HOUSE OF ASSEMBLY

Thursday 18 October 1990

The SPEAKER (Hon. N.T. Peterson) took the Chair at 11 a.m. and read prayers.

MORGAN-BURRA-SPALDING ROAD

Mr VENNING (Custance): I move:

That this House condemns the failure of successive Governments to upgrade the Morgan-Burra-Spalding Road to a standard commensurate with its economic and social importance to the State.

I remain amazed that a road of such importance as this road is still as it was in the 1930s. As I said in my maiden speech, this has to be the most politicised track in Australia—the worst section of the direct route between Sydney and Perth and, after all, it is national highway 64. Over the years—

An honourable member interjecting:

Mr VENNING: He started to fix it up but did not complete it.

The SPEAKER: Order!

Mr VENNING: Over the years various vested political interests in all three sections of government have been involved and have kept the road as it is. As the road lies largely within my district I intend to end this saga of neglect. Many members will have travelled on this road and will know why it enjoys its dubious reputation. I constantly hear that no-one uses the road, particularly the Burra to Morgan section. I find that statement ridiculous because it is obvious to everyone with a clear mind that the reason people take the alternative routes is because the road is so rough and treacherous.

It is very isolated out in the middle and often motorists need help. Par for the course on this road includes blow-outs, broken springs, collisions and roll-overs. Many minor accidents are reported, usually involving serious structural damage. The road's unsealed surface is more often than not rough, loose and dusty. The section from Spalding to Burra covers 40 kilometres, 18 kilometres of which are already sealed. From Burra to Morgan it is 84 kilometres, and 15 kilometres of the Morgan end are already sealed. These sealing jobs were carried out many years ago. It is rumoured that we may get another kilometre or two sealed shortly. However, 91 kilometres remain to be sealed. As I have said before, I cannot understand why this main arterial road has been overlooked.

The Hon. T.H. HEMMINGS: I rise on a point of order, Mr Speaker. In defence of the honourable member, I point out that Standing Order 142 provides that no noise or interruption is allowed in the debate. I have been listening keenly and I cannot hear what the honourable member is saying because of the level of background noise.

The SPEAKER: Order! I will take the point of order, but the member for Napier may regret raising it. I ask all members to pay due respect to the member on his feet and to comply with Standing Order 142.

The Hon. T.H. Hemmings: I'm on your side, Ivan.

The SPEAKER: Order! The honourable member for Custance.

Mr VENNING: Thank you, Mr Speaker. Several members of Parliament—five or six before me—have made representations on this matter. I intend to give it a high priority in my term as the member representing a large part of this area. I can say for the first time that I have the unanimous support of all the local government organisations in the area. That has not always been the case. Also, other councils, not in the area, have offered support, including the Whyalla council, the Minister's own council.

The history of this road and the representations made in relation to it makes fascinating reading. I asked a previous councillor (Mr Harry Quinn) to document the relevant facts, and I have them here with me. He gives an enlightened account of the 60 years of progress of this road (and I offer all members a copy of it, if they would care to read it). Mr Quinn tells how, in the early days, Burra and its districts were bypassed due to the more urgent need to upgrade other roads, especially with the onset of the Second World War. Burra was to get its first sealed road because of the district's mining importance, but as mining dropped off so did its priority. The Jamestown to Adelaide route bypassed it to the west.

It was not until 1964, in a push to get a sealed road to Broken Hill before the New South Wales Government did, that we got some action. Since then many delegations have come down to this place to lobby for the east-west connection. Those involved were Mr G.S. Hawker, Mr Mick O'Halloran (who was a member of the Labor Party from Peterborough), Mr Bill Quirke, Mr Claude Allen, my father Howard Venning, John Olsen and, now, me. I am determined to be the last in a great line of lobbyists on this project.

As I said, this issue has been entrenched with local, State and Federal politics, but none as bad as the local aspect. A key player in this area was a very notable member for Clare in the mid-1950s and 1960s, Mr Bill Quirke—a distant relative of the present member for Playford. Mr Quirke had two interests in this issue: a very parochial view of Clare, where he lived, and also strong business connections in that town. It would not be unkind to say that he saw, rightly or wrongly, that this upgrading would threaten Clare, as the alternative route went through that town.

Two of the previous delegations referred to in the account included Mr Bill Quirke. On one occasion Mr Quirke got an admission from the department's Mr Yeates that Clare had been overlooked and had got a raw deal. Mr Quirke then came up with an alternative idea: 'Couldn't you find some money to get a start on the road from Hanson to Clare?' The response was, 'Yes, I suppose we could.' Mr Quirke put to the delegation: 'We can't leave empty-handed', and the trade-off was done—and national route 64 missed out.

Mr Quirke led a delegation from the district to Transport Minister Virgo, and again supported more progress on the Burra to Clare road—and I quote from Mr Quinn: 'We were done again.' Mr Quirke did not want a sealed road from Morgan via Burra to Port Pirie; he wanted the longer alternative—from Eudunda, Marrabel, Saddleworth through Clare. It adds up to an hour to the trip, depending on where in the Mid-North you wish to terminate or begin your journey. Happily, these past parochialisms are gone. All councils—

Mr Atkinson: Is that right?

Mr VENNING: That is right. All councils, including Clare, now realise the importance of this road and will all join in a united push for its immediate upgrading. Its importance is obvious. Apart from being the direct Australian east-west route, with the demise of rail freight, road transport is very heavy in this area. All the sealed roads in the area are old and are taking a hammering. After every grading of the Burra road trucks again use it, until they cut it up and then use alternative routes. If this road is not sealed, the other roads in the district will need to be renewed in the next two to five years.

The tourist potential of the Mid North and the Clare Valley region is just being realised. Many people from the Eastern States bypass this area because they stick to the main roads. No tourist coaches regularly use this road because of its bad reputation. Connecting the tourist regions of the Clare Valley, Burra and the Riverland with a direct corridor will have tremendous advantages. We want visitors to enter our State further north and then filter down to Adelaide via the Barossa Valley. The route today brings people into the Barossa Valley and they then go on to Adelaide, not realising what they have missed. For a centre such as Burra—arguably the wool capital of the world—to not have an east-west entry is ridiculous.

Burra is a vital district to the State's economy. The merino field days attract people from all over the world to this region—it is the world's mecca in this industry. I wonder what they think of our roads. Burra is also a tourist and regional centre, offering a comprehensive range of goods and services to the far-flung rural districts. I am impressed by the progressive attitude of its leaders and business folk. Yes, Mr Speaker, this is 1990, and to think that a road—National Highway 64—remains like this is an indictment of this and all previous Governments. I know that times are tough and money is tight, but I feel that this Government, and the next Government, have to change their priorities in relation to this road. I will be joining delegations on this issue. I will join the ground swell of support in the entire northern region of South Australia. I only hope that the likes of Mr Harry Quinn, who has had a lifelong interest in this matter, will see his goal achieved.

I note also the Minister's new legislative package and the proposed principal roads legislation. Let us hope that it will cut red tape, local parochialism and bureaucracy. I will support it, and I live in hope. I commend my motion to the House and hope for the support of all honourable members.

Mr HOLLOWAY secured the adjournment of the debate.

SALE OF STA LAND

Mr MATTHEW (Bright): I move:

That this House calls on the Minister of Transport to prevent the STA from taking further steps to dispose of land on Newland Avenue, Marino until such time as traffic options for the proposed Marino Rocks marina have been finalised.

It should be completely unnecessary for me to move this motion in the House today. However, regrettably, we are in a situation where negotiations have come almost to a standstill and to the point where commonsense has not prevailed. Newland Avenue is part of a road linking Brighton Road to the proposed marina sites (after all, we now know that there are two proposed sites at Marino Rocks).

That particular road abuts a considerable amount of land, owned by the STA, which runs between that road and the Noarlunga railway line at Marino. It would seem that that land has been identified by the STA as surplus to its requirements. No doubt, in a desperate bid to raise revenue to cover the cost of free transport that has been handed out to school students, the STA now considers it necessary to dispose of that land. Regrettably, no consideration has been given to the greater ramifications of that proposed sale; namely, the potential to use that land for traffic options to the proposed marina site (whichever one is finally looked at realistically by this Government) and also to alleviate traffic problems within that area.

Over time a number of things have occurred, and I will list some of the most relevant to give members in this place some understanding of them. Ironically, it was on the date of the last Federal election that residents of that area became aware that something was actually about to happen with the land. As residents of the Marino area turned up to vote at the local polling booth, they found a surveyor pegging out land opposite the railway station.

Some of them had the wisdom to question the gentleman who was undertaking that exercise and they were advised that the land was about to be subdivided for housing allotments. Those people were mindful of the fact that that area had been subjected, over more than a decade, to a number of marina proposals and, living in the area, they are well aware that it is obviously a route for people to take their boats to the marina or drive to use such a facility. Naturally, they started to ask questions and a few things started to unfold around that date. I am aware that on 21 February 1990 the City of Marion rightly expressed reservations to the Planning Commission about a subdivision of the land. I made a number of representations to the Minister around that period, requesting that he should investigate the matter.

On 18 April, Marion council placed an advertisement in the local papers to inform the community of the reservations that it had expressed to the Planning Commission. A public meeting was held on 27 April, attended by 100 to 200 residents, and I addressed that meeting. Marion Council again expressed reservations on 17 April 1990, and I wrote a further letter to the Minister of Transport on 4 May. A delegation also met the Minister on 14 June 1990.

Despite all those meetings and all this pleading, still the Minister and the STA have failed to see reason. I can understand the STA's reluctance, for, after all, it has been put in a fairly difficult position. It runs at a continual loss and it is trying to raise revenue in some way. But the Minister of Transport has a portfolio that encompasses not only the STA, but roads in our State. While the Government continues to procrastinate over marina options, it is not unrealistic of me to ask that it hold disposal of that land in abeyance until we have seen what is likely to happen with marina sites.

A number of motions have been moved by the City of Marion which are pertinent, but I should like to draw the attention of the House to one in particular moved by Alderman Schulze, states:

That the council advise the South Australian Planning Commission that:

Council reaffirms its opposition to the State Transport Authority's proposal for land division at Newland Avenue, Marino, and requests the commission to refuse the proposal on the basis that future traffic impacts from proposed housing/marina development at Marino Rocks are not known.

I would not be standing up in this place today unless I had been speaking to the proposed developers of that marina. As members opposite might recall, at this stage we have two proposed developers, because the Government cannot make up its mind as to what it wants to do about the problems that it faces at that site. Those two developers are the Burlock Group of Companies, which has put a proposal before the Government for a marina development 250 metres north of the Westcliffe site, and Morris Property Pty Ltd which is finalising its proposal, and, for the benefit of members opposite, is the group which has purchased the Westcliffe site. Both groups have indicated to me that they are looking seriously at the Newland Avenue land that is owned by the STA and both consider that that land provides a very real transport alternative to that marina site.

The situation is that people who live in the area are saying that we should retain the land and look at the options; the City of Marion is saying that we should retain the land and look at the options; the Burlock Group of Companies

is saying that we should retain the land and look at the options; Morris Property Pty Ltd is saying that we should retain the land and look at the options; and I, as the local member, say the same thing: that we should retain the land and look at the options. However, the Minister of Transport says, 'No. We will sell.' I fail to see where any logic comes into his statement. If the Government is really serious about developing a marina in this State, it will retain that land to look at that option.

Last week in this place, the member for Napier indulged in extended procrastination about how pro-development this Government is. We have seen absolutely no evidence of that. There has been plenty of hot air and plenty of projects have fallen flat on their face. The Leader on this side of the House has demonstrated that many projects promised before elections fall flat on their face afterwards. Simply put, there is a need to look seriously at this site and the Minister of Transport must look more closely at the options for this intersection. I will read from one of many letters received in my office, this one from a Mr Mark Berry, who lives on Newland Avenue at Marino, so he is fully aware of the traffic conditions that prevail at that site. He said in part:

> The future housing development down south and the Marino Rocks marina will increase the usage of Newland Avenue, This land should be retained with the possibility of a two-way road system or improvement to the train line being introduced as the Noarlunga line may be extended making it possible to put an express line away from the station as the traffic increases.

That statement says it all. Indeed, it reflects many of the statements that have been made by community leaders and residents in the area. Clearly, the Government must retain this land if it is serious about marina developments down south.

I believe that this Government has never been serious about anything more than making statements prior to elections in a desperate attempt to appear as though it is pro-development. I will not go too deeply into the marina issue at this juncture, because there will be more opportunities at later dates in this House to speak about the dreadful mess that the Government is making of negotiations in that area.

Dr Armitage: Hear, hear!

Mr MATTHEW: The member for Adelaide said 'Hear, hear!' He is well aware of the debacle that we have seen in this State over a number of years concerning development issues. In closing, I will read an extract from a document promulgated by the Marino Concerned Residents Group, which made four points about this site, as follows:

> 1. While the land currently owned by the STA on Newland Avenue, Marino is now available for purchase, there is an opportunity to re-design Newland Avenue to alleviate the very dangerous traffic situation. An ideal chance arises, for instance, to develop a two-way road system, and to remove the dangerous bends which currently exist at both ends.
>
> 2. An independent traffic management study should be carried out to underline the urgency of the problem.
>
> 3. We are appalled by the underhanded manner that the STA has displayed in using section 7 of the Planning Act in that the residents of the city have been denied their democratic right to view the plans and make comment in the form of objection as laid down by the South Australian Planning Act if they so desire.
>
> 4. With the proposed marina and housing development immediately south of this area traffic will escalate, and the opportunity to improve the road system must not be lost by the sale of this land.

Nothing further needs to be said. That document encapsulates everything concisely. I commend the motion to the House.

Mr HOLLOWAY secured the adjournment of the debate.

CRIMINAL LAW CONSOLIDATION ACT AMENDMENT BILL

Mr BRINDAL (Hayward) obtained leave and introduced a Bill for an Act to amend the Criminal Law Consolidation Act 1935. Read a first time.

Mr BRINDAL: I move:

That this Bill be now read a second time.

The abortion debate in South Australia has occupied various levels of public consciousness and passion and, indeed, the attentions of this House since 1969. The boundaries of both sides of the argument are clearly delineated and I will not insult the intelligence nor waste the time of members by reploughing broken ground. Therefore, I will attempt to confine myself to a few of the more salient remarks.

I have heard suggestions that the Party opposite is looking for options that would allow it to deny its members a conscience vote on this issue. I have every confidence that some members will argue that the measure introduced today will not change the law, and that this Bill may be regarded as a machinery motion.

However, thinking people would contend that this Bill does change the only body of law on the statute book of this State that makes abortion legal, and, therefore, conclude that any attempt to change the law on abortion involves a debate on the issue of abortion if for no other reason than that any member of this House can seek to amend that Bill in the Committee stage. Therefore, I contend that it should demand a conscience vote. Further, the Government cannot have it both ways. If it regards this Bill as a reaffirmation of the 1969 legislation, let it honour that legislation. The Government cannot, on the one hand, argue that a breadth and variation of interpretation must be applied to legislation which is two decades old in order to meet changed social demand, but, at the same time, argue that this Bill which seeks to reinforce the original intent of the legislation is not, in fact, a change to that legislation. I repeat: the Government cannot have it both ways.

Then, as a matter of conscience, the mainstream political philosophies of Australia gives to their parliamentary members a choice in this matter; each of us in this Chamber can, and I feel sure will, answer according to the dictates of their heart and the considered analysis of the information available to them.

An honourable member: Tell us about the Bill.

The SPEAKER: Order!

Mr BRINDAL: For my own part, I confess that my vote, both now and until anybody can convince me otherwise, will be based on some level of ignorance—not, I hasten to add, ignorance of the argument. I understand the compelling case that can be put forward for abortion, that can be put on medical grounds or that can be put as a result of such trauma as rape. I understand, too, that there may well be some more inherent hypocrisy in those of my gender being forced to take major decisions regarding a biological process in which, despite what I hope will always be regarded as an important initial contribution, we cannot participate.

I recognise the argument of those women who claim the right to determination over the processes of their body. However, I remain in ignorance nevertheless. My ignorance is based upon my deep conviction that to be human is to be more than the collective jumble of collaborative cells, which is our physical presence. To be human is to imbue our bodies with that life force, that spirit, or whatever else you might choose to call it, which is of the central core of our being and which marks each of us as unique within our species. Were the abortion debate able to be confined to an argument about cellular biology and cell division, it would

be much easier for many of us to reach a final conclusion on this matter. But no doctor, no scientist, no philosopher, no theologian can tell us with certainty at what point in time a foetus becomes human. That is that great dilemma which explains my ignorance and my difficulty.

I do not believe that there is one member in this House, or in another place, who would vote for a Bill which had as its goal the destruction of human life. That is clearly murder of a kind practised by the worst of totalitarian dictatorships. I accept that those who support abortion in our society do so because they believe honestly that, until a certain age of its development, a foetus is not, in fact, human. While in some ways I envy those people their certainty, I cannot share it and, because of my doubts, must vote according to that great foundation of our law: It is better that 100 felons go free than that one innocent person be gaoled.

The Bill I present to this House today is about other issues that are as fundamental to our society as the abortion debate. It is about the right of this House, as a Parliament assembled, to express as legislation the collective will of those who elect them to govern. It is about the duty of service which the Executive Government owes to the people of South Australia through their elected representatives. In previous debates in this place, I have likened this Government to indolent Neros and Marie Antoinettes, but their level of obtuseness remains such that I feel I should be more direct.

The benches opposite, despite the longing of some members to the contrary, are occupied by no Pharaoh of Egypt or even a Tsar of all the Russias. To your right, Sir, sits no Son of Heaven but a Premier of South Australia and, as such, the chief servant of the will of this House—for that is what the Premier is. The people did not elect him as Premier nor any of his Ministers to their portfolios. They elect each and every person in this House as the member for their district, and whosoever may at any future time occupy the place of pre-eminence opposite does so only by the numbers and by the will of this House.

Yet, I am forced to bring a Bill here today because of the flagrant disregard that this Executive Government has for the very institution from which it is sprung. They stand indicted. They have broken faith, not with this House as it is currently constituted but with those members from both sides of this Chamber who so courageously debated this matter and so carefully amended the original Bill before passing it into law.

The law, as it was passed and as it currently stands, provides that legal abortions must take place only in hospitals, and that hospitals proposing to provide abortions must first be prescribed by regulations tabled in this House. That provision of the law was moved by an eminent Labor member of this House and later Premier of South Australia, Mr Des Corcoran. In speaking to his amendment of Mr Millhouse's 1969 Bill, Mr Corcoran is reported in *Hansard* of 30 October 1969 as saying:

> I am mainly concerned with what might be termed abortion clinics which, presumably, would handle no other type of medical case. If these are likely to be established, Parliament should have an opportunity to discuss this matter and move for disallowance. We have the right to criticise a Minister's actions and he has the right to explain his actions. Under the provision as it stands, we might disagree vehemently with the Attorney-General's reasons but, by then, the clinics would have been proclaimed and it would be difficult to get the decision changed.

Some days later, Mr Millhouse gave the following assurance to this Parliament:

> I point out to the honourable member for Millicent that, because of his amendment, this must all be done by regulation. Parliament will still have an opportunity to scrutinise the regulations.

How has that Executive Government, which today bears the same responsibility, honoured those assurances? Quite clearly, it has not. Instead, by stealth and deception, by evasion and an exhibition of duplicity that borders upon the dishonest, it has clearly evaded the stated will and intention of this Parliament.

Like so many other actions of the Government opposite, while the proposal for an abortion clinic at Mareeba does not strictly violate the law, in the words of my honourable colleague, it flouts it. It flouts it by hiding behind the prescription of the Queen Elizabeth Hospital as a hospital able to perform abortions, which was made some two decades ago, at which time there was clearly no thought that such a prescription would later be used as a significant heritage facade to conceal the erection and operation of another branch of the socialistic brave new world, beneath, of course, a most tasteful neon sign proclaiming euphemistically a pregnancy advisory centre.

Among the bookshelves of many who sit in high places both in this Chamber and in the departments of this Government it is, indeed, Machiavelli's 'The Prince' rather than the works of Marx or Shakespeare that must occupy pre-eminence. Witness, Sir, the hypocrisy of those who voted, as did members opposite, in the autumn sitting for a motion which says in part:

> . . . believes that it was the spirit and intention of the 1969 amendment that legal abortions take place only in the mainstream of medicine, that is, in general hospitals, and that each hospital proposing to provide abortions first be prescribed by regulation tabled in this House.

Witness that when, clearly, Mareeba, as a separate entity, is not capable of providing emergency treatment or the level of care that is naturally associated with a hospital and, worse, is situated several blocks away from the main hospital across a heavily trafficked railway line and an even busier Port Road. That there will be no bed provision within the proposed Mareeba Hospital can be little doubted, as I am reliably informed that the Health Commission believes that the provision of hospital beds in South Australia is adequate for our population level and is, in fact, refusing to license further beds.

Because of this, the Western Community Hospital has recently sold 14 bed licences at a price, I believe, of $50 000 each to hospitals in the north-east and south of the metropolitan area. If Mareeba were to have beds, where would it get the licences? Would the commission, having decided that we have enough beds in this State, decide that we have not enough beds when it comes to pregnancy termination, and would this mean that the population of South Australia could expect that stand-alone clinics would herald a further rise in the number of terminations? Would the Government provide the money to buy bed licences when it repeatedly comes in here saying that members on this side of the House are greedy because they demand things for their electorates? Make no mistake: this legislation seeks to place a check upon this brave new world of theirs.

After the Deputy Leader sought to move a motion related to this matter during the autumn sitting, those who constituted the working party, and whose subsequent report promulgated Mareeba, wrote to the member concerned. Their letter stated clearly that their report had recommended the necessity of four stand-alone abortion clinics in the Adelaide metropolitan area. 'But, we have no intention of going that far,' is the claim of this Government. Yet, within the last fortnight it has become obvious that plans are definitely afoot to establish another clinic that will eventually stand alone on the Queen Victoria Hospital site. How bizarre!

Here we have a hospital offering a fully integrated range of services to women which is about to be dismembered on

the altar of expediency. I, for one, doubt that the total results will be better than the existing service, and I wonder how feminists can countenance the current plans. More importantly, is the Queen Victoria Hospital site the second and last proposal for a stand alone abortion clinic or merely the second? I suspect that it is merely the second. But, by hiding behind that dubious interpretation of an existing statute, this Government and its instruments do much more than flout their own law; they threaten the foundations of democracy of which this Parliament is such an integral part.

In this State, law is made by Bills for Acts, duly assented, that are read, considered and debated three times in this House and in another place. Those laws that we pass can and sometimes should be tested as to their meaning within the whole body of that which constitutes our law by independent arbiters: the judges of our court system. If the Government and its agencies cheat and cannot fulfil the spirit and intent of their own law, how can they, and why should they, expect the citizens of this State to behave any differently? After all, the Government of the day is the Government. It controls the numbers in this place and, if it believes that the relevance or interpretation of law must be altered and codified to reflect developments in society or a movement in the social conscience of its citizens, it has merely to change the law by bringing a Bill before this Chamber.

My neighbour and his neighbour do not enjoy any such right. If, therefore, the Government believes that there is a need to change the law as it relates to abortions, let it do it honestly. Let it bring the matter for discussion before this Parliament, instead of achieving its desired ends by deception and by dishonestly distorting the intentions of the current legislation. Let those who are pro-life and those who are pro-abortion stand up as one, united in one thing only, namely, the demand that the jellyfish of this Government evolve a backbone and the decisive demand that ongoing debate in the sitting rooms, coffee lounges and church halls of this State should once again be heard in the Chambers of this elected legislature. After all, we are now 20 years on. We now have two decades of experience in the performance, analysis and social consequences of the technique. We have two decades more of medical research since the 1969 law was passed.

Since the development of ultrasound in 1976, it has become possible to form a more considered opinion about the embryonic child's attributes and abilities at every stage of pregnancy and in respect of its developing humanity. Surely, that is what this debate has been and must always be about—at what stage can an embryonic child be considered to have attained that development of its humanity beyond which its destruction must be construed as murder? To those who would seek to cloud this debate by saying it is about choice, I would say: this Bill does not deny the right of choice for pregnancy termination to those who desire it, within the framework of the law in this State as it currently exists. It denies them only the right to choose to have a pregnancy termination in a stand-alone clinic. If any members in this place would question the precedent of limiting choice by this Government, let them explain, especially to those country electors whom so many of my colleagues have the privilege to represent, why they are increasingly denied the choice of any local hospital or school at all.

Feminists are right to complain where sexual irresponsibility occurs among men, where gender induces inequalities in social justice and wherever, indeed, sexual exploitation and hypocrisy lie. But, surely, that is an argument that is the kernel of the argument for recommitting this debate to the House. If the law relating to abortion is just, reasonable, honest and morally defensible, let this Government bring it before this place. The Government can and should pursue with vigour its right to have its own employees perform a legitimate surgical technique on their own premises, if the Government can justify it to those employees and to the people of South Australia. Yet, by establishing stand-alone clinics, it seeks to avoid this confrontation. That it neither can nor will justify it must alert those who believe in abortion that the wind of change may well have changed direction. Those who are pro-life may well take heart that the breeze may well now be abaft their beam.

This Bill seeks not to amend the law but to change and strengthen it; not to provide, as many might like to do, a more fundamental restructuring of the law, for that is and should remain the province of the Government of the day, but so to strengthen and reinforce the intention of the 1969 legislation as to force the Government to come honestly into this Chamber with such further amendments as it might think necessary. I can do no better in commending this Bill to the House than to submit to it the words of the *Rubaiyat* of Omar Khayyam:

I shall pass this way but once; if there be any good that I can do, let me do it now for I shall not pass this way again.

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

Leave granted.

Explanation of Clauses

Clause 1 is formal.

Clause 2 provides for various amendments to section 82a of the principal Act. In particular, the amendment will require that the relevant procedure must be carried out in a hospital that is specifically approved under the regulations and, if that procedure is to be carried out in a clinic (as part of a hospital), the clinic must in turn have specific approval under the regulations. A regulation approving a clinic for the purposes of the section will not be able to take effect until it has been laid before both Houses and is no longer liable to disallowance. The amendment will define 'abortion clinic' and 'hospital' for the purposes of section 82a.

Clause 3 is a transitional provision.

Mr FERGUSON secured the adjournment of the debate.

INSTANT LOTTERIES

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

That the regulations under the Lottery and Gaming Act 1936 relating to instant lotteries, made on 19 July 1990 and laid on the table of this House on 2 August 1990, be disallowed.

I am conscious that there has been some attempt by the Government to correct some of the problems in the instant lottery and gambling ticket industry, but it has not been game enough to take on some of the real problems. There is no doubt that private enterprise operations are making a fortune out of the gaming industry in this State, other than the casino. As an example, I refer to a press article of 12 May this year which is headed 'Westfield fundraisers in dispute' and which states:

Westfield Shopping Centre management is refusing to allow charity fundraisers to sell raffle tickets in its malls unless they agree to pay up to $1200 a week in site rental.

. . . But The Australasian Institute of Fundraising (TAIF) has asked Westfield to drop the charges. TAIF public affairs committee chairman, Mr Frank O'Donnell said yesterday that as a company which billed its shopping complexes as community

centres Westfield should help fundraisers who were helping the community.

. . . Sargent Enterprises has since been inviting charities and fundraising groups to hire site space in the malls for $1200 a week.

Subsequently, Westfield said that it would not allow charities to work in its centres and sell lottery or bingo tickets. I have not bothered to check whether or not that is still the case, because it does not affect my argument. Private businesses are also hiring out space to charities from other shopping centres, consequently making a business of it. Section 21 of the regulations clearly provides that nobody should profit by working or selling lottery tickets from these small lotteries. The department is aware of that, but it takes no action to stop it continuing.

Really, it is a disgraceful situation. Other shopping centres as well as Westfield are hiring out their space. Imagine approximately $50 000 a year going from the proceeds of selling lottery tickets for charities to a private enterprise. It is a high price, but tied up in it is another private enterprise firm that has an agreement to operate these booths. I will give an indication of how they operate. I have a copy of a letter sent from that company to a league football club in this State. I will not identify the business or the club, but the letter states:

Dear . . .

Further to your request for information regarding the supply of fundraising tickets, we confirm methods in which we can assist your fundraising program. In return for tickets ordered from our company, we will sell a number of series through our bingo ticket 'booths' [in the shopping centres]. The profit from the sale of these tickets will be deducted from the overall purchase price. A typical invoice for this would read as follows:

				$
30 series of 4×$50 bingo (2 256 tickets/series)	@	$56.40	=	1 692
8 series of 2×$100 bingo (3 000 tickets/series) (booth sales)	@	$75.00	=	600
Total invoice amount				2 292
Less credit from 8 series sold at booth		$250/ series	=	2 000
Total amount payable to [our business]				292

Therefore each series of tickets cost the . . . Football Club $9.73 per series. It should be noted that it is your club's responsibility to pay the 2 per cent licencing fee on tickets sold on your behalf through our booths.

In addition to this method of ticket purchasing we offer the following for every 150 series of tickets delivered to . . . Club, seven more series of Triple Chance Bingo tickets will be sold on your behalf through our 'booths'. The net profit of $805 will be paid by cheque to your organisation. Details of purchases from our company are available on request. Please contact us should there be any further questions . . .

Those operators are employing people to sell bingo tickets, running a whole business from the results of gambling. They are destroying the other people in the industry who sell and print the tickets because they are using the returns from gambling to do that. I invite members to go out and seek the information for themselves. They will see that the game is being exploited and that it is crooked (as I believe it is).

On 9 April 1990 a meeting was held under the auspices of the Australian Institute of Fundraisers. I have a copy of the minutes of that meeting and will quote from item 2, referring to 'Westfield space rentals'. (I know I am referring to Westfield; I do not have the full list, but I will be seeking leave to continue later, and I will subsequently provide the complete list after it has been collated.) Item 2 states:

Committee agreed that the situation was morally unsatisfactory and that Westfield State Manager be asked to appear before committee (. . . 18 April). Committee would attempt to alter the situation to allow charities access under a controlled situation and at nominal cost-covering rates. TAIF to offer all assistance necessary to develop policy and control standards of presentation behaviour . . .

Committee noted the advice given by Westfield that they had acted in this matter at the request of Michael deGeorge [who is in the department]. There had been no consultation between deGeorge and TAIF or its members. It was agreed that deGeorge be asked to comment on this claim and supply TAIF with a statement of policy on the matter. Further action may be taken depending on committee's satisfaction with the reply.

So, the Institute of Fundraisers also was quite concerned about this situation. Time will not allow me to read all the correspondence today relating to this area, but I want to return briefly to the situation of licensed hotels. I do not disagree with the proposition allowing a licence to be taken out in the name of a hotelier, except that I believe that the fees should go into a local community fund and that perhaps the local council or local or State charities should be involved and, in the main, the money distributed on the basis of a committee decision.

Now, under this licensing arrangement a person will be able to take out a licence, and state that that is how the money will be distributed, and then distribute that money according to that licence. If, as the regulation clearly intends social clubs in hotels are allowed to participate in that distribution, it perpetuates a racket that has been going on, even though it may make it more legally or morally acceptable than it has been in the past. The department used to refer to these clubs as 'Mickey Mouse' clubs and they are not really a satisfactory organisation through which profits from gambling operations may be distributed in a society where we have many charities.

In these circumstances a hotelier could take out the licence and have permission to distribute some of the funds to the social club within the hotel, and that leaves the door open for manipulation of the system. I hope that I will have time to demonstrate this, because I can visualise a letter from 'Good-ho Hotel Enterprises,' as follows:

Mrs Gullible,
President of the Over Ninety's Club
Northgate.

Dear Gloria,

Further to our conservation regarding the Over Ninety's Club luncheon this year, as requested may I submit the following menu and proposal for your perusal. May I say how regrettable it is that only 13 people will be attending this year. However, it is pleasing to note that another six people could qualify by this time next year.

A menu could then be given for the organisation to consider and the letter could continue, as follows:

In order to offset this cost, our hotel is prepared to sell eight series of 2 × $100 bingo tickets for your club and the profit from these tickets be deducted from your overall account.

That is what the regulations allow to happen if profits are distributed through Mickey Mouse clubs. Therefore, the letter would continue:

				$
Total luncheon A/c (13 people)	at	$117.43	=	1 526.59
8 series of 2 × $100 bingo (3 000 tickets) series	at	$75.00	=	600.00
Total amount				2 126.99
Less credit from 8 series sold at hotel	at	250.00	=	2 000.00
Total amount payable to Good-oh Hotel Enterprises				$126.59

Therefore each meal cost—$9.73 per head.

It should be noted that it is your club's responsibility to pay the 2 per cent licence fee on the tickets sold on your behalf.

The House will see how the hotel can act within the law yet still manipulate the system. It is a shocking and disgraceful situation and we have not covered the loophole. When the Hon. Mr Wilson was Minister under a Liberal Government he had a committee examine this matter. The previous Minister looked at it and now the present Minister has picked up the responsibility. We need to be much

tougher in our approach. We need to see how the tickets are printed and distributed.

We need to see whether we are putting nearly all the business in the hands of one group. True, I am a supporter of private enterprise, but to give one group the opportunity to manipulate the system involving hundreds of thousands of dollars over a period is wrong. Therefore, I am asking members opposite to take up the matter, to make inquiries and follow them through to see whether there is a joint arrangement on which we can agree. I seek leave to conclude my remarks later.

Leave granted; debate adjourned.

MULTIFUNCTION POLIS

Adjourned debate on motion of Hon. Jennifer Cashmore:

That this House examine the economic, environmental, social and cultural impact of the proposed multifunction polis and examine and make public all commitments so far entered into by the Government, all costs to be incurred by the Government and the specific timetable proposed for development of the project,

which Mr De Laine had moved to amend by striking out all words after 'House' and inserting the following:

welcomes the opportunities created by having Adelaide nominated as the site for the multifunction polis and notes the approval of the Commonwealth Government for the next stage of the project involving a detailed environmental assessment of the Gillman site, an estimate of the infrastructure costs of the project and the methods of financing them, an investigation of potential business opportunities, an assessment of the impact on the social fabric of Adelaide and South Australia, and a collaborative community consultation program between the South Australian and Commonwealth Governments. This House supports the work of the management group chaired by Mr Ross Adler, and looks forward to the publication of its report.

(Continued from 6 September. Page 774.)

The Hon. B.C. EASTICK (Light): This motion and amendment provide the House with a unique circumstance, in my experience in the Parliament, because both are capable of being freestanding. Granted, they approach the same subject in a slightly different way. One is more probing than the other and less congratulatory, but both the motion and the amendment are capable of standing in their own right. Therefore, I suggest to the House a course of action that I believe will be of advantage to the people of South Australia, in allowing the two issues to be debated concurrently but in a slightly different form to the way in which they are presented to us today. Eventually this will lead to a result which, hopefully, will advance the knowledge of the project. It will also give members on both sides of the House an opportunity to vote on the merits of the arguments relative to the two issues.

As members will appreciate the first vote would be taken on the amendment of the member for Price. If that amendment were carried, it would negate the opportunity to further consider the motion that was quite properly and for very real purpose put forward by the member for Coles.

A course of action is provided in Standing Orders Nos 161 to 167 under the chapter 15 amendments. They clearly indicate that it is in order for the member for Price to seek leave to withdraw his amendment and, with the concurrence of the House—and I assure him that there would be concurrence on this side—to subsequently move a substantive motion to the House for debate in due course. This course of action would eliminate the likely lottery situation that we presently have with the member for Coles' quite important motion, which probes a very real issue that is presently before this House and the public of South Australia on a continuing basis—referred to in major articles in newspapers, over the air and on television. Both issues should be considered on the merits of their respective arguments. I recommend to the Government, and more particularly to the member for Price, that this course of action be followed. The House can then differentiate between the amendment and the motion.

I personally would not have congratulated the Government in the way that the member for Price has done, although such statements would not prevent me from voting for a motion if I agreed with the substantive part of it. However, I believe that the fewer the congratulatory-type statements there are in motions the better it is for the parliamentary system. It allows for a more proper approach to matters before the House based not on political point scoring but on the argument of an issue.

That is only a minor difficulty. There are measures contained in the amendment put forward by the member for Price that can be completely addressed, and addressed positively, by members on this side. I believe that there are measures associated with the formal motion that has been put by the member for Coles that need to be addressed by the Government, because the eventual requirement, as far as the public is concerned, is a full and frank exposé of precisely what is involved in the multifunction polis.

What will it do to our future in relation to the funds that are available for a whole host of community activities right across the State, not just in one particular place? Is there sufficient evidence available at the moment to say that it does not pose a danger to the South Australian community and, more specifically, to the Adelaide region in the longer term? That is what my colleague the member for Coles is asking. She is asking for substantive information, information which this House needs and which is important to the people of South Australia.

In this regard, for the purpose of the debate it is very healthy to find that the whole concept of the multifunction polis is being received positively in the broader community. The proposal is being considered positively by a large number of people in the community looking at the pros and cons. The more debate that occurs, the greater will be the eventual advantage to the people of South Australia.

It is based on that concept that I draw attention to what I believe is quite an important decision to be made by this Parliament. In fact, there are two decisions that I believe can be made by this Parliament. Whether it will be one decision or two decisions depends entirely on the attitude that the Government will eventually take towards this matter. I do not want to canvass the general issues any further, because I believe that we will do that on a number of occasions in the future. However, I want to give the Government an opportunity to rethink its position, to allow the debate to proceed on both the motion of the member for Coles and the issues raised by the member for Price.

I recommend to the member for Price that he take advice from his colleagues. I am quite happy to discuss it with him further. I point out that, under Standing Order 165, an amendment that has been put may be withdrawn by leave of the House. Members on this side of the House will agree to that if the honourable member seeks to take that course of action. As a show of sincerity in this matter, I am quite happy to second a motion from the member for Price couched in the same terms as his amendment to the member for Coles' motion. This would be to the advantage of the parliamentary system and I ask members to give due consideration to the matter. The member for Price may be able to indicate to the House between now and next Thursday

the course of action sanctioned by the Government and him.

The Hon. T.H. HEMMINGS secured the adjournment of the debate.

COASTAL SAND DUNES

Adjourned debate on motion of Mr Brindal:

That this House urges the Government to ensure the restoration and preservation of the coastal sand dunes at Somerton Park.

(Continued from 6 September. Page 775.)

Mr OSWALD (Morphett): It is with some pleasure that I rise to speak in the debate. I compliment the member for Hayward on putting forward this motion and, in particular, on the well-researched speech that he presented to the House on 23 August. I remind members that the motion states:

That this House urges the Government to ensure the restoration and preservation of the coastal sand dunes at Somerton Park.

In particular, the member for Hayward was referring to the sand dunes in the vicinity of Minda Home.

The Government replied through the member for Henley Beach who, to some extent, was supportive of the member for Hayward, but he could not seem to bring himself to say that the Government would support the motion. Whether this is because it cannot bring itself to support a Liberal motion for philosophical reasons, I know not, but the fact is that the member for Henley Beach could not bring himself to support the motion. He made some complimentary remarks, and then said:

However, we on this side of the Chamber have difficulty in being able to accept the proposition that he has put before us . . .

Later in his speech, he said:

I do not think that members on this side of the House will be able to comply with the proposition the honourable member has put forward. I do not think that the Government would be able to purchase that land, because of its value.

If the member for Henley Beach is using that as the reason for saying that he cannot bring himself to support this very good motion put forward by the member for Hayward, he has not read the motion. I do not recall the member for Hayward or the motion calling on the State Government to purchase that land. There are many ways by which land can be secured from future redevelopment by entrepreneurial developers than by the Government purchasing it outright.

The member who represents the Minda area is concerned that over the years we have seen a progressive purchase of the sand dunes. Our forebears, whether of conservative or socialist persuasion, have presided over the breaking up, purchasing and selling off of that land to the extent that we now have a roadway on top of the sand dunes and what is called a riprap wall to prevent erosion of that road on the seaward side of the sand dunes; and, because the sand dunes system has been enclosed by the riprap wall, the roadway and the houses behind the Esplanade roadway, there are no reserves of sand available to stop the wave action.

The honourable member was correct in forming a parallel when he described the wave action by saying that the beach at low tide is an inclined plane which goes up to the sand dunes system and, as the wave action comes up, it disperses itself as it runs up the inclined plane of the existing beach until it gets into the sand dunes system, and then the wave action dissipates and there is no energy to take that sand back into the ocean. Of course, what is now happening is that, at times of high tides or in storms, the wave action comes in and, instead of dissipating up on to the inclined plane running up and into the sand dunes, as it is turning, it hits the riprap wall and goes out again and takes sand with it. That is why we get continual erosion of the beach and why the riprap wall which supports the roadway in many cases became undermined. At Somerton Park, as with the situation in the Tennyson area, the wave action goes up, loses itself in the sand dunes and does not go back. That is why there is no erosion of any consequence at those two points.

To its credit, the Government is spending millions of dollars on carting sand up and down the coast. Most of us who have studied this matter fear that, in the long term, we will not win because there will still be movement offshore, and every 100 tonnes of sand brought from the northern beaches and deposited on the southern beaches will eventually move north again and some will be lost to the offshore system.

Again to its credit, the Government mined the deposit at the power house and recently brought it down to Glenelg, where the most enormous artificial sand dune was built. Officers of the department told me that a new sand dune system would be created at Minda so the wave action would dissipate on that system. The locals and I said that it would be gone within six months—and it was gone. It has moved back up the coast. It is providing a pool of sand at Henley Beach and points north. Eventually, it will all move north and that sand will be brought back again.

However we talk publicly, the difficulty in this State is that, in the long term, we will lose. Many people come to my electorate office with various theories. One theory is to put in groynes along the coast. That theory is fine, providing that the groynes are filled with sand. If we were to have a series of groynes running along the coast and a massive offshore sand deposit, which we could use to fill up the sand dunes, tie them down and create the incline plane on which the wave action could dissipate, that would be fine. However, the reality is that we do not have that offshore sand deposit.

We—that is, the taxpayers—tried to bring down Mount Compass sand, at great expense, to create a new sand dune system—but the expense killed it. The sand has been mined out of Torrens Island. I am not sure how much is left, but it is a finite resource. The sand will eventually erode. As I read the member for Hayward's motion, I understood it to say that, historically, Governments of various persuasions have allowed the sand dunes to be built over and now we have the opportunity with the sand dune system at Minda, particularly, to tie up that piece of land by statute so that it can never be lost to the sand dune system.

This motion should be supported. It was with some disappointment that I read the speech of the member for Henley Beach, who could not bring himself to say that he would support it. It is well worthy of the consideration of this House and it would be a popular move in this State, so I urge members to support the motion. I believe it would be opportune to put this motion to the vote today. Members from electorates along the coast have spoken about this at length and probably not much more can be said. It is a statement of what the people of Somerton Park would like to see happen, and it would be nice to think that members from other electorates would give 100 per cent support for the motion.

I applaud the member for Hayward for his foresight and for his knowledge of the area's history and the sand movement. I recall 50 years ago, when I was a young child living at Marino, walking through the sand dunes and seeing the bathing boxes on the beach. People were starting to build houses on the dunes. In fairness to our forebears, it should

be said that it just sprung up and that, unlike today, hardly anyone lived on the beach. I remember when the houses finished at Lockleys and there were no more until Henley Beach. In those days, I can understand why people would buy a block of land on the seafront and build on it.

The problem sprung up and was created through the lack of foresight of our early planners. Nevertheless, the member for Hayward has acknowledged it. We have an opportunity for the Government to enshrine in legislation some protection so that those dunes are preserved. It does not have to be done by the Government stepping in and purchasing the land: it can do it, as it knows, by many other means. I urge members in this House to support the motion.

Mr HAMILTON secured the adjournment of the debate.

CRIME PREVENTION STRATEGIES

Adjourned debate on motion of Mr Hamilton:

That this House congratulates the Government and the Attorney-General for the ongoing implementation of crime prevention strategies including the broad-based 'Coalition Against Crime' and data mapping projects and, further, this House congratulates the Government for involving non-government representatives, business, unions, community groups, local government and the media in its fight against crime,

which Mr Oswald had moved to amend by striking out all words after 'That' and inserting the following:

this House applauds the contribution of non-government representatives, business, unions, community groups, local government, and the media in the implementation of crime prevention strategies, but, acknowledges that it is not a substitute for the proper policing of the community and that they must work with the police in order to do this effectively, and calls on the Government to consider subsidising the Neighbourhood Watch Association dollar for dollar so that the organisation can better play the part expected of it.

(Continued from 6 September. Page 776.)

Mr MATTHEW (Bright): I wish to address briefly the amendment. In so doing I would like to formally recognise the motion that was put forward by the member for Albert Park, as I have no doubt at all that he moved it in a genuine attempt to show his concern for crime prevention strategies in this State, and also to reflect the efforts that he has undertaken during his time as a member in this place. I certainly do not mind, as an ex-member of the State Executive of Neighbourhood Watch, formally acknowledging the work he has done. Indeed, he is well respected by that organisation for his efforts. However, the honourable member obviously finds himself in a frustrating position, because on many occasions in this place and outside he has certainly put forward a number of suggestions that bear merit, but he is faced with a Government that is failing to grapple with the problems of crime in this State, and he is one of those members who is no doubt belting his head against a brick wall trying to put forward constructive ideas but finding resistance in his path.

It is quite obvious that no congratulations should be bestowed upon the Government or the Attorney-General for the crime prevention strategies that have been put together in this State. However, more correctly, those congratulations should be offered to those groups identified in the text of the amendment to this motion, namely, businesses, unions and community groups, local government and the media, for their activities and the implementation of those crime prevention strategies, and also to the community at large for its actions.

At this juncture, I would like to cite correspondence that was sent to the Premier on 30 June 1988, signed by Roger Gordon, the Executive Committee Vice-President of Neighbourhood Watch Association of South Australia Incorporated. It states:

Dear Mr Bannon, enclosed with this covering letter is a submission seeking a grant for the Neighbourhood Watch program to be maintained in this State.

The Commercial Union Insurance Company is the sole sponsor of the community-based scheme in South Australia and while their generosity is acknowledged and appreciated, the success of the program was never predicted to reach the level currently reached.

Their contribution of $50 000 per year allows for 60 areas to be launched. There are 167 areas on the waiting list and a waiting time of 2½ years for some areas. It is respectfully suggested that this period is unacceptable to members of the community wanting to join the program.

If the grant was approved, the rate of establishing areas would be increased and concern, frequently expressed by citizens, may be diminished.

My executive committee and I are anxious to assist in any way should there be any further matters to be addressed.

That was a covering letter for a document which was also sent to the Premier and which was entitled 'To the Premier for Cabinet: Request for Grant—Neighbourhood Watch program'. I quote from that document; the proposal was:

That the Neighbourhood Watch Association (South Australia) Incorporated be awarded a State Government grant of $100 000 and the secondment/transfer of a suitable public servant to the position of State Secretary for the program as a full-time employee.

That letter goes on to give some background, and I should like to read that into the record. It states:

2.1 Neighbourhood Watch in South Australia is sponsored by Commercial Union Assurance Company and they have contracted to fund the program over a three year period at $50 000 annually. This amount allows for 60 areas to be established each year and each area comprises about 2 000 residents of a suburb.

2.2 Currently there are 98 areas established . . . and 175 areas are on the waiting list.

2.3 In simple terms this means that a suburb/area wanting to join the program has a wait of three years before they can be launched. This delay is unacceptable to some areas and they elect to form their own *de facto* scheme—not always successfully.

That last point in the submission to the Premier and Cabinet by that group is very important. That waiting list for Neighbourhood Watch programs remains at about 2½ or three years, and the backlog of groups wanting to join the program is never-ending. Such has been the success of the program that, I am sure, most members in this place will have received numerous inquiries from groups in their areas seeking to be part of the Neighbourhood Watch program and seeking advice from members as to how they go about it.

I am sure that many members of this place have prepared petitions for those groups in order that they may become part of the scheme. While many members are encouraging the growth of that program in this way, they are still doing so without any overall funding program, any overall objective and any overall understanding, in fact, by the State Government as a whole, despite the well-intentioned endeavours of members such as the member for Albert Park.

I recall, almost with amusement, a meeting I attended with the Premier back at the end of 1987, if my memory serves me correctly, at which time I was not a member of a political Party and, certainly, the Premier would not have been aware of any intention on my part ultimately to become a political candidate. The meeting involved my predecessor (the previous member for Bright) and a number of people involved with Neighbourhood Watch. It was at a fairly early stage in the growth of this program, and the Premier was indulging in informal discussion with those of us present in a genuine attempt to find out more about this Neighbourhood Watch program.

He expressed the concern that the program had the potential to grow into some sort of uncontrollable vigilante group.

At that stage, there was no incorporated body and the program as a whole did not have an overall State constitution, but I assured the Premier that I as a citizen could not see that happening and that, if he would take the opportunity to find out more about the program and if his Government would take the opportunity to look at funding options, I was sure that it was something that could benefit the Government and South Australia as a whole, with a reduction in crime.

So, far from being able to take credit for the growth of programs of this sort, this Government has simply blindly followed after the event. Indeed, the Premier himself had absolutely no knowledge about that program. A number of members of the public were present at that meeting to bear witness to the ill-informed statements that he made.

Members interjecting:

Mr MATTHEW: Members on the other side of the Chamber may well bleat about those statements, but I am simply making statements of fact. Members cannot sit there and pat themselves on the back for things of which they as a Government have not been a part. Certainly, there are individual members within the Government ranks who have contributed significantly to that program, and I have singled out the member for Albert Park in particular.

He is one member who can hold his head high because he has contributed to the expansion of that program, but the Government as a whole has not. As a Government, it has not assisted in negotiations for funding. It has not looked seriously at the ultimate growth of this program, its overall ramifications or the potential offered. Any requests for funding in the past have fallen on deaf ears. The Neighbourhood Watch Association could not even get funding for a vehicle to enable police officers to carry heavy equipment to Neighbourhood Watch launch programs. As I have said on previous occasions, to the credit of Commercial Union, they said informally, 'Well, if the Government won't do it, we will do it', and that vehicle proudly bears the name of Commercial Union on its side—and quite rightly so.

Certainly, I will not stand here and knock any sort of private money being poured into policing programs—that is fabulous—but the whole point is that this is happening simply because the Government has wiped its hands of the matter. Members on the other side of the Chamber sit there and say that things were worse in the days of the Tonkin Government. I refer members who did not have the opportunity to hear my speech in the adjournment debate in this place last night to the text of that speech. In particular, I suggest that they concentrate on the figures—Government figures—which I quoted and which demonstrate quite convincingly that crime in South Australia has increased quite significantly under this Government because it has done nothing to discourage rising crime.

Some of the social conditions that the Government has imposed on the people of South Australia through some of the ignorant policies in this place have seen those social conditions worsen and more and more people turn to crime. We have seen an alarming situation develop, to the extent that in the last financial year breaking and entering offences in South Australia occurred at the rate of 116 a day. I challenge any Government member in this House to try to defend those sorts of figures. We are seeing a drastic increase in crime.

Mr Groom interjecting:

Mr MATTHEW: The honourable member opposite keeps talking about other States. Does he not realise that he is an elected member in the State of South Australia? We are talking about South Australia, but members opposite keep pointing to other places. This is absolutely amazing.

An honourable member interjecting:

Mr MATTHEW: Of course, diversionary tactics are all that they indulge in. They wipe their hands of reality, turn their back on the facts and point their finger at someone else. The people opposite are part of the Government. I know that, viewed from this side of the Chamber and from anywhere else, they look like a bit of a rabble, but despite the fact that they were elected on a minority vote they are supposed to be the Government of this State. They should indulge in some positive thinking and put forward some positive plans; they should not pat themselves on the back because of the efforts of other people who, in desperation, have had to take up the cudgel and do something about it.

Mention has been made in this place from time to time—and, certainly, in the original motion moved by the member for Albert Park—about the Coalition Against Crime. The Coalition Against Crime has many members, some of whom are members of the Neighbourhood Watch body. Some of those people have approached me in absolute frustration about the lack of direction and achievement and the general circular discussions that have occurred to date as part of that body. I welcome any attempt or endeavour to get something done in a bipartisan way about our spiralling crime rate. This particular committee was cobbled together on the eve of the State election in a desperate bid by an ailing Government to make it look as though it was actually doing something about law and order in this State.

Members interjecting:

Mr MATTHEW: Listen to them bleating on the back benches.

An honourable member interjecting:

Mr MATTHEW: At least it is a change—they are awake. I note that one member who is usually prostrate by this time is sitting upright. It is encouraging to see that they are all ears and that they are awake. We need to do something about the problems—no patting on backs. We need to sit down in a bipartisan way and look at ways in which we can do something positive about crime in our State.

Crime starts in a number of areas. In our community we have a current problem and a future emerging problem. The current problem needs to be tackled using resources and the future emerging problem needs to be tackled in our schools. I hope that members recognise at least that we have a discipline problem in our schools today. This problem could be tackled and is one of the sorts of suggestions that could be thrown in for discussion by a bipartisan committee.

We must look at ways in which we can introduce stricter discipline in our schools—give control back to the parent bodies in those schools. If they want to have corporal punishment within those schools, let them have it in each school; let the parents decide. They are the ones who have students within the schools and surely they should have a say.

Broadly speaking, I would like to see a little less hot air, a little less procrastination and some serious discussion about crime in our State, not members getting up and patting themselves on the back. I recognise the heartache of the member for Albert Park; he must be beating his head against a brick wall with the company he keeps on the other side of this Chamber. He certainly must be beating his head against a brick wall talking with the Minister, if the Minister's answers to some serious questions that were put to him in the Estimates Committee are any indication.

Mr Lewis: He is like a bucket of blancmange.

Mr MATTHEW: That is probably an accurate statement. I am mindful that time is marching on and, in the brief

amount of time left to me, perhaps we could look at a number of other problems that need to be addressed in this State of ours today.

There are probably two main areas about which people in our State are concerned with respect to themselves. Those areas relate to their own person and their own property. We have seen now that an average of 36 motor vehicles a day were stolen in South Australia during the period 1 July 1989 to 30 June 1990. That means there is a very real chance that many people known to us will have their vehicles stolen or interfered with. That has happened to me once in the past, and I am sure many members in this place are aware of colleagues, contacts and friends who have experienced that same sort of problem.

The Hon. J.P. Trainer: It happened to a Legislative Councillor at the front of the building.

Mr MATTHEW: Indeed, that is right, and we all know that a number of problems have occurred right in front of this building. I made this House aware of a violent incident that occurred against two of my constituents diagonally opposite this building. I think I have reached a stage in my address where members opposite are sitting wide awake and have heard at least some of the messages that have been imparted. I look forward to a response from some of those members at a later date.

Mr QUIRKE (Playford): I must say that, earlier in the debate, the last speaker was waxing and waning about the terrible sins of this Government and what it had not done in the area of crime prevention. A number of members on this side were yelling out what I thought to be a very appropriate question; they asked, 'What are you doing about it?' In fact, they went on to ask, 'What do you suggest?' In fact, in the whole of the last speech, there was no suggestion at all, apart from more thumping in schools and that we have a problem out there. Indeed, we do have a problem out there and we are grappling with it. Greiner also has a problem with it. We are grappling with many other problems out there as well. Where this is concerned, what separates this side from the desert opposite is not only that are we grappling with the problems now but also that for the next three years we will continue to grapple with them, and members opposite will not. I thought the question 'What serious suggestions will you make?' was most appropriate. There was none at all. It is very much like the two bob each way on the marina. I thought that last week, the member for Napier—

The SPEAKER: Order! The honourable member will resume his seat. A point of order was made earlier today about background noise, and that point of order was taken from the Government side. I have noticed in the debate that the noise level has gradually risen again and, let me say, it is on the Government side. I would ask all members to respect Standing Orders, particularly, Standing Order 142, as the point of order was taken previously, and respect an honourable member when he is on his feet.

Mr QUIRKE: Thank you, Mr Speaker. As I was saying, the other week I thought the member for Napier was being a bit rough on the issue of the marina, but basically he came down with some grains of truth. The reality is that we are still waiting to find out whether or not the member for Bright wants a marina in his district. We are also waiting to find out what he wants to do about crime control in our society. What is he really saying to us and to the community—that there has been a problem, that houses are robbed; that cars are stolen; that all sorts of other terrible and horrible things are happening every day? We know that already. We have been struggling with the issues for years, but we have had no help whatsoever from any of his colleagues.

The last time the Government had to grapple with the problem of shortened terms of imprisonment for dangerous criminals in our prison system, what happened? The Opposition thought that it was a good idea that they be let loose on the streets, because that was the effect of its policy. They were the sorts of things going on. At the last Neighbourhood Watch meeting I attended, a member of the public said to me that he had been talking to a member of the Opposition and he had convinced that member to bring back hanging. He thought that that was a good idea. I congratulated that person, not because he wanted to bring back hanging (a policy I do not agree with), but it seemed to me that he had spoken to the one person in the whole community—a member of the Opposition—who has done absolutely nothing for years about the problem of crime in the community.

The reality is that the Government has followed a three-pronged approach in terms of crime. First, there has been a policy of prevention, at which members of the Opposition will often niggle and become negative about. That policy of prevention, primarily through the Neighbourhood Watch scheme, has been very successful. It is well received in the community and to date a total of 250 schemes are in operation. Let me make it quite clear that it was not the member for Bright who obtained the money, the resources or the help for those schemes. This Government has an active policy of crime prevention, and Neighbourhood Watch is the cornerstone of it.

Let us consider the other two parts of the strategy. I have mentioned suitable terms of imprisonment. Many times this Government has gone on record when inadequate sentences have been handed down by the courts. Members on both sides of the fence have made it quite clear that many of the sentences handed down by the courts have been totally inadequate. In those situations, it was this Government that did something about it, not the previous Government. The struggle to introduce responsible sentencing for hardened criminals, in order to protect the community, has been a policy that this Government has actively pursued.

As recently as a couple of days ago, we were all horrified at a television news story of an 87 year old man—

Mr Oswald interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order! The member for Morphett is out of order. He is out of his seat, too.

Mr QUIRKE: —who had subsequently died after being beaten by a juvenile. I do not know the full details of the case, but it was quite clear that the sentence of four months imprisonment was totally inadequate, and this Government acted on it immediately. The Attorney-General, a member of the other place, made quite clear that we as a Government would not tolerate that sort of conduct in our society.

Mr Hamilton: Look at the number of times we have done it, too.

Mr QUIRKE: The member for Albert Park, by implication, raises the question whether this was an isolated instance: it certainly was not. There are many instances where inadequate sentences have been handed down, and this Government has done something about it. As the member for Napier said earlier, it was not this Government that let a man out onto the streets who had committed 10 murders. We were in Opposition at the time. We came into Government in 1982 and set about the business of bringing in a decent set of sentences and deterrents for crime.

There is also a third element in the Government's strategy to tackle the problems of crime. The whole situation in which a criminal gets off on a technicality has now been thrown into serious jeopardy in the minds of every criminal

in this State. The reality is that, as a very important and integral element in our society, if a criminal manages to get off on a technicality or is given a sentence which is reduced, the Crown now has a right of appeal. It was not members opposite who brought about or implemented those policies. This Government has actively pursued those policies here and it is not about the business of letting criminals out onto the street. The member for Bright made a number of comments, sadly, none of which were positive at all. All he said was that there is a problem out there and that we are responsible for it—

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order!

Mr QUIRKE: In conclusion, it is this Government that has tackled crime head-on and this Government does not come in here with simple 'fix it' solutions that more crime is out there because this Government will not tackle it. The reality is that the resources of this Government have fairly and squarely been put behind the problem and I must say that I think that this Government has tackled the job positively and has a great deal of recognition in the community as having achieved great success.

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

That the debate be adjourned.

The Hon. T.H. Hemmings interjecting:

Mr Becker: Sit down!!

The SPEAKER: Order! The member for Hanson has been here for a long time and knows that interjections are out of order and knows that, if they do interject, members should be in their seat.

The Hon. T.H. HEMMINGS: On a point of order, Mr Speaker, I seek your guidance. I was sitting here watching the debate and I saw the member for Henley Beach stand up prior to the member for Davenport—

The SPEAKER: There is no point of order. There is an accepted precedent in the practice of the House—certainly since I have been here and I understand since long before that—that the sides alternate in a debate. It is the practice of the House. There is no point of order and the honourable member has been here much, much longer than I—

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order! —and at times has taken this Chair, and he is well aware of that rule.

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

VANDALISM AND GRAFFITI

Adjourned debate on motion of Mr Hamilton:

That this House enjoins the Government to initiate specific programs to effectively reduce the incidence of vandalism and graffiti in our community and that the House believes that all sections of the community including the Local Government Association be involved with the Government to formulate position strategies to address these two issues.

(Continued from 6 September. Page 777.)

Mr S.G. EVANS (Davenport): I support the motion and, in speaking to it, I congratulate the member for Albert Park and the member for Fisher for their comments. I do not agree with all of their comments but I believe that they, at least, have highlighted a problem that is within the community and have offered some sensible suggestions as to how those problems may be attacked. That does not mean that there will be a total resolution of those problems.

Vandalism and graffiti can be put in the same category or separate categories. For example, I believe it is vandalism if somebody burns somebody else's property. Of course, that would not be graffiti. I want to raise the following example. Earlier this year a young lady was found guilty of breaking in and then burning a sports store at Blackwood, causing hundreds of thousands of dollars worth of damage. Subsequently, she was charged, found guilty, released on a bond and placed under the care and control of Government agencies. That was not the first time that that person was involved in breaking the law.

That is an example of vandalism at its worst. The night before last, right opposite that sports store in the Magnet Shopping Centre, Blackwood, Johnson's drapery store also was burnt. Someone put a brick through the window and then set the premises alight. That business has taken 30 years to build up; it is a family business, with the building and the business owned by the family, but it is now totally destroyed. It is reported that a girl aged 16 years has been arrested and charged with that offence. I do not know who that person is. As I am aware of the *sub judice* aspect, Mr Speaker, I will not refer to this matter other than in this way: I do not know the person but, if she is subsequently found to be the same person who burnt a store earlier this year when under the control and care of State agencies, then I frown on the original decision by the court and upon the agencies that should be caring for that person.

I do not support—although I may have to change my mind in the future—the concept that guardians or custodians of offenders should pay the cost of any damage done, because a vindictive young person can inflict a huge penalty on parents or guardians out of sheer spite, perhaps acting on the spur of the moment, although that person might regret it later. If people are charged with the sort of offence that they have committed several times before, and if they are on a bond and are under the care of Government agencies, or if they commit such a crime after they have broken out from an agency, I believe that the State should pick up the debt if that debt is greater than the amount that that business or individual concerned has carried through insurance.

If we are going to have a system providing that we must be sympathetic to offenders and give them repeated chances—if that is society's attitude—the minority of people who suffer severe loss or physical harm should be compensated by society. As to graffiti and similar offences—my colleague the member for Fisher referred to local government and Government agencies suffering, but private individuals and business operators also suffer—I would have no hesitation in supporting a proposition that the parent or guardian of the individual concerned help remove the offending evidence, or make the offender do it alone—even if it meant a total repaint job, they would have to do this. I am not talking about monetary compensation at all: I am talking about people having to help, and I include a parent, parents or the guardian.

When I speak of guardians, I include Government agencies. If a Department for Family and Community Services officer has the care and custody of a child and that child paints graffiti on a bus shelter or on someone's private property, I believe that that welfare officer has fallen down in his or her duty—the same as does a parent—and should help remove that graffiti. By this method I believe we will get greater responsibility and acceptance from parents, guardians and welfare officers. Some might argue that the Minister should do it, but I would not agree to that as one could have the Minister of Transport standing over the Minister of Emergency Services making sure that the work is completed.

We have to tackle this problem in that way as well as in the ways suggested by the members for Albert Park and Fisher. Their suggestions of encouraging those who are artistic has some merit, but we need to be cautious in taking this path. However, what is beautiful or acceptable to one may not be to another: beauty is in the eye of the beholder.

One thing is quite clear: people should not have the right to interfere with another person's property unless they have permission. If State agencies want artistic work on their establishments, that is their business—but it should be in the taxpayer's interests, as in the end the taxpayer will pay. I am not the only one who wants to debate this issue; others will follow me as I have followed two previous speakers. None of us knows exactly how much graffiti or vandalism is costing this State.

Mr Hamilton: Millions.

Mr S.G. EVANS: It is millions; I agree with the member for Albert Park. The more one moves around the more one sees it. But, is it the result of society, particularly Parliament, over the years saying that we have to give children more opportunities to be individuals; that they are not children, that they have rights and the parents do not have as many rights as they used to have? For example, when my daughter was about 15 years old I hit her and broke my wrist. She cried not because I hit her—she knew why I hit her—but because I broke my wrist; she cried in sympathy with me. I might add that I think we are still a tightly-knit family. We are now saying that you should not hit children, but I believe that sometimes it is necessary. Smart children can start playing the system when they are very young. They know they can have mum or dad over a barrel because a teacher or welfare officer has told them that no-one can stand over them if they are wrong, that they cannot be made to repair or restore things they have damaged, and cannot be made to apologise.

These children play the system. Are they the ones who are now out on the streets? They not only defy parental and welfare officers' authority but the authority of the police. They test the police to the 'nth' degree of the law. Is it our fault or their fault? Is it the fault of past or present members of this Parliament? Did we try socially to engineer this new system to our own detriment? I seek leave to continue my remarks later.

Leave granted; debate adjourned.

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

PETITION: BLOOD ALCOHOL LIMIT

A petition signed by 44 residents of South Australia requesting that the House urge the Government not to reduce the blood alcohol concentration limit for fully licensed drivers was presented by the Hon. P.B. Arnold.

Petition received.

QUESTION

The SPEAKER: I direct that the following written answer to a question without notice be distributed and printed in *Hansard*.

WASTE ELIMINATION

In reply to **Mr MEIER (Goyder)** 15 August.

The Hon. LYNN ARNOLD: Far from allowing wasteful duplication, the changes at the State Chemistry Laboratories are in fact reducing duplication and improving the efficiency of Government operations. The transfer of the State Chemistry Laboratories (SCL) to the Department of Agriculture followed a review of their operations and reflects the preponderance of agriculture-related work carried out by the laboratories.

The transfer will allow the Department of Agriculture to minimise overlap between the State Chemistry Laboratories and its laboratories at Northfield. However, the major benefits will follow the proposed relocation of Department of Agriculture units to the campus of the Waite Institute and the consequent co-location of SCL and its major clients. Even when both the SCL and the Forensic Science Division were under the control of the Department of State Services, they operated as largely independent units with sharing restricted to some stores, a library, staff amenities, a small number of administrative staff and a small personal computer which was used for communication within State Services.

The only item that has been purchased as a result of the transfer has been the small personal computer. This item is now being used for stores inventory purposes. Certainly, in the period since the transfer on 31 July 1989, some administration procedures have changed in order to integrate SCL systems with the remainder of the Department of Agriculture. This has resulted in some short-term costs while staff convert to the new system. Such costs are inevitable but will be more than compensated for by the long-term savings that will accrue.

In relation to staffing, though some staff have changed no additional staff have been employed in SCL as a result of the transfer. The changes have in fact resulted in an overall reduction in staffing within SCL as the position of business manager has not been filled. SCL is now using services from the Department of Agriculture's head office.

On the matter of the wall, this was contructed to improve the security of Forensic Science Division records. It will be readily understood that security is a major factor in a forensic science laboratory. The disposition of space did not allow the staff integration without compromising security. The simple construction of a wall solved that.

PAPERS TABLED

The following papers were laid on the table:

By the Minister of Health (Hon. D.J. Hopgood)—

Medical Board of South Australia—Report 1989-90.

By the Minister of Aboriginal Affairs (Hon. M.D. Rann)—

Royal Commission into Aboriginal Deaths in Custody:
Reports of the Inquiries into the Deaths of—
Gordon Michael Semmens
Malcolm Buzzacott
The woman who died at Ceduna on 18 February 1983

MINISTERIAL STATEMENT: DISABLED PRISONERS

The Hon. FRANK BLEVINS (Minister of Correctional Services): I seek leave to make a statement.

Leave granted.

The Hon. FRANK BLEVINS: The South Australian branch of Disabled People's International yesterday launced a report called 'Out of Sight Out of Mind' which examined the treatment of disabled offenders in the South Australian criminal justice system. It is noted that the report is intended

to be only a preliminary investigation into a complex problem. Nevertheless, the Department of Correctional Services considers it to contain a number of basic deficiencies which have led to quite fallacious conclusions.

The report estimates that 8.2 per cent of prisoners—that is about 70 prisoners in South Australia—experience a measurable intellectual deficit. This figure is based on the results of a survey conducted in New South Wales in 1988 by Hayes and McIlwain. The number of intellectually disabled prisoners in South Australia, according to this approach, is 13 and not 70. This makes a significant difference in terms of planning progress and accommodation requirements. The department attempts to consider fully the special needs of all prisoners and ensure they are met. Wherever possible, the department aims to integrate disabled people into the mainstream prison environment. This maximises their opportunities for involvement in the range of programs available to the prison population as a whole. It is also consistent with the recommendations in the report. A number of areas in the report deserve clarification.

Identified prisoner: As a basis for cooperation with the author, the Department of Correctional Services sought a guarantee of privacy for detainees. It is regrettable that that guarantee has not been adhered to, with the name of a particular prisoner being published. Because of the claims made about this prisoner there are a few points I would like to make.

The Prison Medical Service categorically states he is not sedated 24 hours a day as the report claims, but is on medication for a range of medical problems. This particular prisoner was referred to the Management Assessment Panel by the sentencing judge and over the intervening years has been the topic of considerable debate. By virtue of his behaviour, he is a most difficult prisoner to manage. However, consistent efforts are made to develop programs to enhance the quality of his life. In 1989, for instance, a program was mounted for him at a cost of $10 000 involving the Aboriginal Community Aid Panel; the Aboriginal Health Centre (Pika Wiya) at the Port Augusta Gaol. Sadly, a further episode of self destructive behaviour meant that the prisoner had to be returned to Adelaide for medical treatment and, as a result, the program did not come to fruition.

Currently, the Management Assessment Panel and the Department of Correctional Services are considering a range of program options for this offender in his final time in prison. Negotiations are being conducted by the most senior officers of the department and the Health Commission.

Protection: Prisoners are placed in protection areas for their own safety and not, as the report suggests, to increase the efficiency of an institution.

G Division: I am concerned by the nature of this aspect of the report. The report indicates that:

> People with disabilities are confined during the day to small, bare concrete cages at Yatala Labour Prison.

This is quite untrue. All prisoners have a variety of activities within the segretation unit of Yatala Labour Prison and spend their time in a variety of locations including the games room, an indoor activity area with static hydraulic weights equipment, the outdoor games yard area, and their cell. It should be pointed out that it is not common to place prisoners, including disabled prisoners, in G Division for protection. Two prisoners in the State are being held in segregation on a regular basis for their own safety.

Prison staff: The claims that Yatala Labour Prison staff had negative attitudes to intellectually disabled prisoners is a broad generalisation given that less than 1 per cent of the staff at that institution were interviewed. The training of staff pays particular attention to addressing the needs of prisoners with special requirements. Considerable time is given over the current training of officers to consider the case of prisoners with special needs, such as Aborigines, women, disabled and minority ethnic groups. However, it must be noted that correctional officers are not trained medical personnel, nor do they have specialist skills in the area of psychiatry. It is not reasonable to expect that they should have those particular skills given their role and the wide variety of persons with whom they deal.

Facilities for disabled prisoners: In construction of new institutions and major redevelopments of existing prisons undertaken since 1984, facilities for disabled prisoners have been provided in accordance with those prescribed in the relevant Australian standards.

Special needs unit: The report recommends that a Special Needs Unit be established at Port Lincoln Prison for prisoners with particular needs. If the Government were able to find the necessary funds for such a unit, it would not be located in Port Lincoln. It would be more realistic to place such a facility in the metropolitan area as the prisoners would need ready access to a wide range of services.

Medical facilities at the Adelaide Remand Centre: A psychologist has been reappointed to the Adelaide Remand Centre and prisoners who experience episodes of mental illness have access to a visiting psychiatrist at least once a week. Remandees requiring urgent treatment may be transferred to James Nash House under the Mental Health Act or as a voluntary patient.

Northfield Prison: Allegations about the Northfield prison that money has been reallocated from the women's prison at Yatala is simply not true.

Security: The Jones report indicates that a prisoner's security rating should not be a major consideration if that prisoner is disabled. The department maintains that the security requirements must be of a higher consideration. The Department of Correctional Services welcomes any interest or investigations into the prisons from any organisation. However, they do request that inmates names not be used without permission and that a more accurate assessment of the system is made.

MINISTERIAL STATEMENT: UNACCOMPANIED PRISON LEAVE

The Hon. FRANK BLEVINS (Minister of Correctional Services): I seek leave to make a statement.

Leave granted.

The Hon. FRANK BLEVINS: Yesterday in the other place, the Opposition's legal spokesperson, the Hon. Trevor Griffin, claimed that prisoners released on special unaccompanied leave are made to sign a form which binds them not to speak to the media. I would like to assure the House that this is not the case. As I have told the House on many occasions, and the media would know this from experience, we have a very open prison system in South Australia. We leave it entirely up to offenders whether they do or do not speak to the media. Prisoners on unaccompanied leave are required to meet exactly the same conditions as those on parole, and this does not in any way include any reference to speaking to the media.

PUBLIC WORKS COMMITTEE REPORT

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

RN5405 McIntyre Road-Main North Road-Bridge Road reconstruction and widening.

Ordered that report be printed.

QUESTION TIME

NATIONAL CRIME AUTHORITY

Mr D.S. BAKER (Leader of the Opposition): My question is directed to the Minister of Emergency Services. In view of information contained in the report tabled yesterday by the Federal Parliamentary Joint Committee on the National Crime Authority showing that, at a meeting on 4 August last year between the former chairman of the NCA, Mr Faris, the former Adelaide member, Mr Le Grand, and the South Australian Police Commissioner, Mr Hunt was told that the NCA was vetting the operation Ark report prepared by Mr Justice Stewart, will the Minister explain how the Attorney-General can claim that the South Australian Government did not know until December last year that the Stewart report even existed? Does this mean the Police Commissioner did not communicate the information he had received from the NCA on 4 August either to the Minister of Emergency Services or to the Attorney-General and, if so, does the Minister consider it was appropriate for the Commissioner to have withheld this important information?

The Hon. J.H.C. KLUNDER: I thank the honourable member for his question. He must know by now that I do not, under any circumstances, comment on NCA internal matters. It reports to the Attorney-General, not to me. My only responsibility is for actually paying it.

Mr S.J. Baker: Who's the Minister in charge of the police?

The SPEAKER: Order!

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order! The Deputy Leader is out of order.

OAKLANDS PARK ROAD SAFETY CENTRE

Mr HAMILTON (Albert Park): Will the Minister of Transport advise the House whether the Oaklands Park Road Safety Centre is to be closed? An article in the *News* of 16 October, under the heading 'Safety Centre closures', stated:

> The Government was guilty of gross hypocrisy on road safety matters by allowing the Oaklands Park Road Safety Centre to be closed, the Opposition said.

The Hon. FRANK BLEVINS: I have been accused of many things, but I thought that was a bit rich—gross hypocrisy and not caring about road safety. I thought that was a dreadful thing, but it was a media report. The member for Hayward did not bother to ring or write me a letter or anything, and he is normally—

Mr Brindal interjecting:

The Hon. FRANK BLEVINS: I have told you, and that makes it even worse. A simple phone call, if there was still any doubt in the honourable member's mind about the Oaklands Park Road Safety Centre, would have fixed it up without any problem. But, no, an outrageous story comes out that this Government does not care about road safety and that we are all hypocrites because we are going to sell something that we have no intention of selling. How irresponsible when the facts are clearly known and have been known to all members who have an interest in this area. There has never been any intention to sell the road safety centre, and I suggest that the member for Hayward has always known that.

Mr Lewis interjecting:

The Hon. FRANK BLEVINS: The member for Murray-Mallee asks, 'Why raise the speculation?'

The SPEAKER: Order! The member for Murray-Mallee was definitely out of order with an interjection and the Minister should not respond to interjections.

The Hon. FRANK BLEVINS: You are quite right, Sir. The Department of Road Transport is currently identifying the area of land encompassed in the road safety centre that is surplus to present and future requirements. Again, this has been public knowledge for a year or maybe longer. The surveying services of the department are assisting the Office of Road Safety in identifying the most appropriate area for disposal. Once the area for disposal has been defined, a report will be forwarded to me recommending that the area be formally declared surplus. This initiative will not adversely affect the road safety services offered by the road safety centre. Driver standard and licence testing functions will still be provided at the centre.

The Government is identifying surplus Government assets and parcels of land. This road safety centre incorporates a very large area of land that is never used. It would be irresponsible for a Government not to have an audit of its assets and land holdings and, where they are surplus, not to get rid of them. So, where the member for Hayward gets this far-fetched story, I have no idea. I hope that we will receive an apology from the member for Hayward for calling us hypocrites and for saying that we have no interest in road safety, and I look forward to reading about it in as prominent a position in the paper as we did the original, totally erroneous and fabricated story.

NATIONAL CRIME AUTHORITY

Mr S.J. BAKER (Deputy Leader of the Opposition): My question is directed to the Premier. In view of the information contained in a report tabled in the Federal Parliament yesterday by the Parliamentary Joint Committee on the National Crime Authority that, first, the former Chairman of the NCA, Mr Faris, attempted, before taking up his appointment with the NCA, to delay the transmission to the South Australian Government of the Operation Ark report prepared by his predecessor, Mr Justice Stewart; secondly, that the current NCA Adelaide member, Mr Gerald Dempsey, attempted in September 1989 to have his predecessor Mr Le Grand removed from the NCA by giving advice to the authority calling into question Mr Le Grand's appointment in January 1989; and thirdly, that Mr Dempsey, before taking up his appointment in Adelaide wrote two opinions that were highly critical of the Operation Ark report prepared by Mr Justice Stewart, was the South Australian Government consulted about any of these actions and, if so, did it concur in any of them?

If the Government was not consulted, will it immediately inquire into the reasons for these actions, in view of their implications for previous and on-going investigations of the NCA in South Australia?

The Hon. J.C. BANNON: The South Australian Government has funded the NCA and made certain references to it but has not seen its role as being one of monitoring, directing or otherwise instructing the NCA. Indeed, if that were so, I should have thought the first people to object to it would be members of the Opposition. There would have been cries of absolute outrage. The odd thing here is that the Opposition seeks to have a win on all counts situation:

either we have to have regard to the internal operations of the NCA, reports that had not been formally presented, and all these other things members opposite seek to put on the agenda and, having had regard to them, presumably, take some sort of action (in which case we could be criticised for being involved in the internal operations of the NCA) or, on the other hand, we do as is proper in this instance and wait for the formal communications of the official reports as we receive them from the NCA—and be criticised for not interfering!

I would rather like the Opposition to make up its mind as to where it stands on this, but I stand very firmly—as does my Government—on the basis that the NCA must be left to get on with its work in the manner in which it chooses to do so. All that the South Australian Government can do is respond to the reports officially provided to it by the NCA as constituted at the time those reports are provided.

MURRAY RIVER FLOOD LEVELS

The Hon. J.P. TRAINER (Walsh): Is the Minister of Marine aware of reports of problems being caused along the Murray River by boat operators travelling at excessive speeds during the current flood conditions?

The Hon. R.J. GREGORY: The matter of the high level of the Murray River and of people who thoughtlessly operate their vessels at high speed is causing concern to residents along the Murray, particularly as houses and properties are being inundated by water. My advice is that the level at present is between 12 and 18 inches lower than the previous level when speed restrictions were in place along the Murray. However, if I continue to receive reports from residents expressing their concern to me that the high speed of irresponsible people is causing damage to their properties, for example, the washing away of levee banks and such things, the department will have to consider seriously imposing a speed limit of 8 km/h.

I issue a warning to all operators of vessels on the Murray that they have a responsibility to operate their vessels with care so as not to endanger the lives of other people or the public or cause property damage. There does not need to be a speed limit for that. I also remind people who operate any boat at speed that, if they collide with a floating or partially submerged object, it could rip the hull out of their boat and endanger their lives as well as the lives of any passengers in that vessel. Any of these offenders, if prosecuted, can be fined up to $1 000, and, if people are found to be operating their boats on the Murray River irresponsibly, and cause damage to public property or the property of private citizens, or endanger passengers of vessels or the lives of the public, they can expect the Department of Marine and Harbors vigorously to prosecute its codes.

NATIONAL CRIME AUTHORITY

The Hon. D.C. WOTTON (Heysen): My question is directed to the Premier. Was it a Cabinet decision that no part of the Operation Ark report prepared by Mr Justice Stewart should be made public and, if so, in making that decision, did Cabinet have before it advice from the Solicitor-General?

The Hon. J.C. BANNON: The honourable member has been here long enough to know that Cabinet decisions and proceedings are not canvassed publicly; it is wrong in both principle and practice. I know it is a long time ago, but the honourable member who asked that question sat in a Cabinet. I could excuse one of his colleagues on the back bench for asking a question such as that, but it is very difficult to excuse the honourable member. Why he is still on the front bench, one fails to understand. I am delighted to see him back in his place, but we did not really miss him during the past week or so. I repeat what I have said: the Government has responded to the NCA as officially reported to by the NCA, will continue to do so and, to the extent information should be made public—and we would desire as much information as possible to be made public—it will be made public.

It has all been laid out on the record. The very correspondence that was exchanged over this controversy between respective Chairmen of the NCA emanated from the Government's tabling of that correspondence in Parliament. It made it quite clear. Recently there has been talk about Mr Le Grand's not being able to speak frankly or to give evidence before the Federal Committee. There may be reasons for that in terms of NCA operations and procedures, but this Government was specifically asked for an indemnity and whether there was any barrier or bar and, in fact, my colleague the Minister of Education at that time, the acting Attorney-General, readily put in writing our Government's belief that such indemnity should be given. There is absolutely no barrier as far as we are concerned. That has been our attitude to the NCA and its operations throughout. Nothing productive is done—

Members interjecting:

The Hon. J.C. BANNON: These questions are being asked of us. I suggest that, if the Opposition is interested, it ask these questions of the NCA, because it is the NCA's business, not ours.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order! The member for Kavel is way out of order.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order! The Premier is out of order.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: The Leader is out of order.

RAILWAY STATION CLOSURES

Mr ATKINSON (Spence): Will the Minister of Transport tell the House whether he intends to close Ovingham, Dudley Park and Islington railway stations? Hindmarsh councillor, Alderman Ron Willis, of Renown Park, and Councillor Mary Hidson, of Brompton, have drawn to my attention a letter from the State Transport Authority to the Australian Railways Union listing seven cost cutting suggestions for the Gawler line. Three of these suggestions require the closure of Ovingham, Dudley Park and Islington railway stations.

The Hon. FRANK BLEVINS: I thank the member for Spence for his question, and I know the honourable member will not mind my joining other members in this question, because indeed, apparently, just about every *Weekly Times* and Messenger newspaper in the northern metropolitan area have run the same story.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order! The member for Napier is out of order.

The Hon. FRANK BLEVINS: The member for Elizabeth and other members have raised the report with me. First, let me say that I have not seen this report. Apparently it was prepared a number of years ago for the previous Government and was rejected at that time by that Government.

I am not sure how years and years later it resurfaces. As I understand it, the report was fairly widely reported at the time; nevertheless, it has been resurrected. The position is very serious because suburban rail is in a deal of trouble. To indicate the scale of the problem, about 50 per cent of the STA subsidy goes to the rail section, which carries about 18 per cent of STA passenger journeys. So, for 18 per cent of the journeys, almost 50 per cent of the subsidy is received.

Members can see that there is a real problem. The Government is dealing with that problem by attempting to make rail more attractive. At $3 million each, the Government has invested in 50 new railcars, a heavy capital investment showing our commitment to the rail section of the STA. There is no doubt that unless we can build on the strengths of rail it will continue to founder and become so expensive to the taxpayer that I fear for its long-term future. That would be an enormous pity.

Whilst rail is much more expensive than road transport, I believe it is also the transport mode that will have a renaissance in the future if we all build on the strength of rail and not ask rail to do everything. If we ask it to do everything, because the infrastructure costs are so high we will ensure its death. Over the next one or two years the STA is looking at the various corridors to see whether we can make them virtually express corridors in an attempt to attract people back on to the trains.

People will not go back to the trains whilst these trains are stopping every two or three minutes at various stations. We closed a station two or three weeks ago where concerning 60 per cent of the trains, no-one got on or off, yet trains were still stopping at the station. We have to find a balance of accessibility by the public to the train network while at the same time keeping that network moving swiftly in order to attract more patrons to it.

I assure all members who have rail going through their electorates, including the members for Elizabeth and Spence, that before anything is done with rail in their electorates—for example, the closing of stations or the like—there will be a full consultation process with the community, and there will be an integration of bus timetables with the train service. It may be that some stations will close, and that has already happened. Perhaps some further stations will have to close. The community will eventually come to see the necessity for that if we are to maintain the railways. However, we have no plans to do this over the next one or possibly even two years—

Members interjecting:

The Hon. FRANK BLEVINS: Four years is better; it may spin out a bit—there may be a bit of slippage. Nevertheless, it is a serious problem. It is easy for people to say, 'Keep the trains.'

Mr S.J. BAKER: I rise on a point of order, Mr Speaker. The point of order is that the Minister is becoming repetitive.

The SPEAKER: There is no point of order, but the Minister is—

Mr Lewis interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order! The member for Murray-Mallee is out of order. I ask the Minister to wind up his remarks.

The Hon. FRANK BLEVINS: I will, Sir. In summary, I hope that everyone gives careful consideration, particularly those people who believe that rail should continue, to assist us in using rail in the optimum way. That is the only way that rail will continue. The member for Spence is not a driver: he uses STA rail every day and is one of the few members in this place who does so.

The SPEAKER: I draw the Minister's attention to the fact that that is irrelevant to the question and that it is not part of the subject of the answer. The honourable member for Bragg.

NATIONAL CRIME AUTHORITY

Mr INGERSON (Bragg): Will the Premier investigate whether the Attorney-General has misled Parliament in giving reasons for not tabling the Operation Ark report prepared by Mr Justice Stewart? On 5 April this year the Attorney-General informed Parliament that the Government had decided not to table this report, and one of the reasons he gave was:

> Heavy editing would be required to remove references to informants and suspects, and to ensure that there was no prejudice to the reputations of persons named in the report.

This reason was not supported by advice the Attorney-General received from the Solicitor-General, Mr Doyle, seven weeks before making this statement. I have a copy of that advice, dated 16 February. It advised that chapters one, two and three of the report, and a part of chapter four—in effect, half of the report—could be released.

Importantly, the section of chapter four, which Mr Doyle advised could be released, examined police procedures for investigating allegations of corruption arising out of Operation Noah; made a number of criticisms of specific aspects of police procedures; concluded there was a failure to adequately investigate the allegations; and finally referred to:

> A lack of resolve amounting to a reluctance to take effective measures to enable allegations of police corruption and involvement in criminal activity to be brought to the attention of a permanent and investigatory unit.

This conclusion is virtually identical to the NCA's 1988 report to the South Australian Government on police investigations of alleged corruption and shows that Mr Justice Stewart held the view that, even after the first NCA report and the corruption of Mr Moyse had been exposed, there was still a lack of resolve in South Australia effectively and fully to investigate corruption. With this advice, it also now becomes clearer why the Government would not have wanted Mr Justice Stewart's report made public before the 1989 election.

The Hon. J.C. BANNON: The answer is 'No, the Attorney-General did not mislead the House at all.' This is really trivial nonsense on the part of the Opposition.

Mr S.J. Baker interjecting:

The Hon. J.C. BANNON: No, I will not investigate it.

The SPEAKER: Order! The Deputy Leader is out of order.

Mr D.S. Baker interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order! The Leader is out of order.

WORLD SHOOTING COMPETITION

Mr De LAINE (Price): Will the Minister of Recreation and Sport provide the House with details of the world shooting competition being held in Adelaide this week and advise whether it will assist our bid for the Commonwealth Games in 1998? I have been told that this competition is the biggest shooting event to be held in the southern hemisphere with over 400 competitors from 24 countries.

The Hon. M.K. MAYES: I thank the member for Price for his question because, although it may not have been picked up generally by members, a major event is occurring in South Australia at Virginia. The international practical shooting competition is being conducted at the International Shooting Park at Virginia. As the honourable member said, some 400 competitors are involved from 24 countries. It is

the largest shooting event held in the southern hemisphere. This international event, held every three years, is on the world shooting calendar, and it attracts world class competition. In fact, the current world champion, from the United States of America, is this week shooting out at Virginia along with the team champions who are also Americans. It is important to note that, of the 24 countries competing, eight are Commonwealth countries and, of course, the quality of the event is very important to promote our 1998 Commonwealth Games bid. Indeed, although practical pistol shooting is not an Olympic or Commonwealth Games event, the Virginia venue is one of the best in the world and this event gives us an opportunity to promote it to the people who at other times are involved in Commonwealth or Olympic games events.

I think it is appropriate to acknowledge that, at the opening on Friday evening, the current president of the International Practical Shooting Confederation, Jean-Pierre Denis, who is from Belgium, told me that he thought it was one of the best venues in the world and, certainly, that the format and outline of the event appeared to him to be a high point in terms of IPSC events, which are held every three years. I believe the last event was held in France. Mr Denis' comments were further followed up in private discussions afterwards.

It is important to acknowledge the fact that the success of this event will help our bid for 1998. In respect of the conduct of the bid by the organisers and adjudicators, I thank the Australian and international officials who were involved because I think that, from our point of view, it is certainly a very important promotion of our venues and facilities.

NATIONAL CRIME AUTHORITY

Mr LEWIS (Murray-Mallee): I direct my question to the Minister of Emergency Services and refer him to his answer to the House on 20 March—seven months ago—that the Police Commissioner would be reporting to him after his consideration of the recommendations of Mr Justice Stewart to undertake 'an immediate review of the suitability' of certain police officers 'in the light of the matters canvassed' in the Operation Ark report. Has the Minister received a report from Mr Hunt and, if so, when, and will he disclose any recommendations made by the Commissioner and action taken to implement them? If he has not received any report, will he explain why and say whether any of the officers criticised by Mr Justice Stewart have been either promoted or demoted since the finalisation of his report?

The Hon. J.H.C. KLUNDER: I thank the honourable member for his question. Yes, I did raise the matter with the Police Commissioner, he did investigate it and he did report back to me. I cannot give the honourable member the exact date on which he reported back to me, because I do not keep dates like that clear in my mind.

Members interjecting:

The Hon. J.H.C. KLUNDER: I see; honourable members opposite do remember every date on which they did anything and got any report. That is a pretty clear indication of how few reports they get, if they can remember them all.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order! There is far too much background noise in the Chamber. The honourable Minister.

The Hon. J.H.C. KLUNDER: Nor, indeed, do I recall whether any of those officers has since been promoted. Certainly, none of them has been demoted.

CHILD-CARE

Mr FERGUSON (Henley Beach): Is the Minister of Employment and Further Education aware that child-care centres are facing extreme difficulty with the current shortage of trained child-care staff? I have been informed in correspondence from the Kidman Park Community Child Care Centre Incorporated that it is facing severe difficulties because it is unable to obtain trained relief staff.

The Hon. M.D. RANN: I thank the honourable member for his question, and I think that all members of this House would realise that there is no more passionate champion of child-care and child-care training in this House than the member for Henley Beach. I am indeed very much aware of the difficulties caused by the current shortage of trained child-care staff. One of the issues is, of course, the need to improve the rate of retention of trained workers in the industry. However, clearly there is a need to increase resources to provide for more training places. This is why, in this financial year, additional State funding has been allocated to increasing TAFE student places in the Advanced Certificate in Child-Care.

In a full year this will amount to an extra $100 000, allowing at the minimum an extra 20 people to graduate each year. The lecturers are also exploring ways in which more flexible learning methodologies may enable greater efficiency in the use of these resources, allowing even more students in child care to enroll. The Advanced Certificate in Child-Care takes two years to complete on a full-time basis, thus the increase in the numbers of graduates will not be evident until the end of 1992. I am pleased to inform the House my officers have successfully negotiated with the Commonwealth Department of Employment, Education and Training for funding for short bridging courses for junior primary teachers and nurses to allow them to transfer into the child care area. TAFE will continue to negotiate for funds of this nature whilst these shortages exist.

NATIONAL CRIME AUTHORITY

Mr BECKER (Hanson): My question is directed to the Minister of Emergency Services. Following the disclosure in the report tabled yesterday by the Federal Parliamentary Joint Committee on the National Crime Authority that a special working party, under the chairmanship of the South Australian Deputy Commissioner of Police, had considered all the recommendations contained in the reports of the Operation Ark investigation prepared by both the Stewart and Faris NCA's and had 'taken remedial action where appropriate', will the Minister table any report prepared by this special working party and say what remedial action has been taken as a result of its recommendations?

The Hon. J.H.C. KLUNDER: I will undertake to talk to the Deputy Commissioner to see which parts of that information can be provided to the House without in any way dealing with matters which pertain to the NCA.

PARLIAMENT HOUSE

Mr HAMILTON (Albert Park): Will the Minister of Housing and Construction, in his review of Parliament House accommodation, give favourable consideration to ensuring that elderly and disabled people have ready access into this Parliament from North Terrace? Currently, disabled persons, particularly those in wheelchairs, have to enter the Parliament by the side door. It has been put to

me that this is a second class situation. The Minister would be aware that for many years I have campaigned for this provision.

The Hon. M.K. MAYES: I thank the honourable member for his question and his interest in this issue over the years. Of course, in considering this matter, Mr Speaker, you, as Presiding Officer of this House, have an important role and your opinions will be valuable.

Appendix 3 of the report on parliamentary facilities comprehensively addresses the needs of the public as well as members. In fact, referring to the segment of the report headed, 'Parliament House, North Terrace, Access for People with Disabilities', access to Parliament House at the time of writing is possible by two means, the first being from North Terrace and the second from the Festival Theatre car park. It suggests a particular route which must be followed by people who are in wheelchairs or who have some disabilities and cannot negotiate steps or stairs. Certainly coming in from the western side, the House of Assembly stairs would be fairly formidable for anyone with any physical disability. Obviously, we have to address that matter.

As regards the suggested route, it was stated that is necessary due to the difference in levels between the pavement of North Terrace and the lower ground floor of Parliament House. The report suggests that the obvious way is to come through the door to the south of the building, basically at the basement level. The report then goes on to talk about the route from the Festival Theatre car park. It suggests that we should set aside a disability car park of one or two spaces to allow entry, so that if the public come in by car some facility should be available for them. I think that the Parliament has to address this matter collectively.

This is the report of the Disability Access Adviser who, I think, must be congratulated on a very thorough report. He describes the two means of entry from North Terrace and from the Festival Theatre car park as being adequate. Obviously, we need to address that. He talks about the circulation within the building as being excellent, due to the wide corridors in most areas, but talks again about some of the rooms that are on a different level; people with disabilities must engage steps or stairs in order to reach them. He suggests that some effort should be undertaken in an attempt to address those issues. He talks about the toilets, which is a very important point.

There is a disability toilet on the lower ground floor which is adequate for the present. Again, one has to put that into some perspective in relation to time. He then goes on to refer to members of Parliament with disabilities. Basically, the report states that a member who has a physical disability cannot be accommodated at present. That is a fairly serious statement by this Disability Access Adviser and something we are obligated to address.

Various suggestions are made about modifications required to the Chambers and to access from offices to the Chambers as well as to the route we all follow every day as we move around the building; we could easily realise the difficulties someone with a significant physical disability would have in negotiating Parliament House.

In summary, the disability access sign outside the building is somewhat inconspicuous, and we ought to upgrade it for better identification. It should be an internationally accepted access symbol. So, there are matters with which we must deal, and this whole question is something we must all address. It is something we must seriously take into account when considering what facilities are available in the Parliament.

NATIONAL CRIME AUTHORITY

Mr S.G. EVANS (Davenport): I direct my question to the Premier. Before formally approving the appointment of Mr Gerald Dempsey as an additional member of the NCA on 12 February this year, did the Premier, any other Minister or State Cabinet make inquiries to establish whether or not Mr Dempsey was a suitable person for such an appointment; if so, what was the nature of those inquiries; if not, why not?

The Hon. J.C. BANNON: Mr Dempsey's name was put forward, his qualifications given, and we accepted the recommendation. That is as far as I understand the position. I am not aware that we launched some major investigation into his background and so on, and I am not sure that the honourable member would support our doing that. I repeat that the NCA is established here to carry out a task for the community of South Australia. It is not—and I do not believe it could operate effectively—under the direction of the Government. I repeat: the honourable member and his colleagues would be the first to complain if that were so. I really think that the way members opposite are trying to have a bob each way in this area is a bit pathetic. Let us wait and see what results.

MILLEPEDE CONTROL

The Hon. T.H. HEMMINGS (Napier): Will the Minister of Agriculture report to the House—

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order! The honourable member for Napier.

The Hon. T.H. HEMMINGS: Thank you, Mr Speaker, I will start again. Will the Minister report to the House what progress—

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order! The House will come to order. There is far too much background noise. I am not too sure what the last demonstration was about, but the Deputy Leader and the Leader of the Opposition are out of order. When the Speaker is on his feet, they will not interject. I warn members about that. There is far too much background noise. I call on the member for Napier.

The Hon. T.H. HEMMINGS: Will the Minister of Agriculture report to the House on any progress made with regard to the biological control of millipedes? Members, especially the members for Heysen and Kavel, would be well aware of the problems caused by the millipede in the Hills area. This year, the millipede has started to make an appearance in my own electorate, and I have been asked by constituents to ascertain what measures have been undertaken to control this pest.

The Hon. LYNN ARNOLD: I thank the honourable member for his question. I note that he said millipedes had made it to his electorate only in the past year; they made it to my electorate some years ago, so obviously they have taken some time to travel north to Napier. Two agents are being released for the control of the millipede. The first is the nematode, which has been released in a number of parts of South Australia and, more recently, in the areas of Golden Grove and Aberfoyle Park. It seems to have established itself and to be having some effect on millipede populations, first, in the Adelaide Hills and, latterly, in the two other areas I have just mentioned.

The Portuguese fly known as *Pelidnoptera nigripennis* was released after extensive quarantine provisions late last year and, at four sites, a total of 600 flies, which act in a parasitic

way on the Portuguese millipede, were released. We estimated that that would be sufficient to establish populations because in Portugal, where the fly comes from, they find that a base population of 100 flies per hectare seems to be the norm.

We have done some surveying in the areas where the releases took place and have had some difficulty finding evidence that the populations have established themselves. We will continue to do survey work, because the timing of the survey work may not have been long enough, or it may also be that because the Portuguese millipedes in this country are somewhat smaller than those in Portugal, they are not quite tasty enough for the Portuguese fly. Whatever is the situation, we will do more studies to determine whether or not the Portuguese fly will present major benefits in terms of controlling this pest.

As to the nematode project, with respect to *Rhabditis necromena*, those nematodes are now being supplied from a private operator, and they do appear to be having some effect. Obviously, any agent that is aimed at controlling the millipede will ultimately end up in some kind of relationship with the host upon which it is a parasite and, therefore, it will never totally eliminate the millipede. However, we hope that it will significantly reduce its numbers.

RURAL ASSISTANCE

Mr BLACKER (Flinders): I ask a question of the Minister of Agriculture, and also in his role as Minister of Industry, Trade and Technology. Will the Minister advise whether the increased levels of finance offered to primary producers who meet the eligibility criteria under the system announced last week will also be offered to small businesses that qualified under the previous scheme? If a determination has not been made, will the Minister consider this matter as soon as possible? Previously, some small businesses that earned a certain percentage of their income from the rural sector were offered the same consideration for concessional finance as primary producers. Can the Minister say whether the criteria applying to the old policy will be the same as that for the policy announced on Wednesday 10 October? Many of the small businesses in my area have expressed concern about the lack of cash flow in rural areas, claiming that they are suffering the brunt of the rural downturn in the same way as are the farmers.

The Hon. LYNN ARNOLD: I thank the honourable member for his question, and I will certainly have the matter investigated further. There have been a couple of areas, I guess, of support over time for small businesses in rural areas. One has been those small businesses that derive a significant portion of their income from primary producing activities; the other one was a special scheme that existed for a period whereby small businesses themselves were able to gain some access to rural assistance funds, but that scheme has now finished.

In fact, the scheme did prove quite difficult. The honourable member expressed a great deal of interest in it at the time and was also concerned, along with me, about the low application rate for the scheme. Of those people who did receive loans under the scheme, we have noted a higher rate of bad debts, I am advised, than in the rural assistance scheme generally. Clearly, that must modify or be a factor in any decision to bring that scheme back into existence. I will certainly bring down a report on the matter concerning the extent to which small businesses could be eligible for the arrangements that we have now put in place.

KOREAN LANGUAGE

Mrs HUTCHISON (Stuart): Will the Minister of Ethnic Affairs inform the House whether the State Government's departmental pamphlets are translated into the Korean language? If they are not, will he undertake to look into the matter with the possibility of having this done? Adelaide has a community of over 300 Korean residents to whom this change could be of benefit.

The Hon. LYNN ARNOLD: I will have to get a more detailed answer to the question. I believe that the publications that exist in Korean basically are those that have been prepared by the Department of Industry, Trade and Technology for prospective business migrants from Korea, because we have been involved in attracting business migrants to South Australia. As to other areas of Government publications, I do not immediately know of such publications existing.

However, the Language Services Centre, which is attached to the South Australian Multicultural and Ethnic Affairs Commission, offers a very good translation service and anyone—not only Government departments but any private agencies—who wished to make information available to the Korean community could, for example, get that information readily translated. Also, we could have software packages available which enable preparation of ready-to-print documents in a number of languages, including a number of different scripts, not just the Roman script, and I will check whether or not Korean is one of the scripts or fonts that we have available in that software package. I will bring back a further report.

ABORTION CLINIC

Dr ARMITAGE (Adelaide): Will the Minister of Health clarify the situation concerning plans for terminations of pregnancy to be offered by the Adelaide Medical Centre for Women and Children, and will he dispel rumours that a pregnancy advisory clinic will be set up at the Queen Victoria Hospital which will become a 'stand-alone' abortion clinic after the physical amalgamation of the hospitals?

The Hon. D.J. HOPGOOD: I am happy to do so. In passing, I must apologise to the honourable member. On one occasion I referred to him as the 'intern'. I note in the *Adelaide Review* that not only is he beyond a registrar and a senior surgeon but he is head or chairman of the board. We certainly have to keep that in mind. Of course, the answer is that this is a furphy that has been around for some time. As the honourable member says, there are people in the community who argue that, should the Bill of the honourable member's colleague get up, that clever Hopgood has a way around it, and what he would do would be—

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order!

The Hon. D.J. HOPGOOD: I am merely trying to give a fair account of what seems to have come to me from a variety of sources. I must say that in that respect the honourable member, although I do not in any way blame him, is a little late in the field. What has come to me is that there is a plot afoot to set at nought the possibility of legislation introduced in this House today being effective. As the various portions of Queen Victoria campus of Adelaide Medical Centre for Women and Children are transferred to the North Adelaide site over the next few years, one facility would remain at the Queen Victoria campus—that is, abortion. So, eventually, through a process of attrition, as it were, we would be left with a stand-alone abortion clinic—

The Hon. D.C. Wotton: The biggest in the world.

The Hon. D.J. HOPGOOD: —the biggest in the world, indeed—at the Queen Victoria campus. I thank the honourable member for giving me the opportunity, although in a sense the media have already done so, to clear the air on this matter and indicate that no such plan is in existence.

THE SECOND STORY

Mr McKEE (Gilles): Will the Minister of Health confirm that the youth health unit, The Second Story, no longer operates from Rundle Mall? Where is it now located and will the Minister give an assurance that its services will continue?

The Hon. D.J. HOPGOOD: Yes, I can do that. I can confirm that The Second Story no longer operates out of Rundle Mall premises. We had a number of problems with the lessor, including problems over security. The service is now collocated with the Youth Initiatives Unit in Hindmarsh Square. There are some advantages with this new location, as well as some disadvantages. The obvious disadvantage is that people knew where it was previously located and it will take time for information to get around about the new location. However, the advantages of the new location are: that it is cheaper than the Rundle Mall premises, and there are unlikely to be problems with security. Indeed, it is a rather easier location to secure. I can certainly give the honourable member an assurance that the services which have operated until very recently from Rundle Mall will continue to operate from the new premises. We regard The Second Story as having been a very important initiative and one that we should retain if at all possible.

RURAL ASSISTANCE

Mr MEIER (Goyder): Will the Minister of Agriculture acknowledge that the rural assistance measures he announced last week will in fact make some farmers worse off than they are currently? As one example of the expressions of concern I am receiving about this matter I refer to a stud merino sheep breeder who has an estimated negative income of $10 000 for this year. He applied for additional rural assistance and was advised that he could not add to his existing loan of $50 000, but would have to be reassessed and, if found eligible, could receive a new loan which could be at a higher interest rate than his present loan and would automatically increase to 15 per cent or the commercial rate after three years without any appeal provisions. Yet, his present loan has appeal provisions allowing him to have a lower rate because of hardship factors.

The Hon. LYNN ARNOLD: I will certainly investigate the case if the honourable member provides me with the name of the breeder. Under the new arrangements, if a person wishes to borrow, say, $100 000 from rural assistance, the same rate that has always applied is levied, namely, 10 per cent; and after three years it goes to what is defined as the commercial rate, which is significantly below the private sector commercial rate. An appeal mechanism is available under those arrangements. However, if a larger loan is sought—remembering that the ceiling of $100 000 has not increased since 1987—we have now provided a new situation where a loan of $150 000 can be taken out at a coupon of 12 per cent; and, again after three years it reverts to the commercial rate, which is significantly below that available from the private finance market.

So, if a loan under $100 000 is sought, the arrangements are as they were before. The only variation under the new arrangements are that the larger amount has a higher coupon—12 per cent—but it is still much cheaper than that available in the marketplace. Further, there has been a tightening up on the three year provision because the Rural Assistance Branch found that a lot of energy goes into reassessing each case after three years without necessarily much productive benefit. Under the new arrangements we have sought to tighten up the situation. We may have to look at that again if it is found to be unnecessarily harsh, but the branch wanted to make more efficient the process of assessing loans after three years when they normally go to the commercial rate. The honourable member would accept that under the previous arrangements the majority of such loans, after three years, converted to what we define as the commercial rate.

BOLIVAR EFFLUENT TREE PROJECT

Mr FERGUSON (Henley Beach): Will the Minister of Agriculture give an update on the Bolivar effluent tree project? A public announcement was made in 1989 that $699 000 would be spent on this project to provide a tree plantation for eventual use as firewood in the metropolitan area. The price of firewood has escalated at a greater rate than has the price of most other commodities. In fact, had one of my constituents managed to keep a tonne of wood in his woodshed, he would have received a better return than had he invested his money in oil or gold.

The SPEAKER: Order! The honourable member made a comment there. The honourable Minister.

The Hon. LYNN ARNOLD: I thank the honourable member for his question and I am certainly pleased to provide an answer, not only in my capacity as Minister but also as local member for the electorate in which this very exciting venture is taking place. The project was announced last year but, of course, the actual work leading up to it goes back to 1988 when there was a proposal for a feasibility study to look at whether or not there could be hardwood plantation usage for some of the cleansed water from the Bolivar works. As a result of that feasibility study it was determined, in 1989, to proceed with a pilot study. It is precisely that which has been underway. That pilot program, which is called the Hardwood Irrigation Afforestation Trial, has been done to evaluate the success of growing various hardwood species with water from Bolivar effluent. Also, some areas of trees are being watered with ordinary mains water so that there can be a comparison of growth rate between the two types of irrigation.

As the honourable member correctly advised the House, the funding for this three-year project is $699 000, with some $277 000 coming from the Federal Government and a private industry grant of some $100 000 and the remainder coming from State sources. In October last year there was a soil and topographic survey of the site; in November the final site selection and experimental design; in December last year, the design of the irrigation facilities and the appointment of project staff—a research officer and a technical officer; in January/February this year, installation of irrigation and water supply pipelines; in February this year we had the official opening; in May of this year the planting of 30 000 trees was completed; in June this year a microprocessor controller was installed for the collection of field data and to manage the irrigation system; and, in July this year, project facilities were established and data collection commenced together with routine field operations.

MOTOR VEHICLE REGISTRATION CONCESSIONS

Mr VENNING (Custance): Will the Minister of Agriculture ask Cabinet to reinstate the primary producer motor vehicle registration concessions removed in the budget and, if not, why not?

The Hon. LYNN ARNOLD: As the honourable member should know, the concession that is still available applies to motor vehicles over 2 tonnes, but the concession for vehicles below 2 tonnes has been removed. Evidence over the years indicates that this concession has not been reasonably used by many people who applied for the concession on vehicles that were not *bona fide* primary production vehicles. I believe—and the Minister of Transport could correctly advise me on this—that some 25 000 vehicles have been the subject of this concession on primary producer vehicles. If that is not the exact figure, I will confirm it later. That figure is much greater than the number of farming enterprises in the State. What we really want—

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order!

The Hon. LYNN ARNOLD: —to see is that, if assistance is to be given, it meets the needs of productive capacity rather than recreational capacity. If we are going to give a concession for the recreational use of vehicles, surely any person in the State should be eligible for such a concession. What should be noted is that this Government has—

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order!

The Hon. LYNN ARNOLD: —ensured that, where State fees are put on petrol, for example, we give very favourable consideration to rural areas. I would have thought that that is far more beneficial in a financial sense to rural producers. If producers were actually to add up the benefit they receive by not paying the State petrol taxes that are paid by metropolitan residents they would find that it is very much greater than the relatively small amount that is available under the registration fee concession.

PERSONAL EXPLANATION: MINISTER'S REMARKS

Mr BRINDAL (Hayward): Mr Speaker, I seek leave to make a personal explanation.

Leave granted.

Mr BRINDAL: I claim to have been misrepresented by the Minister of Transport during Question Time. In his reply to the member for Albert Park, the Minister misrepresented remarks which have been attributed to me in the media. I will explain. He claimed, wrongfully, that I attributed to him the label of 'hypocrisy'. I have a great deal of respect for the Minister of Transport, as is recorded in *Hansard* as recently as yesterday. The Minister's claim is quite wrong. However, the dictionary defines 'hypocrisy'—

The SPEAKER: Order! A personal explanation is an explanation of the situation, not the meaning of the words. If the honourable member has taken offence at a comment or statement about himself or his actions, that is totally different from explaining the word.

Mr BRINDAL: I am new to this place, Sir, and I seek your guidance on the matter. In explaining how the Minister has misrepresented me, do I not have to explain the words that the Minister used?

The SPEAKER: The rules are very clear. The honourable member cannot debate the matter. I would have thought that, as this is a collection of parliamentarians, the need to explain the meaning of a word superfluous.

Mr BRINDAL: I bow to your ruling, Sir, and your assurance that members opposite understand what the word 'hypocrisy' means. I did and do allege not that the Minister was guilty of hypocrisy, but that the Government was guilty of gross hypocrisy, and I did so in the context that this Government is reaping a bonanza from the new speed cameras while it is actively considering the closure of the Road Safety Centre. It is the Minister, not I—

The SPEAKER: Order! The Chair believes that the honourable member has sufficiently explained it. I think the House understands the honourable member's point in his personal explanation.

Mr BRINDAL: On a point of order, Mr Speaker. I believe that I am allowed five minutes in a personal explanation.

The SPEAKER: Order! The member will resume his seat. Five minutes is not an automatic allowance. Any member is allowed five minutes when he confines himself to Standing Orders which means that the personal explanation must be relevant and to the point. I believe that the honourable member has made his point and given his personal explanation, which he needed to do, and the Chair believes that the matter has been satisfactorily dealt with.

Mr BRINDAL: Sir, I have not dealt with all the points by which the Minister misrepresented me.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order! The honourable members for Napier and Henley Beach are out of order. The Chair believes that the member for Hayward has explained the point about hypocrisy and that the explanation has been satisfactorily fulfilled.

HOMESURE INTEREST RELIEF BILL

Received from the Legislative Council and read a first time.

STAMP DUTIES ACT AMENDMENT BILL (No. 4)

Adjourned debate on second reading.

(Continued from 23 August. Page 583.)

Mr S.J. BAKER (Deputy Leader of the Opposition): The Opposition believes that this is probably one of the most dishonest Bills ever presented to this Parliament. The Bill is not only misleading, but the second reading explanation is misleading and wrong. Indeed, the Bill is unclear about what it is trying to achieve. Other than that, the Bill fails on a number of counts. It is important to understand that a number of quite far reaching changes are being made in the Bill. I will list the changes for the edification of the House. Stamp duty on general insurance premiums, if this measure succeeds, is to be paid monthly. Stamp duty on compulsory third party motor vehicle insurance is to increase from 50 cents per $100 to $8 per $100 and be paid monthly. Dutiable premiums for general insurance will no longer be net of commission or discounts. Stamp duty on certificates of compulsory third party insurance is to increase from $3 to $15.

The monthly licensing system and higher rates are to take effect from 1 July 1990, and the certificate stamp duty from 1 January 1991. The final list of changes includes increased penalties under the Act. The reason why I say that it is dishonest is that anyone reading the Act would get a completely wrong impression as to why the changes are taking place, the timing of those changes and the good grace of the Government for taking such innovative action. I will

address the dishonesty in the Bill, because it is quite blatant, and it is quite ironic that the Government should justify putting up taxes which will ultimately be paid by the motorist.

I was really upset when I first glanced at the Minister's second reading explanation. It states:

> The rate payable on other forms of insurance (except life insurance) is 8 per cent. To forestall any possible criticism that the Government is favouring a statutory authority over its private sector competitors the rate of duty on compulsory third party policies will be raised to 8 per cent with effect from the 1991 licensing year.

That is totally dishonest. I do not know who writes these things for the Minister, but whoever does needs to be informed that they are in grave danger of causing the Minister to be charged with misleading the House. The Minister would know that compulsory third party insurance incurs next to nothing in terms of stamp duty in two States, and nothing in the other States and Territories.

In New South Wales, the stamp duty on compulsory third party insurance is zero; in Victoria it is zero; in Queensland it is 10c per policy—not 10 per cent; in Western Australia, 25c per policy; in South Australia we are proposing 8 per cent plus a $15 charge on the certificate; and in the Northern Territory and in the ACT it is zero. Yet the Minister's second reading explanation states (I repeat):

> The rate payable on other forms of insurance (except life insurance) is 8 per cent. To forestall any possible criticism that the Government is favouring a statutory authority over its private sector competitors the rate of duty on compulsory third party policies will be raised to 8 per cent with effect from the 1991 licensing year.

Even that last part is an untruth—'from the 1991 licensing year'. It will take effect on 1 July. Who writes this rubbish? It is dishonest for the Minister to bring such a Bill before this House and to try to justify it with the explanation we have before us. The second reading explanation states further:

> If the basis of the tax on general insurers in this State were changed to gross premiums (less reinsurances) there would be uniformity throughout Australia and the national systems operated by these companies would reflect the legal position here as well as in other States. The Government has agreed to change the method of levying tax in this State in the interests of harmonising collection procedures.

The Government is gaining more revenue from this measure. This is not being done out of good heartedness. The Insurance Council of Australia has said, 'They've hit us with a monthly premium that will increase collections by about 8 per cent.' As everyone realises, the current rate of interest is 15 per cent and the Government is also receiving this little bit extra, yet the second reading explanation said that it was all to harmonise.

The Minister does not say, for example, that the rates applying to general insurance differ across Australia—and I will quote the differences that apply—so there is no harmony whatsoever between the States. New South Wales happens to be the highest with 11.5 per cent, while Victoria is the lower with 7 per cent; Queensland has 8.5 per cent and 5 per cent on motor insurance, so that is around the same level; Western Australia is lower with 5 per cent; the Northern Territory has 5 per cent and the ACT is lower with 7 per cent.

So, the rate in most of the States is lower than in South Australia, yet the Minister says we are in harmony. It is absolutely dishonest. I suggest that, if we are to have these Bills debated, the explanation should be substantial and not contain almost blatant untruths. I have already outlined the major changes to the Bill. I know that the Insurance Council, which has actually agreed to the change in the monthly payments, is a little upset that it has traded off its monthly payments for yearly payments, yet there has been no reduction in the rate of payment. According to my calculations, with interest rates at 15 per cent the Minister is gaining an extra 8 per cent in revenue. The Insurance Council had hoped that the Minister would offset and, perhaps, reduce the rate to 7 per cent, which would probably be in line with the majority of other States.

There are two matters associated with the increase in compulsory third party motor vehicle insurance from 50c per $100 to $8 per $100. I have already mentioned that the second reading explanation leaves a great deal to be desired but, of course, we are getting into double taxation here, because not only is the Government going to try to extract its 8 per cent from the SGIC (and, ultimately, from motorists) but also it is putting a stamp duty on the certificate. So, it involves double taxation when most States do not tax the measure at all. The South Australian Government is leading the way in this dishonest measure.

The extra revenue expected to be raised by the lifting of the certificate stamp duty from $3 to $15 is $4.5 million this year and $9 million in a full year. In relation to the monthly leasing system thaat I mentioned previously, the higher rate that will apply to insurance premiums will bring in revenue of about $11 million, from memory.

There is also another important change; that is, the premiums upon which the stamp duty is based shall no longer be net of commissions or discounts. This is in relation to general insurance, and will increase the Government's take by about $4 million a year. It has been suggested that that is for the sake of harmony and so that all the States have the same definitions, but I have already explained that that is not the case.

The Government has obviously ruled out commissions or discounts. They are very important aspects in the general insurance area and they are pretty vital in the life insurance area, which the Minister is having difficulty converting to a monthly payments system. I mentioned earlier that, instead of $100 a month penalty being applicable for non-payment, a flat fine of $10 000 will be imposed. It is also important to understand that, whilst the general insurance industry has agreed to the change from annual to monthly payments, it is unhappy about the timing of the implementation and the fact that the rate does not take account of the change to monthly payments.

There will be a major extra cost to motorists, even though SGIC has announced that it will absorb the increase in stamp duty this financial year. We know that may well occur this financial year, but it is unlikely to continue next financial year.

The Hon. Frank Blevins interjecting:

Mr S.J. BAKER: We have heard no announcement to that effect. The law says that stamp duty on third party insurance shall be paid. It is normally paid by the motorist. For some reason, and it may be as a result of pressure applied by the Government, SGIC said, 'We will bear it this year.' I might add that it would have been difficult for SGIC even to reclaim it from the motorists this year, because we are debating the issue now in Parliament; SGIC had no authority from 1 July to extract that money. It is another clear case of retrospectivity. If private insurance had been involved, and not a deal done between the Government and the SGIC, there would be some very serious questions about the way in which this Government operates, because it would not have been possible to enforce the increased stamp duty from 1 July; there was no authority whatsoever. I seek leave to insert in *Hansard* a table which indicates the stamp duty collections by State from 1982-83 to 1990-91.

The SPEAKER: Is it purely statistical?

Mr S.J. BAKER: It is.

Leave granted.

STAMP DUTY COLLECTIONS BY STATE

	1982-83	1990-91	% increase
New South Wales	601.1	1 753	192
Victoria	353.8	1 284	263
Queensland	271.1	740	173
Western Australia	123.3	409	232
South Australia	118.3	335	183
Tasmania	31.2	89	185

Estimated inflation from 1982-83 to 1990-91 = 76 per cent.

Mr S.J. BAKER: Again, the States have been in the forefront of stamp duty collections, and South Australia has not been shy; its stamp duty collections have increased from $118.3 million in 1982-83 to an expected $335 million in 1991. That represents an increase of 183 per cent. Members may recall that over the same period the estimated inflation rate is about 67 per cent, so the Government has beaten inflation by a factor of three. It has been a very good money spinner for the Government, and I simply observe that, of course, it will not release its dead hand on business in this area.

One of the interesting aspects of the second reading debate was the suggestion that the Government has been negotiating with the life insurance industry for some time, also to bring it on to the monthly payment system. I wish to read some extracts from a letter that has been written to me by the Life Insurance Federation of Australia, which talks about some unhappiness with the proposed change and some of the anomalies that have not been corrected at all, yet the Government continues to pursue the monthly payments issue. The letter states:

> The Bill seeks to establish new methods for calculating and paying licence fee for general insurance companies operating in South Australia. However, it appears to have inadvertently caught life offices under these proposed arrangements because LIFA members market disability insurance which (together with other supplementary benefits like accident benefits attaching to life policies) for the purposes of the Bill is defined as general insurance.
>
> Although the Bill's definition of general insurance excludes any insurance business not relating to life policies, it also states that the term 'life insurance policy' does not include a policy covering personal accident. This definition would suggest disability insurance sold by life offices will have licence fee dutied on a monthly basis, despite the Minister's assurances that 'life insurance companies will continue to pay on an annual basis'.
>
> LIFA argues that disability insurance does relate to life insurance and is indeed deemed to do so by the Commonwealth Life Insurance Act (1945).

That is one of the key issues of the Act about which I will talk briefly as it will be discussed further in Committee. I would like to raise some of the issues that have been raised with me by LIFA, because they have been spelt out in the Minister's second reading explanation. The first relates to double duty payments. The letter states:

> Life insurance companies may have to pay double duty on disability premium income received from 1 July 1990 to 31 December 1990.
>
> The Premier wrote to LIFA's South Australian Branch Chairman on 26 May 1989 proposing that a system of monthly returns for licence fee be introduced from 1 January 1990, LIFA immediately responded and pointed out that such a change in the method of calculation would result in a double payment in 1990—the normal annual licence fee having been paid by the end of February 1990 to cover the period until 31 December 1990, as well as the payment of monthly fee instalment throughout 1990.
>
> For those same reasons, LIFA rejected the Government's proposal to introduce the new system on 1 July 1990. Given that payments are made to the Government annually in February for that calendar year's licence, the change to monthly payments, apart from being less efficient, should actually delay payment to the Government in our view.
>
> Life offices would have to run two licence fee systems—

and that is fairly evident, from the comments I have already made. The letter continues:

> If the Bill is passed, life offices would be left in the unhappy position of having to arrange an annual licence fee for their life business, and yet pay on a monthly basis for all disability products. The administrative costs associated with changing to a monthly system would be even further complicated by the need to run a parallel administrative system for annual licence fee payments.

It further states:

> *(c)* All life office business may be caught for licence fee on a monthly basis.
>
> By virtue of the fact that some life insurance business is classified for the purpose of the licence fee as non life insurance (i.e. general insurance) there is a danger—

and I emphasise this point—

> that the new clause 36 could unintentionally engulf all life insurance in the unwanted monthly return regime. On the face of it, any life company which carries on business classified (for the purposes of the Act) as general insurance is to lodge a monthly return and pay duty on the return.

So, the way in which the Act is structured forces life insurance companies to put forward a monthly return. This is a very sloppy effort by the Minister in the legislation he has put before the House. It is sloppy all round, I would say. Not only was the second reading explanation dishonest but also it was sloppy, as are the provisions of this legislation. On the other issue of the licence fee level being increased, the letter states:

> The Government and general insurance companies have agreed that there be a move away from net premiums as a duty basis for calculating licence fee, to one based on gross premium less re-insurances.

That is, the general insurance industry. The letter continues:

> The stamp duty on disability business will therefore rise significantly, unless some reduction of current rates is introduced to maintain revenue neutrality. LIFA has already complained to the Government over a long period of time about the current high rate of licence fee—

and it provides an extract of how it compares here and interstate.

Members would well know, for example, that we have the highest rate of stamp duty on life insurance in the country at 1.5 per cent. Any attempt to further increase licence fees should be formally resisted. Indeed, the Minister's statement about the additional revenue the Government will receive from the legislation should be strongly criticised for increasing the already heavy tax burden on South Australian policy holders.

LIFA goes on to suggest that to avoid the problems created by the way in which this legislation is drafted, perhaps disability insurance should be made a separate area of attention so that, therefore, we would not get mixed up with where the definitions of general and life insurance cross boundaries. Another issue raised by LIFA, and quite importantly so, is the issue of the contribution tax. The letter goes on:

> Apart from the issues mentioned above, LIFA is also concerned about the Stamp Duty Commissioner's current practice of including the 15 per cent contribution tax element of superannuation premium in the licence fee formula. This action clearly constitutes a tax upon a tax, and LIFA's call for resolution of this anomaly has so far been unanswered by the Government.

Clearly, that matter has to be resolved. I do not know whether anyone has considered taking it to the High Court. If that occurred, there may be some problems for the State Government on that issue. The Bill has a number of problems with it. Those problems have not been helped by the way in which the Minister addressed the House in his second reading contribution. I emphasise that stamp duty has been a bonanza for the Government. It has been an

important part of the revenue stream of taxation receipts received by the Government.

That does not mean that the Government should not take great care about the way that it collects the tax. In previous debates on other taxation Bills I have mentioned the need for the Government to be extremely careful about how it manages its finances and spends every dollar wisely, because that expenditure comes out of taxation that has to be borne by the constituency at large. In respect of stamp duty I seek leave to have inserted in *Hansard* without my reading it a table of a purely statistical nature that compares the rates of insurance applying in the various States.

Leave granted.

Rates of Stamp Duty Payable on Insurance Policy

	General Per cent	CTP
New South Wales	11.5	Nil
Victoria	7	Nil
Queensland	8.5 (5% motor)	10c per policy
Western Australia	5	25c per policy
South Australia	8	8% plus $15
Northern Territory	5	Nil
ACT	7	Nil

Mr S.J. BAKER: South Australia is leading the band in terms of the rates applied in respect of these instruments. I hope that further attention can be given to this matter. South Australia wants to lead in terms of being the lowest taxing State. Some of the anomalous information provided to the House suggests that South Australia is a low tax State but, for the benefit of the House, I indicate that the smaller figures applying for South Australia represent a function of the lack of activity in this State rather than the lack of taxing effort by the Government.

South Australia does not get as much from mining royalties as other States or as much railway tax revenue as the Queensland Government does. South Australia has missed out in a number of areas. Those areas boost the per capita taxation level paid interstate but, when we look at each of the items of revenue raising for this State, we find that South Australia is at least equal to if not in front of most of the States in each of the areas that we examine.

That is also the case with stamp duties. If our Government had performed over the past eight years, we would see taxation revenues being much higher because the Government would have created far more activity that would have returned money to the Treasury coffers. It is often misleading to look at the levels of taxation, because the level of taxation effort in South Australia is equal to if not greater than any other State of Australia. I intend, *pro forma*, to oppose the commencement clause for the reasons that I have outlined: not only is it dishonest but also the provision is retrospective. I will be moving amendments to separate life insurance business from general insurance business in a far more practical way than the Government has acted. I will be asking certain questions about the operation of the Stamp Duties Act.

I wind up by referring to the little deal done between the Government and SGIC that I believe is inappropriate because, at the end of the day, taxpayers will be paying the money. It goes around the same circular route. For example, this year the Government took away all SGIC's profits for the last financial year.

The Hon. Frank Blevins interjecting:

Mr S.J. BAKER: Hold on. This financial year it will increase the taxation burden in one area: stamp duties will milk off a certain amount of that profit and it will then be interesting to see whether the rest of the money is taken by the Government. SGIC is not recovering that money this year—it is not charging stamp duty this year: first, because it is impractical to do so and, secondly, because the Government is a little frightened about that anyway. We can be assured that come 1991-92 motorists will still be paying on top of heavy petrol bills that will still apply at the beginning of the new financial year. As I have said, this piece of legislation contains a number of unsatisfactory aspects. I will not commend it to the House—it does not deserve the support of the House, although I will not be officially dividing on the Bill.

Mr BECKER (Hanson): This is one of those nasty little taxing measures introduced by the Government when the budget was brought down on 23 August. It is ironic to note—and this is the first time I have noticed it—that in the Financial Statement for 1990-91, Financial Paper No. 1, laid on the table on 23 August in the budget speech, the speech on pages 65 and 66 has been reproduced in *Hansard*, pages 581 to 583, in introducing this legislation.

Only one alteration has been made, where the Minister is reported in *Hansard* as follows:

> The extra duty payable may be as much as $4 million in a full year.

The exercise of checking the budget speech and reading the Bill at the same time has meant that there has been no additional information provided to the House about the legislation, and I am concerned about that. It is all very well to say that we will increase stamp duties and then introduce legislation to ratify that arrangement. In the financial year 1989-90, the estimated receipts under stamp duties were $333 100 000 and the actual stamp duties received amounted to $310 633 918, which involved a $22.5 million shortfall in the last financial year.

The estimated stamp duties receipts for 1990-91 amount to $335 300 000, a slight increase on the previous estimate and about a $24.7 million increase over the previous financial year. That is difficult to accept when we consider that the largest amount of money received by the Government from stamp duties as recorded at page 215 of the Auditor-General's Report for the year ended 30 June 1990 comes from conveyances, transfers, mortgages, other instruments and other returns. In the 1989 financial year, the Government received $226 million of stamp duties on those transactions, and in 1990 the Government received $183 million, a shortfall of about $43 million.

In connection with motor vehicles, new registrations and transfers for the financial year 1989, the Government received $62 million. For the financial year ended 30 June 1990, the Government received $69 million, which included $2.5 million collected by the Motor Registration Division on motor vehicle insurance policies initially paid into the hospitals fund and subsequently transferred to Consolidated Account as a contribution towards public hospital costs. The point I am making here is that the two largest areas of stamp duty receipts basically reflect the economy of the State.

We know that there has been a considerable downturn in real estate activity. Almost every week we read in the media that now is the time to buy houses as interest rates have fallen a quarter per cent or half a per cent. The real estate industry does all it can to promote investing in the market but the hard cold fact of life is that the Government's receipts from stamp duty have fallen. There is no indication at this stage, nor in the budget documents, that the trend will reverse, so there could well be a further shortfall in stamp duty over the next financial year. It is very difficult to predict.

The thing that annoys me is that in the budget documents I was unable to find just exactly how much the Government estimates it will receive for the whole of this financial year from these taxes, because in his budget speech the Treasurer told us, particularly in relation to the new licensing system, that the change is expected to produce an extra $11 million in 1991 and $12 million in a full year (it will get only 11 months collection this financial year), and that by increasing stamp duty on third party insurance to $15 the Government expects to raise $4.5 million in 1991 and $9 million in the full year.

Obviously, a difficulty exists in the insurance industry in agreeing on the methods and systems of paying these new taxes whilst the Insurance Council of Australia, representing the insurance companies, had agreed that premiums would in future be paid monthly. The life assurance industry is not happy with that and, of course, has not agreed. It would rather pay once a year. The system of working out the licence fee on insurance and assurance companies was that they pay in February for the previous calendar year. I accept the difficulty presented by insurance companies that, if the rates were increased at about this time of the calendar year, they would end up paying the increased fees on the new rates. There seems to be a bit of incompetence in the management system. It irks me that the amounts are passed on to consumers. This is another one of those little nasty taxes. No matter what the Government does or who it decides to tax, it comes back to the consumers.

Whilst the Government may feel that it is taxing the insurance and assurance industries, it is the poor old taxpayer who cops it again. We are getting tired of continuously having to fork out a few dollars here and a few dollars there. It goes from $3 to $15 on motor vehicle insurance registration. It sounds very nice because the stamp duty on motor vehicle insurance policies goes straight into the hospitals fund, but it then goes straight out of that fund into general revenue. For many years I have complained in this place that the hospitals fund is the greatest misnomer of all time. During the Tonkin Government's period I asked whether we could abolish that fund. It was too hard for Treasury—it did not like it at all.

It is dishonest to pay certain revenues of the Government earned from authorities such as TAB, racing clubs (unclaimed dividends) and the Lotteries Commission, and now stamp duty on motor vehicles, into this fund and then pay it straight into consolidated revenue; then to turn around and say that this money is used to offset health costs. Who knows where it goes? It all goes into one big pot in Treasury, with a couple of public servants fiddling around transferring bits of paper all over the place—a shuffle here and a shuffle there. The end result is that it goes into general revenue. I believe in, and will continue to campaign for, abolishing the hospitals fund and advocate putting tax revenue straight into general revenue.

The amount of money that goes into the hospitals fund nowhere near compensates the cost of running the health services or ancillary health services in this State as we are led to believe. Let us be honest; will the Mininster, in conjunction with his razor gang activities, consider the usefulness of the hospitals fund, abolish it and save the time of a couple of people administering the fund, collecting money and worrying what to do about it? It does not stay there long enough to earn interest. This Government, over the past two years, has not held any money in reserve in the hospitals fund: it was wiped out completely. Whatever is received in income—last year $92.1 million—was taken straight out with $89.7 million put into general revenue as hospitals fund contribution, with $2.3 million from stamp duty. It all goes into general revenue. Let us get rid of it and be more efficient in Government operations.

I feel for the consumers as they are having to bear the brunt of this tax. It is time we had a revolt by the taxpayers and gave a clear message to the Government that it must become far more efficient with such taxes being abolished. The supervision and collection of stamp duty on motor vehicle insurance is hardly worth the effort. Again this Government appears to be greedy and is looking for any way it can to continue penalising the taxpayers. It is continually taking money out of circulation and controlling the people's money. That is always a recipe for disaster.

The Hon. FRANK BLEVINS (Minister of Finance): I thank the Deputy Leader and member for Hanson for their contributions. Amendments have been circulated, which makes me fear that the debate will continue on in Committee. Until I saw the amendments I was going to respond to everything at the second reading stage and hope that I would have to say it only once. I still intend to say it only once by leaving any significant contribution until the amendments are before the Committee. Some harsh words were spoken by the Deputy Leader.

Mr S.J. Baker interjecting:

The Hon. FRANK BLEVINS: He used harsh words, and the pity is that he continues to do so, even when I am about to explain how he has misunderstood. Had the honourable member asked me or any of my officers, we would have been able to clear up the matter for him in a moment. No, the Deputy Leader chose to say something—

Mr S.J. Baker interjecting:

The Hon. FRANK BLEVINS: As long as I get the 7.05 plane in the morning, it is of no relevance to me. The Deputy Leader chose to make these remarks and I will respond to some of them. In relation to the question of SGIC's annual licence and the 1991 date, SGIC does, as I stated, take out an annual licence. It already has a licence for 1990. The next licence it takes out will be for 1991, as was stated; that is, for the 1991 licensing year. The fee payable for that licence will be paid monthly, beginning in August 1990. This change to a monthly system has been made at the request of the Insurance Council of Australia. It does not affect us at all; it is no skin off our nose if the old system continues.

The Insurance Council of Australia, which represents about 90 per cent of the industry, wanted this change and we accommodated it. LIFA, of course, did not want some of these changes and we are also attempting to accommodate it. I am not sure that the Government is not being too soft, because LIFA pays very little in licence fees, anyway. It means that we have to run two systems, when 90 per cent of the industry is happy with one system. Because of LIFA we are having to run two and, in my view, we are far too kind. If about 90 per cent of the industry wants a certain thing, I assume it is good for the whole industry. However, as I said, we are very kind people and for LIFA things will stay pretty much as they are.

Again, on the question of harmony, at the request of the Insurance Council of Australia the Government proposes to change to gross premiums to bring this State into line with all other States. I can only assume that the Deputy Leader contacted LIFA and not the Insurance Council of Australia. If he did contact the council, I think it is unfortunate that he did not tell the House that these changes to bring the practice into line with other States were made at its request. As I stated, this is in respect of the collection procedures that are being harmonised—again, at the request of the Insurance Council of Australia. That is what the

council asked for. It has never been suggested and nor, as far as we know, is the Insurance Council of Australia concerned that the rates themselves are to be harmonised; that was never the issue. Rates vary among States; there is nothing novel about that. However, the Insurance Council of Australia asked the Government to harmonise the method of collection because it runs a national industry, and we agreed to do that.

In relation to LIFA, it is true that a number of issues are still outstanding between LIFA and the Government with respect to life insurance. Therefore, the Bill makes no change to the provisions relating to life insurance—no change at all. Because LIFA did not want changes at the moment, the Government has agreed, even though 95 per cent of the industry wants the change. With respect to disability insurance, the Government proposes a move to a monthly system to meet the request of the Insurance Council of Australia.

Mr S.J. Baker interjecting:

The Hon. FRANK BLEVINS: I am not quite sure what the Deputy Leader wants. I am advised by Treasury officers that that is a fact: the Insurance Council of Australia proposed the move to a monthly system.

Mr S.J. Baker interjecting:

The Hon. FRANK BLEVINS: Why would we put pressure on? LIFA does not want monthly payments, so we have not done it. What is the difference?

Mr S.J. Baker interjecting:

The Hon. FRANK BLEVINS: I am actually looking forward to the Committee stage because, quite frankly, the Deputy Leader either has not understood or has not contacted the Insurance Council of Australia. I am looking forward to his contribution in Committee to see whether he has any information from the council that I do not have. I suspect not, but I will be pleased to see. With respect to disability insurance, the Government proposes to move to a monthly system to comply with the request of the council. The Government is not prepared to hold up this change to suit LIFA while other issues concerning LIFA are sorted out.

The more I go into this issue, the more I realise just how reasonable Treasury officers have been. I think that at some stage the issues with LIFA have to be resolved, and it may well be that that will have to occur in this Parliament, which is a pity, because with 95 per cent of the industry we can resolve these issues by negotiation. It may well be that LIFA, for some reason best known to that organisation, wants the issue resolved in this Parliament. I can assure the organisation that it will have that opportunity, because I am not prepared to run an inefficient system because LIFA chooses not to cooperate. As I said, the overwhelming majority of these changes have been brought in at the request of the industry.

Mr S.J. Baker: They are not.

The Hon. FRANK BLEVINS: The Deputy Leader says that they are not. I will be very interested to see whether he has any evidence to support that statement. He made lots—

Mr S.J. Baker interjecting:

The ACTING SPEAKER (Hon. T.H. Hemmings): Order! I ask the Deputy Leader and the Minister to refrain from having a conversation across the Chamber.

The Hon. FRANK BLEVINS: The member for Hanson made some comments in relation to the amount of revenue collected from time to time through these particular measures. I agree that it is difficult to predict. The member for Hanson went through some previous years and showed that there was a shortfall in revenue. That is quite correct. If we have a downturn in various industries, for example, we get this problem. However, I distinctly remember that when there was an upturn in the housing industry—which happened to coincide with my colleague, the member for Napier's, stewardship of the Department of Housing and Construction—there was a very significant increase in the revenue from stamp duty.

The Hon. T.H. Hemmings interjecting:

The Hon. FRANK BLEVINS: We did, indeed. But, were we praised by the Opposition and the member for Hanson for that activity, which generated that revenue? Of course not. There were headlines every other day from the previous Leader, Senator John Olsen, saying that it was absolutely outrageous. He said that the tax take in this State was climbing all the time and that it was absolutely disgraceful.

When the Premier pointed out to the previous Leader of the Opposition that this was because economic activity was at a very high level, we were told that that was rubbish. That is not the case. It is just a high tax. It seems that the Government cannot win. If its estimates are not spot on and it has a shortfall in receipts, that is because it is smashing the economy. If we have a significant increase in receipts because of increased economic activity, then we are taxing the economy to death. I am not quite sure how I should resolve the problem for the member for Hanson. However, we have been warned—I think that is a fair enough word—by the Deputy Leader of the Opposition that it will all be sorted out in Committee. In eager anticipation, I commend the second reading to the House and look forward to the Committee stage.

Bill read a second time.

In Committee.

Clause 1 passed.

Clause 2—'Commencement.'

Mr S.J. BAKER: Will the Minister explain why stamp duty on compulsory third party came into effect from 1 July 1990?

The Hon. FRANK BLEVINS: It was a decision of the Government.

Mr S.J. BAKER: Is the Minister saying that SGIC and the Government are one entity? It would seem that a number of principles are involved. One is that, if the Minister, the Government and SGIC are one entity, we need some greater explanations for some of the entrepreneurial activities in which SGIC has been involved and from which the Premier seems to want to distance himself. The second principle is that it is clearly retrospective. The Minister will realise that the Government instrumentality involved in this instance, SGIC, had no hope of collecting the money. Will the Minister explain why the decision was made?

The Hon. FRANK BLEVINS: I have nothing further to add to my previous answer. I thought that it was perfectly clear.

Mr S.J. BAKER: That is an interesting precedent that can be raised in other forums when the Minister or the Premier fails to reveal some of the trading efforts of SGIC. Clearly the Government believes that SGIC is part of its normal operations and it shall tax it and it shall place taxes upon its insurances—such as compulsory third party—at will and without any regard to the mechanisms involved, irrespective of whether they are retrospective or whether the cost can be recovered in the process. We are all aware that, come 1991, all motorists will be bearing the burden of that decision.

The Hon. FRANK BLEVINS: I cannot see what the entrepreneurial activities of SGIC have to do with this Bill. If SGIC is involved in entrepreneurial activities, that is a matter for the SGIC board. If the Government were behind SGIC and was telling it what or what not to invest in, the

first complainant would be the Deputy Leader of the Opposition, and he would be quite right to complain. The SGIC has a very responsible board, and I believe that its investments by and large are profitable. Certainly the board appears to be a much better judge of investments than many entrepreneurs in the private sector. If SGIC makes mistakes—and I do not know of any business operation that does not make a mistake from time to time—I would bet that it makes fewer mistakes than the Deputy Leader's mates. All the Deputy Leader's mates are just one step ahead of the bailiff and the courts.

Mr S.J. Baker: Your mates, not mine.

The Hon. FRANK BLEVINS: I did not want to name names.

Mr S.J. Baker interjecting:

The CHAIRMAN: Order! the Deputy Leader is out of order. The Minister will direct his remarks through the Chair and ignore the interjections.

The Hon. FRANK BLEVINS: Thank you, Mr Chairman. You are quite right. To have a go at SGIC and its entrepreneurial activities during the passage of this Bill is inappropriate, just as it would be inappropriate for me to respond in the same way by mentioning the likes of John Elliott, the President of the Liberal Party—touted as the next Prime Minister—and the saviour of the Liberal Party. What about his entrepreneurial activities? We hear the old phrase, 'You could not run a booze-up in a brewery.' I always thought that was a joke.

The CHAIRMAN: Order! The Minister is right to assume that such remarks would be irrelevant to the clause under consideration. I think that he should take his own advice.

The Hon. FRANK BLEVINS: I agree with that, but I had to make the point, reluctantly, that reference to SGIC's entrepreneurial activities has nothing to do with the Bill and only invites comment in return.

Clause passed.

Clause 3—'Interpretation.'

Mr S.J. BAKER: I move:

Page 1, line 20—After 'life insurance policies' insert 'or life company accident or sickness policies.'

After line 20—Insert definition as follows:

'life company accident or sickness policy' means any policy of insurance issued by a company registered under the Life Insurance Act 1945 of the Commonwealth other than a life insurance policy;.

The intention is not somehow to take money from the Treasury; it is simply to preserve the difference between the two forms of business. The life insurance business, as the Minister has admitted, will remain on an annual collection basis. The general insurance industry agreed to this at the request of the Premier. It did not rush to the Premier and say, 'We want to go on to a monthly payment system.' That is not true at all. The Minister is again misleading the Committee. The general insurance industry was approached by the Premier and Treasurer, who, quite candidly, said, 'We would like you to pay your premiums monthly.' That is the truth and that is what is written in a letter from the Insurance Council of Australia, if the Minister wishes to see it. The letter states:

The move to a monthly payments system was first posed by the Premier, the Hon. J.C. Bannon, on 26 May 1989.

The Hon. Frank Blevins interjecting:

Mr S.J. BAKER: That is correct. He posed the question. The letter goes on to say—and it is important to understand this—that whilst the general insurance industry accepted there was going to be a movement to monthly payments—if not tomorrow, it was to be the next day, because it had happened interstate—it was not happy about it because there would be a loss of revenue.

In discussions with Treasury officials it asked for a reduction in the rate to offset the moneys being lost by paying the monthly premiums. If the Minister had been in the job long enough, he would understand that principle. Those companies were not going to throw money holus-bolus out the window and affect their shareholders. They also knew that when we took the discounts into account extra money would be paid. They were doing the right thing by the people they were serving, and asked that, if they were to go onto monthly payments, there be some offsets. Those offsets were not given.

The general insurance industry did not rush up to the Premier and say, 'Look, we want to pay in more money—we really do and we want to go on to monthly payments—and have all our discounts taken away from us in terms of calculating taxation.' Of course, they did not do that. They simply succumbed to the changes that were taking place in the rest of Australia and fell in line, because the argument about their doing otherwise was becoming more difficult to sustain.

Let not the Minister of Finance talk about the general insurance industry rushing in to change the rules and losing money in the process. The life insurance industry has a number of concerns, as the Minister has admitted, which are appropriate and should be addressed. When they are addressed, the Minister and the Premier may get their way and have monthly payments from the insurance companies when those matters have been satisfied.

According to the letter I received from LIFA, negotiations have not stopped on those issues. I have already referred to the dishonesty of the second reading explanation. If the Minister wants another round, I will give it to him, but the second reading explanation states that the Government has agreed that life insurance companies will continue on the annual basis until agreement has been reached. Obviously, because of the anomaly that is raised here, the Minister is not keeping his or the Government's commitment.

It is quite common for life insurance companies to carry disability insurance. It can be part of the package. Not only can an insurance policy state that on the inopportune death of a person the survivors will receive a substantial pay-out of, say, $200 000, but the life insurance policies also provide a form of saving. They can provide a form of disability insurance such that, should a person be injured in such a way that he or she cannot carry on normal duties in the work force, a sustaining payment can be made.

That is part of normal life insurance business, yet the Minister, obviously, does not understand it, given the way this Bill was constructed. The Minister had given an undertaking that life insurance business would be separated until such agreement had been reached, yet in this area of commonality he says, 'Forget about the rules: I will get you through the backdoor.' I commend this amendment to the House as I think it is an important principle. The Treasury will not lose any revenue from it. It is simply keeping faith with the industry as the Minister has promised and is removing an anomaly that currently exists in the legislation.

The Hon. FRANK BLEVINS: As regards the first part of the nonsense just spoken by the Deputy Leader in relation to the Insurance Council of Australia and its desire for these changes, if I thought for one moment that the Insurance Council did not want these changes, I would not be bothering with them. If the Deputy Leader will just grow up a little and stop his silly giggling and smirking and listen, he may learn something.

Mr S.J. Baker interjecting:

The Hon. FRANK BLEVINS: If he would stop interjecting, that would be nice.

The CHAIRMAN: Order! The Chair will take the same point as the Minister.

Mr S.J. Baker interjecting:

The CHAIRMAN: Order! The Deputy Leader is out of order. The Minister of Finance.

The Hon. FRANK BLEVINS: I think that this question has been under discussion between Treasury officials, the Insurance Council of Australia and LIFA for almost two years at the request, I repeat, of the Insurance Council of Australia. If that council says that that is not the case, the people advising me will have a problem. They will receive some very serious 'please explain' requests and have apologies to proffer, but I am assured that it is to the advantage of the Insurance Council of Australia to have monthly rather than annual payments, because when there is a change of rate companies cannot go back to collect the higher rate for the previous 12 months. In this case, they have lost only a month, depending on when the higher rates applied. They lost only a month, if they have lost at all, rather than 12 months. That was a problem the council wanted dealt with—and we have dealt with it.

All these proposals are put with the full agreement of the Insurance Council of Australia. Once that agreement was reached with Treasury, initiated as I say by the Insurance Council of Australia when WorkCover came in, it was formalised by a letter from the Premier. If that is not the case—and I was advised of that about 30 seconds ago as well as long before that in dockets—the Insurance Council of Australia can contact me, because that is the advice I have been given and the advice I am giving to Parliament. I do not know what advice the Deputy Leader gets, but I can assure him that I do not mislead Parliament.

Mr S.J. Baker: You already have in that!

The Hon. FRANK BLEVINS: That's what you say.

Members interjecting:

The Hon. FRANK BLEVINS: I have read it.

The CHAIRMAN: Order! The Minister would have fewer interjections if he addressed the Chair rather than the Deputy Leader.

The Hon. FRANK BLEVINS: I cetainly would, Sir. The Government opposes the amendment. There is no reason why the life insurance companies should have any advantage over the general insurance companies. Both sections of the industry compete in a marketplace for this style of policy and insurance. If it applies to the general insurance industry, it will apply also to the life insurance industry, and there is no question about that. That is totally fair. When they are both in the marketplace selling the same product, there is a level playing field. There is no reason why the general insurance industry ought to be disadvantaged in the marketplace by this Committee's passing this amendment, and we oppose it.

Mr S.J. BAKER: The Minister is well aware that the life insurance industry is to continue paying on an annual basis. This is an element of the life insurance business. Perhaps the Minister cannot read his own words. I do not know where he went to school, but it is part of the general life insurance package under the Act. I do not know who in this House the Minister is trying to convince or whether he is trying to convince himself that he has not misled the House on at least three occasions during this debate. It is in the Federal Act.

The Hon. Frank Blevins interjecting:

Mr S.J. BAKER: That defines whether or not it is part of the life insurance business. The Minister on behalf of the Government quite clearly gave an undertaking that the life insurance business would continue to have its taxation premiums paid.

The Hon. Frank Blevins interjecting:

Mr S.J. BAKER: The Federal Act quite clearly provides that this form of insurance comes under life insurance. It is part of the packages marketed by life insurance companies. Quite clearly, the Minister has also said, as he did in the second reading explanation, that until these little anomalies are sorted out we will continue to have life insurance on an annual basis. He cannot have it both ways: either he is meeting the commitment or he is not.

Let him not mislead the Committee. If the Minister says, 'This is the way I am going to do it, irrespective of what undertakings have been given,' that will be battled out in another place, as I do not have the numbers here to force the amendment. It will be battled out in the other place, but do not let us have dishonesty in the Parliament.

The Hon. FRANK BLEVINS: I am not thick skinned, as you know, Mr Chairman. I am getting a little tired of being accused by the Deputy Leader this afternoon of dishonesty. I am not normally a student of the Standing Orders as I think these things ought to be done between reasonable people, but I am getting a little annoyed at the Deputy Leader being permitted to say I am dishonest. I do not like it. I do not know whether it is out of order, but I do not like it.

The position is that life insurance companies offer disability insurance to the market, as do general insurance companies. It is not a product that is exclusive to life insurance companies. The fact that they are permitted to offer this product under their Act has nothing whatsoever to do with the issue. And general insurance companies are permitted to offer this under the Act. But, if the Deputy Leader is saying that this disability insurance is really life insurance, it will not be affected by the Bill as it is going through. It will not be affected, because the life companies are paying on an annual basis for life insurance—for that product.

The life insurance companies cannot have it both ways. In the marketplace, they are in competition for these policies with the general insurance industry and there is absolutely no reason why they should be put in a competitive advantage by this amendment. If the Deputy Leader contacted the Insurance Council of Australia, which represents 95 per cent of the industry, I am sure that it would put him right.

Amendment negatived; clause passed.

Clause 4—'Substitution of ss.33 to 42.'

New section 33—'Annual licence required for insurance business.'

Mr S.J. BAKER: Regarding the annual licence required for insurance business, was the Minister aware when he put forward this measure that third party insurance elicits little or no stamp duty in all other States?

The Hon. FRANK BLEVINS: No comment.

Mr S.J. BAKER: I thought that was a fairly reasonable question.

The Hon. Frank Blevins: It was a stupid question.

Mr. S.J. BAKER: It was not a stupid question. The second reading explanation states:

> The rate payable on other forms of insurance (except life insurance) is 8 per cent. To forestall any possible criticism that the Government is favouring a statutory authority over its private sector competitors the rate of duty on compulsory third party policies will be raised to 8 per cent with effect from the 1991 licensing year.

That is totally dishonest, when the Minister knows that none of the other States indulge in that form of stamp duty. I ask how misleading the Minister can be in the Parliament.

The Hon. Frank Blevins: I have not misled the Parliament. I do not get—

The CHAIRMAN: Order! The Minister declined the opportunity to reply a moment ago. If he now wishes to

reply, he will have the opportunity to do so. The Minister of Finance.

The Hon. FRANK BLEVINS: What the Minister of Finance is complaining about—and, if I am wrong, if I am being ultra sensitive, Mr Chairman, please tell me, and I will stop complaining and we will deal with it in another way—is that I am constantly being told by the Deputy Leader that I am standing up here being dishonest and misleading the Parliament. I raise a point of order, then, and ask a question of the Chair: is the Deputy Leader entitled to stand up minute after minute and make these allegations? Is that acceptable? If it is, that is fine, and I will deal with the debate in that way.

The CHAIRMAN: The Minister is raising a point of order and, when he has concluded, the Chair will address it. The Minister is quite right to say that the matters are substantial allegations, and the Chair would point out to the Deputy Leader that, if he wishes to continue making references along these lines, he should take the course of moving a substantive resolution in relation to the Minister's activity or alleged activity in the House. That would be the proper course of action. The words themselves are not unparliamentary but, if the Minister objects—and he has now done so—the Chair points out to the Deputy Leader that that would be the best and most proper course to follow.

Mr S.J. BAKER: I thought that this was indeed the proper course of action. If the Minister had some reservations about the way in which he has been addressed, he should have raised an objection. He has now done so. I believe that the point has been made and there is no point of apology. I simply do not need to refer back to the matters raised; I have emphasised them on several occasions and those matters will not be pursued. I will simply be asking questions to elicit certain information as to how the legislation will operate from here on.

The Hon. FRANK BLEVINS: I am very pleased to hear the Deputy Leader say that he accepts your ruling, Sir, and that he will not pursue that tone of debate again. As I said, I apologise if I did not take the various points of order at the appropriate time. That is because, normally, I treat the Deputy Leader as he behaves—like a schoolboy—and ignore him. I think that at some stage, the persistent schoolboy (and, at times, he develops an undergraduate attitude) has from time to time to be corrected.

New section agreed to.

New section 34—'Application for annual licence.'

Mr S.J. BAKER: What a patronising contribution from the Minister.

The CHAIRMAN: Order! Will the honourable member please return to new section 34.

Mr S.J. BAKER: Thank you, Sir, I will. If a company wishes to set up an assurance or insurance business in this State, what procedure is followed? Before that person starts business, must they register that business?

The Hon. FRANK BLEVINS: I assume so. Before anybody starts a business as an assurance or insurance company, I assume that this is the case. However, if the Deputy Leader wants a full report from the Department of Corporate Affairs as to how one goes about this, I will certainly get it for him, but I would have thought that a simple inquiry from one of his colleagues here would fix it up.

Mr S.J. BAKER: I intended to ask a further question, because the new section provides that, on application, the person has to pay the requisite duty, if any. Is any fee involved at the point of application or is no fee applicable until the annual licence is due, at which time the full period until the end of December is catered for in the licence fee?

The Hon. FRANK BLEVINS: The Bill provides that it is possible to carry on business in this way until one is licensed and the licence fee is paid. It is an annual licence. Maybe I am being particularly dense; that is not impossible. I would like a more detailed, longer explanation of the point that the Deputy Leader is trying to make. I do not believe he knows what he is talking about. So, if he can flesh it out a bit, perhaps we can grasp the point he is trying to make.

Mr S.J. BAKER: There is no catch to the question; it is only for my own information. All I was trying to find out was how the system would operate. If, for example, Joe Blow Insurance Company wanted to set up in South Australia, would Joe Blow put in an application form the moment he arrives? Would he or the company have to pay a fee at that stage? Does Joe Blow walk into the State and say that he is continuing his insurance business until the annual licence fee is due, at which time he makes application? I am simply asking what is the sequence of events.

The Hon. FRANK BLEVINS: Yes, Joe Blow has to take out a licence and pay a licence fee, which is a flat fee. When he conducts the business, whatever the appropriate fee is on the business, he pays it.

New section agreed to.

New section 35—'Issuing and term of annual licence.'

Mr S.J. BAKER: This section talks about the annual licence. Everyone has to have a general licence, yet general insurance requires monthly returns. Does general insurance require an annual licence by reapplying each year as well, even though it does not have to pay duty annually?

The Hon. FRANK BLEVINS: Yes.

New section agreed to.

New section 36—'Monthly returns in respect of general insurance business.'

Mr S.J. BAKER: Within 15 days a general insurance company has to calculate its income from the various forms of insurance and pay the moneys due to the Commissioner. Under the annual licence system there was a two month grace period (I think it had to be paid by 28 February): has there been any discussion about the problem of getting accurate measures of the monthly sums by that time?

The Hon. FRANK BLEVINS: I understand that it is a 15 day grace period a month, rather than a two months grace period for 12 months. It seems to be a good deal and perhaps we ought to have another look at it. I understand that the ICA is very happy with it, as it ought to be.

New section agreed to.

New sections 37 to 39 agreed to.

New section 40—'Default assessments.'

Mr S.J. BAKER: What is the period after which one fails to lodge an application or put in a monthly return before the default provisions are brought into play? I cannot find where it is stated.

The Hon. FRANK BLEVINS: The default comes into effect when a 'company fails to lodge an application for an annual licence, or a monthly return, as required under this Act or has failed to pay any duty or has paid insufficient duty on an annual licence or monthly return under this Act'.

Mr S.J. BAKER: How many days pass before the computer spits out that the return has not been made? How long is it before the matter is pursued? What is the normal grace period that applies?

The Hon. FRANK BLEVINS: People will have to comply with the section, which provides:

> Where the Commissioner has reason to believe or suspect . . .

As soon as that has been established, it comes into play.

New section agreed to.

New section 41—'Further duty by way of penalty.'

Mr S.J. BAKER: Does this mean that after 15 days in a month, if an insurance company has failed to pay, a double penalty is imposed?

The Hon. FRANK BLEVINS: That will be a decision by the Commissioner in accordance with the Act.

Mr S.J. BAKER: Can the Minister say how many defaults have occurred in the past three years? The Minister can take the question on notice. Can he tell me what time frame will be involved and what penalties have been imposed?

The Hon. FRANK BLEVINS: The Deputy Leader has gone from the Bill and now refers to the previous system. Under this legislation obviously there are none, because it is not yet through. I will have the Commissioner go through the records and see that the Deputy Leader is notified of the precise number, although for what reason I have no idea. That is the most useless piece of information asked for today.

New section agreed to.

New section 42—'Refund of overpaid duty.'

Mr S.J. BAKER: Previously, there was a three month grace period, and now there is to be a three year grace period under which people can reclaim money overpaid. Is there any reason for this change?

The Hon. FRANK BLEVINS: The Government felt that three months was too short. It thought three years was an appropriate period. There were some discussions with the industry about what was an appropriate length of time. I do not hear anyone complain; I think everyone is happy about that.

New section agreed to; clause passed.

Clause 5—'Amendment of second schedule.'

The CHAIRMAN: Does the Deputy Leader wish to proceed with his amendment to clause 5?

Mr S.J. BAKER: No, Sir, I will not proceed with that amendment. I have made sufficient points on this matter. However, I wish to refer to a letter from the Royal Automobile Association dealing with the increase from $3 to $15 for the certificate. Mr Fotheringham, Chief Executive, RAA, states:

> The decision to increase stamp duty on compulsory third party bodily injury insurance policies from $3 to $15 will impact all motor vehicle owners at the time of registration renewal. The best that can be said about this increase is that the fee has not been varied since 1974 and at least the proceeds go towards the health system. However, the increase is equivalent to 21 per cent and 11 per cent increases in registration fees on four cylinder and six cylinder cars respectively.
>
> The proposal to increase the duty payable by SGIC on compulsory third party bodily injury insurance premiums from .5 per cent to 8 per cent will have either a direct or indirect effect on all motor vehicle owners. If the increase is passed on in the form of higher insurance premiums we estimate that, on average, owners will pay about an extra $14 per year. The RAA considers that the third party bodily injury insurance fund is sufficiently healthy to absorb the increased duty and has called for the fund to absorb the increased cost.

It does that for one year. The letter continues:

> Even if the cost is absorbed it would mean that further possible decreases in bodily injury insurance premiums which might have been expected will not occur.

What the RAA has correctly observed is that, because of the common law application to third party bodily insurance, the fund is now making a profit and there was some perception that that profit would lead to lower compulsory third party premiums in the longer term. With this introduction of stamp duty, that obviously will not occur. I simply reiterate the point made by the RAA about the long-suffering motorist.

The Hon. FRANK BLEVINS: As a long-suffering motorist myself, I also do not like increases in motoring charges but, again, I make the point that in these areas South Australia is the second lowest taxing State in the Commonwealth. We are well below, for example, New South Wales. The registration charges in New South Wales are a great deal higher than in South Australia, as are petrol prices and petroleum duty.

I did not notice in the letter from the RAA, under the signature of John Fotheringham, any of these things mentioned—it was very selective. The motorists in this State pay less into the State coffers than do those in New South Wales. I assure Mr Fotheringham and the Deputy Leader that that is the case. As a long suffering motorist I am pleased that I am suffering in this State rather than in some other States. I would be pleased if Mr Fotheringham would give credit where credit is due. In this State we have kept down charges. This charge has not increased since 1974. The increase has been only at the CPI rate since then. Credit ought to be given where credit is due.

Clause passed.

Clause 6—'Repeal of third schedule.'

Mr S.J. BAKER: This question also relates to clause 4. We note that the Commissioner now has a free reign to determine his or her own forms. This should have been raised as a matter of principle earlier. I feel far more comfortable with the form being prescribed under the Act than I do about the Commissioner making up his or her mind in the process. If that form is not properly filled out a penalty will be suffered by the offending firm. As it is under the control of the Commissioner, it could contain a request for a large amount of detail. Whilst the current Commissioner is in place, I do not expect that to be the case, but legislation should control any possible excesses. I am not sure in my own mind that this is a step in the right direction.

The Hon. FRANK BLEVINS: Any time that this Government has attempted to bring in a deregulatory measure, it has been opposed by the Opposition. It is no surprise that it opposes this issue: it opposes any progress in the area of deregulation—it cannot cope with it.

Mr S.J. BAKER: A form is still required to be issued by the Commissioner. It does not take away that form or say that we will not have any more forms. If the Minister wants to understand it, deregulation means less regulation by which people have to live, particularly people out there paying the bills. They still have to fill out the form and there could be more regulation because the requirements could be more extensive as required by the Commissioner and the Parliament. If the Minister wishes to argue deregulation, he should get it right.

The Hon. FRANK BLEVINS: I have heard the same arguments in principle with regard to eggs, potatoes and milk. When anything that comes into this place with any deregulatory flavour at all, we hear all about those who benefit from the regulations or who can get at the consumer. They only have to knock on the door of members opposite and say that they will lose this advantage or that and we find not a principle in sight and they oppose it.

Clause passed.

Clause 7—'Transitional provisions.'

Mr S.J. BAKER: I request a simple explanation from the Minister on how the payment will work for this year, remembering that the general insurance companies have paid in February for their 1990 licence, but the premiums upon which the stamp duty has been paid ended at 31 December 1989. What will be the first payment required, when will it be required and what period will it cover?

The Hon. FRANK BLEVINS: There is a transition period, as has been mentioned by the Deputy Leader, and it is quite clear. After this provision is enacted, upon the fifteenth of the following month they make their first monthly payment.

Mr S.J. BAKER: I am either dense or simply unable to comprehend something. I am trying to understand whether the first payment will comprise five, six, seven, eight or nine months of stamp duty on premiums. The clause provides:

7. Where a company, person or firm of persons carried on general insurance business before the enactment of this Act, the company, person or firm—

(a) is required to lodge monthly returns only in relation to general insurance business carried on by it on or after 1 July 1990.

I do not know what has happened to the first six months of 1990. The clause further provides:

(b) will be taken to have complied with the requirements of section 36 (1) of the principal Act, as amended by this Act, in relation to the period from 1 July 1990, until the enactment of this Act if the monthly returns required in relation to that period are lodged with the Commissioner not later than the fifteenth day of the month commencing after the enactment of this Act.

The latter part is not a problem. Obviously from 1 July to 30 October, for example, if enacted before that time, that period of return will have to be provided to the Commissioner within 15 days or by 15 November. Will the Minister explain what has happened for the first six months of this year from January to June, because the February stamp duty covered premiums until 31 December 1989?

The Hon. FRANK BLEVINS: A return will not be required for that period.

Mr S.J. BAKER: Is that correct?

The Hon. FRANK BLEVINS: So I am advised.

Mr S.J. BAKER: I am quite delighted that the taxpayers will be saved a considerable sum of money. I am quite happy with the provision under those circumstances. It is unusual, but I am delighted.

Clause passed.

Title passed.

Bill read third time and passed.

EVIDENCE ACT AMENDMENT BILL

Received from the Legislative Council and read a first time.

ADJOURNMENT

The Hon. FRANK BLEVINS (Minister of Transport): I move:

That the House do now adjourn.

Mr BECKER (Hanson): I wish to bring to the attention of the House probably one of the most disgusting and disgraceful situations that has occurred in this State for many years. This has occurred because of the incompetence of the Minister for the Arts. The Philip Morris company wrote to the Minister of Health and sent a copy of the letter to the Minister for the Arts on 12 January 1990. The letter states:

As part of our company's commitment to the support and promotion of performing arts, Philip Morris has sponsored, for a number of years, a series of jazz bands which have performed widely throughout the world. In 1989 the emphasis was on big band sound and an orchestra of 18 of the world's finest jazz musicians, led by Gene Harris and including Australia's own James Morrison, received critical acclaim in each of the 16 countries in which it played. Four highly successful concerts were held in Australia at the Sydney Entertainment Centre, Queensland Performing Arts Centre, Victorian Arts Centre and Burswood Island Resort and Casino in Perth. In 1990, we will again be providing corporate sponsorship of a jazz band of international repute on a world tour. It is hoped that this band will include Ray Charles and B.B. King.

In fact, the band is currently touring Australia as part of a 16 nation world tour. Ray Charles and B.B. King are performing in the band and, of course, James Morrison, an Australian, has been invited to appear with them and has again received outstanding critiques from these great musicians. In other words, we are witnessing in Australia a legend in our time as far as jazz musicians are concerned. The letter goes on:

It is proposed that the 1990 world tour will incorporate a series of concerts throughout Australia and we are hopeful that included in this program will be a one night concert at a major concert centre in Adelaide.

I believe that that is the Thebarton Town Hall. The letter further states:

We understand that the Tobacco Products Control Act 1986 as amended by the Tobacco Products Control Act Amendment Act 1988 enables the Minister responsible to grant a specific exemption to the general prohibition to enable the performance of a tobacco company sponsored event. We are desirous of applying for such an exemption to enable the performance of a one-off concert in Adelaide, which, if granted, is presently planned for some time in September 1990.

As it turned out, it was October. That letter, dated 12 January, was addressed to the Minister of Health, and a copy of the letter was sent to the Minister for the Arts. As has been recorded, a letter was sent to the Minister for the Arts requesting an appointment on 25 January. A representative of Philip Morris telephoned the Minister's office from Perth on 30 January chasing up an appointment to coincide with a visit to Adelaide of one of the staff on 2 February. Of course, the Minister for the Arts was not available.

The Minister of Health replied to Philip Morris on 8 February, stating that he was advising the Minister for the Arts. On 16 February Philip Morris wrote to the Minister of Health stressing the urgency of the matter. There was a series of phone calls and letters and by 6 April the Minister for the Arts finally got around to attending to the situation. This is where the most disgusting and disgraceful performance of a Government, let alone a Government Minister, occurred. The Minister for the Arts wrote to the Corporate Affairs Manager of Philip Morris on 5 April in the following terms:

I refer to your letter of 26 March 1990, received on 2 April 1990, concerning your request for exemption under the Tobacco Products Control Act in respect of a proposed concert by the Philip Morris Superband in October this year. I am surprised at your presumption that your request has been denied; this is certainly not the case. On receipt of the necessary additional information from you in late February, officers of the Department for the Arts prepared a report to me on the request, and the Minister of Health will advise me early next week of his views, as required under the Act.

I therefore expect to be in a position to make a recommendation to State Cabinet in the near future and a formal response should be forwarded to you in late April. Would you therefore please advise me as a matter of urgency whether you wish to proceed with the application for exemption.

The point being made here is that, again, the South Australian public have missed out on the opportunity to hear and see one of the greatest bands in the world. They have also missed out on the opportunity to hear and see some of the greatest jazz musicians that have ever come out of America, let alone Australia's own James Morrison. It is very disappointing to think that, under this stupid Tobacco Products Control Act, any company, be it a tobacco company or whatever, must apply to the Minister for the Arts who then must confer with the Minister of Health about whether an exemption can be granted for, in this case, Philip Morris to sponsor a band to perform in Adelaide.

The band is currently touring Australia and has appeared in every major mainland capital city, except Adelaide. We have missed out again; we have missed out on the opportunity to hold this concert. However, the most incredible situation is that the company wrote to the Ministers on 12 January, yet come 5 April no-one had put up a submission to Cabinet seeking the exemption. The Minister for the Arts seems to be about as good as the Minister of Health who, in his typical hapless manner, did very little about it at all. If this is the way that the Government operates to accommodate organisations that seek Government approval to bring performances to Adelaide, is it any wonder that the arts people are extremely critical of the Government, the Minister and Foundation South Australia?

It all comes back to the stupid Tobacco Products Control Act. In one respect Parliament thought it was doing the right thing and in another respect it has created a stupid, gigantic, idiotic monster. The freedom of choice and the freedom of opportunity has been lost. The Philip Morris company organised a band and sponsored a function to give people the opportunity, at a reasonable cost, to hear, see and enjoy great musicians—legends in their era—as part of a 16 nation world tour. However, when it comes to little old Adelaide, with a population of just over one million people, they cannot perform here. What sort of laughing stock are we making of our State and country, let alone our city?

I thought we were trying to sell Adelaide and South Australia to the Americans, the Europeans and the Asians as a great place to visit, promoting our great lifestyle. In fact, we have a magnificent lifestyle: we have everything available and every opportunity to enjoy an extremely good standard of living. Adelaide should be the corporate city of Australia. Given the way that the Victorians have performed of late, we ought to be in a position now to become the financial centre of Australia. We can do it. We have the land, we have a central business district that is not overcrowded, we have good, sane, sensible planning laws. If any company wants to come in to develop in this State, making proper approaches through the Government and through local government, it can be done, and it has been done. When one looks at the square mile of the city of Adelaide, one sees that there has been no problem with the development of multi-storey buildings and whatever.

It is up to anybody and everybody; the opportunity is there. The Government must realise that the Minister for the Arts, for whom I have tremendous respect (I thought she would have been a better performer as a Minister than she was as President of the Legislative Council) has failed us badly. She has let down the people of South Australia. Her performance has been disappointing. The Minister of Health, the Deputy Premier—I call him hapless Hopgood—is not with it of late. He is a jazz musician; he loves it. He tries to play the trumpet. He still practises in this building and we put up with it. Why could the Government not have cooperated and let us witness this concept?

The DEPUTY SPEAKER: Order! The member for Peake.

Mr HERON (Peake): During the short time that I have been in this House I have heard the word 'privatisation' used quite frequently, especially by members on the Opposition benches. I was aghast to hear the Leader of the Opposition, in his speech to this House on Wednesday 5 September, outline the various Government areas that he says should be privatised.

I am not against competition. Competition in most areas improves efficiency and can mean lower prices. But in areas such as water, sewerage, electricity and telecommunications, where huge investment is required to establish the basic service, once the system is in place the cost of each service declines, especially in highly populated areas. That means that it is cheaper to have one provider, and that is why we do not have two sets of water pipes, two sets of electricity lines or two sets of gas pipes.

I do not think that members opposite understand the ramifications of privatisation, so I will explain to them using Telecom as a scenario. In world terms, Australia is a small market in telecommunications. Countries such as Canada, the United States of America and the United Kingdom have privatised their telecommunications systems. If we compare current charges in Australia with other so-called competitive markets, we discover that most consumers in those countries are worse off.

What must be taken into consideration when debating this issue in comparison with other countries which have privatised their systems is Australia's vast distances and smaller population. In terms of relative land areas, Australia is similar in size to the USA and a little larger than Western Europe. Also, the United Kingdom would fit into Victoria. I mention the land area to members because the size of the land in relation to the size of the telecommunications market of Australia, as well as the difference in population compared with those countries, means that Australia is a small market in world terms and that Telecom Australia's customers are spread at least twice as thin as those of any other major telecommunications provider.

I refer to the cost of a local telephone call: if we compare current charges in Australia with other countries—so-called competitive markets—we discover that consumers in those countries are worse off. In the USA, $5.90 is charged for a three-minute peak time call within a distance of 500 kilometres. In Australia the charge is $1.17. American users are also charged for engaged and unanswered calls. The same goes for rentals, with Australia at $139 compared with $358 in the USA.

If we compare American prices with Telecom's for calls over a distance of 26 kilometres from, say, Adelaide to Elizabeth (using the Washington DC rate), for a 3-minute call the charge in Australia is 21 cents, whereas in Washington it is $1.21. For a 5-minute call, the charge in Australia is 21 cents compared with $1.83 in Washington. For a 10-minute call, the charge in Australia is 21 cents compared with $3.44 in Washington.

The Director of the Consumer Federation of America, Mr Gene Kimmelman, when talking on telephone charges after deregulation, said:

> Had traditional pricing policies been maintained, consumers would be saving between $1 billion and $2 billion a year in overall telephone bills.

Now let me tell members opposite what happened when they privatised telecommunications in the United Kingdom and Canada. The British Telecom local rate, with timed local calls, costs the consumer 95 cents for a 10-minute call, whereas in Australia we pay 21 cents for a 3-minute or a 30-minute telephone call.

What about the Canadian situation when they privatised? Let us take Vancouver, for instance. Telephone calls are free, but the free calls are only for close by subscribers; and, as in America, Canadian users must also pay for incoming calls received. Other urban calls are anything but free. For a call from, say, Aldergrove to West Vancouver, which is about the same distance as from Adelaide to Elizabeth, the consumer pays 24 cents a minute. This puts the proportion of calls which are free into the right perspective. I suggest that members opposite, especially those in rural areas, who support privatisation would have a hard time convincing their electorates to pay 24 cents per minute for a local

telephone call. If Telecom were privatised in Australia, consumers would be much worse off financially. Not only would they be out of pocket, but the service to the system would deteriorate drastically.

Let me quote what the manager of an American telephone company said if Australia privatised its telecommunications system. His company, American Telephone and Telegraph, would be in like a shot. He said:

> I would be the first to get in at the cream. I would put in a microwave link between Sydney, Melbourne and Brisbane. We would establish our own towers and undercut Telecom, because we would not have to provide for the little old lady in the bush. We would make a healthy profit.

We can see what the attitude of private employers is and why they want to get into the industry. What really happens is that no one company is responsible for things that go wrong. The result is increasing pain and suffering for customers, business in particular, who cannot get the service that they need when they want it. Telephone companies form joint ventures with Asian companies which manufacture the telephones cheaply in Asia and then import them back into the United States. More than 25 000 jobs were lost in America when phone production was shifted to South-East Asia.

If Telecom were privatised in Australia, two, three or maybe four companies would be involved in installation and maintenance and the result, naturally, would be massive coordination problems and an adverse impact on costs and service to subscribers. Maintenance would involve call-out charges by contractors, who may not be able to find the fault. Private companies want to compete only in the most profitable areas of the market, which means that STD calls between large capital cities would be used mostly by business. In Australia, with our vast distances and small population, this would mean that the majority of consumers would face higher prices. Privatising Telecom in Australia can only increase charges to the consumer and give a poorer service, especially to those outside the metropolitan area.

The Hon. T.H. HEMMINGS (Napier): I wish to take this opportunity to apologise to the House for my outrageous and sometimes reprehensible behaviour over the past 10 months, in particular to three members opposite. It has not been easy for me to make this decision to apologise, but I hope that what I have to say will be received by all members with some understanding of the private hell I have been through, with some compassion and, hopefully, with a fair degree of forgiveness.

Ten months ago I set out systematically to destroy the credibility of the two most senior members of the Liberal Party, purely on selfish grounds. I assumed—quite wrongly, I have since come to realise—that it was in my power as an individual in this Parliament to dictate who should or should not lead the Liberal Party in this State. It is a well known fact that I prefer the member for Bragg as Leader and the member for Coles as his Deputy, and I set out quite mischievously to achieve those ends. How arrogant can one be! Events over the past six months have, unfortunately, proved that what I wanted to occur will, in effect, occur.

I suppose that I can claim some credit for that. However, considering this and the resultant bad publicity to those two individuals has not given me much pleasure: in fact, it has become a living hell. I wish to apologise publicly to the Leader and the Deputy Leader for what I have done. What right have I to impose my will on the Liberal Party? And I apologise.

How did I go about this awful strategy? First, dealing with the Leader, I continually harped on his being a discount cut flower dealer, which was totally wrong. I mentioned many times about the Leader's being under emotional stress and being tired—again, not really cricket. I have continually brought up his allegations about the propriety of a certain marina developer from Victoria—again, nothing whatsoever to do with me. I say quite sincerely to the Leader of the Opposition: no more will I ever mention those things in this House again.

Concerning the Deputy Leader, I continually carried on about his sole contribution to that exalted position being the purchase of two new suits and a gold watch. How churlish of me! If the Deputy Leader wants to do such things and deck himself out in such finery, what business is it of mine? In fact, what business is it of anyone in this House?

My colleague the member for Henley Beach, who is my conscience and my mentor, informs me that I have called the Deputy Leader a wally 56 times and a whacker 68 times. That is just not on! I hereby pledge to the Deputy Leader that never ever again in this House will I call him such names as a wally or a whacker. It is totally uncalled for and, whilst the words may be acceptable within the Standing Orders, I have come to realise that they are very unparliamentary.

Whilst I still prefer the member for Bragg as Leader and the member for Coles as Deputy Leader of the Liberal Party, so what? If the Liberal Party wants the present leadership, that is its business, not mine or that of the members on this side. If it wants to go down that track, that is its business. Until it changes its mind—and I hope that it does, and I say that quite sincerely, without reflecting on the Leader and Deputy Leader—it is nothing to do with me as an individual.

I come now to the third person whom I have continually maligned in this place—the member for Murray-Mallee. I suppose that I have given some thin motive for my attacks on the Leader and the Deputy Leader, but I ask this House and you, Sir, what has prompted me to attempt to destroy the member for Murray-Mallee? He has shown himself to be no threat to the member for Bragg, so why should I pick on him?

Perhaps it is because I fear his intellectual superiority. Perhaps, as a very small person, I fear his height. I have struggled with this dilemma and confess that I have no excuse to put forward to the House. What have I said to the member for Murray-Mallee to cause him such hurt, and what prompts me to make this unprecedented, I think, statement to confess my sins publicly here this afternoon?

On countless occasions—too many times, as far as I am concerned—when the member for Murray-Mallee has been acting in a slightly eccentric way, I have suggested that he take his valium tablet. It was totally uncalled for. What right do I have to suggest that the member for Murray-Mallee be placed on medication? Also, I sadly confess that on numerous occasions I have asked that a straightjacket be supplied to the member for Murray-Mallee.

Mr S.J. BAKER: On a point of order, Mr Speaker, I find this whole contribution quite repugnant and in absolutely poor taste. This Parliament is not here to listen to this garbage and drivel. It is demeaning to everyone in this House. If the honourable member wishes to carry on with that, we will, indeed, carry on—

The SPEAKER: Order! The honourable member is out of order. I understand the honourable member's point of order. I have gone through the Standing Orders while listening, but the difficulty in this matter for the Chair is that the honourable member appears to be making a serious contribution. It is couched in the terms of an apology for his actions, and it is very difficult for the Chair. In relation to Standing Order 127, I am afraid that I cannot uphold

that point of order at this time, because there is no subject matter—

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order—in the context of the Standing Order for a debate, the Chair means. There is no imputation of improper motives, it is an apology for the actions of the honourable member himself, and the personal reflections are for the purpose of apologising. I understand the attitude of the Deputy Leader, but I do not see how the rule applies.

Mr OSWALD: On a point of order, Mr Speaker, I refer to Standing Order 127. There is no doubt to anyone in this Chamber that the honourable member opposite is using a technique of reversing the direction of the debate and, given a statement he made in relation to valium and the choice of words he used, that alone was a most outrageous statement to make about any member. It was made in such a manner as to bring to the fore statements the honourable member with his perverse humour has made in the past. He has belittled the member for Murray-Mallee and should be condemned for it.

The SPEAKER: The honourable member will resume his seat. Of course, the House has the ability to do that. Unfortunately, despite the words being offensive to members, in the context in which they were put they do not relate to reflection. The honourable member is apologising for his actions. The member for Napier.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order! The member for Playford is out of order. While the Speaker is on his feet, any person interjecting is out of order. The honourable member for Hanson.

Mr BECKER: I rise on a point of order, Sir. I seek your ruling in relation to the reading of speeches. Previous practice was that it was not permitted to read speeches in toto in the House.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order!

Mr BECKER: Don't you ever threaten me.

The SPEAKER: Order!

Mr BECKER: Don't ever try.

Members interjecting:

Mr BECKER: I am not being very careful, because I do not read my speeches.

The SPEAKER: Order! The member for Hanson will address his remarks through the Chair.

Mr BECKER: The ruling I seek from you, Mr Speaker, is in relation to the reading of speeches. The practice in the past few weeks has been that most speeches have been read.

The SPEAKER: I take the point of order. The honourable member is correct; the reading of speeches is out of order. The Chair has no knowledge of the particular speech. As far as the Chair is concerned, the honourable member, as many other members do, may be referring to copious notes, but the point is correct: the reading of speeches is out of order.

Motion carried.

At 5.26 p.m. the House adjourned until Tuesday 23 October at 2 p.m.