be on the record again today, as saying that we are not in that game. While it is not the State's job to protect companies unreasonably,

we are prepared, when approached for advice and assistance, to so provide it and take professional advice and introduce those who can assist.

I can assure some of those people who feel uneasy about the DBSM exercise not only that we will ensure that it is kept under review but that it is no threat to their activities. Indeed, I understand that it has so much work anyway—because there is so much activity occurring in South Australia—that they need have no worries about their business being affected. That is the basis for this matter, and I am surprised that the Deputy Leader of the Opposition picked it up in the way that he did.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order!

DIELDRIN

Mr PLUNKETT: Can the Minister of Agriculture indicate what problems can be caused by the use of dieldrin as a jet spray treatment against fly strike in sheep, and say whether it is possible that dieldrin is still being used for this purpose in South Australia?

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order!

Mr PLUNKETT: In the early 1960s as a shearer I took action to stop the jet spraying of dieldrin while work was being performed in the shearing sheds because it was considered that it was detrimental to the health of workers. I was under the impression that in the late 1960s dieldrin was barred from use because it was shown to penetrate the skin and thereby could be detrimental to workers. I am surprised that this question has not been raised by those members opposite who represent the farmers.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order! It has been very difficult at times to hear the member for Peake, who, as we all know, is very quietly spoken. The honourable member may have strayed into comment at the end of his question and, had I been aware that he was going to make those concluding remarks, leave would have been withdrawn. The Minister of Agriculture.

The Hon. M.K. MAYES: I thank the honourable member for his question, which has been of considerable interest in the community. The media has drawn a great deal of attention to the issue of chemical residues, particularly the testing processes that have been undertaken in the trace-back and the data bank established to deal with organochlorines. The issue of dieldrin has been addressed by the department over a number of years. Since 1966 in this State it has not been approved for use with livestock, and that has been an important aspect of South Australia's protection, not only for the consumer but also for those farmers and farmhands using dieldrin as a chemical for agricultural purposes.

Concerning the matter that has been raised by the honourable member, it is important to consider how dieldrin has been used and whether it can be continued to be used in agriculture. The spraying of dieldrin can result in passing through into the sheep. The sheep is then slaughtered and used for human consumption, and the dieldrin can pass into the person. Being an organochlorine, it can form a cumulative residual that can contribute to the chemicals in the individual. A person can suffer serious health consequences as a result of that ingestion.

It is listed as a carcinogen as a result of any large quantity of dieldrin being accumulated in the human tissue. It can be sprayed on to wool, which can result in the storage of dieldrin in wool grease (lanolin), some of which can remain after processing the wool into garments. However, the likelihood of any quantities being absorbed through the human skin into the living tissue in terms of the individual human is low, and it is highly unlikely that there could be any cumulative consequences of spraying on to the wool.

One aspect that has been emphasised during this debate concerning chemical residues, particularly organochlorine, has been the ingestion by humans, and that can be activated by various means such as spraying, breathing in, entry through the human skin, and through the digestion of meat containing quantities of residual dieldrin or other organochlorines. Clearly, the accumulation of dieldrin can cause serious health problems for any human and, as a consequence of the toxicity which would be attributed, it might also result in more serious consequences if the accumulation is of a high level.

In South Australia, the situation can be regarded as satisfactory because of the survey conducted by the wool testing authority with the object of considering the whole aspect, including dieldrin. The testing of samples taken in South Australia has indicated no evidence of dieldrin residues. Many wool samples were taken from around Australia, and the tests were conducted mainly because of concern at that time with the arsenic-based dips that had been used for agricultural purposes. Therefore, knowing the honourable member's interest in the industry and his own experience, I can assure him that, having had dieldrin on the non-approved list since 1966, the situation is relatively safe and I am sure that the result indicated by the sample returned by the Australian Wool Board through the wool testing authority has shown that there will be little residue in South Australia as a result of the responsible use by South Australian farmers. So, the honourable member can report to his constituents that the situation is fairly safe in this State.

DEPARTMENT OF STATE DEVELOPMENT

Mr D.S. BAKER: Can the Premier say whether the head of his department (Mr Guerin) recently initiated an investigation into certain activities of the Department of State Development and, if Mr Guerin did carry out such an investigation, was it associated in any way with the department's link with DBSM? If not, why? How was the investigation made, and what was the outcome?

The Hon. J.C. BANNON: I am not aware of any such investigation and I should be surprised if it had taken place. So, my answer is 'No'.

ABORIGINAL PUBLIC SERVANTS

Ms GAYLER: Can the Premier say what is the situation regarding the employment of Aborigines in the South Australian Public Service? I have just returned from a visit to the Pitjantjatjara lands and I have heard that the Leader of the Opposition has criticised the Government's failure to increase the number of Aborigines employed in the South Australian Public Service. Is such criticism valid or is the Government still working towards a target of 1 per cent employment of Aborigines in the Public Service?

The Hon. J.C. BANNON: Yes, we are working towards that target. Indeed, I believe that we can claim to have succeeded in moving toward it. Consequently, I was surprised indeed to read a report under the headline ' "Government broke promise of more Aborigines in PS," says Olsen' on 3 September. That statement issued by the Leader of the Opposition arose consequent on an answer to a

question that he had put on notice on 6 August. Incidentally, I can now give updated figures as at 30 June 1987 in reply to the Leader's question. The reference in my answer to the Leader's question was as to the position at the end of 1986 and I referred to the latest Public Service Board report for those figures.

I was subsequently criticised by the Leader of the Opposition. Indeed, he wrote to the Speaker claiming that I had not answered the question adequately. I plead guilty to the charge that I did not provide those latest figures but, in defence, say that I have instructed that questions placed on notice should be answered as quickly as possible. Some can be answered more quickly than others. However, in this instance, where the figures were required, I said, 'Get the answer in' and indeed it was. Only last week, the Public Service Board compiled its table of Aboriginal employment as at the end of 1986-87 but, even disregarding that (and the position has improved during 1986-87) and going back to the end of 1986, the Leader of the Opposition in saying that we have fallen far short because the employment of 273 people of Aboriginal descent in departments only represented 0.53 per cent, was dishonest and misleading: in fact, that represents an increase in employment from 183 when the statement was made in September 1984 to the figure of 273. Therefore, there was a significant increase even to the end of 1986.

What the Leader of the Opposition did not say in talking of an achievement of 0.53 per cent to the end of that period was that, when the promise was made, Aborigines represented only 0.36 per cent employment in departments, so we had in fact had a conscious program that made great strides and achieved great achievements. In fact later figures than that indicate that what I have said is true. The number of Aborigines employed in Government departments as at 30 June 1987 is 317—0.6 per cent of employees or an increase of 73 per cent in the period since I announced that we would work systematically to increase those numbers.

Secondly, in the wider public sector the numbers were 466—that is 0.51 per cent, or an increase of 100 per cent on the original figures for that period. So, the Government is indeed committed to achieving the objective of 1 per cent and it is now working systematically to do so. It has made great progress. Incidentally, those numbers do not include a number of persons in training who we hope will be employed in the coming year. I say all that against the background of the decline in public sector employment. In other words, we are reducing overall numbers in public service departments and we have done that in the last two budgets. Yet, despite that, we are managing to increase the number of Aborigines. So, there is a double issue here: we are making sure that those persons of Aboriginal descent whom we think we should be directing specifically for employment opportunities are not being caught up or suffering in the overall reduction of public service sector.

ROAD TRAFFIC ACT AMENDMENT BILL (No. 2)

The Hon. G.F. KENEALLY (Minister of Transport) obtained leave and introduced a Bill for an Act to amend the Road Traffic Act 1961. Read a first time.

The Hon. G.F. KENEALLY: 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

First, this Bill deals with an inconsistency between provisions contained in the Road Traffic Act and those contained in the Road Traffic regulations in relation to the width of external mirrors on large commercial vehicles. National draft regulations provide for the width of mirrors to extend to 230 millimetres on either side on vehicles with a gross vehicle mass limit of more than 8.5 tonnes. There is a requirement that such mirrors are capable of collapsing to 150 millimetres. On 1 January 1986 the Road Traffic Act regulations were amended to enable the large mirrors to be fitted. However in determining the overall width of vehicles including exterior mirrors, the Act restricts the width to 150 millimetres on either side. The amendment is in line with national recommendations, and the States of Queensland, New South Wales and Victoria allow for the wider mirrors. It is understood other States and Territories have the matter under consideration and at this time the use of wider mirrors is tolerated by the enforcement agencies.

Secondly, the Bill provides for tighter controls when dealing with the weighing of vehicles suspected of exceeding legal mass limits. There are several provisions of the existing Act that need to be changed. For instance there is a need to overcome a technicality concerning the power of a police officer or an inspector requesting the driver of a vehicle to proceed to a weighbridge to determine the mass of the vehicle. It has been held in a case before a magistrate that, as there was no weighbridge at the site where the driver was directed to proceed (portable weighing instruments carried by the inspector were to be used), the inspector's request was not valid because there was not, at the time of the request, a weighing instrument at the site.

A growing problem occurs where drivers of heavy vehicles either refuse a direction by an inspector or police officer to proceed to a weighbridge or refuse to stop. The maximum penalty for refusing to weigh or stop is $1 000 and the average penalty imposed by the courts is in the order of $200-$300. Penalties for overloading on the other hand can amount to many thousands of dollars. For example, the penalty for an overload of 20 tonnes is minimum $3 835, maximum $7 800. During the year ended 30 June 1986, 1 402 overloads exceeding two tonnes were reported. Of those, 119 exceeded nine tonnes, and 43 exceeded 20 tonnes. The penalty for an overload of two tonnes is minimum $235, maximum $600. In other words where the overload exceeds two tonnes there is a distinct financial incentive to either refuse to weigh or refuse to stop. With freight rates at approximately $194 per tonne (Sydney to Perth) an overload of 20 tonnes would return an extra profit of $3 880. In 1986 there were 28 reported incidents where drivers either failed to stop or refused to weigh. This figure does not include a substantial number of drivers of heavy vehicles because inspectors were unable to subsequently apprehend the vehicles and obtain information to compile reports.

Overladen vehicles not only place undue stress on pavement, bridges, etc., but also place severe stress on vehicle safety compenents, for example, brakes, steering, tyres, suspension, transmission, etc., thereby placing the vehicle at greater risk with other road users. These heavy loads escalate the deterioration of pavements, bridges and culverts faster than planned and maintenance costs increase. The National Association of Australian State Road Authorities (NAASRA) in a publication released in 1984 estimates that damage to roads due to overloading results in repair costs of $400 million per annum.

Rather than increase penalties at this time for drivers who fail to stop or refuse to weigh it is considered that

police officers should have power to seize the vehicle and drive it to a place to determine its mass. If this power is granted to police it is contended that the majority of drivers will drive their vehicles to a weighbridge rather than allow another person to drive it. In other words the power to seize and drive would be a last resort. The Police Department does have within its ranks trained personnel who have the specific skills and are well qualified to drive the types of heavy vehicles in question. Where skilled police personnel are not available, it is proposed that a police officer has power to second a person with these skills and experience. The power to seize is not new. Section 160 (2a) of the Act enables a member of the Police Force to enter used car lots and examine, test, or drive vehicles suspected of being unroadworthy. Police in Victoria have power to seize vehicles and drive them to a weighbridge.

Furthermore it is considered reasonable to make the request to proceed to a place to be weighed anywhere on route provided the site is not more than eight kilometres from the route the driver intended to follow. In the past there have been incidents where the driver of a heavy vehicle in attempting to avoid the vehicle being weighed, will drive onto private property or disable the vehicle so that it cannot be driven. Power to enter private property and make a lawful request to weigh the vehicle and if necessary have it towed to an area for weighing is considered essential. Otherwise apprehension will be avoided. Finally there needs to be an immunity for the police against liability for damage to property which may be incurred *bona fide* in the execution of their duties. Again there is a precedent for this in section 160 (4a) of the Act.

The provisions of the Bill are as follows: Clause 1 is formal. Clause 2 amends section 141 of the Act, which requires that the width of a vehicle must not exceed 2.5 metres at any point. Proposed paragraph *(c)* of subsection (4) provides that the width of a rear vision mirror projecting not more than the prescribed distance from either side of a vehicle will not be taken into account in determining the width of a vehicle. This width was previously fixed at 150 millimetres. The proposed amendment enables greater flexibility in the projected width of rear vision mirrors. This is appropriate in relation to vehicles that have a large gross vehicle mass limit or where a vehicle is towing a wider vehicle.

Clause 3 repeals section 152 of the Act, which empowers a member of the Police Force or an inspector to request a driver or person in charge of a vehicle on a road to drive the vehicle or cause it to be driven to a weighbridge or other instrument for determining mass and to permit the mass of the vehicle and its load to be ascertained. A recent court case has revealed an anomaly with section 152. It does not empower a member of the Police Force or an inspector to direct a driver or person in charge of a vehicle to have the mass of the vehicle and its load ascertained by the use of an instrument for determining mass, where such instrument is not set up at some place within eight kilometres of the place where the vehicle is at the time the direction is given, for instance, where the instrument is carried in the police officer's or inspector's vehicle. Proposed subsections (1) and (5) resolve this anomaly.

Proposed subsection (2) provides that a direction under subsection (1) may only be given in relation to a vehicle that is not on a road where the member of the Police Force or inspector has reasonable grounds to believe that the vehicle has been driven on a road in contravention of a provision of the Act relating to mass. Proposed subsection (3) provides that a person must comply with a direction given under subsection (1).

Proposed subsection (4) empowers a member of the Police Force to enter or break into a vehicle, using only such force as is reasonably necessary, and to move, or cause another person to move a vehicle, where the driver or person in charge of the vehicle refuses or fails to comply with a direction given under subsection (1) or there are reasonable grounds to believe that the vehicle has been left unattended to avoid such a direction being given.

Proposed subsection (5) provides that a vehicle cannot be required to go a distance of more than eight kilometres in any direction from the place at which the vehicle was located when the direction was given or at which it was left unattended. However, proposed subsection (6) provides that this limit may be exceeded if the vehicle is driven along the route that the driver is believed to have been following, provided that any deviation from the route does not exceed eight kilometres.

Proposed subsection (7) exempts a member of the Police Force, or a person moving a vehicle at the request of a member of the Police Force, from civil liability for any act or omission in good faith in the exercise of powers under subsection (4). Proposed subsection (8) provides that any liability that would, but for subsection (7), lie against a member of the Police Force or other person lies against the Crown.

Mr INGERSON secured the adjournment of the debate.

SITTINGS AND BUSINESS

The Hon. G.F. KENEALLY (Minister of Transport): I move:

That the House at its rising adjourn until Tuesday 6 October at 2 p.m.

Motion carried.

PERSONAL EXPLANATION: MEMBER'S REMARKS

Mr LEWIS (Murray-Mallee): I seek leave to make a personal explanation.

Leave granted.

Mr LEWIS: During Question Time the member for Fisher, in the course of explaining a question he asked of the Minister of Agriculture, said:

My constituent believes that the department should operate an awareness program that sells the dangers of an outbreak of fruit fly in South Australia and is aimed at tourist operators, as her experience has shown that there is considerable ignorance—along the lines of the member for Murray-Mallee—and complacency concerning the fruit fly issue.

The SPEAKER: Order! The Chair expects that every member will receive the cooperation of the House when they are making a personal explanation. The honourable member for Murray-Mallee.

Mr LEWIS: Can I, therefore, disabuse the member for Fisher: I am a former fruit inspector with three years service in the Department of Agriculture and I do not believe myself to be ignorant of the dangers of a fruit fly outbreak in this State. Indeed, I did all I could to promote awareness of it. My interjection to him, if that is what he was alluding to, was to inquire about whether he thought the dangers were greater from Mediterranean or Queensland fruit flies.

APPROPRIATION BILL

Adjourned debate on motion to note grievances.

(Continued from 9 September. Page 861.)

Mr ROBERTSON (Bright): I take the opportunity to welcome a number of new and continuing initiatives that have considerable relevance to the electorate of Bright. From the capital works portion of the budget it is worth noting that the Hallett Cove school, formerly known as the R-10, is now nearing completion pretty much on schedule. Stage 2 is due for completion in March next year in preparation for the secondary intake at that time. The building of Stage 2 has involved the construction of 16 learning areas with associated wet areas, teacher communication facilities (namely, staff rooms), computing facilities, business studies, home economics, and technical studies areas, and playing fields.

The budget allocation this financial year for that is slightly in excess of $3 million, and that will bring Stage 2 to a successful and, one hopes, timely conclusion. Stage 3 is to be somewhat more grandiose, and in the coming financial year $880 000 out of a total of $3.54 million is to be spent. It will involve eight home-based classroom areas primarily for the secondary component of the school, two art areas, a ceramics area, a music studies area, a drama studio, an activity hall and a gymnasium, which will hopefully be built with the collaboration of the Marion City Council. Depending on the amount of council funding and the availability of funding at various times, it will be a considerably larger and better facility than was originally planned.

I welcome the rather progressive and innovative initiative of the Education Department in collaborating with the Marion council on that, and I welcome the council's participation in what will surely be a marvellous joint venture. In the area of transport, and again with particular relevance to the electorate of Bright, I welcome the continuing allocation of funds from the Australian Bicentennial Road Development program for the continuing purchase of ABRD buses. I know that in this financial year a further $2.4 million out of a total of $12.7 million will be invested in those buses, and the program is due for completion in June next year. That will bring our bus fleet in Adelaide up to a very high standard, and the benefits of that will flow directly into the electorate of Bright and many other electorates.

I also welcome the coming completion in June 1989 of the Adelaide resignalling project which has just begun on the southern Noarlunga railway line. A total of $42.6 million will be spent and, of that, $9.6 million will be spent this year. Work is proceeding apace with that project starting around the Brighton area and moving north and south on the Noarlunga line. It appears at this stage to be pretty much on schedule, and is going ahead with a relatively minimal degree of dislocation to local residents and commuters.

I also welcome the addition of 20 new 3000 class railcars in the coming financial year. The total cost of those is something in excess of $23 million, of which $6.9 million is to be spent this year. Because the Noarlunga line is perhaps the most profitable line operated by the STA and because so many of our constituents use that facility to commute to town, I welcome that allocation. I regard the service on the Noarlunga line as a particularly good service, and I think that that is a view held pretty much universally by people in the southern suburbs.

I will spend some time on the Estimates of Payments section of the recently delivered budget. I welcome, from the Department of Environment and Planning budget, an allocation of $2.14 million to the heritage conservation section. It is worth noting that that is up from $1.65 million last year. Of that $2.14 million, $1.36 million is to go to the State Heritage Fund. A proportion of that $1.36 million will go into Kingston House (in the suburb of Kingston Park) which, even in the previous budget, has benefited quite substantially from the State Heritage Fund, and is now nearing completion. It will serve as a very commodious and capable community focus for the people of Kingston Park. It is a marvellous piece of restoration. I hope that, when it is turned over to the public and to the public of Kingston Park at large, it will become a museum or some other facility for welding the various cultural aspects of Brighton and Marion together and providing a focus for people in the area.

I also see from the budget of the Minister for Environment and Planning an allocation of $662 500 for the coastal management section, which is somewhat higher than last year. From the Coast Protection Fund of $100 000 will come part of the allocation for the restoration of the Brighton foreshore. Since the budget papers were put together, quite clearly a decision has had to be taken about restoration of the foreshore which was so badly damaged in the storms of 22 and 23 June this year. It has recently been announced that, of the total cost of $235 000 to the city of Brighton, $218 000 of that will be met by the Coast Protection Board from its budget. That is not a bad proportion of the total funding allocated by the board for the restoration of the Adelaide coastline which, in fact, totalled $286 000, and I think that Brighton council can feel that it has been fairly treated in the allocation of $218 000 for the Brighton part of the coastline.

It is also worth noting that Brighton council itself has undertaken to put up $17 000 towards the restoration, and I am led to believe that the costs of restoring the foreshore in the Brighton area will be of the order of $178 000 for sand replenishment, drift fencing and the restoration of the Kingston Park foreshore; and a further $50 000 for the repair of the riprap seawall in the Somerton area, which of course is part of the electorate of the member for Hayward.

On the subject of Brighton and storm damage it is worth noting that, from the Minister of Marine's allocation, recreational jetties have received $470 000 in this year. I suggest that that will be absorbed fairly quickly in repairs resulting from the storms of late June of this year, but from that allocation Brighton council again has done relatively well, and the Brighton jetty, the repairs to which will cost something in the order of $5 000 for planking and straightening of piles, will receive $5 000. It is estimated that the total cost to repair that jetty will not be a great deal higher than that.

It is also worth noting in passing the allocation to the South Australian Sea Rescue Squadron, which last year got a grant of $28 000 for administration and purchase of equipment and $9 800 for fuel, both of which figures have increased this year to $29 000 for the grant itself and $10 000 for the purchase of fuel. That will enable the squadron to perform the vital role of sea rescue off the South Australian metropolitan coastline, and I take this opportunity to pay a tribute to the work done by the squadron. The money is indeed well spent, and I am sure that the $29 000 allocated in the grant this year will be equally well spent. One hopes that the squadron does not have too much work to do in the coming summer.

I wish very briefly to welcome two initiatives, under the budget of the Minister of Emergency Services, which come out of the Police Community Liaison section of the budget. The Neighbourhood Watch Program, for which $1.9 million has been allocated this year, has enabled the setting up in the Hallett Cove area of two programs which are running brilliantly and have been run successfully by the local progress association and other people. I hope that, from that $1.9 million to be allocated in the coming financial year,

the people of Marino will be able to set up their own Neighbourhood Watch Program.

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

Mr M.J. EVANS (ELizabeth): There are a number of matters I would like to bring before the House in this grievance debate. First, I would like to discuss what I consider to be an unfortunate trend in the commercial life of Australia, that is, towards total vertical integration of a number of industries. This trend is selective in that so far it is affecting only a particular number of service and retailing areas, but I believe that it sets a dangerous precedent overall and can have some potentially quite damaging effects on free trade in our marketplace, to the grave detriment of most consumers since, on the whole, the products about which I am concerned are used by a large percentage if not all of those in the marketplace.

Some of these areas are quite traditional but, in other cases, I believe that there is a growing danger of the practice spreading into other service industries where it has not traditionally been so prevalent. Some of the areas where I am most concerned—not exclusively, but principally—are, for example, most obviously in the case of petrol companies. The service stations have always been largely owned by the oil companies, with varying categories of lessees or commissioned agents and, in some cases, freeholders owning the property, but the vast majority of cases are on a leasehold basis tied to the oil company that owns the site.

While this may have operated reasonably well in the past, there is increasing evidence, going right back to the Fife report and the Fife package, so-called, of many years ago now, wherein the danger of this practice of the oil companies owning the petrol stations was made quite clear. Despite the recommendations in the Fife package, I do not really believe that substantial progress has been made and, in many cases, I think that the situation is even less free than it has been.

A very traditional area in this respect, of course, is hotels, where the breweries own the freehold of many licensed premises, the licensee simply being the manager of the property on behalf of the brewery with, in many cases, agreements also tying the hotel to the particular brewery's products. There is an increasing risk of the airlines, in an era of deregulation, moving into the travel agency business, securing ever larger percentages of the travel agents' share capital, and controlling that sector of the industry as well.

Although these three areas are not exclusive, by any means, they highlight three prominent areas where the average consumer is strongly affected, and where the anti-competitive elements of this problem will certainly come to light strongly in the next decade. I firmly believe that, if we are to restore that competitiveness, freedom of price structure and competitive service offering to the public in all of those areas of travel, petrol and licensed premises, it is essential that plans are laid now by the legislature, the Government, and by the industry to ensure a transfer of the ownership of those properties and businesses into the hands of the individual franchisee and the individual operator.

In my view it is vital that this transfer take place and the plans be laid now for it, before it is simply too late and very few of the operators are in a position to actually afford the businesses which they operate. When that occurs, they will simply be employees of, in many cases, the multinational operators who manufacture the product concerned or provide the service concerned, and then the element of competition in the marketplace will have entirely gone.

I do not really consider that up until now Government has adequately addressed this problem, and it is one that will need to be on our agenda in the future. Some action has already been taken in the area of land brokers and land agents, an area which in my view is strongly related to this, although there are differences in the approach, and Parliament has made it illegal for a land agent firm to own a land broking firm, for quite obvious reasons relating to conflict of interest and the provision of competition of service.

The Fife package clearly identified the problems of the petrol industry but did not really go much beyond that, and very little effort has been made to pick it up. Unfortunately, the capital cost of these businesses, in the case of hotels, airline travel agents and service stations, is becoming increasingly daunting and shortly will be beyond the reach of the operators at the retail level. It is therefore essential that this is looked at quite closely now.

I would also like to raise the question of urban infill. All members will have received the brochure from the Deputy Premier titled 'Adelaide: its future development'. That discusses, amongst other things, the question of urban infill. Elizabeth is an area which is particularly well suited to this proposition, having one principal landowner, the South Australian Housing Trust, which owns perhaps 40 per cent of the land in the city, and a number of its residential properties, particularly in the double unit category, are now of the order of 30 plus years old and in need of substantial upgrading.

An alternative to that is urban infill. Many of these properties are located on very large blocks, and there is no doubt that, if the Housing Trust continues its inquiries in this direction and is supported by changes to the planning system, substantial action could be taken to ensure that an opportunity exists to utilise existing services in cities like Elizabeth, which have been provided at substantial cost by ratepayers and taxpayers over the years, but which are now utilised by a diminishing number of people. It is essential that urban infill is used to increase the population density in those areas in accordance with modern planning techniques, so that the schools, shops, roadways and existing infrastructure can be better utilised by the whole community and not duplicated in new areas of development from the bare earth. That is a very expensive proposition compared with urban infill. As the pamphlet circulated by the Deputy Premier notes:

> Existing residents will still be able to object to and appeal against applications for housing that could adversely affect the neighbourhood. However, freeing up the appeal system will encourage housing choice.

It is quite clear from that that the appeal system itself needs to be addressed, and this pamphlet and the Deputy Premier have recognised it in that context.

I believe it is inevitable that we will have to move towards a situation where local government takes a greater responsibility for the planning system, and there is a greater degree of certainty in the planning system, even if that means that more categories of development have to be closely defined and placed into the permitted category rather than the consent category. That will need some very careful work in order to ensure that the conditions under which those developments take place with respect to environmental impact and access, height and privacy for neighbours and the like, all of which need careful consideration, are placed into the property category. I believe that if that is done, we can certainly make substantial inroads at minimal cost into our development needs.

I want to mention briefly the work of the Neighbourhood Watch groups which have been particularly successful in

Elizabeth. It was also brought to my attention, when attending those meetings and listening to the advice given by police officers, that Housing Trust building programs have not adequately addressed security questions. The best time at which to implement security measures is when the house is being built. Unfortunately, Housing Trust policies have not properly reflected the need for security in the past, and I hope that the Minister of Housing and Construction will insist that his architects and officers discuss the matter with the police to ensure that the proper guidelines are adopted from day one, when the property is first constructed. That way, the cost to the community will be the least and the long term impact upon the community of Neighbourhood Watch will be most beneficial.

In the moments remaining, I will refer very briefly to the Government sponsored advertisement placed in the *Sunday Mail* recently. My colleague the member for Semaphore also would like to address that issue. The advertisement contains a number of statistical summaries and graphs which I believe do not accurately depict in picture form, although they do numerically, the true state of the budget. It is most unfortunate that the Government published it in that form because, although the figures are accurate, I believe that the graphs have been designed in such a way as to not reflect the correct position for someone who simply looks at it in a casual way. Unfortunately, time does not permit me to go into the detail that that topic requires, but I draw it to the attention of the House in case other members have not yet seen that publication.

Mr FERGUSON (Henley Beach): I rise to express my opposition to the debate that has occurred in this House and the remarks made in relation to child-care. I refer specifically to the reference in *Hansard* when the matter was mentioned by the member for Murray-Mallee. I commend him for looking after his electorate and complaining about the lack of provision of counselling services there. That is a very proper thing for him to do. However, he stated:

> This action is taken in those communities at the same time that the Government is fully funding four new health and social welfare councils and 17 new child-care facilities in the metropolitan area. Those facilities are not for pre-school education or whatever; they are for the children of yuppies, the greedy, not the needy.

I found this to be a particularly distasteful statement, Mr Speaker, and in fact it is not accurate. Of the 17 new child-care facilities that are to be provided according to the budget paper, at least three (or four, depending on your definition of a country area) will be going into a country area, and the provision of pre-school education is the reason why—

Mr Lewis: You name the four.

Mr FERGUSON: It is not accurate to say there will be no pre-school education in the provision of child-care areas, because there is provision so far as child-care centres are concerned. I agree that child-care is a political issue. It concerns the distribution of power, resources and opportunities within families and society at large. Anybody who believes in the sharing of power and equality needs to consider seriously the provision of child-care, in my view. I have been involved in my electorate with a group of ladies who have been anxious to see the provision of child-care. They come from all shades of politics—from those who would support members opposite; from those who would support me; and from those people who would support various other political Parties. They would be absolutely astounded at the statement made in this House in regard to the provision of child-care.

I am aware of the opposition expressed from time to time in the community about the introduction of child-care. This argument is now disappearing, and the question of whether or not society should encourage mothers of young children to have paid jobs by providing child-care has now, to a large extent, disappeared. More than one third of the mothers of children below school age now have paid jobs, as do half the mothers of primary school age children. These statistics, on their own, are a sufficient reason for the provision of child-care. One has to consider not only the needs of the parents but the benefits that such a service offers the children. Children entering into child-care have educational development opportunities. They are able to play with other children and to learn to relate to adults outside the family. Some mothers feel it is almost impossible for them to meet the demands of small children for 24 hours a day while also attending to the domestic chores. Lack of space is also a common problem. Many families live in small houses or flats which do not have gardens or easily accessible public parks. Other difficulties may be less obvious.

All of us realise that not all families can afford toys, books and games, and some of us take for granted that, as a normal part of the provision for childhood, there should be sandpits, paddling pools and swings. These are not always available to many children, especially within my electorate. Attendance at child-care centres provides not only educational benefits but also the opportunity for companionship, imaginative play, and loud and messy games, much of which could not be enjoyed in the children's own homes. I have already mentioned the proportion of mothers of young children who are employed. One in three mothers with children under school age is now in the labour force, and 56 per cent of mothers are responsible for children of primary school age. The tendency of most of us when thinking about the need for child-care is in relation to women's employment, envisaging families with only one child below school age. The reality is that many women go out to work, even when they have two, three or more pre-school age children.

I do not accept the proposition that working wives go out to work for pin money or merely to provide an additional luxury that the families enjoy. In this age of very high interest rates and second mortgages, it is often essential that a working wife is available merely to provide the shelter for the family.

The other factor that we must consider is Australia's changing society. There has been a dramatic increase in the number of single parent families. Reference is often made to the 17-year-old so-called immoral girl who gets herself pregnant in order to achieve social service benefits. I have never accepted that argument, and I cannot see why she would commit herself to a life of poverty by deliberately getting pregnant.

In any event, the problems relate not to this type of person but to the number of divorces that occur in Australia. Once the number of divorces increases, the number of single parent families also increases. These are the people who find themselves in poverty. Recent surveys in South Australia reveal that this problem involves one in every six children. They are poverty stricken, they sometimes go to bed hungry, they are not properly clothed and they suffer all the indignities of poverty.

Employment is likely to be the only way that they can escape from this poverty, but employment is extremely difficult to organise in the absence of child-care. Almost 30 per cent of single parents in a recent Australian study stated that lengthy waiting lists and high costs or geographical

inaccessibility to child-care centres prevented them from making use of these services.

Time does not permit me to mention all the other needs, including those resulting from social stress and the lack of support in areas of social and geographical isolation. Non-English speaking migrants have special needs, and there are many other reasons why there ought to be child-care in this area. One of the propositions put by the member for Murray-Mallee was that the benefit from this type of institution would go to the greedy and not the needy. The Federal Government, in allocating money for child-care centres, has been very specific in stating that this money should be directed to those most in need. Indeed, establishing child-care has been a problem in my electorate in recent years, and I am pleased to say that in this year's budget an allocation is made for a child-care centre in my electorate. This is something for which I have been striving for the past five years. The foundations for the new centre will be going down in November, and the centre will be completed in the following November. The electorate might see the biggest party it has ever seen.

Over the years I have been negotiating with the Minister of Community Welfare, the Children's Services Office, the local member of Federal Parliament and the Minister for Community Services, and I have made many speeches in this House about the need for child-care within my electorate. I am extremely pleased to see that it will soon be a reality.

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

Mr PETERSON (Semaphore): In the few minutes allowed to me this afternoon, I would like to refer initially to certain statistics set out in the *Sunday Mail* of 30 August. I do not claim to be an expert in statistics or know how figures should be presented, but I believe that the advertisement was unnecessary. I do not believe that the Bannon Government needed to do this. The form of the statistics was deceptive, and I do not believe that they are accurate. On page 96 the first graph appears under the heading 'The Budget, back to basics'. Commonwealth payments to the States are shown in a series of graphs. In the first illustration, relating to 1983-84 and involving $1.62 billion, there were 10 divisions in the graph. The next graph was for 1984-85 and contained 12 divisions, involving $1.65 billion. The third graph showed six divisions in allocating $1.54 billion. The graph for 1986-87 allocated $1.47 billion using three divisions. The last graph, for 1987-88, had one division for the $1.37 billion. The actual visual impact was not in line with the fiscal situation.

I turn now to page 145 of the *Sunday Mail* and refer to the graphs depicting per capita levels of taxes. Again, I believe that the graph is inaccurate in regard to what it is supposed to portray. The worst graph, in my opinion, depicts State employment, where the vertical graph goes from 47 100 to 48 700 employees, while the actual physical illustration suggests a reduction by almost two-thirds. I do not think that that is satisfactory. Certainly, I do not know what the advertisement cost but it was probably $15 000 or $20 000, and I do not believe that such expenditure is justified. I thought the budget was basically responsible and included all the important matters, and I do not think this advertisement was necessary.

Mr Duigan: How would you tell the community?

Mr PETERSON: I certainly would not inform the community by giving false graphs. I would do it the right way, with figures. This was a waste of money. In speaking to the budget, I am pleased to see that the member for Henley Beach has finally got a child-care centre in his district, because he has been fighting for that for many years. Indeed, I am pleased that the capital budget included a couple of goodies for Semaphore, one being a fire station for $7.9 million. We have been seeking that since the previous Government appointed Mr Cox to undertake a survey. He suggested the fire station.

Members interjecting:

Mr PETERSON: It took a long time—eight years—and now we have got it. Although it is included in the budget, no date is given, and I will have to check that with the Minister.

Members interjecting:

Mr PETERSON: I am pleased that somebody mentioned the oil tanker berth. At page 45 of the capital works program, under 'Marine and Harbors', $3.8 million is allocated to 'Port of Adelaide oil tanker berth—Fire-fighting facilities'. That has taken three years, but we have got it.

Members interjecting:

Mr PETERSON: It is not the new berth that was promised. The explanation states:

> The work involves the provision, at one of the existing berths, of a fire-fighting installation to AAPMA Guidelines, improved access for fire appliances, and interconnecting product pipelines to remaining berths as an interim measure to improve fire safety pending construction of a new common-user berth.

Members interjecting:

Mr PETERSON: We will be long gone before we see that common-user berth. Indeed, it is a bit irresponsible to include it, because nobody believes that it will eventuate. No-one in the industry believes that that berth will be relocated. It is not just possible. The proposal put forward at the time of the unfortunate fire illustrated clearly that it is just far too expensive to relocate it. I understand the fire protection work will commence in January 1988 and be completed in June 1989. We are pleased about that.

Members interjecting:

Mr PETERSON: The commitment is there, and that is wonderful. In the few minutes remaining, I wish to refer to the submarine contract. I know that the member for Albert Park spoke very well on that topic the other night.

Mr Hamilton interjecting:

Mr PETERSON: The honourable member wanted to sell me a submarine badge for $5. I said, 'I don't need the badge—I have the submarines.' That is fair enough.

Members interjecting:

Mr PETERSON: It is interesting how that happened. The project has been under way for a long time. Let us not go into dates and who did what, and so on. South Australia has it. On 6 August the member for Briggs asked what action the State Government was taking to maximise South Australia's component of the $4 billion submarine program. The Premier's answer talks about what will happen—and how—and about trying to get the industry involved. The Premier said that he wanted to give a message to local industry. He went on to say that it was impossible at this stage to quantify exactly what our share would be but that we would do better than other States and depending on how we tackled it, we would get much more work than was anticipated.

The Premier said that to ensure that it happened there would be seminars, investment opportunities and other quite vigorous activities carried out, and people would become aware of the situation. However, a publication that I picked up the other day worries me. *Australian Productivity*, vol. 3, No. 2, April-May 1987, referring to this subject, asks, 'Submarines: can we meet the quality standards?' The frightening thing about this article is that it states:

Most Australian companies which have registered their interest in taking up part of the multi-billion dollar project to build new submarines for the Royal Australian Navy will find it difficult to match the project's quality standards.

Yesterday a question was asked in this House—and refuted today—about the standard and quality of the new *Island Seaway* vessel.

Mr Hamilton interjecting:

Mr PETERSON: I will come to that. That is unfortunate because it throws a shadow on how we do things in this State. Eglo Engineering has quite a reputation and considerable standing, and has turned out some remarkable engineering projects at its Osborne plant.

Mr S.J. Baker interjecting:

Mr PETERSON: It has built more than pontoons. The article in *Australian Productivity* goes on to state:

But of nearly 1 000 local manufacturers seeking appointment as subcontractors [on the submarine project] fewer than 50 have so far demonstrated to official assessors that they can meet defence standards.

So we have this industry on our doorstep and fears are being expressed. I raise this matter because we must be aware that the standards will be very high. We must set up education and training programs so that we have trained people to do these jobs.

The other day I received a letter from the Electronics Association of South Australia, which also expresses fears about the effect of the submarine project and other projects down the line on its own classification of skill. In relation to training, the letter states:

In the current climate of budget cuts in the public sector, it seems that blanket cuts are being applied with no assessment of the relative worth to the State's economy of the various institutions. A particular example which concerns our members is that of training in the electronics field. With the Submarine project now substantially established—

that is correct: there will be a component in this State—

in South Australia we would expect corresponding resources to be built up, even at the expense of other less critical ones. It appears however that the areas of electronic, electrical and mechanical engineering at technical officer level are receiving the same budget treatment as other areas. We feel that this is potentially disastrous since indications are that we will require a substantial increase in these types of personnel within the next two years. Figures of 200 to 300 are being quoted.

That may be so, and many other professions will be required. I have noticed advertisements for the submarine project appearing in local papers. The project is under way, and the day is drawing closer when we will see these submarines. As I said previously—

An honourable member interjecting:

Mr PETERSON: I do not need the badge; I have the submarine. We must have adequately skilled people.

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

Motion carried.

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

That the proposed expenditures for the departments and services contained in the Appropriation Bill be referred to Estimates Committees A and B for examination and report, by Tuesday 6 October, in accordance with the timetable which has been distributed.

With the indulgence of the House I will not read the motion because of its length and because it has been distributed to all members for their information.

Motion carried.

The Hon. M.K. MAYES: I move:

That Estimates Committee A be appointed, consisting of the Hon. B.C. Eastick and Messrs Ferguson, Hamilton and Klunder, Ms Lenehan, and Messrs Lewis and Olsen.

Motion carried.

The Hon. M.K. MAYES: I move:

That Estimates Committee B be appointed, consisting of Messrs S.J. Baker, Becker, and Duigan, Ms Gayler and Mr Groom, the Hon. T.M. McRae and Mr Meier.

Motion carried.

JUSTICES ACT AMENDMENT BILL

Adjourned debate on second reading.

(Continued from 9 September. Page 846.)

Mr S.J. BAKER (Mitcham): The Opposition supports the Bill before the House. It represents but a small part of a package of measures which have been discussed and will continue to be discussed to tackle the issues associated with child sexual abuse. Before I actually deal with the Bill I will record some criticisms of the Government. First, it should be noted that this Bill deals with but a very small segment of the measures that may be necessary in the future to adequately grapple with the vexed issue of child sexual abuse. Members would recall that a task force was set up in 1984 to review the matter of child abuse—and it reported in October 1986. This is the first piece of legislation that we have seen as a result of that report.

There is a vast number of other issues and recommendations contained in the report that need to be dealt with: some are controversial and others would obviously enjoy bipartisan support. So my first criticism of the Government is that this Bill touches only the edges. I will refer to that later because it has certain ramifications. My second criticism of the Bill is its timing, although we note that there were some delays in another place at the insistence of my colleague. However, because of the way that the parliamentary session has been organised, it has not been possible for this House to consider fully the Bill in the normal way. The Bill was introduced yesterday and it is to be debated today and, as a result of the orders under which we operate, if the Bill does not pass today a number of pending cases within the courts system will not have the benefit of this legislation. Again, I will deal with that in a moment. As I said, there are two criticisms about the way that this Bill has been handled.

The Bill seeks to overcome some of the problems associated with children being present in court at committal hearings. The Bill canvasses the whole ambit of committal proceedings in that it applies to whatever offences may be determined can be appropriately dealt with under these special provisions. It does not necessarily relate only to sexual offences. The House would recognise that the area of sexual offences is undoubtedly the most difficult of all to cope with and, therefore, it is appropriate that the net should not be limited to that area but should be spread across the board.

The Bill allows for children under the age of 10 years to be interviewed, and the results of the interview to be presented at a committal hearing without the child having to be present. That is done in two forms: first, it can be done via a written record of the police interview; and, secondly, it can be done by video interview, a copy of which can be presented to the committal proceedings, and a transcript of the proceedings could be made available with the video. That in itself seems to be an eminently fair and reasonable proposition, on the face of it.

Before dealing with further difficulties that may arise in that context, I shall devote some time to discussing the general topic with which the Bill deals. It is important for members to understand that sexual abuse of minors is a serious problem. I shall talk about child abuse broadly, because of the serious ramifications of both sexual and non-

sexual abuse not only in respect of the children who are abused but also in respect of their children and the wider community.

Research has shown that children who are abused have a high probability of doing the same things to their own children as their parents have done to them. Various estimates are available in this regard. In the area of physical assault, the probability of such assault continuing to the next generation can be 500 per cent greater than in the case of families where such assault has never occurred. In the area of sexual assault, estimating is a little more difficult because of the participation of both sexes. In the sexual assault situation, most perpetrators are male, but not exclusively. Thus, the continuance of that behaviour cannot be considered in the same way as with physical assault. The research is a little equivocal on whether the problem is increasing or decreasing. The general conclusion, however, is that the situation is perhaps not getting much better.

Studies have not been able to ascertain clearly whether the problem is increasing because each generation is passing on the ills that it has experienced. However, even if we have not been involved ourselves, we can appreciate the enormous trauma that is associated with physical and sexual abuse. There are two ways of reacting to the situation as the child goes through the formative years and into parenthood. There can be the positive reaction of saying, 'We'll never allow that to happen in our family.' Alternatively, there can be an acceptance that abuse is a normal part of family behaviour. The abuse about which I am talking has existed ever since the beginning of human life on earth, but only in recent years have we tended to recognise that there is a difficulty in this regard.

Child abuse affects a certain percentage of the population and something should be done about it because of the generational flow-on of the abuse that can occur. This impacts not only on the family concerned but spreads into the wider community concerning people's view of themselves and their family relationships. In seeking solutions to the problem, I refer to the findings of the task force and the extreme arguments that can be advanced. One such argument is that on the filing of a complaint the sexual perpetrator should be locked up. Indeed, it has been suggested that, when a complaint is lodged, the person complained about should be put behind bars never to be seen again. On the other hand, some people argue that, no matter how good or bad the circumstances, the incident should remain within the family.

Fortunately, the community debate lies somewhere between those two extremes. I do not intend to argue all the areas of research in this matter, because that will come later when we consider the recommendations of the task force which, unfortunately, are not before us at this stage. The Bill seeks to determine whether the committal of a person to court proceedings is appropriate by reducing the element of stress placed on young children in this situation when they must appear in committal proceedings and, perhaps in a quiet conducive atmosphere, be tested for the truthfulness of their statements. The existing system has problems, one of which is the extraordinary delays that are borne by the system. I refer members to the contributions made in another place on this Bill by my colleagues, the Hon. Trevor Griffin and the Hon. Diana Laidlaw, who summed up the situation excellently.

An area identified as a considerable problem concerns court committals. There may be a way, as a result of this measure, of streamlining committal proceedings so that we do not necessarily have children present at the time of those proceedings. This may well be a means of speeding up the process. If we have to wait two years before a case comes before the court, the quality of the evidence is considerably diminished and the quality of the justice may be impaired. Each occurrence of child abuse puts the family through great stress, so making it non-mandatory for a child to be present at the committal proceedings is all for the good.

I have spoken today about the reasons behind this measure and about some of the bonuses that could come out of the proposed system. However, what Liberal members are supporting today is not to be taken as a precedent that we would support such a proposal being used as part of the general system of court proceedings, as has already been suggested by more than one person.

I suggest that the process that has been advanced by the Attorney-General and supported by Liberal members in another place can be regarded as a two-edged sword. On the one hand we may well have a better quality of evidence and reduce the trauma that the family and the child must endure. On the other hand, however, all members must be aware of the risk associated with the measure. When a person goes to court, that person is often in the dark as to what evidence will be presented. So, if a person is brought before the court, that person can never guarantee what elements of evidence will be brought against him or her.

By going through this procedure where the police attempt to establish a *prima facie* case all the evidence will probably be revealed. Thus, the person accused of the crime will be in a better situation than he or she would have been in had the evidence never been tendered in that form. In committal proceedings it is only necessary for the magistrate to satisfy himself or herself that there is a case to answer, and indeed the witness will be able to support that case. Once we have a full transcript for the committal proceedings the defence will be armed with far more material than it would have had previously.

The other aspect of this measure is that we are not determining justice as such. When we are talking about young children, we are talking about an area where evidence is very difficult. We know, when talking to our own children, how indefinite they can be and seem. That may or may not be fully revealed by a video tape, and it may act as a counterproductive measure when a magistrate is determining whether or not the case should proceed.

The probability of success in sexual abuse cases is far higher when there is strong medical evidence. However, when that evidence is not so strong—and the vast majority of cases are of sexual interference and not of sexual intercourse—we get into a very difficult area concerning proof. The courts cannot and probably never will be able to determine who is right and who is wrong. In cases where opinion is put forward, particularly opinion of young people (below the age of 10 or even above the age of 10), we get to the situation where perhaps the courts have to be looked at in a different way than the way in which we are looking at them today.

My personal opinion is that in some cases the decision not to proceed with a committal may be seen by an accused as having got away with a crime. One of the things that we have to look at in the law today is what parts of the law serve as well as they should. As I said, when there is significant medical evidence the probability of success in relation to a prosecution is very high and when there is very little medical evidence the probability decreases very dramatically, and decreases more dramatically with very young children.

I am not necessarily disposed towards the proposition that the courts in their current form are the best mechanism to deal with some of these cases. However, these things will

be argued at a later time when we have the other parts of the jigsaw puzzle put before us.

I now deal with the so-called rush to get this measure through the Parliament. The questions I ask, I hope, will be answered during the Committee stage. As this Bill was presented three weeks ago, how do the people already in the system comply with the underlying demands of the new system? Will that evidence already taken comply with what this Parliament believes is the necessary evidence that should be put before the courts? Will those interviews have been conducted by the most skilled practitioners available? Will the proceedings of the interviews have been reported in a way that is consistent with this Act?

To a certain extent I believe that this Parliament has been blackmailed to push through this measure although there are all these cases already in the system. I would argue that, since this legislation has been before the other House for only some three weeks, the 30 odd cases already in the system (as quoted by the Attorney-General) may not comply with these provisions. Hand in hand with that is the fact that nowhere in the contribution by the Attorney-General did he say that we had all the right skills and all the people necessary to undertake the interviews in a way that is envisaged by this measure. The Liberal Opposition accepts the proposition before the House but does not wish this acceptance to be seen as a precedent for later measures that may envisage the extension of the principle contained in the Bill to go further than the measure we have considered here today.

Ms GAYLER (Newland): I strongly support this first of a series of Bills dealing with the law relating to child sexual abuse. It is abhorrent to think that any children in our community are the subject of sexual abuse. It is even more despicable to think that more often than not adults known to the family or part of the family are the sexual abusers. Nevertheless, we must not close our eyes to the facts and figures relating to the extent of sexual abuse of young girls and boys.

In 1985-86, 521 cases of child sexual abuse were reported. In 1986-87 that number had risen to 770 reported cases. There are five fundamental ingredients of child sexual abuse. First, it is nearly always committed by a close family member or friend. Secondly, it is invariably done secretly with no witnesses. Thirdly, a high percentage of offences are against children aged 4 to 11 years. Fourthly, very often there are no physical signs of abuse which might have been going on for many months or even years. Fifthly, alleged offenders nearly always vehemently deny any charges.

In the light of those characteristics there are a number of ways of dealing with the problem of child sexual abuse. Preventive measures are very important. They include discouraging violence, particularly domestic violence and other violence in families. They also include new programs for developing protective behaviour amongst young children themselves. My schools, including Ridgehaven Junior Primary School and others, are introducing protective behaviour programs for their young children, and I am pleased that they have had the assistance of the education northern area advisers in doing so. Two of my kindergartens, Kathleen Mellor and Surrey Downs, and the parents, have shown a very real interest in this matter. They value the idea of ensuring that young children feel confident in saying 'No' to behaviour which makes them feel uncomfortable.

I congratulate the pre-school staff and management committee for recently hosting an important meeting. Prevention will be a very important means of reducing the incidence of child sexual abuse. I am also pleased that the State Government has established a new Child Protection Council, and particularly pleased that the Chairperson of that council is Dame Roma Mitchell, former Supreme Court judge and Chairperson of the Commonwealth Human Rights and Equal Opportunities Commission. A number of these measures were proposed in the 1985 Government task force on child sexual abuse and its most worthwhile report. Since that time, in the recent State budget the Government has announced additional Department for Community Welfare staff and funds to enable it to better handle the incidents that occur.

Turning to the criminal justice system, the legal system must bring perpetrators to justice and protect the young. For these reasons, our law needs to be quite firm and clear to the community and to potential offenders. This Justices Act Amendment Bill deals with committal hearings, the preliminary stage of court proceedings to determine whether a matter will go to trial and whether the accused has a case to answer. This Bill will allow children's evidence to be given by video and transcript of video, including the evidence of children under the age of 10. The process of laying a complaint and giving evidence to all manner of people can be a very traumatic experience—and is, in most cases.

There can be initial interviews and investigations, DCW interviews, police sexual assault unit investigations and interviews, CIB interviews, medical examinations, legal expert and Crown Prosecutor interviews, leading up to committal proceedings and trial. Very simply, this process would be stressful for an adult. For a child it involves tremendous pressure and great trauma, and this has been pointed out very clearly by the Major Crime Squad head, Superintendent Rob Lean, who recently said:

> You can imagine the trauma the child is going through at all those various stages. There is tremendous pressure, and some of the children do break down because of their tender years. Some of the things we are trying to do will do away with some of those traumas for the child.

I see this Bill as an important step in reforming the law. It is a positive initiative which I believe is welcomed by the community, and it certainly is by those in my district to whom I have spoken about the matter. I congratulate the Minister of Health and Community Welfare on all the work he has done on this matter.

Other proposed legal reforms that I hope will be introduced soon include provisions for emergency protection orders and other provisions regarding trial evidence. These two matters are very contentious. In relation to emergency protection orders, I hope that there will be provision in emergency cases for a judge to make an order that the alleged offender be restrained from the home of the child. This is a very serious step to take. Nevertheless, it seems to me that we must not in these cases punish the victim. For example, where the child is a member of the family and is being abused by a member of that family, how can we remove the alleged child victim from that home for the long months that it takes for all of these processes and court proceedings to take place? It seems to me that, in making the difficult choice between protecting the child or the rights of the alleged offender in these sorts of cases, we must come down on the side of the child victim.

The second contentious matter relates to children under 10 years giving evidence. I hope that we will see the judges being given the power to determine that a child under 10 is capable of giving evidence. Of course, the judge will have to weigh up various matters and talk to the child involved. I understand that, if the child is found by the judge to be capable of giving evidence, then corroboration will not be necessary. It should be clear that in most incidents of child sexual abuse corroboration will simply not be possible. I

urge this House to support the first in a series of legal reforms in this very important area.

Mr BLACKER (Flinders): I, too, support this legislation. It is only the first of what I believe will be a number of pieces of legislation attempting to do something about the child sexual abuse problem which appears to be growing in the community. I say 'appears to be growing' advisedly because, although the statistics show a dramatic increase, I think that those statistics could be somewhat distorted by virtue of the fact that it is only of recent times that people have been prepared to be a little more open and report the offences whereas, in years gone by, many of those offences would have been covered up within the immediate family or the extended family so that no officialdom was brought into the offence.

For my sins as a member of Parliament, I suppose I have had a number of constituents confide in me about cases involving this type of offence. It goes from distant relatives who have had members of their extended families involved, to immediate families, where it has been between the father and the children of that family and, more particularly I suppose, it is associated with a step-parent or step-father, in most cases.

I have been somewhat sickened when I heard the stories of these very distraught people. In many cases these people are coming to me not so much for themselves, because by that time they are adults and are attempting to rebuild their lives, but more particularly on behalf of their children or nieces or nephews whom they know have been subjected to this sort of abuse. This piece of legislation aims to make it easier for evidence to be taken, and I personally like the idea of evidence being taken with video cameras without the trauma of cross-examination in a court atmosphere which, more often than not, will be six or eight months after the offence was committed.

By that time, peer group pressure on the child, either from within the family or from without, will be so great that I am given to understand that it is on very rare occasions that the police will be able to secure a prosecution, mainly because the victim has, if you like, got cold feet and has been rather reluctant to go on with the evidence. That is a problem, and it has probably been one of the very reasons why so many offenders have got away with their indecent behaviour.

The court delays are problems of real concern and I believe that, if evidence can be taken by way of videotape very soon after or at the time the offence is detected, obviously there is a better chance to get that sort of information into a court, whereas if one has to wait for six to eight months for a child to be brought to a court, obviously the pressure on that child will be great and the recall of the actual incident may be somewhat distorted in that time as well.

From what I can understand, I believe that in most of the victims' cases it is not so much a vendetta against the offender that they are looking for but more particularly that the abuse must stop. That seems to be the main issue in cases where children are involved. They do not necessarily want to take any vindictive action, like an eye for an eye but, more particularly, they just want it to stop so that they can live a normal and decent life. It is cases like that, I suppose, that are the very reason that many of the victims do not press ahead with more reporting than perhaps they do.

I mentioned briefly the increase in statistics. The member for Newland quoted statistics, and I have some concern with the use of the figures as they are now available, mainly because I do not believe that the offences were so readily reported a few years ago as they are at the present moment. Even though there is a considerable increase in the number of offences reported, there are still many not reported, and therefore a lot of these crimes are perpetrated within the community, much to the distaste of the bulk of the community, in a way in which many people seem helpless to be able to do anything about.

The real problem in my view is the scars that the victims carry for the rest of their lives. They may not be physical scars but, more particularly, emotional scars and the damage done to the person and, in many cases, the effects of that damage on their own family later in life. To that end, I do not believe that this Parliament can be too strong in its actions in handling an issue of this kind, because it is a very serious matter and I trust that Parliament treats it as such right down the line. Probably I, for one, would favour very strong penalties against an offender to act as a deterrent and to prevent and, if need be, set up as an example to other would-be offenders to see that they do not do the same themselves.

I support the legislation. It is certainly not—and I think it is readily admitted—the answer in itself, but it is partway down the track and is something this House should support. Hopefully the legislation which is to follow will be complementary to that presently before the House.

The Hon. G.J. CRAFTER (Minister of Education): I thank the Opposition for its indication of support for this measure and for facilitating its speedy passage through this House. I acknowledge that it has come to us in a manner which is not usual, and I appreciate the cooperation of the Opposition. The Bill has been in the other place for some weeks and has been the subject of thorough scrutiny there. However, it is important that this measure passes through here and is proclaimed speedily so that it can bring to the courts this additional power that will enable the evidence of young children to be taken in committal proceedings in the way outlined in the measure, by amending section 106 of the Justices Act.

I appreciate the comments made by each of those members who have contributed to this debate, and share their concern about this whole area of child abuse and, in particular, the sexual abuse of children that occurs all too frequently in our community. As the member for Newland said, often the perpetrator is a member of that child's family or a person well known to the family. Because of that relationship, the vulnerability of children in these circumstances is all the more of concern to us all. Not only should this measure and the bringing of these matters before the courts and successfully dealing with them stop the behaviour, as the member for Flinders has suggested, but we would hope that, in the process and out of the fullness of the inquiry that has brought about these amendments, the Government's task force on child sexual abuse will emerge a whole range of rehabilitation programs that will see those who have a propensity to offend in this way given an opportunity to receive treatment and mend their ways. They could then take their place as responsible persons in the community, rather than simply being punished by incarceration and at some stage presumably released and, unfortunately, in some cases offend again. So, this is a minor measure, one step along the path, but an important one, and I appreciate its speedy passage today through the House.

Bill read a second time.

In Committee.

Clauses 1 and 2 passed.

Clause 3—'Application of amendments.'

Mr S.J. BAKER: I raised a question during the second reading debate relating to the fact that the Attorney-General intimated that a number of cases were waiting on the passage of this legislation. I understand that the Attorney was keen that it should be on the statute books as soon as possible so that these cases could benefit from the measures contained herein. During the debate, I questioned whether indeed the quality of evidence already taken on those cases would comply with what I think are some very strong requirements under this Act, that the quality of evidence collected via written statement or video be as good as humanly possible and be appropriately witnessed.

The Hon. G.J. CRAFTER: I thank the honourable member for raising this matter. The Crown has taken advice on the application of the Bill in those circumstances and it is believed, as I understand it, that where the police officer who has taken the evidence can at a subsequent time verify that that evidence is true and correct, that evidence can be admitted to the committal proceeding in those circumstances as if in fact it had been gathered in accordance with the provisions in this measure. The Attorney has taken advice from the Solicitor-General in this matter, and that is referred to in the second reading explanation, on the application of the date of commencement of the legislation. I am further advised that if there is some challenge in the proceedings to the validity of that evidence, there is always the option to call the police officer who took the evidence and have him or her verify it before the justice.

Clause passed.

Clause 4 passed.

Clause 5—'Receipt of evidence of prosecution witnesses.'

Mr S.J. BAKER: I wish to make a couple of observations about this clause. Recognising that many of these areas have been canvassed strongly in another place, I do not wish to take up the time of the Committee in going over old ground. However, there are two areas that I believe need specific reference, and I request the Minister to give an undertaking in these matters, which both relate to what is in the system today and what we need to do to make this change work. The first matter is in respect of the training of interviewers and those people who will be handling difficult cases.

Although this measure was initiatied by sexual abuse cases, it covers the whole ambit of all proceedings involving minors under the age of 10. It is important that in those emotional areas, perhaps involving murder cases, physical abuse cases and sexual abuse cases, the quality of the interviewing, given the process that we are now going to follow, has to be of the highest order. There needs to be a training program for all the people involved, particularly police officers, who will have to certify the evidence given in these circumstances.

The related question is whether the Crown should be the sole prosecutor in sexual abuse cases. As I said, this matter was canvassed in another place. We have precedent set in New South Wales and in the United Kingdom where the Crown is solely responsible for prosecutions in this area. There are some good reasons for that, of course. The important thing to remember is that we are not criticising the police but we believe that perhaps police prosecutors may not have had the same breadth of experience because, dealing across the board with a whole variety of offences, they may not have those specialised abilities. In another place the Attorney gave some undertakings that there would be training or briefing that would address the question of how adept the team of interviewers and prosecutors would be in these circumstances. Therefore, for the edification of the Committee, I would be pleased if the Minister would give some undertakings in that regard.

The Hon. G.J. CRAFTER: I understand that the Attorney did give some information to another place with respect to these matters, and I would simply repeat that. With respect to the police, there is already a training program. With respect to Crown prosecutors, a seminar is planned and further training of Crown prosecutors in these new procedures will occur. Further, I understand that the Child Protection Council is considering training programs and opportunities for a wide range of professionals who are working in areas that relate to the provision of services for children in these circumstances.

Clause passed.

Title passed.

Bill read a third time and passed.

ESTIMATES COMMITTEES

The Legislative Council intimated that it had given leave to the Attorney-General (Hon. C.J. Sumner), the Minister of Health (Hon. J.R. Cornwall) and the Minister of Tourism (Hon. B.J. Wiese) to attend and give evidence before the Estimates committee of the House of Assembly on the Approriation Bill, if they think fit.

AUSTRALIA CARD

The Legislative Council transmitted the following resolution in which it requested the concurrence of the House of Assembly:

That this Parliament—

1. registers its strong opposition to the introduction of a national identification system, incorporating the Australia Card; and
2. if the legislation passes the Federal Parliament, calls on the State Government not to cooperate in the establishment of a national identification system incorporating the Australia Card.

FISHERIES (SOUTHERN ZONE ROCK LOBSTER FISHERY RATIONALISATION) BILL

Returned from the Legislative Council without amendment.

ADJOURNMENT

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

That the House do now adjourn.

Mr TYLER (Fisher): In this House on Tuesday night the member for Murray-Mallee, in his contribution to the budget debate, made an astonishing attack on the provision of 17 new child-care facilities in the metropolitan area. He said that these facilities were not for preschool education or whatever, but were for children of yuppies, the greedy and not the needy. When I interjected and tried to defend child-care centres, he replied by saying, 'Your type'.

Child-care is an important priority in my electorate. It is a subject on which I have made contributions in this House before and, in fact, you will recall, Mr Speaker, that in February this year I spoke about the need to increase children's services in my electorate.

I said at that time that one of the greatest needs has been the provision of child-care. Indeed, members will recall that

because of the rapid population growth we have experienced in the District of Fisher, combined with the unusually high proportion of children under the age of 14 years, the State Government has identified the Happy Valley council area as an area with a pressing need for child-care services, and is responding to this need. Newly released 1986 census figures have confirmed that one-third of the population of the Happy Valley council area is aged 14 years or under. This proportion represents well over 10 000 children. I seek leave to have inserted in *Hansard* a statistical age profile breakdown of the number of people in my electorate.

Leave granted.

ELECTORATE OF FISHER

Persons Aged	Census 1981	Census 1986	Percentage Increase/ Decrease
0- 4	3 546	4 250	19.9
5- 9	3 057	4 126	35.0
10-14	2 000	3 540	77.0
15-19	1 308	2 285	74.7
20-34	9 600	10 688	11.3
35-64	5 991	10 950	82.8
65+	698	1 371	96.4
Total Males	13 095	18 512	41.4
Total Females	13 105	18 698	42.7
Total Persons	26 200	37 210	42.0
Occupied Private Dwellings	8 102	11 395	40.6
Unoccupied Private Dwellings	329	471	43.2

Mr TYLER: This analysis shows that the electorate of Fisher is the baby boom electorate in South Australia. Over the intercensal period the population of this electorate increased by 42 per cent to 37 210, making it the electorate with the greatest rate of increase; the largest population; the most children under five; the most children under 10; and the electorate with the highest proportion of 0 to 4 and 5 to 9 year olds. The age distribution of the electorate shows that Fisher has fewer 15 to 19 year olds and aged people than would be expected from an electorate of this size.

Most of the families are young and have young children. In fact, children under 10 years of age make up over 22 per cent of the electorate's population, compared with 14 per cent State wide. Over the past five years these two age groups have increased dramatically. The number of 10 to 14-year-olds in South Australia overall declined by almost 7 per cent, but in Fisher the number grew by a staggering 77 per cent.

In May this year the Happy Valley council conducted a survey to determine what services and supports are wanted and needed by residents of the Happy Valley council area. The survey included a questionnaire survey at local shopping centres and a more comprehensive questionnaire which was sent to about 60 organisations which provide children's services in the Happy Valley area.

Of the 277 respondents to the supermarket survey, 262 indicated that they had one or more children. Of these 262 parents, 10 per cent are sole parents; 18 per cent expect to return to work or study full time; 28 per cent expect to undertake part-time work or study within the next five years if child-care is available (and that is crucial); and 11.5 per cent say that they are unable to work or study at present due to the lack of convenient child-care. The ages of the children is an important factor to consider as it indicates the kind of service needed: 32 per cent of the children represented in the survey are 0-4 years of age, another 32 per cent are 5-9 years, 26 per cent are 10-14 and 10 per cent are 15 or over. This means that nearly two-thirds of the children represented in the survey are under 10 years of age. With regard to specific children's services, the major issues of concern to parents were road safety, especially near schools—

Mr Duigan: How many primary schools are there in your area?

Mr TYLER: About 13 State primary schools and four private primary schools, so there is a number of children of primary school age in my area. Road safety is a crucial issue, especially near schools. Other areas that featured prominently in the survey included recreational facilities for children, and child-care. Approximately two-thirds of the respondents from areas within the Fisher electorate indicated that more school crossings and bicycle tracks are needed. With regard to child-care services, more child-care centres were seen to be needed by 41 per cent of respondents, particularly in the Flagstaff Hill and Aberfoyle Park areas. The member for Murray-Mallee should visit my constituents at Flagstaff Hill and Aberfoyle Park and say what he said in this House on Tuesday night. They would certainly show him the door very quickly.

Mr Robertson: He wouldn't last five minutes.

Mr TYLER: He most certainly would not. It is a crying shame that one of the most senior and experienced members of the Liberal Party in this Chamber should make such extraordinarily uninformed statements. At least some of this need will be met by the opening this month of the new Aberfoyle Hub Child-care Centre, which will cater for children in the 0-5 year age group. The survey also showed a large unmet need for occasional care and before and after school care. Results were received similar to the question of care during school vacations. An average result of approximately 40 per cent to these questions jumped to as high as 62 per cent from respondents in the Flagstaff Hill area.

The second part of the survey, which questioned children's services organisations, received similar results but with a greater emphasis on road safety near schools and the need for more safety houses. As a result of this survey, the Happy Valley council intends to strengthen its role as an advocate, coordinator and facilitator of children's services, including the direct provision of information and physical resources. To this end the Happy Valley council will employ a specialist Children's Services Officer during the current financial year and has determined to give children's services a high priority in budget allocations. The officer will soon be appointed and will be urgently seeking resources for before and after school care, occasional care and school holiday programs.

Members will recall that in February I acknowledged that the State Government's priority in child-care has been for the provision of care for children whose parents work outside the home, and child-care in the workplace. Although these needs have not yet been completely met, much progress has been made. I added that I believed that it was now time that further attention be given to occasional care and out-of-school hours care. Social changes and the physical expansion of Adelaide's suburbs has made the availability of occasional child-care extremely important as more and more parents are unable or choose not to rely on their extended family for this kind of support. The problem is exacerbated by the physical isolation of many people in new developing areas, such as my electorate.

Funding was provided this year for an out-of-school hours care program at the Aberfoyle Park Neighbourhood House. This program, which has been very successful and very much in demand, currently caters for about 30 school-age children and certainly contributes to enabling parents to find employment knowing their children will be safe and

well looked after. However, this program can cater for children only from the Aberfoyle campus schools. The Happy Valley council survey clearly indicates that more of this kind of program is needed and wanted by the community. Indeed, only on Monday of this week I met with the Flagstaff Hill Primary School Council Chairman and discussed the possibility of extending the program to that school.

The Happy Valley Council Children's Services Officer will also be responsible for developing cooperative funding partnerships between the three tiers of government, the private sector and the community, in order to provide the many children's services needed in Happy Valley. As I have indicated, the main areas of concern are child-care, road safety around schools, the provision of playgrounds and bicycle tracks.

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

The Hon. JENNIFER CASHMORE (Coles): During the grievance debate last night I mentioned the future planning of metropolitan Adelaide, the release of the Government's proposals advocating urban consolidation and the papers accompanying that policy document. I referred briefly to the need for public debate and the need to involve local government in ensuring that home owners throughout metropolitan Adelaide are aware of what is proposed. I also touched briefly on something that has not been mentioned in the policy booklet 'Adelaide: Its Future Development', that is, the question of the impact of this policy on transport in metropolitan Adelaide. I will expand on that matter this afternoon.

The prospect of a further 50 000 new dwellings in metropolitan Adelaide based on existing land within the metropolitan boundaries achieved through urban consolidation—that is, medium density housing and better use of existing land—immediately poses the question: what will happen to our streets and roads as a result of the cars that will come from the increase in population? To take a simple example, I refer back to the 1940s and 1950s when there would have been between five and six people to a six or seven roomed dwelling in a suburban street.

During that period there would have been probably one car to each dwelling in a relatively affluent suburb and fewer than that on average in other suburbs. What is being proposed with urban consolidation will bring back to the metropolitan area, we hope, that same number of people in a given street to replace the declining population. However, instead of possibly one car or fewer per household on average, we are likely to have one car per one or two people.

I am contemplating the inner city suburb in which I live and the number of cars presently parked in the small, narrow street because of lack of off-street parking. That street would be ripe for redevelopment under the proposed abolition of residential zoning restrictions. What will happen when four times the number of people live in the street, each of them probably owning a motor car? Four or five things come to mind. First, the space that we devote to cars in the city must be included as an important factor in this urban consolidation program. Off-street parking will be critical. The problems of traffic congestion will be extreme. Another aspect that is equally deserving of attention concerns the need to achieve more disciplined and courteous driving in Adelaide. This problem must be addressed.

Mr Duigan: It enhances the attractiveness of public transport.

The Hon. JENNIFER CASHMORE: Yes, and in that regard the Government of today needs to lift its game considerably in respect of public transport if it is to hope to cope with the difficulties that will arise as a result of the urban consolidation program. I do not expect for a moment that the Government of today will be the Government in 15 years time. Indeed, I expect that it will be a Liberal Government which will embark on a range of initiatives simply because, if we do not do so, Adelaide will become an intolerable city in which to live, and none of us want that to happen.

I am concerned because, in the material issued so far (and I acknowledge that in the time available I have not been able to read all that material thoroughly), the problem of traffic congestion has not been raised, although it is one of the most important problems that should be addressed. Another critical question that must be addressed is the Government's approach to the administration of planning. Yesterday, I complimented the Minister and his staff on the presentation of the documents and the clear and concise way in which some, but not all, of the planning issues had been presented.

The way in which the Government at this stage has approached the issues is satisfactory, but I am concerned because the policy concepts that the Liberal Party supports will run into deep trouble unless the administration of the planning under this Government is vastly improved. In the recent debate on the Planning Bill (No. 2) I drew to the attention of the House some of the extreme difficulties that are being experienced. The level of dissatisfaction about the Government's planning and administration has reached a point where the Premier needs to become involved.

Mr Duigan: Planning administration is mostly at the local level.

The Hon. JENNIFER CASHMORE: I do not dispute that but, because of the Government's centralised policy and because of the lack of competence and efficiency with which the processing of local government approvals is dealt, local government, as well as property owners and property developers, are suffering continued frustration. There is a real cry from the heart from these people. The Planning Institute and a whole range of professional and commercial bodies have expressed a high degree of dissatisfaction with the manner in which the Minister is administering the planning process.

If we start with the most basic and simple things like the failure to acknowledge and reply to correspondence, that is just a simple act of courtesy not to mention proper business management. If we go on and deal with continuing staff changes, with a failure to provide guidelines which enable policies to be adopted and with untold delays and deferrals, then the system becomes so clogged that with the best will in the world—and I believe that there is the best will in the world at local government level—the proposals that the Government is putting forward do not stand the ghost of a chance unless the Government pulls up its socks as far as administration goes.

That is my principal message for today. The message that has been given to me from the whole spectrum of people concerned with planning is clear: that is, that the present situation is untenable. Most people point to the Minister. They do not criticise his grasp of planning. On the contrary, it is respected. However, his grasp of administration is the subject of very serious criticism. I suspect from the comparative silence, if not nods of agreement, from the Minister's colleagues, that they too have suffered from the Minister's failure to acknowledge correspondence, from delays in the Planning Commission and in the department, from changes in sector managers and from criticism at local government level within their own electorates about the way—

The Hon. B.C. Eastick: One question on notice from 30 September 1986 is still not answered.

The Hon. JENNIFER CASHMORE: My colleague referred to a question not answered from September 1986. I could quote chapter and verse of questions a lot older than that that are growing mouldy in the files because they have not been answered. Unless those matters are attended to these good concepts and this excellent presentation is going to founder, and the Minister should be aware of it.

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

Mr RANN (Briggs): I wish to talk about two important issues; first, about an organisation of increasing relevance to our State, the CFS; and, secondly, about an organisation of unfortunately decreasing relevance to our State, the State Opposition. The CFS throughout our State is very much a quiet achiever. I remember the events of Ash Wednesday. I accompanied the Premier to the operations room at police headquarters on the night of Ash Wednesday and throughout that evening I saw reports coming in from around the State from CFS units in peril, battling blazes that were threatening townships like Mount Burr. I was enormously impressed with their professionalism and with the way in which they were prepared to risk their lives in order to save other people's lives and property.

I remember the next morning going up Greenhill Road to see the property of a friend and former colleague (Murray Nicholl) whose home had been burnt. Murray now works in Melbourne but he was a member of the CFS, which battled to save his property and others. I went down to the South-East to see the impact that was like a nuclear holocaust in areas around Kalangadoo, and I saw the huge forests that was devastated.

The other night I accepted an invitation to attend a special ceremony honouring long-serving members of the Salisbury CFS, and this caused me to reflect on how important the CFS is in our State and how very much overlooked it is in terms of what is often regarded as its routine activities, but routine activities that again save lives. Today South Australia has 484 registered volunteer brigades, that is, 18 000 men and women who are prepared to give their time and effort to make the CFS one of the most efficient services of its kind. The continuing growth in interest, training and competitions by volunteers and the spread of the service, is most heartening. It demonstrates in a practical manner that people are willing to take responsibility in their respective communities. Self-reliance in rural communities, in this case for fire protection, is obviously an important ingredient in developing those communities and building character and commitment.

Massive disasters like Ash Wednesday bring the role of the CFS to the attention of the public, but many people would not realise that last year alone the CFS turned out to more than 4 400 incidents throughout our State. The Salisbury CFS attended 135 fires or incident calls during the same period. These ranged from grass and scrub fires to house fires, gas leaks, many vehicle accidents, a ship fire at St Kilda (something one would not normally associate with the CFS), and even an incident involving a diesel railcar. That involved 1 800 hours of firefighting by the Salisbury CFS, in addition to more than 5 750 hours devoted to training and demonstrations.

I am pleased that during the past year the CFS board, with the support of the State Government and the Minister of Emergency Services, has set in place a number of initiatives, including amendments to the Country Fires Act, to improve compensation benefits for volunteers, access to the capital works program to provide additional funds to upgrade equipment, and insurance cover for private vehicles being used in CFS activities. Over the past year training of CFS volunteers has doubled from 1 076 to 2 000 personnel successfully completing various training courses. Training has also been regionalised with regional training committees being run by qualified CFS volunteer instructors. Officer training courses have been introduced, and for brigade members the focus is on brigade level training through the three level system and encouragement of volunteers, particularly new members, to participate.

As we approach this summer in which it is already predicted, because of the heavy rains we have experienced so far this winter, that we are likely to have increased undergrowth and foliage and, therefore, we are likely to have a difficult summer, I place on record my support not only for the work of the Salisbury CFS and its Commander, Frank Dunn (who was awarded the Order of Australia medal earlier this year for his 33 years of service to the CFS), but also to CFS units throughout our State.

The Hon. B.C. Eastick: Is there an official document relative to the insurance on private vehicles?

Mr RANN: I will see what I can find out for the honourable member. I also want to talk about issues concerning the State Opposition. I honestly believe—and I say this with all sincerity—that good government needs strong opposition. One only has to look at the Opposition benches to see the parlous state of the Opposition in this House. I believe that we need a strong Opposition, and I believe that this State has been let down. I have an interest in its improvement because I used to be the recipient of mail from Liberal Party headquarters. I am not sure who the mole was at that time, but I received polling information on the Tonkin Government's record. Every now and again this brown envelope would arrive. Not only did it contain polling information about where they were going wrong, but we also used to get an analysis, if you could call it that, of that polling information by the then State Director (Brigadier Don Willetts). It was quite entertianing reading: 'We will bring up the big guns to knock out Bannon, and we will move up the infantry. Perhaps we will take a shot across the bows'—and all that sort of thing. It was entertaining material. Perhaps we can understand the election losses both in 1982 and 1985.

I have to inform members opposite that new information is circulating about the State Opposition. Sources close to the Leader of the Opposition are advising journalists and other colleagues that there is going to be a reshuffle later this year. We understand that the member for Victoria, as the Premier indicated, will be moved to the front bench, and that this is apparently payment for dumping Robert Hill down to third place on the Senate ticket. The Leader is telling his confidants that he wants to shift the member for Bragg from his transport portfolio, because of gaffes in 1986, and demote the member for Mitcham, because he botched the workers compensation debate and is not taken seriously by industry or the media. The member for Coles is being groomed for the Deputy's position. I am told that the Leader is a little worried about that but concedes that she will have 'novelty value' as a sort of iron lady, the Margaret Thatcher of the Antipodes. A few months ago, according to Liberal colleagues, she was told to lift her game. Apparently, the Leader felt that she was being a bit lazy: if she wanted a top job, wanted to replace the member for Kavel, she would have to lift her game.

An honourable member interjecting:

Mr RANN: I will talk about Heini a bit later. So, we are going to see some excitement from the member for Coles

in the next few months. That is interesting. I support that move by the Leader to promote the member for Coles. I think that she will be of extraordinary value to the Government in that position. I well remember one of the polls sent to me by an ally of Brigadier Willetts, perhaps one of his adjutants—a batman or someone—which indicated that her approval rating was half that of her disapproval rating, so we look with anticipation at this new leadership role for the member for Coles.

The Liberal Leader is also trying to damn with faint praise some of his rivals in the Upper House. I am told that he is saying that the Hon. Mr Lucas and the Hon. Mr Griffin were offered seats in the Lower House. Members opposite might want to sort out among themselves exactly which seats were up for grabs so that they can work out their super. Apparently, the Leader is saying that they did not have the guts to accept a promotion to this hotbed, this forum of ideas and representation of the people of this State.

The Deputy Leader of the Opposition, I understand, has been most gracious about the fact that he is going to be removed from the Deputy Leadership. After all, he has the historic record of being the longest serving losing Deputy in the history of any Parliament in Australia or New Zealand, so he can go out not so much with a smudge on the face of history as with a losing streak.

We have also been hearing from Opposition members about their renewed interest in issues involving poverty. The Leader of the Opposition has been trumpeting his concern for the poor in recent weeks. It is not a real concern, of course, because he has been advised that he has to soften his image if he is to change the perception of voters who believe that he is a knocker and a whinger who constantly opposes, rather than coming forward with new ideas. Apparently, the advice was given to him in Regines about three weeks ago when he was contemplating the effects of poverty. So, his image squad has told him to be concerned about the poor. It is the same sort of phoniness that underpinned that document which was leaked to the *Advertiser* a few weeks ago, showing that members opposite were going to stack letters to the Editor, apparently circulating bits of paper to people to sign saying that the Leader of the Opposition was doing a great job.

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

Motion carried.

JURISDICTION OF COURTS (CROSS-VESTING) BILL

Received from the Legislative Council and read a first time.

At 5.18 p.m. the House adjourned until Tuesday 6 October at 2 p.m.